

THE
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

JANUARY, 1821.

Communications.

Revelation accordant with Reason.

Paganism in ancient and modern times, is equally calculated to enhance the guilt, and multiply the miseries of men. Mahometanism, though grafted upon revelation, is a monstrous corruption, evidently aiming at political subjugation, and the debasement of the human mind. The philosophy of Zeno had little influence upon the world; and that of Epicurus rendered its votaries addicted to the vilest practices. The schemes of modern infidelity have derived their lustre from light purloined from the gospel; they are, in all their forms, the offspring of prejudice and pride, and exist by excluding the truth.

Having the idea of God, our reason can establish the truth of his existence, ascertain many of his perfections, natural and moral, discern our dependance on and obligations to him, and discover outlines of his law, or rules of moral conduct, which we ought to pursue. Those, who are not able to think, or speak clearly of the nature of virtue, and the origin of vice, can nevertheless distinguish right from wrong, and feel a sense or consciousness of guilt, as well as infer from their miseries, a state of opposition to the Creator. In apostasy, it is fit we should be separated from holy and happy beings, and deprived of the sensible presence of the perfectly pure and holy God.

The degradation of an innocent creature implies losses which are immense. Immured in the dark prison of the body, we are excluded from intercourse with separate spirits, and justly treated as convicts, banished from the presence of the Judge. Repentance and faith are at best an imperfect righteousness, and accompanied by propensities to sin, which deserve misery and death.

Against death, the probable evidence of immortality affords, to mere human reason, very slight grounds of comfort. Without a hereafter, man is indeed a mystery; justice has failed; the idea of a future life a tantalizing evil; the faculties of the human mind are misplaced and useless. Yet immortality admitted, a future state, without a revelation, must fill the mind with fearful apprehensions. For although justice requires a distinction to be made between characters, yet the universality of guilt, and the strictness of the claims of justice, seem to exclude hope.

Reason admits, that he who formed the mind, can reveal himself to it; and that he may, if he chooses, remove our uncertainties and fears. The goodness of the Creator, evinced by our present comforts, and even the miseries of man warrant some expectation, that he would do this. The books, which claim the character of a revelation, receive the fullest support from the history of past ages, the manners and languages of the nations. The simplicity of their unadorned narratives, their impar-

veringly studied by all who wish to obtain a clear and comprehensive knowledge of revealed truth. Those who neglect it will derive but little profit from the ministry of the word; they come with minds unprepared to hear to advantage discourses founded on passages of holy scripture. The very gift of such a book imposes on all who possess it an obligation to read and study its marvellous contents. The Bereans were commended for their diligence in comparing the addresses of Paul with the records of inspirations, to discover whether he taught true and sound doctrine. Acts, xvii. 11. Our Lord commanded the Jews, and consequently all to whom his command comes, to "search the scriptures." John, v. 35.

The scriptures, although written in perspicuous language, yet in many places need elucidation; and for the assistance of his people the Lord has furnished the writings of able divines, as well as the preaching of his ministers in general. These writings, in different forms, from the pamphlet to the folio, are a treasure to his church. All Christians should, as far as their means and opportunities for reading will allow, derive aid from these writings in their study of the Bible. Some have not leisure to peruse large volumes, but who cannot spare from his necessary avocations time enough to read a magazine, a monthly pamphlet comprising but a few pages?

Reading and hearing must be combined in the search for truth. The two great avenues of knowledge are the *ear* and the *eye*. The Lord is pleased to instruct his people through the medium of both; he addresses the ear by the preaching of his word, and the eye by his written word and the writings of learned divines.

"Buy the truth and sell it not."
"Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting get understanding.

Exalt her, and she shall promote thee; she shall bring thee to honour when thou dost embrace her. She shall give to thine head an ornament of grace; a crown of glory shall she deliver to thee." "My son, if thou wilt receive my words, and hide my commandments with thee; so that thou incline thine ear unto wisdom, and apply thine heart to understanding; yea, if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver and searchest for her as for hid treasures: then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God. For the Lord giveth wisdom; out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous: he is a buckler to them that walk uprightly. He keepeth the paths of judgment, and preserveth his saints. Then shalt thou understand righteousness, and judgment, and equity; yea, every good path." Prov. xxiii. 23. iv. 5—9. ii. 1—9.

J. J. J.

Remarks on the Duration of Future Punishment.

Few have denied, that man is an accountable being. The awful lapse of our race, and the consequent moral deterioration of our nature, are also admitted by a large proportion of professing Christians. Any plan calculated efficaciously to heal the breach, make reconciliation for transgression, and thus reinstate in the favour of heaven, must be an object of universal interest. Such a plan *Jehovah* has revealed. What it is, is a question of vast moment. The discrepancy among Christians about its nature, character and extent, has been proportioned to the magnitude of its importance. These have been subjects of tedious and accrimonious litigation. To examine closely, and reason dispassionately is more easily proposed, than executed. To discuss topics

of such mighty interest, *suaviter in modo*, and at the same time *fortiter in re*, is rather a rare attainment. A contrary course, however, does not fail to meet condign punishment, as its own legitimate offspring; inasmuch as the imbecility of argument, is usually proportioned to the acrimony of feeling. I dare not anticipate exemption from the error I now most cordially reprobate, while I present some few thoughts on the topic of universal salvation.

That all human beings, however wicked in the present life, nay, that all created intelligences, however diabolical in their nature and practice, shall be ultimately introduced to eternal felicity, or at least, by annihilation, be freed from pain, is a doctrine so fascinating to sinful creatures, that it is not at all surprising, it should have numerous votaries. Reason and revelation have been laid under contribution in support of it. On this question, "I also will show my opinion."

It may be proper, here to give notice, that in the progress of this discussion, I shall assume as a fact, that *justice* is a *natural* and *necessary* attribute of *Jehovah*; that this attribute is inexorable; that it *must* pursue its enemy, and punish its victim; that any compromise with mercy, would leave it no longer immaculate; in a word, that *Jehovah* can as soon cease to *be*, as he can cease to be *just*. Having mentioned these postulates, I shall proceed to show, that if the punishment of sin be not eternal, its limitation to a definite period, must arise either from *personal* expiation, or *vicarious* atonement, or *blank* annihilation. I can form no conception of any other mode of its termination. If, therefore, it can be demonstrated, that the termination of punishment pleaded for by Universalists, cannot arise from any of these three causes, I shall have no hesitation to pronounce it *eternal*. Salvation must be *just*. To aspire

VOL. I.

to an introduction to the beatific vision, in the mansions of immortality, on any other footing, would be utterly incompatible with the very first maxim of both natural and revealed religion: "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Otherwise, what guaranty could we have for the continuance of the possession? If smuggled into the celestial mansions, at the expense of justice, the first impulse of rectitude would direct to an immediate expulsion. Righteousness, therefore, either *personal* or *vicarious*, must establish the claim, and procure the admission. Sin and misery, righteousness and felicity, are necessarily connected by an immutable law: consequently, those destitute of a *legal* righteousness, either *personal* or *vicarious*, have no alternative remaining between eternal punishment and gloomy annihilation.

I shall now proceed to the examination of the merits of each of these *three* ways of escaping eternal punishment. And in the *first* place, I shall endeavour to show the utter impossibility of enjoying eternal felicity by virtue of our *own personal* righteousness. If I succeed in this, it will evidently follow, that there will remain no other way of escaping eternal vengeance, than by a vicarious righteousness, or utter annihilation.

That eternal happiness cannot be obtained by personal merit, I shall attempt to establish in the following manner:

1. Mankind are sinners. Alas! all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God. This is a truth of awful import, and doleful notoriety! There is none righteous: no, not one! The imaginations of the thoughts of the heart, are only evil continually. The matter of fact, and the universality of our apostasy from God, are amply attested by the Holy Ghost. With this testimony, our own experience perfectly coincides; so that, "If we say;

we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." The history of man, is a history of depravity, and its necessary concomitants, lamentation, mourning and wo! The existence of these phenomena in the moral empire of *Jehovah*, are utterly inexplicable on any other principle, than that of rebellion against our rightful sovereign. The matter of fact is indisputable, "Sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" however difficult it may be to account for its introduction into a system previously immaculate.

2. *God is just.* That justice is an essential inherent attribute of the Deity, is as capable of demonstration, as is his existence. The volume of Providence, the most categorical declarations of scripture, and particularly the agonizing crucifixion of our blessed Lord, as the substitute for sinners, when the sword of vengeance was unsheathed against the man who was *Jehovah's* fellow, and pierced the inmost soul of the Son of God; these I say, all, all demonstrate that God is inexorably just. "Justice and judgment constitute the habitation of his throne." If, therefore, the divine law be violated, the offender *must* be punished, either personally, or by his representative. Justice will retain the devoted victim in its grasp, until it has received the last farthing. The righteous and the wicked are alike the objects of its operation. It is the very *cement* of the universe, without which it must instantly be converted into a moral chaos. Its essence consists in *rendering to every one his due*. Let us hear the captain of the armies of Israel, in his farewell address to the people, Jos. xxiv. 19: "The Lord is a holy God. He is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins." If, therefore, there be salvation at all for sinners, it must be in the most perfect unison with justice; so that while there is "peace on earth and

good will towards men, there may be also glory to God in the highest."

3. The *objective* infinitude of sin, precludes the possibility of the sinner's entering heaven, on the footing of his *own* merit, whether *active* or *passive*. By sin, we have contracted an infinite debt, and justice imperiously demands payment. "Pay me that thou owest." I shall not, in asserting infinitude to be an attribute of sin, avail myself of the interrogation of Eliphaz, Job. xxii. 5: "Is not thy wickedness great, and thy iniquity infinite?" Yet I do maintain that this phrase, equivalent to a strong assertion, is nowhere discounted in the scriptures. Yet as this point is *cardinal*, in the discussion of this topic, I shall not avail myself of any expression, from the force of which an opponent may make his escape in the haze of metaphorical phraseology. Let us discuss the subject dispassionately, and examine whether sober investigation will not lead to the same conclusion.

I am perfectly aware of the objections which ingenuity has raised against the *infinity* of human transgression. This is no more than what might have been anticipated. Here is the *citadel*. Surrender it, and all is gone! I would then admit, that eternal punishment would be unjust, and consequently could not be inflicted by a righteous God, for finite transgression; for this plain reason, that the punishment would be infinitely disproportioned to the offence. For, although the intensity of the punishment should be indefinitely small, if its duration be eternal, the quantity becomes infinitely great, and of course infinitely disproportioned to the finite offence. It is inconsistent both with physical and mathematical science, to maintain, that the doctrine of the infinity of sin, goes to establish the old *stoical dogma*, that all sins are equal. The reasoning of the objector is here very plausible: "If the least sin be infinite, the greatest

can be no more; therefore all sins are equal." Let us see whether this will stand the test of examination. It can be demonstrated, that the least particle of matter, is divisible *ad infinitum*; and a sphere which would fill the orbit of Herschel is no more than divisible to *infinity*, however inexplicable this may seem to be. But as the infinite divisibility of matter is now disputed, we shall take the space occupied by any portion of matter. About the infinite divisibility of this, theoretically, there will be no dispute. An *inch* of a line, possesses this property as well as the *diameter* of the orbit of Saturn; yet it will not hence follow that these two lines are equal. Every schoolboy knows, that in attempting to reduce the vulgar fraction one-third to a decimal fraction of equal value, the decimal approximation will issue in an infinite series, which though eternally approaching, will never reach the point of absolute accuracy. Let him take the one-half of the former fraction, viz. one-sixth, or one-twelfth, or one-twenty-fourth, and he will find them all possessed of the same property, infinite divisibility. Will he therefore infer, that they are equal? Again. Every person who has any accurate conception of a mathematical solid, knows it possesses *three* dimensions, *length*, *breadth*, and *thickness*, and that each of these three is as absolutely inexhaustible by any finite process, as are the whole three united. No more, therefore, will it follow, that because every sin is infinite *objectively* considered, that every sin is equal, than that the least assignable portion of space is equal to the volume of the universe; because the *least*, as well as the *greatest*, is in its nature equally possessed of infinite divisibility. From the above reasoning, it will follow, that mere *linear* infinity is as inexhaustible, or rather as *interminable*, as *cubical*; or, if I may be allowed a more appropriate, though unusual term,

radiant infinity; although the difference between these be *infinitely* infinite.

It is sufficiently manifest, that we are not able to form any adequate notion of infinity. But it will by no means follow, that therefore, we are incapable of reasoning accurately respecting it. Is not God himself, are not all his attributes infinite? Yet may not our ideas and reasonings respecting him and them be correct as far as they go? Are our reasonings concerning the phenomena of the physical universe, one whit the less conclusive, that we are utterly ignorant of the essence of matter, or the radical basis in which its properties inhere?

It is not at all maintained, that any *act* of a finite being, can be *absolutely*, or in *any sense*, infinite. A human action, in a strict and accurate sense, is neither virtuous, nor vicious. It is the *principle* from which it proceeds, the *end* in view, and its *relation* to the moral law, that entitle it to the epithet of *virtuous* or *vicious*. A mere physical act, independently of these, is neither *morally good*, nor *morally evil*. The acts of stoning Naboth and Achan, were, in a mere physical point of view, as much alike, as it is possible to conceive. Yet the *one* was *vicious*, the *other*, *virtuous*, entirely upon the principle above mentioned. We do not therefore assert, that any human action is infinite; but we *do* assert, that sin is an infinite evil, inasmuch, as it is a violation of an *infinite* law, rebellion against an *infinite* God, and productive of *infinite* mischief. The law I have just now mentioned, is as infinite as its archetype; its essence, *love*, is a unit. Against this every sin is directed, and consequently is a violation of the whole law. For, "whosoever offendeth in one part, is guilty of all."

This same principle may be illustrated by a familiar example in the following manner. Blame attaches to the wanton abuse of any part

even of the *inanimate* creation. It is wrong to abuse any of God's creatures. Should this abuse be extended to any useful animal, my horse for instance, the wrong is greater. The guilt increases with the ascending scale of dignity of the injured object. Ascend in this gradation, to our own kind; our servant, equal, or superior; say the supreme magistrate: the offence is graduated by the dignity of rank occupied by the individual in the scale of being. Conceive it to be carried up to the Great Supreme, where all our sins ultimately land, the magnitude of the offence becomes infinite, because, the being offended is infinite. But as all are sinners, all are naturally under an infinite load of guilt, which the justice of God necessarily requires to be expiated.

The law of God is the rule which must necessarily for ever regulate the relation between God as the moral governor, and man as the rational subject. This law is as perfect as its original. Take any other standard of moral rectitude, and you are immediately led into inextricable difficulties. Look, for a moment, at the definition given by a modern advocate of Universalism. (Ballou's Lect. page 15.) "Sin is the violation of a law which exists in the mind, which law is the imperfect knowledge men have of moral good." Not to mention the atheistical principle couched in these words, in making man his own law, lord paramount of his own actions, and consequently divesting him of all responsibility, this definition makes error and ignorance, the standard of truth and rectitude! According to this definition, the number of laws must be infinite and infinitely varying; for this law, viz. "Man's imperfect knowledge," may be infinitely different in different individuals at the same moment, and also, in the same individuals, at different times. It confounds *vice* and *virtue*, in making sin and

duty depend upon the *knowledge* of the agent. If this definition were true, then the most atrocious crimes, the murder of the saints of God, the most horrid blasphemies against the Son and Spirit might not only be perfectly innocent, but constitute the most meritorious conduct. "The time will come," saith our Lord, "when they that kill you, will think they are doing God service." We conclude, therefore, that the law of God is infinite—the commandment exceeding broad.

What pity that some of the sincerest friends of the doctrine of *atonement* by the blood of Christ, have, by their admission of the finite extent and demerit of moral evil, brought themselves into such a predicament, that to be consistent, they must abandon, on the one hand, the eternity of punishment; or, on the other, the deity of Christ. Predicated on the finite guilt, they present us with a finite ransom. This *finite* ransom, they tell us, is just commensurate with the number of elect individuals, multiplied into the quantity of the guilt of each. Had there been one elect soul more, Christ must have suffered more; if less, less, in proportion to addition or subtraction of the debt to be paid!

Let us examine this doctrine. What was the penalty annexed to the covenant of works? It could not be *formally* eternal death. Had this been the case, nothing short of the *eternal death* of the surety could have achieved the ransom. Such an idea would meet merited reprobation, from every sober Christian. Eternal death arose, not from the nature of the thing, but was altogether consecutive on the finite capacity of the culprit. In order to the salvation of the sinner, the covenant of grace required a substitutional *equivalent*. Could this have been given by the suffering humanity of our Lord? The humanity of our Lord, in all its exquisite suffering, and nothing in him but humanity

could suffer, the divinity being impassible, could have made no more atonement for our sins, than the blood of a bullock or a goat smoking on the worldly sanctuary. The value of our Lord's sacrifice on the cross, therefore, must have arisen from something else—his deity. To this is to be referred the very *essence* of the worth of the sacrifice he offered. Give up his divinity, and the notion of an atonement is a mere chimera. Were Jesus the most exalted creature God ever made, or *could* make, (reverence!) he would have been as utterly incompetent to make an atonement for our sins, as would have been the offering of the meanest reptile on the divine altar. If, therefore, the *whole virtue, value and worth* of Jesus' passion, arises from the deity of his person; whence his blood is called the blood of God; how shall we form an estimate of the value of that divinity! Who will dare to bring his scale and graduate by any numerical admeasurement, or compound ratio of time and intensity, the value of the sufferings of Jesus; *i. e.* the value of his divine person, without which his sufferings could have had no worth?

4. The expiation of this infinite guilt, admits of no compromise. The debtor must continue in duress, until the last farthing of the debt shall have been liquidated. It is true, some have objected to the propriety of considering sin as a debt; but while we find in that perfect model of prayer, prescribed by our Lord, to his disciples, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors," we need feel no reluctance in viewing sin as a debt due to divine justice. Now, I have already observed, that in the liquidation of this debt, any thing like compromise, is utterly inadmissible. Any partial payment of an infinite debt, would be equivalent to nothing. Infinity is an incommensurable *prime*, measurable only by itself; *i. e.* by infinity. Any thing less, therefore,

than infinity, taken from infinity, will leave an infinite remainder. And consequently in the

5th place—The punishment of sin, upon the footing of *personal* expiation, must be eternal. The finite resources of the culprit can never meet the infinite demands which the inexorable justice of God has filed against him. No payment he can make, can, ever, in the smallest degree, diminish the principal. This would be to suppose an exhaustion of infinity by finite deductions, which is absurd. The want, therefore, of infinite intensity in the suffering, must be balanced by an eternity of duration. Here we find, as usual, reason and scripture leading us to the same conclusion. Their worm shall never die; their fire shall never be quenched; depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. No limits, therefore, can be set to punishment, upon the foundation of *personal* expiation.

S. B. W.

Thoughts on Revivals of Religion.

This is certainly a subject of some importance. The avidity with which pious people receive narratives of religious revivals clearly evinces, that, in their judgment, "times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord" are devoutly to be wished. Christians may differ in their views, concerning the *nature* of a genuine revival; but the thing itself all will readily acknowledge to be desirable. The diversity of opinion which obtains, on this subject, among the friends of Christianity, is, perhaps, rather apparent than real. In our apprehension, it arises partly from a want of agreement, in regard to the meaning of certain terms and phrases, commonly used on topics of this kind, and partly from a neglect to distinguish the effects of a divine influence on the heart, from those excesses of passion, or extravagances

THE
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

MARCH, 1821.

Communications.

Prayer, a reasonable Duty.

The obligation to perform this important duty, seems to grow out of the very relation in which a moral agent must necessarily stand to the Creator and Governor of the universe. It is, therefore, one of the earliest and highest duties incumbent on a dependent moral agent. Deny it; you annihilate dependence. There will then exist a moral being who *needs* nothing from God—who has no *want* to be supplied—who enjoys no bounty he would *wish* to be continued! Such a being must be independent!

The generic nature of prayer consists in a *sense of need, and desire of supply*. It has been invested with modifications of an adventitious character, arising out of particular emergencies. The attributes of prayer have been modified by the *fall*. It is essentially necessary to its acceptability, that it be in the *name of Christ*. This modification will, I conceive, continue through eternity. Confession of sins, is in the present state, a necessary concomitant of prayer. This will be unknown in the regions of glory. Thanksgiving unto God, for his *unspeakable gift*, and all the blessed results, now is, and will eternally continue, an ingredient of this *delightful duty*, so characteristic of the Christian.

If these premises be true, prayer will be a duty for ever incumbent

on, and for ever exercised by a saint in glory, as a necessary result of his moral dependence on the God who made him, and continues to be to him, the author of every good and of every perfect gift. A sense of need, and a desire for a supply, are perfectly compatible with our notions of a felicity competent to moral beings even of unsullied perfection. Had our first parents in the state of primeval innocence, never felt the painful sensation of hunger, they could never have experienced the pleasure arising from the gratification of this appetite. Indeed, in our present state, it is as hard to form an idea of *enjoyment*, without a previous sense of want, as to conceive a notion of a fine portrait, in which all were *light*, without one single *tinge of shade*! This principle is deeply inlaid in our constitution, and strongly evinced in the progressive development of the human character.

This idea, moreover, does perfectly coincide with that indefinite and progressive expansion of the human mind, which we are warranted to believe, will be going on in endless advances in perfection, in the mansions of glory. Now, in the order of nature, expansion must precede impletion, or the capacity must be enlarged, before there can be any void to be filled. But the very existence of a void will generate a sense of *want*. This sense of want, must of course be followed by a desire of enjoyment; and the very existence of this desire in a saint in

are directed; who is the object of your contempt and mockery. Ask yourselves what you gain; what you expect to gain; what you do not lose. Remember that you lose your reputation, at least in the minds of all the wise and good, and all the blessings of their company and friendship; that you sacrifice your peace of mind; that you break down all those principles on which virtue may be grafted, and with them, every rational hope of eternal life; that you are rapidly becoming more and more corrupted, day by day; and that, with this deplorable character, you are preparing to go to judgment. Think what it will be to swear and curse, to mock God and insult your Redeemer, through life; to carry your oaths and curses to a dying bed; to enter eternity with blasphemies in your mouths; and to stand before the final bar, when the last sound of profaneness has scarcely died upon your tongues." *"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless, who taketh his name in vain."* W. N.

On the Duration of Future Punishment.

(Continued from p. 21.)

We now proceed to the *second* inquiry, viz. whether the *extinction* of *penal evil*, or, the *termination* of *future punishment*, can ever result from a *vicarious atonement*.

It is cordially admitted, that a vicarious atonement has been made. "The law has been magnified and made honourable." Jesus "has brought in an everlasting righteousness." A righteousness completely adequate to all the demands of law and justice, commanding the admiration of the universe, has been exhibited to the contemplation of created intelligences. The angels desire to pry into its mysterious origin. A righteousness, on

the footing of which God can be just, and yet justify the ungodly who believe on his Son, has been presented, in such circumstances, as to even solicit and urge its acceptance by sinners, as the foundation of their eternal felicity. The inquiry then, is not about the existence of an atonement adequate to all the purposes for which it was designed. That has been admitted. But the question is, was it designed for *all*, or only for *some* of the rebels against JEHOVAH? A correct answer to this inquiry, will be decisive on the point at issue. We admit, without any hesitation, that if the atonement made by our Lord, embraced every sinner, by it, every sinner, either has been, or will be infallibly saved. The debt, in that case, has been paid. Justice has been satisfied. It has no farther demands against the sinner. All his sufferings are disciplinary and medicinal. Justice would blush at his enduring, either here, or hereafter, the smallest evil of a punitive or penal nature. This would be equivalent to the demand of double payment of the same debt. But, if Jesus was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities; if himself bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin might live unto righteousness, and be healed by his stripes," it would be the most flagrant injustice to distrain the insolvent, for the debt already paid by the surety! "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?"—Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid!

But as the scriptures do not authorize us to believe that the vicarious atonement of the Redeemer embraced every individual of the human race, much less fallen angels, I shall proceed to demonstrate the *particularity* of redemption; or show that Jesus Christ died for a *select* number, and *not* for the *whole* of mankind. However ungracious this doctrine may ap-

pear to its opponents, we feel convinced, that it is the doctrine of the Bible, and can be satisfactorily established. And,

1. From plain scripture declarations. That the persons for whom Jesus laid down his life, are a *selection* from among men, is evident from the epithets and names by which they are designated, by the Spirit of God, in the sacred oracles. They are called *Elect*, according to the foreknowledge of God—*Re-deemed from among men*—*Few*, when compared with the great mass of mankind; many are called but *few* are *chosen*. Jesus denominates them, *his sheep*, *his friends*, *his brethren*, as contradistinguished from the *goats*, *enemies* and *aliens*—*not of the world*, but *chosen out of the world*—*given to him* by the Father—*chosen in him* before the foundation of the world; with many other such characteristics of peculiarity as are utterly inconsistent with universal redemption.

2. From the limitation of Jesus' intercession. This intercession is founded on the propitiation for sin, and coextensive with it: and the propitiation is exactly commensurate with the extent of the Father's donation for this purpose. "All those whom the Father has given unto me, shall come unto me; and him that cometh unto me, will I in nowise cast out." For these he intercedes. "I pray not for the world, but for those whom thou hast given me out of the world. Thine they were, and thou gavest them me, and they have kept thy word." Here they are manifestly distinguished as a *selection* from the world that lieth in wickedness. The intercessions both of our Lord, and of his followers, have their limitations. There is an unpardonable sin, for which prayer would be altogether useless; and that for this plain reason, it is declared to be *irremissible*. Our Lord has declared it so. It is the sin against the Holy Ghost. Now, it is clear,

if this sin be unpardonable, the person guilty of it must for ever lie under the *ban* of vindictory justice, and consequently his punishment must be eternal. We shall show hereafter, that an escape from penal evil by a return to the womb of nonentity, is altogether incompatible with claims of justice. Surely for such persons Jesus could not possibly have made an atonement. How absurd would it be to suppose that our Redeemer, a God of infinite knowledge, should have voluntarily paid the price for sheep, he knew he was never to receive—whose condition he pronounces irretrievable—and for whose salvation, prayers and intercessions may not be made! If there be any force in this reasoning, Jesus did not lay down his life for all men. What! Die the cursed death of the cross—drink the bitter cup of JEHOVAH's wrath, and endure the most exquisite agonies in the room of sinners, while he bare their sins in his own body on the tree, all to bring them to glory, and at the same time declare, he would not so much as *pray* for them, but pronounce their case to be utterly irremediable!

3. If the foregoing arguments be admitted to be conclusive, it will plainly follow, that the doctrine of a universal atonement involves an impeachment of the divine wisdom. Jesus declares the sin against the Holy Ghost to be unpardonable—never to be forgiven, either in this world, or in the world to come. Now it will be granted that our Lord did nothing in vain: but had he died to procure the pardon of sins, declared previously by himself to be *unpardonable*; then, indeed, the question respecting the manner of Abner's death, would not be altogether inapplicable to his. What would be thought of the mercantile talents of a man of business, who, knowing with absolute certainty, that he should never receive certain pieces of goods; yet, notwithstanding, should purchase

them, pay for them, and make every arrangement usually connected with such transactions? Who would employ such a man, either as a factor abroad, or an agent at home? Such a person would be wholly unworthy of confidence. The cases are similar. Our Lord has himself declared, that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall never be forgiven, here or hereafter; and yet by the hypothesis we are combatting, he suffered the punishment and expiated the guilt of this very sin! He paid the whole debt of this very insolvent; the doors of whose prison shall never be unbolted, and whose fetters of despair shall never be struck off, and for whose salvation, he who died to redeem him, will never offer even a solitary prayer! We conclude, then, that all men cannot be exempted from eternal punishment upon the ground of a vicarious atonement, because all were not embraced in its design.

4. The *particularity* of the atonement is evidenced by the restriction of the means of its application to sinners. John xvii. 3. It is expressly declared, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent;" which clearly implies, that not to know Jesus Christ, or, ignorance of him, is the opposite, viz. eternal death. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard?" While the blessed gospel of the Son of God declares to believers, "the promise is to you and unto your seed," it presents no consolation to the heathen, living and dying destitute of the knowledge of Christ Jesus. It pronounces them to be "without God, and without hope in the world." Such is the mysterious, yet equitable constitution, established by God, who doth according to his will in the armies of heaven, and also among the inhabitants of earth, and is obliged to

give an account of none of his matters. He tells us, that "Where there is no vision, the people perish." But had the atonement been intended for all, the means of its application would have been equally extensive.

If it be pleaded, that the means of grace revealed in the gospel are unnecessary to the salvation of the heathen world—if they can enjoy salvation without even hearing of the Saviour, or the mystery of godliness developed in his manifestation in the flesh—if they and their seed, who have no covenant claim of representative identification with believing parents, are nevertheless interested in the atonement made by the blood of the Redeemer, and shall be heirs of the eternal felicity resulting from the vicarious satisfaction of (to them) an *unknown* God,—how superlatively useless must have been the miracles wrought to verify the divinity of his character, and the authenticity of his mission! How vain, the admirable machinery of ordinances, missionary establishments, Bible societies, &c. &c.! How chimerical must be the solicitude of mind, the expenditure of treasures, and the countless sacrifices of personal ease and comfort, in sending the gospel to the benighted heathen! The *mere fact* of the existence of the atonement, whether *known*, or *unknown*, will be sufficient.*

* God is a sovereign, under no other limitation than the rectitude of his own nature and perfections, and such obligations as he has been pleased to impose upon himself. Whether it be his purpose to save any of the heathen, living and dying without any opportunity of external *objective* revelation, by some extraordinary *subjective* manifestation of himself, as a God in Christ, to them, in their *last moments*, is a point we can neither affirm nor deny. We know it not. "Secret things belong unto God: revealed things to us and our children." We dare not limit the Holy One of Israel, from extending the exuberance of his grace, to whomsoever he will, even without the

5. We shall now endeavour to obviate some of the principal objections alleged, 1st, from scripture, and, 2d, from reason, against the doctrine of a particular atonement, or, that Jesus died only for *some* of the human race, and that consequently only *some* shall be saved. Such alone shall be exempted from deserved eternal misery, on the ground of a substitutional expiation. It will be recollected, we showed, in a preceding number, the impossibility of a sinner's escaping eternal punishment, on the footing of *personal* expiation. The vicarious atonement, however valuable in itself, intrinsically considered, can be of no importance to those who were not embraced in its design. But it is alleged, that the scriptures contain sufficient evidence to establish the point, that an atonement was made equally for all, and consequently that all shall be saved. If the premises could be established, we should most cordially admit the conclusion. We are fully persuaded, that such is not the doctrine of the Bible. We shall now proceed to examine,

1st. Some of the supposed scriptural objections to the doctrine of a limited atonement.

(To be continued.)

S. B. W.

external means of knowledge, by the extraordinary communications of his Spirit. Yet we have no *positive* evidence of such extension. All we can say is, that we think it involves no contradiction to the attributes of the Divinity, or to any declaration in the sacred oracles. Philanthropy, in all such cases, will incline to the side of mercy. The entail of the covenant of grace, embracing the parents and their seed, furnishes to believers the most consolatory hopes, respecting their children, when dying in infancy, and consequently incapable of *objective* revelation. That God may, independently of this entail, extend to the children of heathens, dying in infancy, similar grace, we believe, to be repugnant, neither to the scriptures, nor the reasoning here advanced.

Improvement of Aphorisms.

Maxims, which involve in a brief phraseology the deductions of reason, the compressed treasures of experience, and the results of observation upon men and manners, form an acknowledged good mode of communicating instruction. If formed with ingenuity, they have a captivating influence over the mind; and, especially for the youth, they possess a charm which is almost magical. The human mind is naturally indolent, and averse from the labour and research which must necessarily be encountered in the pursuit of general knowledge; but it is seldom too indolent to seize with eagerness, and to remember with fidelity, the pithy apothegm. Among the illiterate and unenlightened, maxims prevail and have a considerable influence upon their conduct, and are often regarded with a strictness which borders on superstition. This fact shows that the instrument has power, and that it may become exceedingly beneficial when judiciously managed. The ancients were aware of this, and have handed down to posterity much of the wisdom of their sages, in this dress; and who knows not, that in the Proverbs of Solomon is embodied a greater mass of wisdom than has ever appeared in the same compass. We have a vast multitude of maxims which are either original in our language, or have been transplanted there, which afford many valuable hints for the regulation of our temper and conduct; but inasmuch as they are valuable only so far as they accord with gospel morality, the Christian has a peculiar property in them, and should improve them to his spiritual interests.

It is our design to present a few brief specimens of the manner in which a Christian may profitably enlarge upon maxims, by reflections of a spiritual cast; and, indeed, they who are candidates for immortality, should thus improve *every thing*

THE
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

MAY, 1821.

Communications.

SHEPPARD'S SINCERE CONVERT,

ABRIDGED BY E. S. ELY.

(Continued from page 170.)

CHAPTER III.

All mankind is now fallen into a most woful estate of sin and misery.

The devil abused the serpent, by making him the means of temptation; and man abusing his own faculties, especially his will, brought himself and all his posterity in him, into an estate of sinfulness and misery. Let us consider, 1st, man's misery in regard to *sin itself*, and 2dly, in regard to *the consequences* of sin.

I.—1. Every man living is born guilty of Adam's sin. Now the equity of God in laying this sin to the charge of every man, though none of Adam's posterity personally committed it, may appear from the consideration, that God in wisdom and goodness constituted Adam the *representative* of his race, under the covenant of works; so that had he stood in righteousness, all mankind had stood with him. It is but equitable, therefore, if we should have been partakers of his gains, that we should be also partakers of his loss; and that he, falling, we should fall in him. This dispensation was calculated to promote the safety and quiet of mankind; for had he stood as our covenant head, all fear of losing our happy estate had been prevented;

whereas if every man had been left to stand or fall for himself, as he should appear in the world, each man would ever have been liable to fall, and in fear of falling. Adam was as likely to stand in righteousness for himself and his posterity, as any one would have been for himself; and more so, if he knew that he had charge of the estates of all the millions which should be born. He was the head of mankind, and they the members of that head; so that if the head practise treason, the whole body is found guilty, and must suffer. If these things satisfy not, there is a day coming, in which God will reveal his own righteous proceedings before men and angels.

Oh! that men would consider the nature of original sin, and be humbled by it. Next to the sin against the Holy Spirit, and contempt of the gospel, this is the greatest sin which cries to heaven for vengeance: for now men's sins are committed against God in their base and low estate; but this sin was committed against Jehovah, when man was at the top of his preferment. He was a traitor in the court, among the favourites, and not a rebel on the dunghill. This sin darkened the very sun, defaced the image of God, the glory of God in man, and became the prolific parent of all the swarms of sins, which have since infested the world. It comprehended in itself a fearful *apostacy* from God, like that of the devil; a horrible *rebellion* against God, in which man took sides with revolted an-

upon their bodies and souls, and the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, shall kindle it: and here thou shalt lie burning, and none shall quench it. They shall be banished from God; shall be the subjects of his fiery indignation for ever; shall be tortured by their own memory and conscience; shall become the companions of devils; shall be filled with despair; and shall be the subjects of the most painful emotions through all eternity. In the anguish of their feelings, they will vomit blasphemies in the face of God, and curse God, that never elected them; and the Lord Jesus, that never shed one drop of blood to redeem them; and the Holy Ghost, that passed by without effectually calling them.

This is the misery of every natural man. Oh! labour to be humbled, day and night, in this woful estate; and if thou dost not obtain an interest in Christ, then farewell God, Christ, and mercy forever. Had Christ shed seas of blood, there would not be one drop of it for thee, until thou comest to see, and feel, and groan under this miserable estate of thy fallen nature.

(To be continued.)

ON THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

(Continued from page 125.)

In examining the supposed scriptural objections to a *particular* redemption, it would be unreasonable to expect much novelty. It would be difficult to find any raw material entirely new. Sometimes new arrangements, different combinations of light and shade, may so affect the appearance, and even the real worth of the article, as to make it more marketable, and consequently extend the range of its circulation. We make no pretensions even to this humble merit. To be instrumental in exhibiting truth—the truth of the word of God, in a simple and unsophisticated dress;

to help to stem the torrent of error and delusion, is our most earnest wish, whether the arguments be new or old. Both the *heresy* we combat, and its *refutation*, have excited the attention of the days of other years. When the enemy comes in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord animates his followers to lift up a standard against him. In the discharge of this duty, the continuance of the contest must be commensurate with the duration of the torrent of hostility. War must be carried on with Amalek from generation to generation.

At this late period of the contest, little *new*, on either side, can be expected. We despise that affectation of originality, which refuses to avail itself of the inventions and improvements of predecessors. Was the sword of Goliath one whit the worse, that it had cut off the head of a blaspheming gigantic Philistine? On the contrary, David says respecting it, "There is none like it; give it to me." Are the arguments of Luther and Calvin, or any of the other reformation sages, any thing deteriorated, by having been used successfully by them, against the antichristian hierarchy? Does the solution of a difficulty, or the detection of a sophism, lose any of its interest or force, because it has been used by the venerable Edwards, when contending valiantly for the faith once delivered to the saints? Nay, though we would not rest a single item of the subject at issue on the mere authority of names,

"Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri,"

yet we confess, we cannot help viewing an argument, as ennobled and more venerable, which has been used by that philosophical Calvinist and redoubtable champion of sacred truth. We here give notice, that on his lucubrations we shall, occasionally, make liberal drafts; and shall never prefer a raw re-

cruit, however fascinating his exterior, to the sunburnt veteran; and that too, for the very thing which should recommend him, namely, because he has seen some service, and has frequently triumphed over the haughty foe. On the contrary, these very circumstances are, in our view, commendatory.

In the discussion of this subject, much stress has been laid on some general expressions, which are occasionally found in scripture; such as, for instance, *all, every, all men, every man, the world, the whole world, &c.* These expressions, it will be admitted, when taken detachedly and independently of their local connexion and modification by the context, are somewhat imposing; particularly in relation to a doctrine, apparently so philanthropic, and so flattering to the native depravity and accumulated guilt of rebel man.

There can be nothing more easy than to show, that the extent of the meaning of those expressions must always be determined by the connexion in which they are found; and that they must necessarily be regulated and modified by the radical principles and general analogy of the system of redemption. That *all* often means no more than a generality, and sometimes but only an inconsiderable number, is abundantly evident from scripture phraseology. The annunciation of the nativity of our Lord by the heavenly messenger, furnishes a striking evidence of this. Luke ii. 10. "Behold I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people." Was this true in an absolutely strict and universal sense of the term? Certainly not. Surely not to *all*, and *every individual* of the whole world, for many millions never heard of it. But it did not furnish *great joy*, even to *all* the Jews who did hear of it. Did Herod, or the Scribes and Pharisees, rejoice at it? Nay, on the contrary, we are informed, that "when He-

rod had heard the report of the wise men, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." Matt. ii. 3. How comparatively limited, in this instance, must this universal term be! In like manner we might quote Mark i. 37, "*All men seek thee;*" and v. 20, "*All men did marvel;*" and xi. 32, "*All men counted John as a prophet;*" John iii. 16, "The same baptizeth, and *all men* come unto him;" Acts iv. 21, "*All men glorified God, for what was done.*" In all these quotations, and numberless others which might be adduced, it requires no great stock of sagacity to discover the very limited sense in which they are used, and that their extent is regulated and determined entirely by the circumstances and connexion in which they are found. By these circumstances, therefore, and connexions, and by the nature of the subject under discussion, and not by the detached universality of a term or phrase, we shall be guided in our investigation of this subject. But as the definite application and meaning of such expressions will be best ascertained by a reference to the texts where they are used in the sacred writings, we shall examine in succession the most striking of those passages or texts, which have been by our opponents generally adduced on this subject. To save time and useless repetition, we shall classify them in such manner, as their common qualities and general bearings on the subject under consideration, may indicate. According to this method, the examination of two or three of the most prominent texts will supersede the necessity of farther analysis of any texts belonging to the same class. And,

1. Such as by the universality of the terms in which the mediatory interposition is frequently expressed in scripture, may seem to favour *universal redemption*.

Of such passages we have an example in Isa. liii. 6. "The Lord

hath laid on Him the iniquities of us all." In this text there are three different *parties* mentioned; namely, the LORD, HIM, and us all. That the *first* of these is JEHOVAH, the *second* MESSIAH, all are agreed. The only ground of controversy is about the extent of the meaning of the words *us all*. Does this expression mean every individual of the whole human race, or only a particular number? This, and this alone, is the point at issue. We maintain that the LORD did lay on Jesus the iniquity of *all* the *elect*—of *all* the *Israel* of God. The supposed proof of alleged universality contained in these words, we might consider as completely neutralized by the positive proof of the particularity of redemption, previously established. But however relevant this mode of refutation might be, we shall not avail ourselves of it; but shall examine and compare this, and the other texts which may be adduced, both with the context, and, when necessary, with the general analogy of faith. We put the question, then, Who are the persons designated by the general expression *us all*?

In the *first* place, they were professors of religion; they belonged to the commonwealth of Israel. *Secondly*, they were confessing penitents: "All we like lost sheep have gone astray, we have turned every man to his own way," is their humble confession to God. In the *third* place, they are such as are "healed by his stripes," as is plain from the context. *Fourthly*, they are such as had an interest in the vicarious atonement. Their language is "He was wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities, chastised for our peace." In a word, they were neither strangers nor aliens, but of the household of faith. But will it follow, that because Jesus bare the iniquities of all such as are described above, that therefore the LORD laid on him the iniquities of *all* the human race? Should a citizen of the United States, either

orally or by written circular, thus address the people: Our Washington, by incredible perils and unremitting perseverance, under the benign auspices of the God of battles, achieved our independence, rescued us from the grasp of tyranny, and secured for *us all* invaluable rights and privileges:—would it follow that every resident alien, although the bitterest enemy, was included in this general expression? Certainly not. Such a conclusion would be utterly repugnant to every bearing of the matter, the manner, and the design of the address. This would be, most illogically, drawing a *general* conclusion from *particular* premises. Because God has laid on Jesus the iniquities of persons of a particular character, therefore he hath laid upon him the iniquities of all the human race, even those who shall continue to reject his righteousness and despise his goodness. And in short, because all real penitents shall be *healed*, ergo, the most impenitent and ungodly shall also be healed! Wretched the argument which leads to such results!

Another passage of scripture is adduced from 2 Cor. v. 14, 15. "For the love of Christ constraineth us, judging this, that if one died for all, then were all dead. And that he died for all, that they that live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him that died for them and rose again." Whoever shall take the pains, carefully to consult the context, will find, that the apostle here apologizes, by very competent reasons, for his attachment to the Gentiles of the Corinthian church, for which he was censured by the Jewish zealots, v. 12—16. A great proportion of the church at Corinth, were Gentiles, and, as such, obnoxious to the bigots of the circumcision. Paul, as the great apostle to the Gentiles, defends himself and magnifies his ministry, by demonstrating that they also were heirs to the same

gospel privileges; that the sacred flame of the love of Christ constrained him to preach the gospel as well to the Gentiles as to the Jews. That he did this, under the conviction of a sound judgment, that if the only mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, died for all *sorts* of men, whether they be Jews or Gentiles; then it will plainly follow, that the Jew and the Gentile were, by nature, *equally* children of wrath, and *dead* in trespasses and sins; so that the former can have no better claim, than the latter, to gospel privileges.

Often we find the word *all* taken in this distributive sense, and in such circumstances as necessarily preclude its extension to every individual. Rom. xiv. 2. "One believes he may eat *all things*." Surely this cannot be understood universally of every individual! Again, (2 Kings viii. 9.) Hazael is said to have presented to Elisha "every good thing;" which can obviously bear none other than a distributive application, and even that in a modified and comparatively limited sense. But it ought not to be overlooked, that there is no substantive expressed with the word *all*, in the passage under consideration. It is not even said for all *men*. We are therefore at liberty to supply such a substantive, as the bearing and sense of the context and general analogy of faith may warrant. It might be all *believers*—all the *elect*—all the *sons* and *daughters*, whom he brings to glory. Neither would there be any inconsistency in supplying the expression, *the sheep*, of his fold; particularly, as our Lord himself had declared, "I lay down my life (I die) for the sheep." These sheep were not confined to the Jewish nation. "Other sheep have I," said our Lord, "which are not of *this fold*." These also must be brought in. In Christ Jesus, there are no distinctions. Agreeably hereto, the apostle in preaching the gospel, disavows all regard to

pedigree or national privileges. Wherefore in the sixteenth verse he says, "Henceforth know we no man after the flesh." Jew and Gentile; circumcision and uncircumcision; all nations, kindred and tongues; all ranks and conditions of men, are equally embraced by the benign and philanthropic system of gospel grace.

Another text, which has been rather unhappily pressed into the service of universalism, is the latter part of the 11th of the 4th chapter of the first epistle to Timothy: "God, who is the saviour of all men, but especially of those that believe." The words themselves contain their limitation, and designate the particularity of redemption—"especially of those that believe." God is the saviour of all men, inasmuch as his providence is universal, and his kingdom ruleth over all. We will freely admit, that this providential salvation extendeth much farther, than the phraseology of this text would necessarily carry it. Ps. xxxvi. 6. "Lord, thou preservest man and *beast*."

One other text, involving also a general term, shall close the examination of the *first* class. 1st John, ii. 2. "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the *whole world*." After we shall have examined this text, we believe that all others marked with the *same* or *similar* characters of universality, will, by the same rule and manner of interpretation, become sufficiently obvious.

The term *world* has a variety of meanings in scripture. Sometimes it signifies the universe. John i. 10. "The world was made by him." It sometimes signifies metonymically the whole human race. Rom. v. 12. "Sin entered into the world," i. e. was chargeable to all mankind. In John xv. 18. it signifies the wicked of the world: "If the world hate you." Again, it is put for the elect, John iii. 16. "God so loved the

world, that he gave his only begotten son," &c. Sometimes also this term means the Gentiles. Rom. xi. 12. "If the fall of them (the Jews) be the riches of the world;" that is, if the fall of the Jews be the occasion of an abundant exhibition of grace in the call of the Gentile world.

We have already stated, that the phrases *all the world*, and the *whole world*, are frequently taken in a very circumscribed and restricted sense. For example, Luke ii. 1. "There went out a decree from Cesar Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed." This could mean nothing more than the Roman empire. In Rev. xiii. 3. we are told that "*all the world* wondered after the beast," while at the same time, there was a society of men, with whom this same beast and his deluded votaries had waged a war of extermination. But in the case under consideration, we have the extent of the meaning of the word *world*, rendered sufficiently definite, by the phraseology of the context in the preceding verse. "We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins." Now, as the advocacy is founded on the propitiation, it would be absurd to suppose that the former should be less extensive than the latter. But the advocacy does not extend to all men. John xvii. 9. Jesus says, "I pray not for the world." How then should the propitiation be for the whole world, in its absolute and unmodified acceptance? But the plain and obvious meaning of the text may be clearly ascertained, by attending to the following circumstances. The apostle John was a Jew, and writes to Jews. Agreeably to the usual manner of speech among the Jews, in reference to the Gentiles, he distinguishes them by the customary designations. He therefore says of our Lord, "He is the propitiation for *our* sins; and not for *our* sins only, but also for the

sins of the whole world;" i. e. of the Gentiles also. This phraseology and its correct application, were perfectly familiar to a Jew, and could not be misunderstood; viz. that Jesus is the only saviour of all the *elect* of God, throughout the whole world, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. Any farther extension of its application is inconsistent with the general analogy of scripture. S. B. W.

(To be continued.)

FOR THE PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

ON BRINGING BIBLES TO CHURCH.

Protestant Christians generally profess to esteem it one of the greatest blessings of the reformation, that they are permitted the use of the holy scriptures, and allowed to try the doctrines of their teachers by that infallible rule. But were we to judge of their sentiments by the manner in which they employ this privilege, we should be apt to conclude that they do not really value it so highly as they pretend. For, from the manner in which they proceed in regard to the use of the Bible, we should infer that they either *now repose implicit confidence in the fidelity of their public instructors*, or that they do not consider it a matter worthy of their attention to know whether the texts from which their preachers address them be in the sacred volume or not.

We are led to this conclusion from the scarcity of Bibles which appears in our churches on Sabbath. If Christians of the Presbyterian denomination bring to church a psalm book, they seem to think that they have along with them the only book that is necessary in the public worship of the sanctuary. They imagine, or at least appear to imagine, that the large Bible from which the clergyman reads his text, is the only Bible that is required in the house of God. Hence, we believe, that clergymen might, in many instances, read their texts from the apocrypha,

THE
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

JULY, 1831.

Communications.

BRIEF THOUGHTS ON BAPTISM.

(Continued from page 243.)

We have contemplated some of the uses of baptism when administered to adults. Let us now inquire into the uses of this ordinance when applied to infants. Here, as in many other things, men run into opposite extremes. Some magnify the benefit of this Christian rite beyond what inspired writers warrant us to expect; while others, equally mistaken in their views of duty, reject it as unscriptural and useless. The former affirm baptism to be regeneration; believing that all infants, washed in the name of the adorable Three, are delivered from the corruption of their nature, and endued with a new principle of spiritual life. To this opinion we cannot assent. We reprobate it as unfounded and dangerous. That the Almighty can regenerate an infant by his grace, is not to be doubted; and from the admission of this fact, it will follow that, if he please, he may communicate spiritual life at the moment in which a child receives the outward sign of this great and necessary blessing. But from the *power* of God to do a thing, we cannot infer his *determination* to do it. His omnipotence, which, by a word, brought this world into existence, is able to create, in the same way, ten thousand other worlds this moment; but no one is so extravagant as to found on this fact an ex-

VOL. I.

pectation of seeing, in this, or in the next hour, such stupendous exhibitions of Almighty power. The power of Jehovah to regenerate a child in the act of being baptized, supplies no ground of expectation that he will do so: nor could we infer even from occasional occurrences of such a connexion between the rite and the thing signified, any thing like a uniform procedure of a sovereign God, in dispensing renewing grace in conjunction with his own appointed ordinance.

If we look at the conduct of baptized children, we shall find no evidence to support this extravagant opinion. Alas! too generally they discover unequivocal signs of a depraved nature, and of being under its full and unbroken dominion. They need, as well as unbaptized children, to be regenerated. If baptism be regeneration, then, for the same reason, circumcision must have been regeneration; and consequently none of the seed of Abraham, who had received this initiatory rite of the church, would have needed the quickening process of renewing grace, how much soever they may have needed repentance and reformation. But our blessed Lord affirmed the necessity of being *born again*, in the most comprehensive terms; and he doubtless had respect to Nicodemus, with whom he was conversing, and all other circumcised Jews who had not been born again, as well as to Heathen men who were destitute of the seal of God's covenant. Simon Magus

the GODHEAD of these *three persons*; which is so plainly expressed in scripture; nor should it abate or diminish our most sacred regards to them.

XX. We are bound, therefore, to pay *divine honours* to each of the SACRED THREE, VIZ. THE FATHER, THE SON, and THE HOLY SPIRIT, according to their distinct characters and offices assigned to them in scripture.

XXI. In so doing we shall effectually secure our own salvation. For the scripture has made our salvation to depend on those offices; which these divine persons sustain, and in the honours due to them, according to those offices, rather than upon any deep, philosophical notions of their essence and personalities; any nice and exact acquaintance with their mysterious union and distinction.

XXII. The man, therefore, who professes each of the sacred Three to have sufficient divine power and capacity to sustain the characters, and fulfil the offices attributed to them in scripture, and pays due honour to them according to those offices, may justly be owned by me, and received as a Christian brother, though we may differ much in our notions and opinions about the explication of the *blessed Trinity*, or though we may both be ignorant or doubtful of the true way of explaining it.

Now, if these propositions are found agreeable to the mind and will of God in his words, then may his blessed Spirit furnish me with clearness of thought, with force of argument, and happiness of expression, to explain and prove them, so far as to enlighten the understanding; and satisfy the consciences of humble and sincere Christians, in this great and glorious doctrine of the Trinity, that they may pay their distinct honours to the *sacred three*, in this world of darkness and imperfection, and walk on rejoicing in their way to the world of perfect light and happiness! Amen.

ON THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

(Continued from page 204.)

II. Another class of texts is ad-
duced in this controversy, which
are alleged to predicate God's *wil-*
lingness to save all the human fam-
ily. To the superficial observer,
these texts will appear decisive.
We shall quote some of the princi-
pal ones. Matt. xxiii. 37. "O Jeru-
salem! Jerusalem! who killest the
prophets, and stonest them that are
sent unto thee: how often would I
have gathered thy children, as a hen
gathereth her chickens under her
wings, and ye would not." Ezek.
xviii. 23. "Have I any pleasure at
all that the wicked should die, saith
the Lord God?" and verse 39, "For
I have no pleasure in the death of
him that dieth;" and chap. xxxiii.
11. "Say unto them, as I live, saith
the Lord, I have no pleasure in the
death of the wicked, but that the
wicked should turn from his way
and live: turn ye, turn ye, from the
evil of your ways, for why will ye
die, O house of Israel?" 2 Peter
iii. 9. "The Lord is not willing that
any should perish, but that all should
come to repentance." 1 Tim. ii. 4.
"Who will have all men to be saved
and come to the knowledge of the
truth." Were there no other por-
tions of sacred writ, with whose
meaning must be reconciled that of
the passages above cited, while they
present apparently a different view
of the subject, we should consider
all controversy on the subject, not
as simply puerile, but as blasphemously
audacious, in rushing on the
thick bosses of Jehovah's buckler.
Here we have the solemn oath of
Jehovah, that he has no *pleasure* in
the death of the sinner—his solemn
oath that he *would rather* the sinner
should return and live. Let us
state the amount in the strongest
terms—in the language of a man of
rare genius, whose work both de-
serves to be, and shall be, more fully
noticed hereafter. "What else can

this mean, than that God is *unwilling*, that sinners should be damned; but *most willing* that they should be saved." Now who is the person that is *unwilling* that sinners should be damned, and *most willing* that they should be saved? He is no less than JEHOVAH, the infinite, independent, and omnipotent God—the Lord God omnipotent, who doth what pleaseth him in the armies of heaven; this transcendently illustrious personage is infinitely able, and infinitely willing to save all mankind. The conclusion is irresistible, that all mankind shall be saved. Surely nothing can be impossible to *infinite willingness* in full unison with *infinite ability*. None can resist the will of God. Psalm cxxxv. 6. "Whatsoever pleased the Lord, that he did in heaven and in earth, in the seas, and all deep places." He doth what pleaseth him in the armies of heaven, and on earth none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou? The will and pleasure of finite beings is often unexecuted, because they want power. But not so with God, for "Who hath resisted his will?" If therefore a God of infinite power, wills the salvation of the whole human family, it must infallibly take place. With God all things are possible.

But stop, reader! suspend thy conclusion, until we shall have examined a little more closely the premises from which this deduction so legitimately follows. The Bible must be consistent with itself. As the same generic principle pervades all the texts cited above we shall select one, and test its meaning by bringing it in contact with facts, phenomena and other scriptures. The solution will be equally applicable to all the rest. Let us take 1 Tim. 2. 4. "Who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth." We are ready to acknowledge, that this and the kindred texts above quoted, furnish a plausible argument in behalf of the doctrine we are endeavoring to disprove. We shall try to give it a candid and impartial examination.

There are evidently two points of inquiry contained in this investigation. 1. The *extent* of the expression, *all men*. Is it to be understood in an *absolute* and *unlimited* sense? or ought it to be understood in a *qualified* and *modified* acceptation? 2. What connexion is there between God's *willing*, in the sense of the text, that all men should be saved, and their *actual salvation*. We shall attend to each of these in their order: and

1. Who are intended by *all men*? Is the expression to be understood absolutely and universally, or in a limited and modified sense?

That the expression *all men* does not necessarily mean every individual of the human race, universally, has been already proved. Has it such a meaning in this place? This bears directly on the point at issue. We shall show that it has not.

In the first verse of this chapter, the apostle says, "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men: For kings and such as are in authority, &c." Now God's willingness to save all men in the fourth verse, is adduced as a reason and argument to enforce the duty enjoined in the first verse. Consequently God's willingness to save *all men*, cannot but be as extensive as that duty, of which it is assigned as the reason. Here is evidently a *petitio principii*, a begging of the question, a well known sophism, in which the very thing to be proved, is assumed as a truth. It remains to be proved, that prayer, supplications, thanksgivings, &c. should be made for every individual of the human race, universally. This duty is not absolute and unlimited in its extent, but modified as plainly as it is possible for language to make it. 1 John v. 16. "There is a sin unto death, I do not say ye shall pray for it." This is *one* limitation. We may

mention a *second*. It cannot be for all and every individual that has been, is, or ever shall be. Myriads of them are in heaven, and need not our prayers—myriads in hell, to whom they can be of no service. We might add in the *third* place, that thanksgivings, as well as prayers are to be made for all men; but surely it cannot be meant that the church of God was called upon to be thankful for the Neros, the Domitians and the Caligulas, scourges of the Roman empire, and the pests of mankind; or for such heretics as Alexander and Hymeneus, whom the apostle had delivered to Satan.

That *all men* cannot mean every individual of the human race is, I think, fully established. We have found its limitation announced by the Spirit of God. We therefore deny that we have any authority categorically and absolutely to pray for the salvation of all mankind, for this would be to pray for the rescinding of Jehovah's eternal purposes; unless we were thorough-paced Universalists, and believed that God intended to save all. This argument should be fully conclusive with all who admit the doctrine of election. There are some who are foreordained unto condemnation, and are vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. Jude 4, and Rom. ix. 22. The truth seems to be, that the meaning generally given by Calvinistic writers, on this subject, is the least objectionable of any, viz. That as all men, absolutely, universally and individually cannot be the sense of the expression, all *sorts, classes, ranks and conditions* of men, are intended—men of all nations, whether Jews or Gentiles—all *grades*, whether magistrates or subjects. It is not true, as has been triumphantly asserted, that *all sorts, all classes, &c.* must either mean nothing at all, or mean all the individuals belonging to those sorts and classes. We could direct the gentleman's attention to

several texts of scripture, which are diametrically opposed to his individual universality. We shall content ourselves with one from Gen. vii. 13, 14. "In the self-same day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah and Noah's wife, and the three wives of his sons with them, into the ark: They and every beast after his kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, after his kind, and every fowl after his kind, and every bird of every sort." None, surely will have the hardihood to maintain that all these animals, absolutely and universally, went into the ark with Noah! Some of every sort only were preserved from destruction. The ark could not have contained them. The thing is absurd. The second and the fifteenth verses, regulate the proportions of the various classes or kinds. And in the twenty-first verse, &c. we are told, "That all flesh died, that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man. All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed that was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven, and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." We hold it to be no more absurd, that *classes or sorts* are meant in the passage under consideration, than that they are, as they necessarily must be, understood in the multifarious assemblage in Noah's ark. It is a well known fact, that the converted Jews had very strong prejudices against the Gentiles and their rulers; and with great difficulty admitted the legality of submitting at all, to what they conceived to be an illegitimate government.

The apostle, therefore, begins this chapter, by presenting to them a more liberalized view of the Christian system; and consequently exhorts, that supplications, prayers and intercessions, be made for all men, i. e. for all *sorts, classes and conditions* of men; or, as it is elsewhere expressed, "For all nations, kindreds and tongues," for, from among all these, some were seen assembled with the Lamb upon Mount Zion. We feel at a loss to conceive, how any person attending impartially to the scope of the passage, and at the same time claiming any kindred with Calvin, can hesitate to admit this exposition.

But a question presents itself, which deserves some attention in the discussion of this subject. Is there any *individual* who has not sinned the sin unto death, for whom you would refuse to pray? We answer, No. The extent of the Mediator's purchase is unknown to us. It must remain during the present life unknown to us. It, therefore, can form no rule of our duty. This question analogizes with that of election. Though in virtue of this, the destiny of the elect and of the reprobate, shall remain eternally and immutably fixt, yet it can never become the rule of our duty. "Secret things belong to God; but revealed things to us and to our children." But in all such cases, it is clear, submission to the will of God, ought to be implied, in all our requests. This amounts to the same thing as to say, "If it be agreeable to thy eternal purposes—If thou hast thoughts of peace and purposes of mercy," &c. To pray that God should save a sinner, contrary to his own immutable purpose, is sheer blasphemy! It would be praying him to *change*, to *deny himself*—to commit *suicide*! As, therefore, we know nothing about the particular objects of the Mediator's purchase, *a priori*, but only from the effects of divine grace on the human heart; "By their fruits

ye shall know them."—In humble acquiescence to the will of God, we are as much bound to pray for all men individually in this modified sense, as we are bound to use any established mean in the ordinary occurrences of human life. Christianity is a *unit*. It is not made up out of heterogeneous materials; neither is it a compound of various, jarring systems. Its law is a *unit*—the transcript of the moral attributes of Jehovah. Of course all its ramifications, in every department of life, emanating from the same centre, must necessarily possess multifarious analogies and intimate affinities. All the duties incumbent on the Christian completely harmonize. In the ordinary business of life, he is bound to *run* and to *exercise* his strength in the performance of his duty. Yet he knows not whether he shall succeed or not. "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong." He knows not whether it be in the divine purpose to render the means efficacious. Yet every mean is *really* a *prayer*, and involves a solicitation of the *end*, from the divinity. Now, as all these solicitations should be made in submission to the divine will, so should our prayers for every thing which we are not positively assured God has determined to bestow. The *duty* is ours, the *success* is of God. Admirably to this purpose are the words of the preacher, Eccl. xi. 6. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good."

A denial of the reasoning just presented, would totally unnerve the arm of industry, strike off the wheels of business, and eventually issue in the annihilation of human society. Let men cease to use means, until they shall have been absolutely ascertained, that God has preordained to render them successful, the grand drama will im-

mediately close, the awful catastrophe will instantly follow. One thing common sense will suggest, viz. that in the use of the means we *may* fail; but in the neglect of them, we *must* inevitably perish. This might be aptly illustrated by allusion to the very common, but *disgraceful* practice of gambling, in *legalized* lotteries. None of the gamblers is such a fool as to believe, that the purchase of a ticket will *necessarily* secure him a prize; none so stupid as to believe he can draw a prize without possessing a ticket.—We therefore do deny, that the Calvinistic doctrine of a definite atonement, in any way whatever, cramps the spirit of prayer, or renders it necessary, that the prayers of mankind should dwindle into an idle battology, “Lord save the elect!—Lord save the elect!” With the same propriety, would the belief in the doctrine of predestination, cut the sinews of industry; and reduce all human means of subsistence to a similar battological exclamation, Lord execute thy purpose!—Lord execute thy purpose!

2. But let us now attend to the second branch of this inquiry, namely, whether there be any infallible connexion between God’s willing, in the sense of the text, “*that all men should be saved,*” and their *actual* salvation. The light shed from the lamp of revelation, will leave to the humble inquirer, no room to doubt on this subject. The sacred oracles, in various passages, clearly intimate to us, that the Deity is said to *will* things, which do not *actually* come into existence. Matt. xxiii. 37. “O Jerusalem! Jerusalem!—how often *would* I have gathered thy children as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not.*” Here we have the divine Jesus *willing* to gather Jerusalem’s children, yet they remain *ungathered*! Deut. xxxii. 29. “O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they

would consider their latter end!” Yet Israel remained a *foolish and inconsiderate people*! Many more texts of similar import might be mentioned, but we conceive those already cited, to be quite sufficient for the purpose. Now before even the shadow of an argument can be deduced from the text in Timothy, under consideration, it ought to be categorically demonstrated, that the *will* of God, is *not used* here in the same sense as in the passages just now cited. But although it should be found to be used in exactly the same sense, still, there is no more inconsistency in supposing that *all men will not be saved*, though God wills them to be saved, in the sense of the text; than that Jerusalem’s rebellion continued, the will of God to the contrary notwithstanding. The truth seems plainly to be this, from the authority both of the Old and New Testaments, in numerous instances, that the *nonrepentance and death* of the sinners, are matters of fact, which take place, contrary to the divine *will*, in some particular sense of that expression. God has no *pleasure* in the death of the sinner; yet the sinner *dies*. God *would* have him to return unto him and live; yet he does not return, but dies. God is *not willing* that any should perish; yet himself informs us, “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and the nations that forget God.” But the argument for Universalism founded on these texts, proceeds on the *assumption*, that God’s *will* is *efficient*, and absolutely *operative*. Here lies the sophism. It will be found in the *major* proposition, when the argument is reduced to the syllogistic form. Thus,

Maj. Whatever God *wills*, comes to pass;

Min. But God wills the salvation of all men;

Concl. Therefore, the salvation of all men shall come to pass.

Here the truth of the conclusion is completely vitiated, by the false-

hood in the major proposition. We have already clearly proved that God *wills* many things, 'in some sense of the word, which do not come to pass. But let us apply the same process of ratiocination to the text in Ezek. xviii. 32. Thus,

Maj. Whatever God *wills* comes to pass ;

Min. But God *wills*, that he who dieth should not die ;

Concl. Therefore he who dieth doth not die !

Credat Judæus Apella ; non ego !
Let him swallow this who can !

I cannot help here dropping a hint, to such (for such there are !) as in conjunction with a belief in a universal atonement and willingness on the part of God and Christ to save all men, admit the doctrine of election. Now the very idea of an election, supposes, a nonelection, rejection, or passing by some who are not chosen. Let us for a moment bring the different parts of this system into contact, and examine their affinities and their repulsions. God is *most willing*, that is *infinitely willing* (for in God these are the same) to save *all men*. Then he is infinitely willing to *save* those whom he has rejected. And as there can be no succession of ideas in the divine mind, he was from all eternity *infinitely willing* to save those whom he *intended not* to save, but rejected and passed by, as Jude 4. "foreordained of old to condemnation." And Rom. ix. 22. "Vessels of wrath fitted for destruction !" Infinitely *willing* to do what he *did not will to do*, that is, was *unwilling to do* ! And to cap the climax of sublime wonderment, he laid down his life to *redeem from death*, those very persons, whom, from eternity he *did not design to redeem from death* ! Jesus made a complete atonement for *all men*. He is *infinitely willing* that *all men* should be saved—yet, at the same time, his *will* concerning some, is, that they should believe a lie, that all might be

damned who believe not the truth. 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12. "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie : that they all might be damned which believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." From such a system, good Lord, deliver us !

Having now, we trust, sufficiently exposed the false glosses, superinduced on the sacred text, let us proceed to state what we believe to be the true meaning of the passage, harmonizing with the context, with the general analogy of faith, and at the same time, in perfect concinnity with the moral phenomena of the universe.

We shall not even attempt to conjure up the hideous spectres, which haunt the wild domains of metaphysical speculation, lest we shock the nervous system of some of our more delicate readers. But we beg leave to apprise the reader, that we have not the most distant idea of denouncing metaphysics, as "an infernal fiend ascending from the bottom of Erebus, or Old Night, croaking her endless and unblest ditty !" The science is as legitimate as physics or mathematics. It deals as much in matters of reality as either of them. It differs from physics, principally in tracing the ramifications of the roots of a subject, if I may be allowed the expression, beyond the limits of physical science ; and exploring more minutely, and more extensively, that part of the concatenation of antecedence and subsequence, which is further removed from vulgar view. Without her aid, human knowledge would indeed be very limited. And, as in other departments of human inquiry, it often happens, that those who have been most beholden to her, and have drawn the most lavishly upon her treasures, are the least disposed to acknowledge the obligation. For ourselves, we would not wish to incur the suspicion of affectation, by concurring in her vituperation. Yet

still we shall avoid entering into any disquisition about the nature of *will, volition, agency, liberty, efficiency, &c.* But any person who reads his Bible attentively, will perceive, that by the *will* of God, is frequently meant, *an expression of the rectitude of his nature and perfections in the form of a law or a commandment*, although not always accompanied with that divine efficiency which is necessarily operative of the effect, at least commensurate with the universality of the injunction. Thus in the exhibition of the *moral law*, God *wills* that all men should be perfect and righteous; that is, he has commanded them to be so. But where shall we find such a man? He commanded our first parents to be so, and not eat the forbidden fruit; yet alas! they did eat it, and thus

"Brought death into the world, with all
its woes,
And loss of Eden."

In like manner, God wills the salvation of *all men*, just as he wills the immediate repentance and sanctification of *all men*, and that all should come to the knowledge of the truth, even while they remain ignorant, ungodly, and to every good work reprobate. He wills all men to be perfect in this life. It is their duty. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect. He now *wills*, that is, *commands*, all men every where to repent and believe the gospel, that their sins may be blotted out. It may be proper here to state that the expression *ὅς θελεῖ πᾶντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι*, may be rendered, who commandeth all men to be saved. The Greek verb *θελεῖ* is frequently used in this sense in the New Testament, for instance, Luke v. 10. John xxi. 21. Gal. vi. 13. *Θελεῖτε*; they constrain (command) you to be circumcised. This explanation offers no violence to the phraseology of even our own vernacular tongue, in which the *will* and the *command* of a superior

are often used synonymously. What is your *will*, sir? and what are your *commands*, sir? are of equivalent import. If this investigation be correct, God's *willing* that all men *should be saved*, no more proves; that all men *will be saved*, than his *willing* that all men should immediately repent, proves that all will immediately repent; or than his *willing*, that is, *commanding* that our first parents should retain their original innocency, and not involve themselves and their posterity in misery, proves that our first parents really did continue in a state of primeval beatitude. Should it be argued here, that even the command presupposes the possibility of the thing commanded; we shall freely admit, God cannot command what in the nature of things is impossible, or what involves a contradiction. But with abstract possibilities or impossibilities, we have, at present, nothing to do. 'Tis absolute truths, plain matters of fact, we are discussing. It is not whether there would be any absolute inconsistency in the nature of things that all created intelligences should be ultimately happy; but whether divine revelation furnishes us with any certain evidence that they shall be so. We deny that it does, and do maintain that the text under discussion furnishes any solid evidence for such a conclusion.

The text from Matth. xxiii. 37. is wholly destitute even of the shadow of support to the doctrine we have been opposing. The passage is evidently figurative. Jerusalem is put for the inhabitants: and not all these, but the governors, civil and ecclesiastical, scribes and pharisees to whom our Lord's discourse throughout the whole context is directed; and who were distinguished for their zeal in killing the prophets, and stoning the messengers of God. These are manifestly distinguished from the ecclesiastical and political children—the mass of the people. It is not said, "*How often would I have gathered you*

and you would not," nor "I would have gathered Jerusalem and she would not," nor "I would have gathered thy children and they would not;" but, "I would have gathered thy children and ye would not." Consequently it is nowhere affirmed in this passage, that the persons whom Christ would have gathered, were unwilling to be gathered. But granting the usually received extent of willingness, we consider it completely met and obviated in the preceding investigation.

III. The *third* portion of scripture, adduced in this controversy, is alleged to assert the universal restoration of the creature. Rom. viii. 19—24. "For the earnest expectation of the creature, waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, together until now. And not only they, but we ourselves also who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." In this passage, there are *two* grand points of inquiry.

1st. What is meant by the creature?

2d. The attributes predicated of it. When the first of these points shall have been ascertained, the second will follow, almost as a matter of course.

We here remark, that if *Edwards against Chauncey* were in the hands of every person, who may likely read the Presbyterian Magazine, we should not say one word on this text, but simply recommend that work to their perusal. But, as we believe this is not the case, we shall present our own opinion, which ge-

nerally coincides with that of the venerable president.

1st. In inquiring what may be the meaning of *creature* or *creation*, in this passage, it may not be improper to remark that the Greek word *κτίσις*, *creature* or *creation*, occurs four times in this place, and ought to have been uniformly rendered by the same English word; whether *creature* or *creation*, is, at present wholly immaterial. Let us endeavour, with all candour, to ascertain its meaning. It would be foreign to the present inquiry to enumerate the various interpretations which have been given to this little word. With its supposed bearing on universal salvation alone, we have to do. The manner in which it has been employed in support of that scheme, will be most fairly represented in the words of Dr. Chauncey, a redoubtable champion in that cause. The doctor asserts, "That the expressions, *earnest expectation, groaning, travailing together in pain*, are more naturally and obviously applicable to the rational, than the inanimate creation. That *παρα κτίσις*, the *whole creation*, is never used, (one disputed text only excepted, Col. i. 15) to signify more than the whole moral creation, or all mankind." That, "It would be highly incongruous to give this style [whole creation] to the inferior, or less valuable part, wholly leaving out the most excellent part, mankind." Now, besides this passage under consideration, this phrase, *παρα κτίσις*, *every creature*, is used only four times in all the New Testament, viz. Mark xvi. 15. where it is said, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel unto every creature." Here it is granted that mankind, and they exclusively, are intended. The other three passages are Col. i. 15. "The first born of every creature," verse 23. "The gospel which ye have heard which is preached to every creature which is under heaven." And 1 Pet. ii. 13.

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake."

We shall endeavour to make it appear, that in none of these *three* texts, does *πᾶσα κτίσις* signify *rational beings exclusively*; in one of them not at all; and in the other *two*, human beings, only as a very inconsiderable part of the whole.

In examining the *first* of these texts, viz. "the first born of every creature," it may be observed generally, that it can furnish no decisive evidence on the subject. The Unitarian may suppose that it contains decisive evidence of his adopted creed; while the Trinitarian understands it very differently; yet both may very consistently include the whole compages of the universe. The word *πρωτοτοκος*, rendered *first born*, may either mean, the HEIR of all things, or the PRIME BEGETTER, or FIRST PRODUCER of all created nature. We shall dismiss this text as furnishing nothing decisive on either side of the question.

The next passage, Col. i. 23. "The gospel which was preached to every creature under heaven," can be very easily disposed of, as to any evidence it may be supposed to furnish to the opposite side of the question. It reads in the original, *ἐν πάσῃ ἡ κτίσει*, in the whole creation; and ought unquestionably to have been so rendered. But if, as is contended, it designates a *human being*, then, literally the gospel was preached, *in*, or *within* every human body—in the *inside* of every man!

Only one place more remains, where the phrase is found, in all the New Testament. 2 Peter ii. 23. "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man—*πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*, to every human creature." The question is, do these expressions signify all mankind? The man who believes that the scriptures enjoin him to submit to every ordinance; that is, literally to every individual of the human race, whether *man*, *wo-*

man, or *child*; whether *black* or *white*; whether *wise man* or *fool*; and to *himself* also, making every one both the *ruler* and the *ruled*, at the same moment; we repeat, the man who can believe all this, is in a situation not very enviable. The hellebore of three Anticyras would be little enough for his own use! But it is plainly evident, that the apostle means human laws and constitutions, as far as they are predicated on the divine authority: and if human beings are all embraced in the expression, it can be such only as are vested with official and magistratical dignity. We have therefore made it appear that *πᾶσα κτίσις* does signify, sometimes *more*, sometimes *less*, than all mankind; and once, *none* of the human race at all.

Having thus examined the meaning of "every creature" in all the other places where it occurs, let us try to ascertain its import in Rom. viii. 23. &c. We have internal evidence in the passage itself, that it cannot mean the whole of the human race. All believers at least, or all who have the first fruits of the Spirit, are excluded. Verse 23, the apostle expressly declares, "Not only they (*πᾶσα κτίσις*) but we ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit; even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, &c." Whatever, therefore, the word "creature" may mean in this passage, we conceive we have shown that it furnishes not the slightest colour of evidence for the doctrine of universal salvation.

2d. We are under no obligation, in this inquiry, to show the meaning of the *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*, every creature, in this passage; or show its capability of possessing the attributes, and performing the functions, ascribed to it in the context. Yet, we cannot take leave of the subject, without observing that there is neither incongruity of properties, nor violence of metaphor, in confining it to the *inanimate* and *brutal* creation. We have then a noble, bold,

and lofty prosopopeia, no where exceeded either in the sacred or profane records. The boldness of the figure can form no objection to its admissibility. For if *earnest expectation, groaning, travelling together in pain, willingness or unwillingness*, did necessarily characterize the beings, to which they are attributed in scripture, as *rational*, then all *creation* will become *rational*! Brutality and inanimation will be totally excluded from this mundane system! In the cxlviith Psalm, all created nature, as well the animate and brutal, as the intelligent and rational, is commanded to praise Jehovah. Isaiah lv. 12. "The mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands." These surely are as bold metaphors, as *earnest expectation, groaning, &c.*, ascribed to brutal or inanimate creatures. In a word, there is nothing said in this passage respecting the creature, which may not, by a very usual figure, be applied to the inanimate and irrational creation, subjected, not for any fault of its own, to the bondage of corruption, in ministering to the depraved lusts of man; and the brutal part, moreover, to pain, misery and death; agreeably to the sentence of Jehovah, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake." Neither does this longing for emancipation from bondage necessarily suppose the resurrection of the brutes to a state of animal sensibility, at the day of judgment, as some writers of respectable name have maintained. These abused and insulted creatures, may by personification be introduced, as longing earnestly for the deliverance which awaits them, at the general resurrection, at the manifestation of the liberty of the sons of God, although their portion may be eternal insensibility. There is nothing incongruous in the idea of longing for such a deliverance. How often do we find the person suffering the

racking pain of the gout, the stone, or any other acute, agonizing disease, longing for the moment when the prescribed opiate shall have lulled him to repose, and have locked up his senses in the complete insensibility of a profound sleep! We dare not positively affirm, that this is the meaning of the passage, since commentators of high respectability think otherwise. But we have no hesitation in declaring, that, in our opinion, there is nothing in this explanation, inconsistent with the general analogy of faith, or with the bold figurative phraseology employed by the apostle.

S. B. W.

(To be continued.)

Reviews.

The Mediatorial Reign of the Son of God; or, the absolute ability and willingness of Jesus Christ to save all mankind, demonstrated from the scriptures. In which work an attempt is made to rescue the gospel call from false philosophy. BY JAMES GRAY, D. D. Baltimore, 1821, pp. 448, 8vo.

We have paid such respect to the opinions of the author of this volume as to read the whole of it deliberately; and should have done it, had we not been honoured by his request, (p. 340,) that we would reciprocate his regard for our judgment. Whatever may have been our expectations on the subject of his *arguments, application of terms and sophisms*, which certainly figure very conspicuously in ROMAN CAPITALS, in this work; we assuredly anticipated a display of fine writing, "a large portion of cheerfulness and good humour," and not a little "play of the imagination and feelings." p. 412. We find all these things, with such mock heroic tournaments against *metaphysics and the philosophy of Christianity*, and such serious assertion of several unscriptural theories as have

THE
PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE.

SEPTEMBER, 1821.

Communications.

LECTURES ON BIBLICAL HISTORY.

No. II.

"And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, to dress it, and to keep it. And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."—GEN. ii. 15—17.

In a preceding lecture, our attention was directed to the creation of the world, with its inhabitants and various productions. We have seen our own species eminently distinguished in the scale of creatures—made but a little lower than the angels—formed after the image of God, in knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness—united, male and female, by the tender ties of conjugal affection, and invested with dominion over the numerous tribes of inferior creatures that inhabit the land, the sea, and the air. We will now contemplate this happy couple, as the objects of Heaven's special regard, as the primitive parents of mankind, and as constituting one of the parties to the covenant which God condescended to form with the human family, then existing in, and represented by them.

Our readers will recollect what was stated in our first lecture—that Eve was made on the same day with Adam, i. e. on the sixth day of the creation week, (as is evident,

VOL. I.

chap. i. 17, "male and female created he them,") though the particular circumstances of her creation, for reasons already mentioned, are not to be met with in the narrative of Moses, earlier than the 21st verse of this 2d chapter. They are both, therefore, to be considered as present, and equally concerned, in the main transactions, related in that portion of sacred history which we are now going to examine.

The critics have been exceedingly puzzled to find the place, assigned as the original residence of our first parents. This is a topic on which fancy has been indulged to an unwarrantable extent. And some, weary of the search, and not being able to fix on any definite spot, bearing all the geographical marks of the earthly paradise mentioned by Moses, have been tempted to conclude, that, by the garden of Eden is meant, in scripture, the whole field of nature, every part of which must have been a paradise, or place of delight to man, while he retained his innocence, and held fast his integrity. But the scriptural account seems, obviously, intended to convey the idea of locality. No person, perhaps, ever read the account seriously without receiving that impression; and, in regard to the most important facts and doctrines of the Bible, our first impressions are very likely to be correct, especially if we read with an honest desire to know the truth, and not with a view to find support for a preconceived opinion, or a fa-

— “left a name, at which the world grew pale,
To point a moral or adorn a tale.”

And what is infinitely more important to him, he has, if death has really set its seal upon him, finished his period of probation, and gone to receive, according “to the deeds done in the body.” Probably no individual of Adam’s race, had ever a higher responsibility to “the Judge of all,” than this man. From that judge he has received an equitable award, which will abide him throughout eternity. In the hands of that judge, who is soon to pass sentence on ourselves, let us leave him. But it is a duty to derive instruction from the dispensations of Providence in regard to him; from what he was, what he did, and what he became. Since hearing of his death, I happened to cast my eye on part of a sermon, delivered shortly after he was incarcerated in the island of St. Helena; which I send you for publication, if you think it proper to be inserted in your magazine. The sermon from which I give you this extract, was an illustration of Psalm xcvi. 1. “The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice.” In showing that God reigneth in the kingdoms of men, the following remarks were introduced. “No age of the world ever witnessed greater or more sudden changes in the state of nations, or in the possession of sovereign power, than that in which we live. Three years since, a fortunate soldier, raised from an obscure original, was perhaps the most splendid and puissant emperor that ever wore a diadem. The world trembled before him; and never on its surface was arrayed an army of such physical force as was then led by him, to the subjugation, as he expected, of the only unsubjugated power of continental Europe. But “the Lord reigneth.” The warrior’s tide of success was expended. At the highest point of his elevation, he was left to infatuated projects. He could not combat with the cold, and storms, and tempests—the artillery of heaven. The blast of Jehovah struck him. His mighty army was

annihilated. He fled—and thenceforth all his glory fled. He who three years since was the most powerful mortal that ever existed, is now a powerless captive in the loneliest isle on earth. How impressively does this teach us that “the Lord reigneth!” that “the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will.” CLERICUS.

August 18th, 1821.

ON THE DURATION OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

(Continued from page 317.)

5. Another class of texts is adduced in support of the doctrine of Universalism, because they establish the *unlimited subjection of all things in the created universe, to the Mediator, previously to his resignation of his delegated empire*. The texts alleged are, Ps. viii. 5, 6, Heb. ii. 6—9, Rev. v. xiii, and 1 Cor. xv. 24—29. The doctrine taught in these texts merits particular attention. As the same principle pervades the whole of these passages of scripture, the examination of one of them will suffice. We shall select the last, which our opponents have considered as furnishing a Herculean argument in their favour. To use the words of one of their champions, this text is “decisive of itself, were there no other text in the Bible of like import.” “Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he shall put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest, that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.”

This passage does demonstrate in

the most categorical terms, that the mediatory empire embraces every existence in the created universe. We will even add, that all created intelligences are necessarily bound to submit with cordiality to his righteous sceptre. But does it follow, that, because all are bound by the strongest moral obligation to yield obedience to MESSIAH, they either *have done*, or *will do so*? Alas! such an inference is wholly incompatible with fact and experience. But we are told that *sin* also will be *subjected*; and that this can be in no other way than by *annihilation*. To this we reply: Sin in the abstract is a mere nonentity. It has no existence. It is with *sinning beings*, therefore, that we have to do in this inquiry. Now, the question is, does the subjection of sinning beings necessarily suppose, either their cordial reconciliation to the subjector, or their annihilation? Very different, indeed, from this, is the idea of *subjection* exhibited in the 110th Psalm. "Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Is this to be understood as involving either a voluntary submission to his authority, or their utter extinction? Nay, the very expression, "put under his feet," or "made his footstool," is utterly incompatible with either reconciliation or destruction. As *friends*, they will sit with him on his throne, and will not be treated with such marks of degradation and contempt, as these expressions plainly import. As *enemies*, men may be under his feet; but this phrase, so far from implying in it, annihilation, necessarily involves the contrary. An enemy may be under the feet of the conqueror, *previously* to annihilation; but *after* it, he is neither under his feet, nor any where else. How visionary the fabrics which are erected on such foundations! The truth is, this passage furnishes not the slightest countenance, either obvious or implied, to the doctrine of Universalism. The seizure of such a post as this is, must have been a forlorn hope. Yet we shall try patiently to examine a little

farther, the use our opponents make of this portion of scripture.

It is asserted that the mediatory "scheme will not be finished at the second coming of Christ; but a great deal will then remain to be done, before the plan of God, for the accomplishment of which, the mediatory kingdom is entrusted to the Son, shall be completed." In proof of this, it is alleged,

1. That this passage of scripture teaches that an universal subjection to Christ is to be effected before the finishing of the mediatory scheme; but this universal subjection is not effected at the second coming of Christ.

2. The reward of the good and faithful subjects of Christ is to be bestowed on them in the kingdom of Christ, and therefore Christ's kingdom will not be at an end, till after they shall have enjoyed that reward, for some time at least. Let us proceed to examine each of these proofs, and with regard to the

1. Viz. that a universal subjection to Christ is to be effected before the finishing of the mediatory kingdom, which subjection is not effected at the second coming of Christ. We most heartily concede the first part. Nothing, indeed, can be more evident from scripture, than the universality of the mediatory empire. Every thing from the roofless heaven to the bottomless deep, is subject to the control of Messiah. But we repeat it, on the *willingness* or the *unwillingness* of this subjection, the whole argument unquestionably turns. If the subjection to the Mediator be *voluntary*, then it is moral and virtuous: and a universal subjection upon moral grounds, would of necessity exclude sin from the universe: but the exclusion of sin from the universe, would, of course, exclude all misery; because misery, unaccompanied by sin as its procuring cause, would be repugnant to justice, and incompatible with God's moral administration. But while the universality of the subjection is cheerfully admitted, the voluntariness of it, and consequently

its virtuous and moral character, are categorically denied. Now, in order to show that all intelligent creatures will be cordially subjected to Christ, and so will be saved, we are told that both sin and the second death will be destroyed. This position we shall immediately proceed to examine: and

1. That sin will be destroyed. This is founded on these expressions—"He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. All things shall be subdued unto him." But sin is an enemy. It must of consequence be put under his feet, that is, it shall be destroyed; *i. e.* it shall be *abolished*, completely *eradicated*, and give place to universal rectitude. Let us examine, for a moment, the logic of this curious process of ratiocination. When thrown into the form of a syllogism, it will stand thus:

Maj. Every enemy of the Mediator shall be *subdued* during the actual existence of his dispensatory kingdom:

Min. But sin is an enemy of the Mediator:

Con. Ergo—Sin shall be annihilated!

Strange logic! Such reasoners are not to be envied of their acquaintance with the lore of the Stagyrice. Let us try the principle of this logic on topics with which we are familiar. For the sake of brevity, we shall present it in the enthymematic form.

General Washington *conquered, subdued, or subjected* Cornwallis and his army:

Therefore he *annihilated* them!

Buonaparte *subdued* Italy, Spain, &c.:

Therefore he *annihilated* them!

But the truth is, the apostle nowhere says, that all enemies shall be destroyed: and if *subduing, destroying, and annihilating*, all mean one and the same thing, then when a father subdues a rebellious son, he annihilates him! When God subdues his enemies, he annihilates them! But if *subduing* mean cordial re-

conciliation to Christ, which it must do, if by means of this *subduing*, those formerly enemies, are now introduced into the beatific vision; and if at the same time *subduing* mean *destruction*, and *annihilation*; then *destruction*, &c., and *reconciliation*, identify! Therefore when Paul was converted, he was destroyed. And when the wicked are said to be punished with everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord; this *punishment* consists in *everlasting reconciliation* to God, and the exquisite enjoyment of a blessed immortality!!!

2. It is also maintained that the second death shall be destroyed. It is contended that as the *first* death is expressly declared to be destroyed, and as the *second* death is as great an enemy as the first could be, it must be destroyed also. The fallaciousness of this reasoning may be easily exposed. There was an indispensable necessity for the abolition of the first death. All the attributes of the Divinity were pledged for its accomplishment; but particularly his faithfulness and his justice. This shall take place at the general resurrection, and shall introduce the sheep and the goats to their respective destinations: the former to the mansions of unspeakable beatitude: the latter to the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the *second death*. The assertion that this shall be abolished, is entirely gratuitous. It is the most barefaced begging of the question. It is alleged to be an enemy to the mediatory kingdom. Let us examine this allegation for a moment. In what does the second death consist? Is it any thing else than the operation of the wrath of God, or the execution of justice on the guilty offender? Is not this the worm that shall never die? Is not this the fire that shall never be quenched? Now we should be glad to know wherein the execution of justice can be hostile to the kingdom of Messiah? No doubt it may be inimical to the suffering culprit:

but surely it can involve no hostility to the Mediator. Who would ever have dreamed, that the public execution of the sentence of the law, on a person guilty of treason against the state, was an act of hostility against that same state? Nay, would it not rather be considered as the most salutary means that could be employed for promoting the public safety?

The advocates of this doctrine would seem not to be aware, that, in their zeal for supporting their cause; they cling to positions, and maintain assumptions, which necessarily lead to ludicrous consequences. Death and hell are to be annihilated. How? By being cast into the lake of fire. But the being cast into the lake of fire, is the second death—"which," says John, "is the second death;" that is, annihilation and the second death identify—they are the same thing. Again, the second death, being as much an enemy to the mediatory kingdom as the first death, must be destroyed, *i. e.* annihilated. Thus we have annihilation itself, annihilated! Should the grammatical law or algebraical canon be applied here, viz. that two negatives make an affirmative, this last annihilation must issue in a reproduction of all the subjects that were annihilated; and thus, death and hell, in all their tremendous and horrific forms, would be resuscitated, and every similar annihilation of them would be succeeded by an equally unsightly resurrection! We shall now proceed to the

2. Argument deduced from the passage, viz. that the reward of the good and faithful subjects of Christ is to be bestowed on them in the kingdom of Christ, and that therefore Christ's kingdom will not end till after they shall have enjoyed that reward, at least for some time. The kingdom of grace, therefore, will not terminate at the general judgment; and during its continuance, after that period, the inhabitants of Tophet will be reclaimed

and prepared for the joys of heaven. Nothing can be more gratuitous than the premises in this argument. The conclusion, of course, is legitimate. But even granting the premises, might not the sentence of eternal beatitude in favour of the faithful subjects of Christ, be instantaneously succeeded by the resignation of the dispensatory kingdom? Or, might they not be perfectly simultaneous? But, the fact is, this pretended argument is so completely destitute of any thing like rational tangibility, that it becomes, upon approaching it, totally evanescent.

This passage, therefore, so far from furnishing any argument for universal salvation, simply treats of Christ's surrendering up the mediatory empire, after the resurrection and final judgment; when all the purposes for which it had been given unto him, shall have been fully accomplished. The extent of this kingdom is commensurate with the created universe. His divinity qualifies him for its administration. The government of all created things rests upon his shoulders. He is King of kings, and Lord of lords. The discharge of his mediatory functions required that the resources of the universe should be at his disposal; not simply as God, coequal, coessential, and coeternal with the Father; but in his mediatorial character. It is consequently an adventitious kingdom. He holds it by delegation from God the Father, as representing and sustaining in this representative character, the sovereign majesty of the triune Godhead. Thus he informs us, after his resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 18: "All power in heaven and in earth is given unto me." As God, he was naturally and necessarily possessed of all possible power. In this character, nothing could be given to him. It is only as Mediator, in the character of the Father's honorary servant, that he could receive a donation. He holds this

kingdom partly as a reward for having finished the work which the Father had assigned him in the stipulations of the everlasting covenant; and partly, as the necessary machinery for the execution of the great purpose of redemption. Thus the apostle, Phil. ii. 9, 10: "He humbled himself, and became obedient to the death; and for *this cause*, God hath *highly exalted* him; and given him a name above every name; that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, and every tongue confess him Lord." And Eph. i. 21: "God hath given him to be head over all things to the church which is his body." Were his mediatory empire and authority limited to the church, it would be usurpation in him as Mediator, to make any inroad by his gospel, upon the heathen world, as not forming any part of his empire, and consequently not subject to his delegated jurisdiction. But were his government *limited to the church*, then, even although his gospel should find its way among the heathen, it would be wholly useless, because it would be unaccompanied by mediatory efficiency. For there is nothing more plain, than that where Jesus is not mediator, he could not act as such. And the efficiency of the gospel does not arise from the agency of an absolute God.

When all the purposes for which this delegated kingdom was conferred upon the Mediator, shall have been accomplished—when all the displays of his grace in saving sinners shall have been made—when the whole economy of salvation, in converting, feeding, defending, invigorating and sanctifying the elect shall have been developed—when all establishments on earth, hostile to Messiah's kingdom, shall have been put down—when all the purposes of his delegated governmental authority shall have been fulfilled; and, in a word, when the whole system of grace and redemption shall have been wound up, and no enemy

shall remain, whom God in the appointment of a Mediator ever intended to reconcile; then, we say, as all the purposes of this mediatory empire shall have been completely realized, the delegated empire conferred on the Son shall be delivered up to the Father. Then, all these subjugatory and reconciling functions shall be discontinued, shall cease for ever. All the machinery of Divine Providence, constituting the vehicle of the energetic influence, by which these phenomena were produced, will terminate. The grand drama has closed. The theatre, scenery, curious mechanism, and vital energy are no longer necessary. There is no more reduction of rebels, or subjugation of enemies. All the elect stipulated for, in the eternal covenant, have been gathered home. The whole design of the dispensatory kingdom having been thus accomplished, Jesus shall resign the providential empire to God the Father. The government of the universe, will then revert to its primordial channel, and God, essentially considered, that is, God the Father, Son, and Spirit, will be the fountain of dominion, and of all divine emanations and communications of glory and blessedness, to all the saints, and to the man Christ Jesus at their head, to all eternity.

But we are not to suppose, that Christ's delivering up the kingdom to God the Father, implies that he shall in all respects cease to be king. This would prove too much. He can resign only the donative empire. The government of the universe, he cannot abdicate. It necessarily belongs to him, as God, coequal with the Father.* His brow must, moreover, be eternally decorated with the laurels he won and the triumphs he gained in achieving the salvation of his church. His Zion will be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem of beauty in the hand of our God. All this must result from his

mediatory interposition, be the fruit of the hypostatical mystery,—the incarnation of the Son of God.

But there is a kingdom which he shall never resign—his church, his purchased possession. “He shall reign over the house of David for ever and ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” This is the travail of his soul, which he shall see, and with which he shall be satisfied. This is his *peculiar* reward, inalienable through eternity. It was for the sake of this that the general kingdom of Providence was given unto him. In the execution of the system of grace, he was authorized by virtue of this donation, to levy contributions on the resources of the universe. In the administration of his providential kingdom, he renders all the movements of creation subservient to the interests of Zion. He has engraven her on the palms of his hands, her walls are ever before him. We might illustrate this scheme by the following similitude: A great and puissant monarch finds a distant province of his empire to be in a state of rebellion. His son, the heir apparent to the throne, is commissioned by his royal father, to reduce to obedience the revolted district. For this purpose he is invested with plenipotentiary powers; and authorized to draw at pleasure on every department of this vast empire. The right in, and government of, the rebel province, when brought back to its allegiance, is the reward of his own loyalty, toils and dangers in the expedition. The object is accomplished. The subjects from being rebellious, become the most affectionate and loyal. He resigns his plenipotentiary powers, and rejoices in the homage of a virtuous and loving people. In like manner, when the administration of the temporary providential kingdom shall have attained all its objects, it ceases; because its continuance is altogether unnecessary. But the

church shall for ever remain, a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a diadem of beauty on the brow of Messiah. The man Christ Jesus shall sit upon the throne of the universe, in mysterious union with the second person of the Godhead, through eternity. “Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” Such appears to me to be the doctrine taught in this passage so grossly abused by the Universalists.

6. Another text has been adduced by a modern writer in his *Treatise on the Atonement*. With great self-complacency, in page 182, he proceeds to tell us, “If my opponent can tell me, how Jesus will *finish transgression* and *make an end of sin*, and yet sin and transgression continue as long as God exists, he will puzzle me more than all his objections have been able to do.” We shall try to puzzle this brave knight errant, by telling him, not how Jesus *could finish*, but how he *has finished transgression*, and made an *end of sin*, and yet sin and transgression shall continue as long as God exists.

The passage to which our author attaches so much consequence, as supporting the system of the *total abolition of sin and misery* from the universe, is from Dan. ix. 24. “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to *finish transgression*, and make an *end of sins*,” &c. If the passage, from which this is an extract, has any meaning at all, it must be to designate and particularize the *time* of the advent of Messiah, and the *consummation* of the vicarious atonement devolving upon him, in such a manner, that nothing short of judicial blindness or wilful obstinacy could mistake or dispute the divine authenticity of the mission of Jesus of Nazareth. Now, this was to be at the end of four

hundred and ninety years, or seventy prophetic weeks from the issuing of the decree granted by Artaxerxes Longimanus to Ezra, in the seventh year of his reign, for restoring and rebuilding Jerusalem. Wherefore, it is abundantly evident, that whatever is meant by *finishing* transgression and making an end of sin, was accomplished at that time. Surely none professing Christianity will deny that this event occurred many centuries ago. Have sin and transgression been utterly annihilated? Woful experience demonstrates their existence. Instead of any thing like evanescence, the present state of society presents many alarming instances of malignant exacerbation. Some other meaning, therefore, must be found consistent with facts and phenomena. In endeavouring to ascertain this, we shall pursue a plan which never has been deemed illegitimate; viz. We shall inquire what these words mean in other passages of scripture, in which their application has never been disputed. In doing justice to this investigation, we shall be obliged to employ a few Hebrew collations; for which the nature of the investigation must be our apology.

The word used by Daniel, in the passage under consideration, rendered to *finish* by our translators, is כָּלָא, and signifies to *restrain, confine, prohibit, separate, &c.*; and in the Septuagint version is rendered by καλῶν, ἀνιχνῶ, συνιχνῶ, καταλείω, φυλάττω, συνιλεω, &c. all nearly synonymous in their respective applications. Let us inquire how the Hebrews used it in the Old Testament, and see whether they employed it to designate the *destruction, abolition* or *annihilation* of any former existences. We find this same word used in Hag. i. 10. כָּלָא שָׁמַיִם מִטָּל, The heavens have *restrained* (themselves) from dew, and the earth hath *restrained* its fruit. Is there here any annihila-

tion of previous existences? Is it not evident there is only a restriction, or a temporary embargo laid upon the existing resources of nature? In Jer. xxxii. 3, speaking of the imprisonment of Jeremiah, we have אָשַׁר כָּלָא, whom (Zedekiah king of Judah) *had shut up*. But who would have ever supposed that the prophet Jeremiah, the antecedent to the relative *whom*, was *abolished, destroyed* or *annihilated*? Again, Ps. cxix. 101, כָּלֹאִי רִגְלִי, *I have refrained my feet* from every evil way. Now, shall we believe that the Psalmist *abolished, destroyed* or *annihilated* his feet? But lest we should seem tedious, we shall quote only one passage more where this word is used. Ex. xxxvi. 6, וַיִּכְלֹא הָעָם מִבְּרִינָה, *And the people were restrained from bringing*. It would have been rather a hard case, if the liberality of the people for the use of the tabernacle, had issued in their *destruction*. It is plain, therefore, from the general application of the word, that it means *restriction, confinement* or *prohibition* from the former *range* of freedom, or uncontrolled liberty of action. Such is evidently its generic meaning, and will very well accord with the scope of the passage, viz. the restriction of the empire of sin, and limitation of the kingdom of darkness, by the atoning sacrifice of our Lord. Sin is in due time destroyed in all who believe on him; it shall not continue to have dominion over them. Thus the prevailing power of sin is restrained, and gradually limited to the implacable enemies of Jehovah's government, in the gloomy mansions of Tophet, where their worm shall never die; nor shall their fire ever be quenched.

Let us now inquire what is meant by *making an end of sins*. The words used by the prophet are לַחֲתֹם חַטָּאת, rendered by our translators, *to make an end of sins*. חָתַם in Hebrew, and Ꝁ Ꝁ Ꝁ the Arabic

root, signify to *perfect, seal, seal up, to close, to finish, &c.* And as the meaning is agreed upon, on all hands, there is no need to waste time in settling it by Biblical quotations. We shall admit it to signify the *ending* or *termination* of a thing, in the fullest latitude. The whole of our criticism, here, will turn on the meaning of the word חטאת, rendered *sins*, by our translators. Now, that this term does not always mean *sins*, whether in the *abstract*, or in the *concrete*, will, we think, be evident from its use and application in the following texts, with many others which might be mentioned. According to lexicographers, *aberration*, or *deviation from the scope or aim*, is the generic signification of its root, חטא. It has the same meaning in the Arabic, in which its root *حالا* is also found. But with its *nominal* modification, or its particular meaning when it puts on the form of a noun, we are chiefly concerned at present. This we shall endeavour to ascertain from its legitimate and uncontested applications.

In Zech. xiv. 19, by an easy metonymy, it signifies *punishment*. ואת תהיה חטאת מצרים, This shall be the *punishment* of Egypt, &c. Here *punishment* is put for its procuring cause—*sin*. In Mich. vi. 7, it signifies that which is given by way of *offering* or *expiation* for sin. Thus פרי בטני חטאת נפשי, The fruit of my body (as) a *sin-offering* of, or for, my soul. Here, by the same figure as above, the word rendered *sin*, means a *sin-offering* made for *sin*. This is further evident from Leviticus iv. 3, and xxv. 29, where *sin* is put for the sacrifice of expiation: for what is there rendered *sin-offering*, is, in the Hebrew, *sin*. And, which is strikingly in point, the apostle (2 Cor. v. 21) says, "For he hath made him *sin* for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him:" that is, God was pleased that Jesus Christ, who knew no sin, should be-

come a *victim* of expiation, or an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of all those whom God had given unto him to be redeemed from wrath. Thus *sin* means the *victim*, or the *sin-offering* for sin, whether in the shape of a meritorious or typical atonement. Manifestly to the same purpose, is that expression in Hosea iv. 8, חטאת עמי יאכלו, *they eat up the sins of my people*; which, beyond all doubt, must mean the *sin-offerings* fed upon, by the priests. Nothing, therefore, can be more plain, than that the *making an end of sin*, in the acknowledged scripture use of the phrase, signifies that all sacrifices and oblation should cease. Compare this meaning of the expression with the twenty-seventh verse: "And in the midst of the week, he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Jesus having, by one offering, for ever perfected those who are sanctified, all sacrifice and oblation must cease of course. The whole of the typical ritual was come to an end, being consummated in that infinitely valuable sacrifice adumbrated by the whole ritual system of the Old Testament economy. Jesus was "the *end* of the law for righteousness to all them that believe." Why should not the shadows cease, when the substance itself, the Sun of Righteousness, had made his appearance? Jesus Christ, the substitutional sin-offering, had himself borne the sins of his people, in his own body on the tree, that they being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness, and consequently, every repetition of sacrifice, symbolical of him, would be a virtual rejection of his infinitely meritorious atonement.

We trust, now, we have made it abundantly evident to the attentive reader, that there is no inconsistency between our Lord's finishing transgression, and making an end of sin; and yet sin and transgression continuing as long as God exists.

S. B. W.