




BX

9941

.749

1838



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

Alvout-Mayers

DIALOGUES

ON

UNIVERSAL SALVATION,

AND

TOPICS CONNECTED THEREWITH.

BY

✓
DAVID THOM,

MINISTER OF BOLD STREET CHAPEL, LIVERPOOL;

AUTHOR OF "THE ASSURANCE OF FAITH, OR CALVINISM IDENTIFIED WITH
UNIVERSALISM," "THREE QUESTIONS PROPOSED AND ANSWERED;"
ETC, ETC; CORRESPONDING SECRETARY FOR ENGLAND TO
THE AMERICAN UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY;
ETC.

LONDON:

SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL:

LIVERPOOL: GEORGE PHILIP.

MDCCCXXXVIII.

LIVERPOOL :
RIDDICK AND KERR, PRINTERS,
BRUNSWICK STREET.

EPISTLE PREFATORY.

TO
ROBERT THOM Esq.,
MERCHANT AT CANTON,
IN THE
EMPIRE OF CHINA.

My truly dear brother,

It will occasion you doubtlessly no small degree of surprise, to have your ordinary avocations broken in upon by an address of this public nature. And, if surprised at the address itself, how much more so at the conspicuous part which, unwittingly, you have been made to play throughout the following pages.

The fact is, that having for some time past contemplated the publication of a volume, which should treat of certain momentous topics of a religious kind, not often made the subject matter of discussion; and having conceived that, by adopting the form of dialogue, I was more

likely to excite interest and make myself understood, than were I to have recourse to a more didactic method of composition; the only real difficulty of any consequence which I encountered, was in fixing upon the parties who should be brought forward as my speakers. To the use of fictitious names, I felt strongly disinclined. The Therons and Aspasios, the Philalethes's, the Theophilus's, and the Biblicus's, of a former day, did not happen to suit my taste. Real personages were what I wanted. But why violate the truth of history, by representing the illustrious dead as acquiescing in sentiments, which, in their time, had not been broached; or to which, as we gather from their writings, their minds were adverse? And what right had I, without consulting them, to introduce living characters as a portion of my machinery? This was somewhat puzzling. At last it struck me, that I might, not only without offence, but even in such a way as to testify affection and respect, bring you on the stage as one of my interlocutors. And this being once resolved on, anomalous as the procedure may appear to be,—indeed, amounting as it does to a practical *bull*,—it was farther determined, that the conversations should be carried on by you with myself. The author of *the whole* was thus to present himself to his readers as merely the author of *a part*.

Conceiving as I do, that I am in possession of views of religion of a more-than-usually important kind; and that I am capable of maintaining these against all opposition; I have certainly acted the part of a superior and a teacher throughout these dialogues. You, therefore, are made to yield. By the arguments which I employ and enforce, you allow yourself ultimately to be overcome.

But have I, on that account, assigned to you a trifling part? Have I represented you as urging objections, of the weakness and inapplicability of which you could have reason to be ashamed? With such treatment of you, I cannot charge myself. So far from putting into your mouth feeble and ineffective arguments and objections, merely that I might exhibit my prowess in demolishing them, I have not allowed you to express a single sentiment of which the most intelligent ordinary professors of religion would not unhesitatingly avail themselves. Nay, in opposing me, the views and notions to which you are made to give utterance, are such as in the works, and from the lips, of such characters one is in the constant habit of reading and listening to. But while I employed you as an adversary, I had to remember that you are, what among the religious *par excellence* it is somewhat rare to meet with, a candid man. Therefore it is, that you are never made to carry your opposition beyond the bounds prescribed by fair and legitimate argumentation. You are never represented as violating conscience. On the contrary, I have sometimes made use of you, after being yourself convinced, to assist me in explaining and enforcing some of those blessed truths, which it is the grand object of this book to bring under public notice. Whenever it appeared to me, that a somewhat less candid and enlightened controversialist than yourself was required to the working of my plans, an imaginary Friend has been called on to supply the *desideratum*. By the introduction of this personage, besides, I have ensured a little more variety, as well as a more thorough sifting and development of my religious system, than if the conversations had been limited to ourselves.

I could have wished to connect your name with some work of greater magnitude and more consequence, than even the following. It is not mere fraternal affection, I trust, which suggests to me, that you are worthy of the highest literary offering which it is in my power to present. And still more important works than this have been planned, and partly executed by me. But why delay, until I can prepare and publish them? Besides the *res angusta domi*, and many other circumstances which poor authors are obliged to take into account in bringing their compositions before the public, can I forget the shortness and uncertainty of human life, and the risque of postponed intentions never being executed? Life is fertile in projects, and in the glowing and glorious anticipations of future doings, with which, in quick and constant succession, it contrives to enchant the mental eye:—

Life is a looking forward from the day
Of being's dawn, the infancy of thought;
While fancy's brightest visions round us play,
And all the path looks fair, and fraught
With full-blown promises;

But death too often steps in most unceremoniously to interrupt and disappoint them; or, in the somewhat quaint language of the sweet poem from which the above extract has been taken,

Death records the flight of time, its doom,
And frames its epitaph, that tells the blast
All we can say of gone mortality, " 'Tis past."*

Desirous, therefore, to avoid adding mine to the stock of 'unfulfilled intentions,'—a species of commodity with which, according to a certain puritanical writer, a place which shall be nameless 'is paved,'—I have resolved to

* *Angel Visits*, by James Riddall Wood. Canto 2d.

'take time by the forelock'; and, however unworthy these pages in many respects may be of your acceptance, to effect, in as far as I am able, an inseparable connection between your name and them.

You understand, then, my dear Robert, that besides your being introduced as one of the principal speakers in the following work, to you the work itself is dedicated. With all its sins and imperfections on its head, it is put under and claims your patronage.

Lest any should be stupid or perverse enough, notwithstanding the disclaimer which I have already made, to suppose that the whole, or any portion, of the language and sentiments imputed to you in this publication is yours, I beg leave, in the most distinct manner possible, to undeceive them. In so far as you are a spokesman in these dialogues, you are the mere creature of my imagination. The ideas presented throughout are mine, not yours. For them I, not you, am responsible. It is true, that, in former days, before your first voyage to South America, we did hold frequent conversations on the subject of religion; and I almost think, that some of the matters treated of in the first dialogue were, on more than one occasion, considered and discussed by us. You were then very young; and, without sacrificing in the slightest degree that independence of thought and character by which you have all along been distinguished, you were pleased to attach an importance to many of my views and statements, which was exceedingly flattering to me. Still, I cannot charge my memory with your having ever expressed yourself as, for my own purposes, I have here represented you as doing. One thing I know, that, at the period alluded to, the all-

important topics treated of in the second and following dialogues, had not even occurred to my mind. Respecting them, therefore, there neither was, nor could have been, any intercourse between you and me. But a truce to all this. Without any farther preface, I interpose myself between you and all the shafts of criticism. If there is any fault to be found with either the matter, or the manner, of these dialogues, against me, and me only, let the censure be directed.

Me, me; adsum qui feci; in me convertite ferrum.

You are in no respect whatever to blame. You were ignorant of the intended publication of the work; you are, up to this moment, a perfect stranger to most of the sentiments which it contains; you are innocent of any guilt which may be conceived to attach to the leading doctrines which it advocates. In so far as these dialogues are concerned, I am the only party to whom the critic has any thing to say, and with whom he has any thing to do. The announcing of *the author* as one of the interlocutors, at the commencement of every dialogue, has been done of set purpose: it being hoped that thereby all mistakes will be obviated, and the circumstance of the whole having proceeded from myself be kept constantly and prominently before the reader's mind.

As to the assaults of criticism upon myself, I neither court nor deprecate them. To me, the language of reviewers, whether making a profession of religion or the reverse, is now very nearly a matter of indifference. This I say, without any affectation. There was a time when, owing to the natural constitution of my mind, the flattery or the censures of magazines and reviews would have pro-

duced a considerable effect upon my feelings. But that period is long since gone past. The neglect, if not contempt, which I have experienced at the hands of “the gentle craft,” with respect to some former honest and well-meant endeavours to obtrude on the public notice views which I know to be true, and which strike me as involving consequences of supreme importance, has tended towards curing, if it has not actually cured, my expectations from the world. “The disciple,” I perceive, must be content “to be like his master;” “the servant, to be like his Lord.” If religious statements be brought down and accommodated to the mere fleshly mind, and its apprehensions of divine things,—well. Physical and metaphysical theories of a present or a future state, however foolish when considered in a scriptural point of view, will, on the ground of the acknowledged genius and worldly attainments of their respective authors, be *received gladly*. 2 Corinthians xi. 19. But woe be to him, who, whatever be the strength or feebleness of his intellect—whatever be his ability or lack of ability—attempts to treat of and exhibit the truth of God, in its native, spiritual, and glorious simplicity. Such an one will speedily, in the neglect, the insolence, or the avowed contempt of the literary demigods of the day, be furnished with a practical comment on the revealed inability of *the mere fleshly mind*, however strong and capacious otherwise, to understand and relish *spiritual things*. 1 Corinth: ii. 14. To treatment of the kind alluded to, you are well aware that for years I have been subjected, As the reward of earnest desires, and repeated attempts, to draw the attention of professing Christians to simpler and more self-consistent views of the

scriptures than those which are commonly entertained, I have been loaded with imputations of heresy, kicked out of an established church, shunned by dissenters, condemned by the Pharisaical, laughed at by the Sadducean, and considered a fitting object of neglect by all. Those productions of mine, in which, without affecting any false modesty, I can say with truth, that I have brought out views of a spiritual kind much superior to the clearest and the best-digested of those which pass current in the world, have not been deemed worthy even of a notice the most contemptuous. This present work, therefore, like some of its predecessors, is published without any great expectation on my part of its attracting regard, and in some measure careless whether it do so or not. Looking upon myself as, like every other human being, a mere instrument in the hands of Jehovah, I avail myself of every opportunity which, in the course of his adorable providence, he may vouchsafe to me, of drawing attention to those glorious discoveries of heavenly truth, of which, from time to time, my own spiritually-enlightened conscience has been made the passive recipient. *Freely I have received; freely I give.* The world in general, the great, the learned, and the talented, but more especially the nominally pious, will continue to treat me and my sentiments with contempt. But what of that? They cannot hinder one of the designs of God from being accomplished. To me it is matter of absolute certainty, that with a view to some end or purpose, however trifling and insignificant in the eyes of the world, the publication of these dialogues must have been permitted to take place. And if a few individuals, obscure and despised like the

author himself—a few of those *babes and sucklings out of whose mouths* their heavenly father is pleased to ordain strength—shall derive the slightest spiritual benefit from their perusal ; if thereby to them Christ and his salvation shall be rendered more precious ; can a higher or more important object be, by the child of God, conceived of, and be, by the divine blessing, attained to ?

Observe, my dear brother, I am not complaining. Indeed, I have no reason to do so. Independently of spiritual considerations altogether, the kindness of friends, and the wide circulation given to my books in spite of the silence of reviewers, have been most encouraging. While thus made instrumental in communicating benefit to some, why should I discontinue my literary labours ? But success in publishing is, comparatively speaking, a paltry consideration. Nay, rejoicing in it would, under my circumstances, be the indulgence of a splenetic, not of a Christian feeling. The grand reason why I complain not is, that complaints with regard to the treatment which he experiences from the world, come with a very bad grace from a child of God. Let me never forget, that Cain was the elder brother, and Abel merely the younger. For in this, as in other cases of a similar kind, *that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural.* As the elder, and as possessed consequently of the natural birthright, to Cain and to his seed belong the good things of this world, as their portion and inheritance. It is *the inheritance of the saints in light, —the inheritance that fadeth not away,*—which has been assigned to Abel, and to those who by faith are one with him. This being the case, why should I, as a believer, expect or claim from God benefits which, to the men of the world,

he expressly declares himself to have made over, and which to them, therefore, rightfully belong? Why should I grudge them their portion? Why should I complain that it is not mine? Have they not a full and unquestionable right to the pleasures, comforts, and advantages of time; and what right have I to interfere with them in the enjoyment of these? No. I do not complain. Flesh and blood, it is true,—my nature as a man,—shrinks back from sufferings and ill-usage at the hands of *a world that lieth in wickedness*. But as a partaker of the earnest of the divine nature of Christ, I reproach them not; I return not *evil for evil*; I wait with patience for *the resurrection of the just*. Luke xiv. 14.

Well am I aware, that, in the present volume, considered merely in a literary point of view, there is much for criticism to fasten on. Its structure, its arrangement, its composition, are far, far indeed, from being faultless. To save trouble, I am ready to admit the severest indictment against it, which it may please the man of taste and refined intellect to draw up. Does he indulge in the language of disparagement? I more. Its style, I grant, is dull, laboured, irregular, involved and unclassical. As to matter, it abounds with repetitions. There is scarcely any thing in it of the smartness and flippancy of fashionable conversation. And there is a value attached by the author to doctrines, which, in the estimate of the world, does not belong to doctrinal subjects at all; and which, according to ordinary professors of religion, belongs to views and sentiments of a totally different description. Well: as to all these and similar points, the recorded plea of the author is *guilty*. On such grounds, he acknowledges him-

self to lie open to censure. And what is his justification? Or has he any? Why, he declares, that his grand, he might almost say, his exclusive object has been, to excite interest in the topics of which he treats, and to make himself understood; and that, if in the attainment of this object he shall have been successful, it will give him little or no concern to find, that his style is chargeable with solecisms and his matter with redundancy. If rendered the blessed instrument of drawing attention to divine truth, he will sit with perfect ease and composure under the imputation of having assigned a disproportionate share of importance to the subjects which he discusses. A few obscure individuals, a single person, roused by his efforts to investigation into the scriptures themselves, and enabled to shake off the fetters of a spurious theology, constitutes his reward. It is to excite in some the suspicion, that there may be more in the sacred volume than either they or their religious guides have ever yet dreamed of, that has been his main object in this, as well as in all his other publications. Are any, by his means, led on in their spiritual researches? Are any, by his means, induced and enabled to assert *that liberty* from the thralldom of human ignorance and error in regard to divine things, *wherewith Christ maketh his followers free*? His end, in that case, is answered. To increase the love of the members of the church for the scriptures being *his* object, he leaves to others the endeavour to attach importance to themselves and their productions. Quitting the use of the third, and resuming that of the first person singular, I observe, that much of what in the subsequent pages may carry with it the aspect of deformity in matter and manner, is actually

intentional. I repeat in a following dialogue, what has been alluded to or even partially treated of in a preceding one, wherever and whenever I think, that repetition is necessary and may be had recourse to with advantage. I often of set purpose, and curiously, construct my sentences after the fashion in which they make their appearance, wherever and whenever I conceive, that the ends of precision and perspicuity are most likely to be promoted thereby. Intelligibility, and a desire cautiously and accurately to define my terms on a subject where writers cannot be too exact, far more than a regard to the claims of elegance, have guided my pen in the composition of the present work. Not that I have intentionally violated the laws and domains of Priscian, or wilfully set myself in opposition to classical authority. But style has been with me an exceedingly subordinate consideration. Language is merely my instrument for bringing under the notice of fellow believers truths of the most momentous description; and never, therefore, can I persuade myself to become its slave.

And now, Robert, let me turn to you, and to your concerns. Of myself and of mine, I have already said enough, and more than enough. Your progress in the acquisition of the Chinese language, and in the opening up of those stores of peculiar and recondite literature over which its strange characters and mystic constructions have hitherto thrown an almost impenetrable veil, have, you may be sure, been productive in my mind of no ordinary degree of gratification. Regularly and carefully are the columns of the Canton Register searched by me. Often have I been amused, and always delighted and instructed, by the

letters and other communications of “Sloth” and “Dust and Ashes.”* The fact of your having been able, in the absence of those eminent scholars and Sinalogues, Messrs. Gutzlaff and Morrison, to conduct satisfactorily in the Peking or court dialect, in behalf of a friend, the pleadings in a cause tried before a tribunal of Mandarins, of itself speaks volumes as to the progress which, in so short a period,† you must have made in the acquisition of the most singular, difficult, and repulsive of all known tongues. Your praiseworthy devotion of your leisure moments, to the comparatively humble task of compiling a vocabulary of the Peking dialect, and also an elementary work for teaching Englishmen at the same time the Peking and Canton dialects, deeply interests me. This “labour of love” will not, I hope, interfere with your continuing those translations from the Chinese poets, which must have been to you a source of so much delight, and which indicate such amazing proficiency in your Oriental studies. *Macte novâ virtute, puer.* The leading difficulties being surmounted, the way to the inmost *penetralia*—the *adyta*—of Chinese literature, now, I presume, lies invitingly open before you.

When, if ever, my dear brother, shall we meet again? Shall we ever *behold* each other *face to face* again, while sojourners in mortal flesh? Are immense tracts of unexplored country, and wide intervening oceans, always to separate us during the remainder of our brief and fitful earthly career; and always to keep you from the embraces

*Signatures adopted by Mr. R. Thom in his correspondence with the Editor of the Canton Register.

† About three years and a half; chiefly spent in mercantile pursuits.

of an aged and respected parent? Questions like these often occur to puzzle me, and cast a damp over my spirits. Emotions springing from reflections of a similar kind frequently, I have no doubt, agitate your own bosom. And who will venture to prognosticate the issue? Blessed be that God, who, hiding the future from the prying and curious eye of man, hath, in mercy to us his creatures, reserved *the times and the seasons* in his own hands. To have been able to look forward through the vista of future life, and to foresee and foretell its various sufferings and its final close, would have been misery, unmixed misery, indeed. Therefore, is a veil, impenetrable by the eye of man, made to hang over it. Enough is it for us to know, that God is love; that the whole course of Providence is subject to his guidance and control; and that he is *making all things to work together for our good*, as well as for his own glory. Let the event to you and me, therefore, be what it may, it will, it must be, right. Years have elapsed since you and I “met on the bridge, and broke the willow twig” in concert with each other; and since, after having parted with you, I “your elder brother” “watched the golden sail” of you “my younger brother,” “lessening in the distance;”* but time has not, in the slightest degree, contributed towards effacing from my mind, or even impairing, the remembrance of the sweet and pleasing, although melancholy scene. Often, often, does it recur to me. Much do I delight to dwell on it. And are my fraternal affections—my desires to

* “Elder brother,” and “younger brother,” are *complimentary* phrases in constant use among the Chinese; but here they are employed in their literal sense. The other quotations are classical Chinese allusions to the parting of relations and friends.—See the Canton Register of the 18th October 1836.

look again on the face of him, to whom I have occupied the place, and cherished the attachment, of a father, as well as of a brother—to be entirely disappointed? This question it is not for me to answer. But this I can say, Robert, that ‘while memory holds her seat,’ and the pulses of nature continue to play, it will not be a small matter that will be able to root out, subvert, or destroy the affection borne towards you by him, who, with pleasure takes this public opportunity of subscribing himself,

Yours sincerely,

In the bonds of strong earthly attachment,

D. THOM.

Liverpool, 2d May,
1838.



DIALOGUES ON UNIVERSAL SALVATION,

AND

TOPICS CONNECTED THEREWITH.

DIALOGUE FIRST.

SUBJECT :

ELECTION AND THE MEANS OF GRACE.

SPEAKERS :—AUTHOR. BROTHER.

B. Do you not call yourself a Universalist, David ?

T. I both call myself one, and am one.—Why do you put the question ?

B. Because I find it difficult, I should rather say impossible, to reconcile Universalism with the doctrine of election : a doctrine which I have heard you declare that you hold in the strictest Calvinistic sense.

T. Wherein do universal salvation and election appear to you to be inconsistent with each other ?

B. Why obviously in this :—that if you maintain it to be the divine intention to save only a limited number of the human race, you are guilty of nothing short of a direct contradiction in terms when, at the same time, you assert that every human being shall ultimately be saved. Election of some, and salvation of all, are ideas evidently and monstrously incongruous. Hold the one, and the other necessarily falls to the ground.

T. So have thought and reasoned men wiser, and profounder, and more learned, than either of us, my dear Robert. But this has been owing to their *spiritual* capacities and attainments never having equalled the powerful *natural* understandings with which confessedly they were endowed. They were great men, but not enlightened Christians. The fact is, that so far from election and universal salvation being incongruous—nay, so far from their being merely reconcileable—if the holy scriptures are to possess any authority in this matter, the one actually implies and involves the other.

B. How so?

T. Let me explain myself through the medium of the answers which I know you must return to questions which I am about to propose to you.—Are you not, when you suppose election of some and salvation of all to be inconsistent doctrines, understanding the words *election* and *salvation* to have one and the same meaning? Or, to express myself differently, are you not understanding *election* of some and *salvation* of all, to be equivalent to the phraseology, *election* of some and *election* of all?

B. Of course I am.

T. And are you not supposing, farther, that the salvation of the few who are elected is the final cause, or ultimate end, of the divine purpose? That is, that when God shall have accomplished the deliverance of his chosen people, his purposes of grace will be exhausted: and that thenceforward, and in regard to the rest of the human family, there will be no scope except for the exercise and display of everlasting vengeance?

B. I confess that such is the view which I have hitherto taken of the subject. If erroneous, how do you propose to correct it?

T. Why, by shewing you that, according to the system of Universalism which I hold, in the first place, God

saves his chosen ones, and saves the remainder of the human race, in two totally distinct ways; and, in the second place, that the salvation of the elect, so far from being inconsistent with, is in the course of God's adorable providence rendered subservient to, the ultimate salvation of the others.

B. May not all this be a mere fancy of your own? Indeed, what security have I that it is not so?—You know how fertile the mind of man is in the devising of expedients by which to get rid of an acknowledged difficulty.

T. I am far from blaming your caution, my dear brother. The treatment which the inspired records have met with at the hands of all sects and parties warrants, nay constrains you, to exercise the utmost circumspection in regard to what may be proposed to you as divine truth.—But allow me to ask you:—Did not the word salvation convey a perfectly different idea to the minds of those who lived before the Messiah's appearance, from what it does to us who enjoy the privilege of living under the New Testament Dispensation?

B. I admit that it did so. The Jews of Christ's time so interpreted their ancient prophecies, as to have expected deliverance from the yoke of the Romans, and their other temporal oppressors: whereas, when prophecy came to be explained by the result, it turned out that deliverance from that very law, which they themselves fondly hoped would prove eternal, had all along been its real import. But what of that? How do you apply it to the present case?

T. By making the blunder of the Jews a means of suggesting to you that, in divine things, a view which is currently and unhesitatingly received may, after all, be very far from being a correct one. Nay, by making it to suggest to you, that the notions of divine truth which most

readily present themselves to the mind, and obtain most general acceptance among the human race, so far from deserving to be implicitly relied on, are almost always those of which we should be most suspicious. This, however, by the bye.—Let me now propose another query:—Was not the salvation or deliverance promised to the Old Testament or temporal Israel, deliverance in time from the yoke of the Mosaic law? And is not the salvation or deliverance conferred on the New Testament or spiritual Israel, deliverance when time shall be no more from the wrath to come? That is, do we not find the word salvation, when applied to the respective deliverances of the temporal and spiritual Israels, to bear two totally different senses?

B. Well, I must allow that you have satisfied me of the existence of two distinct salvations or deliverances: a national salvation of the temporal Israel; and a salvation of the spiritual Israel, of which the former was merely emblematic. So far I observe and grant that the word salvation has two distinct senses, and refers to two distinct series of events.—What farther?

T. Were not the Jews God's elect people in Old Testament times? Chosen by him from among the other nations of the earth?—This, of course, you will not deny.—But now answer me, and answer me fairly:—Was the election of the Jews an end, or a means to an end? That is, does it appear, from the result, to have been God's intention to preserve them for ever in the enjoyment of their peculiar external privileges and immunities; or to render their temporary possession of these privileges subservient to a wider spread of the knowledge of his name, at a future period of time, among the Gentile world?

B. The latter unquestionably. Election, in the case of the Jews, was but a means to an end.

T. And if so, may not the choice of a small number of

the human race to the enjoyment of peculiar spiritual privileges in the kingdom of Christ and of God, or to salvation in one sense, be perfectly consistent with the wider spread of the knowledge of God ultimately among the children of men, or to salvation in another sense? May not the peculiar privileges of the spiritual Israel, like those of the temporal Israel which was its type, be, not an end, but a means to an end?

B. I must understand you better, before I yield an unqualified assent to what is implied in your query.—Tell me, what do you mean by election?

T. Choice of a smaller out of a larger number.

B. That is—

T. The choice of a certain number of the human race out of the whole, by God himself, before the foundation of the world, to be the objects of his special love, and the heirs of his heavenly kingdom.

B. Are you serious in what you say?

T. Why do you think it necessary to ask such a question?

B. Because if you are serious in your avowal, your sentiments, with regard to election, appear to me to be identically the same with those of Calvinists themselves.

T. And what then?—My views on the subject of election are certainly of the strictest and most decided kind. I am satisfied that, according to our blessed Lord's statement, *strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life; and that few there be that find it.* Mattw. vii. 14. The few who do find this gate, are persons who have been predestined from everlasting to do so. Their finding it, and entering into it, are not the result of any exercise of free will on their part, or of their having prepared themselves in any respect whatever for the enjoyment of the privilege; but spring solely from the good pleasure of Jehovah himself. They discover not the

gate; on the contrary, God discovers it to them. For *he is found of them, when they seek him not.* Isaiah lxxv. 1. Rom. x. 20. Not in virtue of any merit of theirs, but in fulfilment of his own gracious, everlasting, and unchangeable purpose, does he cause *the light of the knowledge of his glory, in the face of Christ, to shine into their minds.* 2 Corinth. iv. 6. In the reception of divine truth, the election of God are thus perfectly passive. To them, as predestinated and enlightened from above, is the enjoyment of the kingdom of Christ and of God here and hereafter conceded. And by them, from first to last—

B. Hold—hold—you quite bewilder me. There is not a single idea now expressed by you, in which you differ from the ordinary run of Calvinistic divines. Tell me, is there any point, respecting the elect, in which you and they happen to be at variance?

T. None whatever, that I am aware of, in so far as the origin of God's electing love, and the comparative smallness of the number of those who are the objects of it, are concerned. In so far, too, as Calvinists regard and maintain the purpose of God in election to have been the display of his own glory, or the manifestation of his own attributes and perfections, I am at one with them likewise.—When I say, *at one with them*, observe, I mean with such only as are consistent Calvinists. For a vast number of persons who profess to adhere to Calvin's sentiments, are in scarcely any one respect to be preferred to the out and out followers of John Wesley.

B. This is a most sweeping censure.

T. Nevertheless it is deserved.

B. In what particular doctrinal views do professing Calvinists agree with Arminians?

T. In maintaining creature free will; and representing it to be in the power of sinners, if they choose, to believe the gospel. Have you never noticed that many of those

who are denominated, and considered to be, Calvinistic preachers, are in the habit, in the course of their sermons, and especially towards the close of them, of exhorting sinners to come to Christ—of encouraging them, by a variety of considerations, to make the attempt—of enforcing upon them the necessity of doing so as a matter of duty—of informing them, that it is their own fault if they have not yet believed the gospel—and of threatening them with hell and damnation in the event of the all-important act of faith, to which they are exhorted, not being performed by them? Indeed, they must set about it without delay. “Now,” exclaim these *soi-disant* ambassadors of Christ, most abominably perverting scripture, “*now* is the accepted time—*now* is the day of salvation.” To such language you must frequently have listened. And did it never strike you, that thus to address their hearers was, on the part of the divines in question, grossly inconsistent with the leading principles of the Calvinistic theory?

B. I have often heard exhortations and denunciations such as you describe. But it never occurred to me, until now, that they were inconsistent, either with Calvinism, or with the nature of the gospel.—Even yet, although I cannot deny that an exhortation to believe does, at first sight, look like a call to the creature to elect himself and become his own saviour, and does consequently seem to oppose one of the leading principles of the Calvinistic system, I have little doubt that the worthy men who are accustomed to indulge in such exhortations would, if asked to do so, be able to justify their procedure.—But how would you avoid committing the fault which you impute to them?—What do you consider faith to be?

T. *The gift of God.* Eph. ii. 8.

B. So do those whom you condemn. In words, at least.—But what conclusion—what practical conclusion, I mean—do you draw, from the circumstance of faith being God’s gift?

T. Why this,—that it cannot be in the power of a creature to bestow faith, either on himself, or on others—that to believe cannot, in any respect whatever, be a creature act—and that, consequently, for one uninspired creature to exhort another to believe, is for the one to be chargeable with the absurdity of urging the other to perform an act that is divine, or to usurp one of the supreme and unalienable prerogatives of Jehovah himself!

B. If faith then be, in no respect whatever, an act of the creature, how can it be produced?

T. Simply by *God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, commanding the light of the knowledge of his glory in the face of Christ, through the medium of the scriptures, to shine into the heart.* That is, in believing divine testimony the creature is not active, but passive; he does not act, but he is acted on; he does not put forth an effort of his own, but he is the subject of the almighty and sovereign power of Jehovah. Eph. i. 18—20. In a word, he is as completely passive in the reception of spiritual light, as was the natural creation when, at the almighty fiat, natural light burst through the thick gloom in which all things were originally enveloped.

B. There is no *act of faith*, then, to be performed by the creature, as Roman Catholics think, and as ordinary protestants, ever too prone to acquiesce in their views and statements, have generally admitted.

T. *Act of faith!* No—yes.—That is, faith itself not being an act of the creature, but a principle conferred and implanted by the Creator, to believe is not *an act* which any man, enlightened from above, can either attempt to perform himself, or call upon a fellow creature to perform. But where faith already exists as a principle bestowed by the Creator, there from it, just as from any other principle, *acts* corresponding to its nature will be found to spring.—Faith itself is not an act: therefore, in the

ordinary sense attached to the phrase, we cannot speak of *an act of faith*. But faith is the source or parent of spiritual acts: therefore, in this sense we can speak of *acts of faith*, just as we also speak of *labours of love*.

B. What, under these circumstances, can a minister do?

T. No more than any private Christian can.—He may place *the truth, as it is in Jesus*, before his fellow men.

B. How?—By exhorting them to believe?

T. Most decidedly not. For divine revelation is not a command to the creature to perform any act in order to his own salvation, whether it be act of obedience to law or of obedience to gospel, or any other conceivable act. But it is simply a declaration to the creature, upon divine authority, of an act which the Creator himself hath performed.—The gospel is not a command *to do*, but a proclamation of what *God hath done*. *Be it known to you, men and brethren, that through this man is proclaimed to you, the forgiveness of sins*, is its simple, uniform, and gracious language. The word gospel signifies *glad tidings*. And *glad tidings* to the guilty conscience upon which it takes effect it is, by shewing all works of the creature superseded by a gracious and glorious work of the Creator. It benefits the creature, not by prompting him to act, as is the scope and tendency of all the exhortations and threatenings of the popular preachers; but by producing in his mind a passive, a sweet, a delighted acquiescence in the act which was finished upon Calvary eighteen hundred years since by the Son of God.

B. What do you say? Do you mean to assert that there is no act whatever performed by the creature in believing divine testimony? That he is merely, and entirely, and exclusively, passive in his reception of the truth?

T. Even so, my dear brother.

B. Is there no putting forth of *any* effort on his part to comply with the gospel?

T. Of none whatever. Instead of exertions to believe being stimulated by the gospel, exertions to believe are, in the very act of God's conferring the knowledge of the gospel upon any one, superseded at once and for ever. It is true that, where the gospel is not believed in, there exertions to believe it are stimulated, by misapprehensions of its nature, in the mere Adamic or fleshly mind.

B. You perfectly astonish me! In the event of your being right, a man can have no merit whatever in believing!

T. He has none. And it never was God's intention that he should have any. It was ever God's purpose that the whole glory of salvation should redound to himself the Creator alone: and hence, all who have been enlightened from above, of course and as a matter of necessity, *glory only in the Lord.* 1 Corinth. i. 29. 31.

B. But what, then, becomes of the creature's will? According to you, he believes unwillingly. Whereas, it is expressly stated in the 110th Psalm, that Christ's people *are willing in the day of his power.*

T. So they are. And to suppose that, in my apprehension, believers of the gospel in the reception of the divine testimony are unwilling to believe it, is merely another of your mistakes, Robert.—It is true that, at the very moment previous to any man's believing the gospel, he is unwilling to believe it. And this, because the carnal mind being enmity against God, not being subject to his law, neither indeed being able to be so;—and also, because the individual naturally possessing nothing higher than carnal mind;—it is absolutely impossible that there should be any inclination on his part, previous to believing, to receive the gospel testimony.—But the passage which you have quoted says, that the people of Christ *shall be*

willing in the day of his power. So say I. The conferring upon any man of the principle of faith, which is God's act, is the making of him willing; or is the conferring upon him, at the very same moment, of a new and divine will, which is perfectly different from, and which necessarily supersedes, the will of his natural fleshly mind.

B. In other words, if I understand you aright, it is not by a man's being previously willing to believe the gospel, that he actually does believe it; but it is by his being given from above to believe it, that willingness is imparted to him.

T. Just so.

B. What you say *may be* true. But it appears to me that, by your theory, you do away with the use of means altogether.

T. Means used by whom?

B. By human beings, to be sure.

T. And for what purpose?—Now pause and reflect before you return an answer.

B. I do not see what occasion there is for this warning. The means of which I speak, are means of believing the gospel, and thereby of participating in the great salvation. And it certainly does appear to me, that the views entertained by you, by representing the knowledge of divine truth as being *freely*—I would rather say, *arbitrarily*—conferred by God, set aside entirely the necessity of any creature using means for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the gospel.

T. Remarkable truth! my dear Robert. According to what I have been taught by the scriptures themselves, faith is *arbitrarily* bestowed; that is, is bestowed, not on those who to the eye of mere man would appear to have the best title to it, but on those who, having been *fore-known* and *predestinated* by God to the enjoyment of this privilege before time began, are in time *called* to the en-

joyment of it. And, therefore, it is never by the employment of what he supposes to be means of believing on the part of the creature, that he is brought to Christ, but always in opposition to such self-righteous efforts. Indeed, it would be contradictory to the whole revealed scheme of salvation, were the belief of the gospel to be made to depend, either in whole or in part, on the creature's intentionally striving to believe it. It would be to make belief his own act. It would be to render him his own saviour. It would be to convert life eternal into a reward of human merit, instead of being what it actually is, the gift of God. Salvation would then be *of works*, not *of grace*. To set a man who is ignorant of the glorious gospel, upon using means of believing it,—believing it!!!—is to flatter, and second, and strengthen, the self-righteous principles and tendencies of his fleshly mind, which of themselves prompt the excited conscience to put forth efforts in order to be saved;—and to try to persuade any man that, in consequence of having made such efforts, he has actually believed, is to do what in us lies to substitute in his mind a glorying in self, for that only scriptural ground of glorying, the finished work of Christ.

It was for this reason that I warned you.—The work which was finished on Calvary is that which of itself and alone saves, if scripture be true. This being the case, it is absolutely impossible that any thing, call it what you will, can be requisite in order to salvation, over and above that work. And yet by saying, as you yourself and ordinary Calvinists do, that men must use means of believing, that is, use means *for the purpose of believing*, you actually represent some work, in addition to the work of Christ, as being necessary to salvation; and that, too, a work which the creature himself must perform. This creature work you interpose between the conscience, and the work of Jesus the Creator. You make it the *sine quâ*

non of salvation. “The creature must use means *for the purpose* of believing, and thereby of being saved.” O Robert! why not cut the matter short, and say at once and honestly with the followers of Pelagius and Arminius, that, without the performance of good works by the creature, he cannot be saved.

B. But it is the work of Christ alone which saves.

T. Not, my dear brother, according to your system. For if so, why call upon sinners to use means of believing, or to do any thing else in order to be saved?—If it be Christ’s work alone that saves—and, that this is the case, the whole of scripture testifies to the enlightened mind—what occasion is there for the unbelieving portion of mankind performing any act or work whatever?

B. *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.* Rom. x. 17.

T. True. For the same God, who caused his word to be committed to writing, causes that same word in his own good time and way to reach the ears, and, what is more, to be carried home to the consciences, of *the destined heirs of salvation.*

B. Talk as you please, David, you set aside entirely the use of the means of grace.

T. Means, I again ask you, used by whom?

B. By creatures, undoubtedly.

T. So I do, Robert. And it is the glory of the gospel that *it* does so likewise.—But, because the use of means by the creature is done away with, does there remain no possibility of the use of them in another and superior quarter? If there be no means of grace and salvation as used by the creature, may there not be such means as used by the Creator? What if the scheme taught me by scripture does set aside the worthless and self-righteous efforts of mere creatures, in order to substitute for them a simple, sovereign, and efficacious, act of the Creator himself?

B. I do not understand you.

T. Well, I will endeavour to explain myself.—

Nothing *as used by a creature* is, or can be, a means of salvation. And this for a variety of reasons. Such as:—that *salvation appertaining to God alone* is, in no respect whatever, man's work; that it is already complete, and, consequently, unsusceptible of any increase or addition; and that the only way in which a creature can attain to the enjoyment of it is by its being freely, that is, unconditionally, bestowed upon him by the Creator. Now, the notion of means of salvation or means of believing, which is one and the same thing, requiring to be used by creatures, contradicts every one of these self-evident scriptural principles. For no man can set about using them, except on the hypothesis of salvation being in part at least man's work—of its being still incomplete, without the employment of such supposed means by him—and of certain terms and conditions thus requiring to be fulfilled by him before he can be a partaker of life everlasting.—That is, salvation is proclaimed in scripture as finished by the Creator. Whereas to urge the use of means of grace and salvation by creatures proceeds on the principle of salvation being unfinished by the Creator, and remaining to be finished by them; or of the salvation of the Creator being inefficacious of itself, and requiring to be rendered efficacious by the concurrence and co-operation of his creatures!—What Christian sees not, that to prescribe the use of the means of grace to a fellow mortal, is to contribute all that in us lies to the confirmation in him of the principle of creature-righteousness? And that, in fact, it is in no small degree owing to such erroneous teaching, that men *ignorant of God's righteousness* are induced to go about to establish their own righteousness, not submitting themselves to the righteousness of God? Rom. x. 3.

But while nothing *as used by the creature* is, or can

be, a means of salvation, any thing or every thing *as used by the Creator* may be so. A previous course of profligacy; an open and furious hatred to Christ and his cause, as in the case of Saul of Tarsus; or a religious education and correct moral deportment;—however incongruous, and however inconsistent with the object aimed at by some of them, these various states and conditions of man may to the natural mind appear to be;—nevertheless may all and equally be the means, in the hands of the Spirit, of bringing the individual into those circumstances in which God may see meet to reveal to him his glorious character. That is, while the most careful moral training, the most respectable character, and the most religious dispositions,—which are generally understood to be the best *preparatives* for believing or the most suitable means of grace,—*may terminate*, and generally *do terminate*, in bitter and uncompromising hostility to the gospel; on the contrary, the most awfully flagitious career, and the fiercest previous dislike of divine things, may all at once be brought to an end by a free and unexpected manifestation to the conscience of the gift of life everlasting. For *Publicans and harlots enter into the kingdom of heaven* in preference to the self righteous.—Still, however, the previous career and practices of the individual who is subsequently brought to the knowledge of the truth, whether moral or immoral, are merely in the hands of God the *remote* means of his believing. The *direct* and *immediate* means of faith is always the manifestation to the conscience of *the truth* itself: a manifestation which is invariably and exclusively God's work. That is, it is the effect of previous *means used* not by the creature but by the Creator.—It may be, that a long course of fleshly piety, and a careful perusal by a mere natural mind of the sacred volume, *may* issue in the discovery of Christ Jesus. But it is just as possible, nay, as the result proves, rather more probable,

that they *may not*. And the reason is, that every effort of a religious nature made by the mere fleshly mind tends to exalt the creature in its own estimation, or to a result exactly the opposite of that exaltation of Christ Jesus the Creator which is the grand characteristic effect of the belief of the gospel. The reading of the scriptures, prayer, and attendance upon public ordinances, when practised by the mere natural mind as supposed means of grace, so far from tending to repress its self-righteous actings, constitute the chief sources from which the principle of self-righteousness draws its strength and nourishment. It is only when the reading of the scriptures, and the hearing of sermons, happen to be means of grace ordained and employed as such by God himself, that they will, or can, contribute towards and terminate in the spiritual illumination of the individual.—And be it observed, so entirely is God himself alone the user of the means of grace, that even in cases where persons of a previously religious turn of mind are brought to the knowledge of the gospel, the truth manifested to them from above is *never* that which they were previously seeking after, but *always* something previously unknown to and unsuspected by them. God is invariably *found of them that seek him not*.* The fleshly mind is, in its most pious and religious exercises, *going about to establish its own righteousness*: and if, while so engaged, God shall be pleased to manifest to it, as its own by his free gift, *his glorious divine righteousness*, it is always in such circumstances taken by surprise. The poor deluded religionist was looking for creature righteousness;—but unexpectedly the righteousness of the Creator is revealed as belonging to him, by having been freely bestowed upon him. Sweetly observes John Barclay of Edinburgh, in his treatise *on the assurance of faith*, that “multitudes who, at first going forth, like Saul” were

* Rom. x. 20.

seeking “lost things of lesser value, have lighted, by the special direction of providence, upon the inspired servants of the Lord, have received his word with joy, and returned again triumphing in the infallibly assured hope of a kingdom that fadeth not away.” And this is true. For that which the fleshly mind was employing as a means, not of becoming acquainted with the salvation of Christ, but of increasing its own good opinion of itself, God is, in all cases where faith follows, pleased to over-rule to be the instrument of disclosing to it his own glorious character.

Have you any conception now of the difference between a creature *pretending* to use means of grace and salvation, and the Creator himself *actually* doing so?

B. Why really, if I comprehend you, David, in so far as the use of means of grace by creatures is concerned, it is a mere matter of chance or accident whether they shall, or shall not, terminate in their reception of the truth?

T. Precisely so, Robert. And this, because to use the means of grace and salvation, no less than to accomplish the work of salvation itself, belongs to the Creator alone. What to the fleshly mind appears to be a means of grace when used by the creature, is actually seen by him who is taught from above to be the means of fostering self-righteous propensities, and thereby of drawing forth the most deadly enmity of the creature to God. And hence it is that although some of these *users of the means of grace* as they themselves think, but in reality self-righteous opposers of the revealed righteousness of Christ, are, in the course of God’s adorable providence and in virtue of his everlasting purpose, brought to the knowledge of the truth; yet by far the greater portion of them are left to what is the natural, and what unless sovereign grace interpose is the necessary and inevitable, consequence of their self-righteous conduct. Continuing to use the means of grace, as they fancy, but in fact persevering

in a course of self-righteous endeavours to save themselves, they are allowed thereby to harden themselves more and more against the simple truth.—Thus, my dear Robert, it is impossible for Christians, judging from any present state of the mere fleshly mind, whether religious or irreligious—whether using what are called the means of grace or neglecting them—to say, that this state of mind shall, or shall not, issue in the belief of the gospel. This we know, that the purpose of God will always take effect: *the election will obtain it; although the rest be blinded.* Wherever God intends to save, he will always take care to bring the object of his love into such circumstances as shall lead him ultimately to an acquaintance with the truth.

B. Am I to understand you, then, as meaning that, in so far as our views are concerned, it is a mere matter of chance whether reading the scriptures, experiencing feelings of anxiety respecting one's future condition, and cultivating seriousness of outward deportment, on the part of a natural man, shall terminate in belief of the truth, or in the most intense hatred of it? Indeed that, of the two, such exercises are more likely, humanly speaking, to have the latter than the former result?

T. Certainly.—You have exactly apprehended my meaning.

B. Then what become of the directions for attaining to the belief of the gospel which are given in Doddridge's *Rise and Progress*? What of the elaborate statements, respecting *the duty* of believing, which abound in the works of the late Mr. Fuller, of Kettering? And though last, not least, what shall we think of Bunyan's *slough of despond, fiery law, and wicket gate experience*, as they are described in his delightful *Pilgrim's Progress*?

T. Why, Robert, painful although it be to say so, yet it is fact, that the views of all the eminent men of whom you speak,—in so far as they inculcate efforts to believe.

and works preparatory and preliminary to believing, and this as a matter of duty,—are, by the word of God our only instructor and authority in such matters, decidedly and thoroughly condemned. Because *sometimes* the self-righteous exercises of a human being terminate, by the divine good pleasure, in his having revealed to him what he was previously neither thinking of nor seeking after, *the righteousness of Jehovah himself*,—therefore the writers in question would have the same revelation to take place *always*! Because the goodness of the Creator prevents the self-righteous exercises of the creature in certain cases from having their natural result,—they would, forsooth! absurdly and blasphemously make that which is purely the effect of divine sovereignty, to be a rule for the creature to follow! What is a mere *accident*, they would fain represent as the *essence* of salvation!—Nay, what is worse, because God does, in such cases, bring good out of evil, they would have the creature *to do evil* that *good might come*! Instead of pointing simply to the work of Christ, as that through which alone salvation flows freely to the guilty, and as that by which all creature efforts and strivings for salvation are completely superseded,—they prescribe to their deluded votaries a course of self-righteous exercises to be performed by them, as indispensable to their obtaining an interest in that blessed work: and thus under the guise of fleshly piety, and in a form sometimes more sometimes less refined, setting up creature righteousness in place of and in opposition to the revealed righteousness of Jesus the Creator, they do what in them lies to lead their fellow men, especially the serious portion of them, by what Sandeman fitly denominates, “a devout path to hell.”

B. Your language is too harsh, David.

T. Not more so than scripture warrants, and the necessity of the case demands, my dear brother. All that

is flesh, and all that proceeds from flesh, (as every notion, implying the slightest activity of the creature mind in the matter of salvation, is,) stand condemned by God.

B. Salvation, then, is the result of no previous wish or desire, of a spiritual kind, on the part of the creature.

T. Of none whatever. *For 'tis not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.* Rom. ix. 16.

B. What do you make of those strong wishes, those intense desires, to be saved, which are so often experienced by persons confessedly ignorant of the gospel?

T. They are evidently wishes and desires, on the part of those who cherish them, to find in themselves some good thing, or to be able to perform some good action, whereby they may recommend themselves to God, and acquire a title to salvation. *Good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life?* or, *what shall I do to be saved?* denotes the import, and is generally the language, of this state of mind. But a desire to be saved on the ground of some good thing found in or done by ourselves, is totally different from understanding the salvation of the gospel: a privilege which is conferred of free and sovereign grace; and of which the persons spoken of are, by the terms of your question, destitute. They want to acquire *a right* to be saved: whereas faith, or a spiritual view of the subject, is the passive acquiescence of the mind in salvation as a blessing *freely*, that is, *undeservedly*, bestowed. Salvation to persons ignorant of the truth, and salvation to persons who know it, thus presenting two totally distinct aspects, it is absolutely impossible for those who are ignorant of the gospel to desire salvation in the scriptural sense of the term. Indeed, it is impossible for any man either as unbeliever, or as believer, to desire *this* salvation. As an unbeliever, the salvation which he desires is one founded in whole, or in part, on his own merits.

As a believer, he desires not salvation at all; for he finds himself already in possession of it. *This is the record, that God HATH GIVEN to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son.* 1 John v. 11. When to any one, for the first time, there is revealed the gospel, there is revealed to him the fact of his being already saved; and this independently and irrespectively of all desires, doings, and merits, of his own: a fact of which he had not previously the remotest conception, and his knowledge of which, instead of indicating the progress, is itself the very commencement, of spiritual principle.

B. What then, pray, are the means of grace and salvation to the creature? For, that there exist such means, you have, if I mistake not, already admitted.

T. I know no other means of grace besides the gospel itself.

B. The gospel itself! Why, all our religious folks say the same thing.

T. So they do. But to the word *gospel* the great majority of them attach a meaning essentially different from that which the Holy Ghost himself hath annexed to it in scripture. Their gospel is information that the creature may, if he please, save himself. They pretend to comfort *sincere and pious enquirers*, perverted phrases! with the prospect, that they may attain to life everlasting in the event of their bestowing upon themselves faith, or of their performing some other act to accomplish which belongs exclusively to the Creator.

B. What is the gospel?

T. *Glad tidings.*

B. Of what?

T. Of God's *being*, not of his *becoming*, love: and this as manifested, or made known to me, in the light of Christ's divine righteousness, being my righteousness; and of Christ's divine life, being my life. *God is love: and*

in this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten son into the world, that we might live through him. 1 John iv. 8. 9.

B. To whom is this manifestation glad tidings?

T. To myself, and to all those to whom it is so. It is glad tidings, to those to whom it is glad tidings.

B. Do not mock me, my dear brother. You evade my question. What I want to be informed of is: how is it that the proclamation of Jesus of Nazareth having been the anointed one promised and sent to the Jewish people—of his having taken away sin by his atoning sacrifice, and brought in everlasting righteousness by his resurrection from the dead—and of his being he through whom eternal life flows freely to the guilty—I say, how is it that this proclamation,—for command you will not allow it to be,—becomes glad tidings to any one?—Now do answer me fairly and honestly.

T. I have answered your previous questions as fairly and honestly as the circumstances of the case would admit of, Robert. And if you have failed to perceive that I have done so, I must ever remember that divine truth is a subject which God, not man, is competent to teach.—Nevertheless with a view to oblige you, as well as to discharge my own conscience, I will try if, by varying my language and more fully developing the subject, I can, by the divine blessing, render myself more intelligible.

The gospel, or glad tidings of salvation freely bestowed through Christ Jesus, is read of and heard by thousands who understand it not. And this, for the two following among other reasons:—

First. From the total inability of the mere fleshly or Adamic mind to comprehend it. To a man who is possessed of no higher principles than those which he derives from his natural parents, the gospel always and necessarily appears in the light of a command urging him to do some-

thing, or to possess something, before he can attain to an interest in the great salvation. Taking this view of the matter—and, in his natural state, no other is he qualified to take—of course the death of Christ alone speaks no peace, communicates no joy, to him. The gospel, or glad tidings of the work which Jesus finished on Calvary, is no gospel in his apprehension of things. What he himself must do to be saved, is the question to obtain an answer to which the whole bent of his mind is directed. And an answer which imports that he himself must do or feel something in order to salvation, is the only notion of gospel which, while in a natural state, he has or can have.

But, in the second place, the grand and fundamental reason why by far the greater part of those who hear the gospel never understand it is, that it is not God's intention for them to do so. *While he will have mercy, upon whom he will have mercy; whom he will he hardeneth.* To the bulk of mankind God's declarations concerning Christ, and the work which he hath accomplished, not being, addressed, convey no real and scriptural, and consequently no joyful, meaning. *THEY hear not the joyful sound.*—But while to such persons *it is not given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, to some it is given to do so.* All that happens in the case of the latter is that the gospel becomes, by divine power and in virtue of the divine purpose, gospel or glad tidings to them. *The eyes of their understandings are opened* by God himself, without any assistance derived from themselves, nay in opposition to all their previous views and tendencies; and they are thus enabled to comprehend what to them formerly was dark and mysterious. Having had *ears given to them, they hear.* God, they find to their great surprise as well as delight, is addressing them, or becoming the witness to their consciences. And this, by revealing to them his own character; or by making them acquainted with what he himself is in the

light of the nature, offices, and work of his well beloved Son. For it is by giving them to see the Son, that he gives them likewise to see himself the Father.—This is not, however, to bestow on them the knowledge of a mere abstract proposition. God, in causing them to know Jesus, causes them to know him as one with themselves, and themselves as one with him;—and to know that, in virtue of this inseparable union subsisting between him and them, they possess in him righteousness and life everlasting. They discover it to be the import of the divine *record* or testimony, *that God hath given TO THEM eternal life; and that this life is in his Son.* 1 John v. 11. In the light of this fact they are enabled to discover, upon divine authority, that they are condemned and dead in the first, fleshly, and creature Adam; and that the previous condemnation and death were indispensably necessary, and have been rendered subservient, to the justification and life of which they now partake with their heavenly and uncreated Head. God thus appears to them as love, in having taken away from them, through the transgression of Adam, a paltry and creature life; that he might, through the righteousness of his own dear Son, make them to enjoy with himself life everlasting. That is, the divine testimony, as glad tidings, does not barely speak peace to them, by shewing them, that they have pardon of sin and acceptance with God through Christ Jesus: but it does more; for it inspires them with *joy that is unspeakable and full of glory* by shewing them, that they derive through the second Adam privileges infinitely more glorious than those which they forfeited in the first.

B. In one word—

T. The gospel becomes gospel or glad tidings to any one, in consequence of God giving the favoured individual, at one and the same moment, to apprehend both its truth and his own personal interest in it. When God con-

descends, through the medium of his testimony concerning the Lord Jesus, to speak to the conscience of any one, at that moment the individual knows that he himself is by God spoken to.

B. And the single unsupported testimony of Jehovah, concerning the work of Christ, accomplishes all this?

T. Yes. Rather, Jehovah himself accomplishes all this, by carrying his testimony concerning Christ Jesus and the work which was finished on Calvary, with almighty and irresistible power, home to the conscience.

B. By what means?

T. Merely by causing the person to whom he bears testimony, to see it to be true; and true, not on the ground of external evidence, but in the light of the pure, spiritual, and divine evidence, which is contained in, and beams forth from, itself. In faith there is nothing more—and there is nothing less.

B. If I have caught your meaning, David, every person to whom the divine testimony concerning Christ Jesus is rendered effectual by God himself, knows that he hath been enlightened from above.

T. And why not? Can that be gospel or glad tidings, which is not gospel or glad tidings to the individual himself? Can that salvation inspire me with *joy that is unspeakable and full of glory*, in which I do not know myself to have a personal interest? When light, whether physical or mental, is shining, can I, if in the one case the eyes of my body or in the other the eyes of my understanding be open, remain unconscious of the fact? *Whatsoever doth make manifest is light*: Eph. v. 13: and if the divine testimony as light cannot, when it shines into the mind, manifest itself, what else, pray, is it fitted to make manifest or throw light on?—Besides, Robert, consider, that if the religion of *the living and true God* can leave any species or degree of uncertainty, as to his future

and everlasting well-being, in the breast of him by whom it has been believed in, it can neither be essentially different from, nor possess any real superiority over, the various religions of Paganism. These religions affected to hold out to their votaries the prospect of *the probable* enjoyment of an Elysium hereafter. A *probability*, greater or less, that we may be happy hereafter, is the sum and substance of the hope imparted by Christianity, if we are to trust to our spiritual guides. Thus, in that most essential feature of representing the hope of future happiness to be merely *probable* and *conditional*, do the religions of heathen antiquity, and what is commonly supposed to be the religion of Christ Jesus, completely agree. And why, if this were true, should I prefer the one to the other?—Do you happen to remember the sneering remark of Lord Byron, in reference to this very subject, which appears in one of his published journals, and which has been selected by me as the motto of the fourth chapter of my work on the “Assurance of Faith” :—“According to the Christian Dispensation,” that is, according to the views of it which had been presented to his Lordship, “no man can know whether he is *sure* of salvation—even the most righteous—since a single slip of faith may throw him on his back, like a skaiter, while gliding smoothly to his paradise. Now, therefore, whatever the certainty of faith in the facts may be, the certainty of the individual as to his happiness or misery, is no greater than it was under Jupiter.” And Lord Byron was right, in so far as what passes by the name of *faith in Christianity* is concerned. But he spoke as he did, because he was not himself personally a partaker of that *faith which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*. Heb. xi. 1.—Faith, Robert, is the result of God himself speaking, and bearing witness, to the conscience. And wherever it has a place, we experience what the talented peer whose words I have just

quoted never did, and what thousands of those who profess to be christians never do, that *if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater* : 1 John v. 9 : that is, that if mere human testimony with regard to natural things has been productive, in innumerable cases, in our minds of *something like absolute certainty*; the testimony of God with regard to life everlasting, as freely bestowed upon us through the Son of his love, has, by his own divine and spiritual illumination, been productive in our minds of *absolute certainty itself*.

B. Supposing what you assert to be true, the scriptures cannot be a revelation to all.

T. What! Are you merely, for the first time, beginning to entertain a suspicion of this fact?—The scriptures never were, and never were intended to be, a revelation to all. They are a revelation to the members of the church of the living God only. *The words that I speak unto you, says Christ addressing his disciples, they are spirit, and they are life.* John vi. 63. Extraordinary, indeed perfectly unaccountable, would it be, did we not know the total ignorance of divine things under which the fleshly mind of man labours, that down to the present day the vast majority of those who profess to be Christians should never have even suspected the limitation of the scriptures to *the election of God* alone. And yet the book itself abounds with intimations to this effect. *He that hath ears to hear, LET HIM HEAR,* says the Lord Jesus, in Mark iv. 9. And, *to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours*; 1 Corinth. i. 2; as also, *to them that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ*; 2 Peter i. 1; are specimens of the language employed by the inspired apostles in addressing their epistles. Can words more strictly confine to his believing

family, that revelation of himself which through the medium of the scriptures God hath been pleased to vouchsafe, than those to which I now call your attention?

B. My dear fellow, to recur to the subject from which my last observation diverted you, if your views be well founded, all I have to say is, that very few indeed can be believers of the gospel. Few, if any, of our most eminent Christians will venture to declare, that they know themselves to be personally interested in the work of Christ Jesus. And none that are modest and circumspect would venture to do so, until after having been able to discover in themselves unequivocal marks and evidences of their being in a regenerate state.

T. Strange to tell! Robert, in what you now observe, you are, without intending it, pronouncing a most decided scriptural eulogium upon my sentiments, and an equally decided scriptural condemnation of those which are commonly held and professed.—Christ hath positively declared that his people are “few” in number, and “a little flock.” The apostles, especially the apostle Paul, have frequently dwelt on, and still more frequently alluded to, the smallness of the number of those who are *the children of faith*. It is only “a remnant that shall be saved,” says Paul, quoting from Isaiah, in Romans, ix. 27: and, pursuing his quotations from the same prophet, he adds, “Except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma, and been made like unto Gomorrha.” Verse 29. Indeed, even independently of express information afforded us to this effect, the smallness of the number of those by whom the gospel is believed in might have been fairly enough argued from the circumstance of faith being denominated *precious*:* that which is common, not deserving the epithet.

As to your remark about the inability of those who are commonly regarded as eminent Christians, to speak with

* 1 Peter ii. 7.

certainly of their own personal interest in salvation, you are perfectly correct. And surprising, indeed, would it be were the state of matters otherwise. Modestly and circumspectly waiting, as such persons do, until they shall have discovered in themselves some good quality, upon the strength of which they may fancy themselves the especial favourites of the Most High, they either, like the stupid countryman, in the fable alluded to by Horace, find that the current of evil in themselves streams on for ever ;

Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum ;

leaving them, till the end of their days, in the same state of expectancy and incessant disappointment : or, contriving to delude themselves with the idea that they have performed the requisite condition, or have discovered in themselves the long-sought-for excellence, they sink into a state of religious lethargy, and *go down to the grave with a lie in their right hands*.—To very few, indeed—the *tenth*, or *teil tree*, spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, vi. 13.—it is given from above to see, that they possess in the righteousness of Jesus of Nazareth itself, made known to them by the scriptures and theirs in consequence of their oneness with the performer of it, a righteousness which as divine has swallowed up all their creature guilt and depravity ; and thus few indeed are there to whom is necessarily imparted the absolute certainty of life everlasting.

B. David, David, how severe you are ; and how restricted in your notions of what constitutes genuine Christianity !

T. Say, rather, my dearest brother, how consistent with scripture, and with that very system of Calvin which is so dreadfully misrepresented—so vilely caricatured—by numbers of its professed adherents. If, with all Calvinists, I hold it to have been God himself *who elected* his people before time began ; I do not, in the very same breath, with some, shall I not rather say the majority of them, re-

present it—strange inconsistency!—to be his people *who elect themselves* in time. No. *If of God are all things, through him are all things* likewise. Rom. xi. 36. *If he foreknew and predestinated his people, he also calls them.* Ibid. viii. 29, 30. If it was he who made choice of them in his Son, it is he who carries that gracious choice into effect. Their being brought to the knowledge of the truth, is merely the rendering of their election effectual.—Thus, in my apprehension, all is of God. As the election is of him, so is the calling likewise. It is not that a part of salvation belongs to the Creator, and a part to the creature; but that the whole appertains to the Creator alone.—And as God calls his elect, so are they, when called by him, made to hear him. They were previously *dead in trespasses and sins*: but in consequence of God's calling them, they become spiritually alive. Such persons do not, like numbers who would fain pass for Christians and Calvinists, remain dubious as to the voice of God having penetrated to their consciences, and as to the truth of God having enlightened their understandings. So far from this, his people, although previously *dead*, having *heard the voice of the Son of God, live*; John v. 25; and know that they are alive. Rom. viii. 15, 16. 2 Corinth. v. 1—5. *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true*, 1 John v. 20, is at once the apostle's language and their own. The unchangeable character of Jehovah as love having been opened up to their minds, in the light of the person and work of his well-beloved Son, they are all *children of the light and of the day*—know that they are so, in consequence of the thick darkness by which they were formerly surrounded having passed away—and walking and rejoicing in the light of faith here, they all in due time attain to, and are satisfied with, the light of glory hereafter.

B. In the matter of salvation, then, the creature is entirely a passive recipient.

T. He is so, most assuredly. Were it otherwise, the glory of salvation would be shared by the creature with the Creator. According to the gospel scheme, the whole glory of salvation redounds, as it should do, to the Creator alone. *Of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever.* Rom. xi. 36.—But come, Robert: do you now comprehend what my sentiments are, better than you did when we first entered on this conversation?

B. I think I do. “The elect,” according to you, “are comparatively few in number—were chosen by God in Christ before the world began—can receive no augmentation—are in due time called by God himself—and are brought to the knowledge of the truth, not in consequence of any efforts or preparations to believe it made by themselves, but in spite of their natural, necessary, and increasing, hostility to it. Means of grace and salvation are such as used by God, not by them. For it is he who takes care to place them in the circumstances in which they hear the gospel; as well as he who, by his own almighty and sovereign power, renders the gospel heard by them effectual. And the gospel is not a command to the creature to believe or to do any thing else; but is a proclamation, rendered effectual to the elect, of what God is, manifested in the light and through the medium of what God in Christ hath done.”—So far well. Still, however, I wonder how you contrive to reconcile all this with universal salvation! How, holding such views, you can suppose both the elect, and the non-elect, to *inherit the kingdom of God!*

T. Stop, Robert. You have never heard me either say, or insinuate, that the non-elect shall enter into God’s kingdom.

B. Have I not? Then I beg your pardon for my precipitancy.

T. So far from holding the notion which you have just now imputed to me, of all entering into the heavenly kingdom, on the contrary, I believe upon divine authority, that *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.* John iii. 3. Now as the elect alone are born again, the elect alone do, or can, in my apprehension, see that kingdom.

B. This is to me “confusion worse confounded.” I cannot comprehend you at all—You say, that the whole human race shall be saved. At all events, to give you the benefit of your own distinction, that even the unregenerate or non-elect portion of them shall be saved *in a certain sense.* Do you not?

T. Well. I admit that I do.

B. If so—if all are to be saved—how can that happen, except in consequence of all being introduced, at one period or another, into the heavenly kingdom?

T. What if the salvation of the unregenerate, such as it is, should be connected with the termination of the kingdom of Christ Jesus as mediator? What if kingdom should signify kingly power?

B. Explain yourself.

T. If Christ’s kingdom shall terminate, as scripture assures us it shall do, in the ultimate subjugation or salvation of the unregenerate, then it is plain that they cannot enter into that which, at the very moment of their subjugation, comes to an end. And if kingdom means kingly power, as from numerous passages of scripture it may be easily proved in many cases to do, then it is also plain that, although exercised by the elect as reigning with their Head, it can never be exercised by those who, so far from *reigning*, are *reigned over*.

B. O! I apprehend you! You make the salvation of the elect to consist in their being brought into the kingdom of God, and in their being thereby privileged to reign as

kings with Christ : whereas, in your conception of matters, the non-elect never reign, but are the subjects of the reign of Christ and his people.

T. You have caught and expressed my meaning very accurately, Robert.

B. But will scripture bear you out in all this? I much doubt it.—With your permission, I would hear more of this subject. It deeply interests me.

T. As I have an engagement at this hour, we must in the mean time break off. But, if you have no objections, we may resume our conversation to-morrow.

B. With all my heart.

DIALOGUE SECOND.

SUBJECT :

JESUS THE SON OF ADAM AS WELL AS
THE SON OF ABRAHAM.

SPEAKERS :—AUTHOR. BROTHER.

B. Since parting with you yesterday, I have been thinking over the subject-matter of our, to me, very interesting conversation. The result of my reflections I may state to you has been, that many difficulties, insuperable difficulties, appear to me to stand in the way of the reception of your theory. Among others, the express declaration of the inspired writer, in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, verse 14th: *Of the seed of Abraham he, Jesus, taketh hold.* I translate the passage according to the marginal reading, in order to anticipate and satisfy any objections which you might make, and make reasonably enough, to the supplementary words which are inserted in the authorised version.—Now, my dear brother, how do you reconcile this statement of the apostle, which necessarily excludes all except Abraham's spiritual descendants from an interest in the blessings of salvation, with the notions of Universalists?

T. Do you happen to remember the words of the apostle Paul, which occur at the end of the third chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians?

B. I do. *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*

T. Very accurately quoted. Well; is it not plain, from this declaration, that any human being, by becoming a spiritual descendant of Christ, becomes thereby *ipso facto*, according to the apostolic reasoning, a descendant of Abraham likewise?

B. Certainly. But, then, it is only believers of the truth who, as Christ's spiritual descendants, do, or can, become, through him as the channel, spiritual descendants of Abraham.

T. That is to beg the question, Robert. Undoubtedly if none but believers of the truth could become Christ's descendants, none but believers of the truth could spiritually become Abraham's seed. But what, if the whole human race can be shewn, in one way or another, and at one period or another, to have a spiritual descent from Christ?—Would not the establishment of this fact, establish at the same time the descent of the whole human race, through Christ, from Abraham?

B. Unquestionably.

T. This very fact is what I am prepared from scripture to prove. Believers are in one and a peculiar sense—the rest of the family of man are in another and a general sense—connected with, and descended from, Christ. And thus are both classes of human beings connected with, and descended from, Abraham.

B. Indeed!

T. It is true, nevertheless, however much you may be startled at the assertion.—But before proceeding to the proof of it, answer me this question:—Upon what authority do you and I know the truth of what is contained in the scriptures?

B. Upon that of their divine testifier alone. For, I am satisfied, that it is only a divine witness who is competent to prove divine truth.—It being impossible for God to receive testimony from man, that is, for the declarations of the superior to be proved or corroborated by the inferior ; all that is divinely true must, from the very necessity of the case, be of the nature of light, that is, must be self-evident to the mind into which it has been introduced. To say that God himself becomes the witness to the conscience of a believer, and that divine truth shines in a believer's conscience by its own light, must be synonymous modes of expression.

T. Admirably conceived and expressed, my dear Robert.—Then, upon the principle stated by you, when faith comes to have a place in our minds, we believe in the existence of the persons spoken of in the scriptures, and in the truth of the facts therein narrated, not on the ground of our knowing any thing about them otherwise, but solely on the ground of the revelation concerning them which God hath vouchsafed to us.

B. This, of course, is implied in my position.

T. To proceed.—We know of the existence of Adam and Abraham, and of the relationship in which they stand to their respective posterities, solely upon the authority of the information with which we are furnished by the holy scriptures.

B. This is granted.

T. According to these scriptures, Adam is the head, source, or progenitor, of the whole human family.

B. Yes. For *God hath made of his one blood, all nations of men, for to dwell on the face of the earth.* Acts xvii. 26.

T. And from the same scriptures we learn, that Abraham is the ancestor of the Jews, a portion of the human family.

B. True.

T. Now, Robert, to come somewhat nearer to the point at which I am aiming. You admit that our blessed Lord was, according to the flesh, Abraham's descendant?

B. Certainly I do.—Go on.

T. And that he was also Adam's descendant?

B. As Abraham's descendant, he was of necessity also Adam's descendant.—Who denies all this?

T. No man professing any regard whatever to the sacred volume will deny this. But many are found to deny the obvious and necessary inferences to which it leads.—As Abraham's descendant, had not the Lord Jesus a natural fleshly connection with the whole nation of the Jews? Were not all the members of the Israelitish community his *kinsmen according to the flesh*?

B. Most assuredly they were.

T. And as the descendant of Adam, must not Jesus have had a natural and fleshly connection,—more remote, I confess, than that which he had with the Jews,—still a natural and fleshly connection, with the rest of the human race?—In other words, as you seem to hesitate about returning an answer, must not Jesus, as Adam's descendant, have been connected with all the rest of Adam's descendants?

B. Stop. Let me think.—The idea which you have just suggested is perfectly new to me.—I cannot deny that Jesus must have borne some sort of relationship to all mankind. He was a partaker of flesh and blood. That is, of the nature of Adam. That is, of the nature which is common to every human being.—Well: your demand is reasonable. I do allow, at the risque of whatever consequences may follow from the admission, that as the Lord Jesus stood in a *near* fleshly relationship to Abraham's natural descendants, so he had also a *remoter* fleshly connection with the rest of the human race.

T. Do not be afraid of my drawing any improper inferences from your concessions. I am content, for the

present, to do little more than echo your own words, and say :—Jesus, as Abraham's descendant, bore *a close* fleshly relationship to the Jews ; and, as Adam's descendant, bore *a remote* fleshly relationship to the rest of the human race. The fact of a fleshly connection having been admitted by you to subsist between Jesus and every human being is enough for my present purpose.

B. But you aim at deducing a conclusion favourable to your own system from all this.

T. Most assuredly I do so. But it is such a conclusion as, from the candour which you exhibit—a quality rarely to be met with in religious polemics,—I am not without hopes of carrying you along with me in.—Mark the point of our mutual agreement. It is that, whether *nearer* or *more remote*, the connection subsisting between Jesus on the one hand and Jews and Gentiles on the other, of which we now speak, is but a fleshly one.

B. Here we are agreed.

T. But there is likewise a spiritual relationship subsisting between Jesus and human beings.—Is there not ?

B. Between Jesus and *certain* human beings. You know that the subject-matter in dispute between us is, as to whether this spiritual relationship be confined to a few, or extend to all.

T. Well. There is, however, such a thing as a *spiritual*, as distinguished from a *natural* or *fleshly* relationship.

B. There is.

T. Now answer me,—and answer me with the same delightful fairness which you have all along exhibited,—does the *spiritual* relationship, the existence of which you admit, proceed upon the same principles upon which the *natural* one does ?

B. Propose your question in some other form.

T. I will. Is it upon the principle of *fleshly* descent that God confers a *spiritual* relationship ? Or, is it upon some other principle ?

B. Upon a totally different principle, to be sure. The enjoyment of the privileges of the earthly Canaan, was connected with a *fleshly* descent from Abraham. Whereas spiritual privileges are bestowed of pure, free, sovereign, grace. Those who are the recipients of them are *born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.* John i. 13.

T. So far, good. You admit, then, that it is not the *descendants of Abraham according to the flesh*, but certain individuals chosen by God from among Jews and Gentiles, who become partakers of spiritual privileges through Christ Jesus?

B. I do.

T. And do you remember any particular appellation given to the persons thus privileged, in the New Testament Scriptures?—To express myself in a somewhat different manner: Are such persons represented as being really and substantially, what another class of persons were only figuratively?

B. I understand you.—The persons upon whom the principle of faith in Christ Jesus is conferred, are spoken of and treated as the true Israel of God. They constitute the *real*, as contra-distinguished from the *typical*, Jews. And this, because *he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God.* Rom. ii. 28, 29. Well, now that I have admitted believers in Christ Jesus to constitute *the true Jews—the spiritual Israel*—what then?

T. Why, to call your attention to the manner in which the members of the spiritual Israel are brought to the enjoyment of their special divine privileges. Have you ever considered that that manner is twofold?

B. I have not. Indeed, I am not sure that I comprehend your meaning.

T. You shall not remain long at a loss with regard to it.—Was not Jesus the descendant of Abraham according to the flesh?

B. He was.

T. Then Jesus, as having been Abraham's *fleshly* descendant, must, by making believers of the truth or *the spiritual* Israel his own descendants, impart to them, in some sort, a *fleshly* connection with Abraham likewise. They are Christ's seed; Christ was Abraham's fleshly seed: therefore, in becoming Christ's seed, they are seen to acquire, through him, a kind of fleshly connection with Abraham himself.—You remember the passage which you have already quoted: *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed.* Gal. iii. 29. Thus you perceive that believers inherit their spiritual privileges, not independently of, but in connection with, a species of fleshly relationship which, through Christ, they bear to Abraham himself. They are not themselves Abraham's fleshly descendants; but they are descended from him who was Abraham's fleshly descendant.

B. So I perceive.

T. Thus, then, the first way in which believers of the truth become partakers of their *spiritual* privileges, is actually through the medium of a *fleshly* relationship subsisting between them and Abraham. They are the seed of him, who was himself of the number of Abraham's *fleshly* seed.—But it is not in this way alone, or principally, that their spiritual privileges redound to them. For they do not inherit them *merely* on the ground of their being, in a certain sense, Abraham's *fleshly* seed.

B. By no means. Abraham's fleshly seed, properly speaking, they are not. That seed still exists, and, from spiritual privileges, are utterly and for ever excluded. A

golph is interposed between them and salvation *which*, by them as Jews, never *can be passed over*. Luke xvi. 26. Believers, or the spiritual Israel, I acknowledge, taught by the hint which you have just given me, attain to the heavenly inheritance through him who was Abraham's fleshly descendant; and yet they attain not to it as themselves fleshly descendants of Abraham, but as having been *begotten again of incorruptible seed, even by the word of God, Christ Jesus, which liveth and abideth for ever*. 1 Peter i. 23.

T. I observe that you apprehend completely my meaning as to the twofold manner in which believers become the spiritual Israel: first, as descended from Jesus, who was himself Abraham's fleshly seed; and, secondly, as descended from Jesus by a spiritual, not by a natural or fleshly, generation.—Having observed and admitted this double connection which believers have with Abraham, a fleshly and a spiritual one; and this double medium through which they inherit their peculiar and glorious privileges; have you no suspicion of the consequences to which the fact conducts us?

B. None whatever: if, by the consequences to which you allude, you mean consequences favourable to the theory of Universalists.

T. Have you not expressed yourself satisfied, that the Lord Jesus had a fleshly connection with the Gentile portion of the family of man, as well as with the Jewish portion of it? The connection in the latter case although more close, not excluding that in the former case although more remote?

B. I certainly have.

T. Have you not also been satisfied, that the blessings which are conferred through Christ Jesus are spiritual; the persons who are the recipients of them being the true Israel, that is, the anti-types of Abraham's fleshly descendants?

B. Unquestionably. I have stated my conviction to this effect.

T. And yet, that these spiritual blessings come to believers, not independently of the Messiah's fleshly connection with Abraham, but actually in virtue and through the medium of that very fleshly connection?

B. All this I have admitted, and still admit.

T. Having made these different admissions, does it not occur to you that, in forming a connection with flesh, Jesus formed a connection with a nature common to every human being; and that, if his connection with flesh is one of the *media* through which he is enabled to convey spiritual blessings to a *few*, the same connection with flesh, as a connection with all, evidently opens up a channel through which he may convey spiritual blessings to *all*?

B. In a matter of such importance as this, you must not urge me to an immediate answer. I must take time to deliberate.

T. Perhaps a little variety in the way of presenting the subject may assist you in your deliberations. If Christ's fleshly connection with Abraham, so far from obstructing, actually leads to and necessarily results in the enjoyment of *superior* spiritual privileges by the few who are Abraham's spiritual descendants; must not his fleshly connection with Adam, which, although more remote, is as certain and decided as his fleshly connection with Abraham, so far from obstructing, equally lead to and with equal necessity result in the enjoyment of *inferior* spiritual privileges by the unregenerate portion of the human race? Besides, if the Jews find their anti-type in believers as constituting the true Israel; where are the Gentiles to find their anti-type, except in the rest of the family of man? A circumstance which leads me to the remark, that the close spiritual connection subsisting between Jesus and the true Israel corresponding to, and

being the substance of, the close fleshly connection subsisting between him and the Jews; it is impossible for us, except in a remoter spiritual connection subsisting between our Lord and unregenerate human beings, to find any thing corresponding to, and the substance of, the remoter fleshly connection subsisting between him and the Gentile world.—

Do you hesitate about receiving a truth so momentous on the foundation of mere reasonings? You are right. Well, then, listen to the way in which an inspired apostle lays down, as matters of fact, the propositions which I have just brought out in the shape of conclusions. The passage referred to is 1 Corinth: xv. 21—23. After stating the fundamental proposition of Christ's connection with all flesh in these words, *since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead*; the apostle shews both the general, and the particular, spiritual results of this fleshly connection, in what follows. The general spiritual result; *As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive*: and the particular one; *But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterward, they that are Christ's at his coming*. That is, although through Jesus, *the second man, the Lord from heaven*, some human beings only derive *peculiar* spiritual benefits; yet likewise through him as *the second man*, and thereby as connected with all flesh, *general* spiritual benefits unquestionably redound to all.

B. Is it the import of your argument that Jesus, in appearing in flesh, having taken hold of that which is common to every human being, must, therefore, have taken hold of it for a purpose common to every human being? That is, that having taken hold of or connected himself with the nature of all, he must have done so for the purpose of effecting the salvation of all?

T. Not *exactly*.

B. What then?

T. The argument is, that close fleshly connection with Abraham's natural descendants, having implied close spiritual connection with Abraham's spiritual descendants; therefore, remoter fleshly connection with the Gentile world, must have implied remoter spiritual connection with the unregenerate portion of the family of man. My argument chiefly turns upon that grand scriptural fact, which you have more than once already admitted, that, as Jesus was the Son of Adam as well as the Son of Abraham, his connection with flesh is not confined to a connection with Abraham's fleshly descendants, but extends, although in a remoter degree, to a connection with all the descendants of Adam. And it also rests upon the scriptural fact, that what is fleshly is *the shadow* of what is spiritual and heavenly: Coloss. ii. 17: Heb. ix. 9. 23. 24: from which I infer, that a remoter fleshly connection must be the type, figure, or shadow, of a remoter spiritual connection; just as a near fleshly connection on the part of Christ with the Jews is, by all enlightened believers of the truth, acknowledged to be the type, figure, or shadow, of a near spiritual connection on his part with the New Testament Israel.

B. I *understand* your argument at any rate.—But why did you object to adopting my statement of it? Is it not in reality equivalent to your own?

T. Not *exactly*, as I have already remarked. For, although when it is stated that as Christ took a nature common to all, it must have been for a purpose common to all, a grand general truth is asserted—a truth of which I have availed myself elsewhere;* yet the fact of all being saved, because all had a fleshly connection formed with them by Christ, is a truth different from that which I am now contending for, viz. that the close fleshly connection

* In the second volume of my Assurance of Faith, chapter 6th.

which Christ contracted with some, pointed to a close spiritual connection to be contracted by him with some likewise; and thereby to salvation to be enjoyed by them in a higher sense than it is, or can be, enjoyed by the world in general.

B. You forget that the salvation of any but believers, is the very point in question.

T. I am very far from doing so, my dear brother. But I am not without hopes that this will not long remain a matter in dispute between us.

B. There is a circumstance which, it strikes me, you overlook in all your reasonings on this subject, David, and that is: that Christ has a spiritual connection with his believing people even here; while his connection with the rest of the human race is, as you are well aware, at the best merely a fleshly one. If he had merely a fleshly connection in time with all, I could understand, and might admit, the possibility of a spiritual connection existing throughout eternity with all likewise. But it appears to me, that the fact of a spiritual connection subsisting in time between him and a few human beings, implies the conferring of advantages hereafter on those few, in which it is impossible for the others, as destitute of the spiritual connection in time, to participate.

T. So far from having overlooked the circumstance of which you speak, my dear Robert, it lies at the root of, and is pre-supposed in, all my scriptural reasonings. In this very circumstance, indeed, of the members of the Church having a spiritual connection with Christ in time, of which the rest of the human family are destitute, consists the nearness of the relationship in which the Church stands to Christ; and is there realized in anti-type that near fleshly connection which subsisted between Abraham's descendants and him.—But you cannot tell how delighted I am at your having proposed your objection in the tangible form that

you have done. It will enable me to bring our controversy the more speedily to an issue.

I know that there subsists in time merely a fleshly connection between Christ and mankind in general. I know farther that, while they are in flesh, he gives to his people, and to his people alone, to possess, over and above that fleshly connection with him which they share in common with the world, a spiritual connection with him which is peculiar to themselves: so that, although as to their bodies and natural minds, they continue *fleshly* like others, yet as to their consciences they are *spiritual*, having had conferred on them by faith the earnest of the divine and heavenly nature of the Son of God. And, in virtue of this privilege, even *now* are they themselves *the Sons of God*. 1 John iii. 2. Rom. viii. 14—16.—Under these circumstances, as possessing a spiritual as well as a fleshly connection with Christ while they are upon earth; and as thereby essentially distinguished from those who in time have merely a fleshly connection with the Lord Jesus; I readily with you draw the conclusion, that a fate must await believers hereafter perfectly different from that which awaits the unbelieving world.—This, however, is nothing more than what I have been all along maintaining. In this possession of *the earnest of spirit* here, and in the glorious privileges which stand connected with this hereafter, consists the salvation of *the church of the living God*. Believers, and believers only, are connected with Jesus as the spiritual Abraham. They only are——

B. The spiritual Abraham! What do you mean by employing such phraseology?

T. My dear Robert, are you ignorant of the fact that Jesus is the anti-type of Abraham?—The real Abraham? The true father of the faithful or believers?—Has it never occurred to you, that he whom we call Abraham was merely a type or shadow of Jesus Christ, as Abraham in reality?

B. Why—I can scarcely say that it has.

T. When you consider, that it is Jesus who *begets again* his believing people, *not with corruptible seed, but with incorruptible, even the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever*, you can scarcely fail to perceive that he is *the true father of the faithful*. He is thus seen to be the true Abraham. Abraham, as the ancestor of the fleshly Israel, having been merely the type of that spiritual Abraham who is the ancestor of the spiritual Israel.—But this is not all. Jesus, who according to the flesh was Abraham's Son, was according to the spirit Abraham's Lord. And this, because he was not merely *the offspring*, but also *the root*, of Abraham. He was the true Abraham, not only as the ancestor of the true Israel, but as, according to the spirit, the source, origin, and ancestor of Abraham himself. Hence his language, *Before Abraham was, I am*. John viii. 58.

B. All this is to a certain degree new to me. But I cannot gainsay it.

T. Well, then, it is as the true or spiritual Abraham that Jesus begets his chosen people, by bringing them to the knowledge of the truth. Begotten of him, they are, like him their spiritual ancestor, sufferers on the earth;—*strangers and pilgrims here,—seeking that city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker the Lord is*. Heb. xi. 10. But as, in due time, the typical Abraham's natural descendants were brought into the earthly Canaan, so, in due time likewise, are all the anti-typical Abraham's spiritual descendants introduced into the heavenly Canaan, there to abide and reign with their exalted head for evermore. Rom. viii. 17; 2 Timothy ii. 12.—All this happens to them, not merely in consequence of their possessing a fleshly connection with Jesus; for this they have in common with the rest of the world: but in consequence of their possessing over and above this, even while they are in flesh, a spiritual

connection with him likewise. This spiritual connection necessarily involving in itself the rendering of their consciences, which originally were but fleshly like those of others, actually spiritual even in time; and thereby giving to their originally fleshly minds, by their being made spiritual in time, a totally different fate from the fleshly minds of others which, so far from being made spiritually alive in time, actually perish.

B. I fancy that I understand you. And yet, if so, you are merely broaching the ordinary Calvinistic theory: or something, at all events, extremely like it. You are representing Jesus, as the true and spiritual Abraham, to be the head and ancestor of a true and spiritual Israel—they, like the fleshly Israel whose anti-type they are, being a body selected from the rest of the world; and, like the fleshly Israel, enjoying privileges from all participation in which the rest of the human race are excluded. The spiritual Abraham having begotten his spiritual posterity in time by the word of the truth of his grace, you represent him as elevating them hereafter to heaven, the true and spiritual Canaan, and the place of their blessed and everlasting abode. To this state of blessedness and glory, according to the view of matters taken by you, he does not elevate the rest of the human race.—Tell me, have I succeeded in conveying your meaning? For, let me assure you, that I am most anxious neither to misunderstand nor to misrepresent you.

T. You have expressed my sentiments, so far as you have gone, with the utmost accuracy.

B. Then what have we, all the while, been disputing about? If Jesus, as the spiritual Abraham, save only the spiritual Israel, that is, save only a limited number of the human family, what becomes of universal salvation?

T. Is not Jesus the spiritual Adam, as well as the spiritual Abraham?

B. Let me reflect for a moment.

T. I mean, is it not declared by the apostle Paul, in one passage, Rom. v. 14, that Adam *was the figure of him that was to come* ; and, in another passage, which appears as if it had been expressly intended for an interpretation of that which I have just quoted, is not Jesus denominated *the last Adam* ?*

B. Oh ! you need put yourself to no farther trouble in establishing this point. I admit distinctly that Jesus is the anti-type of Adam, or the spiritual Adam as you seem fond of designating him. Scripture is too full and express in its declarations to this effect, to leave me in any doubt respecting it.—What I wanted time for was, to reflect on the inferences which you might deduce from my admission.

T. Now, then, for one of these inferences.—Jesus, as the true or spiritual Adam, is the Saviour of the whole human race.

B. What say you ?

T. 'That Jesus, as the spiritual Adam, saves all.

B. Explain yourself.—How do you bring out this conclusion ?

T. The general principle is, that as *the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy*, Rev. xix. 10 ; and as all the persons and circumstances of the Old Testament scriptures are typical or emblematic of him and of his kingdom ; so there is always to be found a correspondency subsisting between some leading circumstance belonging to the type, and some leading circumstance belonging to Jesus the glorious anti-type. To take what we are now speaking about as an example :—Abraham was the father of a limited number of the human race, upon whom peculiar temporal privileges were bestowed ; so Jesus, as the anti-type of Abraham, is the spiritual father of a limited num-

* See 1 Corinth. xv. 45, and the context.

ber of the human race, upon whom peculiar spiritual privileges are bestowed. Adam, again, was the father of and connected with the whole family of man, as their common natural ancestor; so Jesus, as the anti-type of Adam, is the father of and connected with the whole human race, as their common spiritual ancestor.—To adopt another mode of expressing myself:—Jesus, by being the spiritual Abraham, is the father of and conveys peculiar spiritual benefits to a few of mankind; whereas, by being the spiritual Adam, he is the father of and the source of spiritual benefits to every human being. Those who have not *peculiar* spiritual benefits through him as the spiritual Abraham, deriving *general* spiritual benefits through him as the spiritual Adam.

B. Is not this an argument which you have employed and urged already?

T. Not quite the same as, although closely connected with, one formerly used by me, and leading to the same result. My former argument was, that Jesus, as the descendant of Abraham, being also the descendant of Adam, must have had not merely a close fleshly connection with Abraham's natural seed, but also a remoter fleshly connection with the rest of the human race. My present argument is, that while, as the spiritual Abraham, Jesus is the spiritual father of, and saves after a high and peculiar fashion, a small portion of mankind, who constitute the spiritual Israel; over and above this, as the spiritual Adam, he must be the spiritual father of all, and must, in that character and capacity, be the source of a general spiritual salvation which is applicable to all.

B. Can you adduce any particular passages of scripture where Jesus is spoken of as the anti-type of Adam? and where all human beings are represented as having a general spiritual interest in him as such?

T. Most assuredly I can. *As in Adam all die, even*

so in *Christ*, that is, as the context evidently implies, in Christ as the spiritual or anti-typical Adam, *shall all be made alive*. 1 Corinth. xv. 22. And, *The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit*. V. 45. Besides, let me refer you, for full satisfaction in regard to this subject, to the argument which the Apostle Paul prosecutes from the 12th verse to the end of the 5th chapter of his *Epistle to the Romans*. There you will find that Adam, as the fleshly ancestor of all, stands contrasted with Jesus, as the anti-type of Adam and thereby as the spiritual ancestor of all: and that the effects of *the one sin* of the former, as resulting to all human beings in condemnation and death; stand contrasted with the effects of *the one righteousness* of the latter, as resulting to all those in whose case sin and death had abounded, that is, to all human beings, in justification and life everlasting.

B. But you know well the restriction of the word *all*, in the passages to which you have alluded, to *all believers*, which Calvinistic divines have agreed in making.

T. Perfectly.—But, in the first place, preferring, as I wish to do always, a divine statement, to the assertions of mere men however eminent, I am satisfied to think with the apostle that *as, by the offence of one*, the fleshly Adam, *judgment came upon ALL MEN to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one*, the Lord Jesus in his character and capacity as the spiritual Adam, *the free gift came upon ALL MEN unto justification of life*.* Rom. v. 18. And, in the second place, having discovered from scripture, the only source of information in such matters, that there is a difference between the character of Jesus as the spiritual Abraham, and his character as the spiritual Adam, while I acknowledge that, in his former character, Jesus only

* Some words are supplied which are not in the Greek; but the words ALL MEN occur in the original in both parts of the antithesis.

takes hold of and saves the true Abrahamic seed, those who are *the holy brethren*, and *partakers of the heavenly calling*, Heb. iii. 1; I am constrained, by the same divine evidence and authority which have extorted from me the confession just made, to rejoice in Jesus as likewise possessed of the latter character, or that of the spiritual Adam, and as such the author of the resurrection from the dead of the whole human family.

B. I readily admit, that even the unbelieving rise through Christ. His voice ultimately penetrates the regions of the tomb; and his mighty power ultimately dispossesses it of all its tenants. *O death! I will be thy plague; O grave! I will be thy destruction.* This, taught by the apostle in the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians, I am satisfied is the language of the Lord Jesus, and proclaims a triumph in which all participate.

T. Precious is the confession which you have just made, my dear brother. But it is completely and startlingly at variance with other parts of your own theory.—By admitting that even the unbelieving dead are raised ultimately through Christ, you admit, first, “a connection to subsist between them and him;” and secondly, that “they are indebted for their everlasting existence, whatever it may be, to him.” In reality, I maintain no more. This is the utmost extent of what I conceive to be implied in Christ’s being the spiritual Adam, when considered with a reference to the unregenerate portion of the family of man.—Jesus, as Adam’s descendant, has a fleshly connection with all human beings; and as Adam’s Lord, or rather as the spiritual Adam, bearing a general spiritual relationship to all, all have such a general interest in his salvation, as ensures to them the benefit of participating in his resurrection. But Jesus, as Abraham’s descendant, bore a peculiar fleshly relationship to some; and as Abraham’s seed, or rather as the spiritual Abraham,

bearing a peculiar spiritual relationship to some, even while they are in flesh, they have such a peculiar interest in him, as ensures to them present resurrection from the dead, and the present enjoyment of life everlasting.—So much then for the fact, that both of us perceive and admit such a connection to subsist between Jesus and all, as ensures even to the unregenerate, resurrection from the dead and everlasting existence. But how do you propose to reconcile the existence of this connection between Christ and the unregenerate, with that other portion of your theory which represents Christ as raising persons thus connected with him from the dead for the purpose of inflicting upon them never-ending torments?

B. Concerning this, David, we shall talk on some other occasion. In the meanwhile, having laid it down as one of your leading positions, that it is as the spiritual Abraham that Jesus saves the elect or spiritual Israel, I want to know how it happens that, as the spiritual Abraham, he can have a connection with and save the rest of the human race? You may remember that, at the outset of this conversation, you seemed to intimate the fact of Jesus, as Abraham's seed, saving *all*; and yet, in the progress of it, you have limited the salvation of Jesus, as Abraham's seed and the spiritual Abraham, to comparatively speaking *a very few*. Now, how do you reconcile your two statements? How do you make Jesus, as the *spiritual Abraham*, to save *a few* and yet to save *all*?

T. Very acutely objected, Robert. And yet the answer is extremely easy. Jesus saves none, except the spiritual Israel, in his character and capacity as the spiritual Abraham. This I repeat in terms the most distinct and explicit.—But it is through his previously being the spiritual Abraham, that Jesus becomes the spiritual Adam and as such the Saviour of all. And thus it is that, although not immediately yet mediately, although not in

one sense yet in another, as the spiritual Abraham he saves all.—You may remember my having given you a hint to this effect already.

B. “Through his being the spiritual Abraham, Jesus becomes the spiritual Adam!” Have the goodness to explain yourself.

T. Cheerfully, my dear brother. Through his being naturally Abraham’s fleshly seed, we have satisfied ourselves that Jesus was also naturally Adam’s fleshly seed. His being the fleshly descendant of the one, having necessarily implied his being also the fleshly descendant of the other.—Just so conversely. Jesus being the spiritual Abraham, and as such the father of the spiritual Israel; implies his being also the spiritual Adam, and as such the father spiritually considered of the whole human race. As through his being Abraham’s seed, he was also Adam’s seed; so through his being the spiritual Abraham, he is also the spiritual Adam.—To express myself somewhat differently: as Jesus could not naturally become Abraham’s seed, without becoming also Adam’s seed; so no more could he become spiritually the true Abraham, without becoming also spiritually the true Adam. A universality of spiritual connection, was as much and necessarily involved in the immediate restricted spiritual connection in the latter case; as the universality of fleshly connection; was involved in the immediate restricted fleshly connection in the former case.

B. Give me some proof of this.

T. It may be proved scripturally in a variety of ways. First. By means of typical allusions: You cannot have forgotten the remarkable fact of the change of Abraham’s name, the circumstances connected with which are related in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis. He was originally called Abram, that is, *the high or exalted father*: but subsequently he had conferred on him the name of Abraham,

or *father of multitudes*. *Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.* Verse 5th. Just so, Jesus who was exalted to God's right hand as *the Prince and Saviour* of his church, subsequently and ultimately appears as the Saviour of the whole human race. He changes from being manifested as saving the *nation that is greatly blessed in him*, to being manifested as *he in whom all the families of the earth are blessed*.

B. Proceed.

T. Secondly. It may be proved by implication. *Thou hast put all things in subjection under his Jesus' feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man.* Heb. ii. 8, 9. The words with which we have to do at present are: *now we see not yet all things put under him.* That is, although Jesus is destined to appear *ultimately*, agreeably to the scope of the whole passage and the psalm from which it is quoted, in his highest character as the spiritual Adam or Saviour of all, we see him *now* only in his inferior character as spiritual Abraham or Saviour of a few. This *inferior* character, however, is paving the way for, and will ultimately run up into, the *superior* one. Having *tasted death for every man*,—through saving his church, the unregenerate themselves shall ultimately appear *put under his feet*, or saved by being subdued by him.

Thirdly. The grand truth for which I contend, of Jesus' character as the spiritual Adam being necessarily involved in his character as the spiritual Abraham, is also proved by facts. 1. Jesus, in his conception, took hold of flesh and blood, that is, took hold of a nature which is common to the

whole family of man. This he did for a purpose common to all, namely, that of converting the nature of flesh and blood into the nature of spirit, and thereby of subduing it to himself. That is, for the purpose of manifesting himself as the spiritual Adam. But as he accomplishes his purpose through the medium of conferring upon his chosen and beloved ones *the earnest of spirit* in time, and of thereby raising them to the enjoyment of the spiritual Canaan with him when time as to them shall be no more, that is, by appearing as the spiritual Abraham, it is obvious, that it is through his being first the spiritual Abraham, he subsequently becomes or rather is manifested subsequently to be the spiritual Adam.—Again, 2: that Jesus' character as the spiritual Adam, is necessarily involved in his character as the spiritual Abraham, appears from the fact, that it is the same glorious being who is the one as well as the other. All the types, be it remembered, shadowed forth one and the same glorious anti-type. Unquestionably, Jesus is manifested as the spiritual Abraham first: a circumstance which necessarily implies that, except by previously appearing in that capacity, he could not subsequently have appeared in the other; and that it is his character as the spiritual Abraham, which involves his character as the spiritual Adam, and not *vice versa*.* But as both these characters belong

* I mean, as to the manner of development or to our apprehensions of things. For, in reality, and when we go to the bottom of the matter, it is Jesus' character as the spiritual Adam or *the all in all*, that involves his character as the spiritual Abraham, as well as his other characters whether real or representative, and not *vice versa*. The principle of this being, that the universal must always include the particular, not the particular, the universal. Still, I can speak with perfect accuracy as I have done in the text, both because it is the same being who is the spiritual Abraham and the spiritual Adam; and because, to us creatures, it is through the development of the particular that the development of the universal takes place, or through being manifested as the spiritual Abraham that Jesus is manifested as the spiritual Adam: in other words, because, to us creatures, from the limitation of our minds and the adjustment of the divine procedure and revelations in conformity thereto, the particular, by appearing first and leading to the universal, appears to us to include within itself the universal.

Compare, in illustration of this, the 2nd chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, from the 5th verse downwards, with the 8th Psalm throughout.

essentially to one and the same divine being, it is perfectly obvious, that the one could not have been possessed by him, without his possessing also the other; or that the one character is necessarily involved in that of the other. As he could not be Abraham's Son, without being also Adam's Son; so neither could he be Abraham's Lord, or the spiritual Abraham, without being also Adam's Lord, or the spiritual Adam.

B. You hold then, with ordinary Universalists, that such declarations of God to Abraham, as, *In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed*; Gen. xii. 3; and, *In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*; xxii. 18; refer to the ultimate salvation of the whole human race through him; or, which is the same thing, through Christ his seed?

T. Most assuredly. For Jesus, Abraham's seed, by having had a fleshly connection with him, had a fleshly connection likewise with the whole human race; and conversely, the whole human race by becoming in one way or another, and at one period or another, Christ's seed, become thereby likewise Abraham's seed. At the same time, I hold this general principle of Universalists, of "a connection subsisting between Jesus, Abraham's seed, and the whole human race, and his salvation of the whole accordingly," without allowing myself to forget, or lose sight of, any of the distinctions already laid down. It is through Jesus, as at once Abraham's seed and the spiritual Abraham, that the salvation, such as it is, of the unregenerate portion of the family of man is ensured: and this, because it is through his manifestation as the spiritual Abraham or the Saviour of the spiritual Israel, that he is ultimately manifested as the spiritual Adam or the subduer of all things to himself; and because he is the spiritual Adam or *all in all*, as well as the spiritual Abraham or *head of the church*. But it is not as the spiritual Abraham, or, to

speaking more correctly, it is not *while manifested as* the spiritual Abraham, that Jesus saves all: for, while he appears as the spiritual Abraham, he is the Head and Saviour of the spiritual Israel or his believing people alone.

B. I now understand you thoroughly. But I am struck with the appearance of a very curious inversion in your system as you propose it. If I have not mistaken you, your theory is, that through being the spiritual Abraham, Jesus becomes the spiritual Adam; that is, he is the spiritual Abraham, before he is the spiritual Adam. But the fleshly Adam existed before the fleshly Abraham! A fact which implies that the order of the spiritual pair is exactly the opposite of the order of the fleshly pair!—Am I correct in my statement of this inversion?

T. Perfectly so. It is a very singular circumstance, and connected with a general scriptural principle, never hitherto noticed that I am aware of. To some remarkable applications of it, I intend calling the attention of my fellow believers, in a work which I am now preparing for the press. Yes. The natural Adam preceded the natural Abraham; but the spiritual Abraham precedes the spiritual Adam. Adam was the progenitor of Abraham; but it is as previously the spiritual Abraham that Jesus produces, or rather manifests himself as, the spiritual Adam.—There is no way of effecting a direct and immediate contact between the earthly Adam, and the spiritual Adam; in other words, of bringing the two into a close and immediate approximation: it being through the medium of the earthly Abraham's direct and immediate contact or connection with the spiritual Abraham, that a contact or connection is ultimately effected between the fleshly Adam and the spiritual Adam. That is, to express myself somewhat after a mathematical fashion, the two Abrahams constitute the two middle terms, and the two Adams, the two extremes: the

two extremes being brought into contact, not directly, but through the instrumentality and interposition of the two middle terms.*

B. Can you contrive to throw these statements of yours into a different form?

T. With the utmost ease. Naturally, the universal goes before the particular; spiritually, the particular goes before the universal. Naturally, the universal or whole family of man as descended from Adam, goes before the particular or the family of the Jews as descended from Abraham; but spiritually, the particular or family of believers as descended from Jesus the spiritual Abraham, goes before the universal or whole family of man made new as descended from Jesus the spiritual Adam. It was through being connected with *the whole*, that Jesus became connected with *a part*, naturally; it is through his being connected with *a part*, that he becomes connected with *the whole*, spiritually. The whole harvest of mankind is his naturally, of which he gave evidence by taking immediate possession of a part, as the first fruits: but it is by *the waving of the first fruits*, or immediate salvation of a part, that he ultimately shews himself to have taken complete possession of and saved the whole harvest spiritually. Compare Leviticus xxiii. 9—21, with 1 Corinth. xv. 20—28, James i. 18, and Rev. xiv. 4.

B. But although the manifestation of Jesus as the spiritual Abraham, precedes the manifestation of him as

* The following may contribute to illustrate my meaning to the reflecting and spiritually intelligent reader:—

Extreme.	Middle Terms.		Extreme.
Fleshly Adam.	Fl. Abraham.—Sp. Abraham.		Spiritual Adam.
	Again:—		
Fleshly Adam indirectly and mediately connected with	directly connected with	Fleshly Abraham directly and immediately connected with	Spiritual Adam. directly connected with Spiritual Abraham

the spiritual Adam; and although thereby the spiritual particular appears to include the spiritual universal; your meaning must be, that it does so to our apprehensions merely. For in reality, in this case as in every other, the universal must include the particular, not the particular the universal. In reality, it must be in consequence of Jesus being essentially the spiritual Adam or head of all, that he is previously manifested as the spiritual Abraham or head of a part; and not *vice versâ*.

T. This cannot be denied: nor is it in the slightest degree inconsistent with the theory to which you have been listening.—It is unquestionably as the spiritual Adam, that Jesus is *the all, and in all*: and as *in him*, in this character, all manifestations of him whether real or representative are included; so *from him*, in this character, all such manifestations of him must in reality proceed. This, however, is a view of matters applicable, not properly speaking to our *present*, but to our *future*, apprehensions of things; rather let me say, applicable, not to the *fleshly*, but to *the spiritual mind*: in the order of divine manifestation, or in the development of the character of the Lord Jesus to beings situated and constituted as we are, the progress being, as we have already stated, from Adam, to Abraham;—from Abraham, to Jesus as the spiritual Abraham;—and from Jesus as the spiritual Abraham, to Jesus as the spiritual Adam. Let us, while in flesh, be content to be raised gradually, in our apprehensions of divine things, from the spiritual particular to the spiritual universal; leaving the attainment of full, and accurate, and comprehensive, ideas of the particular as included in the universal, until we shall *see Jesus as he is*.

B. I think I may almost venture to form a guess as to what your sentiments are respecting the Bereans, or followers of John Barclay of Edinburgh, to whom I know you are much attached; as well as respecting the other

sects and individuals who, in consequence of having by divine grace been enabled to see Jesus as their divine righteousness, have had their consciences purged from guilt, and been rendered partakers of the earnest of life everlasting. Do not you consider that, although they have been begotten again by the incorruptible seed of the word, they are nevertheless standing still at a view of Jesus *as the spiritual Abraham*; not having had the eyes of their understandings sufficiently opened from above—not having been sufficiently enlightened—to be able to contemplate him also *as the spiritual Adam*?

T. Certainly I do. And since you seem disposed to indulge in conjectures you might, with equal truth, have supposed it to be my opinion of a large proportion of ordinary Universalists, (not of all, for blessed be God, many of them know and love *the truth as it is in Jesus*,) that they have never even been raised so high as the Bereans;—that they have never even been enabled, with them, to take a scriptural view of Jesus as the spiritual Abraham. The great mass of Universalists draw their conclusions in favour of their leading doctrine chiefly, if not altogether, from observing the subsistence of a fleshly connection between Jesus and the whole human race; (in which respect, by the way, their sentiments are superior to those of the Bereans;) but they do not seem to understand that, although this fleshly connection was requisite as the basis of and as preliminary to all the subsequent divine procedure, it is, nevertheless, not through this fleshly connection *directly* that salvation takes place. This class of persons, alas! but too numerous, do not seem to understand, that it is *directly* through the medium of the revelation of Jesus as the spiritual Abraham to the members of the spiritual Israel, and through their primary salvation thereby both here and hereafter; and only *indirectly* through the medium of the fleshly connection subsisting between Jesus

and all human beings; that the grand step is taken, by which the secondary and subordinate salvation of the unregenerate portion of the human family by Jesus as the spiritual Adam is ensured and accomplished. It is ignorance of this, existing in their minds in connection with erroneous conceptions of *the character of Jesus as the God-man*, of *the doctrine of election*, and of *the intermediate state*, which vitiates the system of the great majority of the American Universalists. Other circumstances, concerning which I may speak to you at some future period, long since caused me to reject as a whole the sentiments of the followers of Elhanan Winchester.

B. Many thanks to you for the information with which you have furnished me. My mind is far from being in all respects satisfied as to the correctness of your theory. But you have certainly cleared up my views as to the following points:—First. That Jesus, as having been the Son of Adam no less than the Son of Abraham, had a connection with flesh which, so far from having been confined to the natural descendants of Abraham, extended to the whole human race. Secondly. That this fleshly connection of Jesus with all, necessarily implies some purpose of his incarnation which is common to all. Thirdly. That Jesus is at once Abraham's fleshly descendant, and the spiritual Abraham; Adam's fleshly descendant, and the spiritual Adam: or, in other words, that he is at once Abraham's Son and Abraham's Lord; Adam's Son and Adam's Lord. And, lastly, that, in point of order and time, he appears as the spiritual Abraham before he is manifested as the spiritual Adam.—Some other statements of yours, without actually convincing me, have made a considerable impression on my mind.—As I presume that you will not refuse me the pleasure and advantage of again conversing with you on this interesting subject, till we meet again, adieu.

DIALOGUE THIRD.

SUBJECT :

THE TWO LAWS.

SPEAKERS :—AUTHOR. BROTHER. FRIEND.

F. Robert acquaints me that he has been recently holding some interesting conversations with you on the topic of universal salvation. Have you any objections to my becoming a thirdsman on this present occasion, when, it seems, you intend prosecuting the consideration of the subject ?

T. None whatever.

B. I felt confident that my brother would hail with pleasure your accession to our party.

F. Thank you, Thom. I had myself a pretty strong conviction that, in joining you, I should not be deemed an intruder.—Now, Gentlemen, proceed.

B. I leave it to you to begin. Having in some measure exhausted my own objections to my brother's system, I want to hear those which may have occurred to other minds as impediments to their reception of it.

F. Very well. Be it so.—Robert has furnished me with a general sketch of the questions discussed by you

at your last meeting. It seems that on the natural or fleshly connection subsisting between Jesus and the whole human race; and on the fact of Jesus being the anti-type of Adam as well as of Abraham; you founded, what appeared to my young friend here to be, a very plausible argument in favour of the ultimate salvation of all. That is, as he reported matters to me, of the salvation of *some*, in one sense; and of *the rest*, in another. I confess myself to have been forcibly struck by some of your observations as related by him to me.—But there are circumstances involved in every theory of Universalism of which I have ever heard, or of which I can form any conception, which appear both to him and to me to constitute insurmountable obstacles to our thorough acquiescence in your sentiments. For instance: your system evidently leads to the confounding of the righteous with the wicked.

T. This is a heavy charge. But, perhaps, you will have the goodness to state how it does so.

F. By representing the righteous and the wicked as undergoing one and the same fate. Now you know that scripture has denounced a woe against those *who justify the wicked*, as well as against those *who condemn the righteous*.

T. What, if the leading characteristic of my system should be, the making of a complete distinction between the righteous and the wicked; and the representing of them as experiencing two perfectly different fates?—But come. As I suspect your ignorance of what is meant, in scripture phraseology, by the righteous and the wicked, it may not be amiss for me to try whether my suspicion be well founded or not, by first of all denying the existence of any righteous human beings. *There are none righteous among mankind*.

F. Do you really mean to deny the division of human beings into the righteous and the wicked?

T. Instead of answering you in my own language, I prefer borrowing, for the occasion, that of scripture. *There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none that doeth good, no, not one.* Both passages, quoted from the Old Testament, occur in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.—You see that, in reiterating, as I now do, my denial of the existence of any righteous human beings, I do no more than the word of God itself warrants.

F. Oh! I comprehend your meaning. I admit that no human beings are righteous *in themselves*.

T. That is, in other words to admit, that human beings as such constitute *the wicked*. For to say that no human beings are in themselves righteous, and that all human beings are in themselves wicked, are necessarily convertible modes of expression. Thus, then, whenever God speaks of the wicked, in the largest and most extensive sense of which the term is susceptible, he intends thereby Adam and all his natural posterity.—

B. Why do you hesitate about making the required concession? If none of the natural posterity of Adam be righteous, then of necessity all of them must be wicked.—There is no possible way of evading this conclusion.

F. I allow its correctness.

T. Then mark what follows. As by the language of scripture just quoted, and by your own admission, it is established, that none of the human race as such and of themselves are righteous; then if, notwithstanding this, any of the human race shall be found righteous, it must be in consequence of their occupying some other relation, standing in some other character, and possessing some other nature, than that of mere human beings.

B. This is unquestionably true.

F. You observe that your brother is merely stating, in negative but equivalent terms, the doctrine inculcated by the apostle in the 3rd chapter of the Epistle to the Ro-

mans, from which he has already quoted. For, after having proved man's destitution of creature righteousness and condemnation before God, the apostle proclaims and triumphs in the existence of a divine righteousness, in virtue of their union with the performer of which, Christ Jesus, he represents some of the very persons who are guilty in themselves, as nevertheless standing righteous and accepted in the sight of God.

T. Thus far, then, we have proceeded with a thorough understanding of each other.—Now prepare yourself for two questions which go to the bottom of our present subject:—1st. If righteousness be not an attribute of the creature Adam, but of the Creator Christ Jesus; and if it be by making them one with himself, that the Creator renders any of the human race righteous; then, as it is persons possessed of human nature who constitute the wicked, must it not be persons possessed of the divine nature who constitute the righteous?

F. Evidently.

T. 2ndly. As human beings, who are by nature wicked, may nevertheless by grace, even while they continue human beings, possess in their consciences by faith the earnest or first fruits of the divine nature—have we not thus, in the case of believers, an instance of one and the same class of persons exhibiting at one and the same moment two distinct and perfectly opposite characters? Are not the same persons in one capacity, or as Adam's descendants, wicked; and in another capacity, or as Jesus' descendants, righteous?

F. Granted.

T. Observe—for I have no wish to entrap you to acquiesce in a view which you have not maturely considered,—observe, that when we speak of believers, we speak of persons in whom the two apparently discordant principles of wickedness and righteousness meet. In other words, the

very same individuals can be spoken of with perfect truth as both wicked and righteous. They are wicked, as one with Adam; they are righteous, as one with Christ.

B. This is so clear that there is no possibility of doubting or gainsaying it.

F. So say I likewise. But what is the conclusion which your brother is driving at by all this?

T. You shall not remain long in suspense respecting that.

You remember, my good friend, that you represented me as confounding the wicked with the righteous; and this, by assigning to both a common fate. In the few words which we have already exchanged with each other, my object in part has been to satisfy you, that you had formed an erroneous estimate of my views and principles. First. While, borne out by scripture, I deny the existence of a principle of righteousness in human nature, I do not deny the existence of an essential and eternal distinction between wickedness and righteousness: rejoicing, indeed, in the discovery, that the divine nature is, what human nature neither is nor can be, essentially righteous.—Secondly. While I maintain that all human beings as such are wicked, and that consequently between one class of human beings and another, considered as such, there is *no difference* before God; I maintain equally, that there is a difference between some human beings, as having had the righteousness of Christ revealed to them by faith as their righteousness, and as having been thereby constituted righteous as to their consciences before God,—and the remainder of the human race, as continuing wicked, or what they originally were, by continuing destitute of the knowledge and possession of this divine righteousness.—And, lastly, while I have maintained that all human beings as such are wicked, and stand condemned before God; I have equally maintained, that wherever the principle of divine righteousness

revealed to faith, or the nature of Christ, exists, there acceptance with God, as necessarily connected with it, exists likewise.—In one word, I deny the existence of righteousness in the creature: but I assert the glorious fact of the creature being made a partaker of righteousness in the Creator. Can you after this, with any fairness, represent me as confounding the wicked or Adam's descendants, with the righteous or Christ's descendants? or, after my averment that the former stand condemned, and the latter justified, before God, represent me as holding that the fate of the one is the same as that of the other?

But it is not the mere defence of myself, and justification of my own system of religion—a very paltry matter—that I have had in view by engaging in these conversations. To be useful to you, and to promote, God willing, the cause of truth, this, this, has been my chief aim. You have, if I am not mistaken, by means of your admissions, furnished me with the means of rendering you and others some service. It is evident that up to this time you have, in common with the great bulk of religious professors, been conceiving of the righteous and the wicked as *two classes of mere human beings*. The object of my questions and remarks has been to suggest to you, that as Adam's nature is the wicked nature, and as Christ's nature is the righteous nature, therefore, the distinction between the wicked and the righteous is not, properly speaking, a distinction *between two classes of Adam's descendants*, but *between the descendants of Adam and the descendants of Christ*. And, as closely connected with this fact, I have wished to suggest to you also—taking as the basis of my so doing, what you have admitted to be the case of believers upon earth, viz. that they have by faith the earnest of the divine nature in their consciences, and that they are thus at one and the same moment possessed of the two distinct characters of wicked and righteous—I say, I have wished to suggest to

you, taking your admission as my ground-work, the fallacy of a principle which I know is regarded by you as an impregnable axiom, "that it is impossible for the unregenerate portion of the family of man, as *now* confessedly wicked, *ultimately* to become righteous and be saved."

F. I understand you. From the admitted circumstance of believers of the gospel possessing, at one and the same moment, the characters of wicked and righteous—wicked, in one respect, and righteous, in another—wicked, as descended from the first Adam, and righteous, as descended from the second—you want to anticipate an objection which you conceive I might make to the ultimate salvation of the unregenerate portion of the family of mankind, grounded on the fact of their being at the present moment wicked.

T. Not an objection which you *might make*, but one which you actually *have made*. For on what, except on this principle, does your representation of me as confounding the wicked with the righteous proceed?—Certainly, *as wicked* the unregenerate are not saved. But no more so are believers. As wicked, that is, as descendants of the first Adam, and in so far as they are partakers of his nature, they perish just like others. *The body in them is dead, because of sin.* Rom. viii. 10. This circumstance of believers being naturally wicked, as being partakers of Adam's nature, does not, however, prevent them from becoming supernaturally righteous, as partakers in their consciences of Christ's nature. *The spirit in them is life, because of righteousness.* Ibid:—Now my argument is this:—If the terms wicked and righteous are, in the case of believers, applicable to one and the same class of individuals, viewed as standing in the two distinct and separate relations of descendants of Adam and descendants of Christ Jesus; is it any thing more than an extension of the same principle to say, that the rest of the family of

man who as bearing the image of the earthly man are wicked here, shall nevertheless as bearing the image of the heavenly man be righteous hereafter?

F. In spite of all you can plead in your own behalf, you involve yourself in the conclusion, that God saves the wicked.

T. No more, I repeat, than I do in maintaining that God saves his believing people. For they, although originally wicked and *children of wrath even as others*, are nevertheless in Christ Jesus the objects of his love, and the partakers of his saving grace. The fact is, that neither the believing, nor the unbelieving, are saved as wicked or as Adam's descendants. The spiritual benefits which they respectively reap come to them in and through the righteousness of the Son of God alone. And we thus argue, that if wickedness or Adam's nature, in the case of believers, cannot of itself interfere with and hinder their enjoyment of salvation in the highest sense of the term; no more can wickedness or Adam's nature, in the case of unbelievers, of itself interfere with and hinder their enjoyment of salvation in an inferior sense of the term.—Observe, I never maintain that the unregenerate portion of the family of man are saved as wicked. On the contrary, as wicked they perish. It is in and through their connection with *Jesus Christ the righteous*, that salvation comes to either the regenerate or the unregenerate portion of the human race.

F. What you hold, then, is—for I am most solicitous to apprehend your meaning—that, as in believers appear united the two distinct and discordant characters of wicked and righteous; wicked, as descended naturally from Adam, and righteous, as descended spiritually by faith from Christ Jesus; it is thereby proved, that there is no incompatibility between one and the same class of individuals being wicked in one sense and in one respect, and

righteous in another. And, therefore, in maintaining that the unregenerate portion of mankind, those who live and die wicked or partakers of Adam's nature only while here, are destined ultimately, through the putting forth of that power of Christ by which *all things are made new*, to appear righteous hereafter—you conceive yourself to be merely contending for an extension of the principle, of which we have already recognized the existence in the case of the regenerate. Both in the case of the regenerate, and in that of the unregenerate, you argue that the very same beings who, as descended from Adam, are possessed of a wicked nature, and are therefore punished; are also spiritually descended from Christ Jesus, the second Adam, and, as divinely righteous in him, live for evermore. They appear in the twofold character of wicked in the first Adam, the man *of the earth, earthy*; and righteous in the second Adam, *the Lord from Heaven*.

T. I can have no objection whatever to this statement of my views.

F. To me your ideas come home invested with all the freshness of novelty.

B. Tell me what you mean exactly by the terms righteous and wicked, David? You have frequently employed them in the course of this conversation; and I should like, if agreeable to you, to have an accurate and intelligible definition of them before we proceed farther.

T. By the wicked nature, I mean the nature which disobeys divine law. By the righteous nature, the nature which obeys divine law.—Adam, as having had a nature which necessarily violated the law of God, was the wicked man. Jesus, on the other hand, is the righteous man, as having been possessed of a nature which constantly and necessarily yielded obedience to the law of his heavenly father. *Thy law*, says he, addressing God in the language of prophecy, *is within my heart*. Psalm xl. 8. That is,

“love and consequent obedience to thy law constitute my very nature.”

B. So far I comprehend you. But I am still to a certain degree at a loss. How was it that the natures of Adam and Jesus respectively were made known and exhibited? To what law, or laws, were *the two men* subjected?—My reason for putting these questions is my conviction, that of the nature of any being we can know nothing, except as it is developed in outward actions. Upon this principle, of the respective natures of Adam and Jesus we can form no idea, except as these were made manifest in their external conduct. Now, is it by means of one and the same law, or of different laws, that the characters of Adam and the Lord Jesus, as essentially distinct from each other, are brought out and presented to our notice?

T. A very proper question, Robert, and one which goes directly to the point.—But before I answer it, have the goodness to inform me, whether you conceive Adam when he was first created to have been a spiritual man?

B. He was not. As he proceeded from God's hands, he possessed merely a pure creature or soulical nature; and, in this way, he stood contrasted with, as well as was the type of, the Lord Jesus who was possessed of a divine and spiritual nature.

F. What say you? Was not Adam originally a spiritual man?

B. Are you really so ignorant as to put this question? Adam *a spiritual man!* Why, if he had been so, he could not have been the type or figure of the Lord Jesus, as the apostle Paul informs us he was. Rom. v. 14. The Son of God was *the spiritual man*. But suppose our first progenitor also to have been *spiritual* at the period of his creation, and mark what follows. In that case, instead of Adam being *the figure* of the Creator, Christ Jesus, as from

the circumstance of his having been a creature he could be only, you actually *confound him with the Creator!* A being possessed of *pure soul* or *fleshly mind*, as Adam was, might be the type or figure of a being possessed of *spirit* or *spiritual mind*, as Christ was: but how could a *spiritual being* become the type of a *spiritual being?* Does not the idea carry absurdity branded on the very forehead of it?—My dear sir, we must take care not to imitate the practices which we condemn in Unitarians. By representing the Lord Jesus as a mere man like ourselves, that is, by dragging the Creator down to the level of the creature, they confound the Creator with the creature. But if we represent Adam as having been originally *spiritual*,—that is, if, by ascribing to him an attribute which belongs to Christ Jesus, we elevate the creature to the level of the Creator,—are we not chargeable with the equally gross although opposite error, of confounding the creature with the Creator?—The truth is that the notion, so common among religious characters, of Adam having been originally a *spiritual*, that is, a *divine* being, is fraught with the most absurd as well as unscriptural consequences. Of some of these my brother here has given a succinct, and to me a satisfactory, view, in his *Three Questions proposed and answered*: in which he has demonstrated from scripture, that Adam's mind naturally was a *pure soulical* or *creature mind* merely, and as such the figure of Christ's *spiritual* or *divine mind*; and that, if the opposite theory be persevered in, of *Adam's mind* having been originally *spiritual*, it must be at the expense of representing Christ to have come into the world, not to elevate us to a state of glory and happiness infinitely superior to that which Adam originally possessed, but merely to carry back and restore us to the state and circumstances of the already forfeited terrestrial paradise.

F. Well, I must look farther into this matter. There

certainly appears at first sight, such a difference between representing Adam as *spiritual*, and *thereby* the type of a *spiritual being*; and representing him as *soulical* and *fleshly*, and *thereby* the type of a *spiritual being*; as is in favour of your brother's view and your own.—In the meantime, you have begged your brother to inform you, whether Adam and Jesus were subjected to the same divine law. I wait impatiently to hear his answer to your question.

T. The answer is ready. Robert having acknowledged the existence of a distinction between Adam's nature, as having been merely soulical or creaturely; and Christ's nature, as having been spiritual or divine; I now observe, that as their respective natures were different, so also were the laws respectively addressed to them.—To Adam the creature there was addressed but one law, and that couched in the form of a *prohibition*. Its tenor was: *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. 16. 17. This prohibition imposed upon Adam a restraint of the slenderest and most trifling kind. He was, to use the words of Milton,

For one restraint, Lord of the world besides.

And to this he was subjected, with a view to bring out and develop, in a way the most convincing, the vanity and worthlessness of the nature with which he was originally created. Had numerous, strict, and rigid, prohibitions been enforced, they might have been objected to on the ground of their having put human nature to too severe a trial. But a prohibition inferring a restraint so slight was, in the event of its being violated, admirably fitted to evince the essential, total, and irreconcilable, opposition of human nature to God. And violated it was, as soon as the suitable temptation was presented. The event manifesting, that *the mere mind of flesh was*, even in its best estate,

enmity against God; that it was not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, could be. Rom. viii. 7.—But when Jesus, *the second Adam, the Lord from heaven*, made his appearance in flesh, he found already addressed to him, and imposed on him, a law of a very different description from that which had been issued to his natural ancestor. Instead of one prohibition imposing a restraint of a trifling kind, he found himself subjected to a law which imposed *every conceivable species of prohibition*, and addressed to him *every conceivable species of command*. A law which demanded obedience at all times, and in all places—of heart, as well as of life—and the ultimate sacrifice of himself—as well as abstinence from all evil during the whole period of his abode upon earth. A law of the greatest extent of requirement, as well as the most complete intensity of operation; and which made no allowance or provision for failure, even the slightest. A law, in a word, which was searching, dreadful, and fiery; and which demanded a nature corresponding to itself in him who should undertake its accomplishment. Such is the law to which Jesus of Nazareth, as the Christ or Messiah, was subjected. The following is its summary: *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.* Luke x. 27.—Thus we perceive—

F. Pardon the interruption, my dear Sir. I may not exactly understand you. But you appear to me to intimate, that the law enjoining perfect love to God, and equal love to man, was addressed to Jesus the Messiah alone. And, consequently, that it is not addressed to, and is not obligatory on, ordinary human beings.—Perhaps, I have mistaken you. If so, you will set me right.

T. In supposing me to say, that the command *to love God supremely, and his neighbour as himself*, was addressed to the Messiah alone; and never was by God

addressed to, or rendered obligatory on, any of the human race besides ; so far from misunderstanding me, you have exactly apprehended my meaning.

F. You perfectly astonish me !

B. Indeed, David, to tell you a truth, this is one of those flights in which I suspect you will be found to have mounted on Icarian wings.—Do you really expect any one who believes the truth of divine testimony, to repose confidence in your assertion, that it is not incumbent upon us to love God and man ?

T. That I may be thoroughly understood, I repeat the substance of what I actually have said, and of what the sacred volume bears me out in maintaining.—There are only two laws represented by the scriptures as ever having been issued by God to man. Not to all men indiscriminately ; but to the one and the other of these two men, the typical Adam, the creature, and the anti-typical or real Adam, the Creator : and this, because in these two men the whole family of man is, either naturally as in the former, or spiritually as in the latter, summed up. The first of these two laws was issued to the natural Adam in the garden of Eden, in the terms which I have already quoted from Genesis ii. 16. 17 ; the second of them was the law to which the spiritual Adam, the Lord Jesus, was subjected during the period of his abode upon earth. The first of these laws consisted of a prohibition ; *of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it* : the second, of a command ; *thou shalt love the Lord thy God*. The first enjoined abstinence from a single transgression ; the second prescribed the most perfect, undeviating, and comprehensive, love to God and man. The first or the prohibition, in the event of its being violated, was to be followed by the infliction of punishment ; the second or the command, having had annexed to it a promise, was, in the event of its being fulfilled by *obedience even unto death*,

to result in the enjoyment of a positive and eternal reward. The former of these laws was violated by Adam, the creature; the latter of them was kept—gloriously kept, indeed, for thereby *was it magnified and made honourable*—by Jesus, the Creator. By means of the breach of the former law, sin and death entered; by means of the fulfilment of the latter, righteousness and life everlasting were introduced. In a word, the violation of the first or prohibitory law, by Adam the creature, was subservient or introductory to perfect obedience to the second law or law of command, by Jesus the Creator.—Am I so far understood?

F. Understood, most assuredly. But I have not yet recovered from the surprise into which I was thrown by your statement, that to love God and his neighbour is not a duty incumbent on every human being.

T. And it will probably deepen and strengthen your surprise when I inform you, that not only is there no obligation imposed by God himself on mere human beings naturally *to love him with all their heart, soul, strength, and mind, and their neighbours as themselves*, but that, in no state or circumstances whatever, can mere human beings become the subjects of such a command.—If I am not mistaken, my worthy friend, what I have just remarked has tended still further to increase your perplexity.

F. Were it not, Thom, that I might appear to be uncourteous, I would say, that I am strongly tempted to question the sanity of the man who is capable of making an assertion such as that which I have just listened to.—A mere human being under no obligation to love God and man! Nay, incapable of being brought under such an obligation! Pooh! Nonsense!

T. And yet, nonsensical as the idea may appear to you—and insane as you may conceive the mind to be which is capable of entertaining it—it is nevertheless true. Nay, what is more, the whole doctrine of human salvation

hinges on it and is involved in it.—But not to keep you any longer in suspense, allow me to ask you :—Have you ever reflected on these words, occurring in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and already referred to by me, *The carnal mind, or mind of flesh, is enmity against God ; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed, can be?* Verse 7th.

F. Yes, I have.

T. You admit then, I presume, that *the carnal mind, or mind of flesh*, there spoken of, is the mind of every human being naturally ?

F. I do.

T. Very well.—Permit me now to call your attention to certain consequences of what you have admitted. The mind of every man naturally, you allow, is spoken of in the passage quoted ; and in it, you observe, it is declared, that not only is that mind so opposed to God as in point of fact to disobey his law, but as *even to labour under a total incapacity of obeying it. It is not subject to the law of God ; NEITHER, INDEED, CAN BE.*—Now reflect on, and then answer, the following question :—Is it likely, think you, that God who, as possessed of infinite wisdom, must know this entire inability of the fleshly mind to obey any law of his, and as a being of perfect love must be incapable of mocking his creatures, should have required from men an obedience which, from the very constitution of their nature, they were unable, because unqualified, to render ?

F. I cannot answer you positively. It does appear to me, looking at the matter abstractly and speaking candidly, not to be likely, that God should have issued a command *to love himself supremely, and their neighbours as themselves*, to mere human beings: a command which, from the constitutional and indestructible enmity of the fleshly mind to himself and his law, behoved necessarily

to be disobeyed.—Notwithstanding this, however, facts, especially scriptural facts, must carry it over all our presumptions and reasonings. Indeed, is it not one of your favourite dogmas, that God issued the original prohibition to Adam, with the full certainty that he laboured under as complete an incapacity to comply even with it, as he did to obey that law requiring perfect love to God and equal love to man, the issuing of which to him and his descendants is the matter now in question?

T. Glad am I, my dear friend, that you have brought the discussion to a tangible point. We can now grapple with it easily.—It is fact, that God did issue the original prohibition to Adam, in the garden of Eden, with the full knowledge and certainty that that prohibition would be disobeyed. Adam, at his creation, as having been *of the earth, earthy*, possessed nothing more than fleshly mind; however pure and free from transgression that fleshly mind may originally have been. Now the intention of God was to shew what Adam actually was. To bring out to view what fleshly mind was incapable of doing. To make manifest that *in his best natural estate*, whether considered with reference to his mind or his body, *man was altogether vanity*. With this view the paradisaical law, or prohibition recorded Gen. ii. 16. 17, was issued. And the breach of that law, as you are well aware, speedily followed.—By this one transgression was the divine purpose answered; and the fleshly, and therefore worthless, nature of man's mind evinced satisfactorily once for all. And by this one transgression, as a sufficient index or expositor of that enmity to God which is essential to and characteristic of their common nature, was the whole human race brought in guilty before God: upon all of them, as possessed of this same common guilty nature, sentence of sufferings and death having, in Adam the source of it, been pronounced. *Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.* Gen. iii. 19.

Now, in circumstances like this, why suppose the whole human race to have had imposed upon it any other divine law?—As a whole, mankind were already guilty. As a whole, they were already subjected to sufferings and death. Why, then, issue to them any other law? *Cui bono?*—If they could not obey a law imposing a restraint so slight and trifling as that which was addressed to Adam did, much less surely a law which required perfect love to God and man. And as they already stood guilty before God, and subjected to all the possible consequences of creature guilt, to what end issue to them a law the breach of which could be attended with no additional punishment?—As already guilty and condemned before God, they neither were in a situation to receive another divine law, nor could their breach of any other law have rendered them worse than they actually were. And shall God be supposed, in issuing to mere man another law, to have done what under the circumstances of the case would have been perfectly superfluous, and, consequently, a manifestation not of perfect wisdom but of egregious folly?

But this is not all. Important as the facts and considerations just mentioned are, and slightly observed and reflected on as they have been, they do not constitute the real and complete answer to your objection. That answer is found in one of those beautiful, and yet somewhat occult, proofs of divine wisdom which, to but a few highly favoured ones of the Lord, it has been given hitherto to perceive. It is this. Human nature, although unable to obey the law of God, nevertheless behaved to have that law, in the form of a restraint of the slenderest description, once issued to it; and this, with a view to evince its weakness and worthlessness, to bring its original condition to an end, and to open up the way for a higher and more glorious state of things being introduced. This divine law, however, behaved not to be *a command*. And this, because a

command leaves no *alternative*. Commands require to be obeyed, and make no provision for disobedience. If, then, *a command* had been issued to Adam originally, the wisdom of God would have been open to impeachment; seeing that he would have enjoined an obedience which man could not render, and would have left himself unable to make any provision for the consequences of misconduct.—But no. Not to *a command*, but to *a prohibition*, accompanied with *the denunciation of a penalty in the event of its being violated*, was the first man, and in him all his natural posterity, subjected. That is, the divine law imposed upon him, as being *a prohibition*, involved in its very nature *an alternative*. It was not necessarily *to be obeyed*: for, on the very face of it, provision was made for certain consequences to ensue *in the event of disobedience taking place*. This *alternative*, which is connected necessarily with every *prohibitory law*,* having, in the case of the first law given to Adam, pointed to that very result which it was all along intended should follow.—Contrast this with the second law which, I maintain, was imposed on the Lord Jesus. It is *a command*. There is on the face of it *no alternative*. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God supremely, and thy neighbour as thyself*, is its imperative language. There is no provision here made for failure. And why? Because no failure could by any possibility take place. It was addressed to the Creator, *the Lord from heaven*; and by him it behoved necessarily to be fulfilled.—Can these remarks be understood, without carrying along with them the conviction that, not merely did the strictness, and severity, and extent of requirement, of the second law, and the fact of the violation of the first law by Adam having already brought in the whole human race as guilty before God, prevent the possibility of the second law being issued to mere creatures; but that the

* Nulla lex sine sanctione.

second law being couched in the form of a *command*, a form of law which left *no alternative*, and thereby differing from the first law given to Adam which, as a *prohibition*, was attended with an *alternative*, of itself and without any additional reasonings points to the Creator, and not to the creature, as its fulfiller?

Thus, then, the fact of God's having issued one law, having given one prohibition, to Adam, with the full and entire certainty that Adam would disobey it,—and this, that he might thereby make manifest what human nature was, and justify himself in the treatment to which he might see meet to subject it,—so far from laying the foundation for a second or any farther law being given to mere man, actually rendered the issuing of any such second law to mere man an absolute impossibility. There was but one object or purpose for which a second law could be issued by God, and that was, that it might be obeyed; and that, by obedience to it, the effects of the disobedience of the former law by Adam the creature, and in him by the nature possessed by every creature, might be, not merely counter-balanced, but done away with, swallowed up, and obliterated. Now this required that the second law should be given, not to a mere creature, but to one possessed of the nature of the Creator; and that——

F. Before proceeding farther, allow me to enquire, if there does not exist a very great resemblance between your sentiments, and those of Mr. Robert Owen, formerly of New-Lanark, with regard to the state and circumstances of human beings naturally?—Mr. Owen considers man to be so decidedly the creature or slave of circumstances, that it is impossible for him to be any thing else than what he actually is, or to exhibit any other character than what is impressed on him. According to that gentleman and his abettors, man is what his organization, temperament, education, and the other causes which from the cradle to the

grave are constantly operating upon him, make him to be; and can, by no possibility, be different.—Now you seem to me to regard man as being so completely enslaved by his fleshly constitution, as to be totally incapable of rising above it; and as being obliged to act always and of necessity in subordination to it: thereby presenting, to my mind, a very strong and marked resemblance between the views entertained by Mr. Owen and your own.

B. I may just venture to anticipate what my brother has to say in answer to you by remarking, that in whatever respects there may appear to be an approximation on the part of his sentiments to those of Mr. Owen, the points in which that gentleman and he agree, are few and trifling in comparison of those with regard to which they differ.—There can be no very great identity of views between two men, the one of whom regards human nature as capable of being carried out to such a degree of perfection, as that sin and misery shall ultimately be banished from the world; and the other of whom beholds in human nature a principle of which sin and misery are necessarily such constituent parts, that they are likely to be exhibited in a far more marked way in a future period of the world than they have ever yet been, and are destined to be expelled from it only by the destruction of that nature itself.—But my brother wishes to act fairly. And, therefore, if he find Mr. Owen or any other man propounding a sentiment which, in the light of scripture, he knows to be true, he will never, I am confident, reject it merely on account of the quarter from which it may proceed.

T. Thank you, Robert, for your good opinion of me. What you describe is precisely the case just now. Mr. Owen, without being aware of it, has seized, and in some measure taken his stand on, one most important scriptural principle; and his ordinary antagonists, without being aware of it, are attacking him in his stronghold. In such circumstances, of course, he has them at an advantage.

Let me, however, in order to obviate all mistakes, express my views with respect to human nature in my own language; and then, let those who are conversant with Mr. Owen's writings, and competent to the task of instituting a comparison between our respective sentiments, judge how far they coincide or the reverse.

I am satisfied that the nature of every being constitutes the law of that being: in other words, constitutes the authority to which the being is in all its powers, faculties, and propensities, subject. Proceeding upon this principle, as the nature of the cat and that of the dog constitute the laws to which these animals respectively are subject; so does the fleshly nature of man constitute the law to which he naturally and necessarily, both as to body and mind, is subject likewise. Indeed, the principle is of such universal application, that the nature of God constitutes the law, the only law, which the Supreme Being himself recognizes and obeys.—But to return. Adam's body was first created, and then his mind, as we learn from Gen. ii. 7; and the same progress, from the previous existence of body to that of mind, takes place, as we know, in all his descendants. That is, man was originally *of the earth, earthy*; or had first imparted to him a body composed of earthly materials, with which a mind suitable to its earthly nature was afterwards associated. The mind was thus, by its very creation, made to depend on the body; and man owed an allegiance to the law of flesh, or to the constitution of his fleshly nature, before by any possibility he could owe an allegiance to any other law. Flesh is man's law-giver and rightful monarch; and, from the law of flesh, he can by no efforts of his own—no means of his own devising and executing—withdraw himself. To a being thus situated, that is, thus previously owing allegiance to the law of flesh as the law of his nature, one law of God, in the shape of the prohibition imposed on Adam, was addressed.

And this, not to render our natural progenitor subject to divine law, or to evince his capability of ever becoming so; but to make manifest the utter impossibility of his nature ever being subjected to divine law, in consequence of its having been previously subjected, and of the allegiance which therefore it owed, to the law of flesh. Of this, the one transgression of Adam afforded ample and sufficient evidence. It shewed that his mind, as fleshly, was *not subject to God's law; neither, indeed, was able to be so.* That, as fleshly, its very nature constituted *a law of sin and death:* requiring, merely, the imposition on it of a divine prohibition in order to bring out and display what it actually was.

For this purpose, then, divine law entered, not that it might be obeyed by fleshly mind, but that the total inability of fleshly mind to obey it might thereby become manifest. *The law entered, that the offence might abound.* And what the fleshly mind of man originally was, it continues still. Just as much and as essentially opposed to God, and just as unable to keep any law of his, however slight and apparently trifling in its requirements that law may be, now, as when in paradise it manifested its hostility to the law of God in the transgression of our first parents.

F. What say you, Thom? Human beings unable to keep *any* divine law! Surely you are joking.

T. I am perfectly serious. My authorities are, first, the language of scripture which informs me, that *the mind of flesh*, that is, the mind of every human being naturally, *is neither subject to God's law, nor able to be so;* and, secondly, what as a matter of fact is observed by every enlightened Christian, that when evil is avoided by the mere fleshly mind, it is never in subordination to the law of God, or in consequence of its having been prohibited by divine authority, but always in consequence of some

injury sustained, or of the apprehension of some injury likely to be sustained, by the individual himself were he to transgress it. It is thus the principle of selfishness, as essentially and necessarily the principle of fleshly mind; not a regard to God's law as such, a principle which never dwelt except in the breast of the Son of God himself; which dictates and produces all that abstinence from evil by which mere human beings are distinguished.

F. Dear me! what sad havoc you do make among the petitions of our Church! Supposing you to be right, why put up such prayers, as, "Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law;" or, "grant that this day we fall into no sin?" If the human mind be, as you allege and as you think scripture proves, unable to obey any divine law, then it must appear to you absurd, if not blasphemous, for people to be continually asking God for that which he hath told them cannot be, and which consequently he never intends to bestow.

T. Were I to consult my natural feelings, I certainly would be provoked to smile at the idea of *creatures* praying to be enabled to fulfil a law, which hath been already and gloriously fulfilled by *the Creator himself!* Jesus, by his *obedience unto death*, became *THE END of the law for righteousness, unto every one that believeth*; and yet, forsooth! this very law, although ended by him the Creator, nevertheless, in their apprehension, remains and requires to be fulfilled by themselves mere creatures!—But ridicule is not the sentiment which, in the believing mind, a consideration of this subject has a tendency to beget. How painful to think that thousands of those who call themselves Christians, and thereby profess to believe divine testimony, in praying to be enabled to fulfil God's law, are praying for that which could only be conceded to them at the expense of the truth of God! The same scriptures which declare, that Christ hath yielded an en-

tire and satisfactory obedience to the law of God, declare that it is utterly impossible for man under any circumstances whatever to obey it: notwithstanding which, professors of Christianity go on from week to week, and day to day, preferring their petitions in a manner the most serious and devotional, that it may be granted to them to comply with its requirements. By asking God to enable them to fulfil a law which he informs them has already been *magnified and made honourable*, as well as brought to an end, by *his own well beloved Son*; and which, he likewise informs them, they never can fulfil; thus at one and the same moment pouring contempt upon Christ the fulfiller of it, and calling God a liar! Can we, taking into account all the circumstances of the case, entirely resist the suspicion that, in connection with gross ignorance, deep-grained hypocrisy must in many instances prevail in the minds of those by whom such supplications are presented?

But to pass on. If I have been understood, my agreement with Mr. Owen, in so far as the present subject is concerned, extends no farther than to the admission, on my part, of man being naturally the slave of his fleshly constitution; and of the various influences to which he is subjected, during the whole of his life-time. In concluding from the constitutional fleshliness, and therefore selfishness of man, his incapability of having had addressed to him a command *to love God supremely, and his neighbour as himself*—the power of observing such a command implying the possession of a generous, even the divine nature, which human beings as such have not—I hold a view in which Mr. Owen and his friends may or may not acquiesce. It is enough for me, after stating the scriptural facts, that man's nature is fleshly and selfish, and as such unable to obey divine law; and that this was sufficiently and satisfactorily evinced by his violation of the original prohibition; from thence to argue that, as under such cir-

cumstances no other law, especially none inferring conditions so strict and severe as those of exhibiting perfect love to God and equal love to man, was in the case of mere creatures required, so to mere creatures no other law, especially none answering to this description, was by our Heavenly Father addressed.

B. Do you not think, David, that, in the event of the doctrine upon which you are now insisting being correct, a more direct and simple way of establishing it, than by mere inferences however strong, cogent, and undeniable, might be had recourse to? Why do you not at once produce vouchers from the word of God in favour of it?

T. You are merely anticipating, my dear brother, what it has been all along my intention to come to. The inferential argument has been thrown in, merely by way of a preparative for the direct proofs which are to follow. These direct proofs I am now ready to propound and substantiate.

F. If you can establish, by direct scriptural evidence, that the command *to love God, with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and his neighbour as himself*, was addressed to the Messiah alone; that is, that, as *the second law*, it was imposed only on *the second man, the Lord from heaven*; then, it is plain, I must submit. To accomplish this, however, is a task which I *guess*, as our transatlantic brethren say, will occasion you no small difficulty.

T. There is nothing, my dear friend, like making the attempt. *Fortuna favet fortibus*, you know, as we learned and used to repeat in our school-boy days.

Permit me, however, before adducing my arguments, to state what it is that, in maintaining the second law to have been imposed on the Lord Jesus alone, I do not assert: or, rather, permit me to make certain concessions, to all the advantages connected with which you are most heartily welcome. I do admit that, to the Jewish people,

the law issued from Mount Sinai was given in the three following senses:—1st. It was, with all the prophecies which were to succeed and which indeed constituted a portion of it, temporarily entrusted to them, in the character of custodians, depositaries, or stewards; to be by them kept and preserved until he who was the subject of *whom Moses in the law, and the Prophets did write*, should make his appearance; and then to be by them handed over to him as the rightful heir and proprietor, because fulfiller, of the whole. *Unto them were committed the oracles of God.* Rom. iii. 2. 2dly. God having been the temporal monarch of the Jewish nation, or that nation having been what is termed a theocracy, it received the law of Moses as the code or system of statutes to which, during the period of its subsistence as a nation or kingdom of this world, it was to be subject. That is, the Mosaic institutions were given to the Jews, not in their real and spiritual sense, or with any view to their reaping spiritual benefits from the obedience which they might yield to them; but merely in the same way, and on the same principles, as the legislature of any country finds it necessary to impose laws on those who are subject to their sway. What the laws of England are to us, the laws of Moses were to the Jews as inhabitants of the land of Canaan. This falling to be remarked, farther, in explanation of what I have just hinted, that the laws in question, although emanating from God and not from man; and although all typical, emblematic, or shadowy, of *better things to come*; in so far as they had to do with the Jews, as a nation of this world, had only a temporal meaning, were only directed to temporal purposes, and could be enforced by nothing higher than temporal sanctions. Imposed on the Jews, in this sense, the law of Moses was only to continue in force until he, to whom it was *really* given, should accomplish it; and, in this sense, it came to them, not properly speak-

ing as the law of God, but as the law of Moses, a creature like themselves, their temporal and typical king. *If we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more, we shall die.*—*Go thou near, said the Jews addressing Moses, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and SPEAK THOU UNTO US all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee, and we will hear it, and do it. And the Lord heard the voice of your words, (Moses is reminding his countrymen of what had happened at a previous period of their history,) when ye spake unto me, and the Lord said unto me, I have heard the voice of the words of this people, which they have spoken unto thee: they have well said, all that they have spoken.* Deut. v. 25. 27. 28.—In the 3rd and last place, the law delivered from Mount Sinai having been *spiritually*, that is *really* given to Christ Jesus, I have now to observe, that the nation of the Jews had *one real command*, and *one real command only*, addressed to them by God: a command, however, which was not to take effect, and was not to become obligatory upon them, until after the second law, or the law given from Mount Sinai to Jesus the Messiah or Mediator, had from him received its accomplishment. That command was *to believe on him, as the end, object, and fulfiller, of their law*; and thereby to enter into the enjoyment of the privileges and blessings which should be connected with his mediatorial kingdom. The command of which we speak is thus quoted by the apostle Peter: *For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you.* Acts iii. 22. That is, the Jews were commanded to recognize their inability as creatures to fulfil divine law; and that divine law, as such, had never in reality been issued to them; in the light, and through the medium, of recognizing its fulfilment by Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. The only real command addressed

to them was this, not *to obey divine law* themselves, but *to believe in it as obeyed by him to whom alone that law really had been given.* This command was no more intended to be obeyed by them, than was the prohibition originally imposed on Adam. But the object of God in issuing it was, to elicit a view of the inability and worthlessness of human nature which law, couched in its prohibitory form, had been insufficient to bring out. Mankind, it remained to be evinced, were just as unable to seize on blessings, by means of their fleshly minds, when these were placed apparently within their reach; as they had already shewn themselves to be, by means of the same minds, to escape from curses. Hence, as the original prohibition to abstain from eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, was given to Adam, in order to bring out the inability of human nature to avoid evil; the subsequent command to believe on Jesus, as he to whom divine law had been addressed and by whom it had been fulfilled, was given to the nation of the Jews, in order to bring out the inability of human nature to comprehend and delight itself in what is good.—But of this I may speak afterwards.

F. Your last remarks strike me forcibly. They begin to open up to me a view of the subject to which I have been hitherto an entire stranger.

T. Having so far cleared my way, I now state my proposition as follows:—

That the law which was issued from Mount Sinai, or the law which, as the second, stands distinguished from the first which was given to Adam in paradise, was imposed on the Messiah alone.

That the Lord Jesus, was subject to this law, is plain from the apostolic declaration, that *he was made under the law*; a law which, as appears from the context, was that which is summed up in the requirement of *perfect love to God, and equal love to man.*

That this law was imposed on the Lord Jesus alone, is manifest from a variety of considerations. Such as,

1. That the second person singular is employed in it, just as it was in the original prohibition addressed to Adam. *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself*, enjoins on one man the introduction of everlasting righteousness: just as, *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*, having been addressed to one man, paved the way for that transgression in the consequences of which all the members of the human family are involved.

2. The apostle declares that Jesus, as the Christ or Messiah, was *the end of the law*; Rom. x. 4; that is, the person to whom it was addressed, and whom it all along contemplated as its object, no less than he by whose obedience it actually received its accomplishment.

3. *The law is spiritual*. Rom. vii. 14. That is, it has a nature and involves a meaning, totally different from, and infinitely superior to, what by the mere carnal mind it is apprehended to have. It appears, to the fleshly mind, merely to prohibit transgression; whereas in reality it required purity of nature, as well as righteousness of performance: it appears merely to prohibit external evil; whereas in reality it condemned the murderous, covetous, and impure thought, no less than the gross outbreakings of iniquity: it appears to speak to and require the obedience of a creature; whereas in reality it addressed itself to and demanded the obedience of the Creator. When opened in its spirituality, that is, in its reality to the apostle, he found such a difference between its requirements and his own performances, or rather unsuccessful attempts at performance, that, as spiritual in itself, he saw

it neither was, nor could have been, imposed on him as carnal; but must have been issued to, and must have required the obedience of, one whose nature corresponded to its own. *The law*, having been *spiritual*, could not require the obedience of one who was *carnal*, *sold under sin*: but must have been intended for, and addressed to, *the Son of God* alone; *who*, although *coming in the likeness of sinful flesh*, was nevertheless possessed essentially of a spiritual nature, and thereby *condemned sin in the flesh*.

4. *Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.* Coloss. ii. 17. That is, a vast number of shadows, or shadowy representations, of law was imposed on the nation of the Jews; but the law itself in its truth, reality, and substance, was given to Christ alone. And his *obedience even unto death*, not the ceremonial observances and ritual sacrifices of the Jews, fulfilled the law. See this point thoroughly cleared up in the 9th and 10th chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

5. From the 12th verse to the end of the 5th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, an argument is prosecuted which must, even to a mind that is but superficially enlightened from above, settle the whole controversy. I allude to the distinction between *one sin* and *one righteousness* which is there laid down by the inspired writer, and made the foundation of all his reasonings. Now the whole force scope and import of this distinction turn on the fact, that the law of God was imposed on the Messiah alone. If imposed on more than the Lord Jesus, then there might have been more than one righteousness; and consequently the analogy between Adam and Christ would have been destroyed. But as the law given forth in Paradise was imposed on one man alone, and thereby admitted of but one violation; no mere human being ever since having had it in his power *to sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression*: so the second law issued from

Mount Sinai was imposed on one man alone likewise, and thereby admitted of but one obedience, or of carrying into effect but one righteousness; no man possessing even the opportunity of obeying after the similitude of Christ's righteousness. Not more certainly did the possibility of but *one transgression*, imply the giving of the first law to Adam alone; than did the possibility of but *one righteousness*, imply the giving of the second law to the Lord Jesus alone. He who hath not been enabled to perceive this plain and obvious fact, must make a strange jumble of the apostolic reasoning in the passage referred to.

B. Somehow or other, David, I am impressed with the conviction, that you have not yet adduced what you deem your strongest arguments in favour of the proposition you contend for. Have you not other arguments in reserve?

T. Why, to be sure, I conceive that without having recourse to insulated texts, or even to statements which admit of but one satisfactory explanation, such as are those to which I have just directed your notice, the case may be sufficiently made out by placing before you the following broad, unequivocal, and undeniable facts:—

First. Jesus alone possessed the nature which was capable of fulfilling divine law.—This argument, although cursorily treated of already, deserves to be still further insisted on and developed.—Adam, as essentially and inherently fleshly, shewed himself unable to comply with the easiest of all conceivable injunctions, by sinking under the most trifling of all conceivable temptations. That is, the mere nature of flesh was overwhelmed by the touch of the little finger of a law which was inherently divine. The prohibition in itself was spiritual, as proceeding from him who is Spirit; but the first Adam to whom it was addressed was fleshly, or possessed of a nature which, as the sequel proved, was totally unable to comply with it.—But Jesus was the Creator, or Lord from heaven, manifest in

flesh. His mind therefore, as spiritual or divine, was qualified both to receive and to fulfil a law which, like himself, was spiritual or divine likewise;—was qualified to bear, not the little finger merely, but the entire weight of divine law when laid upon it in all the extent and intensity of its demands. The law of God and the Lord Jesus were thus perfectly suitable to each other.—Divine law had hitherto been requiring obedience in vain; for creatures possessed not a nature qualified to meet and satisfy its demands. But now appeared a being in whom were combined all the powers, faculties, and dispositions, requisite to yield it entire satisfaction. Nay, even to *magnify it and make it honourable*. Having thus found in Jesus of Nazareth the being who alone was qualified to obey divine law, why should we look elsewhere for others to whom that law was addressed?

Secondly. The Lord Jesus proved that he was the only being to whom properly speaking the law of Moses had been addressed, not merely by his having been the sole possessor of the qualifications requisite for obeying it, but also by the fact that he himself alone actually did obey it. *The law*, whenever previously supposed by ordinary human beings to have been addressed to them, had been warning them of their mistake, by their continually finding that it was *weak through the flesh*; or that they were unable to obey it, on account of the inherent weakness of their fleshly nature: but at last *God*, by *sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin*, having *condemned sin in the flesh*, shewed to all who were rendered capable of understanding the subject, that to Jesus the Lord from heaven, and not to any of the ordinary descendants of Adam, had that law all along been addressed. On the cross, the Lord Jesus himself said, *it is finished*; intimating, that having obeyed the law of God completely himself, he left neither power nor opportunity for any one to obey

it after him: and by the apostle Paul it is declared, that *Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth*; intimating, that as Christ was the person to whom alone divine law had been addressed, and by whom alone that law had been fulfilled, he was the end of it, or it found its end or accomplishment in him; and that as divine law no longer exists, his righteousness or fulfilment of it, and not any personal obedience yielded by themselves, is that in which his believing people stand perfect and accepted before God. Now it seems to me self-evident, that a law which remained unfulfilled until Jesus of Nazareth made his appearance, and which was so completely obeyed by him as to have had all its claims exhausted and to be consequently incapable of being obligatory since upon any one, must, upon the principle of God doing nothing in vain, have been all along intended for our blessed Lord alone.—But all other evidences of the law from Mount Sinai having been issued to the Lord Jesus only are, in my apprehension, superseded by,

Thirdly, the fact, that the very purpose for which a second law was issued, necessarily implied its having been given, not to a creature, but to the Creator manifest in flesh.—Concerning the first law it has been shewn, that it was imposed on a creature, not that it might be obeyed, but in order to bring out and make manifest the inability of the creature to yield obedience to it. This was an experiment, however, which could not be repeated. Divine wisdom forbade it. The result of Adam's transgression rendered it unnecessary. In the event of another law being promulgated, it must have been with a view, both to do away with the effects of the breach of the first, and also to accomplish the ulterior purposes for which that breach had taken place. Sin, although *it had entered*, could not be permitted to retain a permanent station in the dominions of Jehovah. And it could not have been permitted to en-

ter at all, except with a view to the infinitely glorious results of which its temporary *entrance* and *reign* were to be productive. In a word, the very reason why a second law behoved to be issued was that it might, by being obeyed, swallow up and obliterate the first; and all the melancholy and disastrous consequences to which the first had given birth. Now a purpose like this could not have been answered by imposing the second law on a creature. Besides the fact, that by a creature it might, as in the former case, have been violated; creature obedience, even if rendered, could neither have swallowed up Adam's transgression, nor paved the way for the introduction of a more glorious state of things. God's purpose was not to counterbalance evil with good; but to overcome evil and swallow it up in good. Who sees not that, with a view to the accomplishment of this latter object, the second law behoved to be imposed, not on *a creature*, but on *the Creator*? That it required, not to demand obedience from *a mind of flesh*, but to exact it from *a mind of Spirit*?—And that God did so, is exactly what I maintain. I say, that the second law was given, not to any of Adam's ordinary descendants, but to Jesus of Nazareth, the Lord from heaven: that, by his divine obedience, creature transgression might be, not merely counterbalanced, but obliterated; and creature transgression shewn to be subservient, not to the restoration of creatures to the state in which Adam was originally formed and placed, but to the elevation of them to heaven itself; and thereby to the yielding to God of a revenue of glory from the righteousness of his own Son, which from no other source could have accrued.

F. What do you understand by the law of God having been given *spiritually* to Christ?

T. By *spiritually*, I mean *really*, given to him. Given to him, not in *the letter* or sense which strikes the mere fleshly mind; but in *the spirit* or sense which the law it-

self really bore, and which, from his mode of fulfilling it, we learn it to have borne.—Let me take as an illustration of my meaning the ten commandments. The whole of the Old Testament Scriptures no doubt constituted law to Christ; for he was *the word made flesh*: but the ten commandments will sufficiently answer my purpose.

Before, however, pointing out the spiritual fulfilment of these commandments by the Lord Jesus, (which I will do very briefly, and in the way of hints which you may prosecute and fill up at your leisure,) I beg leave to submit the following observation:—that, although the law imposed on Adam was merely *prohibitory*, not *demanding obedience*, but *forbidding disobedience*; on the contrary, the law imposed on the Messiah was both *prohibitory* and *imperative*: that is, it not only forbade to him what was *wrong*, but it also ordained and required, at his hands, what was *right*. And it is through having yielded obedience to the law of God in this latter way, that the glory of the Lord Jesus principally makes its appearance. He obeyed the law not merely as *prohibiting disobedience*, the form in which divine law had been originally issued to man; but as a command or series of commands *enjoining obedience*, a form in which divine law never was, and never could have been, issued to mere man.

The subsequent commentary will, as much as possible, combine representations of the fulfilment of divine law by Christ, both in its *prohibitory* and its *commanding* forms.

The four first commandments respect the duties or obligations under which our Lord came directly to his Heavenly Father.

I. Thou shalt have no other Gods before (or besides) me.

I. The Lord Jesus abstained from the worship of self, the object of every mere man's idolatry naturally; and worshipped the Lord his God, serving him alone. Matt. iv. 10.

II. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any

II. He abstained from every mode of worshipping even the living and true

thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them : for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me : And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

III. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain : for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

IV. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work : but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God : in it, thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger, that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.

God, which the scriptures did not warrant, and which man might have devised : having yielded obedience to this command of his heavenly father, by fulfilling all the narratives, types, and prophecies concerning himself which were contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, or by fulfilling all the Old Testament scriptures ; the only way in which God could have been obeyed, and thereby worshipped, by the Messiah.

III. He abstained from every breach of the obligations under which he had come, especially from the breach of that all-comprehensive obligation undertaken by himself, *Lo! I come to do thy will, O God!* Hebrews x. 7. 9. : and, as having assumed the name of Jehovah, or, in other words, as claiming to be the Messiah, God manifest in flesh, he shewed by every action of his life, and especially by his obedience unto death, that he had not taken the name of God in vain.

IV. Until our Lord's resurrection from the dead, or during the six remarkable æras preceding that period, *his father had been working, and he also worked;* John v. 17; but from the period of his resurrection, which shewed his work complete, he discontinued working, having entered into his rest, as God did into his : Hebrews iv. 10 : and now, instead of working in the way of obedience to law, or allowing his church to perform works of obedience to law, which would be to violate the spirit of the commandment, he is engaged in bringing the members of his church by faith into the enjoyment of the sabbath or rest, from creature works, upon which he himself hath entered. Hebrews iv. 1—11.

So much for those obligations under which Jesus, as the Messiah, came to his Heavenly Father directly. The following commandments respect the obligations which he took upon himself in regard to both God and man.

V. Honour thy father and thy mother : that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

V. Jesus abstained from dishonouring equally God his father, and earth, or human nature, his mother : on the con-

trary, he honoured his father, by yielding such an obedience to the law of God, as magnified it and made it honourable; and by affording to God an opportunity of glorifying his justice and mercy, as well as all his other perfections, in the salvation of man, through his own obedience, death, and resurrection from the dead; and he honoured his mother, by elevating beings possessed originally of a nature of flesh, to the possession through himself of the nature of God. He hath, therefore, the fullness of blessing, even life at God's right hand for evermore.

VI. Thou shalt not kill.

VI. He abstained from murder; for he came not to imitate Adam in incurring *blood guiltiness*, Ps. li. 14., by *destroying men's lives*: Luke ix. 56.: on the contrary *he came that we through him might have life, and that we might have it more abundantly*. John x. 10. *In Adam all die; but in Christ*, as possessing the very opposite of the murderous character, *shall all be made alive*. 1 Cor. xv. 22.

VII. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

VII. He abstained from adultery; for although the Old Testament church was so guilty, as to have justified him in breaking off his connection with her merely by giving her a writing of divorcement, he was pleased to dissolve the union by the shedding of his own most precious blood; a crime in the perpetrating of which she was the main instrument: and he obeyed the command positively, by becoming, through his resurrection from the dead, *married to another*, even to that church which has an everlasting connection with him, and thereby *brings forth fruit unto God*. See Rom. vii. 1—6.—More briefly: having formed a temporary connection with man by appearing in flesh, Jesus obeyed this commandment, by dissolving the connection through his own death, before giving to man that new and more glorious connection with himself which is destined to last for evermore. 2 Cor. inth. v. 21.

VIII. Thou shalt not steal.

VIII. Jesus abstained from stealing or robbery of every description; although he *accounted it no robbery to be*

equal with God, yet abstaining, while in flesh, from all assertion of his rights as the Lord from heaven, or from all violent seizure of the blessings of life everlasting: on the contrary, having been content to earn the joys of eternity for himself and others as wages, through *his obedience unto death*. Phil. ii. 6—11.

IX. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

IX. He abstained from bearing false witness against his neighbour, whether Jew or Gentile; that is, he abstained from bringing any charge against human beings and human nature, which facts did not warrant: on the contrary, as *the truth*, he always spoke what was true of man, as well as of God; testifying of the former, that *his works were evil*; and of the latter, that he *sent not his Son to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved*.

X. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.

X. He abstained from the coveting of all earthly honours and advantages, and from the desire of all gratifications which were only to be obtained and enjoyed at the expense of others; refusing to *be made a king*, and having not even *where to lay his head*: and all this because he came, *not to be ministered unto, but to minister*; not to covet or possess the things of time, the portion of the children of men, but to *give his life a ransom for many*; and thereby to bestow on the children of men his own portion, even the glories of eternity.

A summary of the ten commandments, as fulfilled by Christ, may be thus stated:—

I. TABLE.

Jesus, 1, worshipped, by obeying, God; 2, in his own prescribed way; 3, without failure in the minutest point of duty; and, 4, having entered into his rest, without leaving occasion for the performance of any additional act of obedience; a course of procedure whereby that rest or sabbath would have been violated.

II. TABLE.

Jesus, 5, honoured not only the Creator, but also the creature; 6, by conferring upon the latter his own life; 7,

through dissolving in himself the connection of the creature with this present world, and imparting to it a higher connection; 8, not seizing violently, but paying the necessary and stipulated price for, the favours thus conferred; 9, illustrating thereby the perfect truth of God, in rendering the execution of deserved punishment upon the creature, consistent with his becoming the participator of heavenly blessings; and, 10, the whole issuing in, not the desire to receive or the actual reception of any thing by the Creator from the creature, but in the bestowing of every thing by the Creator upon the creature.

B. My attention has been drawn lately to the reasoning of the apostle Paul, in the latter part of the third chapter of his *Epistle to the Galatians*. Am I right in conjecturing, that it bears a very close affinity to the subject which we are at the present moment discussing?

T. The facts of the case completely bear you out in your conjecture. Nothing can be more marked than the manner in which the passage alluded to by you represents the second law, or law of love, as having been addressed and limited to the Messiah alone. A few observations will suffice to render this apparent.—Have the goodness to keep the New Testament open at the place, and to refer to it, as I proceed.

After the apostle has shewn, in Galatians iii. 7, *that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham*; and hinted that as in the case of Abraham himself, so in that of every other, justification takes place through faith, and not through obedience to law; he anticipates and answers an objection which might have been brought forward in opposition to his statement, grounded on the fact that it was not previously, but subsequently, to the period of the promise made to Abraham, that the law was issued from Mount Sinai. “You say,” as if the objectors had thus expressed themselves, “that salvation was promised to

Abraham by grace, through faith alone; or, in other words, that he had originally a promise of its being unconditionally bestowed on himself and others. But how is this to be reconciled with the subsequent promulgation of the law? a circumstance which seems to imply that, only in consequence of certain conditions being performed by the creature, was the blessing in question to be enjoyed?" To this the apostle answers in substance, that the supposed objectors had mistaken the purpose of God in the issuing of the said law altogether. That purpose having been, not to defeat the promise, or to render impossible the conferring of spiritual blessings freely in virtue of the promise, but *actually to enable God to carry that very promise into effect*. If the purpose of God in the issuing of the law had been, that its conditions might either in whole or in part be fulfilled by creatures, then, as if the apostle had said, the law would most unquestionably have been at variance with the promises of God. For a promise of blessings to be bestowed *unconditionally* upon the creature, as that given to Abraham was, could never, under any circumstances or by any species of management, have been rendered consistent with blessings *the conditions* of enjoying which were to be fulfilled by creatures. "But what will you think," argues the apostle, "if I shew you, that the law in question was never given to mere man, nor intended to be fulfilled by mere man?—By faith you are to live and be saved. But a law requiring obedience from you as the condition of salvation, would have been inconsistent with your living by faith.—Mark, then, how wondrously the whole matter is arranged, and the freeness of salvation ultimately and completely secured. The law, the issuing of which subsequently to the promise so much puzzles you, was not imposed on mere men, but on the Son of God manifest in flesh. Certain it is that *the law is not of faith*, as it ensures the enjoyment of its bles-

sings not by being believed in, but by being obeyed ; this being its import, that *the man that doth them*, (the works of the law,) *shall live in them* : and therefore it is that *Christ*, as the very man here spoken of, by his subjection and obedience to this law, *hath redeemed us from its curse, having been made a curse for us.*" See verses 12th and 13th.

" Again : I admit," thus the apostle goes on to reason, " that if *the inheritance* of spiritual blessings be by obedience to *the law*, on the part of mere man, then *it is no more of promise*. And yet, the inheritance is in reality by promise : for thus God gave it to Abraham. Verse 18th. How is this to be made consistent with its being enjoyed through the medium of law ? Only in one way : namely, that the law was not given to mere men to be obeyed by them, but *was ordained by angels in the hands of a mediator*. V. 19th. That is, that the law was given to the mediator to be fulfilled by him, and by him alone. Upon this principle," argues the apostle, " the promise having been given, *not to seeds, as of many*, but to the one seed of Abraham, *which is Christ* ; the law, in like manner, was imposed, not on many, but on one ; even on that same one seed to whom the promise had been given : his personal enjoyment of the blessings of the promise, and the enjoyment of these same blessings by us, having been made to depend on the fulfilment of the law by him alone. Now Jesus hath fulfilled the law thus given to him ; and, by so doing, hath procured to himself, as well as secured to us likewise, the accomplishment of the promise. To him, the enjoyment of the promised blessings was necessarily *conditional* ; but to us, these blessings flow *unconditionally*, through him. The reason of the difference between his mode of enjoying these blessings and ours being, that his fulfilment of every condition leaves none to be fulfilled by us."

“ Such is an outline of the wondrous scheme of salvation. By giving the law to Jesus, the seed of Abraham, and to him alone, that law has been completely and most gloriously fulfilled;—and in consequence of its fulfilment by him, the blessings promised through Abraham’s seed by faith are bestowed freely, that is, *unconditionally*, on us. The fulfilment of the law by the Creator hath ensured the enjoyment of the blessings of salvation freely by the creature. And thus the entrance of law posteriorly to the giving of the promise, so far from interfering with or rendering impossible the accomplishment of the promise, has, in consequence of that law having been imposed on and fulfilled by the Creator, become the very means of *the blessing of Abraham*, or the blessing freely promised to Abraham, *coming on the Gentiles, through Jesus Christ,*” Verse 14th.

A similar line of argument is prosecuted by the apostle in the 10th chapter of *the Epistle to the Romans*, from the 3d to the 12th verses.

But enough of this.—Am I understood?

B. For my part, I can say, perfectly.

F. Your allegation is, that as there are only, properly speaking, two men set before us in scripture, viz. Adam and Christ; the former, *of the earth, earthy*, the latter, *the Lord from heaven*; the former, the type or figure, the latter the anti-type or substance; the former, a creature, the latter, the Creator: so there are only, properly speaking, two laws represented in scripture as having been issued by God to man, viz. the one consisting of the prohibition as to *eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil*, which was addressed to Adam, the former of these two men, in paradise;—and the other, being the law of *love to God and man*, which was imposed on the Lord Jesus by the instrumentality of Moses and the prophets: the violation of the former of these laws by Adam, having

brought in sin and death, and entailed upon all his fleshly posterity guilt and punishment;—and the fulfilment of the latter of them by the Lord Jesus, having introduced righteousness and life everlasting, blessings in which his spiritual posterity are, by virtue of their union with him, made freely and fully and gloriously to participate.

Your further allegation is, that as Adam was the wicked man, so all his natural posterity, as one with him, constitute *the wicked*; and that as Jesus was the righteous man, so all his spiritual posterity, as one with him, constitute *the righteous*.

All this I fully comprehend. And I have made the preceding statements in order to shew you that I do so.

B. But, David, there is one thing about which I want to be satisfied. You have said, and I think proved, that no man naturally can obey any divine law, in consequence of *the fleshly mind*, the only mind which human beings naturally possess, being *enmity against God*; being *neither subject to his law, nor, indeed, able to be so*: and that, therefore, the law enjoining *love to God and man* was not given to mere man naturally. You have also, in so far as my feeble judgment can decide in a matter of this kind, established your position, that *the law of love* was given to Christ and fulfilled by him. Surely, however, brother, not exclusively? If I allow that mankind naturally are not subject to the law which requires perfect love to God, and equal love to man; surely you will not deny, that the people of Christ are spiritually subject to that law, and are by grace enabled to obey it?

T. I do deny, in the simplest, the most emphatic, and the most unqualified, terms that I can make use of, that any one, except the Lord Jesus, ever was, or is, or will be, subject to the law which prescribes supreme love to God, and equal love to man: nay, I go farther, and assert, that no person bearing the fleshly form, ever was, or is, or

will be, capable of being subjected to that law, except the Lord Jesus during the period of his abode in flesh.

F. In the name of wonder, what do you mean, Thom?

T. Just what I say; that, according to the sacred volume, to the law imposing the obligation to love God and man, no one, except Christ, ever was, or will be, or can be subjected. And as the law was given to Jesus alone, so he *became the end of it*; or the law came to an end in him by means of his fulfilment of it. When the Creator manifest in flesh exclaimed, *it is finished*, he left nothing for us creatures to add to his work. His obedience to the law of love is our righteousness: a righteousness which, as divine, is susceptible neither of increase nor of diminution.—Can I express myself more distinctly or intelligibly, in reference to this matter, than I have done?

B. Certainly not: only I should like to know how you reconcile your denial of God's law being obligatory upon believers, with the language of the apostle in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, that *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death*. Does not the inspired writer mean to say here, that he was set free from *one law*, by being brought under the obligation of *another law*? Is not that other law *the law of love*? And, is not the privilege which he here asserts as his own, common to him with all the members of the specially-redeemed family?

T. Really, brother, you put me to my mettle. You come at once, and admirably, to the point; and that is saying a vast deal more than can be affirmed with truth of nine hundred and ninety nine out of every thousand theologians, or would-be theologians, with whom one is ordinarily brought into contact.

In answer to your queries:—Do you happen to remember a remark made by me some time since—a remark concerning a subject as to which, I observed, I so far agreed

with Mr. Robert Owen, who has been unconsciously borrowing his notion from scripture—that *the nature* of every being constitutes *the law* to which that being is subject? That as *the natures* of the rat, the cat, and the dog, are *the laws* to which these animals respectively are subject; so *the fleshly nature* of man is *the law* to which he is originally and exclusively subject? A view for which I confess myself indebted to the teaching of the Holy Ghost, through the medium of the truths opened up in the 7th and 8th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans.

B. I both remember your statement as to *the nature* of every being constituting *the law* of that being, and I cheerfully acquiesce in it. But how does it bear upon our present subject?

T. This I now proceed to shew you.

Assuming as true the principle which you have just admitted, *the nature* of Adam was *the law* of Adam, and *the nature* of Christ in flesh was *the law* of Christ in flesh. Adam's nature consisted in subjection to the law of flesh, and opposition to the law of God; whereas Christ's nature consisted in subjection to the law of God, and opposition to the law of flesh. The reason of this difference being, that earth was the origin of Adam's nature, heaven of Christ's nature; the former having been *of the earth, earthy*, the latter *the Lord from heaven*: and that, therefore, to earth or flesh as his sovereign, the former was subject; while to heaven or spirit as his sovereign, the latter owed allegiance. As the nature of Adam was fleshly, the law, the only law, to which he was or could be subject, was the law of flesh; whereas the nature of Jesus having been spiritual in the form of fleshly, the law, the only law, to which he was or could be subject, was spiritual, or the law of God adapted to the fleshly form.—I speak just now of the Son of God as manifest in flesh. And my object is to shew, that as Adam's *nature*, which was fleshly, consti-

tuted *the law* to which Adam was subject ; so *the nature* of Christ, while on earth, which was spiritual in the fleshly form, constituted *the law* to which Christ, while on earth, was subject. Speaking of his earthly nature, then, as a nature essentially subject to the law of God, and as thereby distinguished from the nature of Adam which was a nature essentially subject to the law of flesh, Jesus could with truth say, addressing his Heavenly Father, *Thy law is within my heart* ; that is, “as spiritual myself, subjection to thy law which is spiritual constitutes my very nature.”

But, strange as ignorance of it may appear, it is nevertheless a fact not generally known, that the Lord Jesus as appearing on earth, and as reigning in heaven, has two perfectly distinct natures ; or, rather, that the one nature of the Lord Jesus has appeared under two perfectly distinct forms. First, under an earthly form ; and secondly, under a heavenly one.—The earthly form of the nature of the Lord Jesus *was peculiar to himself*. This is a fact which not one *soi-disant* divine in a thousand has ever even suspected ; and hence the blunderings respecting *the subjection of believers to divine law* with which all, or nearly all, systems of theology are over-run and rendered ridiculous. The earthly form of Christ's nature was subject to divine law ; but this state of subjection was begun and ended with himself. It commenced when he became incarnate ; it was brought to an end when he expired on the cross. He sacrificed it, in sacrificing himself. And as sacrificed, as terminated in him, it was never afterwards either to be resumed by himself, or to be conferred by him upon others.—With the second, or heavenly form of his nature, it was that Jesus arose from the dead ; and it is with this second, or heavenly form, that he lives and reigns for evermore. This second, or heavenly form of his nature, is *not subject to divine law* ; because it is *love*, or *the very principle of divine law itself*.

Subject to divine law he appeared in the first form of his nature, that is, while in flesh; but in love or the heavenly form of his nature, has subjection to divine law or the earthly form of his nature, (through the medium of his death, resurrection from the dead, and ascension upon high,) been swallowed up. As subjection to divine law was the temporary form of his nature while on earth; so love, or a state of triumph over law as well as sin and death, is the form of his nature now and for evermore.

Now it is the earnest of this second or heavenly form of his divine nature which the Messiah, through faith, communicates to us his chosen people. He makes us partakers, as to our consciences, of *his own present nature*. Ephes. ii. 5. 6. The reason being, that the earthly form of his nature, as having been sacrificed on the cross and swallowed up in his resurrection, no longer exists; and, therefore, is not in his power to bestow. Hence it is, that when a spiritual view of the resurrection of Christ is by himself caused with power to enter into, and take possession of, our consciences, *the nature of fleshly mind* is, in so far as the divine communication extends, absorbed and swallowed up in *the nature of spiritual mind*. Previous *subjection to the law of flesh*, (not *subjection to the law of God*, for that was peculiar to Christ when on earth,) is swallowed up in love; sense of sin, is swallowed up in divine righteousness; and fear of death, is swallowed up in the knowledge and possession of life everlasting. John xi. 25. 26. That is, the very same effects which took place in the resurrection of Christ, take place through faith in our consciences. As, in Christ's resurrection, creature principles were swallowed up in such as are divine; subjection to law, in love; sin, in righteousness; and death, in life everlasting: so in our consciences, through faith in his resurrection, creature principles are swallowed up in such as are divine likewise; law sin and death, in love righteousness and life everlast-

ing. We are not through faith in Christ's resurrection *made subject to divine law*; but we are thereby *made partakers of a resurrection spirit*, as in us the earnest of a new divine and heavenly *nature or principle*. Ephes. i. 17.—20. Indeed, see from i. 17, to ii. 12.

In this way, then, the entering of spiritual views into our minds does not *render us subject to divine law*, and *lay us under obligations to fulfil it*, as is commonly but erroneously supposed: seeing that, if it did so, it would impart to us, not the form of the nature of Christ *now*, but the form of the nature which he had *while he was upon earth*; and, besides, would compel us to attempt becoming our own saviours, instead of enabling us to rejoice in that salvation which he himself hath accomplished. On the contrary, the entering of spiritual views into our minds, being the manifestation to us of our necessary and indestructible union with Christ; and, consequently, of his righteousness being our righteousness, and of his life being our life; but, above all, of his complete fulfilment of divine law having superseded the necessity and even possibility of our being called on to fulfil divine law ourselves; we find ourselves, not as Christ on earth was, *subject to divine law*, but as Christ now is, *raised above law*: partakers in earnest of the present nature *of him, in whom it hath pleased the Father that all the fulness of grace and truth should dwell*. And thus *the new mind, or earnest of the divine nature* which is imparted to our consciences, is a *law* to us, not in the sense of our being *as partakers of human nature* subjected to divine commands; but in the sense of *the spiritual discoveries made to us* constituting in us a *new nature*: *the nature* of every being constituting, as we have seen, *the law* of that being. The nature of Adam which we originally have is, as our nature, *a law of sin and death*, because it constrained Adam to sin and die; and the nature of Christ as exalted to glory, which by

grace is bestowed on us who believe, is, as our nature, *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus*, because it constrains us, as alive with our head and with him raised above prohibitions and commands, *to live not unto ourselves, but unto him that died for us, and that rose again.* 2 Cor. v. 14. 15. See also Ephes. ii. 5. 6.

If understood in the remarks which I have made, it will appear, that the manifestation to us of Christ as having died and risen again, or the imparting to us of the earnest of the spirit of life, is *a law* to us, just in the very same sense in which any other *nature* is *a law* to the being who is possessed of it. That is, as *the nature* of every being is in it *a law* not *restraining* from any thing, but *constraining* it to produce effects and exhibit phenomena corresponding to that nature; so faith, or *the earnest of the divine nature*, is in us who believe *a law*, not *restraining* from something upon which that nature is bent, but *constraining* us to bring forth fruits and act in a manner corresponding to that nature. As *that which is born of the flesh*, or under the influence of *the law* of fleshly nature, is *flesh*; so *that which is born of the spirit*, or under the influence of *the law* of spiritual nature, is *spirit*. John iii. 6.

To present in an abridged form what I have just said in reference to this matter.—There are three intelligent natures, and, consequently, three laws, to which intelligent beings have been, are, or may be, subject, set before us in scripture:—1. There is the nature of Adam, consisting in *subjection to the law of flesh*. 2. There is the nature which Christ had while upon earth; consisting in *subjection to the law of divine prohibitions and commands*. And, 3, there is the nature which Christ has now; consisting in *subjection to itself as being its own law*.—Now if the preceding observations have been comprehended, it must be evident, 1st, that no mere human being ever is, or can be, subject to God's law as *a command*: for

naturally, he is subject to *the law of flesh* ; and spiritually, he is subject to *the law of love* operating, not as a *command*, but as a *principle*, imparted to and dwelling in his conscience by faith : Christ alone, while in flesh, having possessed a nature which was subject to God's law as a *command or series of commands* enjoining obedience. And, 2dly, that the communicating to the elect people of God of the knowledge of Jesus's character as the risen and glorified Messiah, is not the relieving of them from *subjection to the law of flesh*, in order to make them subject to the law of God, viewed as a *command or series of commands* : but is the swallowing up in their consciences of the nature which consists in *subjection to the law of flesh*, in the nature which consists in *love or the mind of God himself* ; which as a nature, and not by imposing upon us in opposition to our nature an obligation to obey commands, constitutes *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus*.—In short, of the three intelligent natures, and the three corresponding laws, just spoken of, believers have to do only with the 1st and the 3d ; the first, naturally, and the third, supernaturally : the 2d, or the nature of *subjection to divine law*, as a *command or series of commands*, having been peculiar to our blessed Lord during his abode upon earth ; and, as such, having begun with his incarnation and ended with his atoning sacrifice.

B. That is, to express your idea after my own fashion, and with a view to the clearing up of my own mind in regard to this profound and intricate subject, the law which sets believers free from *guilt*, and from their previous *subjection to the law of flesh*, is not a *new law*, in the sense of its being a *new prohibition or command*, such as were the laws imposed on Adam, and the Lord Jesus during his earthly state ; but is a *new nature* constituting, like every other nature, a *law* to him by whom it is possessed. This *new nature or new law*, in so far as it is conferred and

possessed, by the very fact of its entering into his conscience sets the believer free from his former *old nature*, which constituted his *old law*.

Give me leave to make another attempt to convince you, that I have apprehended your views in reference to this subject.—As no human being ever had an opportunity of *disobeying* divine law, but Adam; so no being, in the form of man, ever had an opportunity of *obeying* divine law, but Christ. Adam's guilt is not ours by our *disobeying* divine law as he did, for no one being subject to a divine prohibition as he was, no one can *sin after the similitude of his transgression*; but it is ours by our inheriting *his nature*: so Christ's righteousness is not ours by our *obeying* divine law as he did, for no one being subject to the law of God as a command or series of commands as he was, no one can yield obedience after the similitude of his righteousness; but it is ours by our being made partakers of *his nature*. And as the nature of flesh, or nature which in Adam disobeyed divine law, is the law to which we are naturally and necessarily subject—which alone we bring into the world with us, and which alone, unless sovereign grace interfere and prevent, we carry out with us likewise; so the nature of Spirit, or nature which in Christ obeyed divine law, is that which, giving us liberty from the other, brings us into sweet and pleasing subjection to itself. In the very act of being *made free from sin, we become the servants or slaves of righteousness*. Rom. vi. 18. As believers, we got rid of our fleshly nature as to the conscience, in consequence of its having been superseded by and swallowed up in a spiritual nature. And thus it is *the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus*, or earnest of the divine nature, which, being introduced into our consciences, sets us free so far from human nature, or *the law of sin and death*.

T. Precisely so. Blessed be God, you now perceive,

that *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus* is neither a prohibition or command, nor a series of prohibitions or commands, addressed to a conscience *still in a fleshly state*, with a view to the improvement of that conscience; (absurd, and yet common, supposition!); much less to a conscience *enlightened and made new by grace*, upon which, as righteous, it is impossible for laws in the sense of prohibitions or commands to be imposed; Galatians v. 23; 1 Timothy i. 5. 9: but that it is *the present nature and mind* of Christ Jesus, as having himself fulfilled the law of God, *superinduced on the believer's conscience*, or, rather, rendered *the very mind, conscience, and nature*, of the believer; and, like every other *nature*, constituting in him *a law or principle* to which he is, not by the will or choice of his fleshly mind, but of necessity and by the formation in him of a divine will or choice, gloriously subject.

F. In a word, *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus* to which believers are subjected, and by which they are *made free from the law of sin and death*, is not, according to you, a *divine command* addressed to their *fleshly consciences*, and requiring obedience from *these*; but is *the earnest of the divine nature as a law* taking hold of, swallowing up, and thereby superseding, their *naturally fleshly consciences*?

T. So, on the ground of inspired authority, do I maintain. *Sin*, says Paul addressing believers, *shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law*, as imposing a series of prohibitions and commands on a fleshly nature which is unable to yield them obedience; *but under grace*, as being partakers through faith of the divine nature, and thereby constrained to live, not unto yourselves, but unto God.

F. Admitting for the sake of argument, Thom, that all this is true, what explanation do you give of the moral

condition of those who are destitute of the knowledge of the gospel ; and, consequently, of the earnest of a spiritual nature?—I understand you when you say, that Christ alone was by nature subject to the law of God; and that by him that law, after having been fulfilled to the very uttermost, was exhausted by the sacrifice of himself. I understand you when you allege that, as Christ himself, having not only obeyed but exhausted and swallowed up divine law, is not subject to that law now, he appearing on high as love, the great fountain of law, and thereby law's superior; so his obedience to, or rather exhaustion and swallowing up of law, becomes to those who are enabled to perceive their oneness with him as he now is, their obedience to, or rather exhaustion of law likewise: and that thus in them, not subjection to divine law, which was Christ's case on earth; but possession of the earnest of love or the divine nature, the full possession of which is Christ's case now; is, in so far as their consciences are concerned, their nature and the principle by which they are actuated. I say, I understand all this.—But whence, under such circumstances, are the unregenerate portion of the family of man to draw their morality? Indeed, what foundation for the morals of ordinary human beings does your system admit of?

T. The length to which this conversation has already been drawn out, and my desire to bring under your notice one or two other important topics before we part, preclude my giving you a detailed answer to your query. Suffice it to say that as every man, while ignorant of the gospel, is properly speaking *his own god*; so every man's own conscience, or conviction of right and wrong, is the moral tribunal to which, while so situated, he is amenable. From this observation of mine you will of course perceive, that I do not rank the natural conscience of man so very high as writers on the subject of religion

generally do. Instead of confounding *the dictates of natural conscience*, with *the law of God itself*, I maintain, taught by the sacred scriptures, that natural conscience is merely the highest form which the fleshly mind of man is capable of assuming: that it is not God himself prescribing laws to the individual, but the mind of the individual, as the shadow and image of the mind of God, prescribing laws to itself, and judging itself according to the laws thus prescribed; and that, therefore, subjection to the dictates of natural conscience, is subjection to the dictates of fleshly mind merely. Observe what I say. My natural conscience is merely my own mind, in the exercise of its self-legislative capacity, prescribing laws to itself: and although in this I observe *the shadow* of divine authority—man being made even naturally *in, or after, the image of God*—I am too well instructed by the Holy Spirit, to confound *the mere shadow* of divine authority, with *the substance*.—Still, natural conscience is most useful,—aye, not to be dispensed with,—in the absence of higher principle. Its *accusings* and *excusings*,* as they are to the mere fleshly mind its only rule of morals, so do they constitute also the safeguard of society. And sorry should I be to attempt to disturb or undermine them, except by the proclamation of that gospel which, whenever it takes effect in any individual and not otherwise, is the superseding of natural conscience, by the swallowing of it up in a higher, even a divine, principle.—But enough. Have you understood—

F. More puzzling theories! It seems to me as if you had determined to be a perfect Œdipus.—What do you mean by alleging, that man is not amenable naturally to any law but that of his own conscience? Is he not subject to the ten commandments? Is he not subject to the various laws which God hath seen meet at various times to prescribe and enforce?

* Rom. ii. 14. 15.

T. Again I must decline entering upon this subject at length. Indeed, your questions have virtually received an answer already. But that I may appear to exhibit no defect of courtesy, and may embrace the opportunity which you have thrown in my way of clearing up what may have been obscure in my previous statements, I remark briefly:—

That mankind as a whole, or if you will the Gentile portion of mankind, never were, and never will be, subjected to *more than one divine law*. That law was the prohibition which was given to Adam in Paradise, and which by him was violated. Since then the Gentiles have been subjected to no divine law, and never will be subjected to any. The gospel comes, not *imposing* law in the shape of prohibitions or commands on the conscience of the believer; but *setting him free* from law of this kind, in consequence of imparting to him by faith the principle of love, or earnest of the divine nature. And this, to the degree and extent to which it is conferred, is *a law* to him, in no other sense than that in which *any* and *every nature* constitutes *a law* to the being who is possessed of it.

As to the unbelieving portion of the family of man, they are now under *no divine law*. The law of Moses was never addressed to them; never imposed on them; never, in any of the senses explained by me, intended to be obligatory on them. In a word, Gentiles have nothing whatever to do with this law, in the way of being subjected to it. The law of Moses was confined to the Jews alone; and confined to them, from the period of its promulgation from Mount Sinai, to that of its fulfilment by the Lord of Glory. Rather, from its original promulgation at Sinai, until the final and irretrievable rejection of Jesus as the fulfiller of it, by his stubborn and unbelieving kinsmen. Since that period the natural conscience of the Jew, no less than of the Gentile, has been to him his only law. If, in the exercise of his self-legislative capacity, either the one or the

other shall be pleased to take any of the laws which were *typically* given to the Jews, but *really* imposed on Christ; or to devise any laws of his own, and to impose them upon himself; the obligations so imposed no doubt become laws to him. But they are not laws imposed by God: they are merely laws imposed by his own conscience acting as its own god, and arrogating to itself the attributes and prerogatives of divine authority. I may impose on myself naturally the ten commandments; or I may attempt to subject myself to the spiritual explication of them given in Matthew v—vii; or I may issue to myself any other laws that I please: and I may say, nay, I may fancy, that it is to the authority of *the living and true God* I am subject. But in all this I am merely deceiving-myself. For it is I, not God, who am all the while the imposer of such laws. The whole is merely an operation of my own conscience, acting as its own legislator and its own judge.

God, in the gospel, is not imposing law, but proclaiming his own character as love. And this, through the medium of proclaiming the complete obedience to law which has been rendered by his well beloved Son. The gospel saves, and the gospel operates on the conscience, not by imposing law in the sense of commands or prohibitions; but by being believed in, and thereby becoming the earnest of the divine nature, or *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus*.

Matters thus revert to the position from which I set out, that upon the family of man, as a whole, never was more than one divine law, namely, the prohibition addressed to Adam, imposed; and that, consequently, for human beings to imagine or pretend that God is now imposing any divine law upon them, over and above the nature which he has given them,—except that *earnest of the divine nature* which he bestows on his people,—is for them grossly to mistake his purpose and deceive themselves. Man, as

being naturally his own god, is naturally amenable to the law of his own conscience, not to the law of God.

Having thus explained myself, allow me to propose that question which I was about to do when you interrupted me, viz. have you understood——

F. Excuse me for again interrupting you. My anxiety to obtain satisfaction in regard to this all-important subject must plead my apology. If I have not misapprehended you, the deliverance which Christ, by conferring the earnest of the divine nature, grants to the minds of Gentile believers, is not deliverance from the law of God; for that you say they are not subject to: but deliverance from natural conscience, as the highest law of their fleshly nature; from the various prohibitions and commands which conscience, in the exercise of its legislative authority, has seen meet to issue; and from the uneasiness occasioned by that violation of its dictates which conscience, sitting as judge, is constrained from time to time to pronounce.

T. You have in some measure, but not quite, understood me. Jesus grants deliverance by faith to his people, 1st, from the guilt of Adam's sin, the *one transgression* of human nature; and 2dly, from all that sense of guilt and dread of future punishment, of which our personal violations of conscience, the lawgiver of each individual's own mind, have been productive.—And this deliverance is communicated, by our being enabled to see, first, that human nature, which had only a *shadowy* existence in Adam and has only a similar existence in his posterity, had a *real* and *substantial* existence in Christ Jesus; Rom. v. 14; 1 Corinth xv. 45. 47: and, secondly, that by the complete obedience of Christ Jesus, and by the sacrifice of the nature which yielded that obedience, there have been an extinction and swallowing up, not only of the *real* and *substantial* human nature of our Lord, but also of our *shadowy* human nature as necessarily involved in it, as

well as of all the effects and consequences which have flowed from our possession of the *shadowy* human nature. Hebrews ix. 26. 1 Corinth. xv. 54. 2 Corinth. v. 4. That is, human nature as it existed in Adam, and sin and death with all the other effects of this human nature, we perceive to have been mere *shadows*: these *shadows* we perceive to have been taken up into, and absorbed in, the *substantial* humanity of Christ: and, consequently, in sacrificing his own *substantial* nature, we perceive him to have sacrificed also our *shadowy* nature, with all that is connected with it and implied in it; just as in rising from the dead, we perceive him to have raised us in himself likewise. And thus it is that, as one with and involved in the *substantial* humanity of the Lord Jesus, we see that his death, was our death; that his life, is our life. Rom. vi. 3—11. Col. iii. 3. 4.

That we are delivered by faith from *the condemnation of conscience*, as the highest part of the law of our fleshly nature; and not from *the condemnation of the law of God*, as if that law had been the law of our nature; is plain from this, that the Lord Jesus, who alone of all that wear the human form was subject to the law of God by nature, was delivered from that law, not by an arbitrary act of his Heavenly Father, but by his *being obedient unto it, even unto death*. A fact which evidently implies, that had we ourselves been subject to divine law by nature, we could have obtained deliverance from it only by yielding an entire and personal obedience to it likewise.—Indeed, in connection with this subject never let it be forgotten, that the reason why the *one transgression* of Adam could have been expiated or atoned for was, that the divine prohibition issued to him was not *according* but *in opposition* to his nature. He owed allegiance to *the law of flesh*, before *the single law of God* was addressed to him. A sin committed by him against a law, which was thus foreign

to his nature, was expiable ; not so, had it been committed by him in opposition to the law of God, as the law of his own nature.

I again proceed to inquire, for the third time, do you remember, and have you understood, the distinctions which I have already laid down, between righteousness and wickedness? and between the righteous and the wicked?

F. Yes. Adam was the wicked man; and Jesus was the righteous man. Adam was wicked, as having been the violator of the first law, or single divine prohibition; and Jesus was righteous, as the fulfiller and exhauster of the second law, or divine command to love God and man. Adam's wickedness sprang from his nature having been that of a mere creature, and as such unable to obey the law of his own conscience, much less the law of the Creator; Jesus's righteousness sprang from his having been possessed of the nature of the Creator, and as such able to obey the law of the Creator. Adam's wicked nature is transmitted by him to all his fleshly descendants; Christ's righteous nature is shared in with him by all his spiritual posterity.

B. All this I think my brother has most clearly and satisfactorily demonstrated. And he will now, perhaps, have the goodness to shew us how it contributes towards the establishment of his theory of Universalism.

T. With all my heart, Robert. Indeed, in the question which I just now proposed to our friend here, and which he has so distinctly answered, I was preparing the way for doing so.

It is now understood and admitted on both sides, then, that Adam and his posterity constitute the wicked, as being possessors of the nature which broke one divine law; and that Christ and his posterity constitute the righteous, as being possessors of the nature which kept another divine law.—Now do these two heads and their two posterities

consist, think you, of two distinct classes of individuals?

F. They are, as to their natures, evidently distinct from each other.

T. True. But that is not an answer to my question. What I want to know is, was Adam a being totally distinct from and independent of Christ? or was he merely the type figure and shadow of Christ, and as such involved in him? And are Adam's posterity distinct from and independent of Christ's posterity? or are they, as mere *shadows*, involved in the posterity of Christ as constituting their *substances*?

B. I confess, David, that I do not quite understand you.

T. Probably not.

F. As little, I am sure, do I.

T. Well, then, I will throw my question into such a form as both of you will, in all likelihood, more readily apprehend. Were Adam and Jesus both creatures? or were they both Creators?

F. Why do you ask such a question? Adam, forsooth, was but a creature; Jesus was the Creator manifest in flesh.

T. Very well. Then had the creature Adam an existence which was independent of that of the Creator, Christ Jesus? Or, was the existence of the former the creature, involved in that of the latter the Creator?

F. There needs no witch to answer a question like this. The existence of a creature, so far from being independent of, must, from the very nature of things and necessity of the case, be dependent on and involved in that of the Creator. So thought, and so reasoned, the apostle Paul; for this is his language when addressing the philosophic Athenians: *In him*, that is, in the Creator, *we live, and move, and have our being*. Acts xvii. 28.

T. So, then, we have ascertained that abstractly, as hav-

ing been merely a creature ; no less than as matter of fact, as having been merely a figure or shadow ; Adam had not an existence separate from that of the Lord Jesus, the Creator and substance. His existence, therefore, and that of the Lord Jesus *are*, or rather *is*, in reality and at bottom one and the same. And just so with the respective posterities of the one and the other. Adam's posterity, as possessed of a *creaturely* and *shadowy* nature, have no existence, except what is dependent on and swallowed up in the existence of Christ's posterity, as possessed of *the divine* and *substantial* nature. In other words, Adam's posterity and Christ's posterity, although possessed of two distinct natures, do not constitute two distinct classes of individuals ; but are the same class of individuals appearing with two different natures, and under two different forms. Wicked, as creatures ; righteous, as partakers of the nature of the Creator.

F. Strange ! that *one* set of beings, should be likewise *another* set of beings !

T. Not more strange, surely, is the view which I have just presented, than the declaration of the apostle, that *as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.* 1 Cor. xv. 49. The obvious paraphrase of which is, that, as we have appeared in the character and capacity of the first Adam's descendants, we shall also appear in the character and capacity of the second Adam's descendants. As we have appeared clothed with the nature of the creature, we shall also appear clothed with the nature of the Creator.¹³—My dear friend, I am sure, has no intention to assert that the Spirit of God, speaking by the mouth of the apostle, was a less competent judge in matters of this kind, than is either he or I.

F. I must confess that the passage which you have just quoted, and the doctrine which is clearly implied, nay

expressed, in it, namely, that one and the same class of persons are both Adam's posterity, and Christ's posterity, had escaped my notice. But how is it that Christ saves, by rendering them his posterity, those who stand condemned as Adam's posterity?

T. By swallowing up their Adamic or creature nature, in his own divine nature.

F. You perfectly astonish me! According to this view of matters, if I have not misapprehended you, the creature nature of Adam is not saved at all!

T. Rather say, the creature nature of Adam is not saved or preserved *as what it is*. In so far as it is a creature nature, it sprang from the dust and to the dust it returns. But inasmuch as this creature nature *became one*, or rather was for temporary purposes *manifested as one*, with the divine nature in the person of our blessed Lord, it is saved, not by continuing a creature nature—for as a creature nature it was sacrificed in him on the cross—but by its change or conversion in him, through the medium of his resurrection, into the divine nature.

F. Although entirely new to me, there is something very striking in your theory.

T. The whole subject of salvation when tolerably understood, although disclosing depths which shall never be thoroughly fathomed by the creature mind, is yet seen to be distinguished by a simplicity and a beauty that are truly refreshing.—Adam and Jesus appear, the one at the top, and the other at the bottom, of the creature nature. In the former, a mere creature, it begins; in the latter, the Creator manifest in flesh, it ends. To the former, the creature, at a period subsequent to his existence, a single divine *prohibition* is given; upon the latter, the Creator, long previous to his appearance in flesh, an obligation, in the shape of a *command* to love God supremely and his neighbour as himself, is imposed. By

the former, the law given to him is violated, and sin and death enter ; by the latter, the law imposing upon him love to God and man is obeyed, and by means of his *obedience to it even unto death*, that is, to the sacrifice of flesh and blood in himself, righteousness and life everlasting are introduced. By the transgression of the former, creature righteousness came to an end, and sin thenceforward was confirmed as the portion of the human family ; by the voluntary sacrifice of the latter, divine righteousness also came to an end, in the sense of its performer being no longer subject to law and consequently no longer in a capacity to obey it, but his righteousness, as complete, was thenceforward confirmed as the portion of the divine family for ever. Through the one transgression of the former, death reigns over himself and all his posterity ; through the one righteousness of the latter, grace reigns to the conferring of eternal life on himself and on all his posterity. Through the one transgression of the former, that is, of the creature, sin and death so attach to and acquire so firm a hold on the creature nature as that, while the creature nature lasts, sin and death must be their inevitable portion ; but by the one righteousness of the latter, that is, of the Creator, the creature nature, the law to which it was subjected, and the breach of that law, are all so completely done away with and obliterated, that, like drops of water thrown into the ocean, they are, in that divine righteousness and in the divine life which is inseparably connected with it, or, in a word, in the divine nature of the Lord Jesus, swallowed up and engulfed for ever.

But now mark, lest there should be any misunderstanding of what I have said :—1. That the Creator does not appear in flesh for the purpose of interfering with, and obstructing the execution of, the penalty of sufferings and death originally denounced against transgression ; on the

contrary, he appears to shew his conviction of the rectitude and suitableness of that penalty, by undergoing it himself in his pure *flesh and blood* body. Had he saved any one from the penalty denounced against transgression, God's truth in threatening that penalty, and his other attributes, could not have been preserved inviolate.—2. As the Creator in whom *all live, and move, and have their being*, Jesus, when he appeared in flesh, had all human beings, or more correctly human nature itself, *substantialized* in him: that is, he appeared as the anti-type of the first Adam, whose *shadowy* oneness with all mankind, as inheritors of his nature, was but a figure of the *real and substantial* oneness of all human beings with Jesus, as their Creator. Adam was the *shadowy* man; Jesus was the *substantial* man; or, rather, in one word, THE MAN. Jesus grasped, took hold of, and comprehended, as it were, in the *Holy thing* which was conceived and born of the Virgin Mary, Adam and the whole human race.—3. Having exhibited a fleshly nature for once in himself pure and spotless;—having obeyed divine law, as far as he could obey it while retaining his earthly life;—Jesus then performed his last and crowning act of obedience to *the commandment which he had received of the father*, by the sacrifice or destruction of his fleshly nature: the sacrifice or destruction of it having been, in reality, from its having been *substantialized* in him, the sacrifice or destruction of human nature; and that nature having thus, by his death, been brought to an end in himself. In other words, in sacrificing or destroying himself, he, in consequence of their oneness with him, sacrificed or destroyed all who are partakers of Adam's nature.—And, 4, Jesus rose from the dead, not with a nature of flesh and blood, but with human nature, that is, with the nature of every human being, swallowed up by himself in his own divine nature. This he alone, as the Crea-

tor, was capable of effecting: the very circumstance of his having been the Creator enabling him to do away with and extirpate sin, not, as, seems to be the common idea, by balancing his own righteousness against it; but, as is fact, by swallowing up sin as an affection of a mere creature, in righteousness as a quality or attribute of himself the glorious Creator.

B. How you delight me with this representation of things, David!

T. Happy am I to hear you say so, my dear brother. Now you begin to apprehend why two laws were given: one law to the creature, to be broken by him; another law to the Creator appearing in the form of the creature, to be fulfilled by him. Yes. It is the fact of Jesus having been the Creator, and of his having as such swallowed up in himself the creature nature and all that has proceeded from that nature, which constitutes the glory of his salvation. Had he been a creature, his creature righteousness could have availed nothing towards the effacing of previously contracted creature guilt. It could merely at the utmost have been a set-off against it, and have on earth benefited himself. But having been the Creator manifest in flesh, every thing that appertains to the creature comes to an end in him. Law is ended, by his fulfilment and exhaustion of it; sin is ended, as having been swallowed up in his righteousness; and death is ended, by its having flowed into him, the ocean as well as fountain of life everlasting. Nay, even the nature of the creature itself is ended, as having found its appropriate *euthanasia* in him whose nature is that of the glorious Creator.—He terminates human nature, because mercy, no less than justice and truth, required it to die. And, having brought that nature to an end in himself on the cross, he communicates to those who have previously been partakers of it, his own divine nature: doing this, not only without any

violation of, but in the strictest consistency with, those same glorious attributes which had imperiously demanded the sacrifice of human nature. Having made himself one with us for a time, by his appearance in flesh, he, through his sacrifice of our nature, his assumption of his own, and his communication of it to us, makes us one with himself for ever. In this salvation of his which consists, not in the preservation or perpetuating of human nature as such, but in the sacrifice or destruction of it; and in the *making* of those who are now partakers of it *new* in himself, by giving them his own divine nature; all are sharers.

B. All this I fully comprehend.

T. Do you? Then let me just make a remark or two concerning that salvation which is peculiar to the church, as distinguished from the common salvation; and thereby bring this long and tedious conversation to a close.

You have by this time observed, that salvation is accomplished, not by the preservation of the creature nature, or by one creature remedying the defects of another; but by the stream of human nature flowing onwards and downwards, until at last it runs into and is swallowed up by one, who, although he appears in the likeness of a creature, is nevertheless the Creator himself clothed with flesh. The creature nature having transgressed divine law, and thereby shewn itself to be unworthy of everlasting existence upon earth, much less of being elevated to a higher state of being,—the penalty of sufferings and death which had been incurred by transgression, truth and omnipotence take care to inflict; and the Messiah does not come in any way whatever to interfere with it. His atonement had a nobler object, than either the preservation of human nature as it is, or the restoration of it to the state in which it appeared originally in our created progenitor. In becoming incarnate, dying, and rising again, the grand objects embraced by Jesus were, 1st, the exhibition of a

nature of flesh and blood, which was the embodying or substantializing of sinful human nature, for once perfect in himself; Rom. viii. 3;—2dly, the sacrifice of the nature thus perfected, as fitted, even in this its best estate, for existence only in time and upon earth; 1 Corinth. xv. 50;—and, 3dly, the elevation to a higher state of existence of the nature of flesh and blood thus sacrificed or destroyed on the cross, by the change or conversion of it in himself, and by means of his resurrection, into his own glorious divine nature. 1 Corinth. xv. 54. Philip. iii. 21. To express the same idea differently:—the object of the Lord Jesus, in undertaking and accomplishing the work of redemption, was to take away sin, by taking away human nature itself as the nature which had sinned: an object which could only be effected by his swallowing up human nature previously rendered his own, and thereby sin as the necessary consequence of it and as necessarily connected with it, in himself, as the incarnate, dying, and glorified Jehovah. And this he hath accomplished. In the benefit of what he hath done, all human beings participate; but in two different orders, and after two different fashions. 1 Corinth. xv. 22. 23.—To some, while they are in flesh, and before the sentence of death can be executed upon them in the ordinary way, he makes himself known: thereby imparting to them *his own present mind*, even that mind of fulfilled and exhausted law with which he himself rose from the dead. Eph. ii. 5. 6. Such persons thus acquiring *the mind* of the risen Jesus, as the conqueror over sin and death, become partakers of the conquering principle or the divine mind themselves; 1 John v. 4; and enter with him into his kingdom by faith here, and by sight hereafter. 2 Corinth. v. 1—8. They are partakers of the first resurrection. Rom. viii. 10. 11. Rev. xx. 4. 5. *This day*, or during *this* period as contra-distinguished from a *future* one, *they are with Jesus in*

Paradise. Luke xxiii. 43.—Not so, however, with the rest of the human family. They follow the fate of Christ's *body*. As for a part of three days it lay in the grave, and then rose; so during time, and the future period of the church's reign, they are dead and remain in their graves: rising not until the dawn of the period of the second resurrection, or that third æra when Jesus appears *subduing all things unto himself*. Hosea vi. 2. 1 Corinth. xv. 22—28. Rev. xx. 5. 6. Such persons neither have, nor can have, the mind of Christ as conqueror; seeing that from his kingdom, or from reigning with him, they are forevermore excluded: it being their fate to be saved, not as conquering, but as conquered; not as kings, but as subjects. They are ultimately subdued by Christ, and by his church reigning with him. They live not and reign not in glory, with the sons of God and heirs of Christ Jesus. But at last, by the manifestation to them of Jesus, and the other sons of God,—by the voice of Jesus, as that of the mighty archangel, penetrating to the inmost recesses of the tomb,—they start up, like all things else *made new*; or in forms corresponding to, and which are the *substances* of, the *shadowy* ones in which they appeared while upon earth.

Thus, as I endeavoured to shew you, Robert, on a former occasion, he who, in the salvation of *his church* appears as the spiritual Abraham, in the salvation of *all* appears as the spiritual Adam. And thus, with reference to the topic with which this conversation opened, the same human beings who, either as Adam's descendants generally or as Abraham's descendants specially, constitute *the wicked*; become either specially as one with Jesus the spiritual Abraham, or generally as one with him the spiritual Adam, *righteous* in him for evermore.

F. Can you state your sentiments respecting the peculiar salvation of the members of the church in such

a form, as that I may be enabled more easily to understand and remember them?

T. I can, and it shall be done with pleasure.—The interest of the elect or members of the church in salvation, is a *present interest*. They find themselves, even while they are in flesh, one with him by whom sin was taken away, and everlasting righteousness was brought in. They are saved or delivered as to their consciences, even now, from sin and death; and this, in consequence of the divine righteousness and everlasting life of their glorious head being manifested to them, and thereby entering their consciences as their own righteousness and life. Rom. iii. 21—24; vi. 23; 1 John v. 11. 20. *There is no condemnation, and no possibility of condemnation, to them as being in Christ Jesus; and as walking, not after the flesh or principles of human nature, but after the spirit or principles of the divine nature.* Rom. viii. 1. Salvation is thus, as to them, a present, realized, unchangeable, and indefeasible privilege and possession.—And of this salvation their bodies too, in due time, partake. *For the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelling in them; he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken their mortal bodies, by his spirit that dwelleth in them.*—Rom. viii. 11.

Perhaps I should add that there is a sense, and that, too, a very important one, in which salvation is restricted to the members of the church alone. In consequence of the *divine* principles of love, righteousness, and life everlasting, entering into and taking possession of their minds, they are saved from the *creature* principles of law, sin, and death. They are even already, through faith in Christ, made alive: Galatians ii. 20: and the life which they have through faith in him, enduring for evermore;—being *the substance* of the *shadowy* existence which they derive from Adam, and, as *the substance*, absorbing or swallowing

up in itself *the shadow*;—of course, they *never die*. John xi. 25. 26.—Very different is the fate of the rest of the human family. As destitute, while in flesh, of more than Adam's nature, they *perish*. John iii. 14—17. They, in the sense just alluded to, are not saved. For human nature, while it exists, is not in them, as in the case of the elect, preserved from its ordinary fate by being changed into the divine nature; and thereby, not as the nature of Adam, but as the present nature of Christ, made to live for ever. Their resurrection is not, like that of believers, effected by the change into divine principles without previously perishing, and thereby in a certain sense the salvation, of what were originally creature principles; but takes place by the change ultimately of what here perished as natural, into what shall hereafter exist as supernatural.

B. Then, David, human nature has always been connected with Christ. In Adam, it must have been *produced by*, if it *shadowed forth*, Christ's nature; and, in Christ himself, we are merely beholding *the shadow* again merged in *the substance* from which it originally proceeded.

T. Your conclusion is perfectly correct. The Lord Jesus is *the root*, as well as *the offspring*, of Adam.—Henceforward you will have some little notion of what our glorious Redeemer intended, when he styled himself, *the Alpha, and the Omega; the beginning, and the end; the first, and the last*. Rev. xxii. 13.

DIALOGUE FOURTH.

SUBJECT :

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT NOT ETERNAL TORMENTS.

SPEAKERS :—AUTHOR. BROTHER.

T. Well, brother, what now do you want ?

B. To obtain some satisfaction, if I can, respecting the doctrine of *eternal punishment*.

T. You have read, I presume, what I have written on the subject in my "Three Questions proposed and answered," and in my "Assurance of Faith." What more would you have ?

B. When I read the works to which you have alluded, I had not enjoyed the advantage of listening to these oral statements of yours by which I have been lately so much benefited. And, besides that the fact if my own previous ignorance may have in a great measure disqualified me for understanding your writings, I almost fancy that, since the composition and publication of your *Assurance of Faith*, your own mind must have been enlarged considerably in its apprehensions of divine truth. If well founded in my conjecture, then by asking you questions respecting

eternal punishment, and attending to your answers, I shall be put in possession of your most matured ideas on the subject. This is what induces me to trouble you just now.

T. Indeed, Robert, I do not know that I have much, if any thing, to add to the views which I have already communicated to the public, with regard to eternal punishment. The perusal, during the interim, of several interesting and valuable treatises on the subject of Universalism, in which views are advocated in many respects opposed to my own, so far from shaking, has materially contributed towards confirming, the leading sentiments which I have long since promulgated. Such being the case, why go over them again?—Nevertheless as no way of eliciting and enforcing truth is to be neglected; and as truth, when stated in one form, may have failed to impart that conviction of which, by the divine blessing, it may be productive when stated in another; I am perfectly willing, to the best of my knowledge and ability, to answer any queries, respecting eternal punishment, which you may think meet to propose to me.

B. I have to thank you for this indulgence; as well as for the kindness and patience which in our preceding interviews you have exhibited. In this conversation, or, at the utmost, in another, I trust to be able to obtain so much satisfaction respecting some of these weighty and momentous topics which I know you to have made particularly your study, as to supersede the necessity of my giving you any further annoyance.—This, I may say, I am aware of, that you are not a believer in the ordinary, and to ecclesiastics most profitable, dogma of *eternal torments*.

T. So far from believing in it, my mind rejects it with abhorrence. And yet I reject it not, as is done by too many, on the ground of mere human reasonings. I cast it

from me, simply because it is a libel on the *revealed* character of Jehovah. How could I hold it, without at the same time holding the truth of the Manichean doctrine of the existence of two co-eternal principles of good and evil, the one of which is for ever struggling unsuccessfully against the other; that is, without holding that the good principle, whatever might be its desires and inclinations, is totally unable to extinguish the evil one? Isaiah xlv. 7. 1 Corinth. xv. 26. 54. Phil. iii. 21. Heb. ii. 8. How could I hold it, without denying that Christ hath *taken away sin, by the sacrifice of himself*, Heb. ix. 26; and without representing him as the confirmer, not *the destroyer, of the works of the Devil*? 1 John iii. 8. How could I hold it, believing and knowing as I do, upon his own infallible authority, that *God is love*; 1 John iv. 8. 16; and that, as such, he is *not overcome by evil, but overcomes evil with good*? Rom. xii. ult.

B. And yet a doctrine, such as is that of eternal torments, which has obtained so strong, so extensive, and so permanent, an influence over the human mind; which is acquiesced in, as if it were demonstrably true, by men of almost all sects and parties; and which is appealed to, as the last and best of all sanctions, in our Courts of Judicature; cannot have had a superficial origin: but must be derived from the depths, and inmost *penetralia*, of human nature itself.

T. Your observation is just, Robert. That instinctive dread of future suffering by which mere human nature, whenever it assumes the religious aspect, is characterised, the enlightened Christian, and he only, is enabled to trace to its deep-seated principles. When explored and laid open in the light of scripture, it is found to have its origin, first, in that sense of guilt and condemnation which first entered into the human mind with Adam's *one transgression*, and which, ready to be roused into activity by the

slightest exciting cause, has descended as an heir-loom from him to all his posterity. Secondly. We discover a source of the alarm hinted at, in that principle of selfishness, which, instead of being a mere feature of human nature as it is generally considered, actually constitutes human nature itself. Man's nature, as limited, is selfish; that is, it desires every thing on its own account, and with a view to its own gratification, enlargement, and everlasting existence. But through sin, man's nature having come under condemnation, and, in the cross of Christ, having been destroyed; that sense of guilt, which, as has been just hinted, attaches to human nature as the source of its most agonizing feelings and the harbinger of its fate, acts powerfully upon the principle of selfishness, by exciting the suspicion, that its desires of enjoyment and immortality, instead of being gratified, are destined to be inevitably and completely frustrated. And how striking to think, that the calamity thus anticipated shall be realized. For nothing but destruction does await human nature, or the selfish principle: those who now possess the human or selfish nature of Adam having their nature annihilated, by its being swallowed up in the divine and generous nature of the Son of God. Thus, then, the dread of future punishment which characterises all who are religious upon natural or fleshly grounds, turns out to be the selfish principle itself instinctively anticipating, and, as a matter of course, shrinking back from, its deserved and inevitable fate. Thirdly. The dread in question has its origin in that ignorance of God and of divine things, under which the fleshly mind necessarily labours; in the inability of that mind to rise in its conceptions above mere man, and the ideas and pursuits of man; and in its consequent tendency to substitute human notions, and human reasonings, for the revealed truth of God. 1 Corinth. ii. 14. Coloss. ii. 8. Take the following as a speci-

men of the almost innumerable ways in which the human mind, while under the power of this invincible ignorance, is prone to delude itself respecting the divine character and intentions:—"Man is revengeful: therefore, God is so likewise." Psalm l. 21.—"Man cannot avenge his wrongs, and at the same time render the infliction of his vengeance subservient to the advantage of those who have incurred it: therefore, God cannot do so either." Matthew xxv. 24. 25. In opposition to Psalm ciii. 10—12, Matthew v. 45, and Rom, xii. 20. 21.—"I am conscious of gross and grievous violations of the dictates of my own conscience, which appear to me to be violations of the law of God, and for which I stand self-condemned: therefore, if God deal with me, as the violators of human law when convicted are dealt with by their fellow men; and if the punishment which he shall see meet to inflict on me be proportioned to his own greatness, and the number and enormity of my offences, it must be a punishment distinguished by the most intense severity, and inflicted without end."—Such is a specimen of the reasonings by which the mere fleshly mind, meddling with the concerns of religion, contrives, under the combined influence of sense of guilt, selfishness, and ignorance of divine truth, to land itself in *something like a conviction* of the real existence of eternal torments.

B. Something like a conviction! Then it is your decided impression, that even those who profess to believe in the doctrine of eternal torments, are not *quite* sure—have no *absolute* certainty—about the matter!

T. How should they? The doctrine is not true; that is, it hath not divine authority for its basis and warrant: and therefore, it is impossible for it to be credited with that absolute and infallible certainty, which can never be produced, except by the entrance into the mind of divine testimony alone.—Besides, observe the workings of the human mind, with regard to eternal torments, in those by whom the

doctrine is generally understood to be believed in. Every natural man, however strong may be his abstract and speculative conviction of the truth of the dogma, has a sort of lurking and indefinable hope that he himself, after all, may not be subjected to such sufferings. For his friends and relations, and especially for his infant offspring, he fondly, although secretly, cherishes a similar hope. And, if a man of tolerably enlarged natural benevolence of character, he sometimes ventures, although with many checks from conscience, and a trembling anxiety lest the latent workings of his mind should be discovered, to suppose, that even the whole of the human race may ultimately escape the endurance of those pangs which, in the nursery and from the pulpit, he has been taught to regard as the inevitable fate of the great majority of them. Nay, these suspicions of the falsehood of the doctrine occasionally, in spite of all the precautions of our spiritual guides, get vent from the press. If you have in your possession that very common book, Isaac Watts' *World to come: or discourses on the joys or sorrows of departed souls at death*: you have only to glance your eyes over the preface, in order to satisfy yourself, how doubtful and hesitating,—how absolutely sceptical even,—reputed princes and champions of orthodoxy sometimes feel with respect to those very torments which, in the exercise of their vocation, they deem it to be their duty, or find it to be their interest, to urge and impress on the consciences of their devotees.—It is the circumstance of the doctrine in question revolting even the natural mind, that has given birth to those numerous fleshly and unscriptural systems of *universal salvation*, to which I am as much and as decidedly opposed, as the most sturdy Calvinist can be.

B. Although my faith in eternal torments is now shaken, I may even say, subverted, it has nevertheless long been my firm conviction that many, perhaps the great

bulk of those who oppose the doctrine, have just as little *real* satisfaction as to the validity of the grounds of their denial, as the ordinary supporters of it possess that their views are true and scriptural.

T. I am pleased to have it in my power to express my entire and unreserved acquiescence in the correctness of your remark. Disgusting, certainly, it is to hear professors of religion exclaim, when the dogma of eternal torments is called in question in their presence, "Oh! I wish that your views were admissible!" or "what you contend for is too good to be true:" seeing that all such exclamations, besides betraying doubt as to the truth of future torments, are a secret compliment paid by the creature to himself, at the expense of the Creator; it being implied in them that *his* benevolence is, and if he had the opportunity of displaying it would be found to be, greater than that of the Being whose nature and character are LOVE. But if there be any thing more disgusting than this, it is to find men who deny that the blessed Jesus was the Creator appearing in the likeness of sinful flesh, *the Lord from heaven*, pretending to assert *their* confidence in the doctrine of "universal salvation." Confidence felt by those who, denying that Jesus was *God manifest in flesh*, and, consequently, that his death was the death of man's Creator, neither have nor can have any notions of the enormity of sin! Absurd! Impossible!

B. Surely, you are not going to assert the doctrine of the *infinite* nature of evil?

T. No, most decidedly. That were indeed to represent salvation as an impossibility. I have been too well taught in the school of Christ, to give into either of the twin absurdities, first, of making sin, which is an affection of a mere creature nature, to be *infinite*; or secondly, of holding it to be possible for *one infinite*, to take *another infinite* away! Let those who have maw capacious enough,

at the same time that they contradict the word of God, swallow such undisguised and unmodified nonsense. I cannot. Notions of *infinite evil*, and of *infinite evil* as overcome by *infinite good*, are not mine; and, therefore, with the blame attachable to them, and the consequences deduceable from them, I have nothing whatever to do.—But in avoiding Scylla, I am bound to take care that I do not run myself upon Charybdis. Sin, although not an *infinite evil*,—seeing that, if so, it must without fail and without remedy have existed for ever,—is nevertheless an *indefinite* one; and, as such, is that which must have existed for ever unless taken away by a being who was *infinite*. A mere creature was not competent to the task. Such a being is not able to act up to the dictates of his own *fleshly conscience*, which, if on some occasions it *excuses*, on others, *accuses* him; much less to act up to the requirements of a *divine and spiritual law*; and, in the rendering of perfect obedience to that law, to sacrifice the nature which was subject to it: thereby bringing to an end and taking away, by one and the same act, both law and sin for ever. None but the Creator, that is, none but an *infinite* being, could, by the swallowing up in himself of the nature of the creature, annihilate sin, which is a consequence and affection of the creature nature:—which, as proceeding from a creature, was by its very nature *finite*; and which yet, as committed against the law of the Creator, had acquired an *indefinite* character, that by no creature nature could have been removed or expiated.

Now, Robert, if you have understood me, you will perceive that while, on the one hand, I deny the *infinite* nature of sin; because according to scripture sin has been taken away, and nothing that is *really infinite* can be so: on the other hand, I laugh to scorn the idea of any creature or *finite* being doing away with that which is, by its very nature, *indefinite*; and hold that, except for the in-

terposition of the Creator manifest in flesh, the *infinite* being, sin and the effects of sin must, as incapable of being removed by the creature or *finite* being, have existed for ever. Indeed, were not the subject too serious for ridicule, it might amuse one to think, that *finite* beings who, by all their *finite* virtue, are not able to secure to themselves even the continuance of a paltry *finite* existence, should nevertheless be found fancying that, by such *finite* virtue, they may, in some way or other, be able to secure to themselves an interest in an *infinite* one!

B. Then sin is, in your apprehension, a *very enormous* but not an *infinite* evil.

T. That it is *very enormous*, is seen in the light of the fact of what was required to take it away. "Ye were not redeemed," says the apostle Peter, "with corruptible things, as silver and gold," that is, not by the means of any creature, or any thing creaturely, "but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb, without blemish and without spot." 1 Peter i. 18. 19. And what the dignity of this Christ or anointed one is, and wherein the value and efficacy of his blood consisted, another apostle explains to us when he says, that "God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all." Rom. viii. 32. But although *very enormous*, and far exceeding in its guilt and atrocity the liveliest and profoundest conceptions of the mere fleshly mind, sin is not *infinite*, for the best of all reasons, that it *has been taken away*. The same death of Christ, God's only and well-beloved Son, which proclaims the magnitude and enormity of sin, as that which by means of a less costly sacrifice could not have been expiated and removed; proclaims likewise, as a glorious and cheering fact, that it hath thereby been expiated and removed for evermore. Jesus hath, as a matter of fact, *put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*: Heb. ix. 26.: or, to avail myself of the highly figurative and expressive language of

two of the prophets, God. in virtue of this sacrifice, hath *cast our sins behind his back*; Isaiah xxxviii. 17 ; nay, *cast them even into the depths of the sea*. Micah vii. 19. What *with man was impossible*, God himself hath actually accomplished.—So that to the mind of the believer two things are always presented in a close and inseparable connection :—1. Sin taken away, at once and for ever, by the one atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus ; and, 2, the enormity of sin, as that which, by no other and no less costly sacrifice, could have been done away with and brought to an end.

B. You mean by all this, if I comprehend you, to assert, that the grand exhibition of God's hatred of sin is afforded in and by the cross of Christ. That, in the very same way in which God pardons sin, he manifests his abhorrence of it.

T. Precisely so. And in the exact order, too, in which you have stated the matter. For, it is not by first apprehending God's hatred of sin, that we afterwards come to apprehend his pardon of it, as the fleshly mind, venturing to meddle with divine things, uniformly suggests ; on the contrary, it is by believing in sin as pardoned through the sacrifice of Christ Jesus, that we attain to scriptural and spiritual apprehensions of it as that which is the object of God's intensest hatred.

Nothing manifests to me more strikingly that total ignorance of spiritual matters which is characteristic of the fleshly mind, than the views which mankind in general cherish and express respecting sin. The common notion is,—and upon this principle all our popular religious works are constructed,—that men have, or at all events may have, conceptions of sin before believing in Christ ; that such conceptions have a spiritual origin ; and that they generally issue in the sinner's being *thereby* brought to the knowledge of Christ. Now every one of these views is

erroneous. Sanctioned by the highest names in theological literature unquestionably they are, but they all stand condemned by the Holy Ghost. For, 1st. before being enabled to perceive what sin really is, in the light of the Son of God the Creator requiring to die, and actually dying, in order to take it away,—my only notion of evil,—the only notion of evil, indeed, which by any possibility I can have,—is of something which is calculated to do a serious injury to myself, and others who are mere creatures like myself. That is, naturally my only standard of evil is the injuries and sufferings which, in consequence of the commission of it, mere creatures are made to undergo.—This, however, is not to have a real apprehension of sin. To conceive of it as what it really is, I must behold it as displeasing to God, not as injuring the mere creature.—Now it is only in the cross of Christ that the nature and extent of the divine displeasure against sin become visible: seeing that there only do I behold “the heel of the woman’s seed bruised,” in the act of atoning for sin; that is, there only do I perceive that sin could not have been expiated and removed, except at the expense of the sacrifice or destruction of the earthly life of the Creator himself. Formerly I conceived of sin as only injuring the creature; now I perceive that in order to its everlasting extinction, the Creator himself, in his fleshly manifestation, behoved to undergo injury. Thus does it appear, that the only standard of the nature and enormity of sin, and consequently the only means by which we can form any conception of its real character, is the injury which, through the medium of his sufferings and death, it inflicted on the Creator, or the price which he voluntarily paid to take it away. 2dly. It is not true, that the notions of evil and of its consequences which, previous to conversion, the mind of man is capable of attaining to, are of a spiritual nature. So far from this, they are merely results of the fleshly or

soulical mind alarmed at, and, under the influence of its native selfishness of constitution, shrinking back from, the endurance of personal sufferings. As connected with and resulting from *natural conscience*, or *the shadow* of the mind of God in the mind of man, such notions, no doubt, constitute *shadows* of *spiritual* views: but they are not *spiritual* views themselves. 3. Those views of evil which the mere fleshly mind is capable of adopting, do not of themselves in any case lead to Christ Jesus; that is, they never of themselves lead the individual by whom they are experienced, to rejoice in that divine righteousness which Jesus the Creator finished on Calvary, as his own personal righteousness: but, on the contrary, always and necessarily constrain him, in one way or another, to attempt, either by abstinence from evil or by the doing of what he fancies to be good, to work out and establish a righteousness of his own. Spiritual views of sin imply views of the righteousness and life of God manifest in flesh, as my righteousness and my life, having been conferred upon me from above, in opposition to the tendencies of my fleshly mind; and, consequently, views of creature sin and creature righteousness, as being alike excluded from all concern in the matter of salvation: but the views of sin which the fleshly mind regards as spiritual, are merely views of evil as something which, although if persevered in hurtful to the creature, may nevertheless by means of expedients, devised and practised by myself, be got rid of; and, consequently, involve in them the notion that I, a creature, must, in some way or other, be my own saviour.

Understanding the remarks which I have just made, you cannot fail to perceive, that, previous to the manifestation from above to any individual of Jesus as *having died the just for the unjust*, and as having thereby *taken away sin* from himself;—and no manifestation short of this

is a *spiritual* one ;—the notions entertained by him respecting evil are natural, fleshly, and selfish ; calculated merely to foster human pride, and to stimulate human efforts for salvation : these very circumstances shewing such notions to be essentially distinct from, and decidedly opposed to, the views which enter into the mind, when to it is vouchsafed a discovery of what sin is, in the light of the sufferings and death which were endured by the Creator for the purpose of *putting sin away*.

B. According to your view of matters, I observe that the knowledge of personal interest in Christ is connected with, I should rather say, is necessarily implied and involved in, the belief of the gospel. To have the knowledge of sin taken away by Christ's atoning sacrifice is, if you are correct, not merely to have an apprehension, for the first time, of what sin is, as that which God hateth ; but also to have the conscience personally purged from a sense of guilt.

T. So completely is this the case, that a profession of having had the conscience personally purged, as the first and necessary effect of the sacrifice and resurrection of Christ revealed to it,—the profession being made in sincerity and truth,—constitutes the grand, the only, test by which the members of the spiritual Israel are enabled to recognise one another. *Christ is the propitiation for our sins : and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.* 1 John ii. 2. *This WE KNOW, that when he shall appear, we shall be like him ; for we shall see him as he is.* 1 John iii. 2. *WE KNOW that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.* 2 Corinth. v. 1. Such are a few specimens of the language common to the apostles with all who are partakers with them of *like precious faith, through the righteousness of God, and OUR Saviour, Jesus Christ.* 2 Peter i. 1.

B. By following out the principles which you have already laid down, I think that I may almost hope to form a pretty tolerable guess as to some other sentiments of yours respecting eternal torments.

T. What sentiments do you allude to ?

B. I will explain myself.

Eternal torments, if I understand the import of your premises, cannot, you conceive, be maintained consistently with the declarations of scripture :—1st, because the grandest conceivable and possible display of God's abhorrence of sin has been afforded in the sufferings and death of *Jesus the Creator* : whereas the doctrine of eternal torments implies, that a still greater display of the hatred of God towards evil is capable of being, and remains to be, afforded in the sufferings of *mere creatures*. It appearing to you, that the glory of the cross of Christ, as exhibiting *sin taken away* by the sufferings and death of *the Creator* alone, would be obscured, nay, *made of none effect*, if, notwithstanding its complete triumph over sin, there remained any necessity for, or even possibility of, eternal *creature* sufferings.—To the same objection, the systems of *temporary and limited sufferings hereafter* advocated by Chauncy, Winchester, Stonehouse, Douglas, and others, are obnoxious : seeing that they all imply the necessity and possibility of some farther and greater display of the divine vengeance against transgression, than what was afforded in the cross of the Lord Jesus.—2dly. Because as God hates sin with a perfect hatred, this hatred must, from the circumstance of his possessing infinite wisdom and power, terminate in its ultimate and complete destruction ; as the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus clearly intimate to us it has done : whereas the doctrine of eternal torments implies that God, instead of destroying, *bestows everlasting existence upon that which confessedly his soul hateth*. Strange to think ! that many who profess to

cherish the greatest loathing and disgust at the bare idea of God having been, in any way whatever, the cause of sin *temporarily entering*, can nevertheless gloat with the utmost intensity of delight over the prospect of God's *perpetuating sin to eternity!* Truly this is *to strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel.*—The only way in which popular religionists can evade the force of the present argument, is by plunging headlong into Manicheanism, and asserting, that *sin having once acquired an existence in the universe, it is beyond the power of even God himself to bring it to an end!*—3dly. Because God overcomes evil with good; or takes revenge on evil by overwhelming it with, and swallowing it up in, the infinite goodness of his own divine nature; as is obvious in the resurrection, as connected with the death, of the Lord Jesus: whereas the doctrine of eternal torments implies, that the goodness of the Creator is so completely overcome by the evil of the creature, as to necessitate the Creator, if he would exhibit his displeasure towards the creature at all, to indulge in a low, brutal, vulgar, unfeeling, impotent, human revenge! Is this consistent with the language of him whose words, when expostulating with the nation of the Jews, are, *my thoughts are not as your thoughts, nor my ways as your ways:* and, who addressing the members of his church, hath said, *Love your enemies; bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you: that ye may be, or may show yourselves to be, the children of your father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust?* Matthew v. 44. 45.

T. To what you have so correctly stated, Robert, you might have added, as still further developing my views in reference to this subject, that God having declared the object of the Lord Jesus in dying to have been *to put*

away sin by the sacrifice of himself, we impeach his veracity when we assert that, in the case of the eternally tormented, sin remains *unput away for ever!*—that God having declared that his Son *was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil*, we impeach his veracity when we represent Jesus as raising certain human beings to sin and suffer for ever; and thereby as *confirming everlastingly*, not *destroying*, sin and suffering two of the Devil's works!—and when God declares that Jesus *puts under his feet, by destroying, every enemy, even death itself the last of them*, it is rather too much for us creatures to turn upon the glorious Creator, and impeach his veracity by roundly asserting that, so far from all the enemies of Jesus being put under his feet by being destroyed, he is actually contented to share his empire with sin and Satan, by conceding to them to reign, nay to triumph, over the greater portion of the human family for ever!

B. This is now abundantly clear to me. Still, however, the suspicion of the possibility of torments being inflicted by God for ever on a portion of the human race, will be found on examination to lurk in, and exercise an influence over, the minds of many who would not chuse openly to avow it.

T. No doubt. But I may now mention to you an argument which, to him who is gifted with a very moderate share of divine knowledge, and possessed of any capacity whatever for reflection, must be productive of an entire conviction, that the infliction of eternal torments upon man is an utter impossibility.

B. What is it?

T. A consideration of the only punishments which man, constituted as in the light of scripture we discover him to be, is capable of being subjected to and enduring. These are three in number:—1. He may be made to suffer and die, thereby undergoing loss; 2. he may be kept out of

enjoyments superior to those of time and sense ; and 3, his very nature itself may be destroyed.—You cannot point out to me a fourth.

B. Why, David, the existence of *a fourth* is the very subject matter in dispute. Our divines, as they call themselves, are fond of representing eternal torments as a species of punishment, additional to those kinds of it which you have just enumerated, to which man may be subjected.

T. Consider what, in maintaining the doctrine of eternal torments, such persons necessarily assert ; and nothing more will, I conceive, be requisite to enable you to see through their sophistry. They mean, if they mean any thing at all, that man *as such* is capable of being tormented for ever. Now unlimited torments, no human being, *as a man*, is capable in his present state of undergoing. This is a matter of fact. Therefore, if to these torments he who is *now* a man shall *hereafter* be subjected, it cannot be that *as a man* he shall undergo them. If endured by him at all, he must endure them as possessed not of *a temporary*, but of an *everlasting*, existence ; that is, as possessed of properties and attributes which, by qualifying him for the endurance of unlimited and eternal sufferings, must be essentially different from those which characterise human nature. In a word, in order to undergo eternal torments *he must cease to be a man*.

Do you understand me ?—That you may be enabled to do so, I will throw my statements into another form. Let me, for the sake of argument, admit, that he who is now *a man*, and *as such* is incapable of undergoing more than *limited torments*, shall nevertheless, in the event of his dying ignorant of the gospel, be *eternally tormented* hereafter. Why, what in that case follows ? This, certainly. That seeing he could not endure these sufferings *as a*

man,—man's capability both of physical and mental sufferings being limited,—it must be in some other nature and character than *as a man* he must endure them. That is, *as a man* he cannot endure them at all.—Do you not perceive that, by this simple, obvious, and conclusive reasoning, eternal torments are necessarily excluded from the catalogue of the punishments to which *man as such* may be subjected?

B. I perceive what you mean; and, am free to admit, that the distinction now laid down by you had never previously suggested itself to my mind.—As a man, or while he is a man, no human being, then, can be punished, except in the three different ways which you have spoken of.

T. In one, or other, or all of these ways:—He may be made to undergo loss, as well as to endure sufferings, in his body and in his mind; he may be deprived, or, rather, kept out of, enjoyments which are possessed by others; and his very nature may be destroyed.

B. State distinctly, and in as few words as possible, if agreeable to you, what it is that hinders the being who is thus capable of being punished upon earth, from being eternally tormented hereafter. I want to make myself completely master of your argument.

T. My proposition is just briefly this, that '*the being* who is supposed to be *eternally tormented* hereafter, cannot be *a human being*.' And the medium by which I prove it is, the admitted fact that man as such is capable of undergoing only *limited torments*.—From this I argue, that if you were to torment eternally one who is possessed of everlasting existence, you would punish, not a human being, but a being whose nature was essentially different! You would punish, not the nature by which sin had been committed and the punishment deserved, but *a nature which had nothing whatever to do with transgression!* That is, according to the precious system of eternal tor-

ments, the nature from which evil emanated, and by which punishment has been incurred, *escapes these torments altogether!*

B. This is evident.

T. Aye! and what is still more, the nature so tormented would be actually *the nature of the Lord Jesus himself!* For everlasting existence is the life, not of Adam, but of Christ.—Thus, by representing God as inflicting eternal torments on beings who are possessed of everlasting existence, *divines*, actually and blasphemously although ignorantly, represent God as torturing for ever the nature of his own well beloved Son!

B. But theologians make a distinction between *everlasting existence*, and *everlasting life*.

T. So they do. But where is that distinction to be met with in the word of God? Shew it me there, and I submit. Until then I conceive myself to be fully justified in rejecting it as the mere coinage and offspring of their own imaginations. Enough is it for me to know, taking scripture for my guide, that only two men,—and two intelligent natures, as connected with and communicated by these two men,—are there presented to our notice. The men are, Adam the man *of the earth, earthy*; and Jesus *the second man, the Lord from heaven*. 1 Corinth. xv. 47. And, agreeably to this distinction between the two men themselves, are the two natures which are set before us: human nature, as possessed and communicated by the one; and the divine nature, as possessed and communicated by the other. Verse 48. In strict conformity to which, those who are now possessed of, or *bear the image of the earthy*, are represented as hereafter being possessed of, or *bearing the image of the heavenly*. Verse 49.

So much for what, on investigating the subject as it lies before us in the sacred volume, we do discover. But neither in the 15th chapter of first Corinthians, nor elsewhere, can

I encounter the slightest trace of a third man : that is, of a man whose nature is neither that of Adam nor that of Christ, but a nature different from that of both. The existence of such a third man, and such a third nature, is indispensable to the possibility of eternal torments being endured. For we have seen, that neither Adam's nature, nor Christ's nature, is capable of being subjected to them. And if such a man and such a nature do exist, let them, in the scriptures—our *only* authority in matters of this kind—be pointed out. Till this can be done, however,—and I suspect it must be postponed till the *Greek Kalends*,—as the existence of the third man and the third nature is a gratuitous assumption—a mere hypothesis—a perfect chimaera of the human brain—it is sufficient for me, and for all who with me love pure, unsophisticated, and unadulterated divine truth, to reject it.

He who asserts, that a man may undergo eternal torments ; and yet finds himself constrained to admit, that it is a being possessed of everlasting existence, and of physical attributes and properties essentially different from those of man, who is eternally tormented : as, on the one hand, he contradicts and thereby refutes himself, by maintaining, in the same breath, that it is *a man* and that it is *not a man* who is thus tormented ; so, on the other, he becomes indirectly an unwilling witness to the truth of the grand position laid down by me, namely, that the subjection of *man*, constituted as he is, to eternal torments, is an arrant impossibility.

B. By the way, it just occurs to me, that the following argument is closely connected with, if not actually involved in, that which you are now prosecuting. The argument is, that no being can ever deserve to undergo a more severe punishment, than the nature itself of which he is possessed deserves to be subjected to.—One point of coincidence between your sentiments, and those of your anta-

gonists, is very curious. Whether I adopt your views or theirs, I arrive at the same conclusion with regard to the fate of human nature : for, strange to tell ! I find you both agreed in maintaining, that *the nature of man has no existence beyond this present life !* You both, I perceive, hold that human nature is destroyed.—There is no doubt a difference subsisting between you with respect to the manner of its destruction. You allege, that this result takes place in consequence of its being swallowed up in the divine nature of Christ : while they, by representing the beings who are tormented eternally to be possessed of everlasting existence, hold, if they have any meaning at all, that human nature, in the case of the unregenerate, is swallowed up in *some third nature*, distinct both from the nature of Adam and from that of Christ ; with scriptural grounds for believing in which, however, they have never yet had the goodness to furnish us.—Still it is an important fact, that, whatever may be the differences existing between yourself and your opponents as to the manner of the *euthanasia* of human nature, you are both thus far agreed, that the nature of Adam does not survive this present life : it being obvious to you both, that in one way or another, either as swallowed up in the nature of the Lord Jesus the second man, or as swallowed up in the nature of some third man yet to be discovered, the nature of Adam the first man is destroyed.

Assuming the destruction of human nature, then, as a settled point on both sides, the important question occurs : how, consistently with justice, can a severer punishment be inflicted on the being who is possessed of human nature, than is inflicted confessedly on the nature itself ? The highest punishment of which the nature itself is susceptible is, it appears, its destruction. Now as every being must act under the influence of the nature which he has, and not under the influence of a nature which he has

not ; and as the nature of man is possessed by him not willingly,—not in consequence of any previous volition of his,—but in consequence of his having been, without any consent of his own, subjected to it ; how, as God is just, can he who in committing evil acts under the influence of the only nature which he has, and of a nature, too, of which he has been a mere passive recipient, be more severely punished than that nature itself is ? How can human conduct which is a mere effect, be visited with more severe punishment than is inflicted on human nature itself the cause, the necessary cause, of all such conduct ?

Until it can be satisfactorily shewn to me, that a being, upon whose nature as essentially sinful and worthless the most ample vengeance has been taken in the utter destruction of it, may nevertheless be so distinguished from his nature, as himself to remain the subject of the most excruciating agonies for evermore ; and until it can be satisfactorily shewn to me, likewise, that evil in its *effects* can with justice be more severely punished than evil in its *cause* ; I must be allowed to cherish the conviction, that the destruction or swallowing up of man's fleshly nature, —a point with regard to which, in one way or another, all parties seem to be agreed,—being the greatest punishment to which that fleshly nature itself can be subjected, must be also the greatest extent to which, by any possibility, the punishment of the being who is endowed with that nature can be carried out.

T. Conclusively argued, my dear Robert. And, perhaps, I cannot do better than follow up what you have stated by observing, that, not only in the *indirect* way which you have adopted, but by every conceivable species of *direct* scriptural evidence, is death, or rather the destruction of the Adamic nature, proved to be the highest penalty to which man as such is capable of being subjected.—It appears by the terms of the original sentence itself,

pronounced on occasion of man's transgression: in which, so far from its being said, that death is to be followed and consummated by sufferings, it is expressly declared, that sufferings are to be followed and consummated by death. *Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life.—In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.* Gen. iii. 17. 19.

It appears from the contrast between the extent of the reign of sin, and that of the reign of grace, instituted by the apostle Paul in the 5th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans: *That as sin hath reigned UNTO DEATH, even so might grace reign through righteousness UNTO ETERNAL LIFE, by Jesus Christ our Lord:* Verse 21 :* and from the language of the same apostle, in the 15th chapter of his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians; in which he expressly denominates *death, the LAST enemy; and speaks of it as being destroyed.* Verse 26. Now if *death* be the extreme boundary of *sin's reign*: and if *death* be the *last enemy* whom man has to encounter; what room, what possibility, is there of its being succeeded by eternal torments?

And, lastly, it appears with the strongest of all conceivable evidence in the light of the fact, that certain human beings are, by the admission of all, partakers of life everlasting, This argument is perfectly invincible.

* *Sin hath reigned unto death.* Rom. v. 21. Not the death of Adam, the creature, and of Adam's natural posterity, as is commonly but erroneously supposed; but the death of the Lord Jesus, the Creator. The death of the Lord Jesus, and not that of the creature, being the utmost extent and boundary, the *ultima Thule*, of sin's reign: and in the death of our blessed Lord, sin and death being so swallowed up and brought to an end, that sin's reign can by no possibility extend further; being immediately and necessarily merged in, and superseded by, that reign of grace through righteousness unto eternal life, to which it has been all along and solely subservient. How dare any man, professing to believe in the supreme divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, think or say, and that, too, in the teeth of language so clear and explicit as the foregoing, that sin can prolong its reign beyond the death of the Creator manifest in flesh?

Had the penalty of sin reached beyond death, or rather beyond the destruction of the Adamic nature, the salvation of a single member of the human family would have been an impossibility. "Eternal sufferings," say popular religionists, "was the import of the original threatening, to take effect in the event of the transgression being committed." Well, be it so. And then, mark the consequence. The truth of God requires the exact and complete execution of what he has threatened: his veracity being no less concerned in the execution of his threatenings, than in the fulfilment of his promises. *Let God be true, although every man should be a liar.* If eternal torments were threatened to mankind as a whole, as such persons allege, they must then be inflicted on mankind as a whole. There can be no escape for any one. God's truth cannot be compromised; and the sufferings being by the terms of the supposition *infinite*, cannot by any possibility be *brought to an end*. By all, as one with Adam the transgressor, eternal torments having been incurred; upon all, as one with him, eternal torments must be inflicted.—"But, the work of Christ."—True; what of that?—"By it, sin has been taken away from the people of God; and their admission into the heavenly regions rendered practicable."—What! has God by saving *any* against whom he had denounced eternal torments, made himself *a liar*? Has even God been able to bring that which is *infinite* to an *end*?—Ah! the system will not answer. It is thoroughly rotten. It blows hot and cold with the same breath. It first makes God to threaten eternal torments; and then it attacks his veracity by representing him as not inflicting them. This cannot be. By admitting that *any* guilty creatures inherit eternal life, popular religionists give a death blow to their own system. Nay, they are constrained by the irresistible force of scripture evidence to admit the truth of a fact which, besides

overturning their theory, opens up a door to the ultimate salvation of all. For an enlightened believer is enabled to remove every difficulty, as well as to explain the whole, by shewing, that death, or rather that the destruction of the Adamic nature which took place in the cross of Christ, having been the full import of the threatening to man, and constituting the utmost extent of sin's reign over him; the resurrection of the Lord Jesus from the dead, which ensures the resurrection of his believing people, is also the event in which sin and death, and all their consequences, are to the whole human family swallowed up for evermore.

B. You mean to say briefly that, according to scripture, sin did not acquire a temporary existence and reign through Adam's one transgression, in order that through Christ's one righteousness it might acquire everlasting existence, and might exercise an everlasting dominion over a large portion of the human family, as is the import of all popular notions respecting the subject; but that sin was permitted to acquire and exercise a temporary existence and reign, in subserviency to that everlasting existence and reign of grace through the righteousness of the Messiah, by means of which the existence and reign of sin unto death, and all the melancholy consequences thereof, are completely and for ever superseded and swallowed up. In other words, sin's reign *unto death* is, not the *rival* of grace's reign unto *eternal life*, but *its servant*. The existence of the former having been requisite, in order to the introduction of the latter; but the latter, in the very fact of its introduction and reign, obliterating, swallowing up, and destroying the former. Thus, instead of the Manichean notion that sin and grace are, in their respective reigns, *eternal rivals*, as the fleshly mind of man, when intermeddling with religious topics, absurdly and unscripturally supposes; your meaning is, that sin in its

reign unto death is merely paving the way, and serving as a pedestal, for the reign of grace, sin's glorious and triumphant destroyer.

T. Such is precisely my meaning.

B. So far well.—But to proceed to other matters. Rejecting as you do eternal torments, is it true, nevertheless, that you hold the doctrine of eternal punishment?

T. Yes, surely.

B. In so doing, is it your intention to dispute the correctness of the interpretation which has been put upon the Hebrew and Greek words commonly translated *eternal* and *everlasting*, by Winchester and others who have adopted the original Universalist view of the subject?

T. By no means. Jeremiah White, in his admirable work on *Universal Salvation*; and, since his time, George Stonehouse, Elbanan Winchester, Neil Douglas, and many more; have rendered good service to the cause of truth, by drawing the attention of religious professors to the real and scriptural meaning of the nouns *עולם* and *αιων*, and of the adjectives derived from them: these eminent writers having clearly and satisfactorily proved, that such words have originally and literally a reference to duration as marked by stages, periods, or æras, and not to eternity properly so called. But useful as their labours have been, I cannot help objecting to them, that they have made too much of the critical argument;—that they have, in their anxiety to press it continually into the service, rendered it occasionally ridiculous;—and that, as in the case of the last verse of the 25th chapter of Matthew, they have sometimes had recourse to quibbling expedients, instead of meeting the assaults of the popular party manfully, ingeniously, and scripturally.

B. How would you deal with the declaration, *These shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal?* Matthew xxv. 46.

T. By at once and unreservedly admitting that, as it is the same Greek word *αιωνιος*, *eternal*, which occurs in both clauses of the sentence, therefore, whatever is the meaning of the term when applied to the life of the righteous, the same meaning it must have when applied to the punishment of the wicked. The duration is in both cases the same. But because I admit this, it by no means follows, that I oblige myself to adopt the ordinary fleshly interpretation which has been put upon the passage.—It is true, that if the eternal punishment be understood to be punishment limited in its duration, so also must be the life. And if the life be eternal, understanding the word eternal in an unlimited sense, so also must be the punishment. For I cannot bear having recourse to the usual practice of understanding the word *eternal* to have in itself an *unlimited* signification as employed in one clause of the sentence, and a *limited* one as employed in the other.—This concession, however, although made in the most distinct and unequivocal manner, is not in the slightest degree favourable to the popular theory, as a few remarks, explanatory of my meaning, may suffice to shew.

The interpretation of this passage depends entirely on the sense which we attach to the word *αιωνιος*.—If it signify duration as measured by æras or successive periods, then the reign of the righteous or spiritual Israel must last as long as, but no longer than, the punishment of the wicked or unregenerate portion of the human family lasts. That is, as during the whole of the period or periods thus capable of being measured by succession, Christ as the spiritual Abraham, and his church as the spiritual Israel, are reigning together in the spiritual Canaan; from all the enjoyments connected with this peculiar and preliminary state of things, and that during the whole period of its continuance, the rest of mankind, as under punishment, are necessarily and completely excluded.—If, how-

ever, *αιωνιος* is to be understood as signifying *eternal*, in the common acceptation of the term ; that is, as having a sense which is absolute and exclusive of progressive duration ; then must the punishment which attaches to the wicked, or Adam's posterity, be of endless duration, just as the life of the righteous, or Christ's posterity, is of endless duration likewise. But we have already seen, that the highest punishment of which man, or human nature itself considered as a whole, is susceptible, is its final and everlasting destruction. And we have also seen, that the whole family of man who, as possessed of human nature, are represented as *originally* one with Adam, the wicked ; are, as made new,—according to the gracious and blessed declaration, *Behold ! I make all things new !* either in time, or when time shall be no more,—represented as *ultimately* one with Jesus Christ, the righteous. Here, then, we have the key to *αιωνιος*, everlasting, understood in an unlimited sense, and as equally applicable to the punishment of the wicked, and the life of the righteous. The wicked, or Adam's posterity as such, are subjected to a punishment of endless duration, by being deprived of human nature for ever ; and by having that nature, that is, by having themselves, swallowed up in the divine nature of Christ : and the very means by which the everlasting destruction, or everlasting punishment, of their wicked nature, and of themselves as wicked creatures, is effected, being by their having their Adamic nature swallowed up in the divine nature of Christ ; of course the everlasting punishment of human beings, as Adam's posterity, or the wicked ; and the everlasting life of the same beings, as changed into Christ's posterity, or the righteous ; are results gloriously, necessarily, and inseparably connected together, in the divine purpose, the declarations of holy writ, and the experience of redeemed creatures.

Opponents are welcome to adopt whichever side of the

alternative they please. They may understand *αιωνιος* of itself to signify *limited duration*; or they may interpret it as denoting *that* which by its very nature is *unlimited*. But they cannot be permitted to *play fast and loose* with the passage. Whatever sense they ascribe to it in the one clause, that same sense they must abide by in the other. If, with Winchester and his followers, they say, that the word here, properly speaking, is expressive of duration as capable of being measured by *æras* or periods, that is, that here it has a *limited* sense; well: then, as, in that case, the intermediate period of the Messiah's *reign before his ancients gloriously*, is the subject referred to in the latter part of the verse; of course the complete and necessary exclusion from all the enjoyments, privileges, and blessings of this reign, and that during the whole period of its existence, of the unregenerate portion of the human family, is what is implied in the punishment threatened in the former part of it. But if with Calvin, Arminius, Wesley, and others, they prefer maintaining that the word eternal is here to be understood in a *full* and *unlimited* sense; then, as the endless punishment inflicted must be consistent with the nature of man as a creature and shadow—with the word of God which denounces against the wicked *everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord*—and with the atonement of Christ, as *the destroyer of the works of the Devil, and the swallower up of death, the last enemy, in victory*—it follows that, if this sense of the term be adopted, the eternal punishment of the wicked, or Adam's posterity, must be the eternal absorption of themselves, and their sinful and mortal nature, in the righteous, immortal, and life-communicating nature of the Son of God.—“Take your choice gentlemen. One, or other, or both of these significations of the words *eternal*, if you please. But it will be impossible for you, with the utmost stretch of human ingenuity, whether you adopt the one or

the other, to drag in the doctrine of future torments. *The legs of the lame are unequal*: but God's ways and manifestations of himself are equal."

B. So, then, I am to understand you as maintaining that a fate of equal duration awaits the righteous and the wicked?

T. Most decidedly. And yet, this merely in so far as the adjective *αιωνιος*, *æonian*, applied to the life of the one and the punishment of the other, is concerned. For after the *eternal* or *æonian character* of both has been ascertained to be the same, the *nature* of the life, and *that* of the punishment, still remain to be considered. This latter point falls to be determined, not by the attribute or quality which is ascribed in common to both; but by the respective natures, and consequent capabilities, of the righteous and the wicked themselves. Now the distinction between their respective natures is obvious. Wickedness is an affection of the creature; righteousness, of the Creator. The wicked, therefore, are beings necessarily possessed of a creature nature; the righteous, with equal necessity, possess the divine nature. What follows from these self-evident premises? Why this: that the wicked, by being descendants of Adam the creature, and by possessing only his nature in this present life, can only be punished *positively* in this present life; and that any punishment of theirs which runs beyond time, must be of a *negative* kind, that is, must consist of one or other of these two things, *exclusion*, or *destruction*, or both. Whereas the righteous, being partakers of the divine nature, are only susceptible of *positive* privileges, or must live for evermore.—And yet the punishment which is *negative*, and the life which is *positive*, are both of equal duration: for, passing over the *negative* punishment of *exclusion* to which a remark similar to that which I am about to make is applicable, the highest *negative* punish-

ment of which the wicked, or the creature Adam's posterity, are susceptible, being their *destruction*; and this destruction taking place, through the medium of this wicked or creature nature being swallowed up in *the divine nature* of the second Adam, the Lord Messiah; it follows, that the conferring of *eternal life* upon all, by the making of them to be righteous, or possessors of the divine nature, is, by that complete absorption of the *wicked* in the *righteous* nature which is implied in the fact, the infliction and sealing down of *eternal destruction*, and thereby of *eternal punishment*, upon the *wicked* or *creature* nature of man, and upon all human beings as originally possessed of that nature.

B. The punishment of the wicked, that is, of Adam's descendants as such, is, then, eternal—understanding the word *eternal* in its highest and unqualified sense?

T. It is. But their eternal punishment is not confined to their eternal destruction. They are punished eternally in more respects than this.

B. What say you? Other kinds of eternal punishment! I cannot now conceive of any, except of eternal destruction.

T. This arises from your not having understood my answer to your question respecting the sense of Matthew xxv. 46; as well as from there being views of the subject which have not hitherto “been dreamt of in your philosophy.”—The fact is, that God punishes eternally the descendants of Adam as such after three different fashions. In other words, there are three different ways in which he inflicts a punishment upon them which, as being incapable of alteration end or repeal, is thereby necessarily eternal.

B. Have the kindness to enumerate them.

T. There is, first of all, the punishment inflicted upon our natural head, and through him upon us, of sufferings and death; connected with and implying deprivation of the

garden of Eden, and all its enjoyments. This is a punishment attaching, not to one or to a few, but to all the human family, including even the Son of God himself; who came into the world subject to sufferings, condemned to die, and shut out from the earthly paradise. And it is a punishment which shall never cease to be inflicted while a single human being remains, and which shall be inflicted to the very uttermost: not only the mass of mankind, but even Christ and his Church having no admission, and never being able to obtain admission, into the enjoyment of the natural and earthly privileges which by the first Adam were forfeited. The loss of these, as the punishment of the one transgression, was eternal and irreversible. Against all, without exception, the gates of Eden are barred for ever. And thus "Paradise regained," in the sense of the earthly paradise being recovered, is a perfect absurdity as well as an utter impossibility. The punishment of deprivation of the earthly paradise, and all the sufferings which are connected therewith and consequent thereon, shall continue to be endured by man until the human race shall be no more. We discover in this fact one species of eternal punishment; or of a penalty which is irremediably exacted from all, and exacted for ever.

Secondly. The wicked, or the descendants of Adam as such, are eternally punished, by being eternally excluded from the kingdom of Christ and of God. That is, the same human nature which forfeited eternally the state of creature purity, and other fleshly advantages, which it enjoyed previous to the transgression of Adam; hath also, through the medium of another transgression of which we are immediately to speak, shewn itself to be unworthy, utterly and eternally unworthy, of rising to the enjoyment of a higher and heavenly state. Flesh and blood, or human nature, was no more able to acquire what was *superior*, than it had shewn itself qualified to retain

what was *inferior*. Nay, as it could not preserve the vantage ground which it originally occupied in the garden of Eden; so, having lost that, *much less* was it capable of rising to the inheritance of *glory, honour, and immortality*.—This exclusion is complete.—It attached to our blessed Lord. With *flesh and blood*, even he could not enter into his own kingdom. For *flesh and blood cannot*, under any circumstances, *inherit the kingdom of God*. Therefore, before ascending to his throne, the Lord Jesus behoved to sacrifice his *flesh and blood* nature; and to rise from the dead with *that nature* swallowed up in *his own divine nature*.—It attaches to Christ's people. With flesh and blood, or human nature, they do not enter into his kingdom. For, *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*. Therefore, not as human beings or as possessed of human nature, but as *begotten again of the incorruptible seed of the word*, and as thereby *partakers of the earnest of the divine nature*, are believers elevated to his throne by their blessed Lord.—Thus, then, is any man a partaker of human nature merely; and does he become possessed of the earnest of nothing higher during his earthly career? Such an one can never enter into the heavenly kingdom. For human beings as such, that is, as the wicked, having shewn themselves to be unfit for retaining this present life, must still less have any meetness for, and any capacity of being introduced into, *the inheritance of the saints in light*.—But, not only so, the wicked, or human beings as such, have incurred exclusion from the heavenly kingdom as a punishment. That kingdom was, as I shewed you in a former conversation, to come to believers or the New Testament Israel, through the instrumentality of the Jews or Old Testament Israel. But as the transgression of one man, was made the means of forfeiting for all human beings the original possession of the earthly paradise; so was the hostility to God evinced by one nation,

made the means of excluding the whole human family, or rather human nature as such, from the enjoyment of the heavenly inheritance. And yet, as the transgression of one man was overruled to be the means of bringing salvation to mankind as a whole ; so has the enmity to God of the Jewish nation been overruled to be the means of communicating the knowledge of the gospel to, and thereby of conferring the earnest of the divine nature upon, that small number of human beings to whom the privilege of *being kings and priests* with their divine head is destined. While, thus, by *being born again from above*, the possession and enjoyment of Christ's kingdom are bestowed on a few of the human family ; and while the opening to their enjoyment of this their peculiar and glorious privilege has been created by the rejection of Christ and his gospel by the Jews ; we are to bear in mind, that it is through the medium of this very misconduct of the Jews, that a sentence of eternal punishment, by means of their eternal exclusion from Christ's heavenly kingdom, hath gone forth against, and shall be executed upon, all who live and die possessed of the principles of human nature merely.

The third and last species of eternal punishment, is that which shall be inflicted on all human beings as the wicked, in the shape of the eternal and irremediable destruction of themselves as Adam's descendants, and thereby of the very nature which they originally possess. Human nature was unworthy to retain its primitive state of purity and happiness ;—it is still less worthy of being introduced into a higher state of existence ;—nay, it is worthy only to be destroyed. It is fit fuel for the devouring flame of divine wrath. Having been created only for a time and for temporary purposes ; and having, as a medium of divine manifestation, accomplished all the ends of its creation ; it is finally and for ever consumed. This is the acmé or climax of the punishment to which it is subjected.—Our

fleshly nature manifested hostility to God, in the person of Adam : for which it has been punished by the everlasting forfeiture of the earthly paradise. It manifested still greater hostility to God, in the persons of the Jews, when *they crucified the Lord of Glory*, and rejected the message of peace and reconciliation which was proclaimed by apostles and evangelists : for which it is punished with everlasting exclusion from the heavenly kingdom. And it is destined to manifest, at the close of time, the greatest conceivable and possible hostility to God, in a united attempt on the part of all, both Jews and Gentiles, (except the few enlightened from above,) to subvert and efface the very existence of Christ's name and cause from the earth, by means of human science and natural religion : for which, *Christ having made his appearance the second time*, shall *punish* human beings as such, and their nature as having shewn itself to be thoroughly, rootedly, and incorrigibly wicked, by *everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*. 1 Thessal. i. 9. This will constitute the eternal punishment of Adam's posterity, and of Adam's nature, in the highest sense of which the phrase *eternal punishment* is susceptible ; as it will involve the final, and complete, and everlasting extinction from the face of the universe of that wicked and rebellious nature, which has, in every step and period of its existence, manifested itself to be *enmity against God* : to be *neither subject to his law, nor, indeed, able to be so*. Rom. viii. 7.

B. I clearly perceive your meaning, and so far acquiesce in the sentiments which you have expressed. There is, indeed, I am satisfied, a series of eternal punishments to which human beings as the wicked are subjected : rising in order one above another like a climax ; until at last the whole is crowned and surmounted by the everlasting destruction, or ultimate sweeping away, of the

guilty race. How simple, how perspicuous, how satisfactory, the whole statement !

Although this view of matters, I now remember, has already, in several different forms, been brought by you under my notice, or at all events suggested by you, I never on any previous occasion was so struck, as I have been on the present, by the fact, that all the punishments which you have enumerated agree in the one grand feature of their being irrevocable and consequently eternal. None of them has been, none of them can be, reversed. The punishment of the forfeiture of the earthly paradise is, I perceive, eternal : for, from access and restoration to that paradise, Adam and his descendants have by the flaming sword ever since been debarred. The punishment of exclusion from the heavenly kingdom is, I perceive, eternal : for, into it no mere partaker of human nature is or can be admitted ; entrance into it being conceded to none, except to those who *are born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed*, and to whom, consequently, has been imparted by faith the earnest of the resurrection nature of the Son of God. And the punishment of destruction is *a fortiori*, I perceive, eternal : for the nature thus destroyed neither exists, nor can by any possibility exist, thereafter ; being swallowed up everlastingly in the heavenly, divine, and completely triumphant nature of the Lord of glory.

T. Perhaps you have not yet noticed the remarkable connection subsisting between these three kinds of eternal punishment, and the fact formerly hinted at by me, that human beings as such are capable of being punished only in three different ways. They may suffer loss—they may undergo privation—and their present earthly nature may be destroyed. Now mark how all this tallies with the positions which have just been laid down. As expelled from the earthly paradise and its comforts, men have in-

curred loss ;—as excluded from the kingdom of Christ, by their unbelief and opposition to his glorious gospel, and as thus continuing destitute while human beings of more than human principles, the majority of mankind experience privation ;—and as dying, never again to live as human beings, destruction, the highest punishment of which their nature is susceptible, is inflicted on them. Thus the three *capabilities* of punishment, and the three *kinds* of punishment actually inflicted on human beings, exactly coincide.

B. Well but, David, how do you reconcile the exclusion from the heavenly kingdom of those who possess human nature merely while on earth, with the fact of their being ultimately saved ? Is there not something like inconsistency here ?

T. There would be inconsistency stamped on the very forehead of my views unquestionably, were I to allege, that human beings, although *excluded from* Christ's kingdom, are nevertheless *admitted into* that kingdom. But I allege no such thing.

B. This denial of yours again puzzles me. Do explain yourself.

T. Cheerfully, my dear brother. Attend to the following facts ; and, by so doing, it is to be hoped that difficulties will vanish, and the whole subject become plain and satisfactory to you.

1. Into the kingdom of God, no person whatever, no, not even the Lord Jesus, enters as a human being. Our Head entered into it by sacrificing his flesh and blood nature ; and believers are introduced into it, not as partakers of human nature, but as having had imparted to them by faith the earnest of the divine nature.

2. Into the kingdom of God, the unregenerate portion of the human race never enter at all. They have no admission into it in any capacity whatever, either as be-

lievers, or as unbelievers. And the reasons are obvious :—The kingdom of Christ, is the kingdom or reign of the divine nature. Now, of this nature, Christ and his church alone are possessed.—Again. The kingdom of Christ as such, that is, as the kingdom of the spiritual Abraham, is destined to come to an end or expire. 1 Corinth. xv. 24. And this, because his character as the spiritual Abraham, is to be merged in his still higher character as the spiritual Adam. Ibid : 28th *compared with* 22d. The object of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus, as the Christ or spiritual Abraham, is the ultimate and complete subjugation to himself of the wicked, or unregenerate portion of the human family. When this is accomplished, his kingdom expires. *See the same verse.* The last act of it is the resurrection of the unregenerate. John v. 28. 29; *compared with* Rev. xx. 5. Now as, in raising them, his kingdom comes to an end, how can they enter into that which has no longer any existence? In the very act of raising them, the kingdom is no more. By what possibility, then, can they be introduced into it?—Still farther. To enter into, or become possessed of a kingdom, is to reign or have subjects. Now, the royal dignity, Christ and his church as one with him possess. He *sits as king on high*; and he concedes to the members of his believing family to be *kings*, as well as *priests*, along *with* him. Rev : i. 6. They enter into his kingdom, and *sit down with him upon his throne.* Ibid : iii. 21. And over the unregenerate portion of mankind, as well as over all things besides, this reign or kingdom of the spiritual Head and his members extends. Thus, while the kingdom in question lasts, the unregenerate are not kings, but a part of what *is put under the feet* of the *King of Zion.* And when the object of the kingdom to which Christ and his church are elevated shall have been accomplished, in the subjugation of the unregenerate, as their own king-

dom then necessarily comes to an end, by there remaining none for them to reign over; so the others can never enter into the reign or kingdom at all, on the same principle of there then existing none over whom, as subjected to them, they might exercise their sway. When, as at *the consummation of all things*, there are *no subjects*, there can of course be *no kings*.—Taking all these facts together, then, it appears, that from the kingdom of Christ the unregenerate are, not for a time or for any limited period, but for ever excluded. They have not the divine nature, or overcoming principle, now; 1 John v. 4. 5; therefore, they cannot reign:—they are not saved until the expiring of Christ's kingdom; 1 Corinth: xv. 23—28; Rev. xx. 5; therefore, it is impossible for them to gain admission into it: John iii. 3:—and they are saved, not by reigning, but by being reigned over; not as kings, but as subjects; and, when saved, as none remain for them to reign over, all being then *put under the feet* of the Messiah; 1 Corinth: xv. 28, *compared with* Psalm viii. *throughout*; it is plain, that they never have the opportunity of being invested with the kingly dignity at all.—Shall I express myself in a more intelligible manner, if I say briefly, that of the peculiar salvation which is enjoyed by the people of Christ, and which consists in an introduction by him into his kingdom, the unbelieving portion of the human race, as *not born from above*, never participate? And, when at last the salvation which was finished on the cross is carried into effect in their case likewise, it is not by their being introduced into the kingdom of Christ or made to reign with him, but by their becoming the subjects of his kingdom, that this takes place: they being saved, not by *sitting down with Christ upon his throne*, and partaking with him of the kingly and priestly characters, a privilege which he hath reserved to those *who are called, and chosen, and faithful*; but by being, as the

subjects of sovereign and efficacious grace, reigned over for evermore.

B. I now understand you, and have to express my entire and unqualified acquiescence in your statements; because I perceive that they exactly tally with the language and reasonings of the apostle Paul, in that passage of the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians to which you have been referring. I mean, the part which runs from the 22d to the 28th verses, inclusive. Christ himself is raised first;—then we have the resurrection of those *that are Christ's, at his coming*;—and, lastly, the subjugation, by means of the resurrection, of the rest of mankind, is clearly the import of the latter part of the passage, as well as the order of procedure of the heavenly triumph. And a wonderful correspondency, I now observe, there is,—as you have shewn in the second volume of your *Assurance of Faith*,—between the language of the inspired apostle here, and that which our blessed Lord himself employed in his conversation with Nicodemus, as we find it recorded in John iii. 14—17.

Having made this admission, will you allow me to observe to you, that I have some doubts as to the propriety of applying the phrase *eternal punishment* to any, except *the third*, of the *punishments* which you have denominated *eternal*. The forfeiture of the fleshly paradise, and the exclusion of the unregenerate from the heavenly kingdom, although punishments inflicted upon all who possess human nature merely, and inflicted without the possibility of modification or reversal, nevertheless strike me as being somehow or another *limited*. I see that the third stage of punishment, viz. the ultimate destruction of human beings, or the swallowing up of human nature itself in the divine nature of Christ, is *unlimitedly* eternal. But I experience some difficulty in regarding the preliminary stages as more than *limited*. Do have the goodness, David, to try to render this matter plain to me.

T. I am glad that you have proposed your difficulty with such clearness and distinctness. It is obvious, that you have fully apprehended my meaning, so far as I have gone.—And now, Robert, paradoxical as my language at first must appear to you to be, I answer you by admitting, that there is a point of view in which the two former punishments to which you have alluded, nay, in which even the third punishment itself, fall to be regarded as *limited*. This paradoxical mode of expression, however, presents no real difficulty to the spiritually enlightened mind. The punishments are all of them *unlimited* in themselves; but they are all of them *limited* by the nature of the subjects upon which they are inflicted. These subjects are creatures; and, therefore, beyond *the existence*, or rather beyond the *destruction* or *annihilation*, of the creature nature, the punishments cannot possibly reach. To carry them farther, you must suppose the uncreated or divine nature itself to be punished: a manifest absurdity, as well as blasphemy; and yet, the mistake into which all those who hold the popular doctrine of eternal torments necessarily fall.—Well, then, the persons punished are creatures; and it is as possessed of a creature nature that they either are, or can be, punished. The destruction, or rather the annihilation, of their creature nature, is the acmé or climax of their punishment. It is, in the most emphatic sense of the term, *eternal punishment*.—I have called it *the climax* of punishment. And beautifully do the other two steps or stages of eternal punishment appear to be subservient to, to lead towards, and to terminate in this last stage or climax. 1. The forfeiture of the earthly paradise and its blessings is eternal; for it is incurred for ever. It attaches to Adam's family as a whole—it is never repealed—and the consequences of it are in every age experienced by every human being. But the power and possibility of inflicting it evidently terminate with

the existence of human beings themselves, and of this present world. The end of time, then, as the end of human nature itself, is the boundary line of the infliction of this punishment: short of which, however, it knows no termination.—2. The exclusion of the unregenerate from the kingdom of Christ which is never repealed, and which attaches to all who live and die mere human beings without a single exception, constitutes the second stage of eternal punishment. This stretches out much farther than the former stage of which we have just been speaking. For, instead of terminating with the end of this present world as that stage does, it is coeval with the existence of the kingdom of Christ itself. So long as this kingdom lasts, so long does the exclusion from life and happiness, of those who in this world have lived and died unregenerate, last likewise. Having been *subject to the bondage of corruption* not merely while they lived on earth, but having come under the power of that bondage still more decidedly when overtaken by the stroke of death, under it they must continue, unless and until they shall be delivered from it, not by *having had restored to them their bondage nature*, but by *being made new*; in consequence of both their present state of exclusion, and the present intermediate state of the church, being swallowed up in the divine nature of the then completely triumphant Messiah. It is only, then, the termination of the kingdom of Christ, which, by bringing to an end the intermediate state of things which succeeds the destruction of this present world and the end of human nature itself, and by thereby destroying *the bondage of corruption* under which the unregenerate during the whole of that period continue, can bring this second stage of eternal punishment to an end.—3. There is that eternal punishment which consists, not merely in the swallowing up of human nature, but in the swallowing up of the intermediate state of things, the kingdom and

the exclusion from the kingdom, in the nature of Jesus, as the spiritual Adam. This punishment of man—this complete absorption of his nature—is eternal. It is the climax, the acmé, the finishing stroke given to punishment. Man's fleshly nature, and sin and death as their effects, thenceforward exist no more. As at once hateful to God, and injurious to his creatures, they are swept away from the universe.

Thus does it appear, that the end of the existence of human nature itself, and nothing short of that, terminates the first eternal punishment. The end of *the bondage of corruption*, by its subjects or those who live and die unregenerate in time being *brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God*, terminates the second eternal punishment. But the third and highest degree of eternal punishment, as consisting in such a destruction of human nature and of all its effects and consequences, by means of it and their absorption in the completely revealed and triumphant nature of the Son of God, as render the subsequent existence of man and sin an absolute impossibility, is a state of things which, unlike the two former states, can know no end at all, and therefore must necessarily last for ever.

The punishments, then, are *unlimited*, in so far as they are themselves *everlasting* ; but the subjects of them being *creatures*, and, therefore, *limited* in their nature and duration, to inflict *eternal punishment* to the fullest extent is, necessarily, at the expense of ultimately *annihilating the creature nature*.

B. It strikes me, that I have a tolerably clear apprehension of your meaning ; and, in order to prove to you that this is the case, permit me to express my views of it in my own words. If wrong, you will have the kindness to correct me.

In the first place, human beings as such, that is, as the wicked, are subjected to three different kinds of punish-

ment; all of which, from the circumstance of their being unalterable and irrevocable, and, still more, of their being inflicted as long as persons capable of undergoing them and states in which they can be undergone exist, may fitly enough be denominated eternal. Taking this view of the matter, human beings are punished, first, by an eternal expulsion from the blessings of the earthly paradise; secondly, by an eternal exclusion from the heavenly kingdom; and, thirdly, by eternal destruction.

In the second place, these different punishments, although lasting as long as the respective states in which they are capable of being inflicted and endured last, are, notwithstanding, of different lengths or durations, owing to the different lengths or durations of these respective states themselves. Thus the period during which expulsion from the earthly paradise lasts, can only be the period of the existence of this present world: the paradise itself being earthly, and the end of this world of necessity terminating both its existence, and the liability of any to be expelled from it.—Again. Exclusion from the heavenly kingdom lasts as long as that kingdom, implying *subjection to the bondage of corruption* on the part of the unregenerate, lasts likewise; and terminates necessarily with the termination of that kingdom.—Whilst the duration of the destruction of human nature, the highest conceivable degree of punishment, can never know any end: the shadowy or human nature, when swallowed up in the substantial or divine nature, being swallowed up in it for ever.

In the third place, each of the two previous eternal punishments is subservient to that which stands immediately connected with it, and immediately follows it; and the two first of them are subservient to the third and last one. The punishment of the eternal expulsion of all human beings, without exception, from the earthly paradise, is

subservient to the exclusion of all who live and die possessed of human nature merely, from the heavenly kingdom; and the eternal exclusion of all mere human beings from *the kingdom of Christ*, is subservient to the ultimate and complete destruction both of human nature, and of the exclusion itself or subjection to the bondage of corruption as the grand consequence of human nature, by means of their being swallowed up in the divine nature of the Son of God, at the period when *he makes all things*, and therefore all beings, *new* in himself.—To explain myself otherwise:—1. Human beings, as such, come to an end with time; their punishment of expulsion from paradise, and all its blessings, thereby ceasing: 2. the *subjection* of the unregenerate portion of them *to the bondage of corruption*, comes to an end with Christ's kingdom; their punishment of exclusion from that kingdom thereby ceasing: but, 3, both their expulsion from paradise, and their exclusion from the heavenly kingdom, ceasing, in consequence of their nature, and the intermediate state of things which succeeds time, being absorbed in the heavenly, and divine, and all-comprehensive nature of Christ, of course this is a state of things which never can cease or come to an end.

Have I expressed your meaning accurately and satisfactorily?

T. Perfectly so, Robert. And I may just add, in illustration and corroboration of the views which you have so luminously presented, that by means of the distinction between the punishments of *expulsion from paradise*, and *exclusion from Christ's kingdom*, taken in connection with the subserviency of these punishments to what follows, a full and comprehensive idea of the utter worthlessness of mere human nature is afforded.—Its expulsion from paradise, points it out as unworthy to retain *the inferior blessings* of its original and earthly state. Its exclusion from

the kingdom of Christ, points it out as still less worthy of being elevated to the enjoyment of *the superior blessings* of the heavenly state.—By the former, it is punished everlastingly with *loss or forfeiture*. By the latter, it is subjected to a similar everlasting punishment of *coming short of or destitution*.—And, when its worthlessness has thus been previously and satisfactorily established, its *bondage* state of exclusion is brought to an end, not by restoration to the state in which it existed originally, but, by what affords the crowning view of its intense and essential worthlessness, its complete and everlasting absorption in the nature of the Son of God.*

B. The whole of your system, if I mistake not, may be comprised in the following sentence:—The object of God, in all that he says and does, in all the acts and manifestations of himself, is *his own glory*. To this, the creation of man originally in Adam, and his new creation subsequently in Christ Jesus, are both subservient. And the end is accomplished by a series of steps or stages: man's natural creation state being, by the entrance of sin, terminated or brought to an end; and the state of things to which the termination of his natural creation state gave rise, being itself terminated by that act of taking sin away, through the medium of which all things are ultimately new created in the Son of God. Farther: the

* Perhaps the view submitted in the text, may be thus expressed and illustrated:—The exhibition of the want of desert of human nature, on the one hand, to retain *what it once had*, and, on the other hand, to attain to *what it never had, and never can have*, has been going on constantly developing and disclosing itself more and more since the first of time; and will go on developing and disclosing itself more and more until time shall have flowed into the ocean of eternity. Human nature is disclosing still lower and lower, and hitherto unsuspected, *depths of evil*; and the distance between *the depths* to which it is with rapid and constantly accelerated pace *descending*, and *the heights* to which it shews itself unworthy to *ascend*, is widening more and more; this *process of descent*, and *increase of distance*, continually going on, until at last the fulness of its unworthiness to *retain inferior*, and to *attain to superior blessings*, having been brought out and exhibited, its final and everlasting destruction, by its absorption in the nature of the Son of God, is the crowning result of the whole.

Son of God himself alone brings to an end the natural creation state; and the Son of God, with his church, brings to an end that intermediate state of things to which the natural creation state gives birth. Is not this a fair abstract of your theory?

T. It is.

B. How pleasing, how beautiful, how harmonious, how convincing, how strictly consistent with holy writ, is this system of yours! The creature punished; and yet the mercy of the Creator glorified! The sinful nature destroyed; and yet the sinner himself saved! The members of the church reigning triumphant with their head; and yet the object of their reign not a selfish one, but that, through the medium of its generous and efficacious operation, blessings and benefits may ultimately redound to the unregenerate portion of the human family! The goodness of the Creator not overcome, as is commonly supposed, by the evil of the creature; but, on the contrary, overcoming the evil of the creature, by its own inherent divine energy!—Truly, David, this is to combine the eternal punishment of the first Adam and his posterity as the wicked, with the gift of eternal life to the church, and through them of a new creation to the rest of the human race as made partakers of the nature of the second Adam the righteous, in a way which no other system of divine truth hitherto conceived or devised can by any possibility do. Its harmony—its glory—prove the system which you advocate to be divine!

T. Most gratifying is it to me to find, my dear brother, that the views which I have been the instrument of presenting to you, have had the effect of opening your eyes to a discovery of the glory which shines forth in the cross and resurrection of Christ Jesus. That you now see the conquest of the Creator to be, not partial, but complete. And that, instead of supposing our dear and divine Redeemer to struggle with evil and evil doers throughout

eternity, unable to mould them to his purposes by overcoming their opposition to his character and will, you have been enabled to cast away from you notions worthy only of a disciple of Manes, and to rejoice in the scripturally revealed fact, that *all things have been put under Jesus' feet*.—Let me congratulate you on the change. Until now it must have been impossible for you to recognise in our dear risen Lord, the person to whom *all power hath been given both in heaven and on earth*.

B. You say truly, brother. It is only since I have been enabled to see *sin reigning unto death, that grace might reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord*, that I have come to possess any correct idea of what divine revelation is. Popular systems of religion, by assuming as their basis the doctrine of eternal torments, after the fashion of the antient Manicheans, as a matter of necessity make sin to be the everlasting and invincible rival of Jehovah! Not so the scriptures. They represent the entrance and reign of sin as merely subservient to the entrance and reign of grace; the former being overwhelmed by, and swallowed up in, the glorious issue to which they so astonishingly contribute.—Besides, how distinctly now do I perceive the intensity of God's hatred of sin displayed, not in giving it everlasting existence, as the supporters of eternal torments most absurdly fancy, but in destroying it.

T. To return to the subject of which we have just been speaking, and which admits of almost indefinite illustration.—You must by this time have completely apprehended the truth of the statement made by me some time since, that *the punishment of the wicked, and the life of the righteous, are both eternal*. There is *no end* to either of them. The wicked are *punished with everlasting destruction*;—the righteous are made partakers of *life everlasting*. And yet, mark the paradox. There is *a limit to the punishment of the wicked!*—How is this? Simply, because

the wicked are *mere creatures*. As such, the highest punishment which they are capable of undergoing, is that of being destroyed; or of passing into the state of non-existence from which they originally came. Everlasting punishment cannot be everlasting torments; for that would imply the possession of everlasting life, or of the divine nature, on the part of those who are subjected to them: but it is everlasting destruction, or the appropriate and necessary fate of a wicked and creature nature; and in this way it stands contrasted with everlasting life, or that attribute of the divine nature which is fitly conferred on Christ's posterity, along with righteousness another attribute of the divine nature.—Thus, then, the punishment of the wicked, or of Adam and his posterity as such; and the life of the righteous, or of Christ and his posterity as such; are both and equally eternal. But they are not equal, in the sense of their being both *eternal existences*. On the contrary, the eternal punishment of the wicked, as being that of creatures, consists in their being destroyed, or passing eternally into a state of non-existence: whereas the eternal life of the righteous, as being a divine principle, implies on their part eternal indestructibility both of nature and enjoyment. The one is *eternal non-existence*; the other is *eternal existence*. Adam's eternal punishment cannot, as the punishment of a being possessed of existence, reach into eternity; because, as a being, he exists only in time: whereas, the eternal life of Christ is truly and in all respects unbounded; because, as a being, he exists throughout eternity. The punishment of the wicked, it thus appears, is *boundless*; but the beings themselves, upon whom it is inflicted, are not so. They are *bounded*. Their existence is confined to time. And this very circumstance it is which renders them the fit recipients of mercy. For, blessed be God! the eternal punishment of destruction as creatures is inflicted, not upon beings with whom the divine punisher has no connection, but upon

beings with whom, not merely as his creatures but as having himself been manifested in their creature nature, he is necessarily and eternally one; and, therefore, as in the very act of inflicting the punishment he *swallows up death in victory*, or absorbs for ever the nature of the creature in the nature of himself the Creator, it so happens, that the very circumstance of their eternal destruction, which constitutes the eternal punishment of the beings who have sinned, constitutes, likewise, the communication to them of the nature of their glorious and heavenly punisher. *O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes;** exclaims the Messiah, in the glowing and triumphant language of ancient prophecy: and by conferring upon the sinful descendants of Adam, in the very act of *destroying death and the grave* their bitter and uncompromising foes, the everlasting possession of his own divine nature, by *making them new* in himself, how fully and gloriously does he redeem his pledge!

Have I been successful in shewing you, that to punish sin eternally, is not to give it eternal existence, but to destroy, or rather annihilate it; and that to destroy or annihilate it, is to make those who are at present the subjects of sin and death, new in their divine destroyer? †

* Hosca xiii. 14.

† The following I propose as a summary of the above argument:—
Christ's life is everlasting life.

The punishment of the wicked is everlasting punishment.

Nevertheless the wicked as such cannot live for ever.

Reason of the difference.

The creature or wicked nature necessarily comes to an end; its termination being necessarily the acmé of its punishment.

Whereas the nature of the Creator necessarily lasts for ever; its everlasting existence being necessarily involved and implied in the fact that it is divine.

Conversion of the one nature into the other.

The divine nature, having become one with the creature nature in the person of Jesus Christ, the destruction of the creature nature is in him effected in such a way, as that the end of the creature nature is at the same time the communication of the divine nature.

B. You certainly have.

T. Is the theme now exhausted? or have you any further questions respecting it to propose to me?

B. I presume that, in the views of the subject which you have already presented, there are involved the principles upon which you object to and repudiate the ordinary notions of Universalists respecting limited punishment hereafter.

T. Undoubtedly. Ordinary Universalists, of the Stonehouse Chauncy and Winchester school, appear to me never to have seriously considered the following facts; or, rather, never to have had such a scriptural view of the subject imparted to them, as to have enabled them to see the utter impossibility of reconciling the following facts with their system. 1. *Limited torments* are obnoxious to *almost* all the objections which, it has already been shewn, are fatal to the doctrine of *eternal torments*. And, above all, to this, that supposing *limited torments* hereafter whether of longer or shorter duration to be inflicted, the being enduring them could not be one possessed of human nature. He may be an angel, or he may be a devil. Nay, he may be conceived to possess *some* of the properties of human nature. But a *human being* he could not be. And as thus, by beings possessed of a nature different from that which sinned, torments if inflicted for countless ages must be endured, it is perfectly absurd to speak of their infliction upon *human beings*. 2. In *limited torments* the punishment is inflicted confessedly for a time merely. Whereas, that punishment of the wicked, to which according to scripture they are subjected, is irrevocable and eternal. 3. If torments contribute in any respect whatever towards the salvation of the wicked, then is the doctrine of purgatory introduced, and is the all and alone sufficiency of the atonement of the Lord Jesus necessarily set aside. 4. *God is love*. 1 John iv. 8. And

he effects a change in the mind of the creature, or begets and draws forth love from the creature to himself, not by appearing armed with vengeance, but by manifesting himself as what he is. That is, it is only by the manifestation to the creature of God in his essential nature and character as love, that the nature of the Creator is or by any possibility can be imparted to the creature. *In this, not in any other way, was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.* Ibid: verses 9 and 10. And, as the result of this discovery made to us, it is stated that *we love him, because he first loved us.* Ibid: verse 19. But in tormenting intelligent beings for ages, no less than in tormenting them for ever, God could appear in no other light than as an object of hatred. In other words, it would be impossible for God, while inflicting *limited torments*, to be manifested in that character of love which scripture shews us indisputably and essentially belongs to him. And what then? Why, that the infliction of *age-lasting*, no less than that of *eternal torments*, as it is at variance with the nature, so it must be at variance likewise with the purpose of Jehovah.—We have seen that it is by manifesting himself as what he is, LOVE; and not by manifesting himself as what he is not, *an object of hatred*; that God, whether in time or at the close of the intermediate state, overcomes and destroys the enmity of the creature to himself. And all Universalists allow, that the overcoming and destruction of this enmity is the object which he aims at, and will ultimately accomplish. But if so, why, by tormenting creatures although only for ages, interpose an element which, so far from being conducive to and productive of, is absolutely and necessarily opposed to and irreconcilable with his object? While

God is tormenting his creatures for ages hereafter, as the followers of Winchester conceive him to do, instead of *decreasing* that view of himself as their enemy which, from the constitution of their fleshly minds, human beings naturally and necessarily adopt, he must be actually *increasing* and *confirming* it. For, under such supposed circumstances, he must be not manifesting, but positively contradicting his glorious character. And if, after all, the change which, by the confession of Universalists of every grade and description, ultimately takes place, is accomplished by the manifestation on the part of God of himself as love, or as a gracious benefactor freely bestowing eternal life, of what use, pray, in that case, have been all the previous torments? As, so far from contributing towards the glorious result, they have obviously and necessarily during the whole period of their infliction been retarding and preventing it, is not the supposition of God's having recourse to them derogatory to his character, not only as love, but as a being whose perfect wisdom obviates the possibility of his employing any except means at once suitable and indispensable to the end at which he is aiming?

B. This I clearly perceive.

T. To follow out and develop this last objection, I may observe:—That, by ordinary Universalists, the nature and object of punishment have been entirely mistaken. Punishment neither has, nor can have, for its object, to elevate any intelligent being to a higher rank in the scale of existence, than that which at any given moment he occupies. And yet, in opposition to this fundamental and undeniable principle, the class of persons to whom I allude imagine that *human beings* (?) are subjected to limited torments hereafter, as a means of fitting and preparing them for their elevation to a higher state! This is absurd. In the divine administration punishment contributes, not to the elevation of beings to a higher state of existence,

but either to the deprivation of them of a state of existence which they already possess, or to keep them out of a state of existence of which they have never been put in possession. Therefore, so far from its being by punishment, it is always and necessarily by the conferring of the divine nature, either here or hereafter, that the elevation of human beings to a higher state of existence takes place. God proceeds by progressive steps in the work of creation: first, conferring human nature; and then, through the medium of the forfeiture of human nature by transgression, not by means of tormenting *that nature* (?) in a future and intermediate state, raising to the possession of *the divine nature* in his well-beloved Son, and thereby new-creating, those by whom human nature had previously been possessed. That is, although the punishment of the forfeiture of human nature contributes *indirectly* towards the possession of the higher nature, seeing that, unless the forfeiture had been incurred, an opportunity for conferring the higher nature never could have arisen; yet *directly* nothing contributes towards the possession of the divine nature by the family of man, but the putting forth of the same divine creative energy, from which the existence of human nature itself at first emanated. To which I may add, that the opportunity gained for the conferring of the divine nature, by the forfeiture of human nature,—the punishment to which, on account of transgression, those partaking of the latter nature are exposed, Gen : iii. 19,—would be entirely lost, could we suppose those who die ignorant of God, to be raised hereafter to the endurance of torments of any kind: and this, because the nature capable of enduring such torments could not, as human nature by being forfeited does, by the very circumstance of its passing away *indirectly* contribute towards the conferring of a higher nature; but would, in consequence of the fact of its continued existence, present a

positive, necessary, and insurmountable impediment to the possibility of the unfortunate individual's being taken out of the state of torments, into which he is supposed to be introduced. A nature by passing away, as human nature does, paves the way for another nature being conferred: but the nature of torments which is supposed by ordinary Universalists to be superinduced upon human beings hereafter, not being understood by them to pass away previous and in order to the renovating process taking place, is by this very circumstance shewn to be either the eternally tormented nature of the popular divines, or an additional figment of their own imaginations.*

B. Are your objections to the doctrine of *limited punishment* hereafter, or that of Winchesterian Universalists, exhausted?

T. Very far from it. Only, I have neither time nor inclination to enumerate the whole of them.—Let me, however, with a view to your satisfaction, throw out hints respecting a few more.

1. Winchesterian Universalists mistake completely the meaning of our blessed Lord, when he speaks of *those who are ignorant of his will, and do it not, being punished with few stripes; and of those who know his will, and do it not, being punished with many stripes.* Luke xii. 47, 48. According to them, this refers to a future state of existence: where the persons chastened very severely, are

* By the way, the argument founded on God's proceeding by successive steps in creation, and on his having bestowed on no being the power of elevating itself above that rank in the scale of existence in which it was originally placed, is admirably employed by Mr. W. Scott, of Edinburgh, towards the beginning of his late work, in refutation of the views entertained by Mr. George Combe, respecting the power of self-improvement and self-progression which the latter gentleman supposes to be inherent in human nature. This is almost the only thing which is valuable in Mr. Scott's work: for, in other respects, its theology is almost as wretched and unscriptural as that of Mr. Combe. To one who has a tolerable acquaintance with divine truth, the opposite mistakes of these two authors appear in many cases to counterpoise and be destructive of each other.

the very bad ; and those upon whom fewer stripes are inflicted, are persons whose lives and characters have not been quite so profligate. Now both parts of their interpretation are erroneous : for, first, it is to what takes place in time, or during the currency of the New Testament dispensation, that our Lord makes allusion : and, secondly, so far from the greater or less severity of the chastisements spoken of having a reference to torments of a limited nature to be inflicted hereafter upon greater or less offenders, Jesus is pointing to such facts as, that an increasing responsibility *in time* attaches to the communication of increasing views of divine truth ; and that, consequently, in exact proportion to the degree in which the character of God is disclosed to *the people of Christ* while they are upon earth, is the degree of sufferings which *they* are exposed to and shall undergo, in the event of their violating the dictates of their spiritually enlightened consciences. That is, it is persons possessed of *the highest*, not persons possessed of *the lowest*, degrees of the divine nature ; it is *the more enlightened*, not *the less enlightened*, followers of the Lamb ; by whom the severest chastisements spoken of by our Lord are liable to be undergone. The language of the apostle Paul, in 1 Corinthians ixth, from the 15th verse downwards, where he declares the awful temporal judgments to which he exposed himself, in the event of his not complying with and acting up to the high sense of obligation under which he laboured, is strikingly corroborative of the view which I take of the matter ; besides affording the best comment on the words of our blessed Lord.

2. The class of Universalists whose views I am at present engaged in combating, by maintaining the doctrine of *limited torments* hereafter, and the efficacy of *such torments*, shew themselves to be woefully ignorant of some of the simplest elements of vital and scriptural Christianity. “ It

is the vilest and most atrocious of sinners," say they, "who suffer most severely hereafter." But what constitutes gross sin, in their estimation? "Evils which are condemned by every man's conscience, and are regarded with abhorrence by the mass of society."—Alas! little do the persons who return such an answer know, that only one *gross* sin, in their sense of the term, has been committed or was ever capable of being committed by man; namely, Adam's one transgression: which, as having occasioned the sufferings and death of the whole human family, and as having opened the floodgates to all the evils that have since inundated the world, must, in point of enormity and atrocity, exceed any and all of those which have subsequently followed in its train. This transgression of Adam violated *the law of God*; whereas the vilest actions with which ordinary human beings are chargeable, violate only *the law of conscience*:—this transgression of his, awful as in its nature and consequences it has been, was notwithstanding pardoned; he having been, through faith, the first member of the church as he had been the first transgressor, and having thereby confessedly escaped all sufferings hereafter; and if thus he who, next to the apostle Paul, was *the chief of sinners*, escaped future sufferings, why should these be visited on iniquities which, as merely the consequences of his, must be of a less black dye than his own?—and, lastly, this transgression of his merely incurred the forfeiture of the life that now is; Gen: iii. 19; it being neither his original offence, nor the ordinary offences against conscience and morality which flow from it, but opposition to divine truth as made known in the gospel, which is attended with, and followed by, the higher punishment of the exclusion of human beings as such from the kingdom of God. None of these facts—scriptural facts, I mean—appear to have been noticed by those who contend for the ordinary enormities of human nature being

visited with limited torments hereafter. Especially the last of them : from which we learn, that the ordinary evils of human nature, however atrocious and deserving to be repressed by the arm of civil authority, are never once in point of enormity to be compared with that exhibition of the devilishness and satanic character of human nature, which is brought out in opposition to the gospel :—a fact made manifest by the outwardly pure and spotless apostle Paul, Rom : vii. 7, 8, Philip : iii. 4—6, and not our common progenitor Adam, having been *the chief of sinners*; 1 Timothy i. 15, 16 ; and by the vastly greater punishment which has been inflicted on opposition to the gospel, than was incurred by the transgression of Adam. The latter lost Paradise, and the life that now is ; the former has entailed upon the Jews, and through them upon all who die ignorant of the truth, exclusion from the heavenly kingdom. Besides, the persons of whom I speak do not perceive that, according to their system, it is actions merely which are punished ; or that God, in inflicting limited torments upon those whom they are pleased to consider as the guilty, is regulated in his procedure by the principles of a mere human legislator or judge. Now as, according to scripture, all human actions however atrocious flow from man's fleshly nature—a nature which was first made manifest in and condemned for Adam's transgression ; that is, flow from a nature which is common to every human being ; it obviously follows, that the nature itself as the fountain must be viler than, or at all events as vile as, any of those actions which, like so many streams, flow from it : and that, consequently, the punishment of none of these actions as being mere *effects*, can exceed that of the nature itself which of all such actions is the *cause*. But the sinful nature of Adam is punished by being destroyed. It is swallowed up in the divine nature of Christ, by his death and resurrection from the dead ;—

by the imparting of the first fruits of his heavenly nature to the members of his church;—and by the ultimate making of all things new in himself. And if the nature itself, from which all the evil actions which have at any time disgraced and afflicted humanity, be thus itself destroyed or brought to an end in Christ; what possibility, pray, is there of future torments, whether limited or unlimited, being inflicted? There being no nature to undergo them, is God, with reverence be it spoken, by punishing *actions* apart from *the nature* from which they spring, to punish *a mere non-entity*?

3, and lastly. What settles the matter to my mind and subverts entirely the Winchesterian hypothesis, is the fact, that human nature is not distinct from that of Christ, but is contained and involved in that of Christ. That is, Adam and his posterity are not beings whose present existence is distinct from, and independent of that of Christ Jesus; but beings whose existence as intelligent creatures is necessarily involved in, and dependent on, that of the Lord Jesus the Creator. Adam was *the figure of him that was to come*. Rom: v. 14. He was *made in* or after *his image or likeness*. Gen: i. 27, compared with John i. 3, and Coloss: i: 16. Nay more: in the Lord Jesus, whose image or representative he was, he and all his posterity *live, move, and have their being*. Acts xvii. 28, with Coloss: i. 17. This being the case, if Adam's posterity after being deprived of their present existence by death were to endure torments hereafter, whether limited or unlimited, it must be in consequence of their having had imparted to them by the Lord Jesus a nature capable of enduring such torments. That nature could not be human nature: for, not only of it are they by death deprived, but it was destroyed on the cross and swallowed up in the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; and, besides, it is totally incapable of undergoing such torments as it is presumed shall

be inflicted hereafter. Farther : the nature in question could not be that of the glorified saints ; for this would be to suppose the possibility of a righteous nature being subjected to torments. What, then, is the nature which, according to Winchesterian Universalism, is to be tormented for ages ? Where shall we find it ? If it exist at all, it must be a nature which is neither that of Adam, nor that of Christ ; but one which is called into existence for the express purpose of being tormented ; and which, when it has served that purpose, is, like that of Adam, to be ultimately swallowed up in that of Christ. But is such a *third nature* conceivable of or possible ? Must our blessed Lord, as the only alternative left, be supposed, strange idea ! to create a nature *pro re natá*, and upon it for a time to inflict the torments which the destruction of human nature itself has rendered it incapable of undergoing ? Must he, in the creation of this third supposed nature, be supposed to degrade himself to become *the minister of sin*, and the temporary *confirmer of the works of the devil* ? Must he, after creating it, pass through a second process of atonement ?—*be crucified afresh and put to an open shame*, in order to its being taken away ? But, above all, are men to be permitted to indulge their own whims and vagaries, in supposing the creation and temporary existence of a nature like that third and tormented nature of which we are speaking, without being able to produce, from the inspired writings, a single statement warranting the supposition ?—No, no. Such creature imaginings we may unhesitatingly reject. Scripture makes mention of the nature of Adam the creature, as the figure of, and as contained in, the nature of the Lord Jesus the Creator. And it makes known to us the passing away and destruction of the former, by the sacrifice which was offered on Calvary, and by the total and ultimate absorption of it in that of the latter ; this constituting its eternal punishment : but of the

creation of an intermediate nature—of a sinful nature which is neither that of Adam nor that of Christ, which is for a series of ages to be tormented and then to be destroyed—it breathes not a single syllable.

B. You have employed an argument against *limited torments hereafter*, and against *their being subservient to the making of all things new in Christ Jesus*, which deserves to be more insisted on than I think you have done. The argument I mean is, that punishment when inflicted upon human beings to the greatest possible extent, instead of having for its *direct* object to carry them forward in the scale of existence, aims *directly* and *properly* at bringing their present state of existence to an end. Thus, the punishments of *the forfeiture of the earthly paradise*, of *exclusion from the heavenly kingdom*, and of *the final and complete destruction of the race*, which are the three *eternal punishments* inflicted on Adam and his posterity, are merely so many means of bringing their present earthly existence to an end, not of elevating them to a higher state of existence. Punishment, like law whose sanction it is, and with which it is inseparably connected, is intended, not *for the righteous*, but *for the unrighteous*. 1 Tim : i. 9. And its only legitimate objects are, either to *restrain* from evil, or, that failing, to *avenge* the perpetration of it. It never yet *constrained*, it never can *constrain*, to good.* Of this circumstance the ancient Stoics, whatever might be their mistakes and blunderings otherwise, appear to have had a tolerably distinct idea.† Now the fundamental error of the doctrine that *limited torments* are inflicted hereafter with a view to the bringing of the wicked to a sense of their enormities, and thereby of turning them to

* See the 5th chapter of 2d Corinthians, verses 14th and 15th, where the nature of the *constraining* principle of *love*, as distinguished from the *restraining* principle of *law*, is simply and beautifully set forth.

† See the Enchiridion of Epictetus.

God, is, that it assigns to punishment an office and function which to punishment does not belong. For all changes from *evil* to *good*, or from the possession of *the nature of the creature* to the possession of *that of the Creator*, are effected, not by punishment however long continued, severe, and afflictive; but by the new creation of the individual, or by the direct imparting to him from above of the divine nature. And if punishment can thus only at the utmost *indirectly* contribute towards the elevation of intelligent beings to a higher state of existence, and this by being the means *passively* of bringing to an end the state in which they had been formerly placed, how absurd, how inconsistent with fact, the notion of assigning to *torments*, in opposition to their merely *restraining* nature as punishment, an *active* and *constraining* agency in bringing to an end the moral evils of creation; nay, how absurd the notion, that a state of torments, once summoned into existence hereafter, should be found actively and intentionally contributing towards the bringing of itself to an end. See Matthew xii. 24—30.

T. Your reasoning is perfectly scriptural and legitimate, Robert.

B. My real conviction, however, of the utter impossibility of *limited torments* being inflicted and endured hereafter, is produced by the fact, that, when deprived of their present earthly existence, human beings have and can have no existence except in Christ. The Lord Jesus having, in his incarnation, taken hold of human nature; having, on his cross, sacrificed or destroyed it; and having, in his resurrection, changed it in himself into his own divine and glorious nature; there is, I perceive, no possibility of any human being living hereafter, except as, in one way or another, participating in Christ's nature. This being the case, where is the place, room, or oppor-

tunity for the infliction of future torments? Upon Christ's heavenly nature, surely, it is not meant that such torments are to be visited!—Indeed, David, it is plain to me, that the doctrine of *limited torments* being inflicted hereafter, has its origin in the most decided ignorance of such facts as these:—first, that human nature has no existence, except in this present world; secondly, that Jesus, in the very act of *taking away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, took away likewise the nature from which sin derived its origin; and, thirdly, that sin, and its source the fleshly nature of man, having thus been brought to an end in Christ, it is a matter of absolute impossibility that sin and sinners should exist to be tormented, either for ages or eternally, in a future state.

T. Notwithstanding all this, in which I perfectly acquiesce, let us do justice to those by whom the doctrine of *limited torments* hereafter was originally broached and contended for. They were the first to break ground against the intrenchments of an unfounded, but apparently impregnable, superstition. By them the dogma of *never-ending torments* was first vigorously assailed. If they committed mistakes, in the circumstances in which they were placed, in the dawn of scriptural discovery, it was but natural for them to do so. Our situation, it is true, is better than theirs was. We occupy a vantage ground which they did not. And, from our greater elevation, we are able to take in a more extensive range and prospect of heavenly and divine truth than it was their lot to contemplate. But, amidst our superior advantages, let us not forget the obligations under which these men have laid us. As pioneers, they have in various respects broken up and removed the roughnesses of the road, and thereby facilitated our progress in the pathway of divine discovery. In perusing the eloquent, original, and powerful pages of

Jeremy White;*—or the profoundly conceived, scripturally expressed, and learned writings of Sir George Stonehouse;†—or the more popular and instructive, but in many respects sadly erroneous, productions of Elhanan Winchester;‡—or the pleasing and inartificially-composed sentences of James Relly;§—or the plain and perspicuous language, and vigorous sense, of the late Neil Douglas of Glasgow;||—although pained to find them all maintaining the untenable position of *limited torments* hereafter, I rejoice to think that, with all their errors, such men ever wrote. They were giants in this particular department of theological literature. They rendered good service to the cause. But their work is done. Into their labours we have entered, and by their very mistakes we have profited. Indeed, except for the error into which they fell respect-

* The restoration of all things: or a vindication of the goodness and grace of God, to be manifested at last, in the recovery of the whole creation out of their fall. By Jeremiah White, Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell. 1st edition, London, 1712. 2nd edition, London, no date. 3d edition, London, 1779.

† Universal restitution a scripture doctrine. This proved in several letters wrote on the nature and extent of Christ's kingdom; wherein the scripture passages, falsely alleged in proof of the eternity of hell torments, are truly translated and explained. (It is the production of Mr., afterwards Sir George, Stonehouse, Rector of Islington.) An octavo of 468 pages. London, 1761.—Sir George was the author of other works on the same subject.

‡ 1. The universal restoration, exhibited in a series of dialogues between a minister and his friend. Wherein the most formidable objections are stated and fully answered. By Elhanan Winchester.—The 4th edition, London, 1799, is enriched with notes critical and explanatory by W. Vidler. 2. A course of lectures on the prophecies that remain to be fulfilled. Delivered in the borough of Southwark; as also at the chapel in Glasshouse-yard, in the year 1789. By Elhanan Winchester. 4 vols. octavo. London, 1789.—Besides other works.

§ Union: or a treatise of the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his church. By James Relly. The edition now before me is a New York one, of 1812. Relly was the author of other works besides the *Union*, a few of which I have read. What constitutes his grand distinction is, that, after having been instrumental in changing his views, he was for some time the pastor and instructor of John Murray, the apostle of Universalism in America.

|| Mr. Douglas was the author of *A version of the Psalms, with copious notes*, and of many other exceedingly useful works. They were published previous to the year 1823, when his death took place.

ing *limited torments*, it is exceedingly questionable if, humanly speaking, the doctrine of universal salvation ever would have obtained a hearing; and if such mighty conquests, as those of John Murray in the United States of America, ever would have been achieved.*—And here, when speaking of those writers and speakers, whose productions and labours have so materially contributed towards the introduction and spread of correct notions respecting the future and ultimate destiny of the human race, it would grieve me to pass over a work of my dear, venerable, and accomplished friend, Mr. Richard Roe of Dublin, entitled, *A short help and incentive to an unbiassed inquiry into the scripture truth of Universalism*: in which, by means of a beautiful application of the system of scriptural parallelism originally noticed by Bishop Lowth,† and since so admirably followed out and developed by Jebb‡ and Boys,§ he has shewn, that the doctrine of universal salvation is so involved in and combined with, as well as forms so constituent a part of the sacred writings, as to render it a matter of impossibility to se-

* “The life of the Rev. John Murray, Preacher of Universal Salvation,” is the title of one of the most interesting pieces of auto-biography which I have ever read. In it there is given a succinct account of the rise and progress of Universalism in the United States of America. My edition, which is that of Boston, U. S. has notes and an appendix, by Thomas Whittemore.

† Praesertim, in praelectione 19na sui operis, inscripti, *De sacrâ poesi Hebraeorum, praelectiones Academicæ*.—Oxonii, 1753; ap. pp. 177—196.

‡ Sacred literature; comprising a review of the principles of composition laid down by the late Robert Lowth, D.D., Lord Bishop of London, in his praelections and Isaiah: and an application of the principles so reviewed, to the illustration of the New Testament; in a series of critical observations on the style and structure of that sacred volume. By the Rev. John Jebb, A.M., Rector of Abington, in the diocese of Cashel: (afterwards Bishop of Limerick.) London. 1820.—A truly elegant and scholar-like production.

§ *A Key to the Book of Psalms*. By the Rev. Thomas Boys, A.M., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Curate of St. Dunstan's-in-the-west, London; author of *Tactica Sacra*, &c. London, 1825.—The pleasure and instruction which I have derived from the perusal of this work, excite in me a strong desire to see Mr. Boys' *Tactica Sacra*, which I have not yet been able to procure.

parate the one from the structure of the other. My friend, it is true, has since discovered, and with that candour and noble simplicity which distinguish his character has acknowledged, the mistake under which at the period of composing the pamphlet spoken of he laboured, in holding the dogma of *future limited torments*. But this, instead of detracting from, to my mind enhances the value of that production, as well as of the very interesting sequel by which it was soon afterwards followed up.*

B. Far be it from me to wish to deprive the supporters of *limited torments* of their justly earned laurels. Indeed, were judgment to dispose me to think or speak harshly of their views, feeling would be apt to interfere and lift up its voice in their behalf. The venerable form of Neil Douglas, and the manly straightforwardness, not unaccompanied with sagacity, of his character, as they appeared on occasion of his visits to our late respected father, frequently rise to my recollection, and plead more eloquently in behalf of himself and his tenets than the most studied reasonings could do.—But truce to feeling. The doctrine of limited torments hereafter is unscriptural, as well as antiquated. It is one of the strong-holds of that system which undeifies the Lord Jesus, denies all efficacy to his atoning blood, and ascribes a merit to human virtue which is entirely subversive of that divine righteousness in which alone the creature stands perfect and accepted before God. Therefore, say I, *delenda est haec Carthago*. While I feel indebted to the advocates of *limited punishment hereafter* for the glorious truths which they have been the means of bringing to light, and for their valuable and satisfactory criticisms on many passages of scripture generally understood in an erroneous sense, towards their lead-

* Notes in answer to certain parts of three recent publications on future punishment, to which are added letters to the author from three benefited clergymen. By R. Roe. Dublin. 1836.

ing sentiment itself I desire to shew no mercy. I want no substitution of a protestant, for a popish, purgatory. It is *the blood of Jesus*, and not torments endured for ages, *that cleanseth from all sin.*—In the mean time, allow me to wish you a good afternoon.

END OF THE FOURTH DIALOGUE.

DIALOGUE FIFTH.

SUBJECT :

THE SECOND DEATH.

SPEAKERS :—AUTHOR. BROTHER. FRIEND.

T. To what circumstance am I to consider myself indebted for the pleasure of this second visit ?

F. Having learned from my friend here the particulars of his last conversation with you, and having been made to feel that your observations and reasonings in favour of universal salvation are not without weight, I have resolved to solicit one more interview with you, for the purpose of having my mind, if possible, brought to some kind of satisfaction with respect to this all-important subject.

I find that you disclaim holding the sentiments of Chauncy, Winchester, and those other Universalists who have contended for the infliction of *limited torments* hereafter : you, in opposition to them, confining the infliction of positive sufferings to this present life ; and regarding the grand punishment to which the unregenerate portion of the human family is subjected after death, and during the

period of the saints' reign, as consisting in complete exclusion from the heavenly kingdom. And I find, further, that, in your apprehension of things, even when raised at the second resurrection, the now unregenerate portion of mankind are not admitted into Christ's kingdom; but are, as subjugated by Christ and the church, made to occupy the place and station of subjects for evermore. Robert reports you as saying, "this portion of human beings never reign, but are reigned over."—Assuming his statement of your views to be correct, I understand you to hold, that *the sons of God*, or members of the church, spoken of in the eighth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, stand ever distinguished from *the creature*, or rest of the human family, mentioned in the same chapter. And that, although by the reign, as consisting in *the manifestation of the sons of God* or members of the church, *the creature*, or unregenerate portion of mankind, shall ultimately *be delivered from the bondage of corruption*, and introduced into *the glorious liberty of the children of God*; yet their deliverance and introduction shall consist, not in their becoming properly speaking sons of God themselves, but in their being subdued by, united to, and made partakers of the nature and liberty of those who are themselves the sons of God. They are not *sons of God*, for these are *begotten again from above* in time by *the word of truth*; but they constitute *the creature*, or those who, through the reign of Christ the Son of God, and such as have the privilege of sonship with him, are ultimately *made or created anew*. Rev. xxi. 5.

May I presume that, in this brief abstract, I have given a perfectly fair representation of your sentiments?

T. So much so, that, in so far as your statements go, I have nothing whatever to add to them.

F. Tell me, is there any author, or is there any body

of men, by whom views similar to your own have been adopted and promulgated?—I should like much to be directed to some standard work on the subject.

T. I am not acquainted with any writer on the subject of Universalism whose sentiments coincide entirely with my own. Perhaps the nearest approach to them will be found in that admirable, simple, and, upon the whole, scripturally-written essay of James Rely, entitled, *Union : or a treatise of the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his church*. The union, the close inseparable and eternal union, subsisting between Christ and his redeemed ones, is that circumstance to which the possession of all the blessings of salvation by the members of the church is by that author traced. In this view of matters, I perfectly agree with him. It is to Christ's oneness with us, and our consequent oneness with him, that we are indebted for both our natural and spiritual existence. It is no less because we died in him, than because we live in him, that we are partakers of life everlasting.—And I may add, that I have no hesitation in giving this high character to Rely's treatise, notwithstanding that its author betrays a good deal of crudeness and superficiality in many of his notions, blunders sadly with regard to the doctrine of *the assurance of faith*, and has by no means treated of universal salvation with that boldness, and openness, and comprehensiveness of statement which his premises warrant, and which, with a little extension of his plan, he might have effected.

F. Is Rely's work to be procured?

T. Not, I suspect, easily in this country. It is common, and, I believe, has been frequently re-printed, in the United States of America. The fact of its scarcity in England is curious enough when we consider, that it was originally a London publication.

B. Did not your friend Mr. Thomas C. Cowan, of Bristol, republish it about ten or eleven years since?*

T. He did; but the edition is, I have every reason to think, exhausted.—Although far from being a polished production, and, in the copies which I have seen, most abominably pointed, the simplicity and scriptural beauty by which *The Union* is characterised are such as must always ensure to it a rapid sale, and thereby render the publishing of it, if properly gone about, a safe speculation. With all its defects, it is a great favourite of mine.†

B. Has no other author on the subject of Universalism broached views which approximate to your own?

T. About four years ago, soon after the publication of my *Assurance of faith, or Calvinism identified with Universalism*, I procured, by the kindness of a friend, the loan of a work by Joseph Huntington, D.D. of Coventry, Connecticut, U. S. entitled, *Calvinism improved; or the gospel illustrated as a system of real grace, issuing in the salvation of all men*. This treatise made its appearance subsequently to the death of its learned author in 1795. Some account given of it by Whittemore, in his *Modern*

* This gentleman, I am proud to think, allows me the honour to call him friend. Mr. Cowan was for many years the highly and deservedly respected minister of St. Thomas's Church, Bristol, and, having seceded from the establishment in 1817, is now pastor of a Baptist congregation in the same city. He is the author of *A brief account of the reasons which have induced the Rev. T. C. Cowan, late of Trinity College, Dublin, to secede from the established church*; 1817; *A Sermon on the work of the Holy Spirit*; 1818; *A Chronological, historical, and spiritual, Bible Catechism*; 1825; *Correspondence between himself and the Rev. Mr. Whish*; and a *Lecture on the impersonality of the Holy Spirit*: 1837: besides having republished, with a preface and copious notes of his own, an American work, entitled, *Bible News, by Noah Worcester, D.D. of Boston, in America*; 1829; and *Relly's Union*, about the year 1827. All of these works, although in several respects opposed to views which are held by me, I regard as most valuable. It is exceedingly gratifying to me to think, that my dear friend, after many doubts and much prayerful consideration of the subject, has had the glorious doctrine of the universal extent of God's love to man, at length opened up to his mind.

† Relly held the doctrine of *limited torments*. In regard to this point there is of course a marked difference between his sentiments and those of the author of these dialogues. But the dogma is not brought out prominently in *The Union*.

History of Universalism, and the resemblance between its title and that of my large work, excited in me a desire to see and peruse it. Many parts of it, perhaps, I should say, the majority of its statements, which are proposed with much clearness and force of argument, quite delighted me. But it labours under many defects. The nature of the fall of man its author does not appear to have understood scripturally; (indeed, who almost does so?); and he was not able to get rid of the absurdity of supposing human beings *justly* liable to a sentence of *eternal misery*, which, nevertheless, is not executed upon them!—Pleasing, however, upon the whole, are my recollections of the book. Much did I find in it corresponding to the views to which I had been previously conducted by the scriptures themselves.

But enough of Huntington. If I am to be confined to speak approvingly of any one writer on the subject of Universalism, commend me to Jeremiah White. Although considerably more than a century has elapsed since the original publication of his “Restoration of all things,” there is a freshness, and a novelty, and a power, and a comprehensiveness of views, about it, which bespeak a mind of the most manly and vigorous description,—a mind, indeed, of the first order,—and justify “old Noll’s” sagacity in having selected him to be one of his chaplains.—It will be understood, after what I remarked to Robert in the course of our last conversation, that I disagree with White, when he supposes that God *restores* any previous state of man, and maintains the doctrine of *limited torments*. But he lived in the dawn of the subject. And, amidst all his errors, I perceive his vigorous and spiritually-enlightened mind grasping results which many of his successors in the same walk of theological literature do not seem to have had the slightest conception of.*

* Shall I forget Stonehouse? Certainly not. Disagreeing with him in many respects as I do, I must take this opportunity of acknowledging the vast amount of

F. Your sentiments, I am informed, tally amazingly with those of the American Universalists.

T. So said Mr. Harris, of Glasgow, as far back as the month of April, 1828, in the course of a very friendly criticism on the first edition of my "Three Questions proposed and answered," which he was kind enough to insert in the *Christian Pioneer*. Strange to tell! at the time when his review was published, I neither was a Universalist, nor acquainted with the sentiments of the great majority of adherents to the cause of Universalism in America. The name of Winchester was familiar to me; but of John Murray, Ballou, Balfour, Whittimore, and the other modern Coryphaei of the sect, I had not even heard. To which it is perhaps scarcely necessary for me to add, that of the productions of the Ballou, or Impartialist school, I was at the time totally ignorant.

The fact is, that, although in the spring of 1828 I was verging towards Universalism, I had not then actually embraced it. My *Three Questions* was composed and originally published, not for the purpose of inculcating and propagating the doctrine of the *salvation of all*, but chiefly with a view to relieve my own mind; and, if possible, by provoking discussion to lead to my acquiring some more enlarged, scriptural, and satisfactory ideas of the divine character, than recent events had shewn me that either I, or ordinary professing Christians, were possessed of. From the month of February, 1826, when my mind first opened to the discovery of the scriptural distinction between *soul* and *spirit**—a discovery which has been the germ of al-

information and the many other advantages which, from the perusal of his *Universal Restitution, a Scripture Doctrine*, I have derived. The profound biblical learning, the aptitude for criticism, and the fairness in argument which he exhibits, are but rarely to be met with in the productions of other authors.

* This took place in consequence of the perusal one day of the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians; particularly, of verses 42—49. A number of events and disclosures of divine truth had certainly been preparing the way for this result: among

most all my subsequent advances in the knowledge of divine truth—I had been much exercised and agitated respecting the fate of the unregenerate portion of the human family hereafter. Owing to the state of dubiety concerning the matter in which I had continued up to the time of its publication, I stated, with perhaps unnecessary candour, in the first edition of the work alluded to, that I then wavered between the *final happiness*, and the *future annihilation*, of the unbelieving. This honest avowal of mine, so different from the tricky conduct of the wholesale gulpers of creeds articles and confessions, drew down upon me a treatment from critics and self-styled divines, which was not particularly calculated to inspire me with love to human nature, or confidence in pretensions to superiority of theological attainments set up by those who presume to act as “keepers of the consciences” of her Majesty’s liege subjects. Indeed, astonishment at the *quackery* which obtains and prevails on the subject of religion, was the leading sentiment of which the attacks made upon me were productive. The abuse of critics notwithstanding, my Heavenly Father kept me, amidst much darkness and great uncertainty as to what the result of my previous discoveries was to be, reposing firmly upon what he himself had been pleased to reveal to me as true from his own infallible testimony. In this state of mind, I was destined to pass nearly a whole twelvemonth. For it was not till the spring of 1829, that I was brought to any settled views,

which I may enumerate, my surprise at the condemnation of views as heretical, by the presbytery of Glasgow, in September, 1825, which I knew to be truths of divine revelation;—the previous discovery by me of Adam and Jesus as respectively the heads of two distinct posterities, and as communicating two distinct natures to their respective posterities, a view brought out and insisted on by me in my *Memo-rial*;—and the perusal of Riccaltoun’s three volumes in the winter of 1825—26. By the way, how remarkably close do I perceive Riccaltoun to have approached to views which I now know to be divine, without seeming to have actually apprehended them. Let me take this opportunity of recommending his works to the perusal of the ordinary petty fry of the theologians.

and attained to any satisfaction, respecting *the fate of the unregenerate*. And, strikingly enough, the previous state of suspense terminated in my embracing, neither *the final happiness*, nor *the final annihilation*, of all human beings, in any of the senses in which theological writers had hitherto decided and treated of these doctrines; but a view of the subject combining and modifying both.—Thus far was I from being, as many have supposed that at the time of the original publication of my *Three Questions* I was, a Universalist.

Would you like to know what were some of the circumstances which more particularly contributed towards the satisfaction and settlement of my mind with regard to the extent and manner of going forth of God's love to man?

B. I certainly would.

F. And so would I.

T. Well, then, to the conviction that there must be a sense in which all the unregenerate are ultimately raised to happiness, I travelled by something like the following process.—

In the course of my reflections, it occurred to me, that it was impossible to adopt more than five notions of the future state of man; or, that five distinct notions exhausted the subject. It was necessary, 1st, that all human beings should be annihilated; or, 2ly, that all human beings should be miserable hereafter; or, 3dly, that only a portion of the human race should be raised hereafter, the remainder being annihilated; or, 4thly, that all the human race should be raised hereafter, but a portion of them, larger or smaller it matters not, to sin and suffer for ever; or 5thly and lastly, that the whole human race should in one way or another be raised hereafter to a state of happiness.—In considering these five supposable cases, (and it is impossible to find a 6th), I without a moment's delay set aside the two first, viz., that of *all being annihili-*

lated, and that of *all being raised to future misery*, as of course and necessarily untenable. Scripture cuts them down.—Three only, then, remained to be considered, viz., the 3d, 4th, and 5th suppositions.—As to the 3d, or the hypothesis, that *only believers live hereafter, the rest of the human family being annihilated or continuing under the power of death for ever*, it quickly struck me, that besides contradicting those passages of God's word which represent Christ as summoning to life again all who have gone down to the regions of the tomb,* as being he *in whom all are made alive*,† and as *swallowing up death itself in victory*,‡ it would leave, in the case of some, death, which is one of *the works of the devil*, undestroyed.§ All I saw must, consistently with the holy scriptures, rise again. Upon such grounds, this hypothesis fell to be rejected.—As to the 4th supposition, or that which assumes Christ *to be the author of the resurrection of the whole human race, and yet to raise some human beings to sin and suffer for ever*, which is commonly called the orthodox doctrine, having observed that, in flat contradiction to scripture which declares, that Jesus *put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, Hebrews ix. 26, that *his blood cleanseth from all sin*, 1 John i. 7, that *he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world*, Ibid: ii. 2, and that *he gave himself a ransom for all*, 1 Timothy ii. 6, it ventured to represent sin, in the case of many, perhaps of a majority, of the human race, as not taken away: and that, in the same spirit of opposition to divine authority which asserts, that hereafter *there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away*; Rev. xxi. 4; it maintained the aggravation and eternity of human sufferings: and, not only so, but that, as in the former instance, it must be

* Such as John v. 25, 28, 29. † 1 Corinth: xv. 22. ‡ Ibid: V. 51.

§ 1 John iii. 8.

held at the expense of maintaining that Christ, instead of *destroying*, confirms *the works of the devil*; sin and suffering being two of the devil's works: I say, the hypothesis of which we now speak, as perpetuating sin and suffering, in spite of the glorious atonement; and as, by representing Christ to raise a portion of the human race to sin and suffer for ever, making him to confirm sin and sufferings two of the devil's works, and thereby to become *the minister of sin*; necessarily cast itself out of my mind, as what it was impossible to hold consistently with any regard whatever to inspired authority.—By this exclusion of the four other hypothetical propositions, I was thus, as a matter of necessity, thrown upon the 5th proposition, that *Christ raises the whole human race, at one period or another,—either at the first, or at the second resurrection,—either in time, or when time shall be no more,—to be happy for ever.*

Again: in consequence of a question addressed to me by an esteemed and intelligent Christian friend in Scotland, I was led to consider, that the grand object of God, in all his arrangements whether of providence or grace, is *self-manifestation*; or that, “for his own glory, he hath fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass.” But, of course, his purpose is to manifest himself *as what he is*, not *as what he is not*. And what, pray, is God? *The just God and the Saviour*. Isaiah xlv. Not, the Saviour and just; but, just and the Saviour. That is, just and yet merciful. To exhibit himself as both just and merciful must, then, be his glorious object.—But what is justice? It is giving to every one exactly what is his due; especially, inflicting upon the sinner the exact punishment which his transgression deserves.—And what is mercy? It is the very opposite of justice, or the bestowing of eternal life upon beings who, so far from having merited it, do not even possess a right to retain the life that now is.—Still farther. What is the perfection of justice? It is the assigning to

every one, without exception, neither more nor less than is his due ; or, so adjusting matters, that the retribution of every sinner shall not in the slightest degree either come short of, or exceed, what his iniquities have deserved. And what is the perfection of mercy ? It must be the bestowing upon every one, without exception, of favours to which he is not in any respect whatever entitled ; or, the raising of every sinner to the possession and enjoyment of a life and a blessedness to which, on the ground of personal merit, he cannot plead the slenderest shadow of a right.—Unless this view of the matter be taken, there cannot be displayed in their fullest and greatest conceivable perfection the attributes of *justice* and *mercy*. And, be it remembered, that to display these, or to make himself known *as what he is*, is God's object. Death, or the forfeiture of the life that now is, *is sin's wages* : and, consequently, if any sinners be visited with a severer punishment than death, in the shape of either age-lasting or eternal torments, they are the subjects of *more than justice*. Again : if only some sinners are partakers of mercy, then have we a display of *mercy less than perfect*. That is, according to the popular system, which maintains that *many* sinners get more punishment than is their due, and a *few* sinners are raised to glory, we have an exhibition, not of *perfect justice* and *perfect mercy*, but of *plu-perfect justice* and *im-perfect mercy*. This, however, cannot be. Both attributes being *perfect* in Jehovah himself, both must be, and are, displayed *in perfection* in his dealings with the children of men. And in no way can we behold this, except by seeing, that, as justice is exhibited in its highest perfection, first in inflicting upon ordinary human beings sufferings and death, and, secondly, in inflicting upon the Lord Messiah, as *having been made sin for us*, those intense agonies and that most painful and ignominious death which constitute sin's wages, or the utmost

extent of the punishment which sin deserves ; so, the demands of justice having by the death of the Lord Jesus been perfectly satisfied and exhausted, mercy is exhibited in its highest perfection, first, in the present salvation of the members of the church, and, secondly, in the future and ultimate salvation through them of the rest of the human family. Justice is displayed perfect and satisfied ; for, as *in Adam all die*, so the Messiah himself, *the Lord from heaven manifest in flesh*, submitted to die, and thereby has *destroyed death*, by *swallowing it up* in himself *the victorious one* : and mercy is displayed perfect and satisfied ; for, in or through the resurrection of Christ, as the satisfier of the claims of justice in his death, *all are* in their several times and orders *made alive*.

Lastly. The argument of the apostle Paul, contained in and presented throughout the fifth chapter of the *Epistle to the Romans*, from the 12th verse to the end, completed my conviction. There I saw Adam and Christ contrasted : the one as having, by one transgression, brought death on all ; the other as having, by one righteousness, conferred life everlasting on all. Universality in the application of death through the former, stands contrasted with universality in the application of life through the latter. I found it impossible, by any kind of quibbling or artifice, satisfactorily to get rid of the truth proclaimed in the 18th verse :—*Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon ALL MEN to condemnation ; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon ALL MEN unto justification of life*. By what stretch of ingenuity could I succeed in making *all men*, to signify *some men* ? It was impossible. And to have had recourse to the low Arminian expedient of admitting, that Christ bestows *the free gift of justification upon all men*, merely in the sense of *offering to all men the gift of justification* ; or, that *he bestows on all men a justification*, of

which nevertheless *all men do not reap the benefit*; was not for a single moment to be thought of. Besides, the magnificent close of the chapter—the burst of divinely inspired and impassioned eloquence with which the apostle winds up the argument, and at once and for ever gives a death-blow to all those Manichean schemes of supposing the eternal existence of a principle of evil, by which the minds of ordinary religionists are perverted from the simplicity of the truth—drove before it every remnant of doubt which, from previous education and deeply cherished Calvinistic prejudices, might still have lurked within. *That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.* In other words, sin, which now occupies the throne, is not the eternal rival of grace: but has had a temporary and limited sovereignty conferred upon it, in subserviency to its own destruction; and to the elevation of grace to a sovereignty which is glorious, everlasting, and unbounded.—Oh! how sweetly, and powerfully, and eloquently has Jeremiah White treated of this subject!*

F. You have hinted, that your investigations ended in your embracing neither the *universal happiness of the unregenerate*, nor *their future annihilation*, in any of the senses in which these apparently discordant doctrines are commonly received and held; but in a view of the subject in some measure differing from, and yet combining by modifying both. Having informed us of the way in which you were led to see the necessity of becoming a believer in the doctrine of *universal salvation*, may I enquire how you contrived, in your own mind, to reconcile this doctrine with the idea of *annihilation*? To me, the two notions

* See his *Restoration of all things*, pages 243—245, edition, 1779; or, if his work should not be at hand, see a note on pages 74 and 75 of the second volume of my *Assurance of Faith*.

appear to be the very *antipodes* of each other. My curiosity is, therefore, most vividly excited to know how you were able to bring them into juxta-position. For your answer, I look with extreme interest.

T. The fact is, that, for some years previous to the period of which I speak, the suspicion had been growing upon me, of human nature and human beings as such having no existence whatever except in this present world. Now in shewing me the *salvation of all*, the scriptures shewed me at the same time the *destruction of all*: thereby confirming the conclusion towards which I had found my mind tending, almost from the very moment that I became aware of the existence of the distinction between *soul* and *spirit*.

To explain myself.—Although human beings were saved, yet human nature itself, I was led to perceive, was not saved and could not be saved as such. As human nature, it had justly incurred sentence of death; and its only destiny, therefore, was to be destroyed. This issue, owing to the truth no less than justice of God, nothing, I saw, could avert. In taking hold of flesh and blood, I observed that the Lord Jesus the Creator, and thereby the anti-type or substance of Adam the creature who was merely his type or shadow, had given unity to, summed up, and, if I may so express myself, *substantialized* human nature in himself. To express myself otherwise: in Jesus, human nature and human beings as partakers of that nature acquired, or rather appeared possessed of *a unity* and *a substance* which, in their natural connection with Adam, had been but faintly *shadowed forth*. Jesus was *the substantial man*. After he had exhibited in himself this substantial *flesh and blood nature* perfect and obedient to divine law during his earthly career, he sacrificed it; that is, he brought it, both in its *substantial* and *shadowy* form, in himself to an end. But the destruction

of a flesh and blood nature in him the Creator, was attended with a consequence which could never have resulted from the destruction of such a nature in the mere creature. In him it could appear in a higher form, by being transformed through his own mighty energy into a higher nature. This took place in his resurrection from the dead. Destroyed, human nature was in Jesus; but in Jesus, as swallowed up in his own divine nature, it also lives for evermore. That is, as human nature, after having been *substantialized* in him by the union which he formed with it in his conception, it was *destroyed* or *brought to an end*, by his sacrifice on the cross; but, as changed by him, through the medium of his resurrection from the dead, into his own glorious and divine nature, it has had conferred upon it everlasting existence and happiness.—Thus was I given to see, and that by the very same scriptures which satisfied me of *the universality of salvation*, also *the universality of annihilation*. Human nature, although saved, neither is nor could have been saved *as what it is*: its change by the Lord Jesus into his own divine nature necessarily implying, that *the salvation of all*, and *the destruction of all*, incongruous as the two ideas at first sight may appear, are nevertheless identical.

Truths with which, from my previous discovery of the distinction between *soul* and *spirit*, I had long been familiar, and which I had already promulgated from the press, were, in consequence of my being thus enabled to apprehend the identity of *salvation* and *annihilation*, more fully opened up and confirmed to me.—I saw, still more clearly than before, that *through Christ* there was no *restoration* of Adam's paradisaical nature: but, on the contrary, that there was through him a *destruction* of human nature, whatever form it may assume; and a communication, to those who now possess *human nature*, of *the divine nature*.—I saw also, with additional force and evidence, that, so

far from there being any principle of immortality naturally resident in man, all immortality is treasured up in Christ : and that it is through Christ, not through Adam, that immortality is imparted to the members of the human family. *In Adam, we die ; it is in Christ, we are made alive. It is because Christ lives, that we live also.*—And, in a word, I saw with still greater distinctness, lastly, that there is no possibility of human nature as such existing except in this present world : the salvation of human beings consisting, neither in human nature being *preserved* to them, nor in its being *restored* to them, ideas which appear to be favourites with the ordinary classes of religionists ; but in human nature being swallowed up by, and converted into, the divine nature of the Lord Jesus. With such views, I need scarcely add, that eternal and even age-lasting torments, both of which doctrines imply the carrying out of human nature beyond this present time state, as a matter of course fell to the ground.

Thus, then, by acquiring a clear and consistent knowledge of Jesus as having been *God manifest in flesh*, as *having died the just for the unjust*, and as *having thereby brought us to God*, we have necessarily combined therewith in our own minds the doctrines of *universal salvation*, and *universal annihilation*. Salvation—in so far as, what is now in all a flesh and blood nature, exists for ever hereafter in all as a divine and heavenly nature, by means of *all things* and persons through Christ *being made new*. And annihilation—in so far as, human nature as such having been united to, swallowed up in, and in this way destroyed by Jesus *the Lord from heaven*, neither has, nor can have, any existence beyond this present time state of things.

F. Accept of my best thanks for the distinctness and copiousness of detail, with which you have stated the progress of your mind in regard to this all-important subject.

I now understand your views much better than I ever did before.

B. But, David, you have said, that Mr. Harris of Glasgow proclaimed you to be a Universalist, a full twelvemonth before you actually became one; and represented your sentiments as, even in 1828, resembling those of the American Universalists. Is it fact that you agree with them?

T. Mr. Harris' critique on the first edition of my "Three Questions" appeared, as I have already stated, in the *Christian Pioneer* for April 1828. But I did not see it till the following year: a desire to peruse it having arisen in my mind from finding, that it had been taken notice of in some of the periodicals issued by the American Universalists. Indeed, it had been the means of making my name known to that body; and of opening up a correspondence between myself and individuals belonging to it. It was, I remember, in the spring of 1829, when my mind was beginning to settle into something like conviction respecting *the love of God to all*, that my first communications from America on this interesting topic arrived; and that, for the first time in my life, I learned any thing as to the existence and progress of Universalism in the United States. For three years, I had been advancing alone; acquainted only with the names, and latterly with a very few of the works, of those who had treated of *universal salvation* in my native country. Light was just dawning upon me. And it had originally entered into my mind chiefly, I might almost say, exclusively, from the scriptures themselves; my discovery of the distinction between *soul* as the mind of Adam, and *spirit* as the mind of Christ, the source of all that followed, having taken place* before I had perused a single Univer-

* In 1826.

salist production.* But now additional and edifying disclosures of divine truth were about to be opened up to me. Mr. Harris had represented me as agreeing with the American Universalists, long before I was satisfied of the scriptural foundation of Universalism itself, or had even heard of the existence of the body to which he alluded. Henceforward, however, through the instrumentality of his own review, I was to be brought into constant, and pleasing, and instructive intercourse with them. From the spring of 1829, until now, my communication with the American Universalists has been uninterrupted.† And I deem it no small honour conferred upon me, to have been considered by a body amounting to at least half a million of individuals, worthy to occupy for the last three years the situation of one of their corresponding secretaries for England.

F. The footing of intimacy on which you now are with the American Universalist body, and the acquaintance which you must now possess with their sentiments, no doubt qualify you to speak with something like confidence as to whether you coincide with them or not.

T. Certainly they do. Having received and read for a period of eight or nine years, the *Trumpet Magazine* of Boston, Mass'tts, edited by T. Whittemore; and, during four or five years, the *Union and Messenger* of New-York, edited by T. J. Sawyer; and having also, through the kindness of my trans-atlantic friends, been put in possession of all the standard works published by the American

* I should say, during an interval of many years. For, about the years 1813 and 1814, I did see one or two works of the late Mr. Vidler, and I think, also, a sermon of Mr. Winchester's, besides Mr. Douglas' notes on the Psalms. But I had not in 1826, nor have I now, the slenderest recollection of the contents of these different publications. My conviction is, that I read them so carelessly, and with such deep-rooted prejudices against the leading doctrine advocated in them, that no impression whatever, or, if any, an unfavourable one, was made upon my mind.

† Conducted principally through John Morrison, Esq. of Chatham-street, New York.

Universalist body within the last twenty or thirty years; including, among others, *The Antient History of Universalism*, by Ballou; *The Modern History of Universalism*, by Whittemore; Ballou's *Treatise on Atonement*; his *Notes on the Parables*; Balfour's *First Enquiry into the scriptural meaning of the words Sheol, Hades, Gehenna, &c.*; his *Second Enquiry into the scriptural doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan*; his *Three Essays on the intermediate state of the Dead*; Hudson's *Letters to Balfour*; Balfour's *Letters in reply to Hudson*; his *Controversy with Professor M. Stuart of Andover*; *The Life of John Murray*; Whittemore's *Notes and Illustrations of the Parables*; &c. &c. I flatter myself, that I am as completely in possession of the views of the American Universalists as any other person in this country at the present moment is; and, consequently, that I have it in my power to demonstrate how far the alleged coincidence between our respective sentiments obtains.

B. Are not the American Universalists at variance among themselves?

T. They are. About seven or eight years since, after many bickerings and the exhibition of much unpleasant feeling, they split into two subordinate divisions, denominated *the Impartialists* and *the Restorationists*. The former, who are by far the more numerous of the two bodies, deny *the existence of an intermediate state of happiness and misery, the infliction of temporary torments, and the immortality of the soul*: maintaining, that although there is a distinction between believers and unbelievers in time, this distinction, nevertheless, extends no farther; the whole human family, after having died, continuing until the end of time in a state of unconsciousness, and then rising again all at once, and without any distinction, to the enjoyment of eternal life.—The latter, maintain *the immortality of the soul, the existence of an intermediate state, torments in-*

flicted upon the wicked during a longer or shorter period, the reign of the saints, and the ultimate restoration through them of all things by Christ. They hold the sentiments of Chauncy, or rather of Winchester; that is, of the older, and, up to a comparatively recent date, ordinary Universalists.*—It is the former class with whose views I have been supposed to agree.

B. I think I have heard say, that other views of Universalism, besides those of which you have spoken, exist and prevail in America.

T. Scarcely now: except among individuals, and some of the German settlers inhabiting the interior of Pennsylvania.—John Murray, who first planted the standard of Universalism in the United States, about the year 1770, was a Rellyan in his views; and had, at one time, several congregations holding or professing to hold sentiments similar to his own. But since he was gathered to his fathers,† Rellyan Universalism has almost entirely dwindled away: the late Edward Mitchell of New-York having been, I believe, the last minister in America who with his congregation adhered to it. Murray's is certainly and deservedly an honoured name among all classes of American Universalists; and Impartialists and Restorationists, (would that I could say, forgetting their common differences,) have lately been striving to testify the respect which they bear to his memory, by having his remains taken from the place of their original sepulture, and deposited with great pomp under a tomb prepared for their reception in the beautiful cemetery at Mount-Auburn,

* Even among *Restorationists* themselves, it would be a mistake to suppose that perfect unity of sentiment exists. White Relly and Murray were inclined to Calvinistic, Winchester to Arminian or Pelagian notions of Christianity. Therefore, when we think or speak of the class of Universalists who contend for *limited future torments*, we must always bear in mind, that, owing to the Calvinism of some and the Arminian tendencies of the majority of their number, even they cannot be considered as perfectly at one among themselves.

† About twenty-three years since.

near Boston. But the system which Murray advocated is gone. Irretrievably gone, I suspect. Impartialism, and Restorationism or Winchesterianism, have completely subverted and supplanted it. By the supporters of each of these two systems certain individuals appear, by a sort of tacit consent, to be recognized as leaders. Hosea Ballou and Walter Balfour may be regarded as the present heads of the Impartialist body; while a minister named Paul Dean, and Charles Hudson the able antagonist of Balfour, take the lead of the Restorationists.

F. I now know that it was to your supposed agreement with the Impartialists that Mr. Harris alluded.

T. It was. And certainly there do exist some very remarkable and interesting points of resemblance between our respective sentiments.—First. We both agree in rejecting *limited torments*. Indeed, as far back as 1827, when engaged in the composition of my *Three Questions proposed and answered*, and a considerable time before I became a Universalist, I was satisfied of the unscriptural character and bearing of the doctrine of *future limited punishment*; and, in a note to the first edition, the substance of which was afterwards transferred to the text of the second, I laid down the principle upon which I repudiated it.—Secondly. We both agree in rejecting every notion of the *atonement* which, either directly or by implication, would represent God as having undergone any change in his views and purposes towards the family of man, in consequence of the mediation and work of Christ. God is not, through Christ, reconciled to the world; but *God is, through Christ, reconciling the world unto himself*. 2 Corinth: v. 19. That is, God being the I AM, *the unchangeable Jehovah*, is not, as it were, reluctantly constrained by the Son's coming to love and deliver the human race; but, on the contrary, so loved man, that it was he, *the Father, who sent the Son to be the Saviour of the*

world. 1 John iv. 14. His salvation of man, therefore, is not in opposition to his inclinations ; but is the result of *the purpose which he purposed in himself before the world began.* Eph: i. 9. 2 Tim. i. 9. Titus i. 2.—Thirdly. We both agree in rejecting the doctrine of *the natural immortality of man* ; or, to express myself otherwise, in rejecting *the immortality of soul.* My convictions in regard to this point flowed legitimately and necessarily from the difference between *soul as a shadowy,* and *spirit as a substantial principle,* which, as I have already hinted, was opened up to me in 1826. The views of *the Impartialists,* although expressed in a manner similar to my own, are, I have reason to believe, derived from other sources.—The three points just mentioned are those in which there obtains something like a perfect coincidence of sentiments between the American Impartialists and myself. The resemblance, indeed, is so striking as fully to justify Mr. Harris in the remark which he made. But it is curious—and no less curious than true—that in regard to every one of these three points my mind was completely made up, long before I had seen or perused a single production of the *Impartialists,* or had even so much as heard of their existence as a body. Common candour, however, requires me to say, that a subsequent perusal of the works of Ballou, Balfour, Whittemore, and others, has furnished me with many additional views and arguments of the most valuable kind, illustrative and confirmatory of my previously existing convictions.

B. But you are far from acquiescing in all the notions of *the Impartialists* respecting the subject of religion?

T. Very far, indeed, from doing so, Robert. So great, I may observe, is the discrepancy subsisting between us, that I scarcely know sometimes whether *as a whole* to prefer their sentiments, or those of their *quondam* friends and allies, but now bitter opponents, *the Restorationists.* Ra-

ther, let me say, the sentiments of such men as Rely and Murray, and their followers: for *the modern Restorationists* appear to me to give by far too much into the comparatively low and unscriptural views of Chauncy and Winchester.

My grand objection to the *Impartialists* is based on the degrading and Socinian notions with regard to the Lord Jesus which, with but few if any exceptions, they have agreed in adopting. They seem to think and act, as if to reject the ordinary and unsatisfactory dogmas respecting the atonement, and to plunge into the depths of Unitarianism, were necessarily identical modes of procedure. Now no mistake can be greater. Upon the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth—upon the fact of his having been the Creator manifest in flesh—hangs suspended the whole scheme of man's redemption. It was because Deity became incarnate, or because the divine nature was displayed in a state of union with human nature, that sin hath been taken away, perfect righteousness brought in, and everlasting life freely bestowed. The actings, and sufferings, and death, and resurrection from the dead, of the Creator manifest in flesh, constitute the only adequate channel through which the life of the Creator, (for such *eternal life* is,) can flow to the creature. Now these glorious and all-important truths, it is evident and painful to think, are neither understood nor relished by *the Impartialists*. And, in some respects, this is not to be wondered at. Such false, self-contradictory, and manifestly absurd views of the atonement have been broached at different times by professedly evangelical teachers of the religion of Jesus, as are well calculated to disgust the reflecting mind. But, O how distressing, when, from want of spiritual discernment, the truths of God are loathed, put away, and cast overboard, along with the errors of man. This, I am sorry to say, the *Impartialists* have done. Because

men calling themselves Theologians have uttered much nonsense respecting *the trinity*, their conclusion has been, in opposition to the divine testimony, that *the nature of Jesus, was not the nature of God manifest in the form of the nature of man*. Because God cannot alter in his purposes, and because the atonement of Christ is in fulfilment of not in opposition to these purposes, therefore they have concluded, with the same disregard of scripture, that the death of Christ, which according to them was that of a mere man, must be totally destitute of what is commonly understood by atoning efficacy : that is, although they admit his death to be *a sort of a channel* through which God displays his love to man, they have no conceptions of the magnitude of sin as it rested on the head of the pure and spotless Lamb of God ; of the weight of the curse which was borne by him ; of the complete destruction or consumption of his flesh and blood nature which the removal of that curse implied ; and, above all, of the fact, that the atonement required both the voluntary sacrifice of the nature to which guilt attached, and the swallowing up of the guilty nature and the guilt itself in a higher nature of which the person offering the sacrifice was possessed ; acts to which no being short of one endowed with the nature of the Creator was competent.—The views of *the Impartialists*, with regard to the nature of the Lord Jesus and the efficacy of the atonement, are thus awfully erroneous ; but, what is more, they are likewise excessively superficial. This is the natural effect of the way in which they go to work. They reject much that is false ; but, along with that, they reject also a great deal of what is true. Even Walter Balfour, by far the most scriptural in his ideas of these subjects of the whole of the Impartialists, and one of the honestest men and professors of religion at the present moment in America, cannot, I fear, be exempted altogether from the charges of error and superficiality of views

which I find myself constrained to bring against the body with which he is connected.

B. Unless the Messiah had been the Creator himself manifest in flesh, how could he, by his own act, have swallowed up sin in righteousness, and death in life everlasting?

F. What are your views respecting the atonement?

T. They have been already given to the public, in the second volume of my *Assurance of Faith*, from page 100 to page 117. But I am perfectly willing, with some little variety and condensation of statement, to repeat them.

With the American Impartialists I agree entirely in maintaining, that *eternal life* is to us creatures, in the strictest sense of the term, *the gift of God*; and with them, therefore, I agree in rejecting *all conditions of salvation*. I care not what the supposed conditions may be; whether conditions to be performed by creatures, conditions to be fulfilled in them, or conditions to be suffered by them; whether faith, or repentance, or self-denied obedience, if these be viewed as acts performed by them: because the very idea of *any condition* of eternal life, whether great or small, whether mental or bodily, remaining and requiring to be fulfilled by creatures, is necessarily and irreconcilably at variance with the scripturally-announced fact of the entire *unconditionality* to them of the blessing. —But because I reject the necessity of conditions of salvation being fulfilled by *creatures*, it does not follow that I reject the necessity of the fulfilment of them by *the Creator*. Indeed, the very reverse. I perceive, taught by the Spirit speaking in the scriptures, that the very reason why eternal life flows freely to me and to the other guilty children of men, is that, by the Creator himself, every condition of it which it is possible to understand, conceive of, or fancy, has been perfectly and gloriously accomplished. The law enjoining complete abstinence

from evil ;—the law enjoining perfect love to God, and equal love to man ;—the law enjoining the sacrifice of a substantial fleshly nature ;—was addressed, not to a *creature*, but to *the Creator manifest in flesh*. This law required to be fulfilled by him ; and upon its fulfilment by him hung suspended the destinies of man. And by him it was fulfilled. When he said, on the cross, *It is finished*, he left nothing undone which was necessary in order to the creature's salvation ; nay, he left not the possibility of any thing being done, of any thing being added to his work, with a view to that glorious result. Divine law as such had never issued *the command to obey* to mere creatures ; and, even if it had, being now thoroughly obeyed and thereby brought to an end by the Creator, obedience to it thenceforward on the part of mere creatures had become an utter impossibility. Thus, then, all the conditions of the creature's becoming a recipient of eternal life, having been fulfilled by the Creator himself ;—those conditions consisting in, his taking away of sin, by his taking away of the nature which had sinned ; his changing and elevating the nature which in us is sinful and dying, by raising it in himself a sinless and immortal nature ; and his freely bestowing upon us, not the nature which Adam originally had, or the nature which he himself possessed while in flesh, but the divine and heavenly nature to which he himself hath thus risen, and of which he is possessed for evermore ;—eternal life, although it came *conditionally* to him, comes *unconditionally* to us ; and in the blessings of salvation, as thus flowing *unconditionally* to us through the fulfilment of all *conditions* by Christ Jesus, consist the nature, glory, and efficacy of the atonement.

In connection with the foregoing remarks, and with a view to make myself still better understood, I may state farther, first, that God, through Christ Jesus, does not re-

mit to us any portion of the punishment which he originally denounced against sin ; that is, does not, through Christ, save us from any sufferings which we must otherwise have undergone, a favourite idea of popular religionists ; for, if so, his truth and justice would be compromised : but, on the contrary, allowing the original sentence against *the one transgression* to take full effect, he nevertheless, through the medium of the atonement, bestows blessings upon guilty creatures which, as not coming to them from the first Adam, were not by *that transgression* forfeited ; and which thus, without any infringement or violation of truth and justice on his part, he is, through his own Son, able because entitled to bestow.—Secondly. The Lord Jesus thus did not, in the popular sense of the phrase, die *in our stead* ; for, if so, we *needed not to die* ; and, if so, he may live *in our stead* likewise : but, on the contrary, he died *along with us* ; by assuming our nature, the original sentence having gone forth *against him* as well as *against us* ; by being the Creator, having gone to the very bottom of and exhausted death ; and by rising to the power of an endless life, not living *in our stead*, as is the necessary antithesis of the popular system, but raising us *along with him*, and giving us to live *along with him*, for evermore.—Thirdly and lastly. Although in compliance with popular usage, the constitution of our minds, and the language of scripture as accommodated to that constitution and to our present situation and circumstances, I have spoken of *conditions* as having required to be fulfilled by the Lord Jesus, I am nevertheless fully aware, that in reality and at bottom there is nothing *conditional* in the whole matter. God, the Creator, is he who *prescribes the conditions*. The Lord Jesus as one with by possessing the nature of God the Creator, is he who *fulfils the conditions*. This being the case, the blessing which is the result of *the prescribed conditions being fulfilled*, comes *freely* or *unconditionally*

to us. But if so, as God is thus *the all and in all* of the whole matter ;—salvation being thus seen to be his, as well *in its plan*, as in *its execution* ;—what is *the enjoining of conditions* to, and *the fulfilling of them* by, the Lord Jesus, but a proclamation to us, in a way suitable to our present capacities, that eternal life is in no respect whatever the result of creature deservings, but solely and exclusively the act and gift of the Creator ?

F. Have you exhausted your objections to the doctrines of the Impartialists ?

T. By no means. With respect to the following subjects, they appear to me to cherish notions which are essentially erroneous : these notions being at variance with views which are presented to us by divine revelation. 1. As to *election*. The display of the attribute of sovereignty by God, in the selection of the members of his church, for the purpose of knowing his name here and reigning with him hereafter, to the exclusion of all others, is stigmatized by them as savouring of partiality and despotism, and rejected accordingly. They seem not to understand that, although every man stands naturally upon the same footing of guilt and depravity, no one being able to substantiate a claim to salvation as a matter of right ; yet the same sovereignty which assigns to the various tribes of animals their respective places in the scale of natural creation,—none of these, previous to its formation, having any title whatever to the place which it holds,—may, without any impeachment, select from amidst a mass of human beings, all confessedly destitute of any title to the preference, any whom it may please to be the objects of special favour. Sovereignty, no less than justice, is an attribute of the Most High. Justice certainly requires, that, when any intelligent being shall have been summoned into existence, he shall be treated according to his nature. And hence, men, as having sinned, deserve to

die; a fate which, therefore, overtakes all. Farther: men, as having had their nature put upon them; that is, having been perfectly passive in the reception of the nature which they have, or, in the language of the apostle, *having been made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same*; deserve to be at one time or another, and in one way or another, *delivered from the bondage of corruption*: and ultimate deliverance is, therefore, even to the unregenerate portion of the human family, the result. But this death, and this ultimate deliverance of the unregenerate, which justice demands, are not inconsistent with, nay, require a display of sovereignty towards a few of the human race. For, 1st, on the very same principle on which God bestows different natures on different animals, ascending from the very lowest up to man himself, and this without any possibility of impeaching his justice, may he and does he bestow upon *some* human beings *the earnest of the divine nature*, a blessing to which *none* of them can prefer the shadow of a claim or title. In so doing, he is merely advancing the scale of being a step farther. Previously to the conferring of faith upon some, the progress was merely from *the inferior animal natures*, to *man's nature as the highest*; but now it is from *the highest animal nature*, to *the divine nature*. And yet be it observed, that, although in thus bestowing *the knowledge of himself*, and thereby an interest in his kingdom, upon *some*, to the complete and necessary exclusion of *the rest*, God no doubt acts *sovereignly*, he nevertheless does not act *unjustly*; for, besides that to all *the wages of sin is death*, God, in delivering the unbelieving portion of the family of man ultimately from the grave, satisfies the claims which *all* confessedly have acquired upon his *justice*, by his having rendered them the passive recipients of the nature which they now possess. And their claims on *justice* being thus satisfied, what more

would they have? Is the creature, with every righteous demand answered, to be permitted to turn on the Creator, and interfere with his sovereignty, by denying his right to bestow on *some*, privileges to which *none* have any claim? But, 2dly, little do the objectors to the exercise of divine sovereignty in the matter of election know, that they are unwittingly opposing that which is one of the glorious and necessary *media* of a world's salvation. In *having mercy, upon whom he will have mercy, and hardening whom he will* in time, our heavenly Father is actually employing the only means whereby ultimately *he can have mercy upon all*. The unregenerate portion of the human family possess, we have seen, a claim upon the divine justice to be ultimately *delivered from the bondage of corruption*. This claim God answers and satisfies. But how? Why, by bringing some of the human race to know his name here, and reign with him in his kingdom hereafter; by making use of *the enmity of the fleshly mind* to him, and his treatment of that mind, as important elements in opening up to his people that knowledge of his character which is in them life everlasting; Rom: ix. 17, 18; and by rendering their present knowledge of him, the means of ultimately communicating that knowledge to, and thereby rescuing from their present state of degradation and bondage, an unbelieving world. *The earnest expectation of the creature, or unregenerate men, waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God*. Rom. viii. 19. Thus, then, is the divine sovereignty, which is such a bugbear to the mere fleshly mind, exercised, not in opposition to, but in the strictest consistency with, divine justice, as well as in subserviency to the purposes of divine wisdom and love; seeing that is through the conferring of the knowledge of himself upon the members of his church here, and the assigning to them a kingdom with his Son hereafter, that the designs of his love with regard to the rest of the fa-

mily of man are carried into effect. John iii. 14—17; Rom. viii. 17—21.

2. The Impartialists, in rejecting the doctrines of *the immortality of soul*, and *the existence of mere human nature as such in an intermediate state*,—in doing which, I am perfectly at one with them,—have rejected along with them the idea of *there being any existence at all to any between death and the final resurrection*: maintaining, that the whole of mankind, without any exception, and without any distinction of believers and unbelievers, after slumbering in their graves until time shall be no more, are at once, and upon one and the same footing, raised to the enjoyment of everlasting life, at the period and by means of Christ's second coming. This they do, overlooking or not understanding the facts, that, according to scripture, there are two resurrections, one *of the just* and another *of the unjust*; that those who as believers are partakers of *the first resurrection*, and this, by becoming possessed through faith of the earnest of spirit or divine mind, *never die*, or have in them a principle of immortality which ensures their continued and everlasting existence; and that this class of mankind, by *being born again*, having Christ's nature in them and enjoying the privilege of being kings and priests with him, sit down with their head upon his throne hereafter, and with him concur and co-operate in the subjugation of the rest of the human family. *Such honour have all the saints.* Psalm cxlix. 9.—Painful is it for me to think that, notwithstanding the many valuable and important discoveries in the sacred volume which the Impartialists have made, they should never have seen that in believers is realized the anti-type of the case of the Jews of old. How plain to those who have received any tolerable measure of divine illumination, that, as the people of Israel were selected sovereignly from among the other nations of the earth, that they might enjoy the earthly Canaan and many other

valuable temporal privileges, and, above all, that through them the knowledge of God might ultimately reach the Gentile world ; so have the members of the true Israel been selected sovereignly from among the rest of the human race, that they might be elevated to his throne in the heavenly Canaan with their head, might enjoy with him many peculiar spiritual privileges, and, above all, that with him they might achieve the ultimate manifestation of the character of God to a now ignorant and unbelieving world.

3. In regard to what is implied in *the knowledge of the gospel, or the nature of faith*, Impartialists also mistake. They admit that faith is *a resurrection* ; but such an one as takes effect only in, and is confined to, this present world. “It is,” according to them, “a moral resurrection ; and to the acquisition of it, as possessing powers fully adequate to the effort, human beings may be exhorted.” Now every one of these views stands opposed to the language and doctrines of inspiration. Instead of their being true, 1st, faith is never the result of efforts put forth by man ; but is the free gift of God to those who are the objects of his sovereign electing love : the possession of it being, *not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.* Rom : ix. 16.—2dly. Faith is not a *moral*, but a *spiritual, resurrection* : that is, it consists not in any improvement or elevation of *the principles of human nature* ; but in the imparting to the individual of *the earnest of spirit, or the divine nature.*—And 3dly, the nature imparted in faith is not a principle which is confined in its existence to this present world : but, as *the earnest of the divine nature*,* survives the stroke of death ;† being the means of the introduction of him who is possessed of it into the kingdom and immediate presence of Christ and of God.‡

* 2 Corinth : v. 1—5. † John xi. 25, 26. ‡ John iii. 3, 5. Phil. i. 21—23.

Many other objections to the Impartialist system occur to me. But I think they may all be comprised in this:—that Impartialists, as they style themselves, have not, as a body, a due conviction of the weakness and worthlessness of human nature; of the condemnation, destruction, and swallowing up, of that nature which took place in the cross of Christ; of the nature which Christ confers on his church, and through its members on the rest of the world, being, not an improved human nature, but his own present, glorious, divine nature; and of the whole scheme of salvation as originating in, and as being carried into effect by, free sovereign grace. Independently of the facts of their associating too much with the infidel and Unitarian classes of the community, and of their ascribing to human nature a susceptibility of advancement and improvement which is in express contradiction to the language of scripture, their dislike of the glorious doctrine of election of itself would suggest to me some notion of human merit as lurking in their minds. Where all are equally guilty and undeserving, why, if this were believed, object to *God doing what he will with his own?*—I know the truth of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. It is not with me *a mere opinion*, but *a matter of faith*. But the footsteps of the special love of God *to some*, as subsidiary to and as terminating in the exhibition of his character as love *to all*, are so clearly imprinted on every page of Revelation, that, except under the influence of notions of creature worthiness, and from ignorance of the nature and functions of divine sovereignty, it is impossible for any one to overlook them. *God saves all*: not because any human beings in themselves deserve to be saved; but because it is his good pleasure, with a view to the complete manifestation of his character through his well-beloved Son, that all shall be saved.

B. Mistaken as the Impartialists may be, you have no inclination surely to side with the Restorationists ?

T. Why should I ? It is to the erroneous notions, and manifest incongruities, originally broached and still maintained by them, that the blunders of the Impartialists are in no small degree to be traced.—Restorationists have represented *limited torments hereafter* as necessary to the completeness of salvation : thereby disparaging the finished work of Christ ; introducing a species of purgatory ; negating the freeness of the gift of eternal life ; confounding *soul* with *spirit*, by ascribing immortality to *soul* or *mere creature principle* ; and, although admitting that human nature itself is to be destroyed at death, nevertheless supposing that actions which spring from that nature may extend their influence beyond the precincts of this present world. They, or at all events the Winchesterians by far the larger portion of them, have, still further, made the electing love of God to some, to proceed on the principle of some excellence of character attained to by them, or created in them ; those about whom there is something good, escaping the torments hereafter which are supposed to be reserved in store for the rest : and all this, although scripture shews, that *'tis not by works of righteousness which they have done, but solely according to his mercy that he renders the members of his church partakers of a peculiar salvation.* Titus iii. 5.—No, no, my good friends : a system like that of the Restorationists will not do for me. It tallies not with the inspired declarations of scripture. If the peculiar salvation of the church spring, not from divine sovereignty alone and exclusively, but from some superiority as human beings possessed by those who are saved over others ; then say I, with the Impartialists, “away with *such a peculiar salvation.*” Tending as it does to exalt the creature in himself, and to throw into the back-ground that righteousness of the Creator

manifest in flesh, in which alone the regenerate stand, and know themselves to stand, perfect and accepted before Jehovah, it positively *stinks in my nostrils*. It is merely one species of low, rank, disgusting Pelagianism.

F. Passing by the mistakes of these different American sects, I want to hear something of your own views concerning other topics.

T. Before quitting our present subject, allow me to remark, that never did the defects of the system of Impartialism strike me so forcibly, as when perusing the written controversy, carried on in the year 1834, between Dr. Ezra Stiles Ely, a professedly Calvinistic pastor, and Mr. Abel C. Thomas, a Universalist minister, both then residing in Philadelphia.* Ely's views, like those of many others claiming to be enrolled among the followers of Calvin, are in scarcely any one respect to be preferred to open and undisguised Arminianism. Thomas evinces talents of a very high order; and, in a manner the most courteous and creditable to himself, brings out the sentiments of his peculiar class.† But he was sadly hampered by his system. While Ely, in a style of cool and easy impudence, is threatening his antagonist with hell and damnation; Thomas, with much suavity of manner, is continually assuring Ely, that he (Ely) at all events need fear nothing, seeing that, notwithstanding all his opposition to what he (Thomas) deemed to be truth, they should both meet together upon exactly one and the same footing hereafter. Were it not for the nature of the subject,

* The entire title of the work is, "A Discussion of the conjoint question, Is the doctrine of endless punishment taught in the bible? or, does the bible teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? In a series of letters between Ezra Stiles Ely, D.D. Pastor of the third Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, and Abel C. Thomas, Pastor of the first Universalist Church, Philadelphia.—New-York: published by P. Price, No. 2, Chatham-square. Stereotyped by J. S. Redfield. 1835."

† The Impartialists.

the constant reciprocation of such compliments by both parties would be inexpressibly amusing. Now, thus to smooth over matters, is not the way for a Universalist who knows the gospel, to deal with one of these free-salvation-hating Pelagians. While it is a fact, and not, therefore, when necessary to be concealed, that through Christ ultimately *all things shall be made new*, Rev : xxi. 5, and, of course, the unregenerate portion of mankind among the rest ; it is also a fact, that with this subject the unregenerate as such have nothing whatever to do : seeing that of it, no more than of any other divine subject, can they form the slightest conception ; and that, consequently, until the gospel be believed in by them, to discuss such a topic with them, is to be guilty of *casting pearls before swine*. Matthew vii. 6. When haters of the gospel like Dr. Ely, wish to treat of the ultimate salvation of all mankind, those who know and love the truth must respectfully, but firmly, decline entering into controversy with them on the subject. But, if they will push it ; and if, like Dr. Ely, they will try, in the spiteful and tyrannical spirit of human nature, to intimidate their opponents ; they must have a civil and courteous hint given to them, that as, by their own admissions, they shew themselves *not to be born again*, they must, if they live and die in their present natural state, be content to be for ever excluded from *the kingdom of Christ and of God*. In other words, those who are so fond of dealing out eternal damnation to others—whose very language smells of the fire and brimstone of the bottomless pit—must have it gently suggested to them, when they assume apostolic* airs and seat themselves upon their high horse, that, as ignorant of the love of God to themselves personally, the only principle of the divine nature in the consciences of believers, they shew

* *Apostolic!* Query. Should I not rather have said *Satanic?*

themselves to be at the present moment the fitting subjects of eternal punishment. Such persons must not, by any neglect on our part, be allowed to run away with the conviction, that we confound the fate of the family of Christ, with the fate of the rest of the world.—Now, my dear sir, for your questions.

F. How do you reconcile your system with the language of scripture concerning a general judgment?

T. Rather say, with what other system than that which I propound and advocate can the doctrine of a general judgment be reconciled?—Two principles are presented to us as now existing, and as now engaged in eager and deadly conflict. Human nature or the nature of Adam, as a principle of sin, stands opposed to the divine nature or the nature of Christ, as a principle of righteousness. Since the transgression of Adam and the issuing of the first promise, until now, these two principles have been exhibited in a state of rancorous and incessant warfare; and in this state of mutual collision they are destined to continue till the end of time. *The flesh*, or human nature, *lusteth against the Spirit*, or the divine nature; *and the Spirit, against the flesh*: *and these are contrary the one to the other*; so that believers cannot do the things that they would. Galatians v. 17. But this conflict shall not last always. God is the judge. From the highest heavens he beholds, regulates, and overrules all. A sentence condemning flesh and in favour of Spirit, he hath already given forth; that sentence he hath already so far carried into effect in the death and resurrection of his well-beloved Son, and in the communication of the earnest of Spirit or eternal life to the hearts and consciences of his Son's people; and he hath assured us, that that sentence shall be fully and finally executed in such a way as shall prove satisfactory to all. Rom : iii. 19. Rom : viii. 19. 2 Thes-

sal: i. 10.* This shall take place at the period of the second resurrection; or of the raising up of those who now perish in an unregenerate state. Then shall the grand and long-subsisting controversy between flesh and Spirit, between sin and righteousness, be definitively settled. Flesh and sin, which had been previously condemned in the death of Adam, in the sacrifice of Christ, and in the sweeping away of the whole human race with the earth upon which they tread,—shall then be condemned for the last time and for ever in the complete absorption of the fleshly and sinful nature, and of those who on earth were possessed of that nature, in Spirit or the nature of Christ. And Spirit and righteousness, which, as appearing in the faith of the Old Testament church, in the person and character of Christ, and in the New Testament saints as endowed with Christ's nature and elevated to his throne, had in every preceding æra been the objects of divine complacency,—shall then receive sentence of final and complete approbation, by being exhibited in their most triumphant form, as the sole, the dominant, and, because divine, the all-absorbing and self-conforming principles throughout eternity. This period of the second resurrection, is the day; and this swallowing up of sin and death in victory, that is, in righteousness and life everlasting, is the manner; in which *God will finally judge or condemn the world, by that man whom he hath ordained* even Jesus Christ. Acts xvii. 31. It will be a *day*, for it will take place at the appointed æra; a *day of judgment*, for sin and sinners shall then be finally condemned, and righteousness and the righteous then finally approved of; and a *day of general judgment*, for all without exception shall be concerned in it. But, what is still more delightful, and still more indicative of divine power, it shall be a *day of*

* Then every mouth shall be stopped.

satisfactory judgment. God through his saints will not be blasphemed, but glorified; God through them that believe will not be contemned and hated, but admired in that day. 2 Thess : i. 10. Although God as a consuming fire shall then appear, visiting with condign punishment and taking vengeance on them that knew not God, and that obeyed not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, and thus completely and everlastingly swallowing up them and their fleshly and sinful nature in himself; yet he shall then appear also thereby making them new. Jesus, as he who dwelt in the bush, burning but not consuming it, shall then appear dwelling in the whole human family; whose sinful and fleshly nature he burned, when he offered up himself a holocaust on Mount Calvary; but whom he did not consume, seeing that in himself he made them new, or reproduced them as possessors of the divine nature, by his resurrection from the dead. It is in consequence of this change, or reproduction, of all human beings in himself as their heavenly Father, that the general judgment shall be to all perfectly satisfactory. Millions of intelligent beings are not to be left for ever weltering in flames of fire, gnawing their tongues for pain, and heaping curses on the Being who gave them existence, dissatisfied with their fate, and incapable of regarding God in any other light than that of a gloomy and revengeful despot; as is awfully and blasphemously supposed by the abettors of the popular creed. No: blessed be the revealed name of Jehovah; he is not an impotent being. He does not weakly, like the imaginary god of the Manichees, and like the god of systems mis-called *Christian* which have adopted the Manichean doctrine as their basis, after having allowed evil to enter into the universe, rest contented to struggle with it throughout eternity, unable to overcome and destroy it.—So far from this, his scriptural character is, that he is the destroyer, because he is the hater, of sin and the other

works of the devil. In the cross of Christ, he exhibits to us who believe *sin taken away.* In the resurrection of Christ, he exhibits to us sin and all its effects *swallowed up* in the divine nature of our Lord. And this, through communicating to us by faith the earnest of the very principle from which the destruction and absorption of sin have proceeded. And, at the period of the general judgment, when all nations are convened before him, it is not to behold *sin confirmed for ever* in the case of any;—a result which would imply the imperfection of Christ's work, the existence of indisposition or inability or both on his part to destroy evil, and above all the necessary and everlasting dissatisfaction of a large portion of intelligent beings with his procedure;—but it is, that the destruction of sin through Christ, which he hath already upon earth exhibited to *the members of the church,* may then be exhibited to *all,* by the resurrection of those who had lived and died on earth possessed only by a sinful nature, in a new and sinless nature, through *the manifestation* to them of Christ and *the other sons of God:* Rom: viii. 19:—this very resurrection of those who continue during their natural lifetime unregenerate, being at one and the same moment condemnatory of their former sinful nature and state, which it swallows up; an approval of the divine nature and character of Christ Jesus, which as alone fitted to live for ever it communicates; and satisfactory to themselves, as then possessed of a nature which, while it condemns their former state of ignorance and opposition to God, is, by the present enjoyment of which it is necessarily productive, the means of enabling and constraining them to understand, appreciate, and relish the whole.

F. This destruction of evil in the case of those who now live and die unregenerate, and this *making of them new* ultimately through Christ Jesus, is what, I presume, you conceive to be the revenge taken on wickedness and the wicked by the divine mind?

T. Yes; and a truly divine revenge it is. To return evil for evil, would be but a vulgar and human piece of procedure. It is what any creature can do. Indeed, such revenge is characteristic merely of the weakness and malignity of the creature mind. Suppose God to restore to the wicked in a future state their present wicked nature, and then to torment them eternally, as popular systems represent him to do, what is it but to degrade him to a level with ordinary human beings? With ordinary human beings, did I say? Let me correct myself. Such a supposition is to degrade him to a level with the vilest and most loathsome of the race: for, steeped in hatefulness of the blackest dye must man's mind be, which can take delight in the infliction of severe and protracted sufferings upon his fellow men. What! Suppose the infinite Jehovah, whose name is LOVE, endowed with the concentrated malice and revenge of a Spanish Inquisitor! —No. *We have not so learned Christ.* We believe, and triumph in the fact, that he will take vengeance on the wicked. *Vengeance belongeth unto him*; and he will exercise it. But his revenge is, like himself, divine. He will not, it is true, admit human nature, or human wisdom, or human virtue, or any thing that is human, into heaven. And the reason is, that, in regard to all that is human, Adamic, or creaturely, he *is a consuming fire.* Hebrews xii. ult. Christ was the great burnt-offering, in which his own substantial flesh and blood nature, and human nature as contained and involved in it, was, as a holocaust, entirely and without reserve offered up to God. But if he saves not human nature as such, he does what is far better. If, in the cross of Christ, he heaped coals of fire upon it, even *burning coals of juniper*,* and consumed it,—it was that, Phoenix-like, a more glorious nature might spring

* Psalm cxx. 4.

from its ashes. For, in the resurrection of Christ, he shews himself, not overcome by evil, as in the exercise of ordinary revenge men are ; but overcoming evil with good, by the conversion of enemies into friends : his revenge being a species of spiritual alchymy, by which the basest are transmuted into the most glorious materials.—This spirit of divine revenge, is likewise the spirit of his church. Its members have caught it from their head. As in him, so in them, it is the exhibition and exercise of love. It points to, it tends towards, it delights itself in, the destruction of the nature which is *enmity against God*. And at last, incapable of any farther or longer restraint, it flames forth in all its light, heat, and intensity, carrying before it the entire consumption or destruction of all that is creaturely : but, in the very act of destroying the creaturely nature and all its consequences, giving a new form, and a heavenly creation, to those upon whom the revenge is taken ; and this, by raising them to the everlasting knowledge and enjoyment with themselves of him whose nature is love.

B. Glorious and truly God-like is this revenge, my dear brother.

T. It is, Robert. We who believe the truth are now necessarily either hated, or despised, or both, by *a world that lieth in wickedness*. We complain not of this usage. Nay, we have no right to complain of it. The world poured obloquy and contempt on our head : and why should not we be prepared for similar treatment at its hands ? *The world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.* 1 John iii. 1. Our business is to see, that there is not excited in us thereby a feeling of unkindness and fleshly resentment. For such, whenever it obtrudes itself, is merely a result of our Adamic nature : and *the wrath of man, we know, worketh not the righteousness of God*. Delightful it is for us to believe, on divine authority, that

the day of our revenge approaches. But still more delightful to think, that our revenge shall consist, not in vulgarly retaliating upon others *evil for the evil* which they have done to us ; but in co-operating with our divine head in the ultimate *deliverance* of these enemies of himself and us *from the bondage of corruption*, and their introduction *into the glorious liberty of the sons of God*. Rom : viii. 21. Perishing in unbelief, it is true that such persons never can reign with Christ : from his kingdom, they being completely and irremediably excluded. But, O ! sweet consideration ! if they cannot reign, at all events they can be reigned over. They can be subdued to Christ ; and we, as reigning with our head, can contribute towards their subjugation. We can lend our aid in *heaping the coals* of divine love *upon their heads*. This, this, shall be our revenge.

F. You have alluded to two resurrections. By these, your previous statements lead me to understand, first, a resurrection of the church, or Christ's peculiar people ; and, secondly, a resurrection of the rest of the human family. Christ, I remember, in the gospel according to Luke, speaks of *a resurrection of the just*, which he distinguishes from that of the others, and which he represents as the period until which the enjoyment of their peculiar privileges by believers is postponed. Luke xiv. 14.

T. That there are two resurrections, is a doctrine, not of one passage merely, but of the whole strain and current of scripture. Of these resurrections, the resurrection of the members of the church takes place, as to its first beginnings in their consciences, in time ; and it is perfected both as to mind and body at the period of Christ's second coming. *The Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelling in them ; he that raised up Christ from the dead also in due time quickens their mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in them*. Rom : viii. 11. As par-

takers of this first resurrection, believers never die. On the contrary, they enter with Christ into his kingdom, and occupy the throne with him during the period of his millennium or thousand years reign.—The second resurrection, or that of the unregenerate, takes place at the close of the thousand years reign, or of the intermediate state; during the whole of which those who are the subjects of it have no manifested existence. *The rest of the dead lived not again, until the thousand years were finished.* Rev : xx. 5.—These two resurrections imply, not a *restoration to life*;—for there is no *restoration* of Adam's life either to saint or sinner;—but *the bestowing of life from above*, at one period or another, upon the whole of the human family.

F. You hold, then, that there is no intermediate state of existence, except for the regenerate.

T. Certainly. The regenerate alone *are saved*; while the unregenerate *perish*. That is, upon the elect or people of Christ alone is bestowed *that knowledge of God*, in consequence of which *human nature* in them, even while existing *as such*, by having a principle of immortality imparted to it, or rather by the natural conscience being swallowed up in *faith, the earnest of the divine nature*, is in a certain sense preserved from perishing. *I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die.* John xi. 25, 26. *This is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* Ibid: xvii. 3.—The consciences of others, remaining destitute of *faith* or *the earnest of the divine nature*, have in them no present principle of immortality; and, consequently, such persons cannot, after death, have any distinct existence, until *made new* at the period of the *second resurrection*. This *second resurrection* is, no doubt, even to the unregenerate, salva-

tion in one sense ; for it is the ultimate rescuing of them, the subjects of mortality and corruption, from the gloomy domains of death : but it is not that salvation which consists in being preserved from dying ; a salvation which is only the portion of those to whom is imparted by faith, while they are in flesh, the earnest of the divine nature, and to whom thereby is conceded the privilege of being partakers of *the first resurrection*.

F. What is *the second death* ?

T. May I ask you to inform me, previous to my answering your question, what you understand by *the first death* ?

F. I cannot conceive of it as any thing else than the import of the sentence originally pronounced upon Adam, and in him upon all his posterity. *Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return.*

T. So far good. Have you ever observed the relative positions, in scripture itself, which *the first and second deaths* occupy ?

F. I do not exactly understand you. The fact is, that I am rather dull of apprehension in these matters.

T. Is not *the first death* spoken of in the book of Genesis, the first book of the Old Testament scriptures ; and *the second death*, in so far at least as the phraseology is concerned, in the book of Revelation, the concluding portion of the New Testament scriptures ? And does not this relative position of *the two deaths*, the one at *the commencement*, and the other at *the end*, of the volume of divine inspiration, seem to intimate, that *the one death* has some sort of connection with *the beginning*, and *the other* with *the consummation*, of that glorious scheme which it is the purpose of God by means of his word to reveal ?

F. This never struck me before. Now that you mention the thing, however, I cannot help noticing it.

T. The best way of ascertaining what *the second death*

is, will be to compare together, and with other portions of the sacred volume, the only four passages in the book of Revelation, indeed, in scripture, where the phrase occurs. These are ii. 11 ; xx. 6 ; Ibid : xiv. ; and xxi. 8.—Taking the two former of these passages together, it appears, that *the second death* is something by which injury may be inflicted, ii. 11 ; but which over those who are partakers of *the first resurrection*, and *reign with Christ during the thousand years*, that is, over those who overcome by faith, *hath no power*. xx. 6. And then, looking to the two latter passages, we find them conjoined with figurative language which indicates, not as is commonly imagined continued torment, but complete and irremediable destruction. *The casting of death and hades into the lake of fire*, which, if a mass of fire in which something else may be engulfed have any meaning at all, must signify the destruction of *death and hades*, is declared to be *the second death* ; xx. 14 ; and individuals possessed of the principles of human nature merely, as is indicated by the works of the flesh which are ascribed to them, (see Gal : v. 19, &c.) are also declared to be subjected to *the second death*, or to the same destruction to which *death and hades* had already been consigned. xxi. 8.—The import of the whole, it strikes me, is, that human beings who live and die possessing merely a creature nature, in consequence of having nothing higher, are subjected to *two deaths*. First. To the death which Adam and his posterity, as possessors of the nature which transgressed the original divine prohibition, undergo : a death which consists in the forfeiture by all of them of the original paradisaical life, and in their all *returning to the dust from which they were taken*. Secondly. To the death which the Jews as a nation, and which all unregenerate human beings, as possessors of the nature which in them resisted the divine command to believe on Jesus of Nazareth as

the Messiah, and consequently as inheritors of their spirit, incurred and undergo : a death which consists in complete and everlasting exclusion from Christ's kingdom ; or, in the awfully emphatic language of one portion of holy writ, in *everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*. 2 Thessal : i. 9. Language which, although at first sight apparently inconsistent with the salvation of the unregenerate in any sense, becomes plain and intelligible when we are led to see, that of Jesus, *as Lord and Christ*, the unregenerate never know any thing ; that in these glorious characters they never behold him ; and that *the second death* to them consists in their being *as unholy*, because *unregenerate*, everlastingly excluded from the presence of the reigning Messiah : Hebrews xii. 14 : their ultimate salvation arising, not from their introduction into Christ's kingdom, or from the manifestation of him to them as Lord and Christ, but from that very state of exclusion itself which they are made to undergo, and by which as *the second death* they are punished, being *cast into the lake of fire*, and Jesus being thereby manifested to them in his highest and most glorious character as *the all and in all*. 1 Corinth : xv. 28. Rev : xxi. 5.

B. To meet your views of the language of scripture respecting this matter, it must be impossible for believers to sustain any injury from the second death. Rev : ii. 11.

T. And no injury from it is sustained by them. They are subjected only to *the first death* ; or to that death of the body and fleshly mind, which Adam and all his posterity in him, by the original transgression incurred and undergo. But even this *first death* believers are subjected to after a fashion peculiar to themselves. Prepare yourselves for something which may at first startle you, and appear to be incredible, but which is nevertheless true :—believers actually die after the manner of Enoch and

Elijah. They are raised from the dead, and thereby made spiritually alive as to their consciences, even while they are dwellers in flesh. Eph: ii. 1—6. They do not *die first* and *live afterwards*, as is the case with the rest of the human race; or as those who are subjected to *the second death* do. But they *live first*, and, *through living, die*; or, in other words, in *the very act* of making them *spiritually alive*, or rendering them *partakers of the first resurrection*, by imparting to them while in flesh *the earnest of his own divine nature*, Jesus is pleased to inflict upon their consciences *the sentence of death* originally denounced against Adam and all his posterity. That is, the present communication to them of *the principle of spiritual life*, is *the swallowing up* in itself of *natural conscience*, and thereby *the death*, because *the killing* of it. What a glorious and blessed *euthanasia!*—Sentence of death had gone forth against the whole human family. That sentence of course behoved to be executed. And yet, not necessarily upon all in one and the same way. For it appears that there are two perfectly distinct modes of inflicting it. Men may be allowed, as ordinarily happens, to live and die ignorant of Christ, and thereby destitute of spirituality: in which case as *they perish*, losing at death the only principles of which while upon earth they were possessed, they are necessarily shut out of Christ's kingdom; or, in addition to *the first*, are subjected also to *the second death*. But upon men, while *naturally alive* although *dead* as to their consciences through Adam's *one transgression*, God may, as happens in the case of his church, bestow the knowledge of himself, or that principle of spirituality or the divine nature, which, in the very act of *making alive*, also *kills*, as being necessarily the *swallowing up* of *natural principles* in *supernatural ones*; and which, from the very nature and mode of its infliction, as being to the individuals the present *swallowing up* of

death in victory, or the present introduction into Christ's kingdom, renders it a matter of absolute impossibility that *the second death*, or future exclusion from that kingdom, should be undergone by them. The former, or the incurring both of *the first* and *the second deaths*, is the fate of the unregenerate. The latter, or the having of *the first death* inflicted through the medium of having conferred on them *the earnest of life everlasting*,—which, by its present swallowing up in them of *human in the divine nature*, leaves nothing for *the second death* to prey on,—is the fate of the regenerate. Thus both classes undergo *the first death*. But after totally different fashions. For, while the world in general *live*, through the medium of *dying twice*; believers *die once*, in the very act of *being made alive spiritually at once and for ever*. Thus upon them the original sentence of *death* is inflicted, by the very fact of conferring upon them *life everlasting*. In their consciences, as in an epitome or abstract, there is realized in time, what shall take place ultimately upon a larger scale in the case of the rest. They become by faith as to their consciences *new creatures*, or *a new creation*: *old things* as to them *passing away*, and *all things* as to them *becoming new*. 2 Corinth: v. 17. The resurrection of Christ, manifested to them by faith, becomes their resurrection. His mind, their mind; his righteousness, their righteousness; and his life, their life. It is thenceforward not *they who live*; but *he who liveth in them*. Galatians ii. 20. Their Adamic nature is destroyed, as well as that of others. But it is not destroyed *as that nature* is in others.—Mankind in general have but *one nature* upon earth, with which they part at death; and they must wait till *the second resurrection* before they can be invested with *another*. Before attaining to it, they must pass through the gloomy vale of *the second death*. As *human beings*, they necessarily perish. See John iii. 14—

16. And to them, there is no life again, until the voice, the *omnific* voice, of Christ shall pierce the regions of the grave; and summon them forth to a state of existence which, although it consists in their being *made new* as a portion of the *all things*, is nevertheless, as to their former state, a resurrection of damnation. John v. 29. Rev : xx. 5. See also Daniel xii. 2.—Believers, however, even while possessed of this transient earthly life, are made partakers of the earnest of one which is heavenly and everlasting. They require not, like the rest of their fellow men, to part with one state before being introduced into another. They require not to perish, before being raised up to live again. On the contrary, they are *by faith*, even while on earth, made to possess a principle which is in them *the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*. Hebrews xi. 1. This is in them the realization of the earnest of life everlasting. John xi. 25, 26. xvii. 3. A very singular and interesting circumstance is connected with this state of things, namely, that the human nature of believers, if in one sense destroyed, as it unquestionably is, by being swallowed up as to their consciences in the divine nature of Christ; yet in another sense *does not perish*, as being *immortalized* during the subsistence of their earthly lives. John iii. 14—16. xi. 25, 26. Hence it is, that, as even now raised with Christ,—as even now partakers with him in his resurrection,—as even now *seated in heavenly places* with him,—believers are even already spiritually alive; and, being so, are of course alive for evermore. Natural death merely affords to them the opportunity of having their whole persons conformed to the model or likeness of their glorified head. 2 Corinth : v. 6—8. 1 John iii. 2. As to them *to live, is Christ*, that is, is to have Christ living in them; so to them *to die, is gain*, that is, is to have *the earnest* of life everlasting exchanged for and con-

verted into *the full fruition*. Philip: i. 21.—But I enlarge too much on a subject, on which, from the ineffably glorious views which it opens up and discloses to my mind, I can seldom trust myself to speak, without running the risk of becoming positively enthusiastic.

B. Now, brother, I am satisfied: and for the pains which you have taken to instruct me, and the information with which you have furnished me, I tender you my best thanks. A doctrine which is consistent with all that scripture hath revealed; which exhibits God as at once perfectly just, and perfectly merciful, *the just God and the Saviour*; which points out the merit of *the one divine righteousness*, as co-extensive in its application with the guilt incurred by *the one human transgression*; which explains how the forfeiture of their earthly privileges by the typical Israel, has been rendered subservient to the possession and enjoyment of heavenly privileges by the anti-typical Israel; which opens up the parallelism between the guilt originally contracted by Adam, running on into still greater guilt contracted by the nation of the Jews,—and the peculiar spiritual privileges conferred on the spiritual Israel, running on into general spiritual advantages conferred on the whole human family; which reconciles the never-ending punishment of the nature of fleshly Adam, with the never-ending life and happiness which are characteristic of the nature of the Lord Jesus; which presents to us Adam's creature and therefore shadowy nature, and sin and death the effects of it, as deservedly swallowed up in the divine and therefore substantial nature of Christ Jesus, which is righteous and everlasting; which teaches that sin and death entered and reigned temporarily, in subserviency to the entrance and glorious reign of grace, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord,—and to themselves being thereby destroyed and swallowed up, and not, as is com-

monly supposed, in order to their becoming and continuing rivals, formidable indestructible and everlasting rivals, of our risen head; in a word, which ascribes *the entire* glory of salvation to the Creator, and *the entire* benefit of it to the creature, is, must be, true.

F. For my part, I cannot go as far as you do, Robert. Doubts with regard to universal salvation still overhang my mind. But much has been said by your brother which may yet contribute to dispel them, and which at all events I will not speedily forget. This I frankly acknowledge, that I deem many of his observations, may I not rather call them discoveries, most valuable. His reconciliation of the doctrine of universal salvation, with that of the complete destruction of the wicked—doctrines which are generally considered to be incompatible—has particularly struck me. It is not merely novel and ingenious, but may, after all, turn out to be the germ of views by which all existing difficulties may be removed; and a system of divine truth, clearer and more self-consistent than any which have hitherto been propounded, may ultimately develop itself. This I say, because it appears to me that men have, up to the present time, been deducing their religious sentiments from by far too narrow premises, and bounding their views by these as if God had nothing farther to reveal to his church.—Whatever may be the result as to my future convictions, Thom, you have my thanks for the kindness and courtesy which in the course of these conversations I have met with at your hands.—Are you not at present engaged in preparing for the press a work on the distinction between *soul* and *Spirit*?

T. I am. But when it may be finished, indeed, if ever, I cannot say. I sometimes feel ready to despond about the matter. The subject involves considerations so momentous, and branches out into connected and subordinate views so numerous, indeed, one might almost say,

so interminable, that had I, before beginning the work, anticipated them, its length and difficulty must have formed powerful reasons to deter me from the prosecution of it. As it is, the manuscript is in a state of considerable forwardness.

F. When it makes its appearance, I shall be most happy to peruse it. Some of the ideas which you have thrown out respecting the difference between *soul* and *Spirit*, both in your "Three Questions," and your "Assurance of Faith," have not been without producing their effect upon me. Many things seem to admit of being easily and satisfactorily reconciled upon your principles, which to me otherwise are utterly inexplicable. Adam and Christ are relatively to each other *type* and *anti-type*, according to scripture. Rom : v. 14. 1 Corinth : xv. 21, 22, 45. If so, then the mind of the one, must stand to the mind of the other, in the relation of *type* to *anti-type* likewise. And this, it appears to me, is the whole basis of and affords the key to your system.

T. Gratifying is it to me to find, my dear friend, that in expressing your inability to acquiesce thoroughly in my views, and in the qualified opposition which in the mean time you are obliged conscientiously to give to me, you are evidently actuated by motives of the most upright and honourable description, Would to God ! that all my opponents were but under the influence of the same spirit ! Then, instead of censuring me and *casting out my name as evil*, without knowing what I have to adduce in behalf of my theory; and solely upon the authority of others who, for aught they can tell, may be ignorant, prejudiced, or interested in their opposition to me;—a species of conduct which every correctly thinking mind must reprobate;—they would either pronounce no opinion at all on the subject, or would at least decline sitting in judgment and acting as critics, until they had taken care to acquaint

themselves thoroughly with the merits of the question. Such ingenuous procedure, however, from mankind in general, and from professors of religion in particular, taught by the word of life, I have no right to anticipate. Nor do I expect it. Innovation on established notions of religion always has been irksome to the creature mind, and always will be so. Divine truth being, in its rise progress and consummation, the greatest of all innovators, by human nature it must and will be condemned. And besides this, in so far as *such truth* is concerned, the fleshly mind of man wants relish for it, as well as capacity to receive it. 1 Corinth: ii. 14. Oppose it, therefore, men ever must, notwithstanding that they do so to their own grievous loss and detriment. *Even so, Father: for so it hath seemed good in thy sight.* Matt: xi. 26. But, although *truth* be rejected by *the wise and prudent*, blessed be thy name! that *the babes and sucklings*, those whom from everlasting thou hast ordained to that end, are made to receive and love it. In this, thy wisdom and thy power are manifest. For, not only is thy purpose thus accomplished, but accomplished in such a way as to shew, that the whole is of God, not of man: the glory of salvation thereby redounding entire and undivided to thee the Creator, and in no respect whatever to the creature. See 1 Corinth: i. 26—31, And as thus always has been, so thus always till the end of time will be, the fate of thy word. *The election receive it: the rest are blinded.* Rom: xi. 7.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A.

“The way of *the appropriating act* entirely reverses the order and way of God. *The act* supposes unconverted sinners, as laudably and successfully employed in pursuing and appropriating God and his salvation; in consequence whereof, they are to become united to God, and accepted of him in Christ. But God’s way is quite the contrary of this. He pursues, and appropriates us to himself, for a peculiar people, in a manner as unsought for, unforeseen, unthought of by us, as the life given to the dry bones, was by the bones; an emblem of our regeneration, when he gives us to believe the report concerning his Son.

“So that he appropriates us, apprehends us, justifies us; wherein we are wholly passive, as we were in our first receiving of life, or as Lazarus was in being quickened in his grave, when we receive by the Holy Ghost, through the word, the conviction of sin, righteousness, and judgment.

“But further to this purpose, for the controversy seems to hinge here, we may somewhat more narrowly review two or three particular places more in the New Testament, whereby it will appear manifest, that there is nothing in the universe meant by justifying and saving faith, but only a pure unmingled and passive conviction, evidence or manifestation, of the alone justifying and saving righteousness of the Son of God, introduced into the conscience by the Holy Spirit of truth, through the medium of the word; and that all who have this

faith, or passive conviction, of the justifying righteousness, are not only justified and saved thereby, but also perfectly assured of their being so.

“ Here by way of introduction we may observe, that the Spirit of truth, in discoursing to us of the things of God, never wrests a word that he uses, out of the ordinary sense wherein the same is used among men, in plain and ordinary conversation about things which they know ; but he takes these things just as he finds them, and applies them in their own proper and ordinary meaning to the things that are heavenly and divine : and this will appear to be his invariable method, even when using the most highly animated and figurative style ; much more when merely reporting a plain narrative of certain most important matters of fact, to all, the most simple, unlearned, and ordinary people in the world, as well as to the mighty disputers and scribes, never varying his manner of speech.

“ Now if this remark be well founded, which I leave to every man’s own conscience and observation at this time ; though, if it shall be controverted, I doubt not but they shall be obliged to deny the scriptures, or else to allow it ; if this single remark, I say, were attended to, I appeal to yourselves, if it would not utterly and eternally overthrow the appropriating act. For where is there any thing in all the use or abuse of language, that would lead a man to think of using an *appropriating act*, to obtain the benefit of any good news, that is, pleasing and interesting news, which he hears, and believes to be true upon the veracity of the reporter ? If the apostles meant any such strange act should be exerted, in order to take the benefit of the glad tidings which they preached, is it not beyond all belief, that they should never hint at any such a thing, either to Jew or Gentile ? Or if they have, for the sake of God and man, let the passages be condescended upon. If they exist, we may look for them in the Acts, where many of their sermons, or declarations of glad tidings, are both begun and ended ; and the issue and application of the whole avowed by the Holy Ghost, (who spoke by them,) to be eternal life, or eternal death, to every soul of man who heard the tidings then brought to their ears. But read the *Acts of the Apostles*,—read the whole testimony of God, from the alpha to the omega of revelation,—no hint of the appropriating act of faith, name or thing, no such mystery, no such use.

“ But to come to particulars. Acts xiii. We hear the apostles, full of the Holy Ghost, open their commission in the synagogue at Antioch ; and speaking to all the people, Jews and Gentiles, as the Holy Ghost gave them utterance, in a plain style, to persons promis-

cuously assembled, like any other congregation upon earth, who could have no notion of what they were going to hear, in order to be in readiness with their *appropriating acts*, so necessary to be exerted, for seizing, in a vigorous manner, and resolutely laying hold upon the benefit of the things that should be spoken, as it were with hand, with *tooth and nail*. No such preparation, nor activity, in the least, is required in the hearers; no apparatus, nor preliminaries at all, insisted for by the speakers, who honestly speak out what they know, and what they know God will stand by. All depths, and inscrutabilities apart.

“Men and brethren, we declare unto you glad tidings: How that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written, &c. Now, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead implies, that he was thereby declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the Spirit of holiness. Rom: i. 4. And also, that he, the promised Messiah, had fulfilled all righteousness; and that he was raised up, for a certain testimony, pledge, or token of assurance to all men, that his Father had accepted his now finished work, even the work of glorifying the Father, by becoming obedient to the death for the sake of his people, according as the Lord himself had spoken, saying. ‘He, even the Spirit of truth, shall convince the world of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more.’ John xvi. And again, ‘I have glorified thee, O Father, upon the earth; and now glorify thou me,’ &c. John xvii. And again, on the cross, ‘It is finished.’ John xix.

“Well, having heard of the resurrection of Jesus, (and the meaning thereof founded on the whole testimony of God,) as a plain incontestible matter of fact, proven by hundreds of eye-witnesses, and miracles innumerable, as come to pass, according to all the prophecies written concerning it; the apostles proceed in their declarations still in the most perfect simplicity of speech, without any the least hint, or warning, that they were about to utter incomprehensible mysteries, as those strange ravings most certainly are, (and Mr. Marshall,* with all the *appropriating* friends, do really allow, that there is some strange unaccountable kind of mystery in appropriation,) about appropriating acts, whereby people are to hammer out for themselves *a truth*, whereupon their eternal salvation is to depend, without any proper evidence given for it in the word of God. But no such doings here: only a

* Author of *The gospel mystery of sanctification*, a work highly commended by Hervey in his *Dialogues of Theron and Aspasio*.—D. T.

plain, 'BE IT KNOWN unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is PREACHED unto you the remission of sins.'

"Now to suppose here, as almost all men do, that by the word *preached*, or published, as it literally signifies, is meant *offered* or *proffered* in any sense of those words now used among men, appears to me to be even pure and unalloyed blasphemy; especially considering the use that is made of such language when applied to Christ or the gospel, being a substitution of a damnable falsehood, in place of the inspired word of God. Observe, the men who published, divulged, spread abroad, told, or reported the miracles which the Lord had charged them to conceal, and tell no man of, are said, in the first language, to have done with regard to the matter in hand, what the apostle did with regard to the gospel, even *preached* it, according to their commission; 'GO PREACH THE GOSPEL.' 'Ye shall be my witnesses.' 'What ye have heard in the ear in secret, PROCLAIM YE upon the house-tops.' Accordingly, they knew what they had to do; and you never find them, (as our modern preachers, under the character which they have assumed, of *Reverend Ambassadors*,) saying, 'We *offer* unto you the gospel: We make an *offer* of Christ unto you: Will ye *accept* of *proffered* grace upon gospel terms?' No, verily. The apostles left all such kind of traffic and negotiation to the father of lies, and the other *right reverend* and *holy fathers*, papists or protestants, who make *merchandize* of the souls of men.

"What then say the apostles? 'We *preach* Christ and him crucified: We *declare* unto you glad tidings: We *certify* you of the gospel.' *Preaching*, *declaring*, and *certifying*, lead us directly to the saving TRUTH; but *offering*, *proffering*, and such like, lead us away FROM the TRUTH, to the doing of something ourselves, under the notion of *accepting terms*, *embracing offers*, and *complying with proffers*. Whence I infer, what I think I have proven, that the former way of speaking is of God, and leads to God; but that the latter is of the devil, and leads men away from God to the devil.

"So now we fix upon it, that *preaching* precisely signifies *publishing* or *spreading abroad* any matter of fact, by telling it. Preaching the gospel, then, is just declaring what the gospel is; and when the apostles produced their infallible proofs, that their tidings were true, they left God to have mercy upon whom he would have mercy, and to harden whom he would harden: if men were not converted, the apostles were clear of their blood; and if men now preach the same doctrine of the apostles, without mixture, addition, or diminution, honestly as they did, those men are clear of blood, as the apostles were.

"But if men must needs to move a step beyond the apostles, and

instead of leaving men with *the declared truth*, proceed over and above to *give directions for conversion, how to attain a saving interest in Christ, &c.*, doing as thousands have done, to set aside *the truth*, they must even take their chance and lot with the spirit by whom they are led. For most assuredly, except they repent, and return* to the simplicity of the gospel, they must die in their sins; and poor comfort will it be to them if they perish, to find hell filled with the multitudes of those whom they have deceived, whether gone before, or following after them.

“Lord in heaven! awaken the deceivers and the deceived, whom thou wilt awaken, to hear the apostles. How sweet is the joyful sound! How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them who bring glad tidings of great joy, which are to all people!”—J. Barclay’s *Assurance of faith vindicated*, pp. 50—54; 3d edition. Glasgow, 1825.

APPENDIX B.

It is well known to many, that, for a considerable number of years, I have set myself, both from the pulpit and the press, in decided and deadly opposition to the popular notion, of *good hope towards God with regard to future happiness*, being in any respect whatever derivable from observation of the workings of the human mind. The work of Christ Jesus proclaimed in the divine testimony, and the character of Jehovah revealed thereby, are, I have maintained and do maintain, the only, the unsupported, and the certain foundation of every believer’s hope of life everlasting. Popular religionists, the genuine descendants of the Pharisees of old, while they pretend to ascribe to the death and resurrection of the Son of God, *some* portion of the divine comfort which those who *are justified by faith* experience; nevertheless take care to introduce creature righteousness, and discoveries of creature excellence, as sharing to a certain degree, with God’s testimony, the honour of imparting consolation to the guilty conscience, and upholding the consolation so imparted: thereby of course nullifying *the gospel of the grace of God* to all who are led astray by their delusions. Under such circumstances, it is striking enough to find some of these demi-gods of *the fleshly pious*, now and then visited with compunctious misgivings as to the truth of the doctrine wherewith their own minds are leavened, and whereby also they are actively engaged in tainting and leavening the minds of others. Such a passage as the following, which occurs in Dr. I. Watts’ *World to come*, a book referred to by me in the fourth Dialogue, will be perused with interest by all who have themselves ever been the dupes of the popular theology, or are fond of tracing to its real origin that

* Return. Query?—D. T.

influence which the evangelical (?) clergy have acquired and possess over the more serious portion of their auditories:—

“Some have imagined, that that perfect satisfaction of soul which arises from a good conscience, speaking peace inwardly in the survey of its sincere desire to please God in all things, and having with uprightness of heart fulfilled its duty, is the supreme delight of heaven: but it is my opinion, *God has never made the felicity of his creatures to be drawn so entirely* out of themselves, or from the spring of their own bosom*, as this notion serves to imply. God himself will be *all in all* to his creatures; and all their original springs of blessedness as well as being *are in him, and must be derived from him*: it is therefore the overflowing sense of being beloved by a God almighty and eternal, that is the supreme fountain of joy and blessedness to every reasonable nature, and the endless security of this happiness is joy everlasting in all the regions of the blessed above.”†

If the amiable respectable and eloquent author, from whose pen the above statement proceeded, had been possessed of a little more discrimination in divine things than he seems to have attained to, he must have been aware, that, in writing what I have just extracted, he was pronouncing sentence of condemnation on his own religious system. For, that rejection of peace and comfort as derivable from within, which he ascribes to the saints above, is actually the privilege of the saints below. Believers do not *here live upon themselves*, and *hereafter, upon God*, as seems to be the notion of Watts and other popular religionists: but they *live upon God* in every stage of their divine existence; *here, by faith*, and *hereafter, by sight*. It is God manifest in Christ, as what he eternally and unchangeably is, LOVE; 1 John iv. 8—10; and not conclusions deduced from dabbling amidst the filth and garbage of their own fancied spiritual experience; that speaks peace at once and for ever to the consciences (naturally guilty) of the people of God. But the poor man's *eyes were holden*, as those of thousands of his fellows are, that he *should not apprehend the truth* as to this matter.

APPENDIX C.

Let me take this opportunity of recommending to the notice of my readers a tract, entitled, *Christian liberty: or, the abolition of the whole law of Moses, for its weakness and unprofitableness, either as a rule of justification or of life. By Adelphos. Glasgow, 1837.* It is the production of Mr. J. Curran, a gentleman at present residing in the Isle of Man. Although the author appears to have but a limited and imperfect view of the case and circumstances of believers, espe-

* Query. *Drawn at all?* D. T.

† *World to Come*, discourse 10th, p. 305. Manchester, 1816.

cially of their being operated on and influenced, in so far as their conduct is spiritual, not by laws addressed to them, but solely by divine truth dwelling in their enlightened consciences as a principle; it is impossible to go over the plain, sensible, and scriptural observations with which his pamphlet abounds, without being both struck and edified. He has disposed in a way the most masterly of the claims commonly set up on behalf of *the law of Moses* to the obedience of Christians.

APPENDIX D.

Although the system of divinity, adopted and promulgated by the acute and learned but eccentric William Law, be, as a whole, sadly unscriptural; yet now and then there occur in his writings passages from which one would be tempted to conclude, that he was not altogether without a glimpse of something better. Of this description are the following remarkable statements, tinged, no doubt, with many of the peculiarities of *the mystic school*, extracted from his work, entitled, *An appeal to all that doubt, or disbelieve, the truths of the gospel*: the first edition of which now lies before me:—

“But let us now change the scene, and behold the wonders of a *new creation*, where all things are called out of the *curse* and *death* of sin, and created again to life in Christ Jesus; where all mankind are chosen and appointed to the *recovery** of their first glorious life, by a *new birth* from a second Adam, who, as an *universal redeemer*, takes the *place*† of the first fallen father of mankind, and so gives life and immortality, and heaven, to all that lost them in Adam.

“God according to the riches of his love, raised a man out of the loins of *Adam*, in whose mysterious person, the *whole* humanity, and the *word* of God, was personally united; the same word which had been *inspoken* into *Adam* at his fall, as a secret *bruiser* of the serpent, and *real beginning* of his salvation; so that in this second Adam, God and man was one person. And in this union of the divine and human nature lies the *foundation* and *possibility* of our recovery.‡ For thus the holy Jesus became qualified to be the *second Adam*, or uni-

* *Recovery*. A mistake. The glorious life of which they are made partakers through Christ, is not a *restoration* to Adam's original paradisaical life, but *elevation* to one infinitely higher. D. T.

† Takes the *place* of. Not quite correct. The proper expression is, “Christ, the second Adam, is the *antitype* or *substance* of the first Adam, the fallen father of mankind.” D. T.

‡ Not *recovery*: for there is no *recovery* or *restoration* of Adam's original state, or of the creature purity of his nature. The union of the natures of God and man in Christ Jesus has been productive, not of our being *carried back* to the earthly paradise, but of our being *carried forward* and *elevated* to the paradise of God. D. T.

versal regenerator of all that are born of *Adam the first*.”—“ All that were born of *Adam*, had also a *birth* from *him*,” (Jesus,) “ and so stood under him as their common father, and regenerator of a heavenly life in them.”—“ The *same Word* that became their perfect redeemer in the fulness of time,” having been “ in them from the beginning, as a beginning of their redemption, therefore he (Jesus) stood related to all mankind as a *fountain* and *deriver* of an heavenly life into them, in the same *universal manner* as *Adam* was the fountain and deriver of a miserable mortality into them.” P.p. 187, 188.

Jesus’ “ conquests over this world, sin, death, and hell, were not the conquests of a *single person* that terminated in himself, but had their real *effect*, and efficacious *merit*, through *all* human nature, because he was the *appointed father* and *regenerator* of the whole human nature, and, as such, had the *same relation* to it all as Adam had : And therefore as *Adam’s* fall, sin, and death, did not, could not, terminate in himself, because he was our *appointed father*, from whom we must have such a state and condition of life as he had ; so the righteousness, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ into heaven did not terminate in himself, but became ours, because he is our appointed *second Adam*, from whom we are to derive *such* a state and condition of life as he had ; and therefore all that are *born again* of him, are certainly born into *his state* of victory and triumph over the world, sin, death, and hell.” P. 189.

“ And therefore if man was to go out of his *fallen state*, there must be a son of this *fallen man*, who, as a *head* and *fountain* of the whole race, could do all this, could go back through all these gates, and so make it *possible* for the individuals of human nature, as being *born* of him, to inherit his *conquering nature*, and follow him through all these passages to eternal life. And thus we see, in the strongest and clearest light, both *why* and *how* the holy Jesus is become our great redeemer.

“ Had he failed in any of these things, had he not *been* all that he was, and *did* all that he did, he could not have made one full, perfect, sufficient atonement and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, that is, he could not have *been* and *done* that, which in the *nature* of the thing was *absolutely* necessary and *fully* sufficient to take the whole human race out of the bondage and captivity of their fallen state. Thus, had he not really had the divine nature in his person, he could not have *begun* to be our *second Adam* from the time of the fall, nor could we have stood *related* to him as children, that had received a *new* birth from him. Neither could he have made a *beginning* of a divine life in our fallen nature, but that he was that

God who could make nature *begin again** where it had failed in our first father. Without this divinity in his person, the perfection of his humanity would have been as helpless to us as the perfection of an angel.

“ Again, had he not been *man*, and in human nature overcome sin and temptation, he could have been *no Saviour* of fallen man, because nothing that he had done, had been done *in and to* the fallen nature. *Adam* might as well have derived sin into the angels by his fall, as *Christ* have derived righteousness into us by his life, if he had not *stood* both in our nature, and as the *common father* and *regenerator* of it; therefore his incarnation was necessary to deliver us from our sins, and accordingly the scripture saith, he *was manifest in the flesh to destroy the works of the devil*. Again, if *Christ* had not *renounced* this life,, as heartily and thoroughly as *Adam* chose it, and declared absolutely for another kingdom in another world; if he had not *sacrificed* the life he took up in and from this world, he could not have been our redeemer, and therefore the scripture continually ascribes atonement, satisfaction, redemption, and remission of sins, to his *sufferings* and *death*. Again, had not our Lord entered into that state of *eternal death* which fallen man was eternally to inherit; had he not broke *from it* as its conqueror, and rose again from the dead; he could not have delivered us from the effects of our sins: and therefore the apostle saith, *if Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your sins*. But I must enlarge a little upon the nature and merits of our Saviour’s *last sufferings*. It is plain from scripture that *that death*, which our blessed Lord died on the cross, was *absolutely* necessary for our salvation; that he as our Saviour, *was to taste death for every man*—that, *as the Captain of our salvation, he was to be made perfect through sufferings*—that there was no entrance for fallen man into paradise till *Christ* had overcome that death and hell, or that first and second death, which stood between us and it.”† P.p: 191, 192.

These extracts from one of the works of a most talented, although in many respects erroneous writer, are presented to the public, not as expressing accurately and perfectly my own views; for in all Law’s statements, particularly in those respecting *Christ’s* having possessed *the same human nature* that we do, I am far from acquiescing: but as affording a proof that he was not entirely destitute of some idea, of the *shadowy Adam and his posterity* having been involved in *Christ Jesus the substantial Adam*; and of the important and glorious consequences which result from this fact.

* Nearly but not perfectly correct. However, let it pass. D. T.

† The italics throughout the whole of these extracts from Law are as in the original edition. D. T.

APPENDIX E.

My dear Christian friend, Mr. Richard Roe, of Dublin, having drawn my attention to a tract, entitled, *The love of God towards the world, as manifested in the death of Christ; extracted chiefly from the Christian Witness*, 2d edition: a tract which, along with others from the same quarter, has been circulated extensively in the south of England, as well as in Ireland, I have been induced to give it a careful perusal. Mr. Roe is right in regarding it as a very fair specimen of that fashionable *evangelical* system, by which the simple gospel of Christ Jesus is attempted to be pushed aside. Like many other productions of a similar class with which it has been my lot at different times to become acquainted, it states doctrines as scriptural which are *exactly the opposite* of what is true. God, according to scripture, *loves some*, that he may *save all*; whereas, according to it, he *loves all*, that he may *save some*. Its author, instead of perceiving, that *spiritually* salvation advances from *the particular to the universal*, attempts to reverse the matter by making salvation to proceed from *the universal to the particular*: instead of perceiving that through *the salvation of Christ*, there is *the salvation of his church*, and through *the salvation of his church*, *the salvation of the rest*; he attempts to shew that through *the salvation of Christ*, there is *the salvation of all*, and through *the salvation of all*, *the salvation of a part*! In other words, setting out with views of God's love to men as being so *universal*, that *all* are called on to believe in it, and *all* may if they please *be saved*,* he nevertheless contrives to close by representing *the number* of those *actually saved* as being *exceedingly small indeed*! Thus after, like many others of a similar description, indulging in "big swelling words of vanity" respecting God's love to *all*, it turns out in reality that, according to his notions, God's love is from everlasting to everlasting only to *a part of the human race*.—I confess that I am apt to lose patience with such theories. "God loves *all*: and yet, it is *in the power* of his creatures to *render* his love to them *ineffectual*!" "Christ has *done all*: and yet, it depends upon a mysterious work *to be done* by ourselves, whether or not his *finished (?) work* shall become *effectual* to our *salvation*!" Out upon such absurdities! They may suit the meridian of the *mere* fleshly intellect; but let them not be heard from the lips, or proceed from the pens, of those to whom it has been given, to however slender a degree, to know, in the light of the mission, work, and mediation, of Christ Jesus, that *God is—not may be, or will be, but is—LOVE*.

* The very essence, by the way, of the abominable systems of Pelagius and Arminius.

Would to God! however, that *nonsense* were all the charge that I could fairly adduce against the tract in question. It lies open, alas! to a reprehension of a far more serious kind. In perusing the passage which I am about to quote, one finds great difficulty in resisting the conviction, that the author was writing in opposition to, nay, was actually bearing down, the dictates of his own conscience. When any one speaks of "mankind—continuing to *maintain* THEIR barrier against God," as if, forsooth, *the creature* could set up any *effectual* opposition to *the will of the Creator*, we can afford to smile at the idea. Not so, when he can sit down and gravely pen such statements as the following:—

"It is important to observe the difference between the prepositions εἰς and ἐπι; as their distinct use is intimately connected with the subject of God's love towards the world, and the assured salvation of His church; as shewn in the following text, literally translated.

"Rom: iii. 21.—'But now the righteousness of God *without law* is manifested, being witnessed by *the law* and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Christ Jesus towards (εἰς) all, and upon (ἐπι) all those that believe;' not 'unto and upon all them that believe,' but the righteousness of God *towards* all, and upon all those that believe. The Jews had been convinced of sin; the Gentiles had been convinced of sin; and thus they had no righteousness in which to stand before God. Whether Jew or Gentile, they had no hope in themselves; but the righteousness of God through faith of Jesus Christ, was not towards Jew or Gentile, but *towards all*; εἰς πάντας. And it was moreover *upon* all those that believe, (ἐπι πάντας τοὺς πιστευόντας,) they stood in that righteousness.

"Rom: v. 18.—'Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came *towards* (εἰς) all men, leading *towards* (εἰς) condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came *towards* (εἰς) all men, leading *towards* (εἰς) justification of life.

"As the passage stands in the authorized version, it states that the free gift came *upon* all men, as though it had been ἐπι and not εἰς; if so, all would have been justified. We know it is not so, nor does the scripture say so. The *aspect* of the act is quite as wide as the *aspect* of the sin of Adam; but its *effect* is a thing entirely distinct. We have in a former passage seen it to be stated to be *upon* all who believe. When the difference between εἰς and ἐπι is noticed, it makes clear what the English translation has obscured.

"It shews that the free gift was *towards all* in its *aspect*; but that its *effect*, and the acceptance of any under it, is something entirely distinct. The accuracy and perfectness of scripture is (are) addition-

ally illustrated. *Εἰς* (towards) seems to exhibit the natural consequence, the effect of any thing looked at in itself; it may or it may not involve the coming to the result; taken in itself it has the effect; for the tendency of the thing is that which *per se*, or left to itself, it would produce or arrive at. The word thus may be seen in many passages of the 6th chapter of *Romans*.”

Now the question which after perusing the above paragraphs suggested itself to me, and which I have no doubt has suggested itself likewise to the more enlightened spiritual portion of my readers, is, could the author, in penning these paragraphs, really believe the conclusion to which he attempts to conduct such as submit themselves to his guidance? Could he really believe, that the admitted distinction between *εἰς* and *εἰς** tends to establish a love of God *towards* but not *to* all; that is, a love of God which “bears an *aspect*” to all, and “which, *per se*, or, left to itself, would produce or arrive at” its legitimate tendency; but which, nevertheless, from the stubborn opposition of *creatures*, and their ability (?) to overcome *the tendency* of the love of *the Creator*, turns out in the case of many to be ineffective? If others can give him credit for having seriously and thoroughly believed, that he had by his philological distinction got rid of the idea of God’s love *towards* all *taking effect*, I confess that I cannot.

Be it observed, that I quarrel not with his *translation* of *Rom*: iii. 21;—that I object not to the distinction made by him between *εἰς*

* Some admirable critical remarks on the different significations of the Greek preposition *εἰς*, when construed with the genitive, dative, or accusative case, have just come under my notice, in a posthumous work, entitled, *A literal translation of St. Paul’s Epistle to the Hebrews, from the original Greek, with copious explanatory notes, by the late Rev. George Vaughan Sampson, &c.* London: Rivingtons, 1828.—See from page 134 to page 140. The learned and ingenious author is led to the dissertation in question, by the very singular and exceedingly puzzling expression, occurring in *Hebrews* xi. 21, *εἰς τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ράβδου αὐτοῦ*; rendered in the common translation, along with the words immediately going before, and (Jacob) *worshipped leaning upon the top of his staff*; in the Douay version, (Jacob) *worshipped the top of his rod*; and by Mr. Vaughan, on grounds which are to me perfectly satisfactory, and (Jacob) *rendered worship (to God) on account of the height of his (Joseph’s) ensign (or staff)*. Let it be understood, that with all due admiration of Mr. Vaughan’s glowing genius and splendid endowments, and frankly admitting that from the perusal of his book I have derived some most valuable critical hints, I should be very sorry to pledge myself to an unqualified approbation of a *translation* in many respects causelessly and even recklessly deviating from the simplicity of the authorised version, and of *notes* in which from time to time an almost unbridled imagination seems absolutely to run riot. Still Sampson’s, with all its imperfections, is a glorious work. It is worth a score of tame, dull, hum-drum performances of a similar kind.

and *επι*, so far as that the former signifies *tendency towards*, and the latter, *present enjoyment of*, the divine righteousness spoken of in the text ;—and that I feel indebted to him for having drawn the attention of his unlearned readers to the difference between the *all*, (*παντας*) *towards* (*εις*) whom the righteousness has *an aspect*, and the *all those that believe* (*παντας τους πιστευοντας*) who stand in it, or, rather, *upon* (*επι*) whom it rests. No ; my objection is of a graver nature.

1. When quoting and translating Rom : v. 18, could it fail to strike him, that either he was doing away with the actual coming down of Adam's guilt and condemnation upon all his posterity ; or that he was virtually admitting the fact of the free gift of Christ's righteousness coming down upon the whole human race ? His translation, and the argument which he would found upon it, evidently recoil upon himself. If *εις* in respect of Christ's righteousness signifies merely *a tendency* which does not *take effect* in the imparting of righteousness and life *to all* ; then, as the reasoning of the apostle is analogical, *εις* in respect of Adam's transgression signifies merely *a tendency* which does not *take effect* in the imposing of sin and death *upon all*. Or, if the *εις* in Adam's case signifies *a tendency* which necessarily and actually *does take effect* in the condemnation and death *of all* ; then so, in order to the completeness of his argument, must the *εις* in Christ's case signify *a tendency* which necessarily and actually *does take effect* in the justification and life everlasting of *all* likewise, Of these alternatives, the author must embrace either the one or the other. If the former, he proclaims himself to be an Infidel ; if the latter, to be a Universalist.—It will not do for him, in order to evade the force of this conclusion, to say, as it is clearly his purpose to insinuate, that *εις*, in so far as it has a reference to the effects of Adam's transgression, signifies *to* ; whereas, in regard to the effects of Christ's righteousness, it signifies merely *towards*. For, were he to do so, he would be acting the part, not of *a translator*, but of *a commentator* ; and of *a commentator*, too, who, with a view to support a favourite theory of his own, was damaging the apostle's argument ; which, being an analogical one, requires, that, in whatever way the word *εις* be translated in one member of the sentence, whether *to* or *towards*, in the same way it be translated in the other member of it. The alternative of *infidelity* in denying the application of *Adam's sin* to all, or of *Universalism* in admitting the application of *Christ's righteousness* to all, he must therefore chuse. And as he could not be ignorant, nay, as his statements and reasonings evince that he was not ignorant, of the dilemma upon which he had run himself, he lays himself open

to the charge of *mala fides* or gross dishonesty, in having attempted to palm upon his readers as a fair argument for the existence of a *divine tendency to love all which does not take effect*, a passage of scripture which, in his own conscience, he did not believe to have the meaning which he was trying to fasten upon it.

2. In his reasoning from Rom. iii. 21, he has laid himself equally open to the suspicion of having proposed that as conclusive, which, in his own mind, he did not believe to be so. In order to his argument being valid, the distinction in the verse in question must be between a *tendency* of the divine righteousness to some which *does take effect*, and a *tendency* to all which *does not take effect*. This meaning, and this meaning only, if his conclusion is necessarily to follow, must the passage bear. But is this actually the only sense of which it is susceptible? Certainly not. The $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, *to*, may signify, (indeed, does signify,) an *aspect* and *tendency towards* which is to *take effect* at a *future period*, while the $\epsilon\pi\iota$, *upon*, may, (as it does,) point to an *effect* which has *already taken place*.* That is, besides a distinction between the righteousness of God *taking effect*, and *not taking effect*,—the only distinction which the author finds it convenient to represent the two prepositions as able to convey,—the two members of the sentence *upon all those that believe*, and *to or towards all*, are capable of meaning, that the righteousness of God which *has taken effect* in the case of some *now*, has a *tendency* likewise to *take effect* in the case of the rest *hereafter*: and that it is the circumstance of its *having taken effect* now in the case of *some*, which leads to its *taking effect* ultimately in the case of *all*.—Now, can I believe that the author was ignorant of *the possibility*, to say the least of it, of $\epsilon\pi\iota$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the *upon* and the *to*, having been employed by the Holy Ghost to denote this latter distinction? I confess, that it is beyond my power to do so. He could not be ignorant, that the meaning assigned by him to the passage was not *the only one* of which it is susceptible. And if so,—if he knew that $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ might point to a blessing to be realized at *some future period*, as well as to a blessing which, although there was a *tendency* to it in the divine mind, yet was *never* to be realized *at all*, his own sense of the passage,—can we respect the controversial honesty of the man who could translate, reason from, and apply the word, as if it had been capable *only* of the latter signification?

3, and lastly. It is evidently the object of the author of the tract to leave on the mind of the unlearned reader an impression, that *aspect to* and *tendency towards*, or, in a word, that *towards* without

* This is the same distinction which is beautifully alluded to by the apostle in Heb. ii. 8,—a passage already treated of in the 2nd Dialogue.

any consideration of *actual result*, is the exclusive signification of the Greek preposition *εις*. For if not, of what use is his philological distinction, and to what purpose are the reasonings which he founds on it? Nay, has he not in so many words said so: for is not *aspect*, as distinguished from *effect*, the sense of the word to which he actually endeavours to confine it?—Now it is clear, that the author of the tract is a man of education and talents. As such, he could not be ignorant, that, in *thus limiting* the signification of *εις*, he became chargeable, if not with direct falsehood, at least with a *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*. *ΕΙΣ* undoubtedly signifies *to* or *towards*; or has the sense of the Latin prepositions *ad*, and *in* when governing the accusative. But is it not well known, that it has frequently, also, the sense of *αχρι, μεχρι* and *εως*, or *usque ad*, that is, that it denotes not *mere tendency only*, but *such a tendency as likewise takes effect*? The very common work of Macknight shews the great variety of senses of which, in the inspired writings, *εις* is susceptible; and, among others, that it denotes both *the final cause*, and *the actual attainment*. See *εις*, in Essay 4th of the *Preliminary Essays* of Macknight, Nos. 147 and 150. This being the case, and it having been impossible for the author as a man of education to be ignorant of it, was it fair in him to insinuate, with a view to get rid of *God's love to all taking effect*, that *towards*, without *any* reference to *actual result*, was the *exclusive meaning* of the preposition *εις*? Was it consistent with common candour, to attempt to found a most important doctrine upon a representation of matters which is essentially and confessedly defective?—But thus it always has been and will be. When erroneous views of divine truth are to be bolstered up, erroneous practices must always be had recourse to.

Can any man taught from above, after perusing the above extract and the remarks upon it which I have found myself constrained to subjoin, hesitate to suspect the thorough honesty of him who was capable of founding an argument against *universal salvation* upon perverted expositions of scripture, and a philological statement, or at least insinuation, which he must have known to be untrue?

How simple and delightful the meaning of Romans iii. 21, &c. when the Holy Spirit is pleased to shed his own divine and heavenly light upon it. Never shall I forget the gratification which some years since I experienced, when a sensible, enlightened, and much endeared Christian friend, Mr. James Smith,—a gentleman who makes no pretensions to classical attainments,—first drew my attention to its real import. “The key,” said that gentleman, “to my understanding it, has been the discovery long since made to us, of the Lord Jesus having,

while on earth, *lived and walked by faith*; indeed, having been *the chief believer, or the head of believers*. See 2 Corinth: iv. 13, compared with Psalm cxvi. 10; and Hebrews xii. 1, 2. This enabled me at last to see, that *the faith of Jesus Christ*, an expression which occurs not merely in this passage but also in Galatians ii. 16, does not signify *our faith in Jesus Christ*, as it is commonly but erroneously interpreted to do, but *that personal faith of Jesus Christ* through the medium of which the divine righteousness spoken of in the text was wrought out. Thus," added he, "I observe the same three classes or orders of beings wearing *flesh and blood*, set before me in this verse, which I meet with in John iii. 14—17, and 1 Corinth: xv. 22—28. That is, first, the Lord Jesus; secondly, his church; and, thirdly, the rest of the human family. 1st. Concerning Christ it is said, that *the righteousness of God is by, or through, his faith*; that is, that it was performed and accomplished by him under the influence of belief in the testimonies of his heavenly father, Psalm cxix. 14, 22, 24, 31, &c. and not from any earthly considerations. Ibid: 72, &c. *For the joy that was set before him*, in the word of Jehovah, he *endured the cross, despising the shame*. Hebrews xii. 2.—2dly. Concerning the members of his church it is said, that this *righteousness of God*, accomplished by means of *the personal faith of the Messiah*, is *upon all them that believe*; or is a blessing and privilege presently enjoyed by them. It has been *revealed from the faith* of Messiah the performer, *to their faith* as enabled by the revelation to rejoice simply and exclusively in his performance.—And, 3dly, concerning the rest of the human race it is said, that this same divine righteousness, through its bestowment in time *upon all who believe*, reaches ultimately *unto all*. That is, as *the righteousness of God*, it ultimately swallows up and thereby annihilates *creature guilt: making all things and persons new* in itself.—Thus have we the course of the divine righteousness traced *from its origin in him*, by his performance of it: *through its application by him*, to the members of the church; *to its termination in him*, as the being *for whom are all things*, as well as *by whom are all things*. Hebrews ii. 10, compared with Colossians i. 16, and Rom: xi. 36."

And my friend Mr. Smith is right. It is not a *mere divine tendency to love all*, which nevertheless *the majority of creatures* may contrive to frustrate in their own case, of which the Holy Ghost is here speaking; but a *divine purpose and tendency* which, in spite of all the enmity and waywardness of the *creature*, the *Creator* takes care *to carry into effect*, in regard to all,—through the medium of the previous salvation of the church,—in his own good time, and his own

appointed way. 1 Timothy ii. 6. *He of whom, and by whom, and to whom are all things*, will never permit any of his gracious and glorious designs to be rendered nugatory by *mere creatures*.

APPENDIX F.

It is far from being my intention to assert, that either Mr. Campbell, late of Row, or Mr. Erskine, of Linlethan, would approve of the style of criticism which I have taken upon me to censure in the immediately preceding article. This, however, I do say, that not only is the grand and distinguishing tenet of these two gentlemen, as brought out by Mr. Campbell in his numerous productions, and by Mr. Erskine in his work, entitled, *The unconditional freeness of the gospel*, the same as that of the author of the tract just commented on, but that criticisms in behalf of their favourite notion, nearly if not quite as reckless and blame-worthy, and therefore as inadmissible, as the above, are not unfrequently indulged in by them. In proof of my averment, let me refer to some of Mr. Erskine's observations, contained in the work last mentioned, between pages 150 and 168, of the 4th edition, 1831. After having perused with great care Mr. Erskine's *Two Essays*, together with the late Dr. Andrew Thomson's *Sermons on the doctrine of universal pardon*, with the *Notes critical and expository* subjoined, I am satisfied, that, before venturing again on the thorny paths of scriptural criticism, it would not be amiss for Mr. Erskine to ponder well, and endeavour to profit by, some of the valuable hints given to him by his learned and logical, but dreadfully unsparing antagonist.

Here let me observe, for the purpose of obviating all misapprehensions as to my meaning, that I say not this from any particular liking to the views and doctrines so ably advocated by Dr. Thomson. On the contrary, it is a question with me, whether his system, or that of Messrs. Erskine and Campbell, be upon the whole the more infidel. Both theories assail the completeness and all-sufficiency of the atonement; although in different ways. Dr. Thomson, without going about the bush, admits, in his usual blunt and straightforward manner, that *faith and the effects of faith are, in some sense; the terms or conditions of salvation*. While Mr. Erskine and his clerical co-adjutor, after talking bigly of the perfection of Christ's work, and almost leading us to think that they had discovered the freeness of the gift of life everlasting, take care in due time to undeceive us by insisting on it, that *this gift of Christ*, (strange perversion of terms!) is merely *laid at our door*, it depending upon ourselves, whether we shall receive the gift (?) or not. Well! Infidelity under the guise of reli-

gion, Proteus-like, puts on a great variety of shapes and phases ; but it always, in the long run, betrays what it is, by this infallible token : that, while faith, as the gift of God, is uniformly found rejoicing in the salvation which on Calvary was finished by the Creator, the Lord from heaven ; infidelity, as a state of the mere fleshly mind, is always and necessarily conceiving, that something performed or to be performed by the creature, whether faith, or works, or appropriating acts, or evidences of vital religion, or something else it matters not what, must be added by the creature to the work of the Creator, before the salvation of Jesus can become effectual to him. Dr. Thomson may, correctly enough in so far as words are concerned, insist on the doctrine of election ; but then, when examined into, it turns out that, upon his theory, it is we who elect ourselves, not God who elects us. And Mr. Erskine may, with equal correctness, insist upon the love of God to all ; but then, it turns out that, upon his theory, this universal love is the attachment of an old, foolish, doting parent, who, in consequence of the stubborn and successful resistance of his children, is unable to carry his wishes for their welfare into effect. Dr. Thomson's system is the Pharisaism of doubts and fears ; calling God a liar in the way of that affected humility, which pretends to regard the sins of us creatures as too great and enormous for the blood of the glorious Creator to have washed away. Mr. Erskine's is the Pharisaism of pride or carnal confidence ; arising from the determination to believe that we have performed that wondrous and mysterious act of accepting of God's love, by which we have contrived to ensure to ourselves eternal life, and to enrol ourselves among the number of God's children ; and calling God a liar, by pretending to derive a confidence from faith viewed as an act of our own, which can only spring from and stand connected with faith as a manifestation to the conscience, passive in the whole matter, of eternal life as the gift of God to us, through Christ Jesus, his well beloved Son. 1 John v. 11. Dr. Thomson, in plain and unvarnished terms, glories in the salvation of the few who have been able to discover in themselves something better than their neighbours : in the true spirit of his own temper and disposition, sturdily and remorselessly consigning over the remainder of the human race to torments inconceivable, unutterable, and everlasting ! While Mr. Erskine, with true mawkish sensibility, after having made the infinite Jehovah to yearn over and desire the salvation of beings whom he himself created, and who have no existence except in him, Acts xvii. 28, finishes by representing this glorious being as obliged to be contented with being able to rescue a few of his creatures, or rather, upon his system, with seeing a few of his creatures able to rescue them-

selves, from the burning fiery furnace!—Such are the twin systems of Pharisaical religious infidelity, which share between them the suffrages of the professedly evangelical world! Which of them, spiritually-minded reader, is the more unscriptural? Perhaps, of the two, Mr. Erskine's is the worse; as being the more specious and insidious. By pretending to represent *salvation*, (or, to give him his due, *pardon*,) as being *unconditionally bestowed*, there is in his theory such an apparent approximation to truth, as not only must to the highest form of the fleshly mind render it amazingly acceptable and captivating, but as is even calculated for a time and to a certain degree to hoodwink and ensnare—to pervert from the simplicity that is in Christ—the less enlightened and discriminating class of believers. 2 Corinth : xi. 3. Blessed be thy name, heavenly father, that thou upholdest the members of thy church, and in due time settest their feet free from such delusions!

From these awful and wide-spreading falsifications of the divine testimony, how delightful and refreshing to turn to the system of “glorious old John” Barclay. Here we find ourselves upon something like sure ground. True it is, that Barclay fell into mistakes. And this, because *a man can receive nothing, except it be given to him from above*. He saw not every thing. It was never given to him to conceive of our adorable head, the Lord Jesus, in any higher character than that of the spiritual or anti-typical Abraham. It never was given to him to conceive of any farther salvation, than that of the members of the spiritual Israel, or church of the living God. But he did not, as the majority of professing Christians do, commit the blunder of setting up the creature as in one way or another his own saviour. *The assurance of faith, the certainty of personal interest in Christ Jesus*, for which he contends, springs directly from *the truth itself*, and not from *efforts on our part to render it truth to us*. He never, as persons of the stamp of Dr. Thomson and Mr. Erskine under one form or another always and necessarily do, enforces the necessity of our “making for ourselves, a new heart and a right spirit;” of our “becoming” our own “creators,” and “forming ourselves new creatures, created again to good works.* No. It is as already made anew, by Christ Jesus himself, through the gift of faith in his own revealed testimony, without any efforts, concurrence, or co-operation of our own, that Barclay represents us, and all the members of the church, as *rejoicing in hope of the glory of God*. It is this simple ascription of the entire and undivided glory of salvation, not in words

* See the works of the ingenious Alexander Pirie, of Newburgh, Fife; vol : 2d, page 239.

merely, but in fact, to God alone, which renders the system of Barclay, or that of Bereanism, defective as in many respects it is, the only tolerably self-consistent, and upon the whole scriptural, system of *partialism* now in existence. Never, never, let the Bereans be induced to part with it for the Rowite notions, or for any of those other ephemeral theories of *assurance of faith* which are incessantly springing up, and clamorously demanding attention. That doctrine of *assurance*, and that only, is true, which represents the believer's confidence as arising directly, and arising necessarily, from the testimony of God concerning Christ Jesus, carried home to the conscience by the Holy Ghost. This the Bereans possess and profess to hold. No doubt, it is to me, and to those who think with me, matter of regret, that our dear friends have not *had the eyes of their understandings* still farther *opened*, to see through the present salvation of the church, to the ultimate salvation of all. But the withholding of this, is of divine sovereignty. He who hath disclosed to them a part of his mind, hath not seen meet to disclose to them the whole. If limited in their apprehensions of divine truth, as unquestionably they are, they are at all events upon the whole correct so far as they go: theirs is not a pretendedly *complete* salvation *of all*, in which nevertheless the creature must perform *his part* of the work, before it can become a salvation *to any*; but they rejoice, that is, if the internal feelings of their minds correspond with their external profession, they rejoice in a salvation which, as divine and therefore complete, spurns any and every attempt at addition to it from the creature; a salvation which to them is of grace in its origin, of grace in its application, of grace in its end.

APPENDIX G.

The following extracts from a letter of my friend and correspondent, the Rev. Thomas J. Sawyer, minister of the Universalist church, Orchard-street, New-York, and editor of the *Universalist Union*, will probably interest some of my readers. The letter bears date, New-York, March 31st, 1838.

“ It would have delighted you, I believe, to have been at our General Convention, held in Philadelphia, in September last. It was, I think, just such an occasion as you would love. The number of ministering brethren present was not so great as we have sometimes seen. This was owing, partly to the badness of our times, and partly to the fact that Philadelphia is considerably beyond the centre of our strength and numbers; New-England and New-York embracing by far the larger part of the Universalist population. Still our hearts were made glad by meeting with many good men and true in the city of ‘bro-

therly love.' I had the pleasure of seeing a brother of Elhanan Winchester, who had travelled more than 500 miles to attend the Convention. Throughout our country, I think the cause of Universal Grace was never more prosperous. The truth runs and is glorified. The number of churches erected by the denomination in the past year is greater, I should think, than in any preceding year.

"You have more opposition in England, I suppose, than we are called to encounter in the United States. *There* all the powers of the world are arranged against you. The whole tide of popularity and prejudice, spiritual and temporal, is there to be stemmed. Thank God! he has servants able and willing to engage in such a work!

"*In this country* things are in many respects different. Here we have no national establishment to crush us. Here we have access to the public mind, both in the pulpit and through the press. Our periodicals alone must exert a mighty influence. Books are also much cheaper, and much more generally read, than among you. Of Ely and Thomas' *Discussion*,* I suppose not less than 7500 copies have already been sold, and the demand continues. Occasionally we have an attack from some of our opposers; but scarcely within the reach of my knowledge has such an instance occurred, without tending to the furtherance of the gospel. So that we can truly say with St. Paul; 'Therein I do rejoice; yea, and will rejoice.'

"By the way, I am thinking of a work on *The Atonement*, and have just commenced a course of reading on that subject. When your books are received, I shall be happy to see your views on this point. I shall hold you to your promise, for a copy of your forthcoming *Dialogues*. You need not fear to speak 'frankly' of us on this side *the Great Water*, while you speak 'friendlily.' We are all much in the habit of expressing our opinions very freely."

It appears from a recent number of the *Universalist Union*, that the Universalist population of the United States is estimated now to amount to between 700,000 and 750,000 individuals.

* For some observations respecting this work, see the 5th Dialogue.

ERRATA.

- Page 18. After the words *mere fleshly mind*, line 5th from top, insert, *in others*.
- Page 30. Line 6th from bottom. Instead of *the were*, read *they were*.
- Page 134. Line 7th from bottom. For *if*, read *of*.
- Page 143. Line 3rd from top. For *he*, read *the*.
- Page 188. Note. In some copies, before *being*, in line 2nd from top, *dele* the word *human*.
- Page 212. Line 16th from top. For *presented*, read *prosecuted*.
- Page 230. Line 4th from bottom. Instead of *seeing that is*, read, *seeing that it is*.
- Page 241. Line 13th from top. Before *man's*, insert *that*.
- Page 246. Line 4th from top. In some copies, for *Ibid: XIV*, read *Ibid: 14*.
- Page 266. Note. In lines 11th and 8th from bottom, for *Mr. Vaughan*, read *Mr. Sampson*.

WORKS BY THE AUTHOR.

1. REMARKS, by the Rev. DAVID THOM, Minister of the Scotch Church, Rodney street, Liverpool, on a series of charges recently preferred against him, before the Reverend the Presbytery of Glasgow, by certain individuals connected with the management of the said Church. With a copious Appendix.—1825. 1s. 6d.

2. MEMORIAL submitted by the Rev. DAVID THOM, to the Presbytery of Glasgow, regarding the theological points of his case. Second edition.—1825. 8d.

3. A LETTER to the Rev. RICHARD T. P. POPE, advertng to some important mistakes committed by him in his recent controversy with the Rev. THOMAS MAGUIRE. By OBSERVER.—1827. 1s. 6d. (*A few copies only remain.*)

4. THREE QUESTIONS PROPOSED AND ANSWERED, concerning the Life forfeited by Adam, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Punishment.—1828. 2s. 6d.

5. RECENT CORRESPONDENCE between the Presbytery of Glasgow, and the Rev. DAVID THOM, occasioned by a second interference on their part with him.—1828. 8d.

6. The MIRACLES of the IRVING SCHOOL shewn to be unworthy of serious examination.—1832. 1s.

7. The ASSURANCE OF FAITH, or CALVINISM identified with UNIVERSALISM.—1833. 2 volumes octavo. 21s.

8. THREE QUESTIONS PROPOSED AND ANSWERED, concerning the Life forfeited by Adam, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Punishment.—2d edition, altered, enlarged, and improved.—1835. 5s. (*Out of print.*)

9. WHY IS POKERY PROGRESSING?—1835. 1s. 6d.

Edited by the Author.

WITHOUT FAITH, WITHOUT GOD : or an APPEAL to GOD concerning his OWN EXISTENCE, &c.—By the late JOHN BARCLAY, A.M. Pastor of the Berean Assembly, Edinburgh.—With a Preface by the Rev. DAVID THOM, Minister of Bold-street Chapel, Liverpool.—1836. 2s. 6d.

The Author intends publishing, at no distant period, a DISCOURSE on the ATONEMENT.



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01144 7143

