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EXORDIUM.

IT has been usual with authors, on the commencement of any important literary work, to invoke celestial aid or divine illumination, and put the imagination on the rack to extort from her new forms of expression, or create new images after which they might paint the irregular and romantic scenery of a lawless fancy; or by inflammatory excitement, produce the ebullitions of the mind which effect those extraordinary vagaries that characterize the productions of those writers, who have rolled like a tennis-ball into the field of science, unguided by the close reasonings of the mathematician or the circumspect investigations of the deliberate philosopher. Not so has the author of this work conducted. For, though none can feel a more humble dependance on the omnipotent arm and unbounded wisdom of the Deity than he, yet far from committing himself to the guidance of the imagination, she has been placed, throughout the volume, under the immediate vigilance and government of reason and revelation. Experience, which Horace calls the mistress of things, has taught the doleful lesson, that enthusiasm, however necessary to the poets, has been productive of the most pernicious imposture, and has seldom contributed to either the instruction or melioration of mankind. Nay, rather fanaticism, its legitimate offspring, has raised its hands, dyed in the blood of victims, to imprecate the benediction of heaven on the most unhallowed fraud and tyrannical oppression! Thankful to the benevolent Parent of intellectual nature, who has lighted up, in the human brain, the brilliant polar star of reason, to direct our course whilst we pass between the scylla of unfeeling and irreverent scepticism and the dread charybdis of a yawning and gloomy superstition, the author of these Lectures, using the means graciously supplied by an impartial Deity, has cautiously distinguished between the wheat and the tares, which grow miscellaneously in the spacious field of religious speculation; and whilst he has carefully bound up the former to enrich his granary, he has consigned the latter to the unquenchable fire, hoping that the good seed may henceforth grow more luxuriantly, bringing forth in its season sheaves of glory. In collecting materials for this synopsis of theology, he has marshalled in review the different armies of contending Theologians; scrupulously examined their claims; and without respect to sect, pretended inspirations, or hideous appellations of heresy and infidelity, culled the precious flowers of sacred literature, extracted their honey, rejected their poison, separated the wax, and retained that alone which he conceived would be healthy and invigorating to the human system.

Having imbibed, in a common-place-book, extracts from a host of writers, without a scrupulous attention to the sources whence they were derived, he is unable to render to all their due, by affixing their names to the passages selected from their works; but wherever the name is not
given, he has become responsible for the accuracy of the doctrine or narrative contained in the Lectures. Let then the following acknowledgments suffice. Among the Theologians, the works of the Apostolic Fathers, of Justin, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Arnobius, Origen, Lactantius, Cyprian, Calvin, Beza, Pool, Junius and Tremellius, Tillotson, Beausobre, Le Clerc, Grotius, Locke, Pierce, Bull, Newcome, Taylor, Lightfoot, Clarke, South, Lardner, Linsey, Waterland, Belsham, Magee, Carpenter, Price, Priestley, Grundy, and Harris, have been consulted. Among the historians, Eusebius, Sozomen, Tillemont, Spanheim, Basnage, Baronius, Du Pin, Jortin, Gibbon, Privéaux, and Priestley. Among the critics, Carpzovius, Pool, Simon, Le Clerc, Walton, Michaelis, Spanheim, Harwood, Marsh, Wakefield, Griessbach, Wetstein and Mill.

Sacred literature was the author’s youthful choice. Impelled as by an irresistibly force, he entered, at an early period, the thorny paths of scholastic discipline with an ardent desire to serve his God and generation in the holy ministry. The persevering industry and enthusiastic resolution of his first years, surmounted difficulties apparently insuperable, and filled with astonishment the minds of his opposing parents and relatives. The rapid progress made in learning, soon effected a reconciliation in the minds of his friends, and at the age of fifteen it was impossible for any speaker to cite, erroneously, a single passage of scripture without his perception of the mistake. Born in the vicinity of Colerain, Ireland, where Presbyterianism predominates, he cordially imbibed its doctrines as taught in the confession of faith, and larger and shorter catechisms; and in the fifteenth-year of his age, A.D. 1802, became a member of a congregation belonging to the Secession from the church of Scotland. About ten years afterwards he imbibed the doctrine of free-agency from the lectures delivered on Ethics in the Universities of Glasgow and St. Andrew’s; and on reading some Arminian writings, especially Fletcher’s checks, and Dr. Whitby on the five points, he adopted the conditional system, supposing it more consistent with men’s accountability, and the impartial administration of a just and wise government. This system he cordially believed and zealously endeavored to promulgate for several years, until meeting with “the dialogues of Elathanah Winchester, his mind was soon captivated with a view of the Divine government that seemed much more merciful, just, and wise, than that exhibited in either of the other systems with which he had been previously acquainted. On his arrival in America he regarded that system which limits all punishment to the present life, as awfully wild and dangerous. But after debating with the Universalists of Philadelphia, on the evenings of Tuesday and Thursday, for more than three months in succession, the evidence appeared decidedly in favor of the opinion, that pain can be experienced in the present life alone; and this sentiment appeared henceforth to be true, whether christianity be from Heaven or of men! Let none mistake the intention of the writer. His faith in the christian religion was not weakened by the change of opinion. Nay, rather a luminous glory shone on the sacred page, but the conclusion manifestly followed, that if the religion of Jesus was from heaven, the doctrine of free salvation, as therein taught, must be of God; but if not, then annihilation is the inevitable fate of man:
Hence it seems impossible that Calvinism, Arminianism, or Restoration by purgatorial pains, can be true; for these schemes, as far as they contain any meaning, attribute to man the power of effecting that which God without him is unable to perform. Let it be left on record, that the writer was a firm believer in the Restoration of all things, during his last years among the Arminians, but he considered the difference of the two sister schemes, so insignificant as not to warrant any schism among brethren.

Never can the human mind long ruminate on the partial and arbitrary scheme of Calvin, or on the oscillating, unphilosophical system of Arminius, without perceiving an incongruous chaos of discordant elements, calculated to induce the mind to avoid its natural exercise of thinking, or to seek relief, from excruciating reflections, either by adopting more rational sentiments, or escaping, if possible, from the iron chains of a tyrannical yoke, into the undefined plains of sceptical indifference. A God without a superintending providence is nothing but an idol of the imagination; and government which admits of lawless libertinism is a manifest contradiction in the nature of things. Arminianism is therefore nothing but Atheism, dressed in the mock robes of senseless superstition; and Calvinism depicts the Deity such an unfeeling monster, as to excite the love of Atheism in every benevolent heart. If God be eternally independent, he is infinitely remote from all hatred, envy, or jealousy: and if an all controlling Lord, he must, as an Omnipresent Parent, be impartial. But as the object of the book is to overthrow the super-structure erected by thebabel-builders of the dark ages; and level with the dust the cloud capped mountains of unintelligible mysticism, we delay not to discuss these subjects in the proem. Suffice it to say, that from the throne of uncreate effulgence, light springs up to dispel the shades of ignorance and delusion; and expose to view superstition's hideous monster in all his frightful forms. Already struck with amazement, the human mind is galled by the humiliating reflection, that ever it should have bowed, in adoration, to an idol so vile and contemptible. But, O superstition, like the cunning Ulysses, you put out the eyes of those whom you have overcome by deceitful intrigue, that though strong as Polyphemus or even Sampson, they are seldom able to deliver themselves!

To effect the emancipation of mankind from the oppressive slavery of ignorance, tyranny, and superstition, let all the lovers of humanity seek, encourage, and earnestly pray for the following requisites:

1. The diffusion of knowledge. For as soon as knowledge shall increase, superstition must fall, together with all the fabrics built on the pillars of ignorance; which she has erected in the Christian world. How deplorably ignorant still remain the great body of professing christians, both ministers and people. How can a man make any considerable progress in the knowledge of the scriptures, by reading only one imperfect translation; and how deplorably the state of that preacher whose literary abilities do not even qualify him to understand the language of that single translation! Would it not be thought absurd if a man ignorant of Greek should undertake to write a commentary on Homer, or a man ignorant of Latin, to write a commentary on Virgil? And is it not equally absurd, to comment on the New Testament without a knowledge of the
Greek, or on the Old Testament without a knowledge of the Hebrew? No wonder that, when a blind people employ an equally blind ministry, both should fall into the ditch! Surely all, who are set apart for the Christian ministry, should so far seek what is so requisite for an interpreter, as to obtain at least so much knowledge of the original as to enable them to compare it with our English translation; and see that the text itself is accurate before they attempt to interpret the sacred writings; for none can be qualified for the interpretation of the Bible, till they understand the languages of the Bible.

We know some will be disposed to reply, we have had learned translators and able commentators which supersede the necessity of studying the Greek and Hebrew languages. But, in the words of Bolingbroke, "suppose a man to have read till he has become a great critic in Latin and Greek; in the oriental languages; in history and chronology; to have spent many years in studying Philosophers, Commentaries, Rabbies, and whole legions of modern Doctors, Yea, let us suppose him to be well versed in all that has been written concerning the nature of God and the soul of man; about matter and form, body and spirit; and yet notwithstanding all this learning, he is in a state of ignorance for want of having examined the first principles and fundamental facts, on which these questions depend, with an absolute indifferen of judgment and scrupulous exactness." To be qualified therefore, to explain the sacred writings, according to their true meaning and import, we must not only be learned but also absolutely free from all partiality and sectarian prejudices. Alas! who is able for these things? O that we could even adopt the words of Solomon, and say, one man in a thousand have we found!

2. Universal Liberty. For, when all systems professing to be Christian, shall be equally allowed promulgation, and no pains, penalties, or injurious epithets, have any influence to prevent a man from speaking freely whatever he conceives to be true, then will every opinion which assumes the authority of Jesus, obtain full investigation; and if its claims be indubitable, it will receive universal approbation. Alas! for how small a price do many self- or barter their religious creed; and, rather than offend their fellow man, pass all their days in dissimulation and dishonesty. Whilst on the other hand proud and ignorant man would assume the prerogative of God, and prescribe laws to the consciences of his fellow creatures; nay even hate his neighbour for the cultivation of one of the noblest virtues—I mean honesty! Let then the bonds of impolitic, irreligious restraint be removed from the worshiper of God, and let free inquiry be encouraged and esteemed by all the free born sons and daughters of Adam.

3. The free interpretation and study of the Bible as of other books. The early reformers, especially Luther and Melancthon, thought it one of the most important advantages obtained by the reformation, that the learned were no longer forced to walk in the trammels of an authorised version, but were at liberty to open the originals. Nor have the European Protestant Clergy, from the period of the Reformation to the present age, appealed, in academic disputations, or in writings designed for the learned, to any other scriptural authority, than that of the Hebrew and Greek originals. It is therefore the privilege of Protestants to appeal at
all times to the originals; and their high and decisive authority, was never supposed by any real protestant, to attach to a mere translation!

That the unlearned may be satisfied concerning the propriety of appealing from our English bible to the original, in all matters of controversy, let the following testimonies be duly appreciated. Bishop Louth, in one of his visitation sermons, observes, that "nothing would more effectually conduct to confirm and illustrate the holy writings, to evince their truth, to show their consistency, to explain their meaning, to make them more generally known and studied, and to remove the difficulties that discourage the honest endeavours of the unlearned, and provoke the cavils of unbelievers, than the exhibition of the holy scriptures themselves to the people in a more advantageous and just light, by an accurate revision of our vulgar translation. This has often been represented; and, I hope, will not always be represented in vain." Dr. McKnight, in his general preface, says, "our authorised version is by no means such a just representation of the inspired originals, as merits to be implicitly relied on, for determining the controverted articles of the christian faith, and for quieting the dissensions, which have rent the church." The learned principal of Aberdeen College, Dr. Campbell, declares, "I have never yet seen a translation of the Bible, or of any part of it into any language I am acquainted with, which I did not think might be, in several places, altered for the better." The ablest Theologian of the present age, Dr. Marsh, professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, England, speaking of the present English version, remarks, in his fourteenth Lecture, that "when we consider the immense accession which has been since made, both to our critical and philological apparatus; when we consider that the whole mass of literature, commencing with the London Polyglot, and continued to Griesbach's Greek Testament, was collected subsequently to that period; and when we consider that the most important sources of intelligence for the interpretation of the original scriptures were likewise opened after that period, we cannot possibly pretend that our authorised version does not require amendment.

In relation to the manner of interpreting the sacred scriptures, the same learned writer, in his fifteenth Lecture, observes, "that if we interpret the scriptures by the aid of reason and learning, we must resign all pretensions to that infallibility, which is claimed by those who aspire to the influence of the spirit. But, on the other hand, there are advantages, which compensate for every defect. The man, who interprets scripture by the aid of reason and learning, without being elated by the supposition of a supernatural interference on his account, will apply, no less modestly than industriously, the means which Providence has placed within his reach. It may be objected, that the situation of inspired writers is different from that of common writers. This is true; but we must understand an inspired writer as well as a common writer, or how shall we know what his propositions are. How, then, shall we investigate their meaning, unless we interpret their words, by the rules which we apply to other writings." When, therefore, all read the Bible, that inestimable gift of God to man, with due observation of that connexion which one part bears to another; with attention to the figurative and idiomatical expressions with which these writings abound, and with that ardor and
freedom of thought, which the sacred scriptures unhesitatingly demand; then shall pure Christianity have free course and be glorified; differences among Christians shall cease; and that happy day arrive in which the Lord shall be one, and his name one.

As a guide to the inexperienced, I would recommend for the study of the Greek Testament, Ewing's or Parkhurst's Lexicon; for the study of the old, the Hebrew lexicon of Parkhurst, or that lately published at Andover, with Stuart's Hebrew Grammar. Afterwards let the student proceed to the use of other Lexicons and Grammars as time and opportunity may serve. But let all, who have any serious desire to understand the scriptures, procure at least the following works; Griesbach's Greek Testament and Schleusner's Lexicon, Kennicott's Hebrew Bible, or that of De'lerlein, with either of the above named Hebrew lexicons, Marsh's Translation of Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, Harwood's Introduction to the study of the New Testament, Beausobre's Introduction, Marsh's Lectures, Campbell's four Gospels, the Septuagint by Bos or Holmes, Simon's critical History of the Old and New Testaments, Gerard's Institutes of Biblical Criticism, Kneeland's Translation, or the Improved Version, Belfour's Inquiry, Farmer on the Demonic's of the New Testament, Wakefield on Inspiration, Yates and Carpenter on Unitarianism, Belsham's calm Inquiry, Priestley's Corruptions of Christianity, Harris's Lectures, Smith's Illustrations of the Divine Government, Ballou's Lectures, Kneeland's do. Prideaux's Connexion's of the Old and New Testaments, Robinson's Dictionary of all Religions, at least the commentaries of Whitby and A. Clarke on the New Testament; Histories of the church by Mosheim and Priestley, the Evidences of Christianity by Paley, Chalmers, Priestley, and Belsham, and if possible, the works of the immortal Lardner.

I shall conclude this preface by observing, that if the following lectures contain any thing repugnant to the attributes of God, or the gospel of Jesus, it must arise from human imbecility, or the author's incapacity to distinguish truth from falsehood. Suffice it to say, he has studied with the Ancients, improved with the Moderns, criticised with impartiality, and received with an honest heart, whatever he considered to be the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Uninfluenced by names or sects, unrestrained by fear or self-interest, assisted by a very liberal education, the conversation of the learned, and the libraries of the enlightened opulent, he has spared no pains, during the last twenty years, to acquire a just and accurate view of God, and the Religion of Jesus.
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HAGIOGRAPHICAL PREFACE.

Having frequently referred, in my lectures, to various readings found in the Manuscripts, ancient versions, and writings of the primitive Fathers, I judge it necessary to give a brief account of them; which cannot fail to be interesting to many of my readers. All the learned well know, that we have not the divine oracles in their primeval language or purity. I shall therefore exhibit a concise view of the language, Mss. and versions of the sacred scriptures.

THE HEBREW.

The books of the Old Testament were all written in Hebrew, except a few chapters in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel. Almost all writers, who have treated of the Hebrew tongue, would persuade us that it was the original language of the whole world; but Gregory Nissen and others, have reprobated the idea as a vain conceit of the Jews. Notwithstanding the proper names and their significations in the scriptures, seem to indicate that it was the primeval language of all mankind. It was used, says Ainsworth, by all the world till the days of Phaleg the son of Heber, and the building of the tower of Babel, 1757 years from the Creation and 100 after the flood. See Gen. 10. 25, and 11. 9. It seems probable that the original language of mankind, was composed of monosyllables, each of which had a distinct ideal meaning. Now if we strip the Hebrew of its vowel points, affixes, and suffixes, it remains that pure simple, monosyllabic language till the present time; for almost all the radical words of that language consist of only three letters. As to the vowel points it is clear that great extravagances have been committed both by their advocates and opposers. Appeals have been made both to the reading of the Septuagint and the Greek pronunciation of the Hebrew, in the Hexapla of Origen; but whoever looks into Origen or the Septuagint, with eyes unjaundiced by prejudice, will be satisfied that the pronunciation exhibited, is very different from any scheme ever proposed by those, who reject the use of the points. The most rational opinion on the subject is, that the vowel points are the invention of the Masoretic or Talmudic doctors, who composed the great synagogue, existing from the days of Ezra till the tenth
century; and that the vowel points were composed by these Jewish Doctors before the time of Christ, with a view to preserve the pronunciation of the Hebrew, after it ceased to be spoken as a living language! All who wish to read the Hebrew bible with critical exactness, will be abundantly rewarded, for their additional labor, in studying the points, so far as to enable them to read after the Rabbinical method. After the confusion of languages, the original is supposed to have remained in the family of Heber, whence it derived its name. It continued to be cultivated by the Hebrews or Jews till the Babylonian captivity, and was therefore called the Jewish language. Is. 36. 11. During the captivity the Jews forgot their language, and learned the Chaldee: hence the holy language ceased, and the impure or mixed Hebrew came in its place. From that time, the Hebrew characters were supplanted by the Chaldaic; and are no longer to be found, except in the Samaritan Pentateuch.—Though the Jews might not wholly forget their language during the seventy years’ captivity in Babylon, yet their children would naturally learn the Chaldee from the people with whom they sojourned. Accordingly on the return from Babylon, when Ezra read the Law in Hebrew, the Levites gave the sense in Chaldee; because the pure Hebrew was unintelligible to the greater part of the congregation. Nehemiah, 8, 7, 8. However, the prophets still cultivated the Hebrew, for Ezekiel wrote his prophecies in Hebrew during the captivity Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, after their return. Being restored to their own land, Judea becoming a province of Syria, they would again as naturally learn the Syriac: and consequently their language would be subjected to another change. The Hebrew was entirely lost as a living language, and succeeded by a mixture of Syriac and Chaldee, which was afterwards known by the title of the Syro-Chaldaic. As this was the language of the Jews of Palestine, in which our Lord and his apostles proclaimed the glad tidings of great joy; whenever therefore we read of the Hebrew in the New Testament, we should understand the Syro-Chaldaic, and not the pure Hebrew, for it had long ceased to be oral, or intelligible to any people as a living language. Let it be clearly understood, however, that the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Syriac are rather dialects of the same, than different languages. The Chaldee character is the most fair and easy, and in it the Hebrew bible is both written and printed. They who desire to see the great affinity of the Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee, would do well to consult the Chaldaic Grammar of Hottinger.

The only writings extant in the Hebrew, are the books of the old Testament. The Talmuds are written in the mixed or Rabbinical Hebrew. The Targums are Chaldee paraphrases on the books of the old Testament by different Jewish Rabbies. That of Onkeles is on the law; that of Joseph on the Hagiography; that of Jonathan on
the Prophets: all of them before Christ. The Targum of Jerusalem written on parts of the Law, is in corrupt Chaldee. At the return from Babylon many of the Jews remained, and many more resorted to them, during the calamities which befell those which returned. Hence there were two great Rabbinical schools one at Babylon and another at Jerusalem, and afterwards at Tiberias. Both these have given Talmuds, or collections of Jewish traditions, said to be the oral law, which Moses taught the elders of the great Sanhedrim. The Talmud consists of two parts, the Mishna and Gemara. The Mishna is the Text, and is a comment on the five books of Moses, compiled from innumerable traditions by Juda Hakkodesh about the year 150. The Gemara is a comment on the Mishna or text of the oral law. The Talmud of Jerusalem is believed to have been made in the third, and the Babylonian in the fifth century: but they are in very corrupt Hebrew. The Babylonian is preferred, probably because most bulky. There is a fine Amsterdam edition in twelve great folios! Ohe Jam saties! See a succinct account of the rites and ceremonies of the Jews by David, Levi, and Basnage's Histoire de Juifs.

THE GREEK.

The scriptures of the New Testament were written in Greek except the Gospel of Matthew. & probably the epistle to the Hebrews, which, in the opinion of many learned men, were written in Hebrew or rather Syro-Chaldais, for the use of Jewish Christians. The language of the Greeks, his, perhaps never been excelled by any other, in copiousness, strength, beauty, and harmony. Every adequate judge will accede to the opinion of Horace,

Graii ingenium, Graii dedit ore rotundo musa loqui.

But as it happens to the language of every people, who are divided into several districts, so it fared with the Greek; it was greatly affected by provincial dialects. The principal of these were the Attic, Ionic, Doric, Æolic, and Macedonic. The Attic most frequently occurs in the New Testament. Still more unfortunately for this precious volume, the Greek had fallen from its primitive elegance and purity, before the Septuagint version was made, or the books of the New Testament were composed. The first alteration in the Greek was effected by the Macedonians about the time of Alexander, when the phrases and idioms of that people became nationalized at Athens. Being subjected to the Macedonians, and the different states of Greece blended together in one great community, the various provincial dialects yielded to the Communis Lingua, which soon after became the general language of composi-
tion. This Koine Dialectos, or common language, says Bentley, was never at any time or place the popular idiom; but a language of the learned, as the Latin among Europeans. The style of the Greek is found most pure and correct, in those writers, who preceded, or were contemporary with Demosthenes; but after him the alteration is very perceptible. During the civil war, which followed the death of Alexander, and the revolutions of Asia and Greece, men of letters flowed to Alexandria in Egypt, and were liberally patronized by the Ptolemies. The Greek tongue became predominant in business and commerce, and was soon associated with the Coptic. The Septuagint version, principally made by Jews of Alexandria, presents singular forms of speech; being written in the Alexandrine dialect, which was a mixture of the Macedonic, Jewish, and Egyptian. In explaining the phraseology of the septuagint and New Testament, critics have frequently drawn their examples from writers, who lived under the Lagidae and Seleucidae: for as some of these monarchs had invited the Jews to settle in the cities which they had built, and others had encouraged them to reside in Egypt, the intercourse between the Jews and Greeks became very great in all the commercial towns; consequently a mixture of the Greek and Hebrew idioms naturally ensued. It also appears from the terms Syro-Macedones, Syro-Hellenes, that the Greek had been established in Syria, during the Macedonian conquests. The language of the Romans was also introduced with their conquests, and the Greek was corrupted even in countries, where it was the vernacular tongue. The Latin also, during the government of the Romans, became familiar to the people of Syria: and hence we find in different parts of the New Testament, not only Latin words, but also Latin phraseology. The impossibility of rendering some Hebrew words by corresponding Greek terms, introduced new words into the Septuagint; and the doctrines and usages of Christianity, affixed new meanings to many terms already in use. This corrupted mixture of various dialects and foreign idioms, called the Hellenistic dialect, is that in which the Greek scriptures are found to exist.

In the Hellenistic style the sentences are generally shorter, more simple and uniform in their structure, than they are in classical Greek; but greatly deficient in elegance and variety. Such obscurity arises from the Hellenistic idioms in the New Testament, that no man can truly understand its language or meaning in many places, without a knowledge of the Hebrew. Thus the Hebrew, having only two tenses, a past and a future, and these being often substituted, one for another; the Hellenistic writers, not availing themselves of the variety of tenses in the Greek, use frequently the past for the present or future; and the future in the sense of the present or past. In Matt. xxiii. 2, John i. 26, are examples of the
past for the present. Isa. ix. 6, and Heb. ii. 7, are examples of
the past for the future, and Luke xxiii. 6, an example of the future
for the present. Also in the Hiphil form of the verb, the Hebrew
represents the subject of the verb as causing the action to be per-
formed by another. Matt. v. 45, and Luke xi. 53, are beautiful ex-
amples of this Hebraism. On the same principle HUDOR ZON, John
iv. 10, ARTOS ZON, John vi. 51, should be rendered life-giving water;
life-giving bread. Likewise Heb. iv. 8, if Joshua KAPEPAUSEN, had
caused them to rest. In a word, such a fountain of light flows from
the knowledge of the original languages, upon the mind of the com-
mentator of the sacred text, that the conscience of every minister
of God’s word, should smite him, if he rest in voluntary ignorance.

THE MANUSCRIPTS.

All intelligent persons must know, that before the invention of
Printing in the fifteenth century, the sacred scriptures, like all oth-
er writings, must have existed only in Manuscript: or by oral tra-
dition. If by oral tradition, they must have been at some time re-
duced to manuscript. These records written on paper or parch-
ment, being considered a revelation of God, would be frequently
transcribed, and the copies greatly multiplied. These writings,
like all others, must have been exposed to various errors arising
from transcription. If we admit that ten errors might arise in the
first, twenty in the second; and so on in proportion, the number af-
ter transcription one hundred times, would amount to thousands:
consequently the last manuscript would differ from the first in several
thousand places. These differences we call various readings. Dr.
Bentley, asserts that if we choose a MS. and a second, wherever we
please; the second will contain a thousand variations from the first.
This we judge to be a safe calculation; and suspect that the most
careful scribe even in the present day, will not write over a volume
so large as the old or New Testament, without varying from the ori-
ginal in more than a thousand places. Wherever Jews and Chris-
tians were dispersed, they would carry with them copies of the Jew-
ish or Christian Scriptures; and these copies would be more or less
accurate, as they were less or more remote from the Autographs of
the sacred writings; or as they had been transcribed by more or
less skilful persons. But if a MS. were carelessly copied, it became
the source of numerous errors in future transcriptions. When the
Autographs of the Apostles were lost, and contentions arose in the
churches, there being no standard of comparison party zeal would
naturally lead the transcribers to multiply alterations, designedly to
promote the creed of their favourite sect. Hence the number of va-
rious readings in the MSS. would become prodigious; & the corrup-
tions more dangerous and lamentable. If a scribe should obtain two or more MSS. and collate them, for the purpose of giving a more accurate copy than either, he would naturally be led to alter from conjecture, where the MSS. differed. Hence it would soon occur that no MS. would contain a fac-simile of the Apostolical writings: but the genuine text of the New Testament, would be found scattered among all the MSS. the less mutilated in proportion as they were near the original, or faithfully transcribed. Like all other writings, an accurate text can only be obtained by a careful, long and laborious comparison of all the MSS. and out of the various readings; selecting that which is commended by the highest authority. And the authority of the readings must depend on the value of the MSS. in which they are found; and the value of the MSS. on the nearness of their connexion with the originals; and the degree of accuracy with which they have been written.

Manuscripts in the large uncial character are preferred; and are marked in the catalogues by the large Roman capitals: Of these, A, B, C, D, and M, are the best.

A. The Alexandrine MS., written in the fourth century, presented by Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, to Charles first; and preserved in the British Museum. It contains the Septuagint, which has been edited by Dr. Grabe; and the New Testament, edited by Woide.—This MS. agrees to a great extent with the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions. It agrees with the Alexadrine edition in the epistles of Paul; with the Byzantine, in the Gospels; and with the Western, in the Acts and Catholic epistles.

B. The Vatican at Rome, written in the fourth century, containing the Septuagint and New Testament. It agrees with the manuscripts D, and L; and in the opinion of Michaelis, is the most ancient and valuable MS. in existence.

C. The Ephrem, so called from Ephrem the Syrian, who flourished in the fourth century; the MS. however, is supposed not to be older than the seventh century. It is preserved in the Royal library at Paris.

D. The Cambridge MS. presented by Beza, containing the Gospels and acts, and the old Ital.translation. Wetstein fixes the date of this MS. to the fifth century. It is believed to be the most important MS. of the Gospels. It agrees frequently with the vulgate; and in many of its distinguished readings, with the Syriac, Coptic, and Sahidic.

M. Stephens' or the Royal MS. at Paris, of the 7th or 8th century. Michaelis considers it invaluable. These five MSS. are perhaps worth any other fifty in existence.

Critics have classed the MSS. and versions into three editions, or revisions:

1. The Eastern or Byzantine edition, supported in Paul's epistles
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by the Alexandrine Ms. the MSS of Mt. Athos, the Russian version, & the citations of ecclesiastical writers in Greece and Asia Minor, during the fourth and fifth centuries. This edition agrees more nearly than the others, with the modern received Text.

2. The Alexandrine, including the Vatican, Ephrem, and other valuable MSS. the Coptic, Ethiopic, and other ancient versions: and is supported by the quotations of Clement and Origen, in the second and third centuries.

3. The Western, including the Vulgate, and old Italic versions; and is supported by the Vatican in Matthew's Gospel; the Sahidic, and the quotations of the Latin Fathers.

Hence it will be easily perceived, that there are only two other sources, besides the existing MSS. for estimating the authority of the sacred Text; the ancient versions, and the exceedingly numerous quotations of the primitive Fathers. These versions and quotations, furnish evidence of the genuine reading of the early MSS. from which they were made; and which were of much greater antiquity, than any MSS. which we now possess. The whole authority of the readings primarily depended on the MSS. But seeing the Autographs and early MSS. are lost; the present manuscript reading, confirmed by the testimony of the ancient Versions and Fathers, is the sole authority, which should be regarded by an editor of the sacred Scriptures.

THE VERSIONS.

The versions are translations of the scriptures, from the original into other languages. All versions before the art of printing must have been made from some MSS. and consequently could only be a transcript of such MSS. as were used by the translators. But, as the MSS. differed among themselves, so the versions made from them, must differ also, according to the MSS. from which they were taken. Hence both MSS. and versions contain various readings; but the most ancient MSS. and versions, and the most carefully written, will approximate the nearest to the original Autographs. But as all the manuscripts and versions of different countries differ in their readings, it is evident they have been formed from different MSS. Some of the versions are of much greater antiquity than the oldest MSS. we now possess; and are therefore inestimably valuable, seeing they tend to show us the state of the MSS. at the time they were written. The principal versions are the Greek, Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Arabic and Gothic.

The Septuagint, is the most notable of the Greek translations; & has ever been considered of the highest importance by all competent judges. It is called the Septuagint, because it was partly com-
posed by the seventy Jewish elders, who constituted the Alexandrine sanhedrim; or under their inspection, two hundred and eighty-five years before the Christian Era. The five books of Moses, are much better translated, than any other part of the Septuagint; and are thought to be, exclusively, the work of the seventy. The only instance of false Greek, Gen. viii. 22, is found in a correct state, ημερα και nux, in several Mss. collated by Holmes. The other books are supposed to have been translated by different persons, at different times; and the whole version finished about one hundred and fifty years before Christ. It is certainly manifest from the frequent quotations made by Christ and his Apostles, that a Greek version of the Old Testament was in general use and esteem at the commencement of the Christian dispensation: and the references of our Lord and his Apostles, to the Septuagint, whenever they cite the Old Testament, has stamped indelible honor on the Greek version. Indeed it must stand as the first and unrivalled copy of the sacred Scriptures, for being made at a very early period, the Mss. of the Hebrew text, must have been in a much higher state of purity, than they could have been, many centuries afterwards. Moreover, where it differs from the Hebrew, it generally preserves what we have reason to prefer, as the ancient and genuine readings: for even where the translators did not understand their author, they commonly show what they found in his text, by the verbal closeness of their imitation. The Septuagint is a most valuable key to the Scriptures of the Old Testament; and its general accuracy greatly facilitates the acquisition of the Hebrew tongue. Nor is it valuable, only as an illustration of the Old Testament; for it also contributes to illustrate the New; whose penmen writing in the same language, referring to the Original, using the same style with the 70 translators, often quoting this version, which they evidently held in great esteem, & with which they were intimately acquainted. Hence it necessarily follows that the one class of writings, should throw the clearest and strongest light on the other. Notwithstanding we have to lament, that Origen, in his edition of the Septuagint, admitting the exclusive integrity of the Hebrew copies, as maintained by the Rabbies, interpolated such words as were wanting in the 70. Soon after three editions were taken from Origen: the first by Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch; the second by Eusebius, which prevailed in Syria or Palestine; and the third by Hesychius, which obtained in Egypt. Though all taken from Origen's Hexapla, they differed among themselves, but Lucian's edition was judged the most correct, being most free from the interpolations of Origen. The original Septuagint, then fell into disuse, and all the Mss. in existence of the Septuagint, are derived from Origen, Lucian, Hesychius, and Eusebius. O! simple, primitive Christians, ye fell an easy prey to the crafty assumptions of the Jewish Priests!
Origen's Hexapla was one of the greatest efforts ever made to illustrate, dignify and establish sacred Scripture. It may be truly called the chef d'œuvre of Christianity, till the seventeenth century. It was called Hexapla or sixfold, because it consisted of six columns containing six different Greek versions of the Hebrew Bible. Ephranius calls it Octapla, signifying that it had eight columns; which indeed it had, counting both the Hebrew and Greek. If we credit Montfaucon, it made sixty large volumes. In the first column he placed the Hebrew Text, according to the Rabbinical copies of the third century. In the second he put the same Hebrew text written in Greek characters; which tends to show the pronunciation of the Hebrew, at that time. In the next four columns he placed the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and the Septuagint. Aquila, about the year 130, made his version, which was so extremely literal that Jerome says it was a good dictionary of the Hebrew words. Theodotion's version was made A.D. 170 and that of Symmachus about the year 200: both of which were also very literal, but not so much so as that of Aquila. As the above three translators were Ebionites, or Jewish Christians, they were suspected of favoring the Jewish mode of interpretation; but we cannot say, the charge has been substantiated. Where Origen met words in the Septuagint, which were not in the Hebrew, he prefixed an obelisk, signifying that they should be rejected; and when he found words in the Hebrew that were not in the Septuagint, he supplied them; and prefixed an asterisk intimating that they should be received. These marks, however, were soon neglected by subsequent transcribers. The Greek versions which occupied his seventh and eighth columns, were discovered in the beginning of the third century, the one at Jericho, and the other at Nicopolis.

The Syriac Version is the most valuable of all the translations of the New Testament in existence. The very learned and critical Wakefield says "this inestimable version would be ill-exchanged for all the MSS. of the Greek Testament in the Universe." I speak of the ancient literal version called the Peshito, which contains the books of the New Testament, called Homologomena, or generally received. It is used by the Syrian Christians of every sect; & esteemed the brightest ornament of our holy religion. Written in the very language, and words of our blessed Master and his disciples, when we read, the very same ideas in syriac words, like the wine in the holy communion, seem to acquire an additional flavor, and become as honey from the comb. This most ancient version, was made either by some of the Apostles, or their immediate successors. The most satisfactory testimony induces us to believe that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Syriac, or Syro-Chaldaic. Postellus says all the Syrian Christians agree in an ancient tradition, that Mark made this translation of the books of the New Testament into his own language.
the Syriac. Alsted and Maritini say it ought to be ascribed to the first christians at Antioch: and Father Simon well remarks, this version is esteemed by all sects, because made before all divisions.

The Christian religion was first published in Syria, which included Judea, Samaria, and Phenicia. The Syriac had remained the language of that country from the confusion of tongues at Babel. This is manifest from Laban's title on the monument, Gen. 31, 47, and the words of the Jewish officers to Rabshekah, 2 Kings 18, 26. That the Syriac was the language of Judea in the time of our Lord, appears from the multitude of Syriac words in the New Testament, such as Elloi, Lamma, Sabachthani, Talitha, Cumi, Golgotha, Boanerges, Bar-Jona, Abba, Gabbatha, Acēldama, Maranatha, etc. The language of myriads of the first christians was Syriac; and Justin Martyr, who as he tells us in his second apology, was a native of Neapolis in Samaria, assures us the writings of the Apostles and the Prophets were read every Sabbath in the christian assemblies.—According therefore to the testimony of Justin, this version must have been made at least as soon as the commencement of the second century. Another argument equally convincing for the great antiquity of this version is, the Cambridge Ms. probably the oldest in existence, often agrees with it where it differs from all others. Moreover this version wants the disputed epistles; second and third John, 2d. Peter, Jude, and the Revelations. This is an evident proof that it was made either before these epistles were written or received. It also wants the history of the adulterous woman John 8.3—12 which is found in one of the oldest Ms. but is not mentioned by Origen, Clement Alexandrinus, Chrysostom, nor Nonnos who wrote a paraphrase, on John's Gospel. But the Dutch editor has basely inserted both this passage and 1 John 5, 7.

There is another Syriac Version called the Philoxenian, made by Philoxenus, Bishop of Hierapolis about the year 508. It is very literal but not so elegant or valuable as the Peshito. Professor White has published a fine quarto edition of the Philoxenian version.

The Jews, fond of the old name, generally called the Syriac, Hebrew; and the Fathers were too ignorant to know the difference.—Indeed neither the Fathers or even the sacred writers, preserve the distinction. Though Justin was a native of Palestine, yet in his dialogue with Trypho, he calls the same language both Syriac and Hebrew. Daniel calls it in one place Syriac, and in another Chaldee. "I distinguish them, says that eminent critic, Ludovicus deDieu, because others do so, but there is no difference except in a few words, and in the punctuation." The Syriac and Chaldee are only two dialects of the Hebrew language, which have frequently been designated by the name of the Parent. See Buxtorf's Chaldee and Syriac Grammar; and the Harmonical Grammar of Ernestus Gerhardus.
The Coptic made in the ancient language of Lower Egypt, holds the second rank among the versions of the New Testament. It contains also the Pentateuch, besides the books of the New Testament; and though it be impossible now accurately to determine its age, yet it is very probable, that its respectable editor Dr. Wilkins is correct, in fixing the time at the close of the second century.

The Vulgate is nearly a transcript of Jerome's version, with some alterations generally for the worse. We do not however, hesitate a moment to place it with all its imperfections, in the third rank among the versions of the New Testament—Jerome undertook this translation at the appointment of Pope Damasus, about the year 380. The ancient Italic, undoubtedly of the apostolic age and yielding to none in antiquity, had become very corrupt by frequent transcription, and other unfavorable incidents, and greatly needed revision. Jerome a Monk of Palestine, and the best Hebrician of all the Fathers, was perhaps the best qualified for such an arduous and important undertaking. Mosheim, pronounces Jerome's the best of all the Latin versions. He professes to have collated the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin MSS. but there is too great evidence that he was governed by the Latin alone. Since his days the Vulgate like several other versions, has been subjected to corruption and change. It is truly visible to hear the council of Trent pronounce this version authentic and immaculate, and at the same time, issue their orders for its revisal and correction. Notwithstanding let it not be understood that I now countenance an unprincipled sectarian prejudice, which goes to state that the Catholics corrupted this version to make it speak their peculiar dogmas. On the other hand I venture to affirm that there is double as much catholic corruption in any version extant among the popular sects of Protestants as can be found in the Latin Vulgate.

The Ethiopic is a very ancient version made into that language for the use of the Abyssinian Christians by Frumentius, their Bishop in the latter part of the fourth century.—It contains the Psalms, Minor Prophets, and the New-Testament. The Sahidic is a very old but imperfect version, used in upper Egypt.

The Armenian Version made from the Syriac and Greek, about the beginning of the fifth century, would have been of great value, had it not been corrupted from the Latin.

The Gothic Version was made by Ulphilus, Bishop of the Goths, in the year 360. An imperfect MS. of this version was found in the abbey of Verden near Cologne, written in letters of silver, and therefore called Codes Argetheus. It was published by Francis Junius in 1665.

The Arabic Version is believed to have been made even later than the Koran, in the 7th century. It is notwithstanding a fine and valuable translation of the sacred scriptures into one of the most co-
pious languages in the world. This is the refined and universal language of Asia; yet it is only a dialect of the Hebrew, though in many respects it far exceeds the Parent tongue. In our remarks on the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic languages, we wish to avoid the Scylla & Charybdis of modern writers, some of whom represent them as nearly if not altogether the same; and others speak of them as wholly dissimilar. Whoever has studied the Latin, Spanish, Italian, and French, can see the relationship of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. Though we are willing to acknowledge the affinity of the Asiatic languages to be still greater than that of the European. There are different editions of the Arabic version, but that of Erpenius is preferred. The Koran is one of the finest specimens of the Arabic language.

The Slavonic and Persian Versions are of a much later date than any of the above translations; and therefore cannot be considered of great value, in determining the sacred reading. Still they are of use, as they show the readings of the Mss. whence they were taken.

The Fathers.

The eminent Bishops, Ecclesiastical writers and early commentators, have been so called from the conspicuous stations they held in the Christian Church. Their quotations of Scripture are so numerous, that nearly all the sacred volume lies repeatedly scattered throughout their works. From their citations, we learn what the Mss. reading was in their times. All the means, therefore, which we possess for obtaining an accurate edition of the scriptures, is a careful and laborious comparison of the Mss. versions, and quotations of the Greek and Latin Fathers. Preparations have been made for the Hebrew Bible by Kennicot and De Rossi of Parma, who have collated above a thousand Mss. from all parts of the world. For the Septuagint by Winchel, Bos. and Holmes, the last of whom, collated above 300 Greek Mss. thirty Greek Fathers, eleven editions of the Greek, and nearly thirty Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Arabic, and Slavonic Mss. A still more complete apparatus has been furnished for the New Testament by the labors of Mill, Bengel, Wetstein, Birch, Alter, Matthai, and Griesbach; who have collated near five hundred Mss. from all nations and of all ages from the fourth century, as well as all the ancient versions and Fathers. Hence we have at present, materials for nearly an authentic edition of the sacred scriptures. This has long been desired by the learned world. For it, every truly sincere lover of the sacred Volume most ardently prays, as an object of the greatest magnitude and importance to the Christian world.—Quando erit disiderium nobis?
That edition of the Greek Testament, which proceeded from the celebrated press of the Elsevirs at Leyden 1624, has been called the Received Text; and has been scrupulously printed word for word, during the last two centuries. It has been regarded with superstitious veneration as containing the very words of inspiration, which nothing short of impiety would dare to alter. But now a flood of light having broken forth from the discoveries and labors of the two last centuries, we have fully ascertained that the Received Text in many places is nothing but corruption and fraud, canonized by ignorance and superstition! At the invention of Printing great ignorance prevailed in literature and religion, hence the best helps had they been at hand, would not likely have been used, and the first editions, taken from only a few late Mss. corrupted by a thousand transcribers, must have been extremely imperfect. The first edition of Erasmus is indeed the editio princeps of the Greek text. It was prepared by Erasmus at the request of Froben, a printer at Basle, in a very hasty manner from four Mss. one containing only the Gospels, a second the Acts and Epistles; and a third only the Apocalypse. The three constituting only one Ms. of the New Testament, modulated by some other documents but more especially by hasty and erroneous conjecture, formed the first edition of the Greek Testament. Mill fixes the age of his largest Ms. to the thirteenth century, and Wetstein, adjudges the other to the fifteenth! But what is worst of all, Erasmus departed from his Ms. in 180 places. The oldest Ms. supposed to be written in the tenth century, was scarcely used at all by Erasmus, who thought it to be corrupted by the vulgate. Even Erasmus himself acknowledges the printers altered the press without his knowledge, and sometimes contrary to his direction. Indeed it was impossible for Erasmus to pay much attention to the collection of materials or work of the press, for he was super-intending an edition of Jerome's works at the same time; and a Latin version of the New Testament. Jocosely speaking of the hasty production, he says in one of his letters, I have just escaped from confinement as Basle, where I have performed the work of six years in eight months! In the second edition he changed the reading in four hundred places, but Mill says in seventy for the worse. The third, fourth and fifth editions made no improvement on the second. The Complutensian edition was made also from a few Mss. of the thirteenth and following centuries; and Stephens' edition in 1550 follows Erasmus as if by a blind impulse, even against the authority of all his own Mss. though he quotes superior authority in above an hundred places. Wetstein declares Stephens differs scarcely twenty times from Erasmus in all the Gospels and Epistles.

Besa possessed invaluable materials, but they were all lost in hi
hands; for deficient in critical ability, and blinded by theological prejudice, he was guided by what he called the analogy of faith, more than by his Mss. This edition agrees therefore with Stephen's except in about fifty places, and many of these without authority.—The Elzevir followed the text of Stephens except a few alterations from Beza. Behold the received Text revered principally for its errors!

**ENGLISH BIBLE.**

King James First, in 1604 issued his commission to fifty four learned men for a new translation of the bible; which being printed in 1611, by his Majesty's special command, has been therefore called the authorized version. This translation still continues in general use both in the British Isles and America, notwithstanding all its imperfections and the strongest remonstrances of the learned and liberal of all Denominations. To all, who are qualified to judge impartially, the following reasons for refusing entire submission to the present English Bible, will prove abundantly satisfactory. 1. Because the translation was made from the received text, which was extremely imperfect. 2. The Hebrew and Greek languages were not sufficiently understood by Divines in the reign of King James. 3. The English language has greatly changed during the last two centuries; and hence the English bible is full of obsolete, unintelligible, and unseemly phrases. 4. The Phraseology of the sacred writers was not properly known or regarded by the translators. In attestation of this opinion, let the collections of Harmer, Paxton, and many others, bear witness. 5. The translators were under the influence of a peculiar creed and despotic control, which induced them to violate the testimony of scripture in many thousands of places. 6. The vast collections of various readings, exhibited by Kennicott, De Rossi, and Griesbach, show the original scriptures to have been corrupted in more than ten thousand different places. Hence a new translation of the whole bible becomes necessary, and the labors of the learned, during the last two centuries, by the blessing of God on free inquiry, have been abundantly successful in procuring heavenly stores for such a laudable undertaking.
RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

GALLATIANS 5, 1.—Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

Were we not assured that every particular, in the great plan of Providence, will ultimately be for the best, we should be tempted to lament, that ever it should have suited the policy of civil power, within three hundred years from the promulgation of Christianity, to adopt it as an engine of state, instead of the ancient Pagan religion: for in that very event originated the grand Papal apostacy, which enveloped the christian world in spiritual thraldom. The spirit and principles of the Gospel were gradually adulterated; its teachers degenerated into worldly minded priests, caballing and intriguing for power, and the people at large, grew every day more ignorant and more corrupt. No sooner had christianity received the sanction of civil power, and was erected into a state policy, than the office of a minister became a lucrative occupation, and the vilest characters aspired to the priesthood, being much more desirous of an honourable and advantageous situation, than of promoting the cause of truth and piety. So far did this disgraceful abuse proceed, that the temple of God soon became the stage of avaricious orators, on which they displayed their talents, solely for the purpose of introducing new absurdities, which were the more admired by the people in proportion as they were unintelligible. Synods and councils were held not to investigate truth, but to paganize the holy religion of the blessed Jesus. Their constant practice was, to anathematize all who did not conform to their reveries, however palpably absurd; and all this did they to obtain court favour and vulgar applause. Thus Christianity was supplanted by a system of Jewish and pagan rites, adorned by the mere speculations of Aristotle and Plato, to which through fear of being called a sect of heathens, theologians have endeavoured to accommodate the language of Scripture. Not satisfied with the love of Grecian fable, they laboured to make the Prophets and Apostles patronize their absurd mysteries, which paralyze the human mind. Having perverted their own understandings, they proclaimed loudly against the use of reason, and blew up the last spark of genius, to devise more effect-

*Delivered at Rochester, by the Rev. John S. Thompson, Jan. 19, 1824.
tual means of obtaining full vengeance on this evil demon of impos-
ture. These corruptions continued to extend and to darken the
heaven of the christian world, till at length it pleased the Supreme
ruler of the Universe to interpose severe checks. As these errors
and enormities advanced more rapidly to their height in the eastern
Churches, these were permitted to fall under the awful scourge of
Mahometanism. The western Churches, after involving the peo-
ple in the depths of ignorance, during that long period, which has
been emphatically distinguished by the appropriate appellation of
the "Dark Ages," have had the effect, where they have continued
to prevail in their full enormity, of almost extirpating every thing
like religion. They have spread such a deluge of infidelity, which
would wear the most alarming aspect, were we not authorized to
trust, that the same wise and gracious providence, which has per-
mitted, will overrule even this scourge, so as to render it subservi-
ent to the recovery of the genuine Christian doctrine. But perhaps
he will first permit it to burn the hay, wood, and stubble, which de-
faces the fair edifice of Christianity, yet not so as to injure the buil-
ding itself, as it came out the hands of its divine founder. The God
of Nature has never left himself altogether without witnesses. The
darkest hour of night often precedes the dawn of day; and from
the shades of darkness, occasioned by the sable curtains, which su-
perstition had thrown around our dormant race, many begin to
emerge to the light, heat, and effulgence of a meridian sun. Whilst
men slept error had sown her tares in abundance. Their pernicious
effects have been severely felt; and the baneful influence of an ig-
norant and tyrannical priesthood, by compelling mankind to feed on
the husks of a corrupt and spurious religion, has produced a re-ac-
tion which threatens to terminate in sceptical indifference. In the
gloom of midnight darkness, some daring and bold men arose, who
 combated, with various success, the corruptions which had been in-
troduced into the Christian system. Among these were Wickliffe
of England, and Huss and his followers in Europe. The seeds of
Reformation thus sown were permitted to lie dormant till Luther
arose, who by his unparalleled intrepidity, awakened general atten-
tion. Such a spirit of inquiry was excited among the people, that
some princes found it necessary to comply with their wishes, by af-
fording a partial reformation; whilst others made it an instrument
to serve political purposes, and some to gratify ungovernable pas-
sions. Of the last class was Henry the VIII., who having, with his
own pen, defended the articles of the Romish Church, and having
no other quarrel with the Pontiff, than his refusal to grant a religious
sanction for the gratification of his lawless desires, promoted a re-
formation, which, at first, could only be called popery in English
dress. Notwithstanding this attempt to regain the first and most un-
alienable right of man, the right of private judgment in matters of
Religious Liberty.

religion, still such absurd doctrines, continued to be established by law, and such horrid punishments were inflicted on men for obeying the dictates of conscience, that the minds of the intelligent and learned revolted at them; and shocked with such enormities, have thrown off the belief and profession of Christianity altogether.—This was long the case in Italy, where the corruptions of the court of Rome were most conspicuous, and many of the Cardinals, and some of the Popes themselves, are well known to have been unbelievers.

First—I shall show that in religion, it is the unalienable right of every man to judge for himself.

Secondly—I shall expose the impropriety of religious apathy.

1st. The very essence of religion consists in the free tribute of the mind to God, acknowledging no master but conscience and God, or those whom God has been pleased to commission as the special messengers of his will. Whilst obedient to man in civil command, religion yields submission alone to the King of Kings, and will admit of no imperious human authority. In the language of Peter and John, she summons every man, before every human personage however exalted, to make this dignified appeal, in a cause which stands alone between him and God; whether we should obey God rather than man, judge ye. Under whatever form of civil government men may be placed, still there are certain rights with which a human being ought not to part; and which, from their very nature, cannot be surrendered to the will or command of any earthly governor. To do justly to speak the truth, and to practice humanity in all its forms, is the duty and right of every man, independently of all civil governments. Power and oppression may punish a man for the exercise of these duties, but no power can deprive him of the sense and consciousness of his right, and no power can justify, no power can sanctify the departure from what appears to a man’s own conscience, to be just, true, or humane. Among those rights which ought, under every form of government, to be reserved entire and sacred to every individual, is the right of conscientious judgment in the whole business of religion. This is a principal part of that moral code, which is antecedent to all civil governments, and therefore independent of them; the dearest interest, which government is invited to protect, and ought never to violate or destroy. All the dignity of Magistracy cannot give additional sanction to this code; for it is the unalterable law of God, and human nature. To this prior, this superior law, with all the rights included therein, civil governments ought always to bow; and deem it to be, its everlasting duty, its noblest province, to secure to every individual subject, the free and uninterrupted exercise of these rights. Whenever rulers depart from this walk, the end of government is subverted, social right and happiness are committed to the spoiler: The seat of jus-
Religious Liberty.

Justice is deserted by the magistrate; and from the bar of the criminal, he ought to answer for the highest offence, that man can commit against his fellow man. Again, as it is foreign to the design of civil government to interfere with the religion of any man, so the very attempt is, in its nature, absurd and impracticable. Such illegitimate governments as those of Spain and Turkey are an affront to human nature, and every free man in the world, of whatever nation, should rise and overturn them as he would quench a fire which threatened the destruction of his own, or his neighbour's property.

Religion, when received by a rational mind, supposes belief and conviction; but belief is the work of a man's own bosom, terminating in that secret and inaccessible part, which no human power can scrutinize. Power may compel to a seeming submission; but the belief remains the same; the attempt therefore to establish a uniformity of faith, by the coercive rod of the civil magistrate, is at impotent, as it is unjust and oppressive. Coercion may produce a set of pliant hypocrites; it may tear asunder all the pleasing bonds of Society; it may finally operate to the destruction of all serious and rational religion; to the introduction of ignorance, and the most debased superstition; but is utterly incapable of working one honest conviction in the human heart, with which alone true religion is concerned. The whole province of religion belongs solely to God, and to that reason which God has committed to man as the proper interpreter of his will, assisted by that moral principle imparted to man as the representative of the Divine Holiness. In whatever way God is pleased to speak to me, whether by the light of Nature; by the light of reason and conscience; or by the light of revelation, it is God's act, not man's—and as God has written, I must read and judge. All men read the same books, but endowed with different talents, educated with different notions and prejudices, and placed in different circumstances, men will judge differently of the same scriptures. Notwithstanding the same revelation, which is addressed to you, is addressed to me also; it proceeds to me from the same authority, therefore with my own reason, and not by yours, I must judge what I should believe. Where God, therefore, is the sole legislator, where his revelation is freely and equally laid open to all, and where all must account individually for the use of that instruction, which God has vouchsafed, submission, as a tribute to authority, is due to God alone. Nor can it be less than a high presumption, and a rude encroachment on the province of the Almighty, for man to dictate to fellow man, what God alone can teach him; and to require, him to believe, what, with the best application, he cannot find in the book which God has submitted to their common judgment. Man may assist me, in attaining that useful information, which my abilities or situation had not enabled me to acquire; he may be the instrument of rescuing my mind from illiberal prejudi-
ces, and obtruded errors; he may use every method, to enlighten my understanding; but to avail myself of the light he has furnished; to judge of the evidence he has laid before me; to form the last decision of what to me is truth, must rest with myself; conviction must be my own internal act; and for the purity of this, I must answer, in my own person, not in his, to God, and to him alone.

There is another argument singular in its kind, that the sacred right of conscious judgment in religion, is to be inferred from the very principles and conduct of its opponents. Every usurpation on the rights of others, must have for its first position, the right of man to judge for himself. That man who dictates to me a faith, has assumed to himself, the very right, which he denies to me; and unless he can produce a patent from Heaven for the exclusive exercise of this right, it is a fair conclusion from his own conduct, that it is a right, felt and acknowledged to be inherent in human nature and belonging to every human being. Thus the oppressor of his fellow thought, when he determined for himself; and thus every man must think, when from any motive, he passes to a different faith, or to a different worship.

The decision of the majority has been urged as sufficient to fix the faith and prescribe the worship of every member. But no such power is deposited with any society. Religion is not a business that may be referred to numbers and to votes. Besides it is not true nor can it be, that the faith of any nation in the world was derived from the conduct of the majority. The history of religion is a refutation of this pretended claim of a majority. All its most valuable movements, have originated from the manly freedom of a few; and the triumph of their reason over inveterate errors and corruptions. Christianity began with individuals, and had its foundation in the right which every christian convert assumed to himself of determining his faith and his mode of worshipping the Eternal.

Conformity to national establishments, is an argument equally futile and preposterous. Ages passed before Christianity was in any form, the religion of the state: and the professors of Christianity were the insulted minority. The reformation was, in its origin and progress the work of individual dissent from established corruptions. Now we apprehend that if the religion of the state be a good argument for conformity, in defiance of conviction, neither christianity nor the revival of it by the reformation ought ever to have existed. Intrusted with the sacred right of religious liberty, our ancestors scorned to betray it to either hope or fear. In defiance of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, they persisted in dissent, and their manly constancy, their generous sacrifice even of life, in the cause of religious freedom, is deservedly praised by all posterity. A whole world enleagued against them could not move them from their strong holds.
Religious Liberty.

2. When men become indifferent about religious opinions, they generally adopt that false and delusive maxim, "It but little matters what men believe if their moral conduct be unblamable." As this maxim supposes effects without a cause, it must appear, after the least examination, to be egregiously absurd. Without a firm belief of the great doctrines of our holy religion, there can be no faith, and without faith, there never can be, either pure morality or acceptable worship. As I consider a fixed creed the subject of faith, and faith the source of genuine morality, and that in proportion to the purity of a man's creed will be that of his morals; I cannot but regard those men as Atheists in disguise, who imagine all attempts to reform mankind in faith and worship, as unnecessary and illiberal. To this class of religious Drones, every appearance of zeal or devotional warmth, is offensive and disgusting.—Openly to avow the religion of Jesus, or candidly to acknowledge a belief of evangelical sentiments, will be deemed by them enthusiastic, or imprudent; and seldom fail to give offence. How unlike the example of Jesus is such conduct! How unworthy the character of honest and rational men, I will leave them to reflect, and all right hearted Christians to determine! But O my soul, come not thou into their secrets, mine honor be not thou united to this useless, inactive, and faithless assembly.

When the son of God found merchants polluting the temple by their traffic, he drove them from that sacred place, and though his conduct appeared disgusting to the careless or interested, it directed the minds of his disciples to a passage in the Psalms, which foretold the zeal of the Messiah for the honor of God and the purity of his worship. Whilst I believe that heaven has favored mankind with a revelation, whose authority and authenticity have been well attested, I must feel an interest in the belief and promulgation of those doctrines, which Christ taught by a divine mission, and which were disseminated by a train of holy martyrs, who valued not their lives, provided they could contribute to the furtherance and establishment of the Christian religion. Moreover when I read the following passages of scripture, "Hold fast the form of sound words."—"Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."—"Prove all things."—"Try the spirits."—"If any man preach another gospel let him be accursed."—"I would thou were either cold or hot."—

I must believe that all, who are indifferent, are spendthrifts of heaven's bounty, and may be justly accounted unprofitable servants.—He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is, a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. To be careless about the religion of Jesus, is to be an unbeliever and, consequently a subject of chastisement; and to worship God in a faithless lifeless manner, is a solemn mockery, affrontive to the God heaven, who justly demands that all our affections, and powers should be en-
gaged in his service. Let not then a foolish or pretended philosophy, deaden the finer feelings of our nature, nor banish from our hearts either the generous or gracious affections. Let us reflect that though a medium ought always to be preferred as being generally most safe, it is certainly as good to be scorched in the torrid zone of over heated zeal, as to be frozen to death, in the frigid zone of sceptical indifference.

It was the error of the last age, to lay too much stress upon the means of religion, it is evidently the error of many in the present age, to pay too little attention to them; and if the former error produced a spurious kind of religion, the tendency of the present sentiments and conduct of many is to leave us no religion at all. Deeply we regret, that in any cause, except that of pure Christianity, mankind cheerfully subject themselves to difficulties.—To become wise, the student pores over the lettered page, and exhausts the vigor of his youth over the midnight lamp. To become rich, the tradesman is pent up from week to week, perplexed with commercial cares, and tortured with corroding anxiety. To become renowned in the annals of fame; the navigator penetrates distant climes, braving the dangers of the ocean, and setting at defiance the horrors of shipwreck. Shall the enlightened christian then be the only character undistinguished for exertion? Shall he alone fold together his arms and repose himself on the couch of indolence? Why not fire with the ambition of acquiring sacred wisdom, of procuring the pearl of great price, and of obtaining that name which shall be had in everlasting remembrance? If you justly imagine that there has been a deviation from the original standard of faith and practice, and that the horrid rites of Moloch have been blended with the mild and benign religion of Jesus. It is yours to raise the tabernacle of David that is fallen; and close up the breaches thereof; and to build it as in the days of old. If the universality of the Divine Love be a favorite tenet which discriminates you from others, reflect that as benevolence was the only motive of action with the Deity, so it should also stimulate you, to call into action all the capacities of your nature, to restore the light and love of primitive christianity; and thereby disperse the darkness and partiality of a cancerous superstition. The Divine benevolence is the crowning attribute of Deity. It sheds a luminous glory over all the perfections of the Godhead. All sects are forced to acknowledge it, but some so circumscribe its extent that they diminish its amiableness; therefore its nature and universality should be clearly stated—strenuously maintained, and devoutly contemplated. The very sentiments, which characterize the Universalian, have their foundation in the immensity of Jehovah’s nature and perfections. May their agreement with scripture convince you of their importance; and may their importance inflame your hearts with the zeal which is accor-
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ding to knowledge. Arise then, vigorously to aid the best of causes, and thereby promote the interests of Christianity at large. Co-operate with the Divine being, by banishing the prevalence of evil, and forwarding the reign of righteousness. The glorious gospel of the blessed God, exhibited to the world in its ancient purity and simplicity will be the grand means of this important renovation. Its doctrines are rational—its precepts just—its examples imitable. It communicates light to the understanding—peace to the conscience, purity to the heart, and irradiates the darkness of the dying hour, by inspiring the soul with a sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection to eternal life. Adhere then generously to a faith which reason and revelation equally embrace, and show your sense of its worth by your consistency. If the many have deserted the standards of reason and revelation, glory in the reproach of being a dissenting and sectarian. Be not then content to think and reason well but act well also. Bring forth into full day, the energy and power of that doctrine, in which you glory; and let your attention to God and a Christian life, proclaim the generous source from which it springs. Nothing contributes more to holiness and happiness than proper notions of God and his holy religion. Who can consider Jehovah as his father, exercising his almighty power and wisdom, to protect, instruct, and bless, and not love the fountain of mercy and goodness. Who can love and delight in God, and not be happy. The thing is impossible! He that loveth dwelleth in God and God in him; for God is love. When we contemplate the Almighty Parent stretching out the earth for our present abode, whirling the spheres of Heaven, to enlighten our path, filling up the vast temple of nature with variegated scenery, to charm our eyes by its pleasing prospects, and delight our hearts with agreeable sensations; when we behold him operating the night for repose and the day for action; when we consider him loving, pitying, and pardoning his creatures even in the midst of rebellion against him, and swearing by himself that he wills our happiness and meditates our eternal joy; when we see him sending prophets, messengers, apostles, and last of all his own son to teach us the way to himself and glory; when we consider that all pain is fatherly chastisement, and that his eternal purpose is the beatification of our whole species; lastly when we view him spreading abroad the heavens for our future and eternal home, how do our hearts glow with love to his sacred person, zeal for his cause, and desire to co-operate with him in all his designs. Who can know him and not love him? Who can love him, and not desire to be like him—this is holiness—this is liberty—this is heaven! Rouse up then your holiness, and put on strength; and in the cause of God and the cause of truth, let us display our banners, and the Lord will fulfil all our prayers. Amen.
Theology.

Heb. 11, 6.—He who cometh to God, must believe that God exists.

Theology is derived from theos, God, and logos, a discourse or treatise; and signifies a discourse concerning the existence, nature, attributes, and conduct of the Deity. Theos is derived from theo, to place, constitute, design, or run; and was intended to excite the idea of an Almighty first cause, the designer, creator, and governor of the universe; the cause and director of all its movements. Theology may therefore be defined, a systematic arrangement of our knowledge concerning God; whether it be the result of reason contemplating the phenomena of nature; or of a supernatural and divine revelation.

The method of reasoning a priori has been much applauded by some metaphysicians, and adopted by them as the most compendious way of attaining their object: whilst others have positively maintained, that no demonstration of the Divine existence can be effected by this method. Though God has given us no innate ideas of himself, says Mr. Locke, yet having furnished us with those faculties with which our minds are endowed, he has not left himself without a witness. To show that we are capable of being certain that there is a God, we need go no farther than ourselves, and that undoubted knowledge we have of our own existence. We also know by intuitive certainty, that bare nothing can no more produce any real being than it can be equal to two right angles. Our consciousness of our own being is a demonstration that from eternity there has been something; for whatever is not eternal of itself, must be from another, and owe not only itself but all its properties to the cause of its existence: therefore the eternal source of all being, must be the most powerful, seeing he must be the original of all power. Since we find in ourselves perception and knowledge, we are certain, some knowing being must have been eternal, otherwise it is impossible there should ever have been any knowledge; for things wholly void of intelligence, and operating blindly, could never produce a knowing being. Hence, from the consideration of ourselves and what we infallibly find in our own constitution, our reason leads us to the knowledge of an Eternal, Almighty, and Intellectual Being. Since no man in his senses, says Dr. Bruce, can dispute the

*Delivered in Rochester, by the Rev. J. S. Thompson, Feb. 1, 1824.
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fundamental maxims and established facts of mathematical and natural science, we may advance with confidence to the proof of the being and attributes of God; if we proceed upon maxims equally incontrovertible; and be content with the same grounds, on which these sciences have been erected. The essential qualities of a perfect axiom are, that it be intuitively true; that the contrary be intuitively absurd; and that it commands universal assent. There are however, maxims assumed in mathematics, which have no pretensions to any of these properties, except the last; and the fundamental principles of natural philosophy require illustration, instead of affording intuitive conviction. Now, it cannot be expected, that in any metaphysical, moral, or historical disquisition, we should pretend to greater precision than can be obtained in these sciences, which treat of more tangible materials; nor should we, if possible, be content with less. It will be sufficient if we can establish our argument on the same foundation—the constitution of our nature.—This is the true medium between dogmatism and scepticism. To these intuitive principles all our conclusions must be traced; and with them all our reasonings must begin. We must be careful in selecting these corner stones of the edifice, but without them it cannot be built. Such principles are too simple to be analyzed; they are equally evident to the vulgar and the learned; they can neither be proved nor disproved; neither doubted nor denied. If denied by any one, we can confute him only by out-voting him, and appealing to the common sense of mankind. The person, who rejects all first principles, must assert that our whole nature is a delusion; and if this be the case, it is vain for us to attempt to detect the fallacy; for on that supposition, what powers can we use that are not themselves fallacious. Thus the foundations of all useful knowledge are equally firm; being laid in the constitution of our nature and the will of our Creator, than which we cannot seek for higher authority. The superstructure will be more or less solid according to the materials of which it is composed, and the skill with which it is raised; but all our most important knowledge is susceptible of an equal degree of certainty. We, who are conscious of our own mental operations, actually exist. Here we start with the mathematician. Like him we require nothing to be in existence but our own minds. Like him our subject is abstract and metaphysical; and like him we build on intuitive maxims. Assuming then that I exist, and that non-entity or mere negation of being can produce nothing, nor any being create itself; it follows there never was a time when there was nothing in existence; for if there was, I could never have come into being. There must therefore have existed some being from eternity. Exnihilo nihil fit, which has been considered the foundation of Atheism, is in fact the basis of Theism. Hitherto I have argued merely from my own existence. The next
step would be to prove that I am not eternal; but this I deem unnecessary. I take it for granted, that I have not existed always, but that my existence is the effect of some cause. This is a fact, which it would be as frivolous to prove as captious to deny.

I may also take it for granted that I am an intelligent being; of this I am as sure as that I exist. If I denied, I might be confuted in the same way as if I denied my own existence; for the more ingeniously I reasoned, the more intelligence should I display. Now as it is manifest that no being can communicate greater powers or excellencies than it possesses; and that non-entity could not give birth to any thing; so we may by parity of reasoning presume, that lifeless matter cannot produce life, nor any unintelligent being originate intelligence. Some intelligent being must therefore have existed from eternity.

The objects of our perceptions during a state of sanity have an actual existence. This maxim depends, on a law of our nature which cannot resist testimony when sufficiently strong. All perceptible objects therefore have an actual existence. Now there are but two sorts of beings in the world of whom we can conceive, the one cogitative, the other incogitative. If then something must have existed from eternity, it is obvious to reason, that it must have been cogitative; for it would be as impossible for incogitative matter to produce cogitative being, as for nothing to produce matter. The fundamental principle of natural philosophy is, that matter is inert, incapable of voluntary motion, & indifferent to motion or rest. Tho' there be not a particle of matter in the universe at rest, yet motion is no part of the essence of matter, otherwise it could never cease. Extension is essential to body; and we cannot separate them even in thought: but we can suppose matter either in motion or quiescent. Motion is not therefore its essence, but its action or change. Now there can be no action or change without a cause; and that cause is not in matter because it is inert; it must therefore be some agent different from matter. To say that motion is eternal in matter, is to contradict the fundamental principles of natural philosophy; and though it were eternal, it would still be action, and would require an eternal agent. Though the agent were eternal, motion could not be eternal; for the agent must precede the action, and the mover be prior to the motion. Supposing matter at rest and inert, if there were no being to give it motion, would it not eternally remain a dead lump? It is impossible matter could add motion to itself, or by its own strength effect any thing. Motion must therefore have been superadded by some other being more powerful than matter. If by motion be meant a voluntary power of moving; this is contrary to the nature of matter. If it mean an involuntary propensity to move, this must operate either in every direction, which would occasion rest, or in one direction only; for di-
versified motion implies a voluntary mover. If therefore matter be inert eternal motion is a contradiction, and matter cannot be the first cause. Thus far we have proceeded on the same principles with the natural philosopher, and from thence we have ascertained another attribute of the Deity; namely Immateriality or Spirit-

Again suppose matter and motion both eternal, they could never produce thought. Divide matter into as minute particles as you will; vary its figure and motion as much as you please; it will operate no otherwise on other bodies of proportionable bulk, than it did before this division. The minutest particles of matter repel and resist each other just as the greater and this is all they can do.—Hence if nothing were eternal, matter never could have begun to be: if matter only without motion were eternal, motion could never begin: if matter and motion only have been eternal, thought could never have had a beginning: for it is impossible that matter, either at rest or in motion, could ever have originated of itself perception and knowledge; for then these must have been properties of mat-
ter, eternally inseparable from even its smallest particles. Since then whatsoever is the eternal, must possess all the perfections that can afterwards exist, it necessarily follows that the eternal is not matter, but a cogitative and intellectual spirit.

Mere cogitation cannot be this eternal being. I am conscious of a power over my own thoughts and limbs. If any one question the existence of this power in himself, the very question would be its own answer as far as intellect is concerned; since he could not ask it, without some command over his ideas; and the very motion of his tongue would prove his power over his organs. We also know, from our own consciousness, that we perform certain mental operations, which from memory and judgment we know were extant at a certain time and not before. These mental operations which began to exist, must be themselves changes, and the mind whose opera-
tions they are, must be the subject of which they are predicated, and is therefore changeable. Seeing all men testify that their minds are the subject of similar mental operations, we cannot discredit their testimony. Every human mind being therefore changeable, cannot be the cause of all changes, but an effect which must have had a cause; since then the human mind is a creature, and intel-

lectual, its cause must have also been intellectual: consequently the first cause is neither matter nor human mind, but an intelligent, all-
powerful, immaterial Spirit, endowed with power over both mind and matter.

This eternal being must be self-existent and independent; be-
cause there was no being before him, to give him life. If he had not existence of himself, he must have derived it from some other being; but this supposes the effect to precede the cause and be
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eternal, which is contrary to the hypothesis. Every being in the universe must either have in itself the cause of its own existence and be self-existent or be an effect of some cause. If we admit the reception of our being from our predecessors and imagine an eternal succession of men, we only remove the end of the chain out of sight, but account not for the origin of man. A first cause is still necessary for the commencement of existence, and as subordinate existence is not necessary, the eternal first cause, must exist of necessity. Again there was a time, when it was a mere contingency, whether I should ever come into being, and what kind of creature I should be. There was no necessity for my creation or birth. Now if this was a matter of indifference in the nature of things, it must have remained so, had not some agent interposed. There must have been some cause, which determined, that one side of the alternative should take place rather than the other; and this cause must have been either necessary or contingent. If necessary, the question is decided; this is the being of which we were in quest: if contingent it must also have had a cause; and that another, till we arrive at some necessary, self-existent cause, not liable to any contingencies. This first cause must be not only eternal, but also immortal; for his extinction would be a contingency to which, a necessary being could not be obnoxious. If his extinction be an event that might or might not happen, there must be some cause to make it take place rather than not. It is therefore a change, and must have a cause; but there can be no cause prior to the first. Since then every thing contingent had a cause, that which had no cause, cannot be contingent, but necessary. The existence of the first cause, is therefore a necessary truth. To evade the force of this argument there is no means but to affirm, that all things are the production of chance or eternally necessary of themselves. But chance is a mere abstract term, which is nothing & can do nothing. The more we search into the works of God; the more discoveries we make; the more exactness, we constantly find: whereas in all the operations of men and chance, the contrary is uniformly true; the more they are understood, the less accurate they appear. Beyond all credulity, therefore, is that of the Atheist, whose faith is so absurdly strong as to believe, that chance could make the world, when it cannot build a house; that it could produce all plants, when it cannot paint a landscape: that chance could form all animals, when it cannot so much as make a lifeless watch. On the other hand how absurd, to infer that things which cannot subsist at any time without a cause, should, without a cause, have existed eternally. Is not this to affirm that all things exist from an absolute necessity of their own nature? But that they do not is evident, seeing there is such an infinite variety of things in the world; whereas necessity is uniform and without variation. Every change or variation in nature or any of its phe-
nomena, proves the existence of a supernatural cause; and if it be ascertained that ever the laws of nature were counteracted by one miracle, the necessity of an eternal, self-existent first cause, is clearly manifested, because matter must be uniform in all its movements. If the whole material world were the Deity, it must be homogeneous; for being one great personage, an entire uniformity must appear in all its parts. Hence all the parts of matter must be animated and sensitive if not intellectual. An infinite succession of limited and dependent causes, is self-contradictory; and carries in it, the idea of an eternal self-existent cause. Moreover none of these dependent beings can be necessary, or have within themselves the cause of their own existence, and therefore they might, or might not have been without any absurdity in the supposition. There occurs to me an argument for the being and providence of God, unnoticed by any writer whom I have consulted, which must be admitted by all to be strong and convincing if not conclusive. It is not drawn from metaphysics, nor from the order, harmony or marks of design in creation; but on the contrary, from the anomalies and irregularities, which continually happen in the motions of celestial bodies. So far are these movements from being regular or harmonious, that I venture to assert, no planetary orb ever described the same figure exactly, in any two of its revolutions. Hence arises the necessity of an all powerful, Omniscient, superintending cause to preserve order in the universe, and prevent the return of Chaos.

This discovery of the necessary existence of an eternal mind, sufficiently leads us to the knowledge of God: for it will thence follow, that all other knowing beings, who have a beginning, must depend on him; and have no other means of knowledge nor extent of power, but what he is pleased to give them; and therefore if he made these, he made all inanimate bodies, whereby his omniscience, almighty power, and providence will be established, and from thence all his other attributes necessarily follow.

The assertion that no demonstration can be effected a priori, is unwarrantable, and it is equally inconsistent with fact to assert, that no demonstration of the being of God has ever been published. It cannot but surprise a serious person, to hear a man plead for an eternal succession of merely limited and dependent beings, without an original and independent cause! What can such a succession of beings, all of which are mere effects themselves, be but a series of beings that has neither necessity nor cause, nor any reason of its existence, either within itself or from without? Must not such a succession be an express contradiction and impossibility, seeing that in every one of its stages it is unnecessary; and that according to this supposition there can be nothing necessary nor self-existent in the universe, for it was equally possible that from eternity there should never have existed any thing at all, as that there should have
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existed an eternal succession of changeable and dependent beings. What but chance, or, in plain words, nothing, could have originated such a succession of effects without any causation. Unchangeability must be an attribute of the first cause; for the eternal can neither acquire nor resign any essential property of his nature, because nothing that can be acquired or lost, is essential. It is essential to God to be self-existent; it would therefore be incompatible with his essence, to cease to be, or change any of his essential properties. To add to his essence would be a degree of self-creation; to detract from it, a specie of self-annihilation. To add to his essence would be to become a new species of being, and if he could divest himself of a part, he might deprive himself of the whole; seeing the whole must consist of parts, and thus become a nonentity, which is absurd. He is therefore immutable in his existence and essential qualities; and his whole nature must continue as it was from the beginning. All changes are effects which must have had an adequate cause. The cause of all changes must have existed prior to each and every change, and have been unchangeable, otherwise it could not have existed before all changes, of which it is supposed the author. The first cause must therefore be itself unchangeable. To begin or end is to change, and consequently the first cause must have been eternal; and whatever is eternal and unchangeable must be self-existent and independent. Hence the first cause must be eternal, unchangeable, self-existent, and independent.

Again, I am a moral being, susceptible of moral impressions, and capable of forming moral opinions and judgments. This faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong is unquestionably, an excellence. Of the existence of it within myself, I have the evidence of consciousness; and consequently this, or a superior faculty, must have resided in some being from eternity. Hence the supreme cause and author of all things must possess infinite goodness, justice, and truth, and all other moral perfections. That there is a fitness or unfitness, an agreement or disagreement in the relations of things one to another, is as certain as that there are different things in the world; and that suitableness, or unsuitableness founded in the nature of things, is antecedent to all arbitrary or positive laws or appointments. These relations of things are what they appear to be to all intelligent persons, whose understanding is not imperfect or depraved. The directions of the actions according to this understanding or knowledge of the several relations of things, unless the will be corrupted by interest, or the affections swayed by some unreasonable passion, constitutes the foundation of morality. The sources of immorality and moral evil are weakness, want, and ignorance. Since God is self-existent, independent and all-powerful, it is impossible his power could be limited by any thing; it is impossible his will should be influenced by any wrong affection, and being
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infinitely wise he cannot err or be ignorant of the nature and fitness of things. Being all-sufficient he must be infinitely removed from all malice or envy, which are the effects of weakness or want; for his almighty power qualifies him always to do that which his infinite wisdom knows is fittest to be done; consequently he must always act according to the strictest rules of infinite goodness, justice, truth and all moral perfections. All evil and imperfections must evidently arise from a deficiency of power or understanding, or from a deprivation of will; but all these are infinitely remote from the Deity, who being infinitely wise, powerful, and independent must have an unalterable disposition to do, and communicate good or happiness: for being infinitely happy in himself, he could not possibly have any other motives to make any creatures at all, but only that he might communicate to them his own enjoyment and perfections, according to their different capacities; and being unchangeable he must ever remain disposed to continue that happiness which he communicates to intelligent creatures. Hence it follows that God cannot but do what is best and wisest, because perfect wisdom and goodness are as certain principles of action as necessity itself. An infinitely wise and good God can no more choose to act contrary to wisdom and goodness, than a necessary agent can act contrary to that necessity by which it is impelled to action. It would be as absurd and impossible for infinite wisdom to choose what is not good; as it would be for absolute necessity to fail in producing its necessary effect.

It is confessed, says Sir Isaac Newton, that God exists necessarily; and that by the same necessity he exists always and everywhere. Hence also he must be perfectly similar, all eye, all ear, all brain, all arm, all perception, intelligence and action: but after a manner altogether unknown to us, and not at all corporal. He is destitute of all body, and bodily shape, and therefore cannot be seen, heard nor touched; nor ought he to be worshipped under the representation of any thing corporal. He endures from eternity to eternity, and is present from infinity to infinity, and by his existing always and everywhere, constitutes the very things we call duration and space, eternity and infinity. He is omnipotent, not only virtually but substantially, for power without substance cannot exist. All things are contained and move in him, but without any mutual passion. He suffers nothing from the motions of bodies, nor do they undergo any resistance from his omnipresence. We know him only by his properties or attributes; by the most wise and excellent structure of things, and by final causes; but we adore and worship on account of his dominion; for God setting aside dominion, providence, and final causes, is nothing but fate and nature.

Hitherto I have argued almost solely a priori, and leave to the candid, whether a demonstration has not been effected by that method.
Divine Unity.

I shall now lay before the reader the manner of reasoning a posteriori, which though confessedly more familiar and popular, cannot be more conclusive. Archbishop Fenelon observes, that "men accustomed to meditate on metaphysical truths, and trace things to their first principles, may know the Deity from its idea; and I own it is a sure way to arrive at the source of all truth. But the more direct and short that way is, the more difficult and impassible, for the generality of mankind; who depend on their senses and imagination. An ideal demonstration is so simple, that through its very simplicity, it escapes those minds that are incapable of operations purely intellectual. In short, the more perfect the way to find the First being, the fewer men there are capable of following it. But there is a less perfect way, level to the meanest capacity. Men, the least experienced in reasoning, and the most tenacious of the prejudices of their senses, may yet with one look discover him, who has drawn himself in all his works. The wisdom and power he has stamped on every thing he has made, are seen as it were, in a glass, by those who cannot contemplate him in his own idea. This is a sensible and popular philosophy, of which any man, free from passion and prejudice, is capable. Who will believe, that so perfect a poem as Homer's Iliad, was not the product of the genius of a great poet; and that the letters of the alphabet, being confusedly jumbled and mixed, were by chance, brought together in such an order as is necessary to describe, in verses full of harmony and variety, so many great events; to place and connect them so well together; to paint every object with all its most graceful, most noble, and most affecting attendants; and to make every person speak according to his character, in so natural and forcible a manner? How then, can a man of sense, be induced to believe with respect to the universe, a work beyond contradiction, more wonderful than the Iliad, what his reason will never suffer him to believe in relation to that poem?"

The plain argument, says, Maclaurin, for the existence of the Deity, obvious to all, and carrying with it irresistible conviction, is drawn from the evident contrivance and fitness of things for one another, throughout all parts of the universe. There is no need of nice and subtle reasonings on this matter; a manifest contrivance immediately suggests a contriver. It strikes us like a sensation, and artful reasonings against it may puzzle us, but without shaking our belief. No person, who knows the principles of optics and the structure of the eye, can believe it was formed without skill in that science, or that the ear was formed without the knowledge of sounds. The admirable and beautiful structure of final causes, exalt our idea of the contriver; and the unity of design shows him to be one. The great motions in the system, performed with the same facility as the least, suggest that Almighty power, which gave motion to the
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earth and celestial bodies, with equal ease as to the minutest particles. The subtilty of the motions and actions, in the internal parts of bodies, shows that his influence penetrates the inmost recesses of things, and that he is equally active, and present every where. The simplicity of the laws that prevail in the world, the excellent disposition of things in order to obtain the best ends, and the beauty which adorns the works of nature, far superior to any thing in art, suggest his consummate wisdom. The usefulness of the whole scheme, so well contrived for the intelligent beings that enjoy it, with the internal disposition and moral structure of those beings themselves, show his unbounded goodness. These are the arguments, which are sufficiently open to the views and capacities of the unlearned; while at the same time, they acquire new strength and lustre from the discoveries of the learned.

The Deity acting and interposing in the universe, shows him to be its governor as well as its Creator. The depth of his counsels, even in conducting the material universe, keeps up an inward veneration and awe of this great being, and disposes us to receive what he may otherwise reveal concerning himself. It has been justly observed that some of the laws of nature now known to us, must have escaped us, had we wanted the sense of seeing. It may be in his power to bestow on us other senses of which we have at present no idea; without which it may be impossible to know all his works or obtain more adequate ideas of himself. In our present state we know enough to be satisfied of our dependence on him, and of the duty we owe him who is the sovereign Lord and disposer of all things. He is not the object of our senses; for his essence, and indeed that of all other substances, is beyond the reach of all our discoveries; but his attributes clearly appear in his admirable works. We know that the highest conceptions we are able to form of them, are still beneath his real perfections; but his power and dominion over us and our duty to him are abundantly manifest, to all reflecting minds.

The argument a posteriori for the existence of God, drawn from the beauty, order, and harmony of the universe, is that which Paul, in the first chapter of his epistle to the Romans, urges as conclusive against Atheists. The invisible things of God are clearly seen from the things he has made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse. This argument is infinitely strong to the accurate philosopher, and sufficiently obvious to the meanest capacity. Who framed this beautiful and stately fabric; this immense and variegated world? Who stretched out the north over the empty space; and hung the earth upon nothing? Who formed these vast and numberless orbs of Heaven, and disposed them in such regular and uniform motions? Who appointed the sun to rule the day, and the moon, the planets, and the stars to govern the night?
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Who so adjusted their several distances, that they should neither
be scorched by excessive heat, nor destroyed by the cold? who en-
compassed the earth with air, so admirably adapted to support the
clouds for rain; to afford winds for health and traffic; by its
spring for the breath of animals; by its motion for sounds; and
by its transparency for transmitting the light? Who fitted
the waters to afford vapor for rain; speed in commerce, and
fish for food and delicacy? Who weighed the mountains in scales,
and the hills in a balance, adjusting them in their proper places for
fruitfulness and health? Who diversified the climates of the earth
by such an agreeable variety, that notwithstanding the great differ-
ence, each should have its proper seasons, day and night, winter and
summer? Who clothed the face of the earth with plants and flow-
ers, so exquisitely adorned by various innumerable beauties; that e-
even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them? Who
replenished the earth with animals, so different in appearance, and
yet so much alike in structure? Who framed, by exquisite work-
manship, the eye for seeing, the ear for hearing; and other parts of
the body adapted to their various uses in the animal economy and
business of life? Who endued the mind of man, with understand-
ing, judgment, reason, and will; faculties whereby God, in a most
exalted manner, teacheth us more than the beasts of the field; and
maketh us wiser than the fowls of Heaven?

All second causes are either the inanimate motions of senseless
matter or the voluntary movements of dependent creatures; and
what is the one but the direct operation, and the other the permis-
sion of Him who ruleth over all? To neglect, therefore, to infer
the existence of the Deity from every thing we see, is as great stu-
pidity as if from the constant and regular continuance of light we
should cease to acknowledge the existence of the sun from which it
proceeds. O come, then, let us worship, let us kneel before the
Lord, our maker. He is our God, he has made us, and not we our-
selves: we are his people, the sheep of his pasture. O worship
the Lord in the beauty of holiness! Say among the heathen the
Lord reigneth. Let the heavens rejoice, and the earth be glad.—
Praise ye him all his angels; praise him all ye his hosts. All peo-
ples, young and old, princes and judges of the earth. Praise God
in his sanctuary. Praise him for his mighty acts; according to his
excellent greatness. Blessed be the name of the Lord, from this
time forth and forevermore. From the rising of the sun, to the go-
ing down of the same; let all flesh bless his holy name forever and
ever. Praise the Lord, O my soul!—Amen.

Read Clarke, Bruce, and Fenelon on the being and attributes of God; Abernethy
on the attributes; Locke on the human Understanding; Derham's Astro-Theology;
Foley and Gloubarns on Natural Theology.
ODE

to the Deity;

From the Russian Anthology, embroidered in gold and suspended in the temple, Judd's—
and in the Imperial Palace in Peisin.

O, thou Eternal One!—whose presence bright,
All space doth occupy—all motion guide;
Unshaken through time's all devastating flight,
Thou only God! There is no God beside,
Being above all beings! Mighty One!
Whom none can comprehend and none explore;
Who fillest existence with thyself alone;
Embracing all—supporting—ruling o'er—
Being whom we all call God—and know no more.

Then from primeval nothingness didst call
First, chaos, then existence—Lord on thee
Eternity has its foundation; all
Sprung forth from Thee;—of light, joy, harmony
Solo origin—all life, all beauty, thine;
Thy word created all, and doth create;
Thy splendour fills all space with rays divine,
Thou art, and wert, and shalt be, glorious, great!
Life giving—life sustaining potestate

A million torches, lighted by thy hand,
Wander unwearied through the blue abyss;
They own thy power, accomplish thy command,
All gay with life—all eloquent with bliss—
What shall we call them? Files of chrysal light?
A glorious company of golden streams:
Lamps of celestial ether burning bright?
Some lighting systems with their joyous beams?
But thou to these, art as the noon to night.

Though naught—the effulgence of thy light divine,
Fervid with gladness, bath reach'd my bosom too;
Yes! in my spirit doth thy spirit shine,
As shines the sunbeam in a drop of dew.
Naught—be all I live, and on hope's pinions fly
Eager towards thy presence: for in Thee
I live, and breathe, and dwell; aspiring high,
Even to the throne of thy divinity,
I am O God! and surely Thou must be.

O thought ineffable! O visions blest!
Though worthless our conceptions all of Thee,
Yet shall thy shadow'd image fill our breast,
And waft its homage to thy Deity.
God! thus alone my lowly thoughts can soar,
Thus seek thy presence. Being wise and good,*
'Midst thy vast works—admire—obey—adoré—
And when the tongue is eloquent no more,
The soul shall speak in tears of gratitude.
DIVINE UNITY.

Zech. xiv. 9. — There shall be one Lord, and his name one.

That the self-existent God must be One, is evident from his existence being necessary. Absolute necessity must always be simple and uniform, without any possible difference or variety. All difference of existence, must arise from some external cause by which it was effected. To suppose two different natures to exist independently and necessarily, implies a plain contradiction; for either of them might exist alone, and it would be no contradiction to imagine the other not to exist, consequently neither of them can exist necessarily. The proper notion of a self-existent being or necessary existence, is the idea of a being, the supposition of whose non-existence is an express contradiction. Whatsoever therefore exists necessarily is the one simple essence of the self-existent being; and whatsoever differs from it, is not necessary, because in absolute necessity there can be no diversity of existence. Other beings may exist besides the self-existent, but none of them can be self-existent, for this would prove them to be the same and different at the same time, which is absurd. Hence it follows, that it is impossible there could be two or more self-existent independent principles, as some Philosophers and Theologians have imagined: for they must either be the same or different, and either supposition is self-contradictory.

That there is one only living and true God, existing by the necessity of his own nature, absolutely independent, Eternal, Unchangeable, without body parts, or passions; infinite in power, wisdom, goodness, and all other perfections, is not only the first and principle article of the Christian Faith, but also the first and most evident truth, which the light of nature teaches; and is clearly demonstrable by the undeniable principles of reason. We however readily accede to Tillotson’s remarks in his sermon concerning the Divine Unity, that “The schoolmen, very few of whom had either exact skill in the holy scriptures, ecclesiastical antiquity or the writings of the ancient Fathers, wrought a great part of their Divinity out of their own brains, as spiders do cob-webs out of their own bowels, & started a thousand subtilities about mysteries, concerning which no Christian is bound to trouble his head, much less is it necessary for him to understand their niceties, which we may reasonably presume they who talk of them never did themselves understand, and least of all is it necessary to believe them.” Again in his sixth sermon, speaking of the jargon of the schoolmen, he says, “I envy no man the understanding of these phrases; to me they seem to signify

*Delivered before the Geneva branch of the Western Association of Universalists, September 24th, 1834, by the Rev. J. S. Thompson.
nothing; but to have been words invented by idle and conceited men, which a great many ever since, lest they should seem to be ignorant, would pretend to understand. But I wonder most, that men when they have amused and puzzled themselves and others with hard words, should call this explaining things."

The doctrine of my text is most unequivocally the Unity of the Deity: or that there is One only eternal, infinite supreme Lord of all; for whose pleasure all things subsist, and on whose will they all depend; by whose word the heavens were made and all the host of them, by the breath of his mouth; Ps. xxxiii. 6; by whose ever watchful providence, all things are governed, so that not a sparrow can fall to the ground without his notice, and whose care numbers the very hairs of our head: Matt. x. 29; who not only made of one blood all the nations of the earth, but also fore-ordained the times and bounds of their habitations. Acts xvii. 26; who manifested himself to the Patriarchs, gave the law to Moses, through a succession of ages, instructed men by the prophets; and last of all hath spoken to us by his Son Jesus Christ, whom he hath appointed heir of all things; the God of Abraham, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The God of the whole earth. Acts iii. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Heb. i. 1–2.

This doctrine of the whole world being under the government of one God, is the natural notion, which the light of nature itself has implanted in the minds of mankind. Had not persons of vain and conceited imaginations, professing themselves wise became fools; had not men of corrupt manners, having their foolish hearts darkened, deified their deceased kings out of flattery to the living, filled the minds of the ignorant and deluded vulgar, with the superstitious belief of many Gods, bearing rule over particular places and countries, the true notion of God, so plain and agreeable to the natural dictates of unprejudiced reason, might well have been preserved among the nations of the earth. The connexion and dependance of one thing upon another throughout the whole material universe, in all parts of the earth and visible heavens; the disposition of the air, the sea, and the winds; the motions of the sun, moon, and stars; the useful vicissitudes of the seasons for the regular productions of the various fruits of the earth; have always been sufficient to make it evident even to the meanest capacities, had they not been continually under the influence of prejudice and wrong instruction, that all things are under the dominion of one God, to whom the whole universe is uniformly subjected. Notwithstanding the strongest prejudices of long established superstitions and enforced idolatry; yet the wisest and best of men, in all heathen nations, have ever seen, and in a great measure maintained this grand truth, as a testimony to a degenerate and corrupt world. Notwithstanding all the provocations of idolatry, God never left himself wholly without witness-
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...but continually manifested himself to all reasonable understandings, with great clearness and great assurance of authority, confirming the dictate of reason, which the scriptures set forth as the first principle of all religion. Deut. iv. 39, and vi. 4; Isa. xliv. 6; 1 Cor. viii. 4.

But why does my text declare the Lord shall be one? Was there ever a time when Jehovah was not one? Brethren, it implies that blinded nations have framed vanities of their own imagination, and set up those who by nature were not Gods, to rival Jehovah in the government of the world, and thereby interrupt the worship of the Deity.

Idolatry is the rejection of the one Eternal, & setting up in his place any object, real or imaginary, and ascribing to it the effects, which are operated by his Almighty power, or the sovereign benefits resulting from his government. Of this class of Idolators are they, who deny the being of a God, and attribute the existence, order, beauty, and usefulness of the world to Chance, Fate, or Nature, which are mere empty names, idols or fictions of imagination, which in the emphatical language of the Apostle are nothing in the world. Much less unreasonable were those ancient Idolators; who stopping short at the immediate and visible causes of the life and plenty, which they enjoyed, worshipped the sun, moon, and stars, as the authors of that good, of which they were really the instruments.

The second species of Idolatry is the worship of false gods in conjunction with the One only God of the Universe. Of this kind was originally the idolatry of the Heathen in general, who though they acknowledged the true God, whose existence shone upon their reason from the works of creation and Providence, yet practised the adoration of other subordinate, imaginary deities, as parts or manifestations of the Deity, in particular places or on particular occasions.

Maimonides, in his treatise on idolatry, says, "in the days of Enos the sons of Adam and even Enos himself, erred greatly, and the counsel of the wise men of that day became brutish. They said for as much as God has created these stars and spheres to govern the world, and set them on high, and imparted to them honor, by appointing them to minister before him, it is meet that we should laud, honor and adore them; for this is the will of God, that men honor and magnify whomsoever he honors, even as kings would have them honored who stand before them, and this is the honor of the king himself. When these thoughts came into their hearts they began to build temples for the stars, and to offer them sacrifices and worship before them, in order to obtain favor of the Creator. This evil opinion was the root of Idolatry. In process of time there arose false prophets who declared God had commanded the worship of such a star or of the stars in general, that the people should make an image of it, offer sacrifices to it and worship it. The false
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Prophet then showed the people an image which he had made after the imagination of his own heart, informing them it was the image of that star made known to him by prophecy. In this manner they began to make images in temples, under trees, and on tops of mountains and hills, and assemble together to worship them. To worship images with service different one from another, and to sacrifice unto them spread through the world, till in process of time, the glorious and fearful name of God was forgotten by all living, and was neither known nor acknowledged. There was no people on earth who knew any other God but the images of wood and stone, to the worship of which, they had been trained up from childhood, and by whose names they had been taught to swear. The wise men among them and the priests, thought, there was no God but the stars for whose sake, and after whose likeness, they had made the images. As for the Rock everlasting, there were none that acknowledged him, save a few persons such as Enoch, Noah, Shem, till that pillar of the world, Abraham our Father was born." See Ainsworth and Clarke on Gen. 4. 26.

The worship of the sun, moon, and stars was the most ancient species of Idolatry. Maimonides, quoted by Lord Herbert de Rel. Gent. assures us, the Sabaeans acknowledged no Gods but the stars.—To this practice Job alludes chap. xxxi. 26, 27. Diodorus says, the first inhabitants of Egypt admiring the beauty of the world, concluded there were two Gods the sun and moon, whom they called Osiris and Isis. Plato tells us those who first inhabited Greece thought the sun, moon, and stars alone to be Gods.

Next to the Host of Heaven men carried away by flattery, deified kings, heroes, and benefactors, and worshipped after their death, those who had obtained renown, during life, for extensive dominion or beneficence. Hence arose the tutelar gods of local influence and homage. The Syrians in Ahab's time fancied that the different parts of the world were under the influence and dominion of different deities. 1 Kings, xx. 23; and similar must have been the opinions of those Samaritans, who being collected from different nations, preserved the worship of their own tutelar gods: and while they professed to fear Jehovah, the God of Israel, they worshipped other gods whom they considered their own. 2 Kings, xvii, 26-41. The deification and worship of dead men, was the idolatry of Greece and Rome, those learned nations of antiquity, who cultivated the arts and sciences, and thereby became so improved and civilized, that all others were considered barbarians; yet being stupefied by superstition, they blindly followed the traditions of their ignorant and barbarous ancestors. Noah, who may be called the Father of men, was in all probability the osiris of Egypt, whose worship was introduced by Orpheus into Greece, under the name of Bacchus, who being the god of wine, and vintage, fully represented the
Noah of the Jews. The same worship was paid to Bacchus, Osiris, and Jupiter, who was the Noah of the Hebrews, the Bel of the Babylonians, the Ammon of the Africans, the Osiris of Egypt, the Baal of the Edomites and other nations, whose worship almost totally intercepted that of Jehovah the Creator, and was general over all the world. From Gen. x. 6, we find that the posterity of Ham having departed from Babylon cultivated the low and fertile soil of Egypt, and attributed their success in the culture of the vine to the instruction of their forefather Noah, afterwards denominated Osiris, and worshipped under the figure of a pied bull, the emblem of agriculture. Some think Osiris was Mizraim or Menes, first King of Egypt. The history of Osiris, Jupiter, Belus, Bacchus and many of the great heroes of antiquity, who were deified after death, is involved in much fable and allegory; but this much we clearly understand, that they were all men of like passions with their blinded adorers. The Hebrew name of Egypt is Mitsraim, so called from the second son of Ham, and first King of Egypt, called Menes in profane history, who settled the country and introduced the worship of his progenitor, Noah: it is also called the land of Ham. Ps. cv. 23–27. The worship of dead men appears to have been the prevailing Idolatry ever since the deluge. The posterity of Ham peopled Egypt, Palestine, &c. Assyria. The whole Mythology of the heathens had its origin in Egypt, which was thence called the mother of the gods. From Egypt it passed to the Hebrews, Phcenicians or Canaanites, and Cretans, and lastly to the Greeks by Cadmus, a Philistine, driven out by Joshua 1519 years before Christ, and thence to the Romans from whom it spread over Europe. The sacred historian has been particular in giving the origin and descent of Idolatry after the flood. Nimrod the grandson of Ham, as some think the Belus of Idolatrous nations, built Babel and founded the Babylonian or Assyrian Empire, and like his brother in Egypt, established that idolatry for which 22 nations of the east became famous. Shem and Japhet were worshippers of the true God, as taught by Noah their father. Shem having settled Arabia, Persia, and India, the knowledge of the Deity was longer and more clearly preserved among the nations of the east. Indeed there is little reason to doubt of Noah being the celebrated Foe of China, who established the religion and morals of that country. Whether the worship of human ghosts became prevalent before the flood is not so clearly ascertained; but the worship of the celestial bodies and dead men has ever been the most prevalent Idolatry since that time. The Teraphim or images which Rachel stole from her father Laban the Syrian, called by Theodoret, idols, had been probably kept by him as the Larres and Penates of the Romans. As Laban was an Aramean, and the Syrian nothing but a dialect of the Hebrew, the change of a letter, which made no part of the Hebrew root, may be
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easily admitted. Teraphim may therefore be from the same root as Seraphim; and as seraph signifies to burn, the images might have been luminous figures made of burnished brass, representing the supposed forms of some stars. The original word is used to signify idol or idolatry. See 2 Kings, xxiii. 24; Ez. xxi. 21; Zech. x. 2; Hos. iii. 4. But Le Clerc derives the word from Rapha, defecit, and infers that the Rephaim or Teraphim, were the deified dead, or ghosts of dead men. The star worship of the ancients, is noticed by Amos v. 15; and a star in the Egyptian hieroglyphics signified or was used to denote a god. The Bel of Babylon, which was worshipped, & held in so great veneration, noticed by the prophets, Isa. xlvi. 1; Jer. i. 2; and li. 44; was said to be a great King who founded that city. The Baal peor of the scriptures was Bela the son of Beor, first king of Edom. 1 Chron. i. 43; Num. xxv. 3.—However names might differ, still Egypt supplied the world with theology and gods. The heathen deities were derived from the great men of the Scriptures; and Manetho, a very ancient Egyptian writer often cited by Josephus, maintains that all the gods of Egypt were dead men, whom they embalmed to give effect to the doctrine of immortality. Fertile her soil, ingenious her inhabitants, but debased, and degraded by superstition; till from the worship of her heroes, she descended to the adoration of the ox, wolf, hawk, stork, crocodile, and cat. Afterwards she proceeded to deify a vast multitude of beasts, fishes, reptiles, and vegetables; and whilst one tribe held in adoration one species of animals, another class had the same animals in abhorrence.

Who has not heard where Egypt's realms are named, What monster gods, her frantic sons have framed? Here Ibis gorged with well grown serpents, there The Crocodile commands religious fear. A monkey god, prodigious to be told, Strikes the beholder's eye in burnished gold. To godship here, blue Triton's scaly herd, The river progeny is there preferred, Through towns Diana's power neglected lies, Where to her dogs, aspiring temples rise. Juvenal, satyr 15.

2. We shall consider the name of God, or Jehovah which the prophet declares shall be one.

The name of God according to the nature of the Jewish language signifies God himself. To praise or call on the name of the Lord, is the same as to call on Jehovah. A similar manner of speaking occurs in many instances in the Hebrew language. The throne of honour of thy majesty, implies the throne or honour of Jehovah. Heb. viii. 1; Ps. cxxlv. 5. God's name becoming great, implies that he shall be universally adored and idols despised. Micah iv. 6.
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It also implies renunciation of all false gods, who fill the minds of their superstitious votaries with false dread and vain imaginations. Lev. xviii. 21. Forgetting the name of God, denotes a falling into idolatry. Ps. xlv. 20. To mention the name of idols, intimates a tendency to idolatry. Ex. xxiii. 13.

The name of God imports his religion. Deut. xii. 4. This name of God is great when men adhere to true religion, by worshipping God alone in the manner he has prescribed, and adorn his doctrines by showing the power of religion in fruits of righteousness. This is the true signification of the name of God. Rom. ii. 24; and of Christ. 2 Thess. i. 12. God is a relative term and has respect to servants. It denotes, indeed, an eternal, infinite, absolute being; but such a being, without dominion, would not be God. The word God frequently signifies Lord, but every lord is not God. The dominion of a spiritual being, or Lord, constitutes God; true dominion, true God. From such true dominion, it follows, that the true God is living, intelligent, all-powerful, and supremely perfect.

There are various names given to the Almighty in scripture, tho' properly speaking he can have no name; for, as he is incomprehensible, he is not nominable; & being but one, he has no need of a name to distinguish him. Nevertheless as names are given to him in the scriptures, to assist our ideas of his greatness and perfection, they are worthy of our consideration. El, denotes him the strong and powerful God. Gen. xvii. 1. Eloah represents him the only proper object of worship. Ps. xlv. 6, 7. Shaddai denotes him to be all-sufficient and Almighty. Ex. vi. 3. Helion represents his incomparable excellency, absolute supremacy, and peculiar residence in the highest heavens. Ps. l. 11. Adoni intimates that he is the great connector, supporter, Lord, and Judge of all his creatures. Ps. cx. 1. Jah implies his self-existence, his giving life to his creatures, and his infinite answerableness to the happiness of himself and all his creatures. Ex. xv. 2. Ehjeh l am, or I will be, denotes his self-existence, independence, immutable eternity, and all-sufficiency to his people. Ex. iii. 14. Jehovah intimates self-existence, absolute independence, unsuccessful eternity, and his effectual and marvellous giving of being to all existence, and fulfilling his promises. Gen. ii. 4, &c.

The most intelligent and philosophic writers infer from the remaining vestiges of ancient religions that the earliest worshippers of the Deity believed and inculcated his Unity; hence the doctrine has descended from the first parents of mankind by tradition to their remote posterity. There was a Temple at Thebes in Egypt inscribed to Yahou or Jehouah, in the days of Moses. Orpheus who brought the Egyptian notions of religion into the rising nations of Europe, about the time of Gideon, one of the Judges of Israel, 1250 years before Christ, taught the existence of a supreme being, under the
name of You-pater, contracted Jupiter. The Grecian Zeus, and the Hebrew Yehu, are manifestly the same word with the usual change in the last syllable. Thus Messiah Heb. Messias Greek: Elijah Heb. Elias Greek: Yehu Heb. Yeus or Zeus Greek. Hence Zeus-pater, vocative Zeupater, by contraction Zupiter or Jupiter, the supreme God of European nations, before Christianity supplanted the ancient Mythology. Zeus comes from Zao, I live, and joined to pater, a father, signifies the living and life-giving father of the Universe. The Phoenicians and Greeks called their supreme deity Zeus, whence the Latins derived their Deus by an easy process. Sanchoniatho, a Phenician or Canaanitish writer, who was contemporary with Joshua or, as we are informed by Porphyry, flourished about the time of Semiramis near 800 years before the Trojan war, calls Jehovah Yeus, & Yao, and acknowledges his obligations in the composition of his history to Jerombaal, doubtlessly Jerubbael or Gideon, whom he calls the priest of the God Yao. He also informs us that Chronus was called II by the Phoenicians, evidently from the El, or God of the Hebrews. Diodorus L. 1, says Moses ascribed his laws to the God Jao. This great self-existent being was acknowledged by the wisest of all nations. Plutarch gives us a dissertation on the monosyllable El, which was inscribed on the gate of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, implying that the temple was dedicated to "the one self-existent God." The ancient Gentiles described the gods Bra'ma, Chiven, and Vishnoo as the offspring of some unknown, eternal self-existence. Homer calls Jupiter the Father of Gods and men: Virgil says let us begin with Jupiter, all things are full of Jupiter; and Porphyry affirms that Jupiter constitutes the life and essence of all beings. Thales, Socrates, and Pythagoras fully acknowledged the existence and superintendence of one eternal self-existence. Nor can the objections arising from a multiplicity of opinions concerning the chief good or the acknowledgement of 300 Jupiters as Varro says, prove that Jupiter was not the name of the One eternal. If twelve cities contended for the honour of giving birth to Homer, certainly when degraded minds began to believe Jupiter to have been a man, we should not be be surprized to find, that every nation should put in their claim to the honour of calling him their own. The presumption then is, that the first Fathers of mankind delivered to their offspring, the belief and worship of one eternal; but through lapse of time they forgot the most high. When men began to philosophize, concerning the Deity, they personified his attributes and thence again, in the opinion of the vulgar, arose a multitude of deities, which intercepted the worship of the One God.—As corrupt Christianity principally consists in the speculations of the Grecian Philosophy, two of the attributes of Deity personified, wisdom & power, are still adored under the names of Son and Holy
Ghost; and what is truly lamentable, Christians by ascribing the passions and infirmities of humanity to their deities, still follow the absurd conceit of the heathen that gods are dead men! O that salvation might come out Zion; and the day hasten, when all shall turn to the Lord with one consent; and all the families of the earth be blessed, in acknowledging the One God of the whole earth! All forms, similitudes, and appearances are expressly prohibited in worship; and ought never to become objects of adoration. Hear and tremble, O ye idolatrous Christians, and let your hearts condemn you when you read the fourth and thirteenth chapters of Deuteronomy, and the 44th and 45th of Isaiah. From Mede's apostacy we learn, that though the Jews wished frequently to join the tutelar gods of the heathen, to the incomprehensible Jehovah; they never ran into idolatry of the grossest sort, till they began to believe Jehovah to be a tutelar god himself. Christians likewise adhered to the belief and adoration of the One Jehovah, till they degraded him to a man of like passions with themselves, who sojourne'd in Judea and was crucified at Jerusalem! Since that time they have vied with any of the darkest nations of antiquity; in the degradation and prostitution of divine worship!

O superstition, what hast thou done! Truly thine awful agency in forming and maintaining many of the ancient and modern creeds, is well described by Pope in his Essay on man.

She from the rending earth and bursting skies,
Saw Gods descend and fiends infernal rise;
Here fixed the dreadful, there the blessed abodes;
Fear made her devils and weak hope her gods;
Gods, partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,
Whose attributes were rage, revenge or lust;
Such as the souls of cowards might conceive,
And formed like tyrants, tyrants would believe.
Zeal then, not charity, became the guide,
And hell was built on spite, and Heaven on pride.

As superstition seldom regards the rank or character of her gods, the degraded Christian Church multiplied her deities, by canonizing departed saints: and imitating the states of Greece and Rome, she too, must have her whole gods, half-gods, and deified ghosts of heroes. Had Unitarianism been always the Universal Religion as it ought to have been, Polytheism and superstition could never have obtained credit in the world. But when men departed from the knowledge of the one true God, they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Polytheism like a many headed monster, arose, full of names of blasphemy, imperiously assuming the names, honors and prerogatives of God. The government of the Creation, which belongs exclusively to the One in-
finite and eternal Jehovah, was distributed among a rabble of deities, the creatures of a foolish imagination. The Universe was no longer regard as the work of one Almighty power, the care of one eternal Providence. Its various provinces were peopled by imaginary beings, who owed both their existence and worship, to the darkened understandings and besotted minds of a deluded world. Temples arose, altars were dedicated to the false deities of superstitious votaries, and the art of the sculptor was employed to give visible form and durability to what perverted imaginations had framed. Then deluded multitudes hastened to the supposed habitations of their gods to prostrate themselves before their images, and pay their adorations to stocks and stones! The Mythology of the Greeks and Romans may be called elegant, by him who contemplates it only in the breathing marbles, which embodied the forms of their deities, or in the poetry to which their agency gives majesty and animation; but he would revoke the strange epithet, could he see it inflaming the brutal appetites of the vulgar, exercising no moral influence over the minds of the majority, and secretly despised by the lettered and reflecting few. Could the dark grottos of Hindoo idolatry utter forth their sepulchral voices, to tell us what rites honor, and what sacrifices propitiate the demons, whose monstrous images are carved on their walls, we should see what a doctrine of ungodliness Polytheism still continues to be.

Before I conclude this Lecture let me lay before you a brief sketch of the history of the revival of the genuine doctrine of Unitarism. This, my brethren, is not a system formed by the creed-makers of the dark ages. It is the religion of Adam; it is the religion of the Patriarchs; of the Jewish dispensation; of the learned and wise of all nations and ages; it is the religion of the blessed Jesus! When you open your bibles you find the Unitarian's faith expressed in the plain language of scripture. Take the following passages and form your creed. To us there is but one God the Father. 1 Cor. 8, 6. There is but one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. 2, 5. He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. 1 Cor. 15, 25. The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercy is over all his works. Ps. 145, 9. God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and 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. 21, 4. About fifty years ago, Linsey opened the first Church in London that ever bore in England, the inscription of the one God. At that time Unitarianism, appeared no more than a little cloud rising out of the sea, but it has rapidly increased in magnitude and extent, and now begins to refresh the troubled nations with its benign influence.—Whole congregations of Trinitarians have deserted the standards of Mystical Babylon, and enrolled their names in the list of those who
worship the Father in spirit and in truth. The flames of Servetus lighted up a torch in Geneva, which rapidly consumes the hay, wood, and stubble; may they soon burn up every inquisitorial dungeon of the besotted and blinded continent of Europe. The spirits of the Polish Brethren are resusciating in their offspring, and now erecting churches in Poland, Prussia and Brandenburgh, for the worship of the One Jehovah.

In Great Britain there are now about four hundred regular Unitarian congregations; two hundred in Transylvania, where they possess an excellent University, and the patronage of a national establishment; two hundred and fifty among the Swiss and French Protestants; about one hundred in Ireland, where the whole southern synod, and also the Presbytery of Antrim have forsaken the ranks of Calvinistic Polytheism and partiality, and avowed the Divine unity and benevolence; and there are now about four hundred and fifty congregations in America, where the cause of God and his Christ is progressing to the astonishment of all beholders. Unitarianism can therefore boast of fourteen hundred congregations and about as many ministers, who worship the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and abhor the impious names of blasphemy!—Amongst all the above advocates of the Divine Unity, there cannot at this day, be found ten advocates for the modern doctrines of Hell and the Devil. Nor are these without talent or influence. Literature smiles on them with auspicious eyes. Even here in America, the only University that has arrived to maturity, is in the hands of Unitarians; and we hope like the waters in Ezekiel, its streams running eastward and westward, will soon inundate the states of the Union.

The triumphs of our principles are not limited to one sect or nation. The earth seems to be holding out her arms to receive the heralds of Unitarianism. Geneva, the birth place of Calvinism, and the very spot were Servetus was burnt by a slow fire made of green wood, as a Unitarian martyr, has abandoned the unintelligible jargon of mysticism, together with all its inquisitorial tortures, and by an act of its Synod resolved that the barbarous and persecuting doctrines of Trinitarianism shall be preached no longer in that Canton. From storming the strong holds of Mystery in Europe, it has proceeded to the shores of India, and already waves its banners in the city of Madras. The greatest difficulty under which we labor, is the want of ministers to supply vacant churches, and rising congregations. But here also we have reason to be satisfied. In England the Episcopal establishment has given us a Linsey, a Whitby, and a Jebb; the Presbyterians, an Emlyn and a Priestley, who have led the way to at least one hundred able ministers, who have followed them from the same connexion; so that the whole presbyterian interest in England has passed to a new name. The Baptists,
have also honored us with the names of a Toulman, a Vidler, an Evans, a Wright, and a Robinson; who are followed by nearly all the general Baptists of England; and a considerable influx of quondam Methodist preachers are reforming the miners of Cornwall, the Potteries of Stafford and the forests of Rossendale.

In England and America, Unitarianism, and Universalism march hand in hand. Indeed that man who can be a Unitarian and not a Universalist, or a Universalist and not a Unitarian, is but half taught in the school of Jesus! In many of the states of this great confederation of Republics, we not only behold the fields white for harvest, but already we have returned hearing our sheaves; and we have reason to believe, the period is fast approaching when the ends of the earth shall remember, and turn to the Lord; and all the kinds of the earth worship before Him. In that day there shall be one Lord and his name One.

My soul illum'd, one only being knows,
Whence ev'ry object, ev'ry moment flows;
To suns, nor human ghosts, I bow no more,
Jehovah I perceive, his name alone adore.

---

HYMN—TO THE ONE GOD.

Eternal God! Almighty Cause
Of earth, and seas, and worlds unknown;
All things are subject to thy laws;
All things depend on thee alone.

Thy glorious being singly stands,
Of all within itself possess'd;
By none controll'd in thy commands,
And in thyself completely bless'd.

To thy great name alone we bow,
Thy just commands we would obey;
All other gods we disavow,
Reject their claims, renounce their sway.

Worship to thee alone belongs;
Worship to thee alone we give;
Thine be our hearts, and thine our songs
And to thy glory may we live.

Spread thy great name through every land;
Their idol deities dethrone;
Subdue the world to thy command,
And reign unrivall'd god alone.
Lecture, IV.*

1 John, v. 7—For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

THE TRINITY.

Brethren, whilst I undertake to expose this doctrine, I feel my obligation to the kind providence of Almighty God, who hath caused his light to shine into the dark places of horrid cruelty, and also, to the mild and equitable government of this enlightened country, for the liberty of free discussion, which I claim and enjoy this day as a public speaker. During the three first centuries of Christianity, this dogma was unknown. The invention of it, after Christianity was transmuted into a state policy, formed the grand apostacy of the Christian religion. The doctrine has been the source of much mischief in every age since the third century, because bold and independent minds could not bear the insult it offered to their understandings. It turned the heads of myriads; chased thousands from the profession of the Christian religion; filled the inquisitorial dungeons with supposed heretics; and dyed the scaffolds with floods of human gore! Nothing can be more horrible than the accounts of Ecclesiastical history concerning the furious controversies, which the introduction of this doctrine occasioned; and the torrents of blood, which were shed to obtain for the monster a general reception. It is not possible to describe the convulsions into which it threw the Christian church in the fourth and fifth centuries; the anathemas which the contending parties hurled against one another, and the dreadful rage with which the stronger party always harassed the weaker. I do not exaggerate, when I say, that in these controversies, millions of human sacrifices were offered at the shrine of bigotry. In truth ecclesiastical history in general, but this part in particular, is little more than a history of the worst passions of the human heart, worked up by enthusiastic zeal, into a diabolical virulence and madness. Indeed orthodoxy never obtained birth till men had renounced their claim to the use of reason, lost their religion, and become systematically wicked. The holy Catholic church had no sooner become politic and orthodox, than she became drunken with the blood of saints. According to the learned Dr. Moore, Pope Julius, in seven years slaughtered two hundred thousand heretics. The massacre in France cut off one hundred thousand. Louis XIV. of pious memory, after the eve of Bartholo-

*Delivered in Rochester, March 14th, 1824, by the Rev. J. S. Thompson.
mew, boasted in his letter to the pope, that he had dispatched 70,000 heretics in a few days!! Peronius avers that in the persecution of the Albigenses and Waldenses, one million lost their lives. From the beginning of the Jesuits in the middle of the sixteenth century, by the testimony of Balduinus, nine hundred thousand perished, within thirty years. The Duke of Alva put thirty thousand to death by the hands of the common hangman; and Vigerius affirms that one hundred and fifty thousand were destroyed in thirty years by the inquisition. This diabolical engine burnt alive about 35,000 persons in Spain alone, and banished millions of her inhabitants, besides filling the galleys and dungeons for years by myriads of victims; yet these demons of torture were all orthodox, the vicars of Christ, and defenders of the faith! But let it not be understood that I blame solely the papal church for all the enormities perpetrated under the mask of orthodox sanctity. By worldly power, Constantine corrupted the christian church in its doctrine and worship, and amalgamated the church and state. By the same red dragon, Henry VIII. created himself head of the church; and during his iniquitous reign from 1509 to 1547, slew seventy-two thousand persons, or six every day on an average, for daring to contradict the orthodox opinion of this consecrated defender of the faith. By the same dragon power, the pious Elizabeth, by the direction of the reformed Bishops, doomed the dissenters to the stake, and burned them alive for their opinions. James 1st. of sacred memory, on account of his inspired translation of the Bible, lighted up the flames of Smithfield, and burnt to death Lyatt, Wightman, and a Spanish Unitarian. Elizabeth enacted that all persons speaking derogatively of the book of Common Prayer, should suffer fines for the first and second offence; forfeiture of goods for the third; and for the fourth offence, imprisonment during life; and all this to protect a book, one fourth of which might have originated in Bedlam. King William enacted that every person educated in the christian religion, denying by writing, printing, teaching, or speaking, any one of the three persons in the Trinity, to be God, or maintaining that there are more Gods than One, for the first offence, shall be rendered incapable of holding any office; and for the second, incapable of bringing any action, or buying any lands, and suffer moreover three years imprisonment. Charles II. banished from their pulpits and houses 2,000 non-conformist Ministers; and the pious assembly of Divines at Westminster, who manufactured creeds for posterity, obtained an act of parliament that all such persons as maintain by preaching, or writing that the Father is not God; the Son is not God; or the Holy Ghost is not God, & that these three are not one eternal God; shall be guilty of felony, and suffer death without benefit of Clergy! In this they doubtless followed their great patron and precedent, Calvin, who burnt the learned Dr. Michael Servetus be-
cause he dared to comment on some of the infallible Reformer's opinions. Well did Milton denominate this assembly, "New Presbytery, old priest writ large." Hence you see the inventors and promulgators of the Trinity never claimed for it the aid of reason, but by fines, penalties, faggot and fire, they endeavored to preserve the Mystery of iniquity. Compared to many of the champions of orthodoxy, and defenders of the faith. Milton's hero is a harmless, & angelic being; for he was forced to do the deed his heart abhorred!

And should I at your harmless innocence
Melt, as I do, yet public reason just,
Honor and empire with revenge enlarged,
By conquering this new world, compels me now
To do, what else, tho' damned, I should abhor.

PARADISE LOST.

The history of what has been called the church of Christ, since the apostolic age, generally contains the most horrid libels that ever were published against the christian religion. All that has been written by infidels, to depreciate the gospel or sap its foundation, is trivial, compared with the practice of those, who have erected themselves into defenders of the faith by the power of the secular arm. Red with the blood of martyrs, she, which sat on the seven hills, though chief, has not been alone in the transgression. The church protestant as well as papal, leaning on the sword of state, has always exhibited in the predominant party, a scene of oppressions, cruelties, imprisonments, exiles and murders, that would disgrace any religion. Human establishments and temporal advantages annexed to the profession of christianity, have contributed to hypocritical subscriptions, false oaths, lying prayers and party zeal; but such protections never contributed to the efficacy of Christ's gospel. The efforts of coercive power and penalties to support or promote the cause of God, are too much opposed to the whole system of the gospel, ever to be admitted as auxiliaries. Let the Jews erect their synagogue, the Chinese their pagod, the Mohometans their mosque, and the Parsees their fire-altar; and worship their God, in their own way, none making them afraid.

Absurd and vain the attempt to bind
With iron chains the free born mind;
To force conviction, and reclaim
The wandering by destructive flame!

Bold arrogance, to snatch from Heaven
Dominion not to mortals given;
O'er conscience to usurp the throne,
Accountable to God alone!
The Trinity.

Americans, ye have set the world a glorious example, by abolishing church establishments, and proclaiming universal religious liberty; ye have thereby broken alike the chains of religious and political slavery, and emancipated posterity from the galling yoke of religious tyranny! Whilst then a misnamed Holy alliance are like Cyclops, in the forges of Vulcan, fabricating the thunderbolts of anathema, or the cursed steel to shed the blood of liberty, or whetting the horrid shears of the relentless Parcae to cut the thread of its life. Whilst the great Bells of Hindostan and Spain yet toll to assemble the people to witness the execrable deeds of a diabolical inquisition, which delights to mingle the horrid rites of Moloch with the religion of Jesus, arise and let it be re-echoed from the St. Croix to the Missouri; from the Lakes to the Atlantic, "Americans shall be free."

1. I shall lay before you a History of the Doctrine.
2. I shall examine its pretended evidences.

The word Trinity is derived from τρις, three, and ὑμων, one, and was formed or forged expressly for the purpose, to excite the incomprehensible, irrational, and most absurd idea of the Three-One! Martin Luther says, "the word Trinity sounds very oddly, and is a human invention; it were better to call the Almighty, God, than Trinity." And John Calvin says, "I like not this prayer, O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity; it savours of barbarity. The word Trinity is barbarous, insipid, profane, a human invention, grounded on no testimony of God's word; the Popish God, unknown to the prophets and the apostles." See Ben Mordecai's Letters.

The first writer of antiquity who used the word Trinity, was Theophilus, about the year 180. However, the term, all barbarous as it was, had no such signification in the mouth of this writer, as that which the Holy Fathers, assembled in Council two hundred years after, determined it should bear. The controversies occasioned by Noetus, Praxeus, and Sabellius, about the end of the second century, were the cause of the term being adopted, to express a unity of substance and a plurality of persons. In this sense, the word was first used by Tertullian, in his discourse against Praxeus, about the year 200,

It is pretended by its advocates, that the Trinity is a great mystery which cannot be known or explained. If so why do they assert it to be a doctrine of Revelation; for whatever is revealed cannot be any longer a mystery. Mysterion is derived from the Greek μυο, or the Hebrew, סתר, both of which signify to hide, shut, or conceal. A mystery is therefore something hid, concealed, covered or unrevealed; but as soon as it is revealed, that moment it ceases to be a mystery. This is evident from the connection and sense in which the word is almost invariably used in the new Testament.—Mat. xiii. 11. Rom. xvi. 25, 26. 1 Cor. xv. 51. Col. i. 26. From
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the most careful examination of all the passages where the word occurs, musterion never signifies any thing incomprehensible, but merely something that remains hidden, unrevealed, or unknown. Accordingly, Paul tells the Ephesians that God had made known the mystery of his will, by the dispensation which he had given to them; even that mystery which was hid for ages, but was now made manifest to the saints. Hence it follows, that the Trinity is not a Gospel mystery. Is it then, of Greek or Roman origin, and can those initiated understand or explain it? No, they confess it is beyond their powers of comprehension. Why, then, talk about it, or mock your reason or understanding, by pretending to explain an inexplicable, or professing to believe ye know not what; for confessedly it remains a mystery?

This doctrine exhibits one of the greatest efforts to deceive and ridicule the rational faculties, ever suggested by human sophistry, in any age of the world. Though Bolingbroke and Ramsay both assert, that it entered the creeds of all the nations of antiquity; and enumerate the Egyptian, Pythagorean, Zoroastrian, Platonic, Chaldean, and Samothrasian Trinities; yet not one of these agrees with the modern hypothesis; for never did any heathen nation in the world acknowledge three self-existent, independent Gods; much less did they imagine these three to be one. Shall we admit that the doctrine of the Trinity is a tradition, delivered to the first parents of mankind, and by them handed down from father to son through all succeeding ages? Surely no such fanciful opinion should be admitted, or even repeated, seeing we have not the least intimation of it in the Jewish history; and the whole nation, as well as their Scriptures, abhor the dogma, as manifestly tending to contradict and dishonor the one Jehovah, and continue the reign of superstition and idolatry.

The first vestiges of a Trinity were discovered by the creative minds of Egyptian priests, those parents of hieroglyphical mysticism; and something similar appears in the worship of Osiris, Typhon, and Isis. Orpheus, who first transferred the doctrine from Egypt to Greece, taught the existence of a Divine Phanes, Uranus, and Chronus; the Persian Magi acknowledged an Oromasdes, Mithra and Arimanius. Plato, whose opinions were adulterated by Egyptian mysticisms during his travels, having personified the Divine Wisdom and Power, first taught that the Logos was an emanation from the Deity, and Divine Power another; and speaks of a Trinity, which he designates by the names of Agathos, Logos, and Psuche, or spirit of the world. But there never was any similar doctrine to that of the orthodox Trinity, consisting of three persons in one God, conceived, much less believed by any nation or people on earth.

From Macrobius and Plato, we learn, that the spiritualists held the
world to be a machine which must have had a maker, whom they
denominated Demi-ourgos. He must have acted from a plan, and
consequently have had understanding, mens, or Logos which they
called a second being. But as they admitted a solar principle, or
soul of the world, they were forced to give it a place in the Deity;
and thence originated their Triad. This system was born a heretic
in Egypt, was transmitted a heathen to the schools of Greece and
Rome; and became Catholic and orthodox by the conversion of the
followers of Pythagoras and Plato to the christian religion.

The notion of Jehovah as a Father, may have first excited the in-
quiry, where is his son? An ignorant and proud philosopher is al-
ways forward to reply. This son they pronounced Nous or Logos,
whom the Latins called Verbum, for 'Mens ex Deo nata,' says Mac-
robius; and the Anima mundi, was called the Holy Ghost. Who
would ever have dreamed that orthodoxy, rather than want a Trin-
ity, would have admitted a heathen Trinity, one of the persons be-
ing universally acknowledged to be the Devil. Without contro-
versy, the Typhon of Egypt, the Siva of the Gentoos, the Arimanius
of the Persians, and the Satan of the Jews, were names used to ex-
cite the same idea, and denote the destroyer! Moreover, one per-
son of the ancient trinities was a female! Isis of Egypt, Myrrha
of Persia, the Diana of the Greeks, the Minerva of the Latins, and
the Virgin Mary of the Catholics, have been similarly described,
& have performed the same offices in the estimation of their deluded
votaries. Indeed the orthodox view of the Deity, the Devil, and
the Virgin, is perfectly harmonious with the sentiments of the ancient
heathens concerning their Triad, or Tri-une Deity. Let the Joneses,
Maurices, and Kidds who seek to impose their Hindoo superstitions
on the credulous, reflect on these things: and let them deny, if they
are able, that the Hindoos did worship the Devil, as one person of
their sacred Trinity. Let them also show if the Hindoos did not
believe their Bruma, Siva, and Vishnu, to be mere creatures pro-
duced by an eternal, infinite and immaterial being. Let them also
deny it if they can, that the Persians did believe their Oromades,
Arimanius, and Myrrha, to be also the production of a God, who med-
itates all the management of the Universe: though at present he re-
cline in happy repose. The whole system is Egyptian, transferred
and taught by Orpheus in Europe about 1270 years before Christ;
and by Zoroaster in Asia, near 600 years B. C.

As the Catholic Trinity is dissimilar from that of the Heathen,
the fabricators of this chimerical paradox, must have been the
Paganizing councils of the fourth century, who, baffled in their
attempts to introduce their favorite dogmas into the Christian sys-
tem, invented the curious labyrinth, at the threshold of which, eve-
ry one who entered, was obliged to renounce, for the remaining part
of his life, all claims to common sense. If words directly opposed
to each other, are allowed to be devoid of all sense, of what use could it be to us, to admit the doctrine as divine; clothed in words that have no possible meaning, and before which, according to the acknowledgment of its warmest advocates, the understanding of man must lie prostrate? Can any thing more effectually outrage common sense, or be more abhorrent to reason, than that doctrine which requires us to believe a son to be as old as his father; derived from him, and yet independent of him, and self-existent? The spirit is derived from both father and son, and, notwithstanding, is himself the Lord and giver of life! Does not reason reel and stagger at the assertion, "there are three persons, each of whom is God, and yet not three Gods, but one God?" The Father gave away all his Deity to the Son, and yet he retained it whole and entire. Both Father and Son gave it fully to the Spirit, but were nothing diminished by the gift. Avant, ye mathematical axioms, and arithmetical calculations, so pernicious to Trinitarian tenets!

All the mysticism and burlesque metaphysics which orthodoxy has employed, to veil the airy fiction from exposure to ridicule and contempt, might have been pardoned; had not its crafty advocates hurled their anathemas against all who dared to remonstrate. But had all the philosophers of that age, in which this doctrine received its existence and obtained regal authority, been determined to expose the religion of Jesus to contempt and ridicule, I know not how they could have better effected their end, than by the curious invention of this mystical and unintelligible labyrinth of absurdity! "A little jargon," says Gregory Nazianzen to St. Jerome, is all that is necessary to impose on the people; the less they comprehend, the more they admire! Our forefathers have said not what they thought, but what circumstances dictated."! See Hieron. ad Nep.

All amusing though it be, yet it is a certain fact, that the fathers assembled at Antioch, A. D. 270, reprobed the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, and hurled their fiery bolts, at the devoted head of the famous Paul of Samosata.

But, not long after, another still more formidable enemy, namely, Arius, attacked their sacred citadel, from an opposite quarter. Sabellius, an Egyptian philosopher, having excited a considerable contest in Africa, by asserting the unity of the Father and the Son, and Alexander having affirmed, with equal boldness, the eternity of the Son, Arius, provoked at their extravagancies, asserted that Christ was made out of nothing. To settle this dispute, Constantine called the Council of Nice, which first began the work of metamorphosing the Deity into a shapeless monster!

The holy fathers, at the call of Constantine, ascend in clouds to Nice, and there without reflecting on what had been done, at a quondam assembly, earnestly hasten not to imitate their master, by pronouncing a blessing on their adversaries, but to thunder alike their
horrid impreca tions on Arius and the former council, and assert the consubstantiality of Father and Son. As yet, they had not discovered the third person of the Trinity, and consequently the doctrine was in embryo, even in the fourth century! The Council of Nice, says Mr. Soverain, did not at all touch upon the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. Far from it. The Holy Ghost was so little considered at that time, that some fathers of the Council, would have made no difficulty, to give the superiority to the Virgin Mary, in making her the third person in the Trinity. This appears from Mahomet taking Mary for the third person of the Trinity. Anselm advises to trust Mary, rather than Jesus her son. See Claude's Essay on a Sermon and Sale's Koran.

But that the reader may have a just notion of this Council, let it be observed, out of nearly two thousand Bishops, only 318 could be induced to act; and even these were partially compelled by the Emperor! It will be easy to form an idea of the manner of doing business at this Council, when we consider, that the poor Bishops, the greater part of whom were incapable of writing their own names, could no otherwise distinguish the true Gospels from a multitude of spurious books, than by placing them under the altar, and then betaking themselves to prayer, that God might cause the true books to rise, and place themselves on the altar, which, it is pretended, miraculously happened. See Dodwell's notes on Ireneus.

Notwithstanding Constantine had the principle hand in the decisions of the Council, yet he soon repented of his orthodoxy; banished the famous Athanasius to Treves, recalled Arius, and died an Arian. Moreover, the Council of Jerusalem received Arius; and Constantius, abetting the dying sentiments of his father, established Arianism as the religion of his empire.

As yet, the pangs were premature; the time for parturition of the man of sin, was not fully come. No doctrine had yet been established, by any council, even three hundred and fifty years after Christ, which would not at this day, be called Arian heresy. Hence Petavius, the Jesuite, and many learned men, have not hesitated to assert, that the Church was Socinian or Arian, till the Council of Nice. Nor was it till the year 383, when the Church was nearly divided between the followers of Arius and Sabellius, that Athanasius began to publish, with some degree of approbation, the doctrine of the Spirit, which he had just invented.

But this novel opinion having obtained a party, he and his associates at the call of Theodosius the Great, held the second general council at Constantinople, A.D. 381, which, not content with two Gods, condemned the opinions of Macedonius, added the Holy Ghost to the other two, saying he proceeded from the Father and the Son, and ought to be adored with them. Thus was completed, the monstrous doctrine of the distinct personality and consubstan-
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That Athanasius invented the doctrine of the personality of the Holy Ghost, and was consequently the Father of the Trinitarian heresy, has been fully attested by Gregory Nazianzen in his twenty-first Oration. "When many says he, were unsound in the faith concerning the Son, many more concerning the Spirit, and very few sound in both articles; Athanasius was moved to assert of the Spirit, what others had done of the Son." The fact has been demonstrated by professor Whiston in his letters to Lord Nottingham, which none can read without admitting that the famous Hero of Trinitarianism was the founder of the system, whether he composed the creed that bears his name or not. Even at that time the doctrine was not tamely received; for the Latin Churches could not bear the absurd and antiscrptural Jargon. Hence we find Hieronymus exclaiming, "what sacrilegious mouth can utter it, or dare to preach three persons or substances." And Facundus Hermianensis L.1 P.8, assures us the church would never have distinguished the Father, Son, and Spirit by the name of persons had she not been pressed by the Sabellians.

During the fourth century, no less than forty-five councils were convened, for the sole purpose of manufacturing creeds, and transmitting the shackles of slavery and superstition to posterity. Out of these, thirteen asserted the doctrine of Christ's Deity; fifteen determined on behalf of Arius; and seventeen concluded in favor of Semi-Arianism, that Christ was an Angelic being. What opinion can we form of these jarring, and self-contradictory assemblies?--Shall we say with St. Augustine that Posterior councils corrected the mistakes of the ancient! Or with Cardinal de Cusa, the Church by changing her opinions, obliges us to believe that God changes his!

"I have just read, says John Wesley, in one of his Journals, Mr. Baxter's History of the councils; it is utterly astonishing, and would be altogether incredible, were not his vouchers beyond all exception. What a company of execrable wretches have they been! For one cannot give them a better name; who, in every age since that of St. Cyprian have taken upon them to govern the Church. How has one council been perpetually cursing another, and delivering all to Satan, whether predecessors or contemporaries, who did not implicitly receive their determinations: though generally trifling, sometimes false, and frequently unintelligible and self-contradictory! Surely Mahometanism was let loose to reform the Christians, and I know not but that Constantinople has gained by the change!

Hilary in his letter to the Emperor Constantius, L.2, C.4, acknowledges that "it was a thing equally deplorable and dangerous, that there were as many creeds as opinions among men; as many doctrines as inclinations; and as many sources of blasphemy as there were faults among them; because they made creeds arbitrarily and explained them as arbitrarily!

The Homo-ousian or constabul
The Trinity.

tiality is rejected and received, and then explained away by successive Synods. The partial or total resemblance of the Father and Son, is a subject of dispute for these unhappy times! Every year, nay every moon we make new creeds to describe invisible mysteries! We repent of what we have done: we anathematize those whom we defend! We condemn either the doctrine of others in ourselves, or our own in that of others. We tear each other to pieces, and cause each other's ruin!” Locke's common-place book.

The learned Turretine, de variis Chr. Relig. fatis, observes that "the Emperor Constantine, being led to the faith, the pomp of empire ruined the Church: for though the heathen were converted to Christ, his religion was degraded to heathenism!" “Let me be bold to assert, says Edwards, in his Patrologia, p. 135, that we should have understood the scriptures much better, if we had not had the writings of the Fathers: for they obscured and depraved them by their different and contradictory comments.” Jeffrey on Phil. i. 10, remarks, that as learning came into the Church, systems of christianity were multiplied, and every point of doctrine disputed, opposed, and defended, till few were able to distinguish what was human from what was divine; and still fewer dared to acknowledge their own opinion. At length the people found it so difficult to understand what the learned had made unintelligible to themselves, that despairing of knowledge they acquiesced in ignorance!”

Bishop Sherlock concludes his sermon on Jude iii, in the following manner: "from these arguments it is evident, that the apostles, who were witnesses and teachers of the faith, had no authority to add to the doctrine of Christ, or declare any new article of belief.—Now if the apostles commissioned directly by Christ, and supported by the miraculous gifts of the spirit, had not this power, can any of their successors pretend to it without great impiety! Did bishops of the fourth or tenth century know the articles of faith better than the apostles? Whence then the pretended power of Churches to make new articles of faith, and doom all to eternal destruction, who cannot receive them? Can any serious christian trust himself to such guides?” Let all such pretended authorities, read the awful denunciations of Paul and Christ; though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other doctrine, let him be accursed! I testify to every man that whosoever adds to the words of the book of this prophecy, God will add to him the plagues written in this book.

Such, my audience, is the history of the Trinity; let us now briefly consider its consequences, Idolatry and superstition.

The religion of Jesus being at the close of the fourth century, completely adjusted to the heathen theogony, superstition began to march with rapid strides. The lying wonders and pious frauds having commenced, the wood of the sacred Cross was easily discovered; and the reign of the beast began, whose mark was the in-
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...ial letters of the three following words—Christou Xulon Staurou, the wood of the cross of Christ! Rev. xiii. 18. Nor was it long after the consecrated wood, discovered by Helen the mother of Constantine, was held in as high estimation as the Saviour himself. The gate to idolatry being opened, the debased church of Christ soon sunk into the most deplorable ignorance and barbarism: and by the canonization of her saints, soon began to rival any of the Pagan nations in the number of her deities and objects of adoration! According to the description given of the cathedral at Rome, by Dr. Middleton, it can be called nothing, even at the present time, but the Roman Pantheon modernised! O, ye Trinitarians, show me the nation of ancient or modern times, which has worshipped a multitude of gods without debasing itself with the horrors of superstition:

From age to age, in her abhor'red control,
Blind superstition held the human soul,
In her long course of vengeance and of guilt,
Her hands still reeking with the blood she spilt.
While history trembled as she penn'd the deeds,
Dared for her unintelligible creeds;
As on the altar, which her hands had rais'd,
The victim suffer'd, and the faggot blaz'd.

In the beginning of the fourth century, Christianity being received by Constantine, obtained the protection of civil power: and from this unnatural union, the most terrible effects rapidly ensued. Councils of ecclesiastics convened by Emperors, soon formed motley creeds and piled on them numerous additions. From the time the doctrine of the Trinity was established by law, the Imperial sceptre shifted like a shadow, from hand to hand: and the state religion modeled according to state policy, by the glorious aid of penal edicts, fines, imprisonments, and executions, arrived finally to the present system of orthodoxy. Here let us date the commencement of the reign of the Apocalyptic beast: and from the fifth to the fifteenth century, the powers of anti-Christian darkness enjoyed their millennium. Idolatry is a crime of which all detest the name; yet it awfully grows on superstitious persons by insensible degrees. Idolatry originated in the worship of beings, who were supposed mediators or benefactors of mankind. The Jews to whom God had given the most express command, never to represent him by any likeness or similitude, fell away insensibly by degrees till they worshipped the calves set up by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel. From them they proceeded in degradation till at length they worshipped the god of the nations, whom the Lord had driven out from before them; & carried this impiety to such a climax, as to burn their children in the fire to horrid Moloch! Like the Jews andPagans, christians first began to revere their departed zealots, preserve relics of martyrs, and then finally they proceeded to worship alike Jesus, his...
cross, and as many of his followers as they were pleased to dignify by the imposing appellation of saints. But as it fared with the Jews and heathen, so it soon occurred to the nominal Christians, God gave them up to a reprobate sense! O, Father of lights, shine into their hearts; lighten their darkness, that they may be converted!

The Divine Unity, is a doctrine written, as with sunbeams, on the etherial heavens, inscribed on the shining stars and revolving planets; and is like the conclusion of the philosopher and the opinion of the peasant. Nothing but the basest superstition could ever have effaced this sentiment from the human mind. Being an eternal truth founded on the nature and reason of things, it must ever be the deduction of unperverted minds. For if God be possessed of all possible perfections, in an infinite degree, all other Gods must be useless, or rather, the very supposition of their existence is absurd. — Their existence, if possible, would only tend to disturb, pervert, or overturn the order and harmony of the universe.

What more could be necessary for the formation and government of infinite space, filled with worlds, than infinite power and infinite wisdom, universally diffused throughout that infinite space. Can infinite space itself, admit more than one infinite Deity? And can that Deity inclose, in his very nature, any other being, that is not subordinate and limited, seeing such a one must be entirely under the influence of his control, and shut up in his unbounded grasp? One infinite Jehovah is sufficient; more would be unnecessary; they cannot exist; infinite space could not contain them. The universe, filled with an omnipresent, Almighty God, is mathematically equal to a universe full of Almighty Gods. Where then is there room for the Trinity? This doctrine is equally abhorred by the testimony of Scripture. Open the book of the law, what saith it? I, Jehovah, am your God. Thou shalt have no other. Consult the Prophets. Jehovah by them, declares there is no other God: I know not any. Hear Jesus himself. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; Him only shalt thou serve. This is eternal life, to know thee the only true God. Ask the Apostles. They also tell you. To us there is but one God, even the Father. In one word, from the first communication of the Deity, till the whole volume of revelation was sealed, the uniform language of God's messengers has been, Jehovah the Creator of the universe, is one; there is no other God but him.

Go, hearers, if you love the monster Trinity, you will not object to his legitimate offspring. If not, despise that which is so repugnant to reason, affrontive to human intellect, and dishonourable to God. Shut, shun those men, who under pretence of explaining the revelation of Heaven, now in the hearts of their fellow men, the most diispiriting and unchristian doctrines! Retreat from the unthinking multitude; seek the paths of virtue and sense, and harness to the voice of Divine wisdom; so shall your God approve your conduct.
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1 John v. 7—For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

In my last discourse, I reviewed the historical evidence for this indescribable doctrine; and it now remains to consider the arguments which its advocates adduce from the scriptures. But first permit me to inquire, if revelation can teach a doctrine so unintelligible mysterious and incomprehensible as that of the Trinity. No, I am bold to say with Dr. Priestly, councils may decree it, rulers may enact laws to maintain, but no revelation can ever teach such a tissue of absurdity. Could the God of infinite wisdom endue the mind of man with intellectual faculties, and then demand a blind submission to contradictory incomprehensibilities, which require such a prostration of the understanding as reduces man to the passive acquiescence of the lower animals, even in matters which are of the most importance to his happiness. Surely we have much more reason to believe, that such an embargo would be laid on the mind, by some tyrannical fellow creature; who wished by our degradation to exalt his own authority and influence. What less than a blind confidence in spiritual guides, could ever have induced men to renounce or despise that reason, which alone makes them wiser than the fowls of Heaven?

It has long been pretended, that reason should bow implicitly to revelation: but is it not highly absurd to pretend to believe that, of which we have no conceptions. God never gave a revelation to the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, or the fish of the sea! Why then has he distinguished man, if it be not on account of his rational faculties? Moreover how could man ascertain the truth of any revelation or distinguish it, from any imposture, but by the use of that reason, which he knows more certainly to have come from God, than any other communication whatever. To speak so as not to be understood, indicates folly, or evil design; and to pretend mystery, is an invention to cast a thick veil over absurdities, contradictions, and imposture. "Revelation, says Mr. Locke, is nothing but natural religion confirmed by the God of nature: therefore no proposition can be received for Divine revelation, if it be contradictory to our clear and intuitive knowledge. He that takes away reason to make way for revelation, puts out the light of both: and does much the same as if he persuaded a man to put out his eyes, the better to

receive the remote light of an invisible star by the aid of a telescope." "That doctrine, says Dr. A. Clark, which cannot stand the test of rational investigation, cannot be true. We have gone too far when we have said, such and such doctrines should not be subjected to rational investigation, being doctrines of pure revelation. I know of no such doctrines in the bible. The doctrines of this book, are doctrines of eternal reason; and they are revealed because they are such." Now, to use the words of an eminent Trinitarian, "what rational evidence is there of the Trinity? The doctrine of the Trinity I have no hesitation in saying, not only transcends, but contradicts human reason." Brethren, I have laid a resolute hand on this irrational, mis-shapen monster, and am determined not to let him escape till he has passed that ordeal to which he ought most righteously to be exposed. I know the Trinitarian deprecates the use of reason, but the Unitarian vindicates its exercise. The one stigmatizes it as carnal, the other considers it the most refined and spiritual part of man, the virtuous employment of which is productive of pleasure. The Trinitarian persuades us that reason is a dark and treacherous guide; the Unitarian, that it is the lamp of the Almighty. Hence the impression of every unprejudiced mind must be, that Trinitarianism and reason are at war with each other; & if the one be embraced, the other must be renounced!

The doctrine of the Trinity took its rise during the reign of servile and ambitious Priests. It fared sumptuously during that long dark period, in which superstition and her legitimate offspring, ignorance, vice, and slavery were predominant sovereigns; reason, virtue and conscience being bound in fetters, and free inquiry proscribed under penalty of being confined in loathsome dungeons, or consumed by the blazing faggots! Of all the absurd dogmas ever propagated in the nominally christian world, none seem so much calculated to bewilder the understanding and excite disgust, as that of the Trinity. Well may it shroud itself in mystery, and shrink from the touch of reason. Free inquiry has burst her chains, the voice of reason demands to be heard; and the human mind no longer satisfied with incomprehensibilities, rises indignant at the shackles of priestcraft and tyranny. Alas, alas! Mystery, Babylon for in one hour is thy judgment come!

Auditors turn not away from Christianity through disgust at its abuses, or despair of finding the truth as it is in Jesus. I speak against Pagan and Jewish corruptions, but my soul loves the religion of Jesus as God's most glorious display of benevolence to man, in his present mode of being. "Though says Jortin in his remarks on Ecclesiastical History, so much of christianity ever subsisted as to distinguish it advantageously from Paganism, Judaism, Mahometanism, or Deism; it varied considerably, and adopted several disagreeing non-essentials, according to the times and the people by
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whom it was entertained. Thus a clear and unpolluted fountain, whose sacred channels are fed by the dew of Heaven, where it grows a large river, and takes a long and winding course, receives a tincture from the various soils through which it passes; so when Christianity became a bulky system, one may easily trace in it the genius of the loquacious and ever-wrangling Greeks; of the enthusiastic Africans, whose imagination was sublimed by the heat of the sun; of the superstitious Egyptians whose fertile soil and warm climate produced monks and hermits, swarming like animals sprung from the impregnated mud of the Nile; and of the ambitious and political Romans, who were resolved, in one shape or other, to govern the whole world. To this we may fairly add the Jewish zeal for trifles, arising from a contracted and illiberal mind. The learned subtlety of the Gentile philosophers; and the pomp and ceremonies of Paganism. As soon as Christianity was established by law, debates became violent; councils after councils convened to settle the differences among Christians; and sometimes they met so frequently, that they might have been called quarter sessions rather than councils. But Gregory Nazianzen, a man of learning, a Bishop and Father of the Church, has told us, in his 55th Epistle, that he chose to avoid all such assemblies: because he never saw that they had good success, but always increased rather than lessened quarrels and dissensions. But enough has been said on this part of the subject, I must therefore hasten to the main object of this lecture, the examination of the scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity.

Men might have naturally expected that if God would favor them with a revelation it should harmonize with his own attributes and with the reason and fitness of things; for none could ever have imagined that the Parent of nature would have given a system of doctrines calculated to mock the understandings of his creatures. — The presumption is therefore, that the Trinity is not a doctrine of revelation. Notwithstanding the Trinitarian fancies that he discovers this doctrine in the very first verse of the Bible; and fearlessly asserts that Elohim, the Hebrew word translated God, is in the plural number, therefore there must have been more creators than one; and this plural noun being construed with the singular verb Bara, created, implies that this plurality consists with Unity! This fanciful conjecture betrays ignorance of the Hebrew language, and shows that the man, who uses it under a boyish parade of literature, discovers that as yet he has not learned his rudiments. Calvin in his commentary on Gen i. 1. speaking of those, who in support of a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, argue that Moses in his account of the Creation, joins Elohim, God, in the plural number to Bara, created, in the singular, advises very properly "monendi sunt lectores ut sibi a violentis ejusmodi glossis caveat," that readers
should be advised to beware of such violent comments.) Dr. Edwards, in his excercises on Genesis, remarks that "some may think there lurks a mystery in the word Elohim constructed with a singular verb, denoting Trinity in Unity; but what shall be said of Adonim, Baalim, and even Behemoth, which you can read with a singular adjunct, Job xiv. 10; which is perhaps used in the plural to express the vastness of that beast.

But admitting that Elohim may mean more gods than one, what can Trinitarians gain from the concession. The concession removes every argument against Polytheism and leaves the heathen in all the confidence which the inspiration of Jehovah can give, that their system of idolatry is as good as that of the Trinitarian. How came the Trinitarian to know that the word Elohim signifies three rather than any other number? A Greek could draw from this text of scripture as potent an argument for the thirty thousand gods of Hesiod as the Trinitarian for his three. St. Austin, who wrote fifteen books in defence of the Trinity, saw this argument in full force, and admits in the ninth chapter of the fifth book, that there may not only be three persons in the Trinity, but any other number!

No text of scripture ever mentions three, more than thirty, or thirty thousand, therefore all the advantage gained by admitting the word to signify more than one, is to open the floodgates of idolatry, for the deification of man and beast! Moreover how could one be infinite in power, if there were another who was his equal? Would not the existence of the second, prove the destruction of the first; or that a thing might be, and not be at the same time? The septuagint version begun 280 and completed 180 years before Christ, uniformly translates Jehovah by Kurios, Lord: and both septuagint and New Testament render Elohim, God, in the singular number. Will Trinitarians say that the Seventy and the Apostles were ignorant of the true meaning of the terms Jehovah and Elohim? If not, then this supposed proof of the Trinity should be forever abandoned.

Buxtorf and other learned Hebrew critics inform us, that the plural is used in Hebrew to denote dignity and majesty, hence the words God, Creator, Lord, Master, Face etc. are found in the Hebrew bible in the plural number. The learned and liberal Dr. Geddes observes in his critical remarks, that the term Elohim is applied not only to the true God, but to false Gods, and even to a single idol whether male or female; such as Baal, Dagon, Ashtoreth, etc. It is applied to one angel in Judges, xiii. 22; to one man, Exod. iv. 16, and vii. 1; Nay the golden calf is so called by Aaron himself. The plural number then is no proof whatever of a Trinity of persons or Gods. This is fully admitted by the best commentators both Catholic and Protestant. See the Dissertation of Drusius on the word Elohim, in the second volume of the sacred classics.
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Gen. i. 26. "And God said, let us make man in our own image," has been frequently urged as proof of a Trinity. But certainly it is no more a proof of three persons than of four, ten, or any other number. The plural is used on various occasions when a plurality of persons cannot be intended. Thus Paul speaking of himself alone, says, I think to be bold against some, who think of us, as if we walked according to the flesh. ii Cor. x. 2. It is not an unusual custom for single persons, especially of high rank, to use the plural pronouns, but no instance can be given in any language, of more persons than one, using the singular pronouns. I, thou, me, him. Hence the Unitarian finds nothing in his Bible on this subject contrary to the known customs of nations and languages; but the Trinitarian finds a chaos of unintelligibility and barbarism.—Mahomet often uses the plural number in the Koran when speaking of God, and yet he professes to have been sent by God to reclaim the Christians from Trinitarian Idolatry; and boldly asserts that if Christians desist not from worshipping Jesus, they will certainly go to hell: and that if any man believe that God is the third part of three, he shall surely be damned.

Deut. vi. 4, Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah, has been considered by many Trinitarians as decisive in behalf of a Trinity and Unity; for why, say they, should it be said Elohim, (Gods) is one Jehovah, if Elohim be not plural and that plurality consistent with the Unity. In reply to this boasted argument, I answer, the nation of the Jews was surrounded by heathen idolaters: and this circumstance alone, even on the supposition of the word implying a plurality, fully explains why the Jewish legislator should proclaim, "Our Elohim is one Jehovah; because whilst the Elohim of the heathen consisted of a plurality of objects, human and inanimate, the Elohim of the Jews, was self-existent, independent, and one only being. The intention of Moses was to caution the Jews against the supposition that their God was like the gods of the heathen. That this was his design, appears evident from Deut. xi. 16. "Take heed to yourselves, that your hearts be not deceived, and ye turn aside and serve other gods and worship them, for the Lord our God is one Lord, God of Gods, and Lord of Lords." So far, therefore is this passage from asserting the plurality in Unity, that it declares directly the reverse. The great founder and teacher of Christianity, called the attention of the Jews to the important doctrine taught in this text to their Fathers, "Hear O, Israel, the Lord thy God is one: Kuriok ho Theos sou, Kuriok eis estin." Mark xii. 29. We have then the opinion of our great Master to authorize our interpretation, because it is evident that He understood the term used by Moses to be singular; and consequently this mighty bulwark of orthodoxy, is levelled with the very dust. Jesus calls this, the first and great commandment; and the first of the decalogue is, "Thou shalt have no G
other gods before my face.” Numerous are the declarations of the Divine Being in the old Testament, asserting his Unity. They therefore, who seek for proofs of the Trinity in the old Testament, must return from the search disappointed.

ii Chron. xxxv. 21, 22. Necho represents himself as coming up by the command of God, and it is said, “Josiah hearkened not unto the word of Necho from Mippi Elohim, the mouth of God.” But as Necho was an idolator, and could have no communication with the God of Israel, he must have used the term, Elohim, to designate the gods of Egypt. The rather says Dr. Prideaux, because this is the only place in all the Bible, where the phrase “Mippi Elohim, the mouth of God,” occurs; and the prophets all say “Mippi Jehovah—the mouth of the Lord has spoken.” In one word, we find Elohim is translated Theos by the apostles, and never Theoi, meaning the true God. May we not therefore, oppose this translation under the sanction of divine authority, to all the boasted knowledge of the most able Trinitarian critics. The apostles give us Theos, God, instead of Elohim, and tell as Theos is but one. The learned Buxtorf, in his Lexicon, says, Elohim, when used to denote the true God, has not a plural, but a singular sense, “singular sense habet de unico et vero Deo usurpatum.” Bythner, in his Lyra Prophetica, says, “it is put in the plural after the idiom of the Hebrew tongue, to express majesty and glory.” Bishop Beveridge, on the 29 articles, remarks, “the term Elohim and the phrases, “Let us make man,” “Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts,” constitute a stronger argument for majesty, and super-eminent sanctity, than for a Trinity in the Divine nature.

Now is it not surprising that Moses, who knew the Lord face to face, never knew this Trinity, nor plurality? The keenest and most accurate research of the most learned, can discover nothing of it in all his writings. Lord King in his “Critical History of the apostles’ Creed,” p. 55, asserts the Unity of the Godhead is everywhere inculcated in the Mosaic law: and the body of the Jewish people have been so immovably fixed in the belief thereof, that during their seventeen hundred years captivity and dispersion, they have never deserted the principle, that God is one. This is evident from the thirteen articles of their faith, composed by Maimonides; the second of which is, the unity of the blessed God. The repeated chorus of the first hymn of their liturgy is, “All creatures both above and below, testify and witness, all of them as one, that that the Lord is one, and his name one.”

We shall now proceed to the New Testament, which being also a revelation from the unchangeable God, cannot be different from that contained in the former dispensation. But where in it can be found such language as the Father is God; the Son is God; and the Holy Ghost is God? Where is it said that the God-head consists of three
persons equal in glory, and the majesty co-eternal? No such lan
guage is to be found in the sacred scriptures.

Matthew xxviii. 19, speaks of three persons or names, but never intimates perfect equality, perfect union, nor any necessary distinc
tion by which we might judge of the Trinity. Modalites co-essen
tialties, co-equalities, Eternal Generations, Processions, Incarnations, Hypostatical unions, and all such monstrous terms are fitter for con
jurers than the messengers of Heaven! He that desires to find such terms must retreat from the scriptures and betake himself to some such composition as that of the Athanasian creed; that tremendous rhapsody, which constitutes the very sublimity of absurdity and im
piety, in which contradictions are piled on contradictions, till the sight makes one giddy: where the infinite spirit is anatomized and laid out in distinct persons; and the whole farce crowned with the declaration, that except every one keep this faith whole and entire, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. All that Trinitarians can find in this text is simply three names: for not one word is said about Unity or equality: neither is the least intimation given of the Deity of the son or holy spirit. The whole argument therefore, that can be drawn from this text, is, that the commission is given to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Spirit; hence the Trini
tarian infers the Deity of the son and spirit from a supposition that Baptism is an act of devotion, which implies that the person, in whose name it is performed, is truly God. But if so Moses must have been God, for Paul says, all Israel were baptized unto Moses. i Cor. x. 1. Baptism in the name of a person is only a rite implying the acknowledgement of that person, as an instructor or guide: and sometimes implies connexion with a sect or party. Accordingly Schoetgen, in his Commentary on the passage, informs us that the Samaritans baptized their proselytes in the name of mount Gerisim, to distinguish their sect, who worshipped in the temple on that mount, from the Jews who worshipped at mount Zion. But who could be so wild as to infer that the Samaritans worshipped a mountain or believed in its Godhead!

The apostolical benediction, ii Cor. xiii. 14, has been alleged as proof of a Trinity. But surely all that could be implied in the passage, is a pious wish that the blessing of Almighty God might be upon them; that they might always possess that favor manifested by God through Jesus Christ, to a sinful world; and that the Divine influence which rested on the apostles and primitive Christians, might remain with them continually. The Greek word Koinonia, from Koinos, common, public, signifies a partaking, or distribution, and may well mean a participation of the Divine influence; but what sense would there be in the distribution of a person? Salvation is of God, through Christ, and effected by the Divine influence, or spirit of God, but where is the Trinity, or any necessity of its ex
istence?
i John, v. 7, is the only passage in the sacred writings, which speaks of three persons being one; and consequently is the only one in the bible, which a Trinitarian can produce to favor the doctrine. But unfortunately for the Trinitarian system, since the late learned Professor Porson, of Cambridge, England, favored the world with that invaluable criticism on this text, in reply to Archdeacon Travis; the learned in general, are ashamed to appeal, any longer, to a passage so undoubtedly spurious. The Eclectic Review for March 1809, conducted by Calvinistic Trinitarians, has these remarks on the review of the controversy. "We are unspeakably ashamed that any modern divines should have sought, pedibusque unguibus, for the retention of a passage so indisputably spurious. They are, in our esteem, the best advocates for the Trinitarian doctrine, who join in exploding such a gross interpolation, and in protesting against its being permitted to occupy a place in the common copies of the New Testament."

The present Bishop of Lincoln, in his "Elements of Christian Theology," says, "I must own that after an attentive consideration of the controversy relative to this passage, I am convinced that it is spurious." Father Simon, a celebrated writer of the Catholic church, and author of the Critical History of the New Testament, which may be justly styled the fountain of modern criticism, having examined the 7 MSS in the French King's library, and 5 in Mr. Colbert's, and found the passage wanting in them all; after due investigation, abandons the text as spurious. Dr. Adam Clarke, on the passage, after a learned examination of the evidence, concludes that it stands on no authority sufficient to authenticate any part of a revelation professing to have come from God. Lastly, Sir Isaac Newton, in a letter to Mr. Le Clerc, entitled, "An Historical account of two notable corruptions of Scripture," published in Dr. Horsley's edition of Sir Isaac's works, has most elaborately discussed the subject, and next to Professor Porson's work, has given the most learned and luminous exposure of this base imposture.

All the Greek Fathers, omit the verse, though many of them cite the sixth and eighth to prove the Trinity, they never mention the seventh verse, which, had it existed, would have been positive proof. This appears from the works of Cyril of Alexandria, Æcumenius, Didymus, Alexandrius, who in their comments on the passage, read the spirit, water and blood, but make no mention of the three in Heaven. It is here worthy of remark, that when the Eusebians urged that the Father, Son, and Spirit, should not be considered as one, but different things; Gregory Nazianzen, and Nicetas, answer that they might be considered as one, because John calls the Spirit, water, and blood one. Hence we reasonably infer from the objection of the Eusebians and the answer of the Catholics that the text was not in their books. Can the most ardent stickler refuse to yield
when twenty-eight of the earliest Greek authors never cite the passage. Notwithstanding, the quotations in the works of Origin alone, are so numerous, that if the New Testament were lost, it might nearly be restored from him.

The Latin fathers do not quote this verse, but on the contrary, as oft as they cite the passage, they omit the three in Heaven, as well as their unity. This is done after the days of Jerome, by Hesychius, Cassiodorus, Beda, and Pope Eusebius. The Epistle of Leo the Great, which quotes the passage, without the seventh verse, and omits also the words in terra, in earth, of the eighth, was applauded in the West, translated into Greek, read in the council of Chalcedon, and solemnly subscribed by all the Bishops. Thus we have the genuine reading without this spurious text quoted by the Pope, owned in the West, subscribed in the East by the fourth General Council, and therefore must have been the publicly received reading, till after the time of that Council. Nor was my text once referred to, or cited during all that long and vehement controversy about the Trinity, which agitated the Universal Church during the fourth and fifth centuries. Now had it been in their books, it would have been frequently produced, as of modern days, as a most substantial witness, yet not once does it occur in all the disputes, epistles, orations, or other writings of the Greek or Latin Fathers. St. Austin wrote fifteen books on the Trinity, but never once referred to my text. St. Ambrose in the sixth chapter of his book Concerning the Holy Spirit, cites the eighth verse to prove the Unity of the three persons, but makes no mention whatever of the seventh. The same is done by Facundus, and Eucherius; therefore my text made no part of the scriptures in those days, when it was most needed, seeing twenty-one of the earliest Latin authors, have never referred, in all their writings, to 1 John v. 7.

The manuscripts of the New Testament in Greek, which are now extant, containing this first epistle of John, are in number one hundred and thirteen. Yet the learned professor of Divinity in Gottenberg University, Dr. Michaelis, in his most invaluable Introduction to the New Testament, positively asserts that not a single Greek manuscript, written before the sixteenth century, contains the controverted passage. Nor is the text to be found in any other Greek manuscript in existence, than the Codex Monfortii, in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin: and this MS is of no value, seeing it is evidently altered and interpolated in this place, and was not written till after the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot. The Berlin MS is only a late transcript from the Cardinal’s edition. From the strictest inquiry, it has been found wanting in MSS of all languages except the Latin; and by the confession of Jerome, it had no existence in the Latin before his time. Though the modern Vulgate has the text, yet it was wanted
according to the testimonies of Erasmus, Father Simon, and Dr. G. Burnet in above thirty of the most ancient MSS: and Cholins notes in the margin of his Latin editions, that it was wanted in the most ancient MSS of the Tugurine library. Most certainly a reading to be found in no MSS except the modern Latin, can pretend to but little authority: and that vanishes when we discover the marks of fraud in many of the MSS: and the fact that the seventh verse is in some of the MSS set before the eighth, and in some after, shows it to have been first added as a marginal gloss; and afterwards inserted into the text by the ignorance or fraud of the transcribers. My text, therefore, has no claim whatever to scriptural authority, seeing it was not admitted into the Latin MSS sooner than the tenth, nor into the Greek sooner than the sixteenth century.

All the ancient versions want this passage i. e. both the Syrian versions, the Arabic, the Coptic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, the Slavonic or Russian, and the ancient Latin. Though the modern vulgate, Armenian and Russian versions have this text, yet it was not interpolated in the Armenian before the fourteenth, nor in the Russian before the seventeenth century. With respect to the Latin copies, it is proper to remark, that some totally omit the verse, others have it in the margin; and of those copies which have the passage inserted in the text, some have it before, and some after the Earthly witnesses. It was omitted in the first and second editions of Erasmus printed in 1516 and 1518; in that of Francis Asulun 1518; in that of Nicholas Gerbelius, printed at Haganau 1521; in the edition of Wolfius Cephalius, printed at Strasburg, 1524; in that of Simon Colinaeus at Paris 1534; in the Latin Tugurine editions of Peter Cholins in 1543 and 1544; in the Saxon and German editions of Luther. In the old English bibles of Henry 8th. Edward 6th. and Queen Elizabeth, it was printed in small types, or included in brackets; but about the year 1570, it began to be printed as it now stands in the English bibles: but by whose authority, it is unknown. However it is now excluded from the text of the justly celebrated Griesbach, and also from that of the most improved modern versions.

The history of the corruption appears to be as follows:—It is an indisputable fact that this text had its origin in the Latin version. It is another equally clear and acknowledged, that the African Fathers were the first, who discovered i John v. 7, in the Latin version. From the combination of these facts, we form this conclusion, that the mystical interpretation of i John v. 8, was written first in the margin of some Latin MSS: which mystical meaning occurred to some of the Latins, who were peculiarly desirous of proving the Trinity; and therefore interpreted the spirit water and blood on earth, to represent the Father, Word, and Spirit in Heaven. Then Jerome for the same purpose, inserted my text in his version: and
about sixty-four years after his death, the Africans began to allege it against the Vandals. Shortly after the Latins began to mark Jerome’s variations in the margin of their books; and hence the spurious testimony of the heavenly witnesses crept into the text by frequent transcriptions; especially during the twelfth and following centuries, when disputation was revived by the schoolmen.

That Jerome interpolated this verse in the Latin Vulgate, is manifest from the preface to his canonical epistles, in which he complains of being accused by some of the Latins of falsifying the scriptures. To this charge he replies, former translators have erred by omitting the testimony of the three in Heaven, so necessary for the confirmation of the Catholic faith. But however orthodox Jerome might have been, he was unable to prevail on the churches of his own times to receive the testimony in heaven; and seeing they knew his insertion, and did not admit the change, they must have condemned it as a fraud. Farther be it known, that by the unanimous testimony of the ancient interpreters, the testimony of the heavenly witnesses was wanted in those very MSS. from which Jerome pretented to have borrowed the passage!

The ancient interpreters to which I refer, are, the ancient Latin, the Syriac, and the Ethiopic. That the passage was wanted in the early Latin, is acknowledged by Jerome himself; & from the account given by Bishop Walton of the Syriac and Ethiopic versions, they were much more ancient than Jerome’s; and were used by the Oriental and Ethiopian nations from nearly the apostolic age. Seeing, then, that the authors of these three most ancient and received versions have not given the testimony of the three in heaven, they are witnesses that it was wanted in the Greek MSS. of their times. I might also have cited the Armenian version, used by the Armenians ever since the age of Chrysostom; but the evidence is rendered complete by the silence of all the controversial writers in that long, vehement, and universal contest about the Trinity, both before, and after the time of Jerome.

Let us not then, on the one hand, blame poor Vigilius, Bishop of Tapsum; for his quotation does not agree with the present text, either in words or sense; and besides, being a writer of very little credit, his influence was insufficient to obtain popularity, or to support a pious fraud. Nor, on the other hand, let it be pretended that the Arians razed the text out of their books. Crafty knaves they must have been, to conspire, so cunningly, all the world over, at the same time, to get all men’s books into their hands, and correct them, without being perceived! Yes, they must have been conjurers too, to do it without leaving any blot or chasm whereby their knavery might be suspected or discovered; and to wipe away the remembrance of it out of all men’s minds, so that neither Athanasius, nor themselves, when they turned to the Catholic faith, which many of
them did after the death of Constantius, could retain any recollection of such a text ever existing in any of the sacred books. Let it, therefore, be confessed, that whilst Jerome pretended to have corrected the Latin by Greek MSS. men of later times have corrected both Latin and and Greek, by the sole authority of St. Jerome.

Let us see how this spurious text was introduced into the Greek scriptures. The first time it appeared in the Grecian language, was in a translation of the acts of the council of Lateran, held by Pope Innocent the Third, A.D. 1215; and was afterwards inserted in the Polyglot of Cardinal Ximenes printed at Complutum in Spain, A.D. 1515, but not published till 1521. To avoid the fury of Spanish bigotry, Erasmus inserted it in his third edition, on the authority of a manuscript, said to be discovered somewhere in England; but that MS. could never be produced: unless we suppose it to have been the Dublin MS. which some zealot interpolated about that time. In 1550, Robert Stephens reprinted this edition of Erasmus, with some alterations and various readings taken from the Complutensian edition, and several Greek MSS. From Stephens through Beza’s edition, it passed to the Elzevirs; and from thence through the common versions.

We have now seen the force of the evidence for the Trinity, derived from the New Testament; and venture to assert that not a single text can be produced from the Bible or Revelation of God, to teach so absurd a dogma, that cannot be perfectly explained consistently with all the genuine laws of criticism and interpretation, on the acknowledged basis of Unitarianism. Here let it also be observed, that almost all the texts of Scriptures, which are supposed to teach, the doctrine of the Trinity or Deity of Jesus, are either spurious, interpolated, or have something suspicious about them; and moreover, so much forgery has not been discovered in the whole Bible, as has been detected in those parts of Scripture, which appear to relate to the above doctrines.

Now let us contrast the evidence for the Unitarian doctrine, drawn from the same source. Of 1300 passages in the New Testament, where the word God occurs, not one implies a plurality of persons. There are 17 passages in which the Father is styled the only God, 320 in which he is denominated God, absolutely by way of eminence, 150 where he is styled God with peculiar attributes; and 90 where all prayer and praise is declared due to him alone; and that every thing ought ultimately to be directed to his glory.

O! ye Trinitarians, produce your strong arguments, and point us to the source from which you can draw them. Are the proofs derived from the appearances of nature? No, the whole volume of nature cries loudly by its unity and harmony, let not the unnatural dogma be admitted. Infinite space is already filled by the person and perfections of the One Supreme God, there is no room for another.
Lecture, VI.*

DIVINE BENEVOLENCE.

Psalms 145, 9. The Lord is good unto all.

In our reflections on the divine character and conduct, it is supremely interesting to know, that the God on whom we depend, is good infinitely, impartially and unchangeably. If we are not persuaded of this, we may fear him, but cannot love or confide in him, as a faithful unchangeable friend. I shall therefore in this discourse endeavor to convince your understandings,

1. That Jehovah is infinitely good and gracious.
2. That his goodness is unchangeable, universal and impartial.

A Priori, we prove the goodness of God from his own nature and attributes. Animals are malevolent in proportion as they are imperfect and merely sensitive; but benevolence as necessarily arises from intellectual nature, as self-love from mere animal existence. Hence moral obligation is founded on truth, and every being who perceives truth, must feel obligation. Jehovah, who perceives all truth, must therefore perceive moral obligation in all its extent; and be more subjected to its influence than all other beings, in proportion as his powers of perception are greater than theirs. Notwithstanding all the diversity of opinion, respecting moral obligation, they harmonize in this chief distinction: It is right to communicate happiness, and wrong to produce misery. This may be admitted as an eternal maxim, as irreversible as the throne of Heaven or the decree of Almighty. God being intelligent, must perceive this distinction; and in proportion as he perceives it, he must approve benevolence and abhor every evil disposition. No argument can be more clear, strong, and conclusive. Therefore it is just as certain, that Jehovah is good, as that he is intelligent; and as certain as happiness is better than misery, so surely is the impartial God, good unto all, Ps. 145, 9. O ye barbarous tribes of men, think of these things; and ye merely sensitive, seek the treasures of literature and wisdom, that your selfish and groveling dispositions may be elevated, and become philanthropic and Divine! The great cause of the opposition of many to the doctrine of Universal love, arises from the darkness that is in them because of unbelief. May the father of light dispel the darkness from their minds, that they may see the truth clearly!

Delivered in Rochester March 28th, 1824, by the Rev. John S. Thompson
By raising our eyes to the stary heavens, and admitting astronomical and philosophical deductions from the phenomena, our minds are astonished by the display of almighty power. On the second of August, 1782, Dr. Herschel observed, that in 41 minutes 285,000 stars passed the field of view in his telescope! By the same authority we are informed, that there are telescopic stars, whose distance is so great that their light must have required above a million of years to reach our earth, though the light descends from the sun to us in eight seconds! Great God, how immense the boundaries of thine infinite abode, and how small a part of thy works do we know!! If every star be a sun, like that of our system, giving life, light, and animation to about two hundred globes like our earth, what must God be, who made, governs, and supports so many worlds!

There is a necessary connection between the attributes of wisdom and goodness. Wherever infinite power exists, there will be also infinite knowledge; and wherever infinite power and wisdom have been displayed, there unlimited goodness shines in meridian splendor. If we reflect on the Divine attributes we shall easily perceive, that the stimulus of action must arise alone from infinite goodness. Almighty power could not be the stimulus, it is the means; and infinite wisdom can only be a modulating principle; and therefore it remains that the only motive of all God's operations, must be INFINITE BENEVOLENCE! If ever the Deity acted, being prompted to action alone by infinite goodness, it must have been with a view to do that which is good, purely good, or good alone. Hence all his works manifest his praise, and will eternally declare his glory. O how sure and steadfast ought to be the intellectual creature's confidence; because God lives, he shall live also; and the conscious existence of intellectual life, is a certain pledge of subsequent happiness and eternal enjoyment!

All evil results from weakness and ignorance. From these arise envy, hatred, injustice, and every species of immorality. However these imperfections blemish the character of man, they cannot be ascribed to the all perfect Jehovah. The doctrine that teaches endless sin and misery, or final destruction, supposes either that God is angry and implacable, or that man is irreclaimable; but both suppositions are manifestly absurd. Admitting the hideous and absurd doctrine, that God is passionate, yet all the hopes, prayers, and penances of every age and country, have had their foundation in the belief that God is appeasible; and surely none will be so bold as to affirm that infinite power and wisdom joined to infinite goodness, are incapable of reclaiming man. Hence it appears from the perfections of the Deity that, notwithstanding all our difficulties about the existence of evil, the benevolent Parent of mankind accomplishes the best end by the best means. Infinite
goodness can admit of no attribute inconsistent with itself. We need only then the knowledge of an attribute, to determine whether it can belong to the Deity. But if an attribute inflict endless pain on any being, that attribute cannot be good; it cannot belong to God. Whatever makes a man more miserable than happy, is positive evil. A good being must always give an excess of pleasure above pain, but according to the doctrine of endless misery, God, the good and just, inflicts an unbounded excess of pain on the great majority of his creatures! Can any human being consider what God is, and what endless misery implies, and then affirm that the infliction of the one, is consistent with the attributes of the other? Jehovah's attributes all harmonize. His justice, holiness, wisdom, goodness and power, have been, and will be exerted to a glorious result. Therefore let universal acclamations of praise spontaneously burst from all intellectual creatures, alleluia, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth!

The design of God can be nothing less than the final and perfect happiness of all his intelligent creatures. The formation of the Universe and its superintendence by the Deity, implies some wise and benevolent design; for none could suppose that God would choose evil for its own sake; evil in his hands must be the instrument of good.

Happy the man, who sees a God employed
In all the good and ill that chequer life,
Resolving all events with their effects,
And manifest results into the will,
And arbitration wise of the supreme.
Did not his eye rule all things and intend
The least of our concerns, since from the least
The greatest oft originates, could chance
Find place in his dominions, or dispose
One lawless particle to thwart his plan,
Then God might be surprised or unforeseen
Contingence might alarm him, and disturb
The smooth and equal course of his affairs. Cowper.

Had evil been designed by the Deity, it would have appeared as the end of nature in all its operations; and good or happiness the consequence of unnatural violence and perversion. Disorder and wretchedness would have been uniform and regular; and pleasure would have been accidental, and only calculated to raise the intensity of pain, by transitory tastes of enjoyment. Had the design of the author of animal life been malevolent, says Dr. Price, the ordinary state of every being would have been trouble, dejection and anguish. The lower animals, and all inanimate nature, instead of administering to our accommodation, would have only tended to
annoy and harrass. The bee would have been without honey; the rose without fragrance; the fields without their pleasing verdure and gay flowers. The fire would have scorched without warming; the light would have dazzelled without cheering; and every breath of air would have cut like a sword. The appetites and senses would have been the instruments of incessant torture, and could never have been productive of pleasure to us, unless merely by accident. Every touch would have felt like the rubbing of a wound; every taste bitter, and every sound a scream! Our imagination would have presented nothing to us but frightful spectres; our thoughts would have been the perpetual seat of deep and constant melancholy, and our reason would have only served to point out our wretchedness; and the irremediless circumstances of interminable woe! In one word, what we now call gratification, could have been nothing but a relaxation of torment; or as a paroxysm of pain, transient and rare; and intended only to set a keener edge on misery, by giving a taste of felicity. But far otherwise is our experience. Wherever we can trace the effects of design, there we behold satisfactory evidence of that great design, being wise and benevolent. All the evil in the world is evidently designed for good, and proves the very means, necessary to effect the divine purpose of love and mercy.

All discord, harmony not understood,
All partial evil, Universal good;
In spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
One truth is clear, whatever is, is right.

Pain and distress are out of the common course of nature; and therefore they are overrated, and magnified wherever they happen. But could we fairly estimate the good and evil apparent in the divine administration, and judge of them properly, the latter would appear to us, when compared to the former, no more than the shades in a fine picture, or the discords in a grand and well managed concert. Those very pains, mixed with the pleasure of animals, are necessary to their enjoyment. The strongest objection drawn from the phenomena of animal sensations, is clearly solved by the consideration that goodness only requires the production of happiness, whether it consists of unmixed enjoyment, or a clear excess of pleasure above pain. In the latter case, however, there can be no suffering, under the divine administration, which is not necessary to the perfection of intellectual felicity. The Almighty Universal Parent is love, we ought therefore to rejoice in existence; and look up to Heaven with satisfaction and certain triumph. Jehovah is good unto all and his tender mercies are over all his works. Hence God, whose nature is love, presides over all events.
Out of seeming evil, still educing good, and better still, and better thence again, in infinite progression.

This doctrine represents Jehovah's character in a glorious, affecting, and amiable light. To the rational mind it affords a continual feast; and being accompanied with so powerful evidence, administers the surest grounds of confidence. No mathematical proposition is more capable of demonstration; and no demonstration can be more clear and evident, than that drawn from the attributes and design of the Deity. Jehovah being infinitely good, wise, and powerful, what could determine him to call into existence a world of peripctent and reasonable beings? Could it be caprice? that is impossible; for being infinitely wise, he must act from a wise and determined design. Could it be weakness? that also is impossible. Could it be to occasion misery? this is most of all impossible and self-contradictory; for a being infinitely wise, good, and happy, cannot purpose misery for its own sake. Human ingenuity cannot suppose any other object than the bestowment of happiness; consequently the great motive that induced the Deity to call a world into existence, was the happiness of his creatures. Nor can the design of God be frustrated; for this would imply a power greater than omnipotence; and to change, implies inconstancy and deficiency in wisdom. Both suppositions are manifestly absurd.

Therefore the conclusion, that God formed man for happiness and will bring him to it, follows irresistibly.

Man's nature, says Dr. Smith, in his illustrations of the Divine Government, is designed for some excellent purpose. The noble powers by which he is distinguished, are intellectual, social, and moral. By the first he can observe the beauty and order of nature; investigate the cause of its phenomena, and ascertain the laws by which it is governed. He can penetrate its secret recesses, and calculate the distances, and movements of surrounding worlds. His social affections lead him out of himself, and attach him to his fellow creatures; he rejoices in their joy, weeps for their woe, and feels himself bound by a thousand endearing ties. His moral faculties enable him to sit in judgment on his own conduct, and distinguish between good and evil. He can hold intercourse with the great author of his being, whom, though shrouded from mortal view, he can feel, and of whose presence he has an awful consciousness.

Now for what end can a being so wonderfully endowed be called into existence? Why such faculties given to him?—To adorn and secure the triumph of evil, and afford to the universe an eternal spectacle of majestic desolation, or fallen and perverted grandeur? No! rather to add to the beauty of the fair creation, by proving that one principle pervades all, from the highest to the lowest, and one almighty good God, directs all its operations. The highest order of intelligent creatures, who fulfil the councils of the most high,
are filled with that adorable object whom they serve and contemplate. Why then should man possess a nature, which falsifies every appearance, and disappoints every hope. A capacity which enables him to soar with the seraph, and a destiny, which levels him with the brute? Fie on the meanness of the thought.

God made the Universe, says Dr. A. Clarke, on Gen. 1, and governs all things according to the counsel of his own will. That will is infinite goodness; that counsel is unerring wisdom. Whilst under the direction of this counsel, we cannot err; whilst under the influence of this will, we cannot be wretched. Behold the firmament of his power, the sun, moon, planets, and stars, which he has formed not for himself, for he needs none of them; but solely for his intellectual offspring. What endless gratification has he designed for us, in placing within our reach these astonishing effects of his wisdom and power; in rendering us capable of searching out their wonderful relations and connections; and of knowing himself, the source of all perfection, by having made us in his own image and in his own likeness.

2. A posteriori, the evidences of Eternal goodness rush on our view from all the appearances of nature. All animals are pleased with existence, and seem to acknowledge it the gift of the Creator; who has been pleased to call them from non-entity, to partake of existence, in common with its great author. Animal sensations appear to have been given solely for the gratification of animals. The more we investigate, this proposition, the more evidence shall we acquire of its truth. There is not one of the animal functions whose natural exercise is painful; nor is there one, whose natural use is not productive of real pleasure. Hence we naturally infer that there must be more happiness than misery in the present state of existence.—Were it not so, we should see all animals tired of existence, and watching for an opportunity to throw off the burden of life, and return to a state of unconsciousness. But the reverse is the fact. Every exertion is used to prolong life, and protract the season of dissolution.

The primary tendency of all the laws of nature, with which we are acquainted, is to happiness and enjoyment. The fruits of benevolence are scattered throughout the whole world. Every new object we meet, every new discovery we make, and every step we advance in the knowledge of God's works, afford us new reasons for admiring the glory of his perfections. A universe so fair and harmonious, so orderly and beautiful, so abundantly peopled with numberless varieties of living beings, all rejoicing in existence, all liberally supported and enjoying blessings suited to their nature and situation, could never have been the production of an evil, selfish, or malevolent being. Within the boundaries of observation, we behold every region of our earth, abounding with inhabitants, and every tribe of
animals plainly made for happiness; and their natural and ordinary state is that of health and enjoyment. So overflowing is the divine goodness that from vegetable life up to reasoning man, there is no chasm. Every rivulet, every leaf, every particle of matter is peopled with inhabitants. Above, around, beneath; the air, the earth, and the water; every tree, shrub, and every leaf, teems with delightful existence; and nature is replenished with the effects of uncreated and everlasting benevolence. A universe so boundless in extent that all imagination is lost in nothingness, built on purpose to be the seat of bliss and the theatre of God's munificence will forever cry aloud God is good unto all! If we raise our views to the planetary worlds, and behold the myriads of starry systems rolling in unbounded space; and then reflect on the countless hosts of living beings, which people these unnumbered systems; all brought forth by one beneficent parent, to partake of his care and share his bounty; O how transcedingly great must be the goodness of Almighty Love. Again, when we consider the fulness and extent of creation, and that it is scarcely possible to fix the eye on a single spot in the vast universe of God, where there are not life and happiness; and then calculate the sum of enjoyment; what an effort of benevolence. What a display of the goodness of God.

2. Having ascertained that Jehovah is infinitely good and gracious, we proceed to show that his goodness is unchangeable, impartial and universal. God is unchangeable in his essence, because his being is necessary and his essence self-existent. Whatever exists of necessity, as it cannot but be, so it cannot but continue to be invariably the same. That which depends upon nothing, can be effected by nothing, can be changed by nothing, can be influenced by no power, can be impaired by no time, nor varied by no accident. The scriptures very emphatically express the unchangeability of God by calling him, who is, was, and is to come. That this phrase is a simple appellative is evident from the construction, apo tou ho on, which though unusual, is agreeable to the prophetic style. He is denominated immortal and incorruptible and therefore unchangeable. 1 Tim. 1, 17, and 6, 16; Rom. 1, 23; Ps. 90, 2, and 102, 27; James 1, 17. Jehovah's purposes, covenants, and promises, are immutable. Ps. 33, 11, 36, 5, 89, 21; 111, 3-8, Job 23, 13, Num. 23, 19, Mal. 3, 6. His gospel is immutable, Heb. 6, 13—18 and 13, 8. Gal. 3, 8. Tit. 1, 2.

The divine impartiality is the natural result of his omnipresence. If existence be a perfection, and it is the foundation of all perfection, it follows that as continuance to exist through long periods of time, so also extent of existence, and consequently of power, thro' large portions of space must be a greater degree of this perfection. Now as the self-existent being, who is absolutely perfect, must be eternal in duration, so his greatness must be immense; otherwise
his perfections will be limited, which implies imperfection. By 
supposing him to be finite in extent, the perfection of his power will 
be totally destroyed, as it would be, to suppose him temporary in 
duration. For as any being, which is not always, at the time when 
it is not, is as if it never had been, so whatever being is not every 
where, in those places where it is not, is, as to all the purposes of 
power and activity, as if it had no existence at all. For no being can 
act where it is not any more than when it is not. Hence the sup-
position that any place can do without the presence of God, or that 
God can be in any place, to the exclusion of any other, is the foun-
dation of Atheism. For if one place can do without the physical 
presence of the Deity, by a parity of reason, every place may do 
without him; and consequently theism is a fallacy and atheism is 
confirmed and established. By enlarging this perfection to its ut-
most possibility, we must ascribe to God, entire infinity or immensi-
ty. We must conceive of him as a being that fills infinite space, that 
contains all things in his own boundless nature. Who is not con-
 fined or circumscribed by any space; but co-existent and present 
with all things; and, infinitely beyond what we can imagine, with-
out limits or bounds; in whom we live, move, and have our being; 
and in whom all things really subsist. As it is necessary that he 
who made all beings, must have existed before the things he has 
made, so it is equally necessary that he be present with the things 
which he has made and governs. For surely things could not be 
made without the existence of the actual power, which made them; 
nor can things ever be governed, without the presence of that wis-
dom, by which they are governed. Whatever argument therefore 
proves the being of a God, or his unerring providence, must also 
equally demonstrate his actual omnipresence. Seeing God is omni-
present he cannot be influenced by distance or propinquity as his 
limited creatures. The common father of all, alike near to all, he 
 is equally attached to all his offspring. Hence there are no traces 
of a partial God to be discovered in his vast creation. He made 
no distinction in the nature of mankind: for whatever differences 
prevail, they are of degree and not of kind. Partiality and ca-
price are marks of imperfections and ought never to be ascribed to 
the universal cause. If our eye be evil, let us not on that account 
charge God with injustice! Tillotson justly observes, "that ac-
ording to men's notions of God, will be their religion. If they have 
gross and false conceptions of him, their religion will be absurd 
and superstitious. If they fancy God to be ill-natured and armed 
with infinite power, they may fear him but they will never love him; 
and will be to apt to conduct towards others as they imagine God 
deals with them; for all religion naturally inclines men to imitate 
him whom they worship." God is love. Amen.
Lecture, VII.

PART SECOND.

DEMONOLOGY.

1 Tim. 4, 1.—Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines concerning Demons.

Mede and Newton have well observed that doctrines and spirits, in many places of scripture, are synonymous and explanatory one of the other; and refer to 1 John 4, 1. The Bishop is also of opinion that the text should be translated as above, implying that the seducing spirits taught doctrines concerning Devils or Demons. Our translators should have first ascertained whether the scriptures teach the existence and influence of Devils, before they described them as instructors of mankind: and it would have also been proper for them to have consulted the meaning of terms a little more distinctly, and thereby avoided the very improper translation of didaskalii daimonion by doctrines of Devils. If we compare Jer. 10, 8, Acts 13, 12, and Heb. 6, 2, with my text, we easily perceive that the word of, should be rendered concerning, and the passages read, doctrines concerning Vanities, the Lord, Baptisms, and Devils or Demons. This text is therefore a prophecy that the idolatrous mythology of demons taught by the Gentiles, should be revived among the christians, who should apostatize after the manner of the Jews and Gentiles, to the worship of demons or dead men. The Apostle appears to refer to the prophecy of Daniel, chap. 11, 36—38, where the doctrines of demons or false gods is noticed by the divine spirit through the medium of the prophet. In the New Testament, through the negligence, prejudice, or ignorance of the translators, the word devil occurs as the english term for the three Greek words, daimon, daimonion, diabolos; but the latter only should have been rendered devil. The two first words are both derived from daio, to divide, and all the ancients used the term, daimon, to signify a being, who distributed to man his due proportion of pain or pleasure. Hence Daimones among the Greeks, and manes among the Latins, were words of the same import or meaning.

Quisque suos patimur manes.—Virgil.

All have their manes, and their manes bear.—Dryden.

I
Some have supposed that the word demon, in the sacred writings, always implies an evil spirit or devil; but this is a conceit of St. Austin and others, which will not bear investigation. Demons, according to the Gentile Mythology, were middle powers between the sovereign God and mortal men, who performed the office of mediators, and executioners of the divine purposes. Of this opinion was Plato, the most competent judge, and consummate writer on these subjects. Apuleius de Deo Socratis, affirms, "the demons are middle powers, by whom all our desires and deserts pass to the gods. It would derogate from the majesty of the celestial Gods to be concerned about such things; therefore all things are done by the will, power, and authority of the celestial Gods, but by the obedience and ministry of the Demons."

It is abundantly manifest from the best writers of antiquity, that demons were the supposititious ghosts of dead men. Hesiod, a most ancient writer, who flourished nine hundred years before Christ, describes that happy race of men, who lived in the first or golden age of the world, as being promoted, after death, to the rank of Demons by the will of Jupiter: and appointed to be the guardians of men, and the observers of their good and evil actions.

*Autar epi men touto genos kata gaia kalypse,*
*Tou men daimones eisi, Dios megalou dia boulas, k. t. l.*

Plato agrees with Hesiod, and admits that he and many of the poets speak excellently in affirming, that when good men die, they obtain great honor and dignity, and become Demons. In another place he maintains that all, who die valiantly in war, are admitted into Hesiod's golden generation, and constituted Demons. Eusebius and Theodoret both cite and approve these passages from Hesiod and Plato, and use them as an argument for similar dignity and honors being bestowed on saints and martyrs. Hence it is clear from the writings of the greatest men of antiquity, that the term Demon, originally and properly applied to deceased dead men. In this very sense, it was understood by the philosophers at Athens, in the days of Paul; for when he preached Jesus and the resurrection, they thought he wished to introduce Christ to them as a Demon, or deceased dead man. Accordingly they say "he seemeth to set forth strange Demons."—Acts 17. 18. Here our translators were as much puzzled by the word Demon, as by the term Hades, 1 Cor. 15. 55; for though they had constantly translated Demon, Devil, and Hades, Hell, yet they were in the above places forced to abandon the doctrine of Hell, and metamorphose their Devils into Gods! It is also clear, from the term deisidaimonesterus, used by Paul, Acts 17, 22, that the superstition of the Athenians consisted in the fear and worship of these Demons. Epiphanius, haranguing against the idolatrous worship of the Virgin, says Paul predicted that "some should apostatize from sound doctrine, giving
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need to doctrines concerning Demons, and become worshippers of the
dead, as they were worshipped in Israel." Here Epiphanius refers
to Baalim and Astaroth, which were men and women deified after
death. Indeed idolatrous Israel adopted the model of their gods
from the neighboring nations; and the opinions of Josephus con-
cerning the Demons, agree with the notions of the heathen Philoso-
phers. Homer calls Venus, Demon—liad i7, 98—104, and though
many of the Greek writers use theoi kai Daimones, as distinct,
thereby indicating different grades in their objects of adoration;
yet Demons and Gods were generally synonymous terms. The
word daimonion, in the text, should not have been rendered devils;
and the opinion of Austin, that the word demon constantly means
an evil spirit, is both false and futile.

It is acknowledged however, that according to Plutarch, it was
an ancient opinion, that some of these Demons fearing that good
men might rival them in honor and happiness, or attain to equal
dignity, endeavored to prevent and hinder them in the pursuit of
virtue. Accordingly it became the opinion of later philosophers,
that part of the demons were wicked and malignant. Josephus,
wars, B.7. C. 6. says these evil demons were no other than the spirits
of the wicked, who enter into the bodies of the living and kill them,
unless they obtain help against them." Hence the Demonology of
the later philosophers and the Pharasaic Jews, was perfectly analo-
gous to the modern doctrine of good and bad angels. The whole
system of Demonology, as also that of the Chaldean and Jewish
Angelology, is founded on the fanciful supposition of a separate
state of spirits, being freed from the body, but possessing its pro-
possibilities, who assist or torment the living, accordingly as they
feel benevolently or malevolently disposed towards them. Nothing
in all the reveries of a lawless imagination, can exceed the wild-
ness of the supposition that souls can subsist after death without a
body, and notwithstanding, retain the corporeal passions of that
body, from which they are disentangled!

Daimonion appears synonymous with Daimon. It is used by
Zenophon and Plutarch to denote the Deity: but it signified gene-
really, deified spirits, adored as mediators. When we compare my
text with 1 Cor. viii. 4—7, and x. 14, 20, 21. 1 Tim. ii. 5. Rev.
x. 20, we cannot fail to see that the Daimonia were the objects of
religious adoration, and certainly were not considered as devils.
Diabolos and Daimonion, are not once confounded, though the first
occurs above thirty, and the latter about sixty times, in the New
Testament. The word devil is therefore a very improper transla-
tion of daimonion in the above texts of scripture. We admit that
the word daimonion, in Mat. 12, 24—27, and the parallel passage,
Luke 11, 14—20, is to be understood in the evil sense, according
to the definition of Josephus; and implics that agreeably to the
Jewish notions, some dead men's spirits had the power of annoyed the living: but by no just rule of interpretation can the word be ever rendered by the term devil.

Demoniacs were insane or epileptic persons, who were incurable in those days of medical ignorance; and therefore, from the violence of the symptoms, were regarded by the superstitious, as possessed by diabolical agents. This view of the subject has been successfully maintained by the learned Joseph Mede in his discourse on John 10, 20, and by Lardner and Farmer on the Demoniacs of the New Testament. The Jews learned mostly their notions of Demons and Angels during the Babylonian captivity, where they became acquainted with the Persian philosophy. Being ignorant of physiology and pathology, they attributed every disease, of whose symptoms they were ignorant, to the influence of Demons: and from the prevalence of the opinion and the credulity of the patients, the subjects of these sore diseases, believed themselves to be possessed of Demons, just as the deluded creatures of modern times, have admitted themselves to be witches. Justin Martyr urges it as an argument for a future state of existence, that demons, whom he calls the spirits of the dead, seized and tormented men.—Chrysostom mentions it as a vulgar opinion, in his days, that all, who died a violent death, became demons. He also tells us that some Demoniacs would affirm that they were possessed of the soul of such a monk. Homer, speaking of a man, whom a violent disease had wasted, says a hateful demon had entered into him. From this general opinion, epilepsy obtained the name of sacred disease. Like the Jews, the Romans believed in possessions, but used different names, calling the ghosts, Larvae, and the men possessed, Larvati. Even to the present day, the Turks retain similar notions of insane persons.

Probably the greater part of these silly stories about demoniacs, were fabricated by the Pharasees, who seized on every idle rumour to support their dogmas concerning spirits, against the objections of the Sadducees. From Mat. 17. 14—18, and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, it appears the Evangelists considered the demoniacs as persons affected with Lunacy or Epilepsy. The Jews also identify insanity and possession, John, 10. 20. Indeed it is highly probable, that the notions of demons were rather the vulgar opinion, than the sober sentiment of the enlightened part of society, even in the days of Christ. Origen says the Physicians endeavored to account for these cases in a natural way, calling them bodily diseases, not admitting the agency of impure spirits. Plotinus, a celebrated philosopher of the third century, blames those who ascribe to demons, diseases, which he says arise from excess, indigestion, and other natural causes, and are often cured by medicine. Hypocrates the father of Medicine, whose knowledge of the animal
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Economy greatly surpassed that of all others in his age, wrote expressively to prove that there was nothing supernatural in the case of supposed Demoniacs; but that all the symptoms arose from natural causes. "When a man, says he, becomes incapable of speech, is suffocated, foams, gnashes his teeth, shuts his hands close, his eyes being distorted, and falling down, kicks with his feet; that man has the Epilepsy." How absurd and inconsistent with the superintending providence of God, to admit that the Universal Parent would allow evil spirits to take possession of his own children, and torment the creatures of his care, the objects of his ceaseless love!

Diabolos from diaballo to dart or strike through, or to calumniate, strictly signifies an accuser, a calumniator, an impostor, an informer or spy and is constantly used in the Septuagint as the translation of Satan, an adversary, and Zar an enemy. If therefore we translate the word, Diabolos, into English according to its proper meaning we shall never be at a loss to know the Devil and his occupation, nor the means of successful resistance. We shall be perfectly qualified to understand the language of Christ to the Jews and his apostles, John, 6. 70. and 8. 44. Dr. S. Clark well observes on the last passage, that personification was very frequent in the language of the Jews, and nothing was more common than to call men by the appellation of that abstract quality, which principally predominates in their character. Hence the phrases, children of wisdom, of the Devil, of God, of a murderer, are easily analyzed by changing the abstract for concrete terms; and reading wise, godly, persecuting or malevolent, children. We now clearly perceive the propriety of calling Judas a Devil. John, 6. 70. Peter, Satan, Mat. 16. 23.—Simone Magus, a child of the Devil, Acts 13. 10. and slanderous women, devils, Titus, 2. 3.—and how such devils go about as roaring lions seeking whom they may devour.

From the doctrine of Demonology arose the Jewish notions of Angels. The Jews in their state of degeneracy adopted many of the heathen dogmas concerning demons, yet preferred the name of angel to Demon, as they did the word Paradise to the Greek Elysium. The learned the names and grades of the Angels during their captivity in Babylon, and afterwards amalgamated their Religion with the Platonic Philosophy, in Egypt during the reign of the Ptolemies. The wisdom of Solomon and works of Philo are standing evidence of this assertion. That the notions of an Angelical Hierarchy originated among the Heathens, appears from the works of Jamblichus and Hierocles. From Maimonides we learn that the Jews having adopted the heathen Demonology, divided the heavenly host into ten orders. The Christians having embraced the same fanciful opinions, arranged them under nine classes, angels, archangels, virtues, powers, principalities, dominions, thrones, cherubim and seraphim. Petavius labors to confirm this division by testimonies from the Fa-
thers, tradition from the Jews, and the writings of Paul, Eph. 1. 21, Col. 1. 16. The Talmudists have multiplied the good Angels to more than 300,000,000,000, and the bad to a number beyond all computation. Isidore and others say, the number of the elect is exactly equal that of the fallen angels, being chosen from men to fill the places vacated by their rebellion. But Daillon affirms there is only one devil, and the Christians borrowed a plurality from the heathen; whilst Averroes maintains there is no devil at all!!! Here then come the scriptures to decide the controversy. From Mat. 18, 12, and Heb. 2. 16, Hilary determines that angels are to men, as an hundred to one. Fallen Angels, cries another, must be more than five thousand, for a Demoniac said my name is legion, Luke 8. 30. One third exactly of the angels fell, exclaims another, for the Dragon's tail drew a third part of the stars from Heaven, Rev. 12. 3. Tis certain adds a fourth that the good angels are more numerous than the bad, for we read of twelve legions of the former and only one of the latter. Mat. 26. 53.

But while we disprove the existence of such fanciful beings, a thousand voices exclaim, we have seen them! If so why may we not also obtain a view? Come forth then, whatever ye are—shadows or substances, spirits sublimed or transmuted natures—ye who have left your clay to wither, and become the messengers of heaven, and tread the winds and the star-sown wilderness above us! Come down from your stately heights, and stand visible before us! Or, if indeed ye live in the grave, or haunt on Purgatorial shores, pale tenants of the dim Elysium—Arise and be manifest!—No, they appear not but to their deluded votaries, to the believers of such fables, and no unbeliever can ever obtain a glimpse, even though it were by the pale light of the moon!!

How deplorable is the state of the human mind, degraded by superstition. Fear being the mother of superstition, we may reasonably expect her Gods to be hideous and terrific. Hence an imaginary Devil has obtained the greatest veneration in many countries

*Were I inclined to amuse myself with this controversy, says Mr. R. Robinson of Cambridge, I would collect all writings sacred and profane on this subject; and then summon the various writers to take their proper shares. What remained of Revelation expounded by just reasonings, would constitute my faith on this article. Pedantic superstition in King James first, would load away sorcery, witchcraft, and devils by wholesale. Pagan presumption would ship off hieroglyphics, astrology, magic, and manichaeism. Popery would claim a large share of angelography. Vulgar observations of effects, and ignorance of causes would come in for a large proportion of small talk on those occult powers. Fancy in rhetorical guise, would reduce a volume of well set words to a page of meaning. The volume would be hers and the page, mine. Politicians would then take away a large stock of the titular tribe. Sound reasoners on Demonology would represent the Demoniace of the New Testament as diseased people. Those would claim many a text from the subject, and I could not reasonably refuse their claims. Bright and black wings, rays, horns and cloven feet would fall to the artists. At last I should find, that the best guardian angel, is a good conscience, and the most formidable devils, my own deprived passions.*
of Asia and Africa: and even at this time, however incredible, his worship is very prevalent throughout all Christendom. Being the popular god of modern superstition, if any independent man, who dares to think, expresses a doubt of his existence, the alarm is sounded, and fearing that the empire of the god of this world is about to be upset, all who wonder after the beast, hasten to cry out for whole hours, great is the Devil whom we adore! Be not surprised, the existence and influence of the devil are as necessary to the creeds of modern times, as the honors of Diana to the craftsmen of Ephesus!

From what has been already said, it is fully manifest that among the various objects of blinded nations' fear, the ghosts of departed heroes were admitted at a very early period. It was imagined by weak and perverted minds, that men who had distinguished themselves, in this world, by either good or evil actions, would retain their dispositions in the next; and be actively engaged in promoting the welfare of mankind, or plotting their ruin, as far as these propensities excited, or their influence extended. Therefore, men became naturally inclined to honor the good spirits for their services, and offer sacrifices to the evil, to placate their malevolence!—We have also seen that Plato and many other eminent philosophers taught that all intercourse between the Deity and mankind was carried on by means of demons, who ought on that account to receive divine homage; and that this doctrine was received by many of the heathen nations, and even by many of the Jews, especially the Essenes, who believed that thousands of these demons officiated as mediators with Jehovah, and therefore ought to be worshipped.—That it was also a general opinion, that acute diseases, plagues, apoplexies, epilepsies, were operated by demons, or ghosts of wicked men, who entered human bodies and destroyed those who were not powerfully supported by the good demons. Accordingly we find, that in all the passages of scripture, which speak of persons possessed of devils, the original word is daimonion and not diabolos, which should not therefore have been translated devil, nor devils.

But it appears to have been an early and much agitated question among the ancient philosophers, whence sprang that moral and physical evil which so often weakens the enjoyment and destroys the happiness of mankind. Being unwilling to abase human pride, by charging it on man, or to attribute malevolence to the Deity, they imagined the existence of a wicked spirit to be absolutely necessary to the existence and continuance of disorder and pain in the world. But the quantum of evil being so great, they supposed that the evil spirit must nearly equal the Deity himself in wisdom and power. This doctrine of devilism was derived from the Persian theology, which taught the co-existence and nearly co-equality of two great first causes; the one the author of all good,
the other the source of all evil. This absurd opinion was the invention of their Magi, who were unable to account for the origin of evil, on any other principles. Very different from this wild fancy, was the message of Jehovah to Cyrus, by the Prophet Isaiah, which reproves the foolish sentiment, and declares Jehovah to be the author of light and darkness, and the Creator of both good and evil. Indeed it is altogether impossible that good or evil could exist otherwise; for that God who fills the immensity of space, must inclose in his very nature, all beings to whom he gave existence, and by whose fatherly care they are preserved. Hence it follows that the notion of the existence and influence of the devil is altogether inconsistent with correct and scriptural views of the divine nature and character. If a devil exist, he must be the rival or servant of the Almighty. The first supposition is atheistic; for if there be a God, he is without a rival; nor would he suffer his designs to be frustrated, nor employ a servant to violate his laws, or disturb the peace of his empire. But says the objector, if there be no devil, then there is no God, no hell, no need of preaching! I would not have noticed such manifest puerilities, were they not proclaimed by the doctors of divinity and theological professors of our day, who sound the watch word of heresy, and lead the van of persecution. Is there no proof of God's existence but that the devil needs an opposer? O fie! Must God exist and we preach for the devil's sake? Shame on those men who sacrifice truth and insult good sense, to fan the fire of fanaticism! Is the devil the maker and governor of the infernal regions? Then certainly he will take good care not to torment himself nor his friends. The wicked have nothing to fear, for if any suffer, they must be the pious servants of God, who have rebelled against his satanic majesty. Moreover, if the devil be the director of hell, and fallen angels the inflictors of its punishments, can these unfortunate sufferers be the tormentors of men who have been equally unfortunate as themselves? Then surely the devil and his angels are God's servants, and must receive the reward of their services. But are God's servants unhappy, and will virtue and misery be long connected? If not, then it follows that devils will become saints, and hell a field of liberty!

The term Satan indicates no more than that propensity to evil so frequently observable in human conduct, and which like the chemical doctrines of phlogiston and caloric, is of great utility for the explanation of difficulties. All classical readers know that the most beautiful writings abound with bold, figurative, and hyperbolical descriptions. That nothing is more ornamental in poetry than prosopoeia, or the representation of good and evil qualities, virtues and vices, by personal characters. The word Satan signifies an adversary, and sometimes it only denotes the abstract quality, calumny. Accordingly, our translators have rendered it, throughout the bible.
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Though the term Satan, occur frequently in the scriptures, yet generally some human being is intended. David is so called, 1 Sam. xxix. 4. Hadad is denominated Solomon’s devil or satan, 1 Kings, xi. 14. David describes those who rendered him evil for good as his satans; and prays that his satans might be clothed with shame. Ps. cix, 20. 29. Jesus calls Peter, satan, and Judas, a devil, Matt. xvi. 23. John vi. 70. In the New Testament, treacherous men, slanderous women, and opponents of every kind, are called satans or devils; and these words signify no more than adverse propensities. Indeed it would be an impious reflection on the character of the Deity, to suppose he had formed and let loose myriads of malevolent spirits to destroy the happiness of mankind.

If it be demanded whence arise those inducements to evil which so often disturb the peace of society, and ruin man’s happiness, the answer is both easy and scriptural. The heart is deceitful, and every man is tempted when he is drawn aside, or enticed by animal passions or bodily appetites. These expose us to innumerable trials and temptations. Intemperance, avarice, ambition, envy, and discontentment beset us in their turns, and without the utmost vigilance and circumspection, we are in danger of being overcome. Now can the just and merciful God, the father of mankind, and moral governor of the world, think these propensities to evil so insufficient for the trial of our virtues, that he must superadd the agency of an evil being so subtle, so malicious, and so powerful as the Devil. What a desperate chance have we of succeeding against such an adversary. Shall we say, good is the will of the Lord; and that in all this he has done all things in wisdom! Banished forever be the thoughts from all rational and serious persons. God could no more act thus than cease to exist. Every principle of his nature holds such conduct in eternal abhorrence!!

Let the believers in a devil, consider 1. That the belief of his existence constitutes no fundamental article of the christian faith; no part of the new testament states the necessity of believing such an unreasonable doctrine. If particular passages seem to imply it or cannot be clearly explained or understood, yet no inference should be drawn from a few passages that would contradict the decisions of reason and the general tenor of scripture. 2. It was perfectly consistent with the mission of Jesus to adopt the language of the country on all subjects, which did not constitute the main objects of that mission. Christ came not to teach men philosophy, neither to spend his time in combating the jewish demonology. Every reasonable person, on whose mind the rays of science have shone, will readily admit that neither the astronomy or cosmogony of Moses will stand the test of modern experience; and might not our Lord as consistently use the foolish language of the Jews about Demons, Demons, and Devils, as Moses, the absurd and fanciful opinions of the

K
ancients concerning astronomy. 3. There is no passage that can be adduced to support the doctrine of a devil, which does not contradict some part of the received opinions on that dogma—but every text in all the scriptures which speaks of the devil or satan, can be fairly interpreted or explained, consistently with the whole tenor of scripture, on the supposition that there is no such being, but that these words universally mean an adversary or something adverse.

We might have expected that the most pertinacious believers in a devil, would have rejoiced to find, that reason, scripture, and common sense, are equally opposed to the terrifying dogma. But, alas! such are the religious infatuation and credulity of mankind, that an opinion once admitted is seldom rejected however palpably absurd or monstrously ridiculous. Hence we find Christians cling as close to this doctrine, as if their present and future happiness depended on the existence and influence of an infernal fiend! Atheism and the disbelief of a devil vibrate the same feelings of horror in the superstitious mind; and, perhaps, atheism itself is deemed by some to be less insidious. But if a devil there be, possessed of those powers and attributes generally ascribed to him, Atheism becomes acceptable, and loses all its hideous forms, for the existence of such a being proves the non-existence of God, or that he is deficient in wisdom, goodness, and power. Why then should men be alarmed, when this doctrine is attacked or disputed—and why should the war-hoop of party be sounded, when we attempt to disprove and explode this injurious and unreasonable opinion? Has the devil created the universe, and filled it with inhabitants? Is he the author of all good, on whom our present and future happiness depends? Did all being start into existence at his command, or is it supported by his power? Is his dominion unbounded and perpetual, and shall his authoritative voice awake the myriads of the dead, determine their doom, appoint heaven as a reward for his enemies, and people the Tartarian gulf with his allies and friends? What impious absurdity? Jehovah alone holds the reigns of universal empire, and all that can excite our hopes in this world, or perfect our felicity in the next, is unconnected with a satanic being.

If the doctrine that teaches the existence and influence of a devil, involve serious consequences, if it be anti-scriptural and unphilosophical, if it be fatal to man's moral improvement, if it poison the stream of religious knowledge at the fountain head by supposing that God has a powerful antagonist, whose designs he has been unable to frustrate, and whose rebellion shall be as durable as the divine existence. In short, if correct notions of the divine character and government be inconsistent with the belief in such a being—for the honor of God and religion, let the infamous doctrine be forever rejected.

Those who believe in the existence of a devil suppose, that the
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evil, which prevails in this world, results from his infernal agency; and also expect that evil to become still greater in another and future state of being. There they look for a hell, crowded with inhabitants, through the resistless powers of diabolical influence: and this reign of misery, this triumph of the devil, they expect to be so complete and signal as to undergo no change through the revolution of eternal ages!! How can persons who expect such a catastrophe of human affairs, have correct notions of that God, who is all benevolence; whose plans are conceived in wisdom and executed in mercy; whose power cannot be resisted, and whose very name and nature are Love. Those who think God has a competitor, must deny the absolute will of the Deity, and his general providence. They derogate from his supremacy, and eclipse his glory. Thy dishonor him, and perplex themselves with wild and embarrassing conclusions. In a word, they conjure up a devil to their own confusion, to the injury of christian truth, and the serious mischief of morality. The fear of a devil may perhaps keep some men of weak minds from excessive vice, and make them slavishly religious, and hypocritically moral. But the love of God alone, proceeding from a grateful recollecton of his goodness and providential care, can produce genuine piety and virtue.

It is somewhat outrageous to suppose, that the Devil will punish wicked men who sinned by his instigation, and performed all their wicked deeds, in obedience to his desires. Can the punishment of sinners be inflicted by that being whom they never offended; and God, whose laws have been violated, have no concern in their sufferings! The belief in the existence of a devil is equally injurious to virtue, simplicity and christian truth. It affords a palliative for crimes, and induces men to believe that wicked thoughts and evil actions have not been fomented in their own hearts, but spring from the suggestions of the wicked one. Sometimes men are hurried into enormities, conceiving themselves particularly tempted, at which their mild natures would shudder, were they not influenced by this deceitful doctrine.

If the belief in a devil did not obtain, men must either trace their sins to God as the author, or admit they originate with themselves; and as they could not presume to charge God directly with sin, they would of necessity, acknowledge their own accountability; and repentance producing reformation, might justly be expected to result from such a happy conviction. Another serious evil arising from a belief in the existence of a devil, is the continual alarm and terror that reigns in the weak minds, tinctured with superstition, by the apprehension of satanic machination and artifice. Every inclination to enjoyment, every expostulation on religious faith, and even every suggestion of truth, though in the very words of scripture, if it seems to contradict long received opinions, are all attribu-
ted to the seduction of Satan; and thus the perpetual dread of an imaginary being, keeps the mind in darkness, and the heart in palpitation. Wild enthusiasm, gloomy superstition, and a long train of delusive thoughts, successively distract the serious mind which is unfortunately clouded by a belief in the devil. And what is worse, men suppose him to be so refined in subtlety, and so irresistible in power, that vigilance is almost useless, and the strongest heart cannot feel subjection to his will without horror and dismay—Hence a belief in the existence of the devil, has driven many weak persons to despair, which most assuredly is the natural consequence of such a wild doctrine. What idea must those men have of God, who believe that he has placed his feeble creatures in a situation so hopeless and cruel? Must they not conclude that God created man for the purpose of making him miserable? And can the Creator be an object of love, veneration and gratitude, whilst he is viewed in connection with a malignant devil.

If the account we have given of the Devil be just, then all notions of witchcraft, or of being possessed of the devil, are vain and groundless. 'Tis all deceit and imposition on the weakness and credulity of mankind! For shame! Let us entertain more honorable sentiments of the moral government of God. Let us think ourselves safe under the protection of his providence; safe from the malice both of devils and wicked men. Let us learn, not to disturb ourselves with any vain or superstitious fears of evil spirits, for we are not subject to any malicious powerful beings. The Lord God Omnipotent reigns alone, whose tender mercies are over all his works. This consideration should fill us with ease and tranquillity, otherwise we do not give God the honor due to him; we do not repose that confidence in his providence, which his wisdom and goodness require, and the security of our own happiness demands. O how different from the doctrines of devils are the views of God exhibited in the gospel of Jesus! There we read of one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in us all. That it is his gracious intention to save and render eternally happy all his intelligent offspring. There we behold no mighty devil to blacken the moral horizon, or frustrate and baffle the designs of the Deity. But on the contrary, a religion all mild and beautiful, that breathes nothing but pure benevolence, and evidently indicates the approximation of a period, in which truth will completely triumph over error, and happiness be universal. Amen!

"See from her tomb, as from an humbler shrine,
Truth, radiant goddess, sallies on my soul,
And puts Delusion's dusky train to flight."
Lecture VIII.

HELL.

Hosea xiii, 14. O Hell, I will be thy destruction!

Christian auditors you may ask me, wherefore have you changed the common reading of the text and used the term Hell, instead of the grave? I reply, every person acquainted with the original languages, in which it hath pleased God to communicate to man the sacred intelligence of life and immortality, will readily admit, that the Hebrew word, translated grave, in the common version of the Text, is that very same term, which is translated Hell wherever the word occurs in the old Testament. I am therefore justified in reading my Text as I have done in your hearing; and the good sense of the passage as well as the fulfilment of the prophecy require this change in the mode of reading. But seeing the word Hell occurs in the sacred scriptures as the translation of three different words, Sheol, Gehenna, and Hades, I shall endeavor,

1st. To give an explanatory history of these terms,
2d. To disprove the doctrine generally deduced from them.

My hearers will be surprised by the declaration, that not one of the original words, which our translators have rendered Hell, conveys the idea of a place or state of punishment in another mode of existence; and consequently their just indignation will be excited against that deceptive system of duplicity, which has so long abused mankind by the misuse of terms and perversion of reason and religion. The word Hell in its modern acceptation, excites in the mind a very different idea from that which the term formerly expressed. To our notions of it the words of the Latin poet apply.

"Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur ab illis."

The word has lost its primitive signification, which, like the original words of which it is the translation in our bibles, was perfectly innocent, and has acquired the modern and hideous idea of a place appropriated to the execution of interminable punishment. The word Hell, therefore, by the consent of the ablest commentators of all denominations, should be expunged from our bibles; and no longer used as the translation of the Greek or Hebrew terms; for there is, confessedly, no word in the original scriptures to express the modern idea of Hell! The word, says Dr. A. Clarke, is derived from the Anglo-Saxon Helan, which signifies to cover, conceal, or hide; and hence the tilings or covering of a house, and the covers of books are to this day called Heling, and the phrase to hell is still used as synonymous with to cover or hide, in several of the western counties of England, especially, Cornwall, and Lancaster. Thus the true and primitive meaning of the word hell, was perfect-
ly accordant with the idea suggested by the Hebrew _sheol_, and the Greek _Hades_; for as nouns, all the three words imply something unseen, concealed, or invisible; and have therefore been employed with propriety to convey the notion of an unseen world, the grave, or state of the dead in general. Similar are the sentiments of the learned Archbishop Usher, expressed in his Treatise de Lim. Patr.—"We have no word in the French or English language to express the idea conveyed by the Hebrew _sheol_, the Greek _hades_, or the Latin _inferi_. Our English word _hell_ had anciently this meaning; being derived from the German _hill, to hide_. Hence the ancient Irish used to say _'hill the head,'_ meaning to cover the head. So that our hell then answered to the Greek _hades_, which signifies an unseen place." Drs. S. and A. Clarke, Campbell, Whitby, and others, approve the above definition of hell, and harmoniously unite in opinion, that hell originally answered to the Greek and Hebrew terms, but ought not to be used in the modern sense, as the translation of _sheol_ or _hades_.

How strange then, that from the term _hell_, should have arisen those dreadful notions, which are so assiduously propagated in the world, and which men of fruitful imaginations have so effectually made to operate as the means of delusion and aggrandizement. It is not however surprising, that superstition should act most powerfully on the fears of her votaries, since the human fancy can paint with greater energy the misery than the bliss of a future state.—With the two simple ideas of darkness and fire, we can create a sensation of pain, which may be aggravated to an infinite degree, by adding the idea of endless duration. Hence from the greater facility of depicting the horrors which distract the mind or ruin the peace of society, hell, which contained just as much happiness as misery, in its idea, came to be used by religious impostors of every description, as a fit engine to awe the mind of the credulous into that pliability, necessary to favor the views of the avaricious priest or tyrannical monarch. Egypt, the mother of gods, superstition, and mystery, gave origin to the whole doctrine of _Hell_: if we lop off the exuberances of infuriated orthodoxy, during the dark ages of papal delusion. These happy plains, says Diodorus, extending from the Nile to the Pyramids, where once stood the famous _Memphis_, reported to be the abode of the just after death, are no other than that beautiful country in the vicinity of the lake _Acherusia_, near _Memphis_. It is not without foundation, that the dead have been said to reside here; for here terminate the funeral ceremonies of most of the Egyptians. Their bodies, having been conveyed across the Nile and the lake _Acherusia_, are finally deposited in tombs constructed under the surface of these plains. The ceremonies yet practised in Egypt correspond with all the notions of the Greeks, concerning the infernal regions.
SHEOL.

This word, which is translated Hell in the scriptures of the old Testament, signifies only the state of the dead indiscriminately.—Thus Ps. 89. 47, according to the translation of the common prayer reads, what man is he that liveth, and shall not see death; and shall he deliver his soul from the hand of hell? What Solomon says, (Prov. 27. 20.) hell and destruction are never full, is perfectly explained by chap. 30. 15, there be three things which are never satisfied—Sheol or Hell, etc.

The Hebrew word, sheol is derived from shaal, to ask, pray, or hide. Kennicot, who compared the bible with above 1000 Mss. and thus became a practical Hebrician, affirms that the radical meaning of shaal, is to ask or pray. In this sense our translators understood it, Gen. 32, 29. Deut. 4, 32, and 32, 7. Josh. 4, 6. Jud. 18, 5, etc. The septuagint renders it aitesan, in Ex. 3, 22, and every impartial inquirer will be satisfied by consulting Pool's Annotations on the passage, Whitby on Acts, 2, 27, Kennicot's first dissertation p. 390, and Shuckford's Connections, vol. 2, p. 340.

The learned Buxtorf defines sheol, the "general place of the dead;" and another very competent judge and excellent Commentator, Dr. Whitby, says according to the scriptures, the Jewish writers, the ancient Fathers and the still more ancient heathen, the Hebrew Sheol, and the Greek Hades, which answers to it in the translation of the Seventy, signifies the place and receptacle of all the dead. In this sense alone can we understand the sacred writers.—In the first place where the word sheol as a noun occurs, Gen. 37, 35, we find the pious Patriarch, saying, "I will go down into Sheol, to my son mourning." How absurd to suppose that Jacob believed his beloved son to be in a place of torment! And how desperately wicked the language both of the holy Jacob and the patient Job, if we attach to the word Hell the modern meaning. The former exclaims, "I shall go to Hell," and the latter prays, "Oh that thou wouldst hide me in Hell till thy wrath be past!" Job. 14, 13. In the views of our modern Evangelical preachers, Hell is the very focus of the Divine wrath, yet Job prays to be hid in it, in order to escape that wrath! O how confounded is the language of Babel! Our modern Babel-builders have long pretended to speak a holy, ancient, and Biblical language, but God Almighty, in respect for the truth, has manifested their character by the confusion of tongues!

It is proper here to notify my readers that in the old Testament the word Sheol, does not mean the place of separate spirits; for the writers of the Jewish scriptures had no knowledge of a future mode of existence. They neither feared nor hoped for anything beyond the grave! Sheol therefore only implies the state of the dead or that chaos of nonentity that was supposed to follow dissolution.—
Neither friend nor foe, learned nor unlearned can put his finger on a single passage in the old Testament and say, here is information, that man shall live again. Had the sacred writers ever thought that Sheol meant the abode of spirits, or had they believed in a separate state, they would not have declared, "there is no device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol. Eccl. 9, 10. In death there is no remembrance of God, and none shall give him thanks in Sheol, Ps. 6, 6. Sheol cannot praise God. Is. 38, 18. And that the dead know not any thing. Eccl. 9, 5. A man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all go into one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. Eccl. 3, 19, 20. As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not! Job. 14, 12.

We have shown that sheol, as a verb, signifies to ask or inquire; as a noun it conveys the idea of asking, or inquiry, and denotes that solicitous desire of man to know his fate or destiny after death. Hence we see that it differs radically from the hades of the Greeks, or the Hell of the moderns. Sheol, or Saul was also a common appellative name in Israel. Their first king was so called, as also the great apostle of the Gentiles; but surely none would have been so wild as to have called their dear children by the name of sheol or hell, had they conceived it to mean the accursed region of the damned! We therefore fairly and rationally conclude, from a full investigation of the passages, that the sheol or hell of the old Testament denoted inquiry, a request, or figuratively, the invisible world, great solicitude, anxiety or trouble; and any person accustomed to etymological investigation, will readily perceive how easily and naturally the figurative sense arises from the literal. In the figurative sense we understand it, Ps. 9, 17; 30, 3; 86, 18; 116, 3; and similar passages. In some of the old English versions, the seventeenth verse of the ninth Psalm is thus rendered, "the wicked go into hell,"—i.e. into anxiety and trouble. This translation is perfectly harmonious with the revelation of God, and the experience of man. There is no peace saith my God to the wicked; they are like the troubled sea; Is. 57, 20, 21; into this hell Jonah went, when he endeavored to flee from the Lord. The pains of this hell took hold of David when he went into it, by the commission of those crimes, which tarnish his character, and blacken his memorial to all generations. O sinner thou canst only keep out of this hell, by doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with thy God.

But my audience may demand what is implied in the text, O Sheol I will be thy destruction. I answer, the Lord God will swallow up death in victory; and wipe away tears from all faces. Is. 25, 8. God will dwell with men, and they shall be his people, and he shall be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither
shall there be any more pain. Rev. xx1, 3, 4. The Hell of the bible
is that anxiety and trouble which are the effects of sin; and follow
as consequence that vanity to which the creature is subject. Rom.
viii. 20. But the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of
corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God, at the
restitution, regeneration, or new creation of all things. The trans-
gression shall be finished, sin terminate, death and hell be cast into
the lake of fire to be destroyed, and evil be abolished from the empire
of God!

Hades.

Hades from α, not, and εido, to see—signifies unseen, invisible;
the invisible receptacle or mansion of the dead, where all departed
spirits are supposed to reside, without any distinction whatever.—
In the scriptures, it is often personified as a king of terrors, or de-
stroying monster, having his basileion, or kingdom.—Wisd. i, 14.
This is implied in the phrase, ήεοs hadou, or ονάη hadou. Genesis
xxxvii, 35. Num. xvi, 30. Is. xiv, 11. Math. xi, 23. His pulai, or
gates. Is. xxxviii, 10. Math. xvi, 18. His puloroi, or doorkeeper-
ers. Job xxxviii, 17. His cheir, or hand, Ps. xlix, 15. And his
kentron, or sting. And notwithstanding that many have formed an
unholy alliance, or covenant with him, to support his iniquitous ad-
ministration, Is. xxviii, 15, yet he will be cast eis ten limnen tou pu-
ros, into the lake of fire. Here, my auditors, is the fortunate event
my text contemplates when death and hell will be destroyed, and
golden years return again.

Hades was generally considered by the ancients as a deep cavern
or dark region, located in the centre of the earth, by those who ad-
mitted the spherical form of the globe, but according to the vulgar
notions of astronomy among the ancients, it was thought by the ma-
jority to be as far beneath the earth as the heaven was above it.—
Hence Zophar, speaking to Job of the incomprehensibility of the
Deity, says, it is high as heaven, deeper than hell. Homer, Hesiod,
and Virgil, describe Hades as being as far beneath the earth as
heaven is above it.

Τοσσον ενερθ’ haideo hoson ouranos est apo gaias.—II. 8, 16.
Τοσσον ενερθ’ hupos ges, hoson ouranos est apo gaias.—Theog. 720.

------------- tum Tartarus ipse

Bis patet in precess tantum, tenditque sub umbras

Quantus ad aetherum cali suspexit Olympum.—En. 6, 577.

Josephus, who borrowed his views from the Grecian traditions,
which had been lately adopted by the Pharisees, tells us "hades
is a subterraneous region, where the light never shines, and which
must therefore be perpetual darkness. This region is appointed as
a place of custody, in which the souls both of the righteous and un-


righteous are detained. Into this region there is only one descent, at whose gate there stands an archangel with a host. The souls which pass through the gate go not all one way. The just are guided to the right, and conducted to a luminous region which we call Abraham's bosom. The unjust are dragged to the left hand by the angels allotted for punishment, who reproach and threaten them by their terrible looks. This is evidently the view of hades exhibited in the parable, Luke 16.

From the time of the Pythagorean and Platonic Philosophy, the hell of the ancient heathen was divided into two mansions; that on the right they called Elysium, from a, not, and luo, to dissolve, which they intended to signify eternal existence, and is derived from the same word which the apostle employs, Heb. vii, 16, to express endless duration. The Elysium of the Greeks, called by the Jews the bosom of Abraham, was believed to be a pleasant and delightful place abounding in all manner of delicacies; but its pleasures they supposed to be corporeal and sensual. The left hand department was appointed for the wicked. This mansion they denominata Tartarus, either from the verb tartarizo, to tremble, or tarasso, to disturb. This was the lowest and most dreadful place in hell, in the opinions of the Greeks and Romans, and is that to which the psalminist alludes, Ps. lxxxvi, 13. It is also mentioned from an apocryphal work, 2 Peter, ii, 4. The entrance or descent into this subterraneous region, the Latins supposed to be through the lake Avernus in Campania, near the bay of Puteolus, now called Lago d'Averno. The exhalation from this lake was believed to be destructive to all birds; hence called Avernus from a, negatively, and ornis, a bird. This name, however, says Lucretius, was afterwards applied to all places or lakes possessing similar qualities.*

Strabo describes the country around this lake as abounding with fountains of warm waters, mixed with salt, sulphur, alum, and bitumen, which gave origin to the names of Phlegethon and Pyrphlegethon, two rivers of hell—so called from these warm sulphurous waters. Of this passage to the infernal regions Virgil says,† the descent at Avernus is easy, and the gate of Pluto lies open night and day.

The Greeks had a passage into hades at Taenaris, a promontory of Peloponnesus, now called capo maina. Of this Virgil also takes notice, when he tells us that Orpheus having entered the passage of Taenaris, and the lofty gates of Pluto, he visited the shades and their terrible king.‡

We cannot refrain from viewing with a mixture of pity and rid-

---

*Nunc age Averna tibi, quae sint locacumque lacusque.—L. 6, 788.
†Aen. 6, 25.
‡ Taenarias etiam fauces, alta ostia Ditis Ingressus, Manesque adiit regemque tremendum.”—Geor. 4. 467.
icale, the foolish fancies of the ancients and moderns on the local position of hell. When our modern pietists of much devotion, little learning and much less sense, address the Maker, they look up, supposing him a venerable old man, commodiously seated in some lofty region in the Zenith, whilst they believe his Satanic majesty holds a commanding position in the Nadir, or regions directly beneath. Were these sages, who measure heaven and hell, and fix their stations in the vast empire of the Deity, to look into a book on astronomy, and there discover that the Zenith and Nadir changed places every twelve hours; so that the point directly above at noon, would be perpendicularly beneath at midnight, how would they be alarmed! Surely that man that looks up to find God, believes as much in a local and tutelar deity as the Israelites, when they adored the calves at Dan and Bethel!

Though Hades has sometimes the signification of Sheol, and simply intimates the idea of an unknown and unseen state or non-entity, yet it more generally denotes the abode of spirits indiscriminately. In the Septuagint it answers to sheol, and cannot therefore communicate any other idea than that of the Hebrew term. Therefore by Hades, many have understood the grave; and in that sense it is sometimes used by the Greek writers.

Metros d' en hadou kai patros kekeulhotoin,
Ouk est adelphos hostis an blastoi pote.—Sophocles Antig. 924.

The reformers generally maintained in their controversies with the Catholics, that hades simply denoted the grave or state of the dead. Hence Corneil a Lapide, in Ephs. 4, 16, asserts that Calvin and Beza both denied the descent of Christ to hell; believing hades to mean no more than the grave. Indeed our orthodox commentators on Acts 2, 27, are as strenuous advocates of the innocent meaning of the term, as any Universalist whatever: and the uniform testimony of competent judges, ancient and modern, affixes one meaning to the word hades, i. e. the invisible world, or abode of spirits. The Greeks assigned one Hades to all that die: hence they often say "pantas homos thnetous haides dechetai. Hades receives all the dead." Caius, a Roman Presbyter, adopts similar language. "En hadou sunechontai psuchai dikaion te kai adikon.—
The souls of both the just and unjust go to hades." Job exclaims 1heol Bethni, hades is my house, 17, 13. Thou wilt bring me to the house appointed for all living."—30. 23. Both Homer and Euripides say of the dead in general, katelthein eis dom hadou—they go to the house of hades: and the learned Windate says, hauden nekron chorion exponent Graeci, the Greeks call the place of the dead, hades. Homer describing the rage of Achilles, says, it sent prematurely to hades, the souls of many brave heroes.*

* Pollas d' ipthimous psuchas Haidi proiapen. II. 1, 4.
Dr. S. Clark, in his sermon on Ps. 16, 10, says, "in the New Testament, the word hell sometimes denotes a place of punishment for the wicked, in other places, the state of the dead in general. But this ambiguity is only in the Translation and not in the original; for wherever a place of torment is mentioned, the word is always Gehennah in the original. But when only the state of the dead is intended, it is expressed in the original by Hades, a quite different word, which though translated hell, signifies only the invisible state. Accordingly the prediction, Mat. 11, 23, thou Capernaum shall be brought down to hell, means: that great and proud city should be levelled with the dust, and utterly disappear as those who are buried in the grave. When the rich man in hell, lift up his eyes, being in torment, Luke 16, 23. The original only signifies that he was in the invisible world, wherein were Abraham and Lazarus; to which went Christ and the thief, and all that die, both righteous and wicked. When our Lord promises, Mat. 16, 18, that the gates of Hell should not prevail against his Church, the words pulai hadou, gates of hell, strictly rendered, signify the passage to the invisible world, i. e. death; and the import of the promise is, that death itself, the utmost extent of all persecution, should never be able to suppress his doctrine or extinguish his religion from this world. Lastly, prophecy intimates, that death and hell will deliver up the dead, and be then cast into the lake of fire. Hence it is very evident that hell cannot mean either the place or state of the damned, but on the contrary, the state of death, or death itself, including all human woe, which then shall be no more. So in Ps. 16, 10—Acts 2 27; thou wilt not leave my soul in hell. plainly implies a solid faith on the resurrection of the body. From this explanation of all the texts which relates to this subject, concludes the Dr. it is clear the scriptures nowhere teach, that our Lord, by descending into hell, ever entered a place appointed for the punishment of wicked men, nor is there any thing in reason, from which it can, by any just consequence, be inferred."

Hence we may fairly and reasonably conclude, from the unanimous testimony of the most learned and impartial Commentators both ancient and modern, that Hades does not signify a place appropriated to the punishment of the wicked.

GEHENNA.

According to the testimony of the scriptures, and the best historians, Gehenna was the name of a valley, south-east of mount Zion, which was the most southerly of those mountains, on which stood the once celebrated city of Jerusalem. The most remarkable
Declivity of mount Zion looks towards the south-west, being formed by a deep ravine, called in scripture Ge-Ben-Hinnom, or the valley of Hinnom. This valley running from west to east, met on the south-east, the valley of Jehoshaphat, or as it is some times called, the valley of Kedron, from the brook of that name by which it was watered. Here the horrid rites of human sacrifices were paid to Moloch and Beelphégor. The origin of the name is somewhat obscure. From Joshua 15, 8, we should incline to think it obtained the name from some family called Hinnom, to whom it once belonged. Some think it was so called from the facts noticed Is. 66, 24. The dead bodies of apostates and malefactors being exposed as a public example, might induce men to call the valley Hinnom, there they are, implying there lie or hang the bodies of those vile transgressors who forsook the God of their fathers, and followed the vanities of the nations. But others with more accuracy derive the word from the hebrew verb, Hannam, to yell, believing the valley to have obtained its name from the shrieks of the children sacrificed to Moloch.

St. Jerome, a native of Palestine, informs us that the valley of Hinnom, called Gehenna in the new testament, was a fine and beautiful place, adorned with gardens and well watered with fountains. The grandeur of the scenery first invited the idolatrous Amorites, and afterwards the Jews, to erect here the standard of superstition. Moloch signifies a king and was, very probably, a brazen image, designed to represent the sun, seeing fire was so much used in his worship. This opinion receives support from what is said by the prophet Amos 5, 26. Selden, who has given us a prolix account of this idol and the rites by which he was worshipped, adduces several testimonies to prove that the Phenicians and other nations, in the vicinity of Judea, actually sacrificed their children in times of calamity, to this blood-thirsty Demon. Hence the phrase “to pass through the fire,” signifies to burn in sacrifice.—See Deut. 18, 10, 2 Kings 23, 10. Lev. 18, 21. 2 Chron. 28, 3. Jer. 7, 31, 19, 5. and 32. 35. Ps. 106, 37, and Ez. 16, 20, 21.

Bochart affirms that all the people of the east, worshipped the sun and consecrated to him, horses which they believed to be nimble as the sun. And as it was a prevailing notion that the sun was carried about in a chariot—chariots were dedicated to him, and horses slain in sacrifice by the Armenians, Persians, and others: and for the same reason the idolatrous kings of Judea, were drawn out at the eastern gate of the city, which looked towards Tophet, to salute the sun on his appearance above the horizon. Accordingly we find that when they worshipped, they turned their faces towards the east—Ez. 8, 16. The sun, as an object of idolatrous worship, was adored under the names of Moloch, Adrammelech, Baal, and Bethshemesh, 2 Kings 23, 5, 11. The following pas-
sage from Diodorus Siculus L. 20, will show to what an enormous extent the fanatical reverence for this fiery God had prevailed amongst the people of the east. "When Agathocles, tyrant of Sicily, besieged Carthage, the inhabitants imputing the calamity to the displeasure of Saturn, to whom they had lately sacrificed supposititious children; or such as they had privately purchased, whereas formerly they had burnt to his honor the best of their offspring: reflecting on these things, and seeing the enemy encamped at their very walls, they were seized with religious dread, for having profaned the honors of the Gods, and in haste to rectify their errors they chose two hundred of the noblest children and sacrificed them quickly. Many others, accused of irreligion, gave themselves up willingly, to the number of no less than three hundred! For they had a brazen statue, stretching out his hands towards the ground, in such a manner that the child placed in them, tumbled down into a pit full of fire.""

The following extract from D. Kimchi on 2 Kings 23, 10, will tend to explain the tabernacle of Moloch, mentioned Acts 7, 43, 4 our Rabbins of happy memory inform us that although all other houses of idolatry were in Jerusalem, Moloch was without it. His image was made hollow, and sat within seven chapels. Whosoever offered a flower, they opened to him the first of these; whosoever offered turtles or pigeons, they opened to him the second; to him that offered a lamb, they opened the third; to him that offered a ram, they opened the fourth; to him that offered a calf, they opened the fifth; to him that offered an ox, they opened the sixth; but whosoever offered his son, to him they opened the seventh." Fabius also informs us that "the image of Moloch was made of brass, curiously contrived with seven cells, probably to represent the seven planets; and the offerings being put into these receptacles, they were shut, and all were burnt to ashes, whilst the people danced about the idol, and beat timbrels or tabrets to drown the cries of the tormented." Who can fail to observe the striking similarity between those horrid monsters of antiquity, who burnt their children whilst they danced to the sound of the timbrel; and those modern advocates of a still more horrible Moloch, who tell us they shall sing in heaven, whilst their children shriek in the unquenchable fire of an endless Hell! Let not the reader be surprised, for all this is perfectly orthodox, and agreeable to the language of the holy fathers. "How shall I laugh, exclaims Tertullian, how rejoice, how exult, when I behold so many monarchs groaning in the lowest abyss of darkness; so many magistrates liquifying in fiercer fires than ever they kindled for Christians; so many sage philosophers blushing in red hot flames—!" But I must cast a veil over the rest of this infernal description! Surely if a just God there be, who loves mercy, he would hurl the laughing
miscreants from the battlements of heaven, into the Tartarian lake, there to exchange the laugh of mockery for the yells of despair!

Tophet, like Gehenna, is somewhat of dubious signification. In certain passages of scripture it clearly implies the name of a place; and from what is said of it Is. 30, 33, many have supposed it to mean hell, or the abode of the damned. Indeed Dr. Campbell thought that in the latter age of Jewish history, the word Tophet, was exclusively used to denote the hell of the moderns. Of this opinion I was also, during the early part of my ministry.—But how great was my surprise when I first read Jer. 19, 14. "Then came Jeremiah from Tophet, whether the Lord had sent him to prophesy?" What said I, Jeremiah in hell! and sent there to prophesy! But on further inquiry, I found Tophet to be the name of a place in the valley of Hinnom, near the city of Jerusalem, 2 Kings 23, 10, Jer. 7, 31. The children of Juda built Tophet in the valley of Hinnom, for the express purpose of burning their infants to Moloch or Baal, when all the good feelings of their nature had become extinct, by the baneful influence of superstition; but the Jehovah of the Jews declares, the wicked thought never entered his heart to build a place for the burning of his offspring, see Jer. 7, 31, and 32, 35. Tophet was a great image erected to Moloch, hollow within, and prepared for the reception of those innocent victims, which were committed to the flames, as expiatory sacrifices to appease the wrath of this senseless god of consuming fire! O ye worshippers of gods, whose very bowels emit columns of liquid flames, and whose breath is a stream of brimstone, think of horrid Moloch. Consider also, if the worshippers of the apocalyptic beast, be not tormented as the Jews were, by the slavish dread of a terrific monster!

Jewish writers in general are of opinion, that Tophet received its name from Toph, a drum, because that instrument was used to drown the cries of those infants, that were sacrificed to Moloch; but Le Clerc objects to this etymology, because it does not appear that large drums were known to the ancients; and the sound of the less, called taber, used in dances, was not sufficiently loud; & for the large we are indebted to the Arabians, who first brought them into Spain. Though this objection does not seem very forcible, yet it is more reasonable to believe, that Tophet signifies a fire-stove, and that the large hollow image of Molech was so called; and probably that part of the valley of Hinnom, where the image stood, bore the same appellation. There is little pleasure in describing scenes of horror, but it may be useful to show us the evils of a false religion, and inspire us with grateful emotions for the enjoyment of the true. Be it known then, to the disgrace of the Jews, that although in possession of the knowledge of the one only true God,
like modern Christians, they were too much inclined to the worship of idols; and having consecrated the solar fire as a deity, they erected Tophet as an altar to one of those agents, which God employs for the benefit of the world. An idol of brass, having the head of an ox, but the body of a man, was made to represent the fiery god; and the idol seated on a throne of brass, a crown was placed on its head, and its hands extended to receive their gifts. But what gifts were deemed most acceptable? Ah! had the fruits of the field or herds of the stall sufficed, it would have been well, but cruel Moloch cried for blood; and nothing less than the tender pledges of conjugal love, could glut the rapacity of this wrathful deity! The hollow idol was heated to redness—the parent by a refinement of cruelty, in order to acquire the summit of sanctity, must become the priest—himself must place his darling in its arms! No bewitching smiles or mournful cries must drive him from his purpose. His heart must be steeled against every tender impression, and a most complete conquest obtained over the strongest feelings of humanity. Fortunately the shocking scene was of short duration. The sacred drums, impiously so called, drowned the cries; and whilst the bodies of the innocent children became the victims of a merciless superstition, their souls reorganized, were received to the embraces of a kind and merciful God!

To prevent the continuance of this horrid practice, Josiah defiled this valley by making it a common depot for the filth of the city and the bodies of those criminals which were refused the rites of burial. 2 Kings, 23. 10. This valley was also made the place of execution for all who were condemned to be stoned or burnt to death by the supreme court at Jerusalem, called the Sanhedrim. According to the Jewish law there were nineteen offences, which subjected the criminal to suffer death by stoning; and ten, which were punished by burning to death, in the fire of Gehenna. Many of those who were stoned to death, were also hanged, and their bodies left to be meat to the fowls of heaven or the beasts of the field. Gen. 40, 19, 2 Sam. 21, 9. Jer. 7, 33, and 19, 7. Burning was performed either by roasting in the fire Jer. 29, 22, or in a furnace Dan. 3, 23, or by pouring melted lead down their threats. Lightfoot, from the Talmuds, informs us, that this last punishment was performed in the following manner. "The criminal being made fast, a towel was put round his neck, and two men taking hold of the ends of the towel, one pulling one way, and the other the opposite, they forced him by strangling to open his mouth; then a third poured boiling lead down his throat and burnt his bowels."

Some have thought from the peculiar use of the valley, Gehenna became proverbial to express any great punishment, or afflictive dispensation; and might therefore be used by our Lord, to designate the torments of Hell in another word. In favor of this suppo-
sition, they refer to the Targum on Gen. 3. 24. and 15. 17. But the Targums were not composed till long after the Jews had mixed in captivity, with the Pagan nations and learned of them their fabulous ideas concerning the state of the Ghosts in Hades.*

Nothing can be more clear than what has been asserted by Le Clerc and Gibbon, that from the time the Jews received the Sinai dispensation of the Law, till the Babylonian captivity, the hopes as well as the fears of the Jewish nation, were confined within the narrow compass of the present life. But after the Jews were restored by Cyrus, and became divided into sects, the Pharisees received under the name of traditions; the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, with several other speculative tenets from the Philosophy or religion of the eastern nations. Gibbon's Rome, vol. 1. ch. 15. Plato, in Tim. et de Repub. uses such language as to manifest, that he and Socrates borrowed their ideas of future rewards and punishments from others; and Suidas informs us they borrowed them from the Egyptians. But notwithstanding all the influence of the Pythagorean and Platonic Philosophy, supported in this instance, by the combined interests of Priest-craft and King-craft, Cicero, a most consummate philosopher and statesman, who flourished about fifty years before Christ, declares, Tuscul. Quest. L. 1. S. 10. that the old fables of the Elysian fields and Pluto's kingdom, were grown ridiculous, and abandoned to the poets and painters! Moreover, it is extremely futile, to refer to Jewish Targums for support to a doctrine denounced by the Jewish scriptures. Had the Targums taught the doctrine alleged, though it were only as a Jewish tradition, surely we would much more reasonably expect to find it in the Mishna, which was the grand repository of all their traditions. Yet so far from supporting the doctrine, the quotations of Dr. A. Clarke on Mat. 12. 32, show that both the Babylonian and Jerusalem Gemara assert, unequivocally, that death wipes off all stains, even the sin of blasphemy!

We are perfectly in accordance with Dr. S. Clark, and Dr. Campbell, in saying that Gehenna is the only word, in the new Testament that signifies a place of punishment, but we deny that place of torment to have any longer an existence in the vast universe. In order to exhibit the sandy foundation on which these learned advocates of an invisible Gehenna, have built their chimerical palace for Pluto, I shall examine all the passages where the word Gehenna occurs in the new Testament, and offer to the candid reader a brief, yet satisfactory explanation. In reading the Greek Testa-

* This discourse on Sheol, Hades, Gehenna, and Tartarus, was delivered in the long room of the Mansion-House, Rochester, Oct. 19, 1823, and nearly printed before the author had the pleasure of seeing Mr. Bellour's excellent work; therefore no use could be made of it.
ment we meet with the word Gehenna just twelve times; and the following are all the passages in which it is found. Mat. 5, 22, 29, 30—10, 28—18, 9—23, 15, 33. Mark 9, 43, 45, 47. Luke 12, 5, and James 3, 6. In two of these Mat. 23, 15, and James 3, 6, the Drs. accede that the word must be understood figurative-ly. The other ten are devisible into three classes. The first class includes those passages where Christ cautions his disciples against the sin of apostacy, and refers to the mode of punishing such offencers among the Jews by burning them in Gehenna. This class includes Mat. 5, 29, 30—10, 28—18, 9. Mark 9, 43, 45, 47. Luke 12, 5. The second class includes only one passage, Mat. 5, 22 where he describes the danger of him, who preferred a charge of apostacy against another; and the third or last contains only one, also, namely Mat. 23, 33, where our Lord demands of the scribes and Pharisees, how such serpents as they, could escape the punishment of Gehenna. Hence the illustration of one passage will suffice for the whole, with all intelligent and candid persons.

In Mat. 5, 22, Jesus, in allusion to the punishment of crimes in the valley of Hinnom, speaks of the fire of Gehenna, which is very unwarrantably translated, hell-fire. In this passage, three offences are noticed, and three degrees of punishment proportionate to the crimes. 1. Anger and its consequences, for which an appeal might be made to the judgment, or less Sanhedrin, consisting of twenty-three Magistrates, whose power extended to many capital offences, and the infliction of punishment even by strangling or beheading. 2. Contempt, expressed by the opprobrious title of Raka or Shallowbrains; for which the offender might be arraigned before the Council or Grand Sanhedrin, which consisted of seventy-two Elders, whose business was to take cognizance of capital offences only, and especially those committed against religion; and to receive appeals from the lower council, for the Grand Sanhedrin alone had power to inflict the punishment of stoning or burning alive. 3. The third offence consisted in mortal hatred or enmity, expressed by the term, Moreh, or apostate. The crime of apostacy was generally punished by roasting or burning alive in Gehenna; and the force of our Lord's words will appear, more strikingly, when we reflect that every person, who accused another of apostacy, if he failed to prove the charge, suffered the punishment due by the law to the guilty, and was consequently burned instead of the accused. No wonder then, that our master should say, whosoever shall call his brother moreh or apostate, shall be in danger of the fire of Gehenna. We also hence see the propriety of the admonition in the 29th verse and collateral passages, to abandon every thing, though dear as a right hand or eye, rather than by apostacy expose the life to destruction, in the fire of Gehenna. The common translation of Mat. 5, 22, and the doctrine
generally deduced from it, are alike contemptible and ridiculous! What! our Lord sentence another to hell-fire, for an offence of which he himself was frequently guilty, see Mat. 23, 17, 19.—Luke 11, 40, and 24, 25. The word hell occurs twelve times in the New Testament, as the translation of Gehenna; but surely no honest man would have used the former word to express the idea of the latter. Hell means a concealed place; but Gehenna was the valley of Hinnom, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, well known to all the inhabitants of that city. There is, therefore, no affinity in the terms, nor in the ideas suggested by them; and accordingly the best versions retain the word Gehenna, wherever it occurs in the Greek.

Notwithstanding as Gehenna is called the place where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched, Mark 9, 43—49, some farther explanation may be necessary. From this passage it has been argued that "our Lord calls the fire, into which the wicked shall be cast, unquenchable; and speaks of Hell as a place where the worm dieth not; and that to show the perpetuity of the punishment of the wicked, he adds every one shall be salted with fire." But "this argument, says Newcome, is founded upon a false interpretation of the metaphors, which are here employed; and is altogether fallacious. Jesus only speaks of the wicked being cast into the valley of Hinnom, into the unquenchable fire, where the worm dieth not. Yet in the valley of Hinnom, the worm died when its food failed, and the pile, on which human sacrifices were burnt to Moloch, was often extinguished. Salt being a preservative of food, was among the Jews an emblem of virtue and knowledge, by which the mind is purified Col. 4, 6." God says of the fire on the levitical altar, it shall never go out. Lev. 6. 13. That he would kindle a fire in the gates of Jerusalem that shall never be quenched. Jer. 17, 27. Ez. 20, 47, 48. The smoke of Idumea was to go up forever and its fire not to be quenched. Is. 34. 10. Yet these fires have all ceased to burn many hundreds of years ago—

There were many circumstances which caused the valley of Hinnom to obtain the title of a place "where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." In Gehenna, 185,000 of the army of Senacherib fell by a fiery pestilential disease, and thereby the prophecy Is. 30, 33, was almost literally fulfilled. For this king of Assyria, Tophet was ordained and the breath of the Lord like a stream of brimstone enkindled the fire for the destruction of his army. At the time Jerusalem was taken by the Babylonians, thousands of slaughtered Jews were thrown in heaps in this valley, according to Jer. 7, 33, and 19, 7. It was the place of public execution for criminals and a common depot for not only all bodies refused the rites of burial, but also for all manner of pollution. To prevent noxious vapour from proving injurious to the health of the city, a
fire was kept continually burning to consume the bones, decayed bodies of the slain, hanged, gibbited, and the common filth of the city, which being largely supplied, caused the fire to obtain the epithet, unquenchable. Dead bodies exposed to the influence of the atmospheric air, soon became putrid and clothen with worms; hence the valley received the name of the place where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched, Is. 64, 24, Mark. 9, 44. But how wild is it to suppose the existence of a place like Gehenna, in another world? Can fire and worms subsist together? Can worms eat spirits and fire burn incorruptible bodies? No! Let man be immortal and all the fires of a thousand Hells shall be unable to injure him!

TARTARUS.

Though some might consider an explanation of this term essential in a discourse of this nature, yet we deem it almost entirely unnecessary, because the word never occurs in any part of scripture universally acknowledged by christians. The second Epistle of Peter especially the second chapter has been disputed in all ages; and the probability is, that if Genuine, the apostle, without approving the fanciful notions of the Heathen, might cite a commonly received opinion, & argue from acknowledged principles. When we treated of Hades, we there observed that Tartarus was supposed to be the lowest and darkest department of that subterraneous region. From what is said 2 Peter 2, 4, 17. and Jude 13, Dr. Campbell, Ewing and others, suppose Tartarus to be the dungeon or prison-house of Hades, where the ghosts are reserved in chains or solitary confinement, might we not ask these sages how spirits disembodied can be chained or what doors or walls can confine immaterial beings? But poor orthodoxy must avoid interrogation as well as definition. It seems then that whilst Hades was esteemed a kind of Debtors' prison, Tartarus was regarded as the solitary cells of criminals.—But tho' superstition's fancy paint her gloomy scenes in different shades, still Hades and Tartarus were considered as one and the same and never were, nor are they yet, believed, by the learned, to be the abode of final wretchedness. To this opinion Dr. Campbell fully agrees and the best Lexicographers define the words accordingly. Tartarus says Phavorinus is "aer hypogaiois kai anemos," subterranean air, where the sun shines not;" and Stephanus defines Hades "hypo gavais topos skoteinos, a dark place under the earth."

We have now finished our investigation concerning the import of the Hebrew and Greek terms translated Hell, in the common English version, and venture to conclude, that not a word in all the Greek and Hebrew scriptures, signifies a place of punishment for the wicked after death. On table, on pagan table alone, have orthodox divines built the antichristian dogma of Hell-torments.
Lecture IX.

HELL DESTROYED.

1 Corinthians xv. 55. O Hell, where is Victory.

Brethren, You have heard of the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men, and have been induced to admit that such a dispensation merited the title of Evangelion, good news. But when this grace of God displays its glories by triumphing over sin, death, and hell—you are constrained to exclaim with Paul, it is the glorious gospel of the blessed God. Herein you behold it unbosom the eternal and unchangeable love of God towards mankind, by forming them in goodness, directing them in wisdom, glorifying them in power, and performing all things, for the exaltation of his own glory, and the eternal beatification of all his intelligent offspring. I know not with what feelings you have assembled this evening—whether you are disposed to hear what God the Lord will say, or determined to hold the vulgar opinions for the sake of popularity: O my God, save me from being a dissembler, a sycophant and bigot. Let me die an independent man, that my death may be glorious; but may I never live an hour in sinful conformity, alike detested by God and honest men. The reading which I have adopted is supported by the Greek text, the best translators and commentators of ancient and modern times, and is the reading found in the margin of many of your bibles. The word Hades, which occurs eleven times in the New Testament, is rendered hell in all except in my text where it is translated grave. In this the crafty translators, whose heads and creeds were equally full of hell and damnation, betrayed their attachment to the pious frauds of antiquity, and their disposition to save from ruin their favorite system. They perceived if the word Hades should be translated hell, in the text, the doctrine built on this supposititious foundation would come to naught. Hell having lost its victory, and death its sting, universal salvation must follow; and the Pagan doctrine of hell torments, which had been introduced into the Christian system, be forever neglected. Beholding the inevitable catastrophe which would befall the whole system, rather than admit, the good news would extend to all, they exposed themselves to the charge of corrupting the word of God!

Awtful as the terms, death and hell, may sound in your ears, my text unfolds the grace which will triumph over sin. It is an abyss which will swallow up death in victory; it is a key which shall unlock the gates of Hades, and let the prisoners go free. Death being the wages of sin, followed it as a consequence; but sin being destroyed, hell, death, and the grave must cease to devour.
Hell Destroyed.

Friends, I undertake to disprove the wicked doctrine of hell torments. If I succeed we shall rejoice together that men are now delivered from that which held them, all their lifetime, in bondage through fear of death. I shall achieve for you a more glorious liberty than that of which a Washington could boast, and introduce a new epoch in history, more important than ever has yet been commemorated by the offspring of Adam. Great God, favor my efforts!

The doctrine of Hell torments is drawn from false premises; these are 1. sin is infinite and eternal, 2. the eternal purpose and pleasure of the Deity is, that men continue to insult his character and government, that he may have the honor and satisfaction of damping them to new and untried scenes of fortune, during his own lifetime. The absurd doctrine of infinite sin depends on two others equally absurd and monstrous, namely, there shall be an eternal law of prohibition, and an eternal propensity or liability to sin, therefore an eternal hell. An everlasting hell was built by Paganizing Christians on the supposition that sin is infinite, which they supposed to be the violation of an infinite law, whose penalty was eternal damnation. Now if sin be infinite, it must be so either in the parts, or in the aggregate; if not in the parts, it cannot be in the whole, for infinity can never be shown to consist of parts. If thus, one sin be infinite, and infinity cannot be augmented, then all the sin, committed since Adam, amounts to just nothing; for his sin being infinite, could not be augmented; and therefore, joy to a world of sinners! they have nothing to fear. Moreover if infinite sin merits infinite punishment, then one sinner deserves all the punishment of an eternal hell—and God himself cannot prepare more than infinite punishment; consequently there never could be more than one sinner, nor more than one sufferer in the universe. It would be absurd to suppose that God ever gave such a law—there is no intimation of it in the bible; infinite sin is nonsense, and infinite punishment is equally ridiculous. Now if such be the law, purpose and disposition of the Deity, no man but a mean, ignorant hypocrite, would say he deserves better treatment than the insults of the wicked or the curses of the damned!! But I shall plead, on behalf of the God and Father of my master, Christ Jesus, not guilty, and endeavor to remove the reproach from his character by demonstrating the falsity of the charge from the evidences of almighty power and love derived from the voice of reason and the testimony of Revelation.

In all the descriptions of the divine law given in the sacred oracles, it is uniformly represented as a rule of life, and all its promises and threatenings are commensurate with the present imperfect state of existence. The law was not made for a perfect man; but for the lawless and disobedient; and there is no intimation in the bible of disobedience ever having entered the world of spirits. All moral evil or imperfection, is confined to the carnal and terrestrial
instance and can never pass the gates of death. The whole testimony of God on this subject, is summarily expressed by Paul in one brief sentence, “HE THAT IS DEAD IS FREE FROM SIN,” Rom. 6, 7. The supposition of man’s liability to sin in another mode of existence is not only irrational and antisciptural, but also repugnant to the moral change, which all human beings experience in death and the Resurrection; and the wicked thought that God’s pleasure is the destruction of his creatures, is denounced by the oath of Jehovah and the mission of Jesus, Ez. 33, 11. 1 Tim. 2, 4. John, 3, 17. and 1 John 4. 14.

If all sin originate in the earthly or sensual body, will not the dissolution of this earthly body terminate the reign of sin? Again, if the condemnation due to sin be protracted one year after sin has ceased, what assurance have we that condemnation will ever be removed? May not the same disposition in Deity that leads him to punish sin one year after it cease, induce him to punish it eternally? If man be freed from temptation or liability to sin, at death, ought any thing less than actual experience or the plain testimony of God, induce us to admit, that man can suffer after death? These questions are designed for the consideration of those who believe in purgatorial or disciplinary pains after death, as well as for the awakening of those who dream of everlasting Torments.

An endless hell is useless, even according to the opinions of its advocates. They affirm, men will ever be atoning for their sin, but never succeed to expiate even the least crime they may have committed. Hence the punishment of hell must be inflicted to gratify a malignant and revengeful passion in the deity. Sure nothing less than pure malevolence could inflict pain for no other purpose than the gratification of incensed wrath. If the torments of hell could answer any good purpose, we could admit them; but they are neither for example nor correction, consequently, they are the offspring of free unmerited malevolence! Who can address a prayer to Jehovah, and call him father believing that he prepared hell for man, whom, unasked, he had thrown into existence, knowing that he would terminate his course in the terrific regions of despair. O Calvinists, what thing ye of your God, who begets children, makes a fire for them, and burns them to death. Nay, that is nothing; he immortalizes their existence to please himself with their contortions! O Arminian, what better is your God, who makes man, prepares the fire, clears the way, and sits calm and composed whilst he beholds his creatures going into the fire, and forever writhing in the liquid flames!!

Some of my auditors, who revolt with horror from the doctrine of an endless hell, are still inclined to approve the doctrine of Purgatory. This dogma originated as far as we can ascertain, with the Platonic philosophy. He taught that there is in matter a certain re-
fractory force, which resists the will of the great Artificer. Out of
the soul of the universe, which had itself become contaminated by
material mixture, God formed inferior souls, numerous as the stars,
and sent them down to the earth to be imprisoned in bodies. But
the soul being immortal, by disengaging itself from animal passions
and rising to the contemplation of a world of intelligences, might
regain its original habitation. Matter can never suffer annihilation;
the world therefore, shall be forever; and by the action of the ani-
mating principle, it accomplishes certain periods in which every
thing returns to its ancient place or state. See Enfield’s history of
Philosophy.

The Platonic and Pythagorean doctrines had been admitted into
the traditions of the Pharisees before the time of Christ—John ix. 2.
Their ideas of punishment were Platonic, and those of a resurrec-
tion Pythagorean. Josephus tells us that in the region of Hades,
angels are appointed as guardians of the souls, who distribute tem-
porary punishments unto them, agreeably to every one’s behavior and
manner. Virgil causes Anchises to teach this doctrine to Aeneas.*

* "Sulpicia expendunt, aliae panduntur imanes
Suspense ad ventos: alis sub surgite vasto
Infestum elitur sectus, aut excutit ignis
Quisque suas patimur manes, Exunde per ampliun
Mittimus Elysium."—Aeneid, 6, 740.

For sin are various penances enjoined,
And some are hung to bleach upon the wind,
Some plunged in waters, others purged in fires,
Till all the drugs are drained, and all the rust expires.
The souls thus cleansed, to blest abodes repair,
And breathe in ample fields, the soft Elysian air.

In these lines Virgil describes the threefold means of remov-
ing the pollution of the sinner; First, by the winds; second, by wa-
ter; and third by fire. That after they had undergone purification
they were introduced into the fields of the blessed. Origen adopted
the Platonic doctrine and enlarged on it, and hence it became the
prevailing sentiment among the christians of the third century.

The description of the infernal regions had been abandoned to
the fancy of painters and poets, who peopled them with so many
phantoms and monsters, who dispensed their rewards and punish-
ments with so little equity, that a doctrine, the most congenial to
the human heart, was disgraced by the absurd mixture of the wild-
est fictions. The doctrine of a future state was not held in repute
by the polytheists of Greece and Rome. They believed the provid-
dence of the Gods to be visibly displayed on the theatre of the pres-
ent world; therefore they neither feared nor expected a future state
of existence.
The doctrine is inferred from the abuse of the terms, Hell and damnation. We have shown that the word Hell, in its modern signification, is totally abjured by the spirit of prophecy and the testimony of Jesus; and consequently it is a violation and corruption of divine truth, to place such a word in the Bible. We shall now show that it is equally abusive to intrude the word damnation on the sacred records of life and immortality. From Krino, to distinguish or judge, is derived Krites, a judge or critic, Krisis, a distinguishing, a judging, or determining; and Krima, a decision or sentence. But if Krisis or Krima mean damnation, then Krino, must mean to damn, all judging must be damning, and every judge, a damned person! Let us however admit the reading of Matt. 23, 33, and John 5, 29. “damnation of Gehenna,”—Resurrection of damnation.” and then let us translate accordingly the following passages, where the same word, Krisis, occurs. John 5, 22, the Father hath committed all damnation to the Son. Ver. 27, given him authority to execute damnation—Verse 30, my damnation is just—John 16, 7—11, the comforter will reprove the world concerning damnation—concerning damnation, because the prince of this world is damned. Jude 14, the Lord cometh to execute damnation on all! Again, we shall take the word Krima, and translate it damnation. John 9, 39, for damnation I am come into the world—1 Peter 4, 17. Damnation must begin at the house of God! Lastly let us take the word damn. Mark 16, 16, he that believeth not shall be damned. John 8, 10, 11, he that hath no man damned thee—neither do I damn thee—Matt. 12, 41, 42, the men of Nineveh shall rise and damn this generation—the Queen of the south shall damn it. In these passages the Greek word is Katakrino, but the simple verb Krino is also rendered to damn by our translators, 2 Thes. 2, 12. God shall send them delusion, that they all may be damned. Now we shall use the same liberty in a few instances. John 5, 22, the Father damneth no man—3, 17, the Father sent not the Son to damn the world. John 12, 47, If any man hear my words and believe not, I damn him not; for I came not to damn the world, but to save the world. But some may be disposed to exclaim, stop, you abuse the scriptures! Nay rather I would show you how you have abused them, by putting into them, the pagan & diabolical terms, Hell and damnation—I therefore conclude that there is no word, in the original scriptures, that can, with even a shadow of propriety, be used to signify the punishment of Hell, which is what is generally meant by damnation.

The doctrine of future rewards and punishments, was built on the supposition of the immortality of the soul; a doctrine as fanciful as any of which the reveries of imagination can boast. All the phenomena from birth to death, are repugnant to the immateriality and immortality of the human soul; and compel us to admit with Lucretius, that all experience demonstrates, that the human mind grows and
decays with the body.* God has given us reason to distinguish, and senses to perceive and reflect; but this very reason shows the absurdity of embracing an opinion of spirit, which none of these senses will support. This doctrine was invented in Egypt, the mother of superstition, and brought by Orpheus to Greece. Thence it passed to the Romans; and being so admirably adapted to flatter human pride, Indians, Scythians, Gauls, Germans and Americans, eagerly received the dogma. The hypothesis of future punishment served two important purposes; first as a reply to the Atheists, who objected to the unequal distribution of good and evil in the present state; secondly, to restrain the manners of men, through the fear of being miserable in another world. Legislators believing the doctrine to act as a powerful charm, used their utmost exertions to give it publicity and influence. Hence Polybius blames the great men of his time for teaching the common people to despise the fables of the poets, and represents them as useful fictions. This doctrine was received by the Pharisees under the reign of the Asmonean princes, as well as several other articles from the philosophy of the eastern nations, such as fate, predestination, angels and spirits. See Gibbon's Rome, vol. i. chap. 15.

Though the philosophers sometimes pretend to countenance the dogma of future punishment, yet they taught that death would terminate all our sufferings; and in order to reconcile the minds of men to bodily dissolution, they affirmed death would either be an utter extinction of being or a change for the better, for with one voice they all rejected every kind of future punishment. Pythagoras taught that all souls were a portion of the great soul of the universe, and discarded the notion of future punishment, as a vain terror.—Plato sometimes favors the representations of the poets, at other times despises them, as conveying too frightful ideas of futurity.—Cicero not only disavows, but even ridicules the doctrine of future punishment, and represents it to be opinion of the philosophers, that the gods are never angry, and therefore incapable of hurting any person whatever.

Josephus appears to have had clear ideas of the origin of the doctrine, for describing the religion of the Essens, he says, “they had the same notion as the Greeks, who allowed the islands of the blessed to their brave men, and the regions of the ungodly in hades to the wicked, who, as their fables relate, are punished there. Hence their dehortations from vice, and exhortations to virtue, whereby the good are bettered by the hope of reward after death, and the vicious restrained by fear of torment. These doctrines lay an unavoidable bait for such as have once had a taste of their philosophy.”

As our Lord delivered some of his discourses in the vicinity of

*Quoque pariter cum corpore et una crescere sentimus, pariterque senescere mentem.
Gehenna, a reference is made to that valley three times in the gospel history. But will any one pretend that the Jews believed, there would be a place in another world like Gehenna, in the neighborhood of their city? Did our Lord ever inform his hearers that after death men would be put into a place like Gehenna? Answer these questions in the affirmative, and show the proofs, or forever abandon the wicked dogma. To what part of the universe can we look for the modern hell, whose elements are fire and flame, the abode of creatures totally abandoned of God; where infinite wrath perpetually abides; where nothing can be felt but inexpressible torments—nor heard but incessant groans and curses to all eternity? O ye Pagan fabulists and worshippers of Moloch, give to your gods the glory due to their deeds; but do not blaspheme our God also! In vain do paganizing Christians tell us of bible hells and evangelical torments. If there were not a single sentence, in all the bible, on behalf of salvation, but that psalm, 145. 9, "his tender mercies are over all his works," it alone would suffice to water out all the hells of the universe!

Punishment in another state of being was never threatened, by God, as the penalty of any law which he ever gave to mankind—therefore it cannot be inflicted. Deity cannot inflict a punishment for the breach of a law, which has never been promulgated; nor for the violation of a law, to which man was incapable of yielding obedience. Now where, in the volume of revelation, has God published a law, the penalty of which is damnation, in a future mode of existence? Our eagle-eyed, evangelical preachers, have discovered this heavy threatening in the phrase "Thou shalt die!" If so, then why are they not afraid, for the threatening is unconditional? If to die, means to die spiritually and eternally, then all who die must undergo the penalty; and be forever abandoned of God to the regions of despair, where all the guilty ghosts of Adam's race must forever shriek and howl,

Beneath the weight of heavy chains,
Tormenting racks and fiery coals;
And darts to inflict immortal pains,
Dipt in the blood of damned souls!!!

Had the heathen poet heard these heralds of damnation, proclaim the coruscations of divine wrath, he would doubtlessly have cried out

Tantæ animis æstibus iræ?—Æn. I. 11.

Can heavenly minds such dire resentment show,
Or exercise their spite in human woe?

Surely these advocates of endless misery, must be unbelievers themselves, otherwise they would fear to add to the revelation of heaven, lest God should add to them the plagues written in his book.
Hell Destroyed.

But perhaps they are of the same mind with their pious ancestors, that God will never bring men to account for pious frauds or useful corruptions of the sacred text! O for the day when every man will speak the truth to his neighbor, and the priest's lips keep knowledge, that the people may learn the law from his mouth!

In the annals of history, we read not of a more unprovoked hatred, and a more base crime than that of Cain. Abel had brought his offering to the altar of the most high God, and presented it with effusions of gratitude to the sovereign of heaven, and love to all his creatures. His sacrifice was accepted; Cain's heart boils with indignation—the venom of his spleen had almost destroyed him; nothing can glut his vengeance, till he dyes his hands in brother's blood!—Surely the thunders of Almighty will not sleep, nor his lightnings cease to play, till the wretch be hurled into the hottest of Tartarean flames. Yet strange to relate, the Gracious God of heaven only threatens him with temporal banishment from the society of his brethren or father's family. O Cain, had you lived in the days of orthodoxy, they would have told you such news as would have harrowed up your spirits; for to all the temporary pains threatened by God, they add eternal misery in the lake, that burns with fire and brimstone!

When God gave the law on Sinai, amidst thunders, lightnings, tempests, and smoke, we might have naturally expected, that if he ever intended to denounce damnation fire would have proceeded from fire, and smoke from smoke! But will any man be so wild or fanatical as to assert, that the Jewish law contained any such threatening as eternal misery? No Jehovah, previous to the Babylonean captivity ever imagined that God would punish him, in another world for sins committed against the Mosaic institution. The heaviest penalty ever threatened in the Jewish law, was the loss of life, or the dispersion of that nation. Shall it be pretended that God concealed the pains of hell, till the sinner was snared and taken, and then inflicted the never ending torments of a merciless burning fire? God forbid, that I should so blaspheme my Creator's character and government.

Can it be admitted that the glorious gospel of the blessed God contains those dreadful denunciations, unknown to the Mosaic dispensation. Surely not. Jesus is the mediator of a better covenant, founded on better promises. The law is called the ministration of death, and the gospel the ministration of life; can then the ministration of life, unfold the horrors of an eternal death, unknown to that very dispensation, which was emphatically denounced the ministration of death?

Reviewing on this part of our subject, what is called Evangelical preaching, we may apply to modern preachers, the language of God by the prophet Jeremiah; Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard; they have made my pleasant portion a wilderness. Chap. 12, 10. They think to cause my people to forget my name by their
dreams. Behold I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that use their tongues, and say he saith. Jer. 23, 27—31. Often have I challenged these dreamers to produce a single passage from the sacred scriptures, wherein God had threatened man with punishment after death; but though my request has frequently caused the little divines to rage, yet it always proved a sovereign anodyne to all my philosophical and literary opponents. Indeed I have fully come to this conclusion, which I deem perfectly correct, that were it not for ignorance, fanaticism, and the love of gain, there could not be found a single advocate of hell torments!

The law killeth, but the gospel or spirit of life quickeneth. Like the good God from whom it sprang, it is a fountain of living waters whose streams magnificently flow in glorious abundance, producing life & purity throughout the vast empire of the universe. The excellence of the new covenant & its superiority will appear by considering that all its promises are absolute and unconditional; and therefore incapable of mutation. From the first proclamation of the gospel, all the blessings of it were pronounced to be free grace, flowing from an impartial God, and therefore for the whole family of the great universal Parent.

When Jehovah said to Adam, “the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head?” when he promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, that in their seed, i.e. Christ, “all the families of the earth shall be blessed,” were not these promises unconditional? Is the law, says Paul, against these promises of God. Gal. iii, 17, 21.—God forbid! The law which was 430 years, cannot disannul the covenant of God in Christ, that it should make the promises of none effect. Micah, addressing the great God, says, “Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn to our fathers from the days of old.” Micah, vii, 20. Jehovah never can change, therefore his truth and covenant shall endure for ever. Men may err, through ignorance, from the right way, and God may chasten them with rods, yet will he never make void his covenant, nor change that which he has spoken, but his faithfulness will remain to all generations.—Ps. lxxxix, 30, 35. I will make a new covenant saith the Lord, not according to the covenant I made with Israel when I brought them out of Egypt: I will print my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people; they shall all know me from the least to the greatest, for I will remember their sins no more.—Jer. xxxii, 31, 35. Heb. viii, 8, 13. God’s record concerning his Son, is that we, the whole offsprings of Adam, have eternal life in him. The unbeliever attempts to make God a liar, by not believing God’s report; notwithstanding, the unbelief of man can never make the word of God of none effect. The gift of God, which comes to all men, is eternal life; and when Jesus
our life shall appear, we shall be like him; for he will change our vile bodies into his glorious image, and so we shall be ever with the Lord.—1 John iii. 2. Phil. iii. 21.

Punishment in the future world is inconsistent with the justice of God, and the changes to which the human body is subjected. Such are the laws of animal economy, and the transmigration of matter, that pain must immediately follow the vicious act as its consequent, or otherwise it cannot with propriety be inflicted. Through the influx and deflux of particles, the human body is perpetually changing, and must entirely change every five or six years; therefore God has ordained that the righteous are recompensed in the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked; they have no rest day nor night, but are continually tormented. In a word, the wicked are turned into hell, i.e. trouble, fear, and pain, from the day they assume the character, till they cease to be wicked—then, and not till then, shall they enter into rest. O the riches both of the goodness and wisdom of God.

Some may ask shall not the wicked be put into hell after death? Is not this the meaning of the psalmist, Ps. ix. 17. I answer no; the Pagan hell was after death, but the biblical hell is in this state of being. Poor mistaken man, no longer dream that thou canst sin willfully, and yet escape the just chastisement of the Lord. His hand will find thee out. His eyes run to and fro through the earth, beholding the righteous and the wicked, and men will distinguish; they must see, if guided by truth and light, that God maketh a difference between him that serveth the Lord and him who serveth him not. Mal. iii. 15.

In this body dwell those propensities which induce man to sin.—Bodily appetites and passions entice the man. Sin and suffering follow unlawful indulgence. In the self same body in which man offends, in it he shall undergo the reward of his folly, and there is no respect of persons.

The doctrine of the resurrection prohibits the doctrine of future misery. Many have supposed that God will raise the dead in similar circumstances to those in which they departed this life, but the supposition is heathenish and anti-scriptural. Paul treats largely of the resurrection, but never intimates that any should have reason to dread, the consequences. He affirms, that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. Death was the wages of sin; it followed as a consequent, but grace reigning through Jesus, the common Lord and redeemer of man, abounds to the obliteration of guilt, and the introduction of everlasting righteousness; abolishes sin and its consequences, disease and death; brings immortality to light, and passes upon all men for justification of life, which the Son of God imparts to every man without exception. In the history of the res-
uraction Paul does not contemplate moral character, nor distinguish parties. Therefore, he adopts the human body, as the subject concerning which he predicates all he says, concerning a future state of being. This body is committed to the earth in dishonor, it is raised in glory; in weakness, but raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body; it is sown in corruption, but raised incorruptible; a mortal body, but raised immortal. All must be changed. Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. As we have borne the image of the earthly, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly. Our first state of being has been earthly, carnal sensual, fleshly, corrupt and mortal; but our second mode of being, shall be heavenly, spiritual, intellectual, incorruptible, and immortal. O glorious state of unchangeable, unmixed felicity. When shall we enter into it and see the joys of our Lord! Rejoice, believers. Rejoice in the Lord, his beloved disciple informs you, when Jesus appears, you shall be like him, i.e. he shall change your vile body, and fashion it like to his glorious body, by that power by which he is able to subdue all things to himself—Phil. iii. 21. Jesus, the faithful and the true witness, testifies, that in the resurrection, men shall be as the angels of God! Luke 20 36. Blessed Saviour, never did the base notions of the resurrection proclaimed by pretended orthodoxy, enter thy mind; nor were they known to thine apostles. On the contrary, they proclaim glory, honor, and immortality to every soul of man, every son and daughter of Adam without distinction, as God's free gift to the whole human race.

No rational man could ever have indulged in opposite sentiments, had not his mind been abused by superstition and dishonorable views of God. There could be no proportion between the finite feeble acts of men, and interminable pain or bliss—for the evil or good which man may perform in this life, is abundantly recompensed. The future state of existence is entirely of free, sovereign, and unmerited favor; and as God is impartial, he bestows it on all his intelligent offspring indiscriminately. In this appears the character and conduct of a truly benevolent father; he was able to impart blessings and happiness to all his offspring, he showed his impartiality and wisdom in doing so. The Diatheke, testament, or will which he made, bequeathed eternal felicity and immortal happiness to all the legatees; and his wisdom and power provided the means, as Omniscience saw necessary, to place every one in full possession of the inheritance.—Oh how inexpressibly better are the promises of the new covenant, than those of the old. These were conditional and temporal, but eternal and universal honor to the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth; the promises of the new and well ordered covenant are absolute and eternal. The crown is incorruptible, and fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us. All the men in earth, or devils in hell, if such beings and place exist, could never touch that
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crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge will give in the day of the resurrection and restitution. Gospel hearers, the heavens must retain Jesus till the time of the restitution of all things, but the apostle tells you that he expected the Lord Jesus from heaven to change our vile bodies and make them like his glorious body. The change and restitution are the same. At that happy period, foretold by the prophet,

*His own soft hand shall wipe the tears From every weeping eye. And pains, and groans, and griefs, and fears, And death itself shall die.*

Brethren, I have finished my discourse against the unmerciful doctrine of Hell. In this and the two foregoing Lectures, I have labored to disabuse mankind, and release them from the yoke of superstition and Priestcraft. Now, celestial light irradiates your minds, and enables you to behold the liberty of Christ and his Gospel. Be no longer slaves but the Lord's freemen. O may your grateful hearts acclaim the high praises of your God; and every action of your lives, evince the triumphs of Redeeming Love, Amen.

†† Error. The text should have read, O hell, where is thy Victory!
As false and corrupt notions in religion, as well as immorality of conduct, spring from improper conceptions of the Deity and his attributes, I will endeavor to establish such sentiments as may, by the assistance of Revelation, deliver us from these evils. And at the same time demonstrate that Jesus, the Christ, cannot be the supreme God of the universe.

1. As nature and all its phenomena suppose the existence and superintendency of an omniscient and omnipotent cause, it follows that the first cause must be self-existent, and all his attributes unoriginated and necessarily what they are; for a being cannot produce its own attributes, and contingency implies a modifying cause. Now as the proper notion of self or necessary existence is the idea of a being, the supposition of whose nonentity would be an express contradiction, Christ cannot be that self-existent being—for the supposition of his non-existence implies no contradiction whatever; seeing it is agreed by all that the Father is the first cause of all things, and capable of doing whatever is necessary to be done. Neither can he be the self-existent God, for his attributes and life were derived from God, and dependant on him. He never pretended to be either almighty or omniscient, but confessed he was ignorant of some things, and that of himself he could do nothing. The whole history of his life and doctrines depose against his Deity, and raise our thoughts to the one Jehovah, whom he acknowledged as his Father and God.

2. The attributes of the Deity must be infinite, and he must exist every where, in the same manner he exists any where. The contrary supposition would imply a secondary cause, modifying the first, or that God is limited, and capable of improvement. Christ cannot, therefore, be the self-existent God: for the universal scriptures declare that he was limited, being confined to a place; and increased in wisdom and stature. He confessed his dependance on his Father for existence power, wisdom, and doctrines; his commandment he received and obeyed; him he adored, as his
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God, who give him that high commission, which he so honourably discharged; to whom he was accountable for his conduct, and who so liberally rewarded his fidelity, by giving him glory and honour, and exalting him to be Lord, Prince, Saviour, and Judge of men. As the Scriptures nowhere testify that his person consisted of two natures, which indeed would have been impossible, whatever is predicated of his person, must be true of the whole person and nature of Christ. But the Scriptures declare that he was weary and fainted—therefore not Jehovah, who is neither hungry nor faint. That he came from one place and went to another—therefore not Jehovah, who fills heaven and earth with his presence. That he knew not the day of judgment—therefore not omniscient. That not he but the Father performed the miracles which were wrought—therefore not omnipotent. That he did not his own will—therefore subordinate and dependant. That, in all things, he was made like other men—therefore a man, differing only from other men by the high commission he held, the qualifications God bestowed on him, and the honors which the Deity conferred on him for his fidelity, that all men might likewise have hope in God.

3. The Deity must be simple and uncompounded; identically the same every where; without parts, for these must be distinct, and either unintelligent or an infinity of deities.

This proposition is completely opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity; for God, being without parts, cannot be three, but if he can be three, there is no reason why there should not be thirty thousand, agreeably to the catalogue of Grecian mythology. If God be uncompounded, he cannot be composed of Father, Son, and Spirit. But some will say, we only intend three names for the self-same substance. Then I will say, all the sons of Adam may be considered only one person, with myriads of names; for undoubtedly, they have all one nature. If this reasoning be correct, then all Trinities, co-essentialities, co-equalities, modalities, eternal generations, processions, incarnations, and hypostatical unions, are terms fitter for conjurers than Christians. As by the system of the Trinity, it is affirmed, that there are three persons, each perfect in himself and each truly God, and yet that these three are but one perfect God; is this not tantamount to affirming, that there are three, and not three; or, plainly, that three and one are the same thing? Do not such assertions present to the mind of every man a self evident contradiction?

4. There cannot be, in the universe, more than one self-existent being. For if there be a second, he must possess the same attributes, and to the same extent, as the first; and consequently, both must be eternally and necessarily the same, every where alike present, without any possible difference or distinction, and therefore one and the same. Two such beings cannot subsist; and the sup-
position of a second, is only a mere repetition of the being and attributes of the first.

It has long been admitted as an axiom in philosophy, not to admit more causes than are necessary. But all admit, that God, the Father, is cause sufficient for nature and all its appearance. Is it then, not antiphilosophical, to admit the Son and the Spirit to the claim of being first causes, in the government or formation of the world.

It is entirely surprising, that men should plead for the Deity of Jesus, seeing nothing like divine honours were ever claimed by him; nor did he ever pretend to the attributes of the one Jehovah. Moreover, it would be absurd and blasphemous, to say of God what Christ says of himself. He acknowledges his Father’s superiority; confesses his own ignorance of the day of Judgment; that the chief seats in the kingdom of heaven were not at his disposal, but the sole property of his God and Father. He promises, to his disciples, that he would pray the Father, to send the Spirit to be their Comforter; which plainly implies, Christ had not the gifts of the Spirit, till he obtained them by prayer. He declares, he came from God, and would return to him. But it would be absurd to say, he came from himself, and would return to himself. He informs the Jews, that “Whither he went, they could not come.” But had he been God, he must have been present wherever the Jews could be. He also, forewarns his disciples, that he would leave them, and go to the Father. Could such language apply to Jehovah, who fills immensity of space with his presence, whose very nature is as widely diffused as the extent of infinite space, and can no more be condensed or limited, than infinite space can be reduced to a point.

The infinite God may communicate more power and wisdom to one man than to another; but he cannot be confined to one place, to the exclusion of another; nor is it possible, that the nature of the infinite Jehovah, can be localized, or inhabit one place more than any other. “Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord. What house can you build me, or where is my place of rest?”

The Sabellian and indwelling schemes, are, therefore, founded in ignorance of the Divine nature, and easily overthrown. For the infinite God, could no more dwell in the body of Jesus, than in that of Paul, or any other man. But if it be said, the Deity of Jesus was infinitely diffused, and omnipresent, then it follows, that Jesus could no more be God, than John, James, Joseph, or any other man. For the Deity is equally present to all, in all, and through all; and consequently, if Jesus be God, then every man in the world is equally God; for, undoubtedly, God is equally present through them all. How weak then, must be the argument, which assumes the Deity of Christ, from the affirmation, that God was in Christ? As well might we infer, that all men are God or gods, for the Scriptures assure us, that God is in them all.
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But, methinks, I hear one cry stop, heretic, you blaspheme the Saviour, and I will not attend to your carnal reasonings! Nay, rather stop thou that judgest; lest thou also be condemned. "When Socrates proclaimed the Unity of God, he was accused of impiety, and forced to drink the lethal, potion. When the renowned Galileo asserted, that the sun and whole firmament of heaven, are not whirled round this earth in four and twenty hours, but that our globe effects this wonderful appearance, by a simple process round its axis, he was prosecuted and imprisoned, for differing in opinion with the Franciscan monks! When our Saviour bestowed the blessings of his simple and heavenly doctrines on mankind, he was accused of sedition and blasphemy; he was reviled and persecuted even unto death! So, when Unitarians maintain, that the Gospel of our Lord is simple and beautiful; that it teaches nothing in direct opposition to the evident principles of our understandings; that the broad meaning of Scripture is plain and intelligible; and that instead of its being opposed to reason, it is upheld and insured, by its unconstrained support; they are stigmatized as blasphemers and infidels! But I venture to affirm, their doctrine is a tide in the affairs of men, the progress of which, no bigotry, malevolence, or persecution, can arrest. Like the doctrines of our Saviour, in early days; or the philosophy of Galileo, in later times, it will rise triumphant; and time, as it steals along, gradually disclosing the radiant forms of truth, will leave to succeeding ages nothing but un-speakable amazement, that any reasonable creatures could have thought and acted as Trinitarian Christians have done."

Polytheism was the disgrace of human intellect, and the most daring crime of which man has ever been guilty. It lay at the very fountain-head of all that perversity of character and abuse of reason and religion, which has prevailed in the world. When men forgot their Maker and became darkened in their minds, pride and ignorance inducted them to vilify the character of the Deity; humanize God and deify men. This awfully took place, in the Christian world, during the decline of literature and reign of superstition. The meek and lowly Jesus was, contrary to his own doctrine and desire, deified by his weak followers, and the very design of the Gospel subverted.

Though we consider the deity of Jesus, not only antiscriptural but physically impossible, yet we shall examine the scripture testimony. Is. x., 6, is frequently adduced as proof that Jesus is called the mighty God. But the Hebrew Text should have been translated The Mighty God shall call him, a wonderful mediator, Father of his age, and the Prince of Peace. The Greek Scholar will do well to consult the Vatican Septuagint, where the word God, is wanting. If this reading be correct, all the controversy, about the application of the term, God, to Jesus, is forever set at rest. I believe it impossible to produce a text from the bible, where Jesus is called God.
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Our ears are often struck with the titles of Jehovah and God, applied to the Saviour; but I venture to assert, that the name of Jehovah, is never given to Christ, in any part of the sacred volume, though it would have proved just nothing, if it had been attributed to him fifty times. Men, altars, places, &c. have been called Jehovah; yet none have hence concluded, that these men and altars were Gods. Joshua signifies Jehovah the Saviour; Elijah, Jehovah my God; but who will believe Joshua or Elijah to have been the eternal first cause of all things.

John i. 1, is the only place, in the whole Bible, where, according to the English Version, Jesus receives the appellative God; but, that this is a mere appellative term of office, appears from the structure of the Greek phrase, Theos en ho logos, which should be rendered "The word was God’s or a god," i. e. a divinely commissioned person. Clemens Alexandrinus having cited Gen. iv. 25. observes the word God in this place, must mean the true God; because it has the article before it.

Origen on John, "The Apostle does not say, the God, with the article, but God without the article; because he intended to speak of Christ’s authority. The God is the true God, but God without the article intimates authority." Eusebius contra Marcion, p. 127. "The Evangelist could have said the word was the God, with the article, had he thought the Father and the Son to be one, or that the Word was God over all." Epiphanius cited by Bishop Pearson, declares, "If we say God, without the article, we mean a heathen or a false god; but if we say the God, with the article, “tis evident we mean the living and true God." Where then was Middleton’s rule about the Greek article? Where it ought to be, in the depth of oblivion.

Acts 20, 28, "Feed the church of God, which he has purchased with his own blood." This, says Wakefield, is one of those unscriptural texts which sturdy polemics of little learning and no shame are continually intruding on our notice, to the deception of common readers, and the disgrace of ingenious criticism. No such expression could possibly come from the pen of our Evangelists. No such idea could enter the head of a primitive professor of the gospel. Seven Mss. only, and those of no antiquity and of little value, read God. None of the versions support this reading, except the vulgate and Philoxenian—Syriac. Forty-seven Mss. read Lord and God, but these also are neither of high antiquity nor of much value. Moreover, this reading is entirely unsupported by the ancient versions, and ecclesiastic writers. Ten Mss. read Lord. These are of great antiquity and authority, and of different families. All various readings in which these Mss. agree are admitted as genuine by the best critics. Besides this reading is supported by the most ancient versions and ecclesiastical writers.
The Arabic version has both readings, viz. Lord and God, which proves the original was corrupted in the time of the translator, and that he made his translation from the Greek, a position which has been disputed. But the Syriac, that most ancient and most excellent version, which would be ill exchanged for all the Mss. of the Greek testament in the world, reads the church of Christ. And the Coptic, that other most excellent and accurate version, reads the church of the Lord. The Philox, Syriac has Lord in the margin. Griesbach reads Lord, and declares that on the evidence he could not do otherwise. To those who feel shocked at the idea of God dying, Wakefield proposes relief in the following manner:—Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own son. In proof that blood and son are synonymous, he gives Virgil's authority,

"Proijce tela manu, sanguis mvs."—En. 6. 835.

If this criticism be just, then the text may be fairly read as it stands in the common version, without anything absurd, or without affording the least assistance to the Trinitarian cause.

Rom. 9. 5.—God over all. Trinitarians imagine that this is an appellation of Christ, but with what authority, will soon appear. The punctuation of this verse has occasioned much controversy and obscurity. Every able commentator, however, knows that the original copies were not pointed at all. Michaelis justly observes, "many obscurities have been occasioned by a false method of punctuation, and every commentator should remedy this by occasional alteration, and not servilely to adhere to the present arrangement." These things being admitted, the 4th and 5th verses form a grand climax, and should be read thus: Israelites to whom belong, the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the law, the service, the promise, the fathers, the Christ according to the flesh, the God over all, blessed be his name, for ever. Amen.

In this translation I have followed Harwood, Whithy, and Slichtingius, names that will always be dear to the church of God and sacred literature. Many of the ancient fathers strictly denied that Christ was God over all, as the common reading in our translation would suggest, which shows that they did not read the passage with the same punctuation or construction found in the English Testament. From Waterland's Vindication, it is abundantly manifest, that Dionysius, Justin, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Tatian, Tertullian, and Hippolytus all asserted that there was a time in which the son was produced, consequently they never imagined him to be God over all. Moreover Athanasius himself, contra Sabel, affirms "that Jesus is not the Father, nor as the sabellians say, the only God, all the holy scriptures testify. And again contra Gentes, he says, "he who is strictly the true God, is the Father of Christ."

Phil. 2. 6. Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery
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to be equal with God.* Which may be fairly read thus. Who being in the appearance of a god, did not esteem it a prey to be like a god. In vindication of this reading I observe, theos is without the article, and may therefore be read according to the strictest construction of the Greek and English languages, a god. And this rendering best accords with our Lord’s intimation, in the tenth chapter of John; and in this text, Paul has, in all probability, a view to this, when he styled him god, in a subordinate sense, meaning a divinely commissioned person. This conjecture receives strength from the use of the article, in the following verse; where the Apostle designates the supreme God, by the terms, ho Theos. Moreover Eusebius against Marcel. L. 1. c. 18, cites this very text, to prove that our Lord is not ho Theos, God with the article; for he says, “How was he in the form of God, if he was himself, ho Theos, God with the article, or the supreme God, and how could he not think of the prey of being like God, if he was himself ho Theos, the supreme God.”

This being admitted, our Lord was in the form or appearance of a god, i. e. of a prophet, or divine messenger, to whom the word of God came, performing as they did, miracles, signs, and wonders which constituted the strongest proofs of a divine commission, and the grand mark of resemblance between the Prophets. In this sense, our Lord thought it no robbery to be like a god, i. e. a Prophet, for he possessed the power of working miracles in confirmation of his mission.

Harpagmon, properly signifies, rapine or something taken as a prey, with which the possessor shows an unwillingness to part.—Our Lord’s history justifies this interpretation. He never made a public display of miraculous powers, and therefore may be very correctly described, as not considering his gifts as the great prophet of God, or in other words, the form of a god, a prey to be eagerly retained or ostentatiously displayed; but willingly submitted to be treated as another man, and to humble himself to the death of the Cross. And this sense of the word, is confirmed from the design of

* I shall here lay before the reader, the different translations of various eminent Commentators.

Who, being in the likeness of God, on account of that authority and power with which he was invested, was not eager in retaining that likeness to God —— PIERCE.
He did not consider it as a prey to be hastily caught at, or, he did not eagerly desire to be like God. —— NEWCOMBE.
Did not arrogate to himself, to be equal with God. —— TILLOTSON.
He being in the form of God, did not covet to be honored as God. —— CLARKE.
Being in the form of God, did not assume to be equal to God. —— WHISTON.
Who, being in the form of God, did not esteem as a prey, this resemblance of God. —— IMPROVED VERSION.
Who, being in the form of God, by reason of the miracles he wrought, took the form of a servant, by laying aside his extraordinary power, and ceasing to work miracles. —— GROTII and PRIESTLEY.
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the apostle in this passage, which, most evidently, was to hold up our Lord as a patron of humility to his friends at Philippi.

That truly laborious critic, Wetstein, observes "the adversative particle, "but," which follows ver. 7, shows that by the phrase "thought it no robbery," the majesty of Christ, or how great he was, is not declared, but rather his humility, and the manner in which he conducted himself. After Whitsby, Newcome, and Schleusner, I prefer rendering the words, \textit{is\ a\ Theo, like a\ god.} In proof of the propriety of this translation, I refer to the Septuagint. Job. 11. 12, "Man is born, \textit{is\ a\ Theo, like a\ god.}" 40. 15. "Behemoth eateth grass, \textit{isa\ Theo, like a\ ox.}" These are only two passages out of many, which may be found to support the above reading.

In allusion to this text, we find language entirely corroborative of the interpretation I have given of the word, \textit{harpagmon,} in the form of an ex-communication, at a council in Rome; 1076 "Beate Petre, ego non reprimam arbitratus sum, ad sedem tuam ascendere, potiusque volui vitam meam in peregrinatione finire." Frabrit. Bibli. Gr. 11.

Some of the fathers translated this text thus; he thought not of the robbery of being like, or equal to God. Novatian cap. 22. Although he was in the form of God, \textit{non est rapinam arbitratus;} he did not think of the robbery, or prey of being equal to God. Origen on John, "Christ appeared more divine, when he humbled himself to death, then if he had thought of the prey of being like God, and had not become a servant, for the salvation of the world."

Col. 2. 9. In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. This, I suppose, has been thought as strong a proof of Christ's divinity as any passage in the bible. But surely none will imagine, that Godhead means more than God; & if not, could Paul wish all the Ephesians to be Gods, when he prayed chap. 3, 19, that they might be filled with all the fulness of God? Surely not. If all the fulness of God dwelt in Christ, then the fulness of God, and the fulness of Christ, are the same. But Paul says a well instructed Christian has arrived to the fulness of Christ. Ephes. 3, 19, and 4, 13.—Hence it is evident, that, in all these places, the fulness of God, or of Christ, means nothing more than a perfect acquaintance with the Gospel; and is a phrase of the same import as the excellency of the knowledge of Christ. Phil. 3. 8. Again if God dwelling in Christ, make him God, the indwelling of God, or Christ, will make men Gods also. Gal. 2, 20. Col. 1, 17. Ephes. 3, 17. The fulness of Christ and the word, or Gospel of Christ, are synonymous. Surely, it is full time for men to give up the foolish idea of God, dwelling in a Temple, being shut up in an ark, or incarcerated in the body of a man. I challenge all the world of believers in the Godhead of Christ, to find me, in all the bible, so strong a proof of Christ's Divinity, as I can find for the Godhead of every Christian, in 2 Peter 1, 4.
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Heb. 1 8. Some think Christ is here called God by the sacred writer; but this is a great mistake. The verse should have been translated, concerning the son he saith, God is thy throne forever. The preposition, pros, is translated of in the 7th verse and should have been so rendered in the eighth. Thus also the apostle speaks in Rom. 8: 31. What shall we say to these things, i.e. concerning these things; for so the phrase, Ti eorumen pros tauta., should have been translated. To the learned reader, the accuracy of this translation will appear from the following parallel,

Ho thronos sou, ho Theos eis ton aiona—God is thy throne forever. Hemeris mou, ho Theos eis ton aiona.—God is my portion forever.

In both these examples, the word, God, is in the nominative; and seeing they are parallel readings, taken from the septuagint of the 45th & 73d Psalm, they should be translated accordingly. To urge this passage, therefore, as a proof of Christ's deity, on the authority of God, manifests the greatest puerility in biblical knowledge, or a knavish disposition to impose on the credulous.

I am aware that some will consider these remarks too censorious, especially in relation to the commentary of Dr. A. Clarke on the passage; but they are just and well merited. The Doctor says "this verse is very properly considered a proof, and indeed a strong one, of the Divinity of Christ. Some late versions have endeavored to avoid the evidence of this proof by translating the words thus, God is thy throne forever; and, if this version be correct, it is certain, the text can be no proof of the doctrine." Now we not only say, that this version is correct; but we also affirm, that the Doctor knows it to be so: Notwithstanding he conceals his knowledge, here and elsewhere, in his commentary; and argues, through pretended ignorance, for an absurd and antiquated dogma, contrary to well known and established facts ! ! !

He affirms "Jesus must be God; and the design of the apostle is to prove this. The whole scope of the place requires the word, God, to be in the vocative; and the original Hebrew cannot be consistently translated any other way." Did the learned Doctor suppose that all were ignorant of Hebrew but himself; and could he be so careless as to openly commit himself by referring to the Targums? If the Rabbins understood the forty fifth Psalm of the Messiah; and if the Hebrew of the sixth verse cannot be consistently translated otherwise, than by declaring the Messiah to be the eternal God; how could these Rabbins still continue to believe him only a man? Alas! how have the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!!

The Hebrew, kisara Elohim olam vand, is well and correctly translated by the apostle Heb. 1. 8, and by Wakefield in his version of this passage; and the Doctor's objections amount to a learned am-
bages, pitiable silly!! The Doctor perceiving his labor to be like that of Sisyphus, calls in the assistance of his learned friend, H. S. Boyd, who appears on the theatre in surprise, that "none of those, who deny the Divinity of Christ, have had critical acumen enough to discover that the words cannot possibly admit of being translated, God is thy throne." We shall soon see the extent of this learned gentleman's "critical acumen."

He produces an orthodox rule, about the use of the Greek article; and affirms it is always prefixed to the subject, but not to the predicate of a sentence; offers, Theos en ho logos, as an example, and tells us, the Greek Translators of the old, and the authors of the New Testament, write agreeably to this rule!! Now if the above rule was known to the Greeks, we would naturally infer every deviation to be a grammatical error; and it would have been incorrect for John to have said, ho Theos en ho logos. But we have seen in our quotations from Origen and Eusebius, on John 1. 1. that according to their opinion of Greek phraseology, the Evangelist could have said, ho Theos en ho logos, the word was the God. All the knowledge therefore of the Doctor and his learned friend, on the structure of a Greek sentence, dwindles into insignificance before the luminous criticism of Origen and Eusebius—Mr. Boyd acknowledges that "if any passage in the Psalms have a substantive noun, and its predicate in the same sentence with the article prefixed to both, then, indeed, his argument will be good for nothing." We have produced two passages of this description, from the forty fifth and seventy third Psalms; and can produce many from the New Testament!! See two examples in one verse, 1 Cor. 15. 58. Alas! unfortunate Goliath, thou art slain with thine own sword! Is it not shockingly awful to hear rational men, professing to believe only in one God, represent that God talking to another God, equal to himself. Alas! Alas! Christianity, how art thou wounded in the house of thy friends!

1 John 3. 16. The word, God, in this verse, is in italics, showing that it was interpolated by the translators. If it be asked, why they did so? we answer, to support the monstrous doctrine of a human suffering, and dying god!! The English reading has only the authority of one MS. and that of very little credit! It is rejected by Mill, Wetstein, Bengel, Griesbach, Wakefield, Newcome et c. If we should admit the common reading, the pronoun, he, could not refer to God, because the text would then teach a doctrine of the most shocking nature, the death of the eternal, infinite, and immortal Jehovah!!

1 John 5. 20. "To paraphrase this passage of true religion, says Dr. Doddridge, is quite enervating the force of scripture; and taking a liberty withplain words, by no means to be allowed. It is an argument for the Deity of Christ, which almost all, who have
written in its defense, have urged: and which, I think, none, who have opposed it, have ever appeared to answer.” The whole strength of the Dr’s. argument consists in referring the pronoun, this, to Christ, the nearest antecedent, let us apply his reasoning to a similar case, 2 John 7. Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus the Christ, is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and antichrist. Now according to Doddridge’s mode of reasoning, to refer the singular pronoun, this, to the remote and plural antecedent, deceivers, “is taking a liberty with plain words, by no means to be allowed.” By the rule adopted in the reasoning of the Dr. and others, whereby they would prove that Jesus is the true God, they can prove him to be a deceive and antichrist; which, indeed, he must have been, had he pretended to be what they erroneously call him. In both places, the pronoun, οὗτος, this, which usually belongs to the proximate, must be referred to the remote antecedent the deceive and antichrist is he who confesses not that Jesus is come in the flesh or that he was a real man.—The true God is that being, the knowledge of whom, Jesus taught his disciples.

“Some moderns, says Dr. S. Clarke, refer the pronoun, this, to Christ, who is mentioned immediately before; but others, with all the ancients, and more agreeably to John’s style, John 17, 3, understand it of God the Father, who is also mentioned a little before.—The construction is not difficult. We know that the son of God is come, and has given us understanding that we may know him that is true, τὸν ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, the true God; (So the most and best Mss. have it, in like manner as John 17. 3.) and we are in him that is true i. e. the true God; for the construction of the words manifestly require them to be understood of the same person; by, or through. his son Jesus Christ, (agreeably to the Bishops’ bible in the time of Henry the Eighth.) This is the true God and eternal life. No writer, before the time of the council of Nice, interprets the words, this is the true God, concerning Christ; and how they were understood in the following age, appears from the manner in which Epiphanius argues; “Christ, says he, ought to be acknowledged the true God, though not so called by St. John.” We should carefully remember, that the writers of the New Testament, instead of putting the relative in the neuter gender as the Latins do, when it refers to an antecedent sentence, made the relative to agree with the following noun. Οὗτος has here the same signification as τοῦτο, i. e. this belief in the mission of Christ, and knowledge of the true God is eternal life. Compare Philip. 1. 28, Eph. 3. 13. and Mat. 7. 12. Dr. Whitby adopts this manner of reading and explaining this passage, and says “thus the disciple well accords with his Master and only teaches what he had learned of him, John 17. 3.”

We have now examined this famous passage on which, as Dod-
Deity of Christ.

Drudge admits, orthodoxy has laid its foundation. We have also discovered this boasted fabric to have been built on the sand; and its materials to be hay, wood, and stubble. It cannot stand the ordeal. The rains and winds will carry it away: Seeing it cannot abide the trial of enlightened criticism, but is forced to sculk into the dark shades of ignorance and mysticism, where fraud engenders delusion and superstition, it must soon retreat from the theatre of the Christian world, though it leaves millions of spectators to wonder after the beast!

We have the testimony of Epiphanius and Athanasius, two of the most celebrated fathers, that the Apostle does not in this passage call Christ the true God. Their superior knowledge of the Greek ought to put to the blush modern smatterers, & the names of Clarke and Whitby should put to silence the tongues of those who are theologically, the lame and the blind.

Rev. 1. 11. I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. Dr. Doddridge, in his note on this passage, says, I cannot forbear recording it, that this text has done more than any other, in the bible, towards preventing me from giving into that scheme, which would make our Lord nothing more than a Deified creature. All men are more or less blinded by prejudice; and had not the Doctor been affected by this too general contagion, he would have seen, that no system of theology, adopted by any sect of Christians, tends more manifestly than his own, to represent Jesus as a Deified creature.

But the good Doctor was not aware that he rested his faith on a passage, disavowed by all antiquity, as a spurious interpolation. It is wanted in the Alexandrine, Vatican, Ephrem, and 31 other MSS. In the Coptic, Syriac, Aethiopic, Armenian, Slavonic, & Vulgate Versions. It is also excluded from the editions of Complutum, Grieves, Plantin, Bengel, and Griesbach, and from the translations of Newcome, the Improved Version, and the Catholic Testament of Rheims.

Alpha and Omega are the names of the first and last letters in the Greek Alphabet, and are fitly paraphrased, the beginning and the end. When these terms are applied to Christ, they are qualified by some explanatory phrase, as I was dead—chap. 1. 17, and 2. 8: but when applied to the great Eternal, they are used in the most absolute and unqualified manner, as in Rev. 1. 8. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord God, (as Griesbach and the Vulgate read) who is was, and is to come, the Almighty. Because Jehovah assumes this title. Is. 44. 6, and Jesus adopts the same. Rev. 1. 17, men have inferred that Christ is God; but the context shows the fallacy of such reasoning; for he who says, I am the first and the last, says also, I was dead! O ye believers in the Deity of Jesus, could the Eternal Jehovah die?

By the phrase, I am the first and the last, the Saviour means no
more than that he is the beginning and the end of the Christian dispensation; or that by the commission and power of Almighty God, he set in motion that mighty system, which will hereafter include every rational inhabitant of this world; and will finally complete that glorious dispensation, by which the countless millions of Adam's race, will be led on by him as the Captain of their Salvation, to glory, honor, and immortality. Thus Jesus, by his obedience and death, shall have the glory and happiness of being the author and finisher of Salvation for all the offspring and family of Heaven, Alleluiah.

The worship of Jesus has first been inferred from some passages of scripture, and then urged as a strong plea for his Deity.—Heb. 1. 6, has been generally adduced to authorize the worship of Jesus, contrary to the most express declarations of holy writ. If we refer to the 97th Psalm, 7th verse, which the author, of the epistle to the Hebrews cites, and compare it with John 10. 35 and Heb. 1. 6, the obscurity vanishes, & the doctrine supposed to be taught in this text, flies to the shades of darkness, and the land of forgetfulness. The Psalmist says, worship him all ye gods. Jesus declares, they were called gods, to whom the word of God came. i.e. the prophets or messengers of the most high. The word Angel, from the Greek, Angelos, signifies a messenger. According therefore to the authority of Christ and his apostle, the passage reads, reverence the Messiah, all ye messengers of God. i.e. acknowledge him your superior. Moreover the word, proskuneo, translated worship, Heb. 1. 6, does not signify divine homage or adoration.

On consulting the Greek Testament, we find five words used to express the idea we attach to the English word, worship, viz. proskuneo, laturgeo, latreuo, sebomai, and proseuchomai. The first is used to express that civil respect which one man shows to another, and which is very different in the different countries and ages of the world; consequently the application of this word, to denote the homage or respect shown to Jesus, cannot reasonably be adduced to authorize his worship.

In the Septuagint and New Testament this word occurs in the following passages. Abraham worshipped the children of Heth, Gen. 23, 7, 12.—All the congregation of Israel worshipped David, 1 Chron. xxix. 20.—King Nebuchadnezzar fell on his face and worshipped Daniel, Dan. ii. 46.—The leper worshipped Jesus, Matt. viii. 2.—The servant, to whom his master forgave ten thousand talents fell down and worshipped him, Matt. xviii. 26.—The man cured of blindness worshipped Jesus, John ix. 35.—Cornelius worshipped Peter, Acts x. 25.—God promises that the disobedient members of the church of Philadelphia, should worship the minister of that church, Rev. iii. 9.—And God commands the elements of nature to worship, or obey, Jesus, Heb. 1. 6.—From these texts
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It appears evident, that the word worship is chiefly used to express civil respect, and cannot be alleged to prove the religious adoration of any being to whom it may be applied. Let the advocates for the worship of Jesus show in what part of the Scriptures any of those other words, used to express that honour due to God alone, is applied to Christ, and then they will have at least some shadow of evidence for their doctrine, but at present they have none.

Those ascriptions of honour and power to Jesus, which occur in the book of Revelation, cannot be adduced to prove either his Deity or authorize his worship; because, 1, we have no key to this enigmatical book; 2, its authority has been disputed in all ages of the church; and 3, the book itself does not command nor approve the worship of Jesus; but, on the contrary, represents Jesus as rejecting and disavowing all such worship, see chap. 19. 10. and 22. 9. 16. Moreover no stress can be laid on the word heaven, which is represented as the theatre of war, and incapable of affording either safety or protection to the persecuted woman. The best commentators, such as Locke, Dr. Owen, and many others, expound heaven and earth, by Jewish and Christian churches, or Ecclesiastical, and Civil distinctions. See and compare the following scriptures, Dan. viii. 10; Joel ii. 10; Hag. ii. 6, 7; Luke xxii. 26; Acts ii. 9; Eph. i. 10, and iii. 15; Rev. vi. 12, 15, &c.

As Unitarians we cannot, we dare not, worship as God, him who would not allow himself to be called good without reproof, nor suffer his beloved disciple to do him homage, Rev. xix. 10, and xxii. 9; but on his taking leave of his disciples plainly forbids them ever after to pray to him, or ask of him any thing, John xvi. 23, commanding them to address all prayer to his and their common God and Father, who knew their wants, and needed no intercessor to prompt his infinite goodness to acts of benevolence and mercy.

It is equally the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, to pay all adoration to the Supreme God alone. See Ex. 20. 3, Mat. 4. 10, Mark 12. 30, Rev. 22. 19. But if Jesus be not God, the deification and worship of him is as truly Idolatry, as that of which Pagan nations were guilty! The violation of the first commandment, is universally acknowledged to be the crime of idolatry. All, therefore, who pay to any inferior being, that worship, which is due to God alone, are certainly idolaters, whether they be Pagans or pretended Christians. No mental reserve, mistake of judgment, or attachment to the object of forbidden reverence, can be pleaded as excuse. The priests of Baal would not have cut themselves, had they not believed him to be a God. Nor shall the supposition of Christ's equality with the Father, excuse his worshipers more than those of Baal.—I hesitate not to repeat the charge of idolatry against all the Establishments of Christianity in the world, in which worship is paid to any other being than the God and Father of Christ; and conse-
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quently, I assert that among Unitarians alone, the true worship of the one living and true God, is known and practised. Is it not astonishing to hear rational beings, in direct opposition to the revelation of heaven and in defiance of reason, begging mercy from their God, by his nativity, fasting, temptation, death, and bloody sweat!!! O ye worshippers of more god's than one, how long will ye grieve your humble Savior, by continuing through your idolatrous conduct, to prevent the progress of his kingdom by the conversion of the Jews, Mahometans, and heathen! How unworthy of the character of Christians are they, who assemble with congregations whose faith and practice are equally repugnant to reason and revelation. Harken ye that fear God, to the voice of heaven, Rev. 18, 4, come out my people, and be not partakers of her sins, least ye receive of her plagues. Let that awful passage sound in their ears, who worship more objects, than the one Jehovah; "Thou shalt worship no other God; for the Lord, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God!!! Ex. 34. 14. The prohibition Rev. 22, "see thou do it not," should alarm every Christian who is disposed to worship any other being than the one supreme Jehovah. The proneness to idolatry, among Christians as well as heathens, has been, in all ages, both melancholy and shocking! The religion of heathens consisted chiefly in the worship of human spirits, supposed to be elevated after death, to a participation in the government of the world. Trinitarians think themselves excusable in worshipping Jesus, on account of the godhead dwelling in him, or his union with the supposititious second person of the Trinity. But on the same principles, the worship of every being in the universe, is equally excusable, for undoubtedly God is in them all.

Will not the same apology be admitted for the worship of Pagans, seeing they also plead that they do not worship wood and stone, but the Deity in them. In fact the worship of Jesus cannot be distinguished from that of Paganism: and as prescribed in the litany, it is a most direct and undisguised idolatry. The distance between God and every other being in so immense, & unapproachable, that all, who under any pretence of resemblance, indwelling, or union, worship any other than the self-existent Jehovah, are no less idolators than if, under the same pretence, they worshiped wood or stone! O how much do the reformed churches of Christendom, need to be reformed themselves!!

All whose eyes are not shut against the voice of reason and scripture, will easily perceive that the idolatrous worship of Christians is the grand apostacy, predicted in the New Testament. Sir Isaac Newton and the learned Mr. Mede in their commentaries on the Revelation, speak of all nations having corrupted the Christian religion; of a long lost truth of the first importance; of a great sin, into which the whole body of the reformation had fallen; but which was
by them considered no sin whatever. The learned Mr. Taylor, author of Ben Mordecai's apology, says these writers point at the supremacy of God the Father. This grand truth has long been lost by the general declaration of the churches, that two other persons are his equals. This is so far from being considered a sin, that it is considered a sign of orthodoxy and pervades the whole reformation. This, however, is that spiritual fornication, for which the Jews were so frequently and grievously punished. Avoid it then, O. avoid it, both carefully and anxiously.

Though Christ solemnly declares that the great design of his mission was to bear witness to the truth, yet he never bore witness to his Deity; nor ever once pretended to be the only Lord God; nor have his disciples ever ascribed to him the peculiar titles, or religious worship, which belong to the Creator and Father of the Universe.

In the face of all that mass of evidence here produced against the Trinitarian's faith and practice, can it be reasonably expected that any sincere Unitarian will join in a religious worship equally unmasked and prohibited by Jesus, and by his God and Father. We separate from Trinitarian assemblies, because they have invented and set up, as objects of adoration, gods whom the holy scriptures disavow, and reason rejects. Without a "thus saith Jehoqah," we cannot associate with such worshippers, nor unite in those assemblies, which cannot fail to grieve our Master, dishonor God, and support the kingdom of darkness, error, superstition, and idolatry. The charge of infidelity may grieve us; but will not disconcert us—we acknowledge that, after the manner called heresy, we worship the God of our fathers, and we believe all that is written in the law and the prophets, and are the true and faithful witnesses for the divine Unity, and for the purity of the Christian Religion.
Lecture, XI.

HUMANITY OF JESUS.

Jesus, a man approved of God by miracles, wonders, and signs, which God did by him.—Acts. 2, 22.

Christian auditors, whilst I undertake to vindicate the truth of the Apostolic doctrine contained in my text, I feel all that embarrassment which so powerfully tends to distract a speaker, who knows that prejudice, popularity, and the early bias of education have already raised ramparts, turrets, and strong walls against his efforts to capture the citadel of your hearts, or obtain your assent to one of the most plain and interesting doctrines of the Christian Religion. Be assured, brethren, I do not feel concerned for myself alone, but for you also. You love, I trust, the blessed name of Jesus. Suffer me to say, that I love him also; and would not, I humbly believe, speak a word, diminutive of his real honor and dignity, to save life or gain a world! But may we not err by by thinking too highly of our benefactors, especially when they gain such an ascendancy in our estimation as to intercept the reverence and worship due to the Creator alone! This I apprehend to be the fact in relation to the meek and lowly Jesus, the friend and benefactor of mankind. My object, therefore, in this discourse, shall be to prove that the simple humanity of Christ, is the doctrine of the gospel; and to show you the intimacy of that relationship, which subsists between you and him, whom God has exalted to be Lord and Christ, Prince and Saviour.

Various have been, and still are the opinions of Christian professors concerning their Master. Some suppose him to be the Supreme God of the universe; others, the Son of the Father, by an eternal and ineffable generation. A third class believe in his pre-existence as an Angelic being; whilst a fourth regards him, as altogether one of the human family, differing from his brethren, only by the high office and extraordinary qualifications, which the Deity bestowed on him, as the captain of our salvation. Against the first opinion, reason, philosophy, and revelation combinedly depose. None but the most obstinate and wilfully blinded will continue to advocate such a manifest impossibility. Nor can it obtain support from any other than the deplorably ignorant, the deceitful
hireling, or those who have prostituted their rational powers at the shrine of superstition, and fallen victims to ungodly fear!! Having combatted this absurd doctrine, in the foregoing lecture, I shall not resume the discussion of the same subject; but proceed to examine the evidence for his divine sonship and pre-existence.

The doctrine of a subordinate or demi-god creating worlds and then becoming incarnate and dwelling with men, is such an anomaly as, at least, requires express revelation. "I am not a Philosopher exercising the speculations of my uncertain reason to form a conjectural proposition; I am a Christian endeavoring to ascertain the meaning of an infallible proposition, which I allow is laid down by God himself. My concern is not with what God may do; but with what he declares he hath done. His deity is his glory: hath he given it to another? I am Jehovah and there is none else; there is no God besides me. A just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me. Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any. Is. 45. 5. 21, and 46. 9. This is the God of my bible; but besides this God, we are told there is another god, a delegated god. Here are two gods; a supreme God and a subordinate god; a natural god, and an artificial god; a great god and a little god. A Philosopher has one God; a Jew has one God; a Christian, it seems, has two gods. What a world of difficulties belong to this proposition! Is this delegated god entitled to worship? The idea of a God without a title to religious worship is inadmissible. Is all worship due to the subordinate god, or does the supreme God claim any? Which acts of devotion belong to the one, and which to the other? A mistake would be dangerous, and I have no guide. Every inspired writer forsakes me. Jesus Christ, it seems, created all things that are in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible; and a creator proves by creating, his eternal power and godhead, Rom. 1, 20. The proposition supposes that God may empower a creature to create. Perhaps he may. But God declares he has not done so. Who measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with a span? Who comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance? Lift up your eyes on high and behold, who hath created the heavens? Hast thou not known? Hast thou not heard that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary? Is. 40, 12, 26—28. I am therefore obliged to reject the notion of a subordinate god, and a delegated creator."

**Divine Sonship** has been urged as the grand orthodox plea for the deity of Jesus, since the time of Justin Martyr. Aristotle, the later Platonists and Pythagoreans, believed in the existence of super-mundane deities; and taught, that the world and all the inferior
god proceeded eternally from the Great First Cause, by way of emanation. Justin, being a Platonic Philosopher, introduced this dogma into the Christian religion about one hundred years after the death of our blessed Master—*Hinc illè lacrymæ!* Hence the origin of the Christian polytheism and idolatry.

How the Trinitarian hypothesis of consubstantiality and co-eternity can agree with the notion of Sonship, I am unable to conceive; and therefore leave the advocates of mysticism, and enemies of reason, to harmonize these discordant sounds. The doctrine, I am convinced, is not only naturally impossible, but also contrary to the general tenor of the Holy Scriptures. Men may beget sons who may increase in bodily and mental faculties, so as to equal their parents; but with God, this is impossible.

Jehovah can neither communicate his own self-existence, nor the infinity of his attributes; for then he would communicate himself, and necessarily cease to exist. All things created, must be limited, and consequently, want all the properties of the one Jehovah. Accordingly, the sacred writers describe Jesus as a dependent and subordinate being, and never once, in all their writings, do they ascribe to him one of the essential attributes of Deity.

Christ is called the Son of God, on account of his office as Messiah. It appears plainly, in the Gospel history, that these two titles, the Son of God, and the Messiah, were synonymous among the Jews, at the time of our Lord's public ministry. When St. John, at the end of his Gospel, declares, that what he had written was in order "that they might believe that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God," it is plain, that he uses the terms, Son of God, as only another phrase for the Christ, that is, the Messiah. The same is true of Nathaniel’s declaration on seeing our Saviour: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel." When the Jews asked our Lord, "Art thou the Son of God?" their meaning undoubtedly was, art thou the Messiah? And thus that very question is expressed in Mark xiv. 61. "Art thou the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed?"

It would be wasting your time to say more on this subject. Such is the true account of a phraseology in Scripture, which, though easy and intelligible, has produced some of the grossest conceptions of the Deity and exposed Christianity to ridicule and scorn. If men who endeavor to disseminate the doctrine of Emanations and Processions, would cease to anathematize those of a different opinion, and condescend to use their reason, we might then demand, with certain success, whether it be possible that a derived being can be independent? Can such a being subsist necessarily in the first moment of its existence? If not, can it in the second or any subsequent instant? Must not all derived beings owe the
continuance of their existence to that cause which first produced them? Then will acumen, candour and openness to conviction induce them to perceive and confess, that by supposing the existence of a being to continue, when that on which it depends ceases, they suppose an effect without a cause; and seeing their favorite system ruined, they will be ashamed of their fashionable semi-atheism; and be compelled to acknowledge, that all the creatures of God do incessantly depend on him for the continuance of their existence."

Some Trinitarians have observed the force of this reasoning; and have therefore abandoned their heathenish notions of filial Deities. Dr. A Clarke, on Luke i. 35, says, "The doctrine of the Eternal Sonship, is, in my opinion, anti-scriptural, and highly dangerous. I reject it, for the following reasons: I have not been able to find any express declaration concerning it in the Scriptures. Eternity has no beginning, nor reference to time. Son implies time, generation, and father. Generation implies a time in which it was effected, and a time previous to such generation. Father, in reference to son, implies priority; and consequently, in this case, superiority. This destroys the eternity of our Lord, and robs him at once of his Godhead. The conjunction of the terms, Son and Eternity, is absolutely impossible, as they imply essentially, different and opposite ideas."

The titles given to Christ, are entirely inadequate to prove him either a god or a pre-existent spirit; for most of these titles are applied to other men; and if there be any title given to Jesus, that cannot apply to another man, it is peculiar to him as the Messiah. Is Jesus called the Son of God? So, in the language of Scripture, are all good men. God says to Pharaoh, "Israel is my son; let my son go."—Exodus, iv. 22. And elsewhere, he says, "Bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth." Is he called the only begotten Son? So Isaac is called the only begotten son of Abraham. "I am a Father to Israel, says Jehovah; and Ephraim is my first born, or only begotten son."—Jer. xxxi. 9. Is he called god? So were all magistrates and prophets.—Ps. lxxii. 1. John x. 35. Is he called Christ? So was Cyrus, Is. xliv. 1. and David called Saul, Jehovah's Christ; saying, Shall I stretch out my hand against the Lord's anointed? Lastly is he called the form or image of God? So man was made in the form of God, and the new man or Christian is the image of God who created him, Ephes. iv. 24. Christ being called the image of the invisible God, plainly implies that God cannot be seen, and intimates to us the reason why he is called the form or image of Jehovah, because in him eminently shone forth the perfections of Deity.

The advocates of the Divine sonship, generally ascribe to Jesus,
the formation of the material world. But the sacred writers have been peculiarly careful to prevent the least possibility of mistake. They always attribute the creation of the Universe to the God and Father of Jesus; but whenever they speak of Christ as performing any great or important action, they are peculiarly careful to use such language as to designate Jesus the instrumental, but never the first, cause of the action. As δια, in Greek, always denotes the agent an instrument, John and Paul mark this distinction by the phrase, δια αυτου, through him, John, 1, 3, Col. 1, 16. The scriptures acknowledge no more creators than one,, Thus saith Jehovah, who created the heavens, who stretched forth the earth, and gave breath to the people upon it, Is. 42, 5. O give thanks to him that by wisdom made the heavens, and stretched out the earth over the waters. Ps. 136, 5, 6. Both Jesus and his apostles teach that God the Father created the visible world and all things therein. The Apostles collected address their prayer to the only God and Father of the Universe, saying, Lord, thou art God, who made heaven and earth, the sea and all things that are in them. Acts 4, 24. Christ and the apostles distinguish the Creator of the heavens and the earth from Jesus Christ, Acts 4, 24, 27, 30; and 17, 24—28, 31; Luke 10, 21; Mat. 6, 30, and 19, 4. Isaiah also distinguishes the Messiah, whom he predicts, from the Creator of the heavens and the earth, 42, 1, 5, 6; 44, 24; 45, 18, 21, 22. Moses declares by the word of God the whole visible world, was created, Gen. 1, 1, and Ex. 20, 11. Lastly, the Psalmist asserts Jehovah alone was the Creator of the world and all things therein, 33, 6—9; 89, 8—11; 146, 5, 6.

The careful reader will easily distinguish a two-fold creation in the scriptures. The formation of all things, which they attribute to God alone, and the renovation of all things, which they ascribe to Jesus Christ. Hence Paul says if any man be in Christ, he is a new creation, 2 Cor. 5, 17. Behold I make all things new. Rev. 21, 5. Accordingly when Paul says, all things were created by Jesus, he means all things were created anew by him. This was the opinion of Calvin. Grotius, and Beausobre. When it is said all things were made by Jesus; and that by him God created the worlds, the Greek verbs are in the aorist tense, and may relate, indefinitely, to any time; and if they did refer, exclusively, to the past, the language would then be only similar to that of the prophet. Is. 9, 6.

John, 1, 3. Eph. 3, 9. Col. 1, 16, and Heb. 1, 2, are the passages in the sacred volume that can be produced with even an appearance of propriety in favor of Christ having acted as a delegated creator in the formation of the world. I have said a delegate creator, for the above passages in the original Greek do not represent Christ as the first cause of the actions said to have been perfor-
med by him; but only as the instrumental cause, in subordination to some other being, who operated by him as the instrument. In the above texts, the phrases *di' auton, di' ou, dia Jesus Christou*, are peculiarly emphatical, and show the great care of the apostles to keep in view the supremacy of the Eternal Jehovah, and to distinguish between the all controlling, uncontrolled power of Almighty God, and that delegated power which Christ exercised in subordination to the will of the Father. Though the preposition, *dia*, with a genitive, occur nearly 330 times in the New-Testament, it always marks the instrument, except in two places, Rom. 11, 36. Heb. 2, 10. The praseology used, Mat. 1, 22, is a fair specimen of the mode of writing, adopted by the penmen of the New Testament. In the phrase *hypo tou Kuriou dia Prophetov, by the Lord, thro' the prophet*. The word *hypo* denotes the first cause, or original operator, and the preposition *dia* distinguishes the instrument through the medium of which the action was performed. These observations are peculiarly worthy the attention, both of the Greek scholar and Theological Inquirer.

John 1, 3. The beginning in this Gospel means the commence-
ment of the Christian dispensation & not the beginning of the world, as some have imagined. To be persuaded of the validity of this assertion, the inquirer needs only to consult Chap. 6, 64, and 15, 27. All things were made by Jesus, does not imply that he created any thing, that all things relative to the the new system, were transacted according to his direction. "God, says Mr. Locke, frames and manages the whole new creation by Jesus Christ,"

*Omnia fecit nova Christus, Christ made all things new,* says Calvin. The Apostles therefore speak of the regeneration, but not of the creation of all things by Jesus. The verb, *egeneto*, translated, *made*, in this verse, never signifies to create, in the New-Testament; though it occur more than 700 times. In this Gospel it occurs 63 times and signifies to be, to become, to be done, or happen. See Chap. 15, 7, and also 19, 36: also Mat. 5, 18 : 6, 8 : 21, 42 : 26, 6. All, therefore, that can be inferred from this passage, is, that all things, in the Gospel dispensation, were done by the authority or direction of Jesus, the Messiah. But there is a powerful objection to the use of this passage, which shall be mentioned elsewhere.

Ephes. 3, 9. This is the next passage in the New-Testament where creation seems to be attributed to Jesus as the instrument under God. But, unfortunately for orthodoxy, the words, "by Jesus Christ," are wanted in the Alexandrine, Vatican, Ephrem, Cambridge, and several other Mss. Also in the Syriac, Coptic, Aetheopic, Itala, Vulgate, and the Arabic of Erpen, which is the best copy of that version. They are also omitted by several of the fathers. Gries-
bach has thrown the words out of his text, and professor White
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says "they are indisputably spurious." No argument therefore can be brought to support an absurd doctrine from a spurious passage disavowed by the best Mss. versions, and editions of the holy scriptures. We agree with Dr. A. Clarke, that nothing "can be argued from a clause, of whose spuriousness there is the strongest evidence."

Col. 1. 16, "by him all things were created." This clause has been triumphantlly adduced to prove the creation of all things by Jesus Christ. But most of our remarks on John 1, 3. will apply to this passage also. Calvin, Grotius, Locke, Pierce, Lardner and Beausobre, understood the passage, of the regeneration, and not of the creation of all things. We are emboldened to add our name to so highly respectable a catalogue. The verb, ἐκτίζω, in the Greek of the above clause, does not exclusively signify to create: for if so, the Greek version of Prov. 8; 22, would destroy the Trinitarian doctrine. Because that passage makes wisdom, which, they suppose to be Christ, to say, "the Lord created me." Dionysius Romanus, affirms that ἐκτίσει signifies, appointed, "Men, says he, who have erred from the truth, contrary to holy writ, mistake it for ἐποίησε, but these words are very different." Athanasius, in his second oration, and Eusebius against Marcellus, agree in opinion with Dionysius as to the signification of the verb ἐκτίσει; and render it constituted or appointed. Taking, therefore, as our guide, the opinion of these men, who were certainly competent judges of the import of a Greek word, we have the meaning of the apostle in the following terms; "by him, Christ, all things, relative to the Christian dispensation, were appointed. Such was the meaning which the Apostle designed to communicate in the above passage. For that the apostle in the last passage does not intend the creation of natural substances is evident; for, 1st. He does not say that by him were created heaven and earth, but things in heaven and things on earth; 2nd He does not specify things, but states of things, as thrones, dominions, &c. which are only ranks and orders of beings in the rational and moral world. 3dly This opinion is confirmed by the 18th and 18th verses where Christ is described as the first or head of the new creation. 4thly The creation of the heavens, earth, sea, and all things in them, is uniformly and invariably ascribed to the Father both in the old and New Testament. Hence it follows, that the creation which the apostle ascribes to Christ, is that great change in the moral world introduced by the dispensation of the Gospel, which is often called a creation: a new creation. This great change the apostle here describes under the symbol of a revolution; introduced by Christ amongst certain ranks and orders of beings, by which according to the Jewish Demonology borrowed from the Oriental philosophy, the affairs of states and individuals were superintended. In the same imagery Jews and Christians, who enjoy-
ed the light of Divine revelation, residing figuratively in heaven, are represented as constituting a polity under the government of angels, principalities, and powers; so the unevangelized world is a polity, under the government of a fictitious personage, called Satan, the ruler of the air, or Jupiter, and his angels. Eph. i. 20. and ii. 4, 6.

Heb. 1. 2. By whom also he made the worlds. Di'ou kai tous aionas epoiesen. What could induce the translators to render aion, World? We can assign no other reason than the love of system, which lead them here, as in many other places, to corrupt the word of God in order to make it support their traditions. The term, aion, in the New Testament, never means the material world; consequently, there is nothing said in this passage about creation of any kind, by any being whatever! Doddridge and Wakefield translate the clause, "By whom also, he constituted or established the ages."—The Syriac, Vulgate, and Arabic read, "Through whom he made or founded the ages." Dr. Sykes explains the phrase, by saying that the different extraordinary dispensations were made by or for Christ. But we think differently, and will undertake to show that none of the above versions give the sense of the original. From the first verse it appears that the prophets were the principal agents in the dispensations previous to that of the Messiah, and that Christ succeeded them in managing a subsequent dispensation. Hence he is declared in this epistle to have become a high priest of future good things. Chap. 9. 11; and the Mediator of a new covenant, 8. 6.—Both the old and New Testaments describe the previous dispensations as preparatory to the last and best age of the Messiah, but never intimate that they were appointed on account of the Messiah. Col. 1. 12—23; John 1. 17.

According to the Hebrew idiom, which prevails in this epistle,—the plural number is often used for the singular superlative; therefore the true signification of aionas, in this place, is the age by way of eminence, hence agia implies the most holy place, Heb. 9. 24. Tous ouranous, the true Heaven chap. 4, 14. The plural number is used both in the old and New Testaments to express the age of the Messiah. The eschetai hemerai of the prophets and the eschetoi khrinos of the apostle have this signification. Is. 2. 2, Dan. 10. 14, Micah 4, 1; 1 Pet. 1. 20. This rendering is farther confirmed by the peculiar name of the Messiah. Is. 9. 6. where the Prophet calls him Abi od, Heb. Pater mellontos aionos, Sept. Alex. Father of the future age. The term, aionas, therefore, should be rendered age, and the whole phrase "by whom also he constituted the age." Hence we fairly and correctly conclude, that the sacred scriptures afford no support to the doctrine, which supposes Christ to have been the creator of the worlds.

The pre-existence of Christ is not a doctrine of revelation, but
seems to have been brought into Christianity, by some of the learned converts from Heathenism; in order to render the religion of Jesus more agreeable to the Pagan Philosophy. Dr. Mosheim refers to Cudworth's "Intellectual System," for proof that Alexander followed Origen, and Plato, in his speculations concerning the Logos, a term afterwards applied to Christ. The doctrine of Christ's pre-existence is, however, a drag of the Pythagorean and Platonic Philosophy, which combinedly, taught the pre-existence and transmigration of souls. Notwithstanding as some passages in the New Testament seem at least according to the English translation, to favor the notion of Christ's pre-existence, I shall undertake an impartial examination of them, in the order in which they occur in the sacred volume.

John, 1, 1, 14. In the beginning was the word—the word was made flesh. From these words, men have argued that Christ was with the Father in the beginning of time; and became incarnated four thousand years afterwards! But by comparing John 6. 64; 15. 27, and 16. 4; Luke 1, 2, and 1 John 2. 7, the weakest shall be satisfied, and the most stubborn compelled to admit, that the word, beginning, is limited to the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, when Christ began to be about thirty years of age. Luke 3, 23. The phrase, ho logos sarks egeneto, in the 14th verse, should have been translated, the word was flesh, that is a real man; and the meaning of the Evangelist is, that this divinely commissioned person was truly a man, not in appearance only, as the Gnostics taught, but really, so that he was seen & felt, and lived familiarly with his disciples, manifesting all the characteristic infirmities of man. That the word, flesh, is often used to signify man, appears sufficiently evident from Gen. 6. 12, 7, 21. Num. 27. 16. Ps. 56, 4. Luke, 3, 6. John 17, 2. Hence we clearly perceive that John says nothing at all about a pre-existent being becoming incarnate, as some have vainly imagined.

John 1. 15. He was before me, and Col. 1. 17, he is before all things, have been considered as plain declarations of Christ's pre-existence. But seeing no Grecian can deny, that protos signifies chief or principal; the phrase may therefore be correctly translated, he was my superior, or principal. Pro, from which Protos is derived, many also signify superiority; consequently, nothing favorable to Christ's pre-existence, can be justly inferred from these or similar passages.

John, 8, 58. Jesus said unto them, before Abraham was I am. In this passage two difficulties, are contained which have exercised the pens of commentators and Polemics. The first consists in our Lord's declaration that he was before Abraham. The second in applying to himself the terms I am; by which phrase according to the English translation of the bible, Jehovah designates himself. Let us first take the latter difficulty into consideration.
Moses had asked God his name, and what he should say to the children of Israel, if they enquired from what authority he derived his commission. To which God replied; I AM THAT AM. Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel; I am hath sent me unto you." Ex. 3, 14. No text of scripture was ever more perverted by a wrong translation, than this in Exodus. The original Hebrew stands thus; "I will be who I will be;" or perhaps more properly, "I will be what I am;" a form of words expressive of the eternal existence & unalterable nature of Jehovah. The Septuagint reads, "I am the existing. or "he who exists." "The existing hath sent me." To make therefore, the I am of the Evangelist, a reference to this passage of the Pentateuch is a most idle fancy, unsupported by the original; and what is more to the purpose, it is equally unsupported by the Septuagint; the text book of the Gospel writers. The Syr. Sam. vers. Sam. Targ. Onk. and Pers. adopt the words as they are in the Hebrew as an appellative without any interpretation. The Arabic has "the Eternal who will never pass away. The Targ. Jon. B. Uz. well expresses the sense by "I am he who am and will be." But the Vulgate has Ego sum qui sum, from which our translation appears to have been taken. This difficulty is therefore the offspring of mere ignorance. The phrase I am has not the least claim to be esteemed a name of Jehovah. Our translators should have supplied the pronoun he in this verse as in verse 24. Then both texts would have read alike "Before Abraham was I am He." Unless you believe, that I am He, (the Messiah.)

The second difficulty arises from a prolepsia frequent in the phraseology of the New Testament. It was determined in the counsels of Providence before the ages—before Abraham was, that the Messiah should appear; so Christians were selected or pre-ordained before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1, 4, 5. 2 Tim. 1, 9; so the names of the servants of God were written in the book of life, from the foundation of the world, Rev. 12, 8. 17. 8. Events determined are often described in scripture as accomplished, see Matt. 17, 11; 26, 45. Heb. 12, 22-25. Moreover in this very chapter Abraham's conviction of a future Saviour was so strong, that he is said to have seen the day of his coming as if it had actually arrived. The Targ. Jon. Ben. Uz. with which the Targ. Jerus. corresponds in Gen. 3, 24. says, "before the world was created, Jehovah created the Law; he prepared the Garden of Eden for the Just; and Gehennah for the wicked." Such language was customary among the Jews. The interpretation of this passage is easy, before Abraham be I am; or I exist before Abraham: for he never can be really Abraham, till all the families of the earth are blessed in me! Hence Beza here observes that the meaning is, Christ was before Abram in the divine decree: so also Grotius on John 17, 5. The Greek phrase Prae Abraham genethai, ego sum, is correctly translated; before Abraham
become, I am. The phrase will then appear elliptical but the ellipse can be easily supplied; and it then reads thus, before Abraham become the father of many nations, I exist. This interpretation is perfectly easy and natural, the promise to Abraham will be accomplished in his seed which is Christ; and when all the nations are blessed in Christ, Abram will then have become Abraham or the father of many nations; but not till Christ shall have reconciled all nations, and brought them to realize God's promise to that Patriarch. Hence we see that Christ must be before Abraham, and the passage says nothing whatever either about Christ's deity or pre-existence.

How ridiculous must the defenders of Christ's Deity appear on hearing the true meaning of this text!! How contemptible, how unprincipled are those doughty champions of Orthodoxy, who decide on controverted points of doctrine with the most dogmatical assurance without possessing the first requisite of theological criticism, the ability of consulting, in the original languages, the records of eternal Salvation!!

John 17. 5. has often been adduced as decisive proof of Christ's residence, in the heavens, before his appearance on earth; but the honest inquirer will easily perceive, that Christ did not say he was with the Father, but only that he had glory or honor with the Father, before the world existed. The preposition, para, translated with, should be rendered, in the presence of. When Christ tells his disciples, Matt. 5. 12, and 6. 1. of their reward in heaven, para Patri, in the presence of the Father none will hence infer that the disciples were either in heaven, or ever had been there; no more ought we to infer, from John 17. 5. that Christ had ever been in heaven. In John 1. 5. it is said there was a man sent, para theou, from the presence of God, but none thence conclude that John pre-existed in heaven before he was born of Elizabeth. Paul tells the Ephesians, Eph. 1. 4. that God had chosen them before the foundation of the world, consequently the argument for the pre-existence of these Ephesians is just as strong from the words of Paul, as that for the pre-existence of Christ, from John 17. 5. Compare this passage with Titus 1. 2, and 1 Peter, 1. 20. - In this solemn address to God, Jesus prays not for a restoration of withdrawn honor, but to be put in possession of that dignity and glory, which God had fore-ordained to bestow on him, as the reward of his services in the faithful discharge of the mediatorial office. In this point of view, the passage has been understood by the most eminent commentators of different sects in the Christian world. Grotius says, "Christ was before Abraham in the same sense as the Rabbins say, in Talmud, de voitis; the law was before the world;" and refers with great propriety to 1 Peter 1. 20, and Rev. 13. 8. For if it can be said Christ was fore-ordained before the world; and slain from the foundation of the world, it may also be said he had glory with the Father before the world.
was. Beza says, by the day of Christ, we understand his nativity. Abraham saw it by faith, for Christ was before Abraham in the Divine decree. Surely therefore, that doctrine must be meekly and implicitly received, which stands on no better foundation than such irrational and illegal inferences?

1 Cor. 10. 4 and 9. Because the rock, from which the Israelites obtained water in the wilderness, is here denominated Christ, some have inferred that Jesus was that rock. When Moses preferred the reproach of Christ to the treasures of Egypt, Heb. 11. 26, will any suppose that Christ was known to the Egyptians, and despised by them? Certainly not. Israel was the Christ to which the Apostle alludes, who bore reproach in Egypt, Ps. 105. 15. The word Christ signifies, the anointed or the Sent. Nothing therefore can be inferred from a mere name; and those christians, who believe their Christ a morsel, of bread, which they can eat daily, are not more stupid than those, who imagine he has been a rock or a fountain of water. In the ninth verse, the apostle advises the Corinthians not to tempt God as some of the Israelites tempted; for so the text reads in several of the best Mss.

1 Cor. 15. 47. is triumphantly adduced as irrefragable proof of our Master's celestial origin: and because the verse, in the English bible, says, the second man is the Lord from heaven, the little divines, who have never seen any other, suppose no believer in the simple humanity of Christ, can have the effrontery or infidelity to reply. But let them know that the best Mss. versions, and most eminent Fathers omit the word. Lord, and read the verse thus; the first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven, heavenly. The attentive reader will easily perceive that the Apostle does not here compare Christ with other men; but describes the first state of man before the change, produced by death; and the second state of the same man after he is made spiritual and immortal. I am happy to find Dr. A. Clarke so honest and bold on this passage as to discard the word, Lord, from the text, and express his opinion that Paul is not here speaking of Christ at all. Let not, therefore, so weak an argument be, henceforth, offered in proof of such an unreasonable doctrine.

Col. 1. 15. The first born of every creature. Rev. 3. 14. The beginning of the creation of God. The truly learned and laborious Dr. Lardner, says these phrases imply that Christ is the chief or most excellent of the whole creation, Grotius, in loco, "primo-genitum Hebraeiis dicitur, et quod primum et quod summum est, in quoque genere," Pelagius in loco. "Primoogenitus non tempore sed honore, Juxta illud; filius meas primogenitus Israel. Now the amount of the whole testimony of these learned commentators is this; the first begotten, only begotten, and most beloved, are synonymous phrases. According to the Hebrew idiom, the greatest
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at best beloved was called the first or only begotten. Hence Isaac is called the only begotten son of Abraham, though he was neither the only son nor the first born. See Prov. 4. 3; Mat. 3. 17; Mark 1. 11, and 9. 7; Luke 3. 22; and Heb. 11. 17. Hence also it is manifest that arch, the beginning, Rev. 3. 14, means the chief or most noble of the new creation or Christian church.

We have now finished our examination of those scriptures which have been generally adduced to prove the Deity, Divine Sonship, and pre-existence of Jesus, and have found them a collection of unscriptural passages generally vitiating by designing men with a view to support their unhallowed traditions. Indeed almost all the notable corruptions of the sacred text, that have been detected, are manifestly, the pious frauds of those who have turned aside after other gods and forsaken the fountain of living waters. The uniform testimony of the sacred writers is, that Jesus was a man. In contradiction to this testimony, a class of designing men refer us to a few idiomatical or obscure passages of which they, themselves, are perhaps the most ignorant. Their mere reference they consider adequate proof, that the testimony of Christ and his apostles is either false or defective: for though they admit, he bore witness to the truth, yet they assert, not to the whole truth. He was a man; but he was moreover a god or an angel! To the first proposition we assent with all the true and faithful witnesses; for support to the latter, they betake themselves to heathen or fabulous stories; against which the sacred oracles universally depose.

The design of God in the mission of Jesus, was evidently to establish the belief and adoration of one only God, under the pleasing appellation of a Universal Parent. But if we admit the doctrine of the Divine Sonship, we cannot reasonably oppose polytheism of any kind: for every argument in favor of a plurality of divine persons, becomes a pillar in the Pagan temple. The whole fabric of the heathen mythology was built on the doctrine of Theogony, whereby they could, at all times, multiply their gods to whatever extent they pleased. Whilst therefore the notion of divine sonship, emanations, or processions, stands approved by the Christian churches, their attempts, to christianize the heathen world, will always prove abortive; for they will never be able to disprove Roman, Grecian, or Asiatic Theology. To establish the doctrine of the simple humanity of Jesus in opposition to the heathen dogmas of idolatrous nations, we offer the following arguments, which, though they may not produce conviction in the mind of those, who either despise or dread the use of reason, will suffice to dispel the clouds of mysticism, darkness, and superstition, from the minds of rational and candid Christians.

1. Every doctrine concerning the person of Christ, except that of my text, is involved in mystery, absurdity and contradiction. Those,
who believe in a God-man, are forced to say, he had two natures; the one omniscient the other ignorant; the one weak the other omnipotent; the one divine the other human; and to cover these palpable contradictions; and unite things devoid of all affinity, they cast a mystic veil over them, saying, he had only one person! Now if any of these advocates of mystic delusion, will tell what an intellectual nature is without a person, I should then know something of which I now fear I shall die ignorant. They tell us Christ had only one person; if so, he had only one nature; and that was the nature of man. But his two natures were united in one person; if so, the divine and human were amalgamated into one chaos of jarring and irreconcilable elements! No! the two natures were united without mixture or confusion!! Good God! my head is confused!! Absurdity! Rhapsody! Heresy! Confusion! Eternal God blow with thy winds, and sweep them all away.

2. God never promised more than a human Messiah. In the promises he is described the seed of the woman, Gen. 3. 15. The seed of Abraham in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed, Gen. 22. 18. Moses told the Israelites, the Messiah should be one of them like to him, Deut. 18. 15. Isaiah describes him as a man of sorrows, Chap. 53. 3. In the promises to David he is distinctly predicted to be his son and off-spring; and never once, in all the prophecies does there one intimation occur, that Christ should be more than a man by nature.

3. The Jews never expected their Messiah to be more than a man. This proposition is confirmed by the history of that people in all ages, the present not excepted. When Justin, who had been a Platonist, the heathen theogony into the religion of Jesus, Trypho, a Jew, remonstrated, saying they who think that Jesus was a man, and, chosen of God, was anointed the Christ, appear to me to advance a more propable opinion than yours; for all of us expect that Christ will be born a man; if he therefore be the Christ, he must, by all means, be a man.” See dialogue p. 238. It also appears from the first book of Origen against Celsus, that all the Jews, in his time, believed that Christ was described by all their prophets as a man only. Athanasius, de Sent. Dion. says, “the Jews were all firmly persuaded, that their Messiah should be nothing more than a man like themselves.” St. Augustine, Confess. B. 7. C. 9, acknowledges that he was a believer in the simple humanity of Christ till he read the works of a Platonic philosopher! Mr. Linsey, in his address to the students of Oxford and Cambridge, has shown that Justin was the first who taught the pre-existence of Christ. The truth of Linsey’s proposition is almost entirely conceded by Justin himself. “If, says he, I should be unable to prove his pre-existence, Jesus may still be the Christ, though it appear that he was a man born of man and become Christ by election.”
See Lardner on the Logos and Whitby on Rom. 9. 5. The attempt to deny the Messiah, was the principal cause of separation between the Jewish and Gentile Christians in the second Century; for, since the Babylonian captivity, the Jews have beheld, with detestation, every enticement to idolatry; and, consequently, never can become Christians till these Christians put away the abominable thing!!

4. The History of Christ is the history of a Man.—He tells his adverse countrymen, who called him the carpenter, the son of Joseph and Mary, "ye both know me and whence I am: ye seek to kill me, a man, who has told you the truth." He was born as a man, experienced many dangers in infancy—grew up like other children—increased in wisdom as in stature, and wrought at his father's trade till thirty years of age. He was weary and faint—he hungered and thirsted—he wept and rejoiced—was grieved and tempted—he died and was buried! His disciples believed him to be a man and treated him as such. They admonished him, they rebuked him and denied him! When the people saw him work miracles, they glorified God who had given such power to men; and when they beheld the miraculous appearances at his death, no change was produced in the mind of the spectators concerning his nature, but their conclusion was "certainly this was a righteous man." After the disciples were endowed with the holy spirit on the day of Pentecost, they still remained in the belief that he was only a man; Peter so describes him in my text and Paul says, "there is one mediator, the man Christ Jesus."

1 Tim. 2. 5. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews argues that it behoved Christ in all things to be made like his brethren. Heb. 2. 11, 14, 18; that both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, nature and origin, hence he is not ashamed to call them brethren: consequently Jesus must have been a real man. Christ is therefore our real kinsman, being born of man not only man but the son of man by natural descent from Adam; and being the only one that was free, he ransoms us, Jure propinquitate, by virtue of kindred. The Evangelist, Luke, carries his genealogy through David and Abraham up to Adam, to show that Jesus was that seed of the woman, who should bruise the serpent's head; the seed of Abraham in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed; the son of David, in whom the everlasting kingdom, promised to that Patriarch, should be established. But what meaning could there be in all these things, if Christ was by nature a foreigner to our earth and to our race? Nay! what is worst of all, what hope could man derive from the example or resurrection of a god or an angel? None at all! But if Jesus was really a man then we may aspire after his piety and hope for a glorious resurrection.

The miracles performed by Jesus, cannot be admitted as proof that he was more than man. Though he possessed more of the spirit than any other man, yet the prophet Elisa could tell the king of Israel
the secret counsels of the king of Syria, 2 Kings, 6, 12. He saw and heard the whole transaction between Gehazi and Naaman.—Nor was he present when the widow's oil increased; nor when Naaman was healed, 2 Kings, 4, 4–7 and 5, 12, 26.

Though many of my Unitarian and Universalist brethren still believe in a demi-god, and in all the unintelligibility of transmigration and metamorphosis, yet I am happy to behold the rapid progress of divine truth; and venture to predict that the period is near when the Arian churches of America, like those of England, shall be swept as with a whirlwind, whilst the Humanitarian will flourish like a green bay tree! At no remote period the gigantic Lardner stood alone; potent only through the Almighty of truth. He conquered! Joined by that venerable confessor, Linsey, and the philosophical, though persecuted, Priestley, the little band soon put on the laurels of victory. Their triumphs were splendid, their retinue glorious! Some of the most intelligent and brightest ornaments of humanity enlisted under their banners, and the old Puritanical churches followed in the rear. O for a name among the Lockes, the Lardners, the Linseys, and Priestleys, and my peaceful ashes shall rest in quietude, inurned in the tomb of glory; and my history shall be embalmed in the memory of the blessed!
Lecture 12.

Miraculous Conception.

Disquisition on Luke 4. 22, Is not this Joseph's Son?

It has generally been believed that our Lord came by Mary, a virgin, who, through a divine and miraculous influence, conceived and brought forth the Saviour of the world. But as there is no proper evidence to support the assumption, I shall undertake to disprove this fanciful opinion, and demonstrate its absurdity. To prove the affirmative of the question, and show the fallacy of the negative, is the object of the following disquisition.

1. The testimony of genuine scripture is that Jesus was really the son of Joseph.

Frequently the question of the text was put by the Jews, but never answered by Christ or any of his apostles, in the negative. The genealogy given by Luke depends entirely on this fact, both for its meaning and propriety. The writer sets out with this position, that Jesus was the son of Joseph, and as such gives his lineage through David to Abraham. It will never satisfy an honest and candid inquirer, to tell him Jesus was reckoned the son of Joseph, or was adopted the son of such a man. The candid will immediately say, what has this to do with his real genealogy? If Jesus was the real son of Joseph, there was sense and meaning in the genealogy by Luke; if not, and he was only the son of Mary, there seems to be in it all the deception and artifice of a designing impostor. What advantage could there be in our Lord being born of a virgin? Will the advocates of such a doctrine still continue to tell us, that it was necessary for our Lord to be born of a virgin, that he might be free from original sin? How can this be unless all virgins are free from it also? If so then females must be guilty of original sin when they marry! Consequently they expose themselves to be damned eternally for doing what God has commanded!! No resumes the respondent, it behoved Christ to be born of a virgin, to fulfil prophecy. And will it be admitted, that God did not foreknow events, when he predicted them, and that he is compelled to exert omnipotence
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to avoid contingency? Surely this is to talk foolishly, if not wickedly for God. But the scriptures never foretold that the Messiah should be born of a virgin; nor is there any allusion to Christ in the passage referred to in Isaiah! Our Lord was therefore the real son of Joseph and Mary, by natural and ordinary generation.

2. He must have been the son of Joseph, otherwise he could not have been the son of David, and therefore not the true Messiah, who was to come from the lineage and family of David.

All the Jews knew that their Messiah must come of the house of David, yet they never object to him, that he was of another tribe or family, which they most certainly would have done, had he not been as they sincerely believed, the real son of Joseph. Many contend for the miraculous conception, without ever seriously reflecting on the consequences which must follow, if their position can be maintained; but if Mary was not of the tribe of Judah, and she the only parent of Christ, then it clearly follows, that the religion of Jesus is an imposition on the credulity of men, and that the Jews are right, and Christians yet strangers to God and his covenant.

That Mary was not of the tribe of Judah, may be fairly inferred from the first chapter of Luke, where she is called the Cousin of Elizabeth who was of the daughters of Aaron, and whose husband was Zacharias, a priest of the tribe of Levi. But there is still extant an ancient book, entitled "The Testament of the twelve Patriarchs" containing the predictions of the sons of Jacob, believed by most of the learned to have been the work of a Jew, and to have been originally written in Hebrew; this book describes the Messiah as the offspring of Judah by Joseph, and the descendant of Levi by Mary. A Greek edition of this book, was published by Grabe and an English translation by Whiston; the latter of whom, considers the book genuine and sacred. It is certain that Origen cites the book as an authority in his fifteenth homily on Joshua—It is however of little importance whether the book be canonical or not; If we admit with Cave, Dodwell, Grabe, Beausobre, and Lardner, that the author was a Jew, and that the book was written so early as the first or second century; it will hence follow, that he had the means of knowing to what tribe Mary belonged; and as he describes her of the tribe of Levi and no one has ever contradicted him, we lawfully infer that she was a daughter of Aaron; and then for the honor of Christ and our own credit, as his followers, we must admit, that he was really the natural and legitimate son of Joseph by Mary the Levite!

From this book we extract the following testimonies. Simeon says, "The Lord will raise out of Levi a Priest, and out of Judah a King: and he shall save all the Gentiles and the stock of Israel." Gad says, "out of Judah and Levi, the Lord will raise a savior to Israel." Similar are the testimonies of Joseph, Levi, and Naphtali. That the Redeemer should spring from the tribes of Juda and Levi, is consistent with the fair interpretation of many parts of the sacred
Miraculous Conception.

It was also perfectly suitable, that so it should be, seeing our Lord was to unite the sceptre and priesthood, and to be constituted a priest on the throne of David, and anointed a prince and a Savior. This is also implied in the words of Zachariah the prophet, 6:13, when he predicts that Christ should be a priest and a King; and that a council of peace should be between both these offices, because both united in the person of the Mediator; and in this beautiful arrangement of the God of order, who is he that cannot behold propriety and consistency, and feel an irresistible influence, notwithstanding all his prepossessions, tending to lead him to acquiescence in the wise and admirable plans of Divine wisdom.

We have thus far proceeded on the affirmative, and might add many things, but we hasten to attend to a supposed great and insurmountable objection, to what we have assumed. We are referred to the first chapter of Matthew and likewise to the first of Luke for positive declarations to contradict what we have already asserted.—We know that such declarations there occur, but we believe we have just reasons for doubting their veracity. We only beg the patience of the reader, till we assign these reasons, which we deem conclusive against the authority of these chapters. Cry not out then, prematurely that if we reject one part of the scriptures, we may reject the whole, for the question is not yet decided whether they ever were a part of the scriptures. Though the voice of scepticism and fanaticism unite in the above declamation, yet the suggestion that we endanger the whole by rejecting a part, arises from great ignorance of biblical history. None will act so foolishly as to cast away all his money, merely because he has detected one piece of base coin among it; and it would be equally absurd, to reject the bible, because some parts may not be genuine. Suppose the Koran and bible to have been bound together in one volume, and one of those strong sticklers for the integrity of the bible, to have been the owner. He is strongly advised by a friend to take away the Koran from the bible, because it contains the religion of Mahomet, and makes no part of the religion of Jesus. No says the man, if I give up a part of the bible, I will renounce it altogether. Now it is clear, that the man was under no necessity to resign any part of his bible. The object of his friend's advice, was to induce him to cast away the Koran, which ought not to have been placed with the sacred scriptures—for the man's bible would remain as perfect and entire when separated from the Koran, as when bound with it in the same volume.—Honey is called sincere when separated from wax, and gold refined when freed from baser metals with which it may have been alloyed; so the scriptures become more valuable, genuine and authoritative when delivered from the mass of spurious additions, by which men have corrupted the revelation of heaven; and were every spurious word, verse, or chapter removed from the sacred volume not one doctrine ever taught by Christ or his apostles would suffer by the deduction. The more the scriptures are investigated, the more they
will appear to be what they profess; and truth, like gold, will ever be a gainer by the trial of experienced and skillful judges.

We are fully aware that many zealots, totally ignorant of the first principles of Theology, are always first in raising the cry of infidelity against all who complain of the purity of the holy scriptures; but that many interpolations exist in the very best copies, is undeniable; and there are many passages scattered throughout the whole volume, which create such difficulties as cannot be solved without admitting them. Little do they consider, who manifest zeal but not according to knowledge, the advantage they give to infidels, by not admitting the existence of interpolations and even corruptions in the sacred volume. Never was there a more ponderous millstone hung about the neck of Christianity, than that prepared by pleading for the entire purity and integrity of the sacred scriptures; a weight which none but frantic desperados will dare impose on the Christian religion. In the last chapter of the book called Deuteronomy we have an account of the death of Moses, and the succession of Joshua—In Gen—12. 6, it is said that when Abraham came into the land of Canaan, the Canaanites were then in the land. In Gen. 22. 14, these remarkable words occur; as it is said to this day, in the mount of the Lord it shall be seen: and in Gen. 36. 3, these are the kings that reigned over Edom, before there reigned any king over the land of Israel. Will any rational man suppose, that these passages were written by Moses? Certainly not. If then such passages be not admitted as interpolations, they must unquestionably destroy the authenticity of the books; and all the threatenings of Hell and damnation, which the monkish priest may fulminate against the sincere inquirer, will produce no effect. He will satisfy his mind in this point by saying, I have detected fraud in one case, I may naturally expect it in another: and he whom I have found a designing deceiver in one instance, I have reason to suspect in another: such passages could not have been written till the Canaanites were cast out of their land; the temple erected on mount Moriah; and a succession of kings had reigned over Israel. Dr. Prideaux supposes that Ezra, in his edition of the scriptures, added many interpolations, which appeared to him necessary for illustration; and that Simeon the just made similar additions to those books, which were added to the sacred volume after the death of Ezra: but however they came into the holy writings, it is clear they exist in them, and to acknowledge them is Christian and honest; but to deny them is deceitful and infidel. If then the scriptures suffer through the spurious additions, which have been made to them by designing men, let us, as honest men, be the first to acknowledge and correct them! Let it even be our motto, the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.

In the first place let it be carefully noticed that the two first chapters of Matthew, the two first of Luke, except the four first verses and the five first verses of John's Gospel, seem exordiums to the
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Gospel history given by the Evangelists; and that Mark rejects the prefaces and affirms that the introduction of John, as the forerunner of Christ, is the beginning of the Gospel or gospel history of Jesus the Christ. Now if we reject these prefaces, the four Evangelists commence the gospel history in the same manner, and Mark affirms this introduction of the history by the notice of the Baptist as Christ’s forerunner, is the beginning of the gospel. Hence it follows that the two first chapters of Matthew, the two first of Luke and the five first verses of John are either spurious, or Mark is a false witness! Indeed one would be almost inclined to think from the beginning of Mark’s Gospel, that he had seen the spurious additions of Matthew and disavowed them, as making any part of the sacred history of our Lord.

There are many things incredible, related in these introductions, such as the story of the Angel and Mary—of the wise men—of the slaughter of the innocents, and of Christ’s flight to Egypt.

The Magi were Persians who could neither know any thing about the Messiah, nor feel the least interest in Jewish affairs. All the hopes arising from a promised Messiah, were wholly confined to the Jewish nation, and no expectations extended to the Gentile world, till after the crucifixion of our Lord. The Persians could have no belief in Jewish prophecies, if they were understood, and consequently there can be no reason assigned, why the wise men should come to Jerusalem to pay their homage to a poor, despised, undistinguished individual. But the reason they give for their coming is too ridiculous: we have seen his star in the East—as if the scriptures would countenance the foolish and knavish tricks of fortunetelling, by the appearances of the planets or stars! The guide by which they are conducted is a star! What skill had these sages in astronomy? A star, a Globe larger than the whole earth, travels before them and stands over the house! What! a set of poor visionary fortunetellers and astrologers the first to acknowledge the Messiah! O tell it not in Gath lest the daughters of the uncircumcised rejoice, that there was not a prophet of the Lord in the camp of Israel—not a man of Isachar who had knowledge of the times, till they were instructed by the Persian astrologers!!

Moreover according to these chapters, at the birth of Christ, Herod and all Jerusalem were alarmed; the priests proclaim him the Messiah; a prophetess announces him the Savior; Angels from heaven acclaim his praise; and to prevent the revolt of the Jewish nation from the Roman yoke, all the young under two years are slain. These events would make a deep and lasting impression on the memory of every individual of that generation. The name of Jesus, the son of Joseph and Mary would be awfully and painfully engraved on the tablets of their hearts. But anon Jesus appears in the temple, none are astonished at the name of Jesus, none alarmed for the son of Joseph, none recognise him as the Messiah, the king of Israel! The general inquiry is, who is this? Is not this the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? Alas! what stupidity! Tho—
sands of mothers bereaved of their tender offspring for the name of Jesus, have all forgotten! But a little ago, kings, priests, and prophets proclaimed him the Messiah, now they too have slept their sleep outright!! They no longer remember the babe of Bethlehem, the son of Joseph and Mary! Good God! could intellect dwell in the brain of such besotted creatures!

Again according to the statement Luke 1. 36, Jesus and John were nearly related, and being born and educated in the same neighborhood and the offspring of two Cousins, they would be intimately acquainted with each other; and all the miraculous circumstances of their births and descent. From the instructions of the mothers and the common fame of the country, Jesus would know John, not only as his relative but also his harbinger in the new and great dispensation; and John would equally know Jesus as his relative and Lord; notwithstanding John at the time of Christ's Baptism, declares his entire ignorance of the person and descent of Jesus; saying I knew him not! John 1. 31, 33. Can any man harmonize such discordant expressions?

If the introductions be true, Christ should have been called Jesus of Bethlehem, and not Jesus of Nazareth.

In all parts of genuine scripture Christ is called Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph. Nor does Christ or any of his apostles ever tell us, that this appellation was incorrect. Never does Jesus disown Joseph as his father, nor Nazareth as the place of his birth. On the contrary, he tells the Jews who still called him a Nazarene and a carpenter, the son of Joseph and Mary, ye both know me and whence I am. This acknowledgement of Christ is entirely sufficient to settle the controversy.

The two genealogies are contradictory and neither agree in the names of the persons nor the number of the generations.

Many writers have attempted a harmony, but they have found their labor as useless as that of Sisyphus and themselves like unfortunate Ixion, condemned to roll round on the wheel to the place whence they began. The pretended Matthew fixes three great Epochs; the first period is from Abraham to David; the second from David to the Babylonian captivity; and the third from the captivity to the birth of Christ. To each of these periods, he assigns just fourteen generations, neither more nor less. This is going to work artificially indeed! But if we admit Luke's we must exclude Matthew's, for they are eternally at war with each other, and there can be no use nor meaning in Luke's unless we admit the natural descent of Jesus from Joseph by ordinary generation.

The Chronology of these spurious introductions is irreconcilable with that of the true Evangelists and co-temporary historians.

According to the second of Matthew, Jesus must have been one or two years old before the death of Herod; for he had slain the children from two years old and under; and Jesus had lived some time in Egypt before Herod's death. Luke says Jesus was thirty years old in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and Dr. Lardner admits
that all the notes of time in the Gospels, easily synchronise with this being the fifteenth year of the sole empire of Tiberius. Now as Augustus died and was succeeded by Tiberius on the nineteenth of August: A. U. 767 A. D. 14, our Lord must have been born A. U. 753; and Herod, if Matthew's testimony be admitted, must have lived till the year A. U. 755, but Josephus says Herod's life was despaired of at the time of the great Eclipse which happened A. U. 750 and that he died before the feast in the same year. Consequently, according to Luke and Josephus, Herod was dead about four years before Jesus was born! Where now is the clandestine story of the wise men, Herod's trouble, the slaughter of the innocents and similar silly tales! That our Lord was thirty at the time of entering on his public ministry is most reasonable to suppose; and if we allow of liberty on the one hand, we may equally assume it on the other, and say with as much plausibility that he was not thirty as that he was more than thirty. At this age the Levites entered the office of the priesthood, Num. 4. 3, 47; and seeing Jesus submitted to the baptism of John, saying, thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness, we may rationally conclude he conformed to the general custom in this case also. But seeing it cannot be proved that Herod lived later than A. U. 750, nor that our Lord was born sooner than A. U. 753, it follows that Herod was dead three years before Christ was born!! Hence we conclude that these introductions are spurious, seeing their narrative and chronology are contradicted by approved Historians and the sacred scriptures!

Moreover these introductions contradict themselves. The supposed Luke says, Jesus was born at the time of the taxation: but from Eusebius it appears this tax was not laid on the land of Juda, till after the death of Herod and the banishment of Archelaus, and in this chronology Eusebius, Josephus, and this same Luke agree. Hence Herod was dead before Jesus was born, and the false testimony of the supposed Matthew must either have been rejected by Eusebius, or wanting in the copies of the Gospels extant in his days. This much we know, that the Jewish Christians for whom Matthew wrote, never admitted the introduction into their copies of his Gospel. The Ebionites and Marcion began their Gospel at the third Chapter. The narrative of these introductions is too heathenish to have had a place in a book, acknowledged as divine by a Jewish Christian; and from the nature of the story and its similarity to that of Mars and the vestal virgin, there can be little reason to doubt of its being composed by some heathen convert, in the beginning of the second century, and afterwards affixed to the gospel of Matthew and subsequently to that of Luke. The design of the writer was evidently to raise the Master of Christians to the rank of the heathen deities; and the texture and phraseology of the three introductions, betray the heathen Platonist rather than the humble and Jewish disciple of Jesus. Indeed the very first verse of Matthew intimates, that the writer is not the real Matthew, but some other citing from some book like the Gospel of the infancy, which is a fabulous nar-
rative of the transactions of Christ’s childhood!! And it cannot be denied that men, who wrote books and attributed them to Jesus himself, could easily forge these introductions as they did an hundred other books and ascribe them to the labors of the Apostles; and even affix their names to the veriest fooleries, in order to obtain credit for them in the world.

Among those, who have written in refutation of the Miraculous Conception, may be mentioned the Rev. John Grundy of Manchester, in his Lectures addressed to Trinitarians; the Rev. George Harris, late of Liverpool, in a course of lectures entitled “Unitarianism and Trinitarianism contrasted,” and the Editors of the improved version. The Rev. Thomas Belsham, in his sermon on the death of Linsey, justly ascribes all the errors of the Christian religion to the fabulous story of the Miraculous Conception; and, in a manly, independent, and judicious manner, thus describes the progress of the christian corruptions. “Errors concerning the person of Christ, have lain at the foundation of all the corruptions of the Christian Doctrine. The pride of heathen Philosophy could not submit to acknowledge the authority of a crucified Jew. Ashamed of the humble prophet of Nazareth, it first maintained that he was a man in appearance only, not in reality. Driven from this wretched and untenable position, it next raised him to the rank of a hero—god, by the invention of a miraculous conception. It then united to his human nature, a Divine logos, to sustain the part of the Christ. Its next invention was to substitute a created, but superangelic spirit for his human soul; and to delegate to this exalted creature, the creation and government of the Universe. By one gradation more, the crucified man, was advanced to an equality with the Father, the infinite and eternal God. After this, the spirit of inspiration was first personified, then deified. Next followed the deification of a woman, the humble mother of Jesus. Then succeeded an immense train of saints and martyrs, canonized as inferior and tutelar deities; the objects of local and individual worship. The rear of this host of errors is brought up by that paragon of absurdities, the transmutation of a morsel of bread into a God, first to be adored, then to be eaten by its worshipers; an extravagance far exceeding all the fooleries and fables of Pagan Mythology.”

To conclude, the writer of this Essay remembers when he believed in the perfect equality and coeternity of the son with the Father, and estimated a man’s religion by his high opinion of the savior: now believing Christ a real man, the son of Joseph and Mary by ordinary generation, he protests that his love and veneration for the Redeemer is not in the least abated, by a change of opinion concerning his person, nor the expectation of obtaining salvation in the sacred name, and by the power of Jesus, at all diminished.
and Ecclesiastical writers of the first centuries. The most eminent Biblical critic of the present age, Professor Griesbach, has excluded the word, God, from this text, in his most improved and laborious edition of the Greek Testament, and informs us, that those critical laws, which he had adopted, and which had obtained the approbation of the most learned critics, demanded its exclusion from the text, and that the primitive reading of both the Alexandrian and Western editions, as well as the most ancient witnesses of all classes, deposed against the common reading; and that no support, in its favor, could be derived from any monument of antiquity, prior to the end of the fourth century. The word God, is wanted in all the Uncial manuscripts except the Cambridge, into which it has been interpolated, according to the opinion of all the learned, who have inspected that Manuscript. All the Latin versions and all the Latin Fathers of all ages, are standing witnesses against the common reading of this passage, for the word God, is wanted in them all. Nor was it known to antiquity before the fifth century; for when the Emperor Julian denied, that Jesus was ever called God, by the Apostle Paul, Cyril of Alexandria never cites this passage in reply, nor did he refer to it, in the controversy with Nestorius.

The reading found in the Latin versions and Fathers is, Great is the mystery of Godliness, which was manifested in flesh. According to it, the text may be thus paraphrased: “confessly important is the gracious dispensation of the Gospel, the doctrine according to godliness; which was revealed to us by one, who was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; which was proved to be of divine origin, by the attestation of the spirit; which was viewed with astonishment and delight by those who were sent to publish its doctrines; which was preached to the Gentiles, believed by multitudes, and gloriously received wherever it was proclaimed.”

This reading is supported by the Syriac, Ethiopic, Latin and Arabic versions, and all the Latin MSS. It is cited by Hilary, Ambrose, Austin, Bede, Fulgentius, Pope Leo the Great, and many others. The construction is easy, harmonious, and rational, being entirely free from those objections to which the other two readings are liable. Moreover, Nestorius reads which, and absolutely excludes other readings, by saying “That thing which was manifested.” Now, since he cites the text thus, and urges it against the Divinity of Christ, we should naturally expect that if this had not been the received public reading in the Greek Churches, his adversaries would have exclaimed against him for falsifying the text; but no such accusation is ever intimated in all the annals of ecclesiastical history. So far to the contrary is the fact, that Cyril and Cassian, the two principal writers who opposed him, cite the text just as Nestorius had done. Yea, if possible, Cassian (though he wrote by the instigation of Pope Leo the Great, A. D. 430,) is still more explicit; for he tells Nestorius that it was not a creature, but the mystery, of godliness, which was justified, and that he would have easily discovered this, had he read the whole text. Hence, Cassian makes
mysterium, or its relative quod, the nominative case to all the following verbs. The corruption of this passage was effected by Macedonius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, in the beginning of the sixth century, with the design of more effectually maintaining his doctrine of two natures in Christ, against Nestorius, who asserted that Christ, as son of man possessed only one nature. Liberatus, Archdeacon of Carthage, who lived in that very age, has transmitted to us this account of Macedonius, in his Breviary, which he wrote in A. D. 535. So manifestly was Macedonius convicted of fraud, that Anastasius banished him for the corruption. Similar is the testimony of Hincmarus, concerning the falsification of this passage. See Pearson on the Creed, art. 2, Le Clerc on Hammond, and Sir Isaac Newton on remarkable corruptions of Scripture.

But, however popular the common reading may be, and however well adapted to the purposes of modern orthodoxy, yet most certainly it was altogether unknown to the churches and ancient writers, during the Arian controversy; for, as often as they quote the passage, they read "Great is the mystery of godliness which was manifested." Moreover, to allow the word "God" to have a place in the text, (says Dr. L. Carpenter,) would transform one of the most beautiful passages in the New Testament, into the meaning jargon of the schoolmen; for, according to the doctrine of the R. T. he, who is at all times present, in every part of the universe, was circumscribed by a human body: he, who alone has immortality, was raised from the dead by the Spirit; he, who dwelleth in light inaccessible, whom no one hath seen, or can see, was seen of men: he, who is the blessed God, and consequently for ever and infinitely happy, was received up into glory.—Such doctrines are so confounding to the imagination, and throw such a weight on Christianity, as to weaken, if not altogether destroy its evidences. Although partizans and bigots be blinded to the truth, and even contend for the corruption of Scripture, where it makes for their favorite dogma; yet the true friends of Christianity will rejoice at the detection of fraud, and follow the light of truth wherever it may lead them.

As the word 'God' is not found in the text in any early MSS. or versions, and was ever cited by any ancient writer for four hundred years after Christ, it ought, therefore, to be expunged from our Bibles as a base imposture. For what the Latins did to first John, v. 7, the Greeks have done to 1 Tim. iii. 16, and nearly about the same time i.e. during the reign of creed-manufactory.

If any demand where is the mystery of which the Apostle speaks, if this reading be true and genuine? I answer, as Timothy resided at Ephesus when Paul wrote, it is very probable the Apostle alluded to the temple of Diana, and the heathen mysteries. These mysteries were concealed, empty speculations, mere amusements or mysteries of wickedness, which concealed and promoted vicious practices; but the gospel was a revealed dispensation of godliness, leading to the practice of piety and virtue. It is not a mystery of unintelligible opinions, barren speculations, enthusiastic flights, superstitious
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One Mediator between God and man; The man Christ Jesus; 1
Timothy, ii, 5.

The term, Mesites, translated mediator, generally implies one who
interposes between two parties of which he is equally the friend, with
the design of reconciling them. Hence it follows that the appoint-
ment of a mediator implies an offence; and the object of that ap-
pointment, is to effect a reconciliation. Accordingly the Apostle
declares, the mediator is not of one party, but of two, Gal. iii. 20.
In ordinary cases a mediator is commonly obliged to propose a
compromise, which may involve a change of measures among the
parties; and in this point of view, the law might have been supposed
to have disannulled the promise of God. But when it is consid-
ered that God, who gave the promise, is unchangeable, and that he is
one of the parties, then the supposition becomes inadmissible; for
the Apostle calls the promise and oath of God, immutable things.
Heb. vi. 18. Is the law then against the promise of God? God for-
bid! Gal. iii. 21. Hence it follows, that the change is in man, who
alone needs the reconciliation.

There is another view of a mediator exhibited in the scriptures,
namely, that of a surety; compare Heb. vii. 22, ix. 15, and xii. 24.
Now a sponsor or surety is one who undertakes for the performance
of a promise: so God is represented as making his own oath, the me-
diator of the promise to Abraham, for the Apostle says, emesiteusen or-
ko, he mediated it, or secured its accomplishment by an oath, Heb.
vi. 17. It may be proper to observe, that Christ is not called our
surety, but the surety of a better Testament; Heb. vii. 22; for God
has appointed and qualified him to put us in full possession of the
promised inheritance. For this purpose Jesus was selected from
among his brethren, anointed to be Lord and Christ, Prince and
Saviour; the one Mediator between God and man, to reconcile men
to God; that having gathered together all things in heaven and on
earth, he might become that one shepherd, whose one fold shall in-
clude the whole human species.

In order to elucidate, systematically, the Doctrine of Reconcili-
ation, we shall first treat of the Mediator’s person, and secondly of
the terms, used by the sacred writers, to express the objects of his
mission.

The Mediatorial office has generally been considered the result of
the union of the Divine and human natures in the person of our
blessed Master: but a little reflection and attention to the scriptures,
will plainly show that no such union could ever possibly subsist. The
doctrine of two natures in Christ appears to have originated in the
mind of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, in the beginning of
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the fifth century; for the church had not fixed any opinion on the
subject, previous to the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431.

The doctrine of the Trinity, had produced such confusion of ideas,
that men knew not how to describe the Master of Christians. Hence
Nestorius affirmed, that Christ, as son of God and son of man, must
have two persons. On the contrary, Eutyches, an Abbot of the
convent of Constantinople, affirmed Christ had only one Divine na-
ture and person, in which the humanity was lost as a drop of water
falling into the vast Ocean. But the general Councils of Ephesus
and Chalcedon determined, that there are in Christ two distinct na-
tures in one person, without change, mixture, or confusion!!

In relation to this incomprehensible doctrine, may we not demand,
if the true and essential nature of God were united to the man Jes-
us, so as to constitute only one person, not wholly divine nor wholly
human, but both at once, must not the two natures in their un-
ion, have lost their separate qualities? If they did, then there was
something like confusion, perhaps, interfusion!! If they did not,
then there could be no union! But, if the union of the Divine and
human natures be indissoluble, what may be predicated of the one
nature, may be predicated of both; and therefore if the Messiah di-
ed, the Divine nature died also!! There can be no alternative.—
Either the Messiah did not die, or the two natures, which constitute
his person, must have died! But if it be alleged, that the Di-
vine nature withdrew from Christ before he died, then the union was
not indissoluble; and if only the human nature died, then only the
man Christ Jesus died, and this is Unitarianism.

How would a Jew stare at the man, who should assert that the
Jewish prophecies described the Messiah as possessing the true na-
ture of the one Jehovah? Is the Messiah the one God? This will not be
maintained. When the Messiah was put to death, was. God still
perfect? If so, then God and Jesus are two distinct persons. Far-
ther, if Christ have two natures, he must have two persons, and,
consequently, two distinct minds. How then could he will or per-
form any thing, seeing the one mind might will entirely differently
from the other?

It is painful to reflect, that any reasonable being should ever have
imagined, that the immutable Jehovah should be liable to metamor-
phosis, and become a child of a span long, or confined to the body of
puling infant!! How could one being be perfect God and perfect
man; finite and infinite; mortal and immortal; omniscient and igno-
rant; omnipotent and impotent; and above all, how could all these
discordant attributes concentrate in the same person? The one word
impossible, is a sufficient reply to all such heterogeneous dogmas.—
Notwithstanding, as 1 Tim. iii. 16, and Heb. ii. 16, have long been
considered decisive testimony on this point, I shall proceed to con-
sider the evidence afforded by the two passages.

1. Tim. iii. 16. God was manifested in flesh. The word, God, in
this passage is not authorised by the testimony of the best versions
and Manuscripts, nor is the use of the term supported by the Fath-
and invited them to the honors of a peculiar people, they are represented as called and begotten. Hos. xi. 1. Now as the terms buy, purchase, and redeem can not be understood literally, they must be used metaphorically as when we read of buying without money. Is. lv. 1. We are said to buy when we earnestly endeavor to obtain; thus we buy the truth, Prov. xxiii. 23; and when through carelessness or obstinacy we attend not to the means, we are said to sell it. Hence God is represented as buying a people, when he interposes in their favor; so he purchased Israel: and he sells a people when he withdraws external favors or suffers their enemies to prevail against them. Deut. xxxii. 30. All therefore that is wanted to a right understanding of these terms in the New Testament is only to reflect on their use in the Old; for as God selected the Israelites, rescued them from bondage and exalted them to a state of privilege and happiness, and is therefore said to have called, chosen, and redeemed them; so Christ in like manner having called the Gentiles to a more blessed and happy state, and by the gospel, redeemed them from heathenism, he is also represented as having purchased us to be a peculiar people; his redeemed, chosen, or sanctified ones.

1. Be it observed that a nation in all ages is reckoned the same people. And the church in all ages is considered as one body. Though but one generation of the Jews were in fact delivered from Egyptian bondage, yet as that deliverance was attended with happy consequences to all succeeding ages. That people were instructed to say in all generations, the Egyptians evil entreated us and the Lord brought us out of Egypt and hath given us this land. Deut. xxvi. 6. So though only one generation of our ancestors was converted from heathenism by the light of the gospel, yet as we enjoy the good effects, we may say God has delivered us and translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son. In conformity to this method of speech, Jesus says, Matt. xxiii. 31, have ye not read what was spoken to you of God; though spoken to their ancestors about 1500 years before they were born. See Mark x. 3. John vi. 32.

Before the gospel was preached to the Gentiles, they were described as enemies, ignorant, weak, and dead. Rom. v. 10. Acts xvii. 30. Rom. vi. 6. Eph. ii. 1. But after they heard and believed the testimony of Christ and his apostles, they were represented as reconciled, strong, enlightened, and alive. Rom. v. 1. 1 John ii. 14. Heb. vi. 4. Eph. ii. 5, 6. Like the ancient Jews, they were considered as called, sanctified, saved, redeemed, and as a society denominated, "the city of God, the heavenly Jerusalem," and their names as citizens were enrolled in the city register, or Lamb's book of life. But as all these things denoted only a state of peculiar external privilege, without the least connexion with immortality or a life beyond the grave, there is no reason for surprise, that many, who were thus called, and chosen to the enjoyment of such temporal favors, should relapse into former ignorance and alienations; and returning to their former state, be again considered as dead: and their names erased from the book of life. So far therefore as the enjoy-
ment of gospel privileges may be called a state of salvation, the Arminian has consistent views; but his error becomes egregious, when he transfers these views to another mode of being, or supposes that this redemption and salvation imply deliverance from suffering in another world, or the enjoyment of celestial felicity. Equally do Christians in general mistake, when they imagine, that Christ bought or redeemed men by giving a price for them or suffering as their substitute. Could Jesus buy them from God? His by the supposition they were not; for they are called the children of the wicked ones and consequently were not at God’s disposal! But if they were God’s previously to the purchase of Christ, then they ceased to be God’s after the redemption; but this is absurd. Will any in modern times assume the ridiculous hypothesis that Jesus bought men from the devil? If so, then he certainly would not pay the ransom to God, for this would be injustice and robbery; and the very supposition destroys the whole superstructure of redemption, according to the Catholic and orthodox systems. Hence the general view of the redemption by Christ, is absurd and grossly erroneous! Jesus bought or ransomed us, as he did with much labor and suffering, what was proper to free us from ignorance and sin; to purify us as a peculiar people for the enjoyment of happiness. Seeing then that no proper meaning can be fixed to the terms, buy, ransom, purchase, when taken literally, they must be used metaphorically.

I acknowledge that many able and sincere commentators have been lead into very corrupt notions of the redemption by Jesus, from the use of the terms, Lutron and Apolutrosis. We do not reject the authorities of Suidas and Schlesner, when they tell us, that these words imply a “reward or price given for the redemption of a captive,” nor do we deny that Lutron signifies the ransom paid for a man’s life, Ex. xxi. 30, but we affirm, that these terms are used figuratively, when applied to Christ; and, in the words of Rosenmuller, assert that they “comprehend whatever Christ taught, did, or suffered, to free men from evil; and especially from sin, the source of evils; that they might attain true felicity.” Hence we may, with great propriety, say that the doctrine, example, sufferings, and death of Jesus, constituted a ransom for those who were thereby profited through faith and conformity: because these were the means God used to effect the renovation of mankind, and their recovery from ignorance, sin, and moral degradation. Nor do we know how these ends could have been attained, otherwise than by these very means; and are therefore prepared to assent fully to the declaration of Peter, neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Acts iv. 12. But though our redemption be attributed to the blood of Jesus, we should not consider that it could be of so immense value, yet being used figuratively to denote his character, it implies his goodness and perfect obedience, which became the cause of his exaltation, and of the recovery of millions of human beings from a state of slavery and moral death.
ceremonies, or immoral actions; but is a mystery of piety, which, though concealed for ages, was made manifest by the Son of God to all, through the dispensation of the new and everlasting covenant.

Heb. ii. 16. A mistake of the translators has occasioned theological blundering among divines, in their comments on this passage. Much has been said about Christ's incarnation, or taking on him the nature of man, and passing by the lapsed angels, without pity or compassion. But how will these implicit believers and teachers be surprised, on learning that no such meaning can be deduced from the original; nor could a careful observer of the context, be at a loss to ascertain the true sense of the sixteenth verse, notwithstanding the imperfection of the translation. The apostle had said in the ninth verse, "We see Jesus crowned with glory and honor through the pathema, suffering of death," and in the tenth verse, observes that it became him by whom are all things to sanctify the captain of our salvation by pathematon, sufferings; and in the fourteenth verse he assigns the reason of Christ's suffering, which is this. That as he was a man, and men his brethren partakers of flesh and blood, and consequently of all the infirmities and diseases incident to humanity, he, Christ, also took part in their pathematon, sufferings, that through death he might abolish that which has the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver those, who, by fear of death, through all their life time, were subject to bondage. For verily he, who had the power of death, verse 14, did not arrest as prisoners, angels, but he arrested the seed of Abraham.

In support of this translation let it be observed that Teleiosai, rendered to make perfect, should have been translated, to consecrate, because that as the filling of the hands of Aaron and his sons, completed the ceremony of their consecration, so the sufferings of Jesus is represented as finishing his consecration as the great high priest of our profession. See Heb. ii. 17 and 8, 28. Hence according to the Septuagint, God commands Moses, Teleiosai tas cheiras Aaron, kai tas cheiras ton huion autou, literally, to fill the hands of Aaron and the hands of his sons; but our translators have there correctly rendered the phrase, to consecrate Aaron and his sons. Ex. xxix. 9, 33. Teleioo is used in the same sense and connected in the same manner with hagiazo, to sanctify, in Heb. ii. 10, 11, and should therefore have been translated, to consecrate: for so the word is used in the Septuagint. See Ex. xxix. 10, 33, 35. Lev. viii. 35; xvi. 32; xxi. 10. Num. iii. 3.

Katargese, rendered destroy in the 14th verse, signifies to disannul, dissolve, or abolish, and ought to be used here, in the same sense as in Romans vii. 2, 6, where our translators have rendered it by the phrases, to be loosed, to be delivered, implying that on the death of the husband, the law which bound the woman, was abolished, and was no longer in force. So Christ is said to have abolished death and brought to light life and immortality by the gospel; and this he will effectually perform, when he delivers us from its power by the resurrection. Hence it manifestly appears, that the term,
devil, in the 14th verse, implies the mortality of our nature with its associates, all the diseases and infirmities of humanity. None but Manachecans will admit that the imaginary being, called the devil, has power to produce death; for if so, all are delivered to his will by God, and his triumphs are complete and universal. But as personification is extremely frequent, in the figurative language of scripture, the mortality of man as well as every other thing, inimical to his health and happiness, is called a devil. In the same figurative language, sin and death are represented as reigning like absolute monarchs. Rom. v. 12, 17, 21. And in like manner, the Son of God is said, in one place, to destroy death, in another, to destroy the works of the devil, and in a third, to destroy sin; which are all phrases of similar import, and imply the destruction of all that is injurious to mankind. This glorious end shall be accomplished, when Christ shall have abolished or disannulled that law of human nature which produces dissolution.

Epilambanetai in the 16th verse, signifies to seize or arrest, to detain as prisoners, and this is done not by Christ, as the common translation intimates, but by him that has the power of death, that is mortality. Accordingly the 16th verse should be rendered, Verily it seized not angels, but it arrested the seed of Abraham, i.e. the heirs of the promise of God to that patriarch.

Now if this be a fair statement of facts, and if the 16th verse of this chapter be shamefully interpolated by our mistaken translators; and if it have no reference whatever to Christ, it follows that orthodoxy, combating the billows of scripture evidence, in her struggles for life, seizes the floating weed, or a mere rope of sand, which suffers her to fall and perish in the dark abyss. Let then her advocates seek for assistance from another quarter, for they can obtain none here.

2. We now proceed to investigate the import of those words used to describe what the Mediator has done for mankind. And the first class of words which we shall notice are redeem, buy, purchase, ransom, &c.

In order to obtain correct ideas of the use of these terms, let it be remembered that the writers of the New Testament were Jews, and would be naturally lead to use the phraseology of the Jewish scriptures wherever it could be admitted. As God therefore pleased to distinguish the Jewish nation by selecting them for the purpose of preserving his worship in the earth, and imparted to them a revelation to diffuse the knowledge of the Deity, so he is said to choose them; and they are represented as his chosen and elect people. Deut. iv. 37, 76. 1 Chron. xvi. 13. In the execution of his purpose, he rescued them from the servitude and idolatry of Egypt, and brought them to enjoy liberty and peculiar privileges in that goodly land which he had promised; therefore he is said to have delivered, saved, bought, purchased, or redeemed them. Ex. iii. 8; xiv. 30; xv. 2, 15, 16. Moreover as God brought them from the most abject slavery,
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There is another class of terms that demand our attention; these are propitiation, atonement, sacrifice, and reconciliation.

After the Vulgate, our English translators have rendered the word, *hilasterion*, propitiation, which translation Le Clerc vindicates and Hammond condemns. Certainly we ought to distinguish between *hilasterion*, a propitiatory, and *hilasmos*, a propitiation. 1 John ii. 2. *Hilasterion* never signifies propitiation, as translated in the Latin and English versions, but is always used, wherever it occurs in both the Old and New Testaments, to express the Mercy-seat, which was the golden lid of the Ark, over which hovered the cherubim, upon which the shechinah or cloud of glory rested, and from which the divine oracles were dispensed. Ex. xxv. 22. Num. vii. 89. Lev. xvi. 2. Heb. ix. 5. The Hebrew, *kapporeth*, is rendered by the Septuagint, *hilasterion*, by the Vulgate, *propitiatorium*, and by our translators, in all other places, *Mercy-seat*; and therefore they should have so translated it here.

If it be asked, what idea ought we to have of Christ as a mercy-seat? We answer, the mercy seat was the cover of the Ark of the covenant, where God tells Moses, “I will meet with thee, and I will commune from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim, which are upon the Ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in command to the children of Israel.” Ex. xxv. 22. This was the place from which the voice issued, giving Moses orders what to do. Num. vii. 89. Hence the application is easy: God sent his Son to dispense oracles to men, and make known the councils of the most high: and thus the Apostle describes Jesus as speaking to us from heaven. Heb. xii. 2. Again as the mercy-seat was the place where God met with Moses, the representative of the people, so God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself. 2 Cor. v. 18; and Christ is the brightness of the Father’s glory. Heb. i. 2. Moreover on the great day of atonement, Aaron sprinkled the blood on and before the mercy-seat; Lev. xvi. 13; and burned incense, the emblem of prayer, Ps. cxli. 2. Rev. viii. 3-4; and caused the smoke to cover the mercy-seat. From this, God dispensing mercy and goodness to the people, would teach us that he is seated on a throne of mercy, the basis of his intercourse with men; and that all our prayers and services should have reference to him as placed on the mercy-seat. Let then our view be directed to the Almighty, as meeting us in Christ the Mediator, not as a devouring fire, or a stern Judge, but as a God whose mercy endureth forever, manifested in Christ, as our Father, benefactor, and friend.

Lastly, as the word *propitiation*, implies any thing whereby conformity to the will and character of the Deity is effectcd, and as the great object of Christ’s mission, was to turn every one of us from iniquity, and thereby reconcile us to God, Christ may, with great propriety be called a propitiation; for all that is wanted, to propitiate us to God, is moral conformity to his image. God needs no propitiation, he changes not; therefore in us the change must be ef-
fected. Hence it must appear evident to every unprejudiced person, that this beautiful allusion of the Apostle to the propitiatory, which was intended to represent Christ as the medium of the Divine communications to mankind, gives no countenance to the commonly received doctrine of atonement, by vicarious sufferings. See Hammond, Le Clerc, Taylor, and Imp. Ver. on the passage.

Atonement, Rom. v. 11. "I cannot imagine, says Dr. Taylor, what could induce our translators to render *katallagen* by atonement, when they render the verb, *katallasso*, by reconcile, and *katalluge* by reconciliation, in all other places. See 1 Cor. vii, 11. 2 Cor v. 18, 19, 20. Rom. xi. 25; 2 Cor. x. 18, 19." These words are never applied to the Jews, but only to the Gentile world. Therefore to gain a correct notion of their import, we must remember, that during the long period from the time the covenant was made with Abraham till Christ came, while the Jews were the peculiar people of God and his professed subjects, the rest of the world were under revolt, being the subjects of false gods, to whom they paid idolatical homage. Gal iv. 8. Hence they are called strangers, foreigners, and enemies. But in the gospel, they are invited to return to their allegiance to God, and promised pardon on submitting to that kingdom which God had erected under his Son. Accordingly such of the Gentiles, as believed in Christ, were adopted into the kingdom of God, and became his people and subjects. 1 Thes. i. 9, 10.—Thus the Gentiles were reconciled, or their state was changed from rebels, to that of subjects at peace with God; Rom. v. 1. That this is the true import of the words *katallasso* and *katallage* appears from their derivation from *allo*ς, another, which intimates a change, whereby a person becomes another, or differently minded from what he was before. 1 Cor. vii. 11. If she depart let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband. But that all this should be understood nationally, in relation to external privilege, without any view to real virtue or a state of preparation for heaven by personal holiness, is evident from the distinction made by the Apostle, between reconciliation and salvation. Rom. v. 10. If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

The word *atonement*, radically signifies the same as reconciliation, at one or agreed. But it is capable of being perverted to a very different sense; and hence they who attach the heathen doctrine of placating wrathful gods, prefer the use of the term *atonement*, to that of *reconciliation*. Surely the scripture could never excite the notion of God being angry, and afterwards appeased by sacrifices; for if the immutable Jehovah was ever angry or wrathful, he must have remained so eternally. Every view that can be taken of the doctrine of atonement, as taught by christians in general, divests Jehovah of the attributes of goodness and immutability; and places him on a footing with the human idols of the Pagan world. The original word signifies a change, and if applied to God, must mean that he changes, which robs him of every claim to deity.
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The doctrine of atonement, implying a satisfaction to Divine justice for the transgressions of the sinner, is a most unholy, licentious, and absurd dogma, which should be expunged out of every book, as it must out of every mind, before the knowledge of God can enter. If Jesus were the only God, as the believers of this doctrine assert, to whom could he make an atonement? If to any, surely to himself; and if this were effected by sufferings, then he must have punished himself to please himself, which outrages all common sense!! If there be three persons in the Godhead, the Father, Son, and Spirit, then the dispositions and attributes of each and all of them, must be the same. If the Father were angry, the Son must have been angry— if the Father required an atonement, the Son must demand it also. Who then shall interpose on behalf of man? If the Son make an atonement, then the doctrine is proved false, which supposed the Deity to require an atonement or piacular sacrifice, or the supposed Deity of Jesus is denied. If Jesus be God, and made an atonement to the Father, then by parity of reasoning, Jesus can not admit of any being saved, till the Father become incarnate and make an atonement to the Son. In like manner must the matter be adjusted between them, and the Holy Spirit. O God of wisdom, what confusion and impurity is here!!

But say the advocates of this doctrine, Jesus must be God and have made an infinite atonement for our sins, or our case is hopeless. Why, what need for an infinite atonement? If the sin of one man, requires an infinite sacrifice, then there will be needed, just as many infinite atonements as there have been, or shall be sinners in the world; and just as many infinite Gods must become incarnate, and suffer in man's stead, as there will be sinners saved from infinite and endless wrath!! Moreover if Christ have made an infinite atonement for the satisfaction of Divine justice, why will not all be saved? Will God be unjust to himself? Can he punish himself for no purpose? O ye christians, when will ye admit the understanding God has given you, to vindicate the Divine character from such unhallowed aspersions!

Many still cling to the notion of substitution, from reading certain phrases in the Scriptures, which, if taken literally, would seem to imply the doctrine. But a careful perusal of these same scriptures, would soon recover them from this deception. As the transgressions of Israel were placed on the head of the scape goat, and he carried them off, to signify that they were pardoned. Lev. xvi. 21, 22. So the Lord is represented as placing our iniquities on Christ, who bears them away. But this figure should convey to our minds the abolution of sin, when the transgressor becomes reconciled to God, through the instrumentality of Christ or his gospel. For as Christ is said to bear our sins, Is. liii. 11; John i. 29; 1 Peter ii. 24, so he is said to bear our sickness. Matt. viii. 17. If then he became a sinner because of our sin, he must have also become an invalid by our diseases. But as he carried our sorrows, Is. liii. 4, and bore our diseases, Matt. viii. 17, without either becoming sick,
or accounted diseased, so he carried or bore our sins, without becoming a sinner, either really or imputedly. The Hebrew nasha, Is. liii. 11, and the Greek, elabe, Matt. viii. 17, are the words, used in the description of the scape-goat, Lev. xvi. 22, and imply that Christ takes away sins, as the goat figuratively did, not by suffering for them, for this the goat did not, but by turning men away from their sins, or delivering them from the desire or disposition to sin; and this he does when men are reconciled to God in this world, or when he delivers them from the bondage of corruption, in the morn of the resurrection. When therefore it is said that Christ died for us, we ought not to imagine that he died in our stead; for experience demonstrates that we all die each for himself; and that every man still suffers for his own sin. But Christ died for us, that is on our account; for all the actions and sufferings of his life were for the honor of God and man's benefit. So far however are the scriptures from teaching the doctrine of substitution that they represent men suffering for Christ as he suffered for them. Phil. i. 29. Acts xv. 26, xxi, 13. As none therefore will dare to say, that we suffer for Christ's sins, so none ought to assert that he suffered in our stead, the innocent for the guilty. It notwithstanding clearly follows, that Christ suffered on our account, with a view to our advantage; and with that benevolent disposition of mind, which inclines every good man to do good even at his own hazard. Nay he may even be said to have suffered in our stead, because had he not been faithful unto death, millions, who have been reclaimed by his doctrine and example, might have, all their lives, remained under the bondage of corruption.

The doctrine of bloody sacrifices, as substitutes for virtue, especially human victims, had its origin in the darkened minds of Pagan idolators. "When mankind lost sight of a beneficent Creator, the God of purity, and consecrated altars to demons and hero-gods, such as Moloch and Baal; these objects of blinded fear led them to the most horrid acts of cruelty; and to every species of obscenity; and even to burn their sons and daughters in the fire to their monster gods. Such we read was the conduct of the king of Moab, who offered his eldest son for a burnt offering on the wall, when his capital was besieged; and with these scriptural facts, all accounts, ancient and modern, exactly correspond. See Townsend's character of Moses.

Homer, who wrote nine hundred years before the Christian era, gives us one account of human victims. But not till it was conceived that a great and most malignant spirit was the proper object of fear; or that provincial gods, equally malignant, disposed of all things in our world, did men bind their own species to the altar, and in times of distress, sacrifice those whom they valued most.—After Xerxes passed the Strymon, he buried alive nine young men and as many virgins; following the example of his wife, who had commanded fourteen Persian children of illustrious birth, to be offered, in the same manner, to the god that rules below. Thus in the
infancy of Rome, Curtius, for the safety of his country, devoted himself to the infernal gods! So when Aeneas performed the last rites for his friend Pallas, he sacrificed eight captives to the infernal gods! Thus we behold the vain notion of vicarious sufferings, distinctly marked in the rude conceptions of a benighted and savage world, who foolishly imagined, that the guilt of the offender might be transferred to the innocent. How much is it to be lamented, that civilized nations should have retained the crude notions of their barbarous ancestors. These dreadful calamities never could have happened in the world, had not the knowledge of the Great Jehovah been lost, and his person and worship supplanted, by an imaginary apostate spirit, whose adoration has been at different times universally diffused over all the nations of the earth.

The practice of shedding human blood before the altars of their gods was not peculiar to the Trojans and Greeks; the Romans followed their example. In the first ages of their republic, they sacrificed their children to the goddess Mania; and Augustus, after taking Perusia, sacrificed on the ides of March, three hundred senators and knights to the divinity of Julius Caesar. The Carthaginians sacrificed their children to Chronus. In Heliopolis the Egyptians sacrificed three men daily to Jano. The Spartans scourged to death young women, to gratify Diana; and the Arcadians did the same to appease the wrath of Bacchus. The Sabian idolaters offered human victims to Myrtha—the Cretans to Jupiter—the Lacedemonians to Mars—the Lesbians to Bacchus—the Phocians to Diana—the Thessalians to Chiron. Caesar informs us, that the Gauls being persuaded that the gods could never be appeased otherwise than by giving life for life, constructed wicker images of enormous bulk, and having filled them with men, they first suffocated and then consumed them by fire! Long smoked the altars of Woden with Swedish blood; and the Danes, in the January of every ninth year, sacrificed ninety nine men, with as many dogs. It is well known that the Brahmins have had their human victims, in all ages; and even in our days, thousands have voluntarily perished under the wheels of their god Jughernaut. But who in America will approve a practice so infernal; and who will be so impious as to say, that God has sanctified the example, by the slaughter of his son? Away then, O away with the unholy doctrine of substitution; and let the shocking narrative of bloody human victims be heard no more in a Christian land.

We have long been taught that sacrifices were instituted by Jehovah; that they commenced immediately after the lapse of our first parents; and were intended to typify and represent the sacrifice of the mediator, which he should make for the sin of mankind, about four thousand years after. But this is altogether gratuitous conjecture, and is totally incapable of either proof or vindication. If God was pleased to institute sacrifices and offerings as substitutes for virtue and obedience, how could he afterwards abrogate them, or declare them insignificant and unavailing, during the very time of the Mosaic institution, under which they were practised? Can the popish doc-
true of indulgences, or of selling licences for the commission of crime, be blamed or condemned by those, who advocate the divine origin of sacrifices? Surely n-t, without the greatest inconsistency. God declares he has no delight in sacrifices; that he will not reprove for the neglect of them; that they were vain oblations; and the apostle pronounces them insignificant and inadequate to answer the end for which they were intended. See Ps. i. 8, 14, and li. 16. Is. i. 11, 14. Heb. x. 1, 8. We therefore conclude that they were not of divine origin but borrowed from the dark idolatrous nations, and practised, by God's permission, in the external parade of an emblematic and ceremonial worship.

From this investigation of the terms and phrases, used by the sacred writers, to explain the objects of Christ's mission, we can fairly conclude, that man alone being in a state of irreconcilation and rebellion against his maker, Christ the ambassador of Heaven, came on a message of love from his Father, and our Father, and labored, most perseveringly to reconcile us to God. That his whole life being devoted to this great end, may have authorised the apostles, speaking after the manner of the Jews, to represent Christ as a lamb, a sacrifice, and a propitiation; and so far as the message was successful, to denominate him our Saviour, Redeemer, Justification, and Redemption. If however it be demanded, wherein consists the design and end of Christ's death, to which the sacred writers attach so great importance? We reply.

1. The death of Christ was necessary to ratify the covenant of grace and mercy. He was the faithful and true witness. For this cause he was born and came into the world, that he might bear witness of the truth. He died a martyr, and thereby sealed the truth of his testimony with his blood. Throughout his public ministry, he had taught the doctrine of a blessed immortality; and his death was admirably calculated to confirm that doctrine. His public crucifixion, during one of the principal Jewish festivals, when strangers were collected at Jerusalem from all parts of the then known world, would naturally produce inquiry, and cause the name and doctrines of Jesus to be every where known. His resurrection from the dead while the multitudes remained at the festival, would naturally tend to incline men to farther inquiry, and prepare the way of the Lord and his gospel among the nations. Though his resurrection could not be an example or evidence of that of other men, seeing his body had not undergone decomposition, yet it was Jehovah's seal of the covenant, which confirmed the truth of Christ's mission and the doctrine of pardon and eternal life. Under this view the gospel is of the very highest importance to mankind. Influenced by a desire to exist beyond the grave, the sages of antiquity sighed for immortality, but never could arrive at certainty on this awful and interesting subject. By the death and resurrection of Jesus, the darkness is removed, doubts are dissipated, and the clear light now shines; for he hath brought life and immortality to light by the gospel.
2. The death of Jesus exhibits the most perfect example of obedience and moral excellence. He had authority to lay down his life; and authority to take it up again. This command he received of his Father. He might have avoided a violent death, had he deserted the path of duty; but by strict adherence to his duty, he exposed himself to pain and sufferings, that he might become our example in suffering for the cause of truth and God. In his death he manifested no resistance nor ill-will to his enemies. His gentleness and meekness, showed that in him was fulfilled the prediction of the prophet, "He was led like a lamb to the slaughter and like a sheep is dumb before his shearer, so he opened not his mouth." His life and death evinced nothing but pity for his enemies, submission to the will of his God, and love to the whole human race.

3. He died to effect the salvation of mankind. The common notion of salvation is exemption from future punishment, and enjoyment of future bliss. But this is rather a consequence of the gospel salvation, than the salvation itself. If we speak literally, the death of Christ was never designed to free man from the consequences of sin; much less to intercept or pervert the exercise of justice. A holy God cannot suffer the guilty to pass unpunished, and a just God will not punish the innocent instead of the guilty. The death of Jesus therefore, should never be regarded as a means of degrading the attributes of Deity, for the sake of favoring human impiety, or obtaining a licence to sin with impunity. But as the death of Jesus was the seal of the everlasting covenant, and the confirmation of the gospel message, it was eminently calculated to produce conviction in the minds of men, that he came from God; and believing the Gospel, their lives become assimilated to his precepts and example. They turn from idols to the living God; and being saved from sin, they cease to experience its consequences. Thus Christ died for us; and thus he died for our sins; that we being turned from our iniquities might serve God in newness of life, all our days. Hence it appears that the salvation Jesus died to effect, and which the believers in him can alone enjoy, consists in a state of reconciliation to God; and this reconciliation is effected, in the mind of rebellious man, when he beholds in the Gospel glass, the face of his merciful Father, breathing only love and pity for his erring offspring. Alarmed at the folly of his unholy and vile conceptions of his Maker, and reflecting on the degradation and misery experienced in a state of alienation, he exclaims, I will arise and go to my Father. Perceiving immediately that God is love, he finds his heaven is begun, and walking in the commandments of the Lord and the light of his countenance, he lifts his eyes to the Heavens and in the spirit of adoption cries,

There is my house and portion fair,
My treasure and my heart are there,
And my abiding home;
For me my elder Brethren stay,
And angels beckon me away,
And Jesus bids me come.
Thus we have finished this most important disquisition, the greater part of which, has been occupied in clearing away the rubbish from the spiritual temple of the Lord, polishing the rude materials, and preparing for the erection of a Divine and permanent superstructure. In the mission of Jesus, we behold the love of the Universal Parent, freely flowing to a sinful and rebellious world. No price was required, no bloody sacrifice needed to induce the God of love to pity his offspring. He selected Jesus a man from among his brethren, he endowed him with wisdom and power, thus making him adequate to be the Saviour of the world; for to say that God could not make a man, a sufficient Saviour, is to assert that he either knows not the extent of the salvation needed, or that God's power is limited; either of which is tantamount to atheism. Having therefore duly qualified Jesus, and sent him to be the Saviour of the world, all who hear and believe the message of the Son, experience initial salvation through the pardon of sin, and joy and peace in believing. This Salvation, therefore, is not a deliverance from the consequences of sin, whilst men live in transgression, but it is a deliverance from the tendency and disposition to sin; and hence a deliverance from its consequences. But as the proclamation of the gospel is limited, and all men do not hear, much less believe the glorious message; there are still but few, comparatively speaking, who enjoy initial Salvation, in this world. Notwithstanding as God appointed Jesus to be the Saviour of the world, and on account of his obedience to death, appointed him likewise, the great Steward of Heaven, to dispense the blessings of the new and everlasting covenant; He shall open the kingdom of heaven, not only to all who believe and are partially saved in this live, but 'tis in the whole human family; by the glorious change of death, for honor and immortality, all shall be introduced into the joys of their Lord. Amen. J. S. T.
SUPPLEMENT.

UNIVERSALISM.

A Sermon from Acts xxviii: 22, "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest," delivered in the Court House, Utica, April 24, 1825.

From this simple syllogism, "I think therefore I exist," the great Descartes originated his whole system. Human knowledge in all its ramifications, and in all the Almightiness of its operations, displayed in the invention, improvement, and cultivation of the sciences, is but the offspring of thought. Intellect, like the God whose image it is, and from whom it proceeds, exhibits its inexhaustible energies to the astonishment even of itself, in creating, preserving, ruling, and reforming the moral and political world; saying to the things that are not, be; to the chaos of jarring elements, let the discordance cease; let the light be separated from the darkness; let there be a way in the wilderness; let it be free from obstruction, and so straight and plain that the wayfaring man may not err therein. Many are thy properties, numerous thine honors, and unbounded thy favors, O intellect, God's first, best and most essential gift to man. Though I should eulogise thee throughout the whole of this discourse, every careful observer of the vast treasures of wisdom and knowledge obtained from thee, would adopt the words of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon, one half has not been told me. Confusion and disorder mark thine absence. Error and vice stalk abroad whilst thou sleepest. Slavery, impiety, anarchy, and all the train of human woes, are but the noxious weeds that pollute the soil, uncultivated by thine all renovating hand. Hence ignorance is but the negative of reflection, and vice the never failing offspring of ignorance.

When heaven would beatify man and raise him to the rank of the celestials, it poured out on him a flood of intellect, which enabled him, intuitively, to perceive his alliance with heaven and his claims to immortality. But alas, "gens humana ruin in vetitum nefas," the human race hastens into wickedness. Let then the offender hear reproof, for Solomon says, he that hateth it is brutish. There is a generation of men, O how perverse, how ungrateful, who would persuade us to rise and mutiny, not only against thought, but also against wisdom and knowledge, her legitimate offspring. Nay they would even solicit our alliance in this unholy warfare! In order to effect this object, they declaim against the exercise of thought, and denounce reason as destructive to the soul; inimical to religion and opposed to the teachings of the word and spirit of God! Friends, we think we can decipher their meaning; we even flatter ourselves we have discovered the cause of their opposition to the exercise of reason, in matters of religion. The irrational, mysterious, unintelligible, and fraudulent dogmas, which through a serpentine craftiness,
they would impose on us, have led to these sprainings and cunning tricks by which they have long succeeded to hold the mind in vassalage and the heart in trepidation. Brethren, if all thought be not a mere revery, if the world exist and men upon it, if there be any thing true, wise and good, it is by understanding we discern it, and the mind is the medium, God has vouchsafed, for making the distinction. If then human happiness or misery can be augmented by ought we can say or do, it becomes us to rouse from the Lethal sleep into which we have fallen, by the implicit use of those deleterious nostrums, too long administered by unskilful pretenders to the ruin of the religious world. Let us assume our privileges as men and as citizens of this happy realm; and in the enjoyment and exercise of man's inalienable right, and in obedience to heaven's high behest, acquit ourselves as intelligible beings, in distinguishing good from evil, truth from falsehood, virtue from vice; and still more especially the privileges of men from the vassalage of a slave or the degradation of the beasts or reptiles that grovel in the dust.

The ancient sages adopted a maxim of which modern acumen has never been able to detect the fallacy. On the contrary, our ablest philosophers and poets, and even heaven itself, by divine revelation, have borne witness to its excellence and expediency. It is thus expressed by Pope,

"The proper study of mankind is man."

Notwithstanding, whenever we enter on this study, and begin to reflect on our origin, preservation, and final destiny, the notion of a first cause, a superintending providence; and a state of immortality, bear in upon us, and demand a share in our reflections, and effect a powerful influence over all the operations of our minds. In the prosecution therefore of this discourse, regarding you, my audience, as honest inquirers, preferring the request of the text, I will candidly develope my views of the great Eternal Cause of all worlds, his conduct towards man his creature, and the condition of man in the present and future world. Hence our discourse will be guided by the following arrangement.

1. God is one only being, possessed of all possible power, wisdom and goodness.

2. In relation to his intelligent offspring he acts in eternal harmony with all these attributes; and the object of his government must be consistent with their spontaneous operation.

3. Man ever was, is, and eternally must be, such as God would have him to be; and therefore every stage of his existence must tend to develope God's unlimited power, wisdom, and goodness; and the result of all causes and effects in the moral world, must be productive of the highest honor to God and the greatest happiness to mankind, both collectively and individually.

1. The divine unity is the result of the divine perfections. This proposition is so clear and incontrovertible, that no mathematical demonstration can bring more certain and powerful conviction to the human mind. So sure as God exists, and man is a reflecting being,
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so certain is the truth of the divine declaration, God is one: and just as certain is the falsehood of the doctrine of the Trinity, or that God is more than one. If divine power be illimitable, there cannot be more than one Omnipotence. The moment that we ascribe Omnipotence to a second being we deny the infinite power of the first.—The same may be said of all the other attributes of the Deity. The Trinitarian is therefore as certainly convicted of error or deception in his creed as he can be of his own existence. The pretence, that the three persons are not three Gods, but one, on account of possessing the same nature and attributes, is as silly and absurd as to affirm, that there never was more than one man; and that all the millions of Adam's posterity make only one, because of the unity of their nature. But the fallacy of the latter proposition is intuitively evident, to the weakest capacity; and just as evidently false must the first appear to every mind not perverted by a viciated education, or deprived by the influence of a blind superstition.

The doctrine of the divine Unity is so plain, so rational, so intelligible, so scriptural, that I think I combat a shadow, whilst I discourse against Polytheism of any kind. All denominations of Christians verbally admit the unity of God, however repugnant their theories or illegitimate their conclusions. God and human intellect witness, reciprocally, this great foundation of the Jewish and Christian systems. But how painful the thought, that men professing obedience to God and the doctrine of Jesus, men who would arrogate to themselves, the exclusive privilege of being orthodox defenders of the faith, should, in opposition to the testimony of God, nature, and intellect, still continue to outrage their own understandings, by pleading for a plurality in unity. Councils may decree it, kings and princes may proclaim and defend it, and all the pains and penalties of this world and the next, may be denounced against them who disbelieve it; but the doctrine of the Trinity, that three are one, and one, three will be held in abhorrence by the reflecting mind, and every intellect God has made, if not debased by prejudice or superstition, must pronounce it a manifest imposition. O rational men despise it. You cannot believe it. God has made you incapable of such folly! His holy word abjures it, and warns you against every tendency to idolatry. O give to the Lord the glory due to his name by acknowledging him the sole God and Parent of the universe, and ascribing to him the undivided praise of all his works.

Often has it grieved me to hear men, who profess to fear the Lord and obey his commandment, so far dishonor themselves as to ascribe to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, equal and undivided praise!! Does not the very repetition of the term, God, in the above doxology, declare a belief in three Gods; and if the praise be equal, how can it be undivided!! O that men would cease to use such unmeaning, unholy language; or that all, who fear God, would forsake the assemblies where such expressions are wont to be used! May God purify us from all inhuman rites and ceremonies, and sanctify us to the worship of the Father in spirit and in truth!
The latter part of my first proposition, that God is possessed of all possible power, wisdom, and goodness, is as self-evident as the first: for none that admit the being of a God, can deny the infinity of his perfections. He therefore must be as unbounded in wisdom and goodness as in power. Some of the opponents of God's goodness, are making very daring efforts to circumscribe his wisdom. They are not ashamed to assert that God has no foreknowledge; and to vail this deception, they affirm that all time with God is one eternal now! In many cases, falsehood may be detected by the extravagant efforts made to conceal and dissemble; and if extravagancy and craftiness, be evil omens, there is no want of either in the foregoing affirmation. If with God there be no distinction of time or seasons, he is more imperfect than his creatures, who daily perceive this distinction. Will any say, that in God's account: we are co-eval with Adam, and he cotemporary with the last of his offspring. Surely not. The assumption that all time is an eternal now with God, is as false in his estimate as in ours. Moreover, if there be no fore-knowledge with God, all prophecy must be conjecture, and even existence itself, must be a dream.

If we admit the fore-knowledge of Deity, we will be led to adopt the language of the Scriptures and say, "Known unto God are all his ways from the beginning of the world!" And having adopted this notion of the Divine prescience, we will easily perceive, that God fore-saw what man would be, and what he would do, before that he created the earth or man upon it. If then God be guided by wisdom, and influenced by goodness, how could he exert his Almighty power for the destruction or disgrace of his other attributes, in forming mankind, if according to the common notion of his conduct, man should be an eternal loser by existence. Nay, sooner than God could have made man liable to eternal misery, all the attributes of his nature would have rose, in mutiny, against the execution of that almighty fiat, by which the world and all things began to exist. Rest assured, brethren; that, the existence of the material world and all its phenomena, are so many proofs that the doctrine of endless misery is a libel on the character of God, as the universal Parent of nature and all its operations.

2. We may, here appropriately inquire into the moving cause of man's formation. In reply, Heaven, earth, and human experience respond, benevolence was the only attribute, which could prompt omnipotence to action. For the manifestation and honor of this attribute, man was made, and shall continue a standing monument of eternal and unbounded beneficence. An infinitely wise God could not make a being to become the object of his envy or dislike. The supposition, that man became what God did not intend in his creation, amounts to a denial of his omniscience and his capability to govern the beings which he made. The Omnipotence of Deity never could be the cause of his performing any action; nor could his wisdom, for the first is only the means and the latter the modulator of
his operations. No other motive can intellect devise, for the formation of man, than the eternal goodness of God, flowing in streams of ceaseless beneficence to all his dependent offspring. To say that his purposes of grace shall be frustrated, or the store of his benevolence exhausted or perverted, is no less than to calumniate the wisdom and power of the Deity. If the wisdom of God be eternal and unbounded, he saw the end from the beginning, and the tendency and result of every operation, from the first cause to the last effect of all the movements of the interminable universe, both in time and eternity. Almighty power could not act in opposition to infinite goodness, for this would suppose that malevolence predominated, in the very seat of pure, eternal unchanging benevolence.

All the attributes of God must therefore harmonize in man’s happiness, which is the only end the Divine benevolence could propose to itself, in becoming operative: and with its free and spontaneous exercise, all the perfections of Deity symphonize, in the formation, preservation, and salvation of mankind,

3. Man was, is, and must ever be, what God intended he should be; and his eternal destiny will only tend to develope the infathomableness of that Ocean of goodness, which dwells in the Deity, and ceaselessly flows in copious streams for the beatification of his intelligent creatures.

These propositions are so plain and intelligible as to require no demonstration; for it manifestly follows, that if God’s design, in relation to man, at any period of his existence be frustrated, it must be by a power greater than Omnipotence, which is absurd and inadmissible. Hence it is intuitively evident, and follows by rational deduction, that man must be at all times, what God would have him to be, in the station and circumstances in which he is placed. How fanciful then the histories of a Paradisaical state, or Golden age, when God was so pleased with his creatures, and man so perfect and happy! When the earth produced spontaneously, and the horn of plenty poured out such a flood of luxuries for the satiety of man’s appetites and desires.

But it is asserted, the Scriptures teach these opinions, and we ought to receive them. I answer, the Scriptures, like every other faithful witness, must be so understood as not to allow contradiction, for then the evidence would be unavailing. These Scriptures however, affirm, that man was made subject to vanity, and had not, in his primeval state, the knowledge of good and evil; consequently, in this infantile state, he was ignorant till taught by experience; and hence it follows that the history of the whole intellectual world, is epitomised in the experience of each individual.

Alike irrational and indefensible the doctrine, which supposes that God, on account of man’s rebellion, became dissatisfied with his creatures, and grieved by what he had done. How absurd the supposition that God should be defeated by his creatures, and God and man equally subjected to penitence, on account of man’s mis
conduct!! How long will it be, O ye sons of men, ere it suffice you, to represent the Great Jehovah, a foolish, changeable, and irritable being, altogether like yourselves. Cease, O cease the folly and impiety of degrading your maker. The doctrine of implacable wrath in God, and an infinite satisfaction made by Jesus, to placate the Deity on behalf of man, exceeds all the vagaries of heathen traditions in extravagance and absurdity. What! could the Eternal change? If ever angry, must he not have remained so eternally? All the hue spun theories about God’s displeasure with his creatures, and Christ’s mission to save them by expiatory sacrifices, are founded in the rude and savage conceptions of a Pagan world, and amount to the most direct and infamous slander of the divine character and government. Learn my auditors, that folly is bound up in the heart of the child, but the rod and reproof will put it far away. God by due discipline, will bring his sons and daughters to maturity, and when perfected, they will show forth his praise.

But some of my auditors may feel disposed to object to this discourse, because, in it, there is nothing about Man’s lost estate by nature—his recovery by the incarnation and bloody sacrifice of the second person of the Trinity—the present and eternal triumphs of a malignant Devil—an awful future judgment, and an eternal Hell for the wicked, I acknowledge the justice of the charge, for I have said nothing in approbation of such opinions, and I trust you shall never hear such doctrines mentioned by the mouth of a Universalist ministry, except with a view to refute them or expose their folly and impiety. God cannot be so hard a task master as to require from his creatures credence of an absurd and incomprehensible doctrine: and the very admission of a doctrine being mysterious, is a tacit acknowledgement that it forms no part of revelation, but is an invention of designing men. The Universalist believes in one placid, unchanging God, who never was angry with his creatures; but is now, and eternally will be, a God of love. That out of the multitude of his goodness and mercy, he sent prophets and apostles to instruct and teach mankind the paths of truth, virtue, and happiness. That he has given man a revelation of his sacred councils, in the Old and New Testaments, and sent his son Jesus, the Christ, to bless every one of us by turning us away from our iniquities; which glorious work he will perform, through the plentitude of Divine power and wisdom, which God has bestowed on him—not by becoming our substitute and suffering the punishment due to our crimes—not by producing any change in the mind of God towards us—but by teaching us the doctrine of his heavenly Father—setting us an example of moral rectitude, and finally changing our vile bodies in the resurrection, and making them like his glorious body, immortal, incorruptible, holy, and celestial. The Universalist can not believe that God would make, appoint, or permit a Devil to baffile his own designs or mar his fair creation—Divine wisdom could not act thus. Could the God of consistency, of purity, of truth, of holiness, form
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Isa. 32:49, 50.

a devil, or rest satisfied with an administration, directly opposed to that of his own devising. It is too absurd to be admitted. Judgment is executed in the earth, under the righteous administration of God, who always renders to every man according as his works may be—consequently hell or pain is in this world and not in another, into which nothing terrestrial and imperfect shall ever enter.

Know then that man never was, nor never can be lost in the proper sense of the term. Upheld by Almighty power, acknowledged the child of God and heir of heaven, the divine truth and fulness are pledged for man's support and maintenance; and as soon shall the rivers of life fail, that flow from the throne of the Eternal, as man cease to experience his relationship to his Maker. Away then with the pagan doctrines of angry Gods, dying Gods, and bloody sacrifices as substitutes for virtue, God abhors vice, rewards the righteous and will not let the guilty pass unpunished. Yet safely shall Thou dwell, O man beneath the shade of the Almighty, who is thy Maker and protector, and who will, in due time, introduce you, all pure, all holy, celestial, and incorruptible into his more immediate presence, where there shall be fulness of joy forever more.

Such are the views of the Universalist, and such must become the religious sentiments of mankind generally, when knowledge becomes universally diffused throughout society. These truths are so manifestly evident, so consistent, so simple, and harmonious, that their success will keep equal pace with the emancipation of the human mind from the thraldom of superstition, and the prejudices of a corrupt education. All they require is a candid, honest investigation. They fear not the most rigid scrutiny, but exult in the prospects of an impartial and accurate inquiry. Let them have a fair hearing; and let them be acquitted or condemned at the bar of a righteous tribunal. All we ask for them is indemnity from subordination, and an honest heart, in which these seeds of life may be sown. Honesty is one of the noblest principles in the civil and political world, and constitutes the very foundation stone in the temple of virtue, and a chief pillar in the city of the living God. O then be honest to follow the sincere convictions of your own consciences and the testimony of Jesus. Nothing can be more insulting to all the attributes of the Eternal Jehovah, than dissimulation in his service, or hypocrisy in religion. None, who are found guilty, can be esteemed by either God or man, till purged from the haven of their Pharisaical wickedness, or cleansed by the purifying fire of the divine chastisements.

Brethren, we are confident in these things, and this our confidence does not arise from our ignorance of the opposite opinions, as is generally the case with our opponents; but having received a commission from the Son of God to preach the gospel to every creature, we dare not limit the mercy of the Holy One of Israel, nor call that common which God has cleansed. Like Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Christ in the gospel, we call God to witness, that our preaching among you, is not yea, nay, but yea; for all the promises are yea and amen in Christ, to the glory of God by us. Whilst then the partialist would
arrogantly pretend to scan the secret councils of Jehovah, and feast his dreams of fancy on the supposition that he has discovered his own name and those of a few others engraven on the palms of the Redeemer’s hands, the Universalist puts full confidence in the testimony of Jesus, that he came to seek and save that which was lost, as an eternal refutation of such ungodly partiality. Such a decree of selection would stand an eternal implication on the truth and divinity of Christ’s mission and doctrine; for if according to the above opinion, a decree of præterition had passed on part of mankind, that very part must have constituted the lost, whom Jesus came to seek and save.

But whilst we are thus fully persuaded in our own minds, let us cultivate charity, which is the bond of perfectness. Let us remember that love is the fulfilling of the law, and the essence of true religion. The more men are influenced by love, the more they resemble their maker; and the more they appropriate God, heaven, and salvation, as their exceeding great reward, the more they will rise into the Divine likeness and be transformed by the renewing of their minds. Remember the saying of your blessed Master, According to thy faith be it unto thee. Let never the charge, the ignorant, antisciptural charge of licentiousness, against doctrine of Universal faith, induce you for a moment, to relax your confidence in God or his impartial benevolence. It is faith, which purifies the heart, whilst blind unbelief, the cause and foundation of partialism, pollutes the soul, and makes the heart of man as a cage of unclean birds, and an everflowing fountain of perennial wickedness. But cultivating the Christian virtues, let our hearts be cheered with the agreeable anticipations that Heaven will soon open a brighter era on the world; when the darkness shall be scattered, the reign of evil cease, and an everlasting righteousness be established amongst the children of men. This glorious age must come. The promise and oath of Jehovah are pledged for its accomplishment. Is. xliv. 23, 24. Is. lv. 10, 11. This is the covenant of God our Saviour, this the decree of the immutable Jehovah, who is of one mind and none can turn him; for the fulfilment of such a benevolent purpose, for the execution of such a glorious design, let all the redeemed of the Lord, say Amen. Even so come Lord Jesus.
LECTURE 14.

CHRIST’S COMING TO JUDGMENT.

A Disquisition on 2 Thess. i. 6—10.

Since I have begun to labor in the vineyard of my Lord, as a minister of the Everlasting Gospel, the subject of this Lecture has frequently been alleged by my opponents, as an unequivocal demonstration of human woe in a future mode of existence; and an insurmountable obstacle to the progress of the doctrine of universal salvation. A variety of circumstances has called the attention of the public to this passage of scripture, as a dernier resort of the opposers of Universalism; and it has been selected seven times by different clergymen, in the vicinity of this populous and growing village, in their attempts to overthrow or establish the Abrahamic Faith.—I have therefore undertaken to show, that this portion of sacred scripture relates to the severe chastisements of God, inflicted on the Jews for rejecting our Lord and persecuting his followers; and that it has no allusion whatever to the destiny of men in another and unseen world. The discussion of this contested and alarming passage shall be conducted according to the following arrangement.

1. I shall endeavor to render the translation more correct and agreeable to the original Greek.

2. I shall speak of the time, manner, signs, and end of Christ’s coming.

1. The Greek preposition meta signifies in company; co-operation in the same design; adherence to the same party. The original meaning of the word, appears to have been a conducto whom others accompany. Hence the phrase, thlibomenois meth hemon, may be rendered, our fellow sufferers; and meth angelon, co-operating with his messengers, or conducting his messengers as a leader or a captain. Accordingly the seventh verse will read, “rest to you our fellow-sufferers at the revelation of our Lord Jesus, co-operating with his mighty messengers,” i. e. conducting the Roman army to inflict the long predicted woes on the Jewish people and nation. The phrase diken tiein, in the ninth verse answers to the penas dare, of Virgil, and signifies to pay justice, atone, expiate or suffer. This is the constant, and I may add the almost invariable meaning of the above phrases, in the best Latin and Greek classics. The ninth verse ought therefore to read, “who shall suffer, oletroon aionion, aionia.
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loss from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his majesty." Is. ii. 19. 21. The term, olethron, translated destruction, has induced many to adopt the unmerciful and unscriptural notion of the annihilation of the wicked. But this fanciful opinion must have originated from inattention to the scriptural and classical use of the term as well as the doctrine of the everlasting gospel. Ollumi, in Greek, e reo, in Latin, perdre, in French, and perish, in English, are terms frequently used to express apprehension of some impending danger. Olethron derived from ollumi, may therefore be correctly translated loss. Moreover what Paul calls tribulation in the sixth verse is denominated destruction in the ninth. Where Luke uses the word apolesai to destroy, Matthew employs the term basanisai, to torment. Though both the evangelists intended to communicate the same idea, Luke iv. 34, Mat. viii. 29. When Matthew speaks of destroying both soul and body in Gehennah, Luke expresses the same ideas by the phrase, cast into Gehennah. Mat. x, 28, Luke xii. 5. If the wicked be annihilated on account of their iniquity, how can the reward be according to works? But the uniform language of scripture declares both the righteous and the wicked shall be recompensed for their deeds; and men shall be beaten with many or few stripes in proportion as they have been more or less vicious in their moral conduct. If the phrase, to be no more, Ps. civ. 53, Lam. v. 7, which, in several languages, implies to die, mean utter and perpetual extinction of being, then Noach, Joseph, and David must have been annihilated. Gen. v. 24; xlii. 13, and Ps. xxxix. 13. If the second death, which Whitby on my text shows from the targums of Onkelos, Uziel, and Jerusalem to be a proverbial expression denoting the correction of the impious, mean annihilation, then those who are cast into the lake of fire cannot be tormented day and night; nor can the wrath of God abide on unbelievers. Rev. xiv. 11, John iii. 36. But Israel, who destroyed himself, Hos. xiii. 9; the son of predication, 2 Thes. ii. 3, the wicked whom the Lord will destroy, 2 Thes. ii. 8, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction; 2 Thes, i. 9, and will utterly perish, Deut. iv. 26; Josh. xxiii. 16, and Deut. xxx. 18, was no other, in the opinion of Lightfoot, Le Clerc, Hammond, and other able commentators, than the Jewish nation, which, as a body politic and ecclesiastical, was destroyed or dispersed forever. Notwithstanding if ever the design of God in creating intelligent beings, the objects of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, or the covenant and promises of God, be accomplished, the soul-chilling doctrines of annihilation and endless misery will then be demonstrated equally false and delusive. Let the believers of destruction reflect on the character of that God who, though he bring to destruction the sons of men, yet saith to them return again, Ps. xc. 3; and who declares that not one grain of that Israel whom he destroyed, should perish, Amos ix. 9; and then let them say whether God shall deliver from destruction, agreeably to Ps. civi. 20? If the above criticism be correct, my text will read thus. *Seeing it is righteous with God to recompense tribulation to them who trouble you, but rest
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to you, our fellow-sufferers, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven, as a flame of fire, co-operating with his powerful messengers (the Roman army) administering justice to those who neither honor God nor obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall suffer aionion loss (being excluded until the fulness of the Gentiles come) from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his majesty.

As I have adopted the term aionian instead of everlasting, some explanation may be necessary. It is derived from the noun aion, which, Phavorinus says, signifies ke zoe kai hoi bios, life, or to metron tes anthropinês zoês, the measure or length of human life. The word 'age' is the most appropriate in the English language to express the significance of the Greek aion, Thus we speak of the age of a child, the age of a man, the antidiluvian age, the Patriarchal age, the Christian age, and the age of the world. In all these examples, we find the term 'age' varied, and the extent of its duration known only by the qualifying words or phrases with which it is connected; for by the above examples the word 'age' may indefinitely denote a period of one year, fifty years, two thousand years, or five thousand years, as the sense may require. The Hebrew olam translated aion in the Septuagint, and correctly rendered into English by our translators only once, Ephes. ii. 7, by the word age, signifies a concealed or unknown period of time, whose duration like the terms aion and age, can only be measured by the subject to which it is applied. The Hebrew slave who stipulated to serve his master, od olam; Sept. eis aionan, English forever, Ex. xxi. 6, Deut. xv. 17, did not thereby agree to serve for any definite period of time; for the duration of his servitude depended on the following circumstances: 1. His own death. 2. The death of his master. 3. The return of the jubilee. Whichever of these occurred first, dissolved the agreement, and effected the termination of that indefinite period indicated by the phrase od olam, eis aionan, forever. Accordingly the same phrase is translated forever, all the days of his life, as long as he liveth, 1 Sam. i. 11, 22, 28. Hence we see the Hebrew od olam, the Greek eis aiona, and the English forever, or everlasting expressive of the duration of the Hebrew's servitude, or Samuel's life might have indicated a period of a week, three days, as in Jonah ii. 7, or one year, but could not exceed the time of 48 years; for every 49th year brought again the return of the jubilee. How despicable then must those doughty champions of orthodoxy and advocates of endless misery, appear to intelligent readers or hearers, when they urge the argument for eternal misery from the term aion, as implying eternal duration; whilst the very highest classical authority limits the term to the length of human life. Isocrates and Zenophen say, ton aiona diegin, to pass the term of life. Teleutaios aionan, in Herodotus and Sophocles signifies, to second life, or die. Homer uses aion frequently as the synonyme of xor, life, II. iv. 478, II. v. 685, and II. xvi. 458. And sometimes for the period of a short life lost in battle. Ho nun aion, in the scriptures, always signifies the present life. See Whitby on Ephes. ii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 10; Mark x. 30:
Surely if the word 'aion' imply eternal duration, Christ and his apostles must have been very ignorant of its meaning; for he tells them, the harvest; or founding of the christian church, is the end of the aion. Mat. xiii. 39. Lo I am with you till the end of the aion. Mat. xxviii. 20. And they ask him, what shall be the sign of the end of the world, aion. Mat. xxiv. 3. Moreover the writers of the New Testament speak of a time before the aions, Ephes. iii. 9; Col. i. 26; of the end of the aions, Heb. ix. 26; of aions past and aions to come, Col. i. 26; Ephes. ii. 7; of a period which shall last through the aon of aions, Ephes. iii. 21; of a time after the aions shall be ended, and of a period hyperbolically exceeding aionian, 2 Cor. iv. 17; and lastly of the formation, or constitution of the aions, Heb. i. 2. Do our doctors know these things? If not, are they not shamefully ignorant? If they do, ought not their efforts to impose on the credulous, induce us to beware of them in time to come? Felix quem aliena periculio cautum.

Having ascertained the import of the word aion, nothing more is needful than to only mention that aionios is derived from aion exactly as the word yearly from year, or daily from day; and as aion can never imply infinite duration, the aionian loss or destruction must be temporary. This view of the subject entirely excludes the doctrine of annihilation as well as that of endless misery; and at once pronounces the reign of evil or loss to be limited, and followed by a blissful succession of ages, producing streams of pure perennial felicity, lasting and perpetual as the existence of Deity, and universal as the whole number of intellectual beings throughout his vast empire. Here, I conclude this part of my discourse by observing, that the aionian loss mentioned in my text, is the aionian correction, (as the word implies, Mat. 25. 46, 1 John iv. 18, see Petit Pierre, on the Divine goodness,) whose duration and termination is distinctly fixed by the apostles to the time of the fullness of the Gentiles, Rom. xi. 25. Then will the aions terminate, Eph. i. 10. And all Israel will be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation!

2. I shall now proceed to consider the time, manner, signs, and end of Christ's coming.

1. As in the Old Testament, remarkable events are described as signal interpositions of the Deity, Deut. xxxiii. 2; Is. xxxv. 4; Hab. iii. 3; so I readily concede to the opinion of Dr. John Taylor, that in some places in the New Testament the time of our Lord's coming coincides with the time of our death. For as our christian course ends when we die, our Lord is represented in several parts of the New Testament as coming at the end of our life. John xiv. 3; 1 Cor. xi. 27; Phil. i. 6, 10; 1 Thes. iii. 13; and v. 23; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.—Moreover this opinion is strengthened by the consideration that, we are never in the New Testament, exhorted to prepare for death, but for the coming of Christ. This is an important truth, of great weight in the christian religion, and worthy of our most serious consideration.
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2. The coming of Christ, called by Paul, Parousia tou Kuriou, 2 Thess. ii. 1, is by the learned Dr. Hammond, referred to his coming to destroy the Jewish nation and worship. To this period, says Dr. Whitby, the apostle James most certainly alludes where he exhort the brethren to be patient till the coming of the Lord; adding this parousia, or coming of the Lord, is at hand, and the judge standeth before the door. James v. 7, 9. This is the coming of the Son, so often mentioned in the prophecies, concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jewish nation. Mat. xxiv. 27, 37, 39. This appearance of the Son of man, was immediately to follow the tribulation of the Jews, occasioned by the invasion of the Roman army. "Immediatety after the tribulation of those days, shall appear the sign of the Son in heaven—and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory." Mat. xxiv. 29, 30. "For there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people—and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be lead away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles; then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and glory. Luke xxi. 23, 27. The time of Christ's coming was so distinctly fixed, that none could possibly mistake. "There be some of you standing here," said our Lord to his disciples, "who shall not taste death till ye see the Son of Man come in his kingdom." Mat. xvi. 28; Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27. "When they persecute you in one city, flee ye into another, for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come." Mat. x. 23. "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Mat. xxiv. 34; Mark. xii. 30; Luke xxi. 32—This prediction was verified in John, and explains our Lord's meaning. John xxi. 22. "If he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Indeed the language of Christ could not be more definite and determinate than it was in reply to the high priest's adjuration, Mat. xxvi. 64. Ἡ ϕαρμακεία, "presently, or after a short time, ye shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven." Accordingly both Christ and his apostles warn their auditors to watch, and be prepared for that event, seeing that it might be both sudden and unexpected. "Be ye also ready for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." Mat. xxiv. 44. Paul exhorts the Philippians to moderation, and adds as a reason, "the Lord is at hand." Phil. iv. 5. He advised the Thessalonians "not to sleep as others, but watch and be sober;" and appeals to their own knowledge of the uncertainty of Christ's coming, as an argument of vigilance. "Yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night. But ye are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief in the night." 1 Thes. v. 2. 4. 6. In like manner Peter admonishes all to whom his epistle might come, to be sober and watch unto prayer, because the end of all things was at hand, and Christ was ready to judge both the quick and the dead. 1 Pet. iv. 5, 7. Behold I come quickly, says Jesus, he that is unjust, let him be
unjust still. Seal not the prophecies of this book, for the time is at hand. Rev. xxiii. 10, 12. What shall we say of those preachers who 1750 years after these predictions have been fulfilled, still persuade their hearers to expect Christ's coming to judgment? Let us pity them!! For either the scriptures are a forgery, or these teachers of the law, know not what they say nor whereof they affirm!!!

Some may object to the time I have fixed for the coming of Christ, from the language of the apostle in the next chapter, where he cautions the Thessalonians not to be troubled by his word or letter concerning the coming of Christ, which might have excited alarm; for previously to that event, there would come, apostasia, a falling away; and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition. This grand apostacy has been generally applied by protestant commentators, to the corruptions of the Romish church, and consequently those, who have been educated under the influence of tradition, may be inclined to object to any sentiment inconsistent with the prejudices of their education. But how is it possible on the common theory to account for the general alarm occasioned by the first epistle? It is evident from 2 Thes. ii. 1, that the Thessalonians understood the apostle as speaking of an event altogether at hand, in the first epistle, chap. ii. 19, chap. iii. 13, chap. iv. 15, and chap. v. 23. The apostle begins the second chapter of his second epistle thus, "I beseech you brethren, that ye be not troubled concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our translators have unwarrantably and ignorantly rendered, huper tes parousias, by the coming, without one single instance of classical authority.—On the contrary I have rendered it, concerning or on account of, which is the true and proper meaning of the term huper. The Latin super, is evidently derived from the Greek huper, and retains its signification in the following phrase, super Hector multa, asking many things concerning Hector. One principal cause of the second epistle was undoubtedly to remove the apprehensions excited by the first. Notwithstanding the apostle says nothing in the second to induce them to believe that any considerable time should elapse before the coming of Christ. On the contrary he tells them, chap. ii. 6, 7. "The mystery of iniquity doth already work;" and appeals to their own knowledge of the cause of delay in Christ's coming; and informs them that as soon as he who now letteth (in all probability Claudius the Emperor) shall be taken away, by death, then shall the wicked be revealed, then shall the Jews make defection from the Roman government, which shall occasion their destruction by the Roman army.

This is the grand civil apostacy which produced their overthrow and dispersion. That this apostacy was a civil rebellion, Mr. Le Clerc on Hammond, has abundantly shown; the term apostacy is frequently used in scripture in a political sense. Jerusalem is called three times in one chapter Polis apostasis, the apostate city. Ezra iv. 12, 15, 19. Whitby agrees with Le Clerc, but believes the apostacy also implied a religious defection. There can be no doubt but
the great apostacy of the Jews from christianity before Christ's com-
in; hastened their destruction. This much appears from the words of Christ, Mat. xxiv. 22. "Except these days should be shortened no flesh can be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." Their religious apostacy arose from their attachment to the law of Moses; secondly from their expectations of a temporal Messiah; and thirdly, from their severe sufferings by persecution. To this apostacy, the apostles refer in awful language, Matt. xviii. 7, 8, 9, Heb. vi. 6, 8. It became exceedingly great, not only in Judea and Palestine, but also in Asia and all places where the Jews had received the gospel, 2 Tim. i. 15. This falling away was distinctly foretold by our Lord, Matt. xxiv. 11, 12, as an event which should precede, the destruction of Jerusalem. No inference therefore can be drawn from this epistle to dissolve the connexion between this apostacy and Christ's coming. Therefore the coming of Christ, mentioned by Paul must be the appearance of the Son of man to destroy the Jewish polity and nation.

There being many who think that the prohibition to marry, was peculiarly to the catholic defection, a few remarks, relative to that subject, may therefore be necessary in this place. Dr. Whitby in his commentary, 1 Tim. iv. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 1, has sufficiently demonstrated, that it was a philosophical question much agitated in the days of Paul, whether it were good to marry? Bion, Antisthenes, Menander, Appollonius, Porphyry, and the Pythagoreans, in general, held the negative.

As the Pythagorean philosophy was very popular at Corinth and other parts of Greece, the apostle might, therefore, notice it with disapprobation. But from what he says, 1 Cor. vii. 8, 27, 29, 40, it is manifest, that Paul could not have considered the prohibition to marry as any considerable part of the apostacy. The Judaizers were beyond all others the most remarkably peculiar in their restrictions concerning meat. Dr. Lightfoot on Acts xv. 20, shows that when the second temple was destroyed, the Pharisees, who taught that it was unlawful to eat flesh or drink wine, said "we should ordain among ourselves not to marry." The Essenes were disinclined to marry, and the Gnostics, who probably sprang from Menander, held that to eat flesh or marry was of the Devil. Hence we see there is no sufficient reason for the peculiar application of this prohibition to the Roman catholic church.

Objection second. The coming of Church is said to take place in the last day. The Jewish Rabbies admit as a general rule that wherever we meet the phrase, the last days, or the latter days, we should understand it, of the days or age of the Messiah. The Targums thus interpret the phrase, Gen. xliv. 1, Num. xxiv. 14, Isa. ii. 2, Jer. xxiii. 20, Dan. iv. 44, Hosen iii. 5. Peter applies the last days of Joel's Prophecy to the time of Christ. Acts ii. 17, 2 Pet. iii. 3. The other apostles use the same pharseology, to denote the same epoch. 2 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 1 John ii. 18, Jude 17. 18. Dr. Pocock justly observes, that by the latter days most Jewish and Christian commentators understood the days of the Messiah, who is called in the Sept.
Vers. Isa. ix. 6, *Pater aionis Mellontis,* Father of the age to come. See Whitby on Heb. vi. 5, et alibi. Moreover, the Hebrews always use the plural number, to express honor, dignity, and emphasis: therefore according to the idiom of the sacred writers, last days, when used to denote the time of the Messiah, mean only last day in the singular. Hence John calls the same period of time, last day, last hour, John xi. 24, 1 John ii. 18. Consequently last day, in scriptural language, means the whole or any part of the Christian era. This objection therefore arises from ignorance of the language of Scripture, and cannot militate against the time I have fixed for the coming of Christ. Consult Simpson's Essays on the language of Scripture.

Objection third. In Mat. xxiv. 30, and Rev. i. 17, it is said all the tribes of the earth shall mourn, when they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven. To this we reply: in Jewish and prophetic language, the earth is often limited to the land of Judea. Is. vi. 4, Mal. iv. 6, Ps. xvi. 3, xxv. 13, xxii. 29, 34, xxxvii. 3, 9, 11. See Whitby's appendix to Mat. xxiv. and Dr. Campbell's Notes on Mat. ii, 6, and Luke ii. 1. Supposing John to have wrote the Revelation so late as 96, which is by no means probable, he might notwithstanding use the words of Christ, seeing the great destruction of the Jews by Adrian, was still future. But the evidence is in favor of that hypothesis which fixes the date of the Apocalypse to the reign of Claudius or Nero. The style of this book is much fuller of Hebraisms, than that of the Gospel, consequently written soon after John left Judea, where he had been accustomed to speak Syriac. He calls the governors of the churches angels, but Paul in his first Epistle to Timothy about the year 63 calls them bishops, which title was ever after retained in the churches, consequently the revelation was written before the Epistle to Timothy. Epiphanius affirms John prophesied in the reign of Claudius Caesar, and his opinion appears to be confirmed by allusions in the Revelation, to the temple and altar as then standing. The title of the Syriac version of this book, which at least shows the opinion of the churches of Syria, is, "The Revelation made to John the Evangelist, by God, in the isle of Patmos, where he was banished by Nero the Caesar." Hence we have sufficient reason to conclude, that John wrote the Revelation before the destruction of Jerusalem; and that the references to the day of judgment, coming of Christ, and passing away of the heavens, were allusions to the abolition of the Jewish dispensation.

2. The manner of Christ's coming. The text declares, he shall be revealed, a flame in fire—i.e. in great splendor, like a flame of fire.

The word *Ph logos,* is in apposition with *Kurio*; and words put in apposition mean the same person or thing. Hence the Lord Jesus is here called a flame by fire. But as the word is derived from *Phlego,* which signifies to shine, as well as to burn, the phrase may mean no more than that as the brightness of fire, or in fiery brightness, the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven. As Paul was a Jew, he adopted the language of the prophets, Joel and Malachi, who had called the time of Christ's coming to destroy the Jewish nation, the
great and bright day of the Lord. Joel ii. 31, Mal. iv. 5. Isaiah predicted that the breath of his lips should slay the wicked, and Paul citing his words, declares, the Lord shall consume the wicked with the breath of his mouth. Isa. xi. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 8. Malachi says, Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble, and the day shall burn them. Mal. iv. 1. Alluding to the same event, the Psalmist says—A devouring fire shall go before Jehovah. Ps. i. 3. John the Baptist foretold, that Christ would burn up the chaff with fire unquenchable. Mat. iii. 12. And Paul warns the Corinthians, that the day should be revealed by fire, which should try every man's work. 1. Cor. iii. 12. These passages of scripture seem to mark the severity of that condemnation which befell the ancient people of God, on account of their unbelief and apostacy. Under the notion of unquenchable fire, the prophets described the most terrible judgments of God; Isa. i. 31, and 66, 24, Jer. xvii. 4, 27. Water, air, and fire, were considered as purifiers by the Jews and Eastern nations; and of the three, fire was believed to possess the highest purifying quality. Hammond, Le Clerc, and Beausobre agree that under the phrase "unquenchable fire," John foretells the ruin of the Jewish nation. This is not therefore a fire of extermination, but of purification and beneficial correction.

Notwithstanding the appearance of Christ as a fiery brightness, was not designed to indicate a wrathful or avenging disposition, but merely the dignity and glory of his person and office. This will readily be admitted by all who attentively consider the language of the Jewish scriptures. When Jehovah appeared on Sinai, the mountain burned with fire. Ex. xix. 18, Deut. iv. 11, and ix. 15. There he showed Israel his great fire—i. e. the glory of his majesty. Deut. ix. 36. The Shechinah or glory of the Lord, which abode between the cherubim in the temple, was the appearance of a flame of fire. The person who appeared to Ezekiel in vision, "was surrounded with brightness which was the glory of the Lord; and the brightness was the appearance of fire." Chap. i. 27, 28. The appearance also of the creatures which drew the triumphal car of Jehovah, was as a flash of lightning, and as burning coals of fire, like the appearance of lamps; and out of the fire went forth lightning; and the whole appearance of Jehovah's train was a fire enfolding itself, and a brightness round about it. Ex. i. 4, 13, 14. At the translation of Elijah, there appeared horses and chariots of fire. 2 Kings ii. 11. Elisha was surrounded with horses and chariots of fire, as an emblem of the Divine presence and protection. 2 Kings vi. 17. The throne of the Ancient of Days was like a fiery flame, and the wheels like a flame of fire. Dan. vii. 9. The seven spirits before the throne appeared like lamps burning with fire. Rev. iv. 5. Malachi prophesied that Christ should be as a refiner's fire; and our Lord foretold, that as lightning shineth from the east towards the west, so should the coming of the Son of Man be. Mal. iii. 2, Mat. xxiv. 27, Luke xvii. 24.
We may therefore safely conclude, the apostle had these predictions full in view, when he wrote my text, and described the coming of Christ, as the appearance of fire. Indeed our Lord foretold he would come in the glory of his Father; but the glory of the Father was always manifested to the Jews by a brightness or appearance of fire. Hence the fiery brightness denotes the majesty of Christ, and not his judgments; much less can it denote a material fire designed to devour his enemies! Though the severe judgments of the Deity be sometimes represented in the scriptures, under the notion of fire, streams of fire, or a furnace of fire; yet this is not the design of the metaphor in my text; for the glory of Christ, and not his judgments, are indicated by the flame. Innumerable passages of sacred writ show the fiery brightness, attending the manifestation of Jehovah, or his messengers, to be an emblem of majesty, and not of vengeance.

3. The signs of Christ's coming, were the shaking of the heavens; the heavens passing away with a great noise; the elements melting with fervent heat; the earth and its works burnt up; the sun darkened; the moon not giving her light; and the stars falling from heaven; great earthquakes; fearful sights, and signs, in the heavens; famine and pestilence; the sea and the waves thereof roaring. Mat. xxiv. 29, Luke xxi. 11, 25, 26, and 2 Peter iii. 10. These are highly metaphorical expressions which frequently occur in the sacred scriptures. Of them the truly learned Jewish Rabbi, Maimonedes thus observes, "these expressions are proverbial, importing the destruction or utter ruin of a people or nation," Artemidorus says, "the sun darkened or turned into blood, the stars falling, imply, in prophetic language, the destruction of many people." Whitby's Com. vol. 1, gen. pref.

Bishop Warburton, Julian, B. 1, C. 1, observes, the kingdom of Christ succeeded the Jewish theocracy; and till the Jewish law was abolished in which the Father presided as king, the reign of the Son could not take place; because the sovereignty of Christ over men, was the sovereignty of the Father over the Jews, transferred and extended. This being the most important era, in the economy of grace, and the most awful revolution in all God's religious dispensations, we see the elegance and propriety of the terms to denote so great an event, together with the destruction of Jerusalem, by which it was effected. For in the old prophetic language, the change or fall of principalities and powers, whether spiritual or civil, is signified by the shaking of the heavens and earth; darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars. The rise and establishment of new kingdoms or empires, by processions in the clouds of heaven, by the sounding of trumpets, and the assembling together of hosts and nations." This perfectly accounts for the gathering of the elect; the awakening of the dead; the meeting of the Lord in the air; and the sounding of the trumpet; all implying the establishment of christianity or the kingdom of Jesus on the ruins of the Jewish dispensation.
The same venerable writer, Div. Leg. vol. 2, b, 4, says, "This language was borrowed from the ancient hieroglyphics, in which the sun, moon, and stars, were used to represent states and empires, kings, queens, and nobility: their eclipse or extinction, denote temporary disasters, or their entire overthrow. In like manner the holy prophets, called kings and empires by the names of the heavenly luminaries. Their misfortunes and overthrow were represented by eclipses and extinctions; stars falling from their firmament, are employed to denote the destruction of nobility. In one word, the prophetic style seems to be a kind of speaking hieroglyphic."

Maimonides assigns the following reason for such phraseology.—"As Isaiah, ch. xxx. 26, speaking of such as had been conquered, says, their sun and moon have lost their light; so he says also of conquerors; their sun and moon increase their light. For experience proves that the eyes of men, in great misery, grow dim, and do not see the light in its full splendor; the nerves being weakened, by want of spirits. On the other hand, when by joy the soul is enlarged, and the animal spirits are conveyed in abundance to the organs of vision, the sun and light appear greater than before."

Let us now look into our Bibles and we shall see these opinions both confirmed and illustrated. Isaiah predicting the destruction of Babylon ch. xiii. 10, says, "The stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth; and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. Again, describing the destruction of Idumea, he says, ch. xxxiv. 5; "all the hosts of heaven, shall be dissolved; and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll; and all their hosts shall fall as a leaf falleth from the vine, and as the falling fig from the fig tree." Ezekiel foretells the destruction of Egypt, in the following language, ch. xxxii. 7, 8. "I will cover the heaven and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light. All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and set darkness upon thy land saith the Lord God." Joel describing the destruction of Jerusalem, adopts similar terms, ch. ii 10, 30. 31.—"The earth shall quake before them, (i.e. the Romans;) the heavens shall tremble, the sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining. I will show wonders in the heavens, and and on the earth blood and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before the great and terrible day of the Lord come." Now as Peter applies part of Joel's prophecy to the events of the day of Pentecost, and Joel declares that in those same days and that time the other signs should be manifested, we have no reason to protract the remaining part of the prophecy longer than the destruction of Jerusalem, which followed soon afterwards.

In allusion to the above prophecies, especially that of Joel, our Lord predicted fearful signs, and shakings of the earth and heavens. But as several of the signs foretold by our Lord, were designed to warn the disciples, many of them literally happened. So Josephus,
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L. 4, ch. 17, informs us of a dreadful tempest, frequent lightnings, terrible thunderings, roarings of the sea, and quakings of the earth. That armies were seen in the clouds, in battle array, and compassing the city; and that a comet pointed its fiery tail down upon the city, for a whole year, portending its ruin; L. 7, ch. 31. Tacitus, the Roman historian, says, the temple seemed to be in flames, by fire issuing from the clouds. L. 5, p. 621.

Though some of the signs of our Lord's coming were literally fulfilled, because without a figure they were described in the prediction; yet the description in general is highly symbolical. That the stars falling from heaven, emblematically represented the overthrow of the Jewish rulers and teachers, evidently appears from the following passages of scripture. Daniel says the little horn waxed great, even to the host of heaven, and cast down some of the host, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them; Ch. viii. 10. Isaiah describes the king of Babylon as saying, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; Ch. 14, 13. The tail of the great red dragon drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and cast them to the earth; Rev. xii. 4. I need not multiply citations to prove that stars were symbols of religious teachers. The single reference to Rev. i. 20, is abundantly sufficient.

Drs. Lightfoot and Hamond, having referred the language of Peter, concerning the coming of Christ, in the third chapter of his second epistle, to the destruction of Jerusalem; and Mr. Le Clerc having exposed the fanciful application of this chapter and some other parts of scripture to an imaginary future general judgment yet to come; Dr. Whitby seemed somewhat offended, yet promised to be more friendly with his learned opponents, in his commentary on the gospels. He admits the application of Peters' predictions to the destruction of Anti-Christ. Rev. xvii. After which, in his opinion, follow the new heavens, and new earth. But had the Dr. sufficiently considered the subject, and maintained consistency in his own theories, he would have been forced to admit that the new heaven and new earth denoted that new order of things which succeeded the abolition of the Jewish heavens and earth, or ecclesiastico-civil polities. Then all the elements of that dispensation melted with fervent heat, and the heavens, or Mosaic dispensation, passed away with a great noise. This great event was undoubtedly the object of Hag- gai's prophecy, ch. 2, 7, cited by Paul, Heb. xii. 26, where, and on Thess. ii. 1, Whitby entirely concedes the disputed ground to his opponents by remarking that "this shaking of the heavens and earth, cannot mean the subversion of the material world; but is a metaphor, usually adopted by the prophets, to denote the entire overthrow of a state or kingdom."

No man can be surprised by the third chapter of Peter's second epistle, who reads the following scriptures. Isa. xiii. 13. I will shake the heavens, and the earth will remove out of her place, in the day of his fierce anger. Ps. lxxvii. 18. The voice of thy thunder was in the heavens; the lightnings lightened the world, the
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earth trembled and shook. Isa. xxiv. 19, 20. The earth is utterly broken down, the earth is clean dissolved and moved like a cottage. Jer. iv. 23, 24. I beheld the earth and lo! it was without form and void; the heavens and they had no light. Now the context most manifestly shows that this language was desorative of the destruction of nations; and if ever such language apply to the subversion of any people, certainly to the Jewish. About 2,000,000 perished in the city of Jerusalem, by Titus, and in the eighteenth year of Trajan, the Jews having made sedition in Lybia, Egypt, and Mesopotamia, that war, says Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. L- 1, c. 15, extinguished pollas muria-das Ioudaion, many myriads of the Jews. From the 16th to the 18th of Adrian, they again rebelled, and then were almost utterly exterminated, and prohibited ever to return to Judea. On attempting to recover their favored country, he ordered their ears to be cut off, their bodies to be marked as rebels, and dispersed them as slaves through all the provinces of the empire. According to the best authorities, more perished in the war against Adrian, than in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. Thus was awfully accomplished, the prediction of our Lord. "Wherever the carcass, the Jewish people, is, there will the eagles, the Roman army, be gathered together." Luke xvii. 37.

Another sign of the coming of the Son of Man was, great earthquakes in divers places. Luke xxi. 11. Of these significant emblems of political commotions, there occurred several within the scene of this prophecy, and according to the prediction, in divers places. In the reign of Claudius there was one at Rome, and another in Apamea, in Syria, both recorded by Tacitus; and Philostratus, in his life of Appollonius, mentions one in Crete, others at Smyrna, Miletus, Chios, and Samos; in all of which places, Jews had settled. During the reign of Nero, there was one in Campania, and another at Laodicea, both noticed by Tacitus;—the latter is mentioned by Eusebius and Orsius, who add that Hierapolis and Colosse, as well as Laodicea, were overthrown by an earthquake. There was also another in the reign of Galba, recorded by Suetonius. Josephus also informs us, that "in the awful night when the Idumeans were excluded from Jerusalem, a heavy storm burst on them; violent winds, incessant torrents of rain, constant lightnings, and most tremendous thunders, and roarings of earthquakes, as if the system of the world had been confounded to effect the destruction of mankind; so that one might have easily conjectured that these were signs of no common events."

Another sign was, that the gospel should be preached to all the world, and then should the end come. Mat. xxiv. 14, Of the fulfillment of this prediction, the epistles of Paul. addressed to the christians of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Colosse, and Thessalonica; and those of Peter to those in Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, are standing monuments. Paul tells the Romans, their faith was spoken of throughout the world; and the Colossians, that the gospel had been preached to every creature under heaven. The Acts of the Apostles, written seven years before the destruction of Jerusalem, attests the
fact, that the gospel had been preached to all the then known world.
Bishop Newton observes, that the history of the church shows, that
before the destruction of Jerusalem, the gospel had been propagated
northward to Scythia, southward to Ethiopia, eastward to India, and
westward to Spain and Britain. Moreover, both Eusebius and Theo-
doret attest, that the apostles preached the gospel in the Britanic isles.
Doddridge, in his notes on the passage, says, it appears from the most-
credible records that the gospel was preached in Mesopotamia, Idum-
ea, and Syria, by Jude; in Egypt, Mauritania, and other parts of Af-
rica, by Mark, Simon, and Jude; in Ethiopia, by Matthias and Cana-
ce's Enoch; in Pontus, Galatia, and other parts of Asia, by Peter;
in the territory of the seven Asiatic churches, by John; in Parthia, by
Matthew; in Scythia, by Phillip and Andrew; in the northern and
western parts of Asia, by Bartholomew; in Persia, by Simon and Jude;
in Media, Carmania, and other parts of the east, by Thomas; from
Jerusalem, round the vast tract, to Illyricum, by Paul; in Spain, Gaul,
and Britain, in all probability by the Apostles; and in all which places
churches had been planted within thirty years after the death of Christ,
and ten before the destruction of Jerusalem. See Athan. Epist. ad

The last sign of Christ's coming, which I shall notice, was that
false Christ's should arise and seduce many, and thereby occasion a
Before the destruction of Jerusalem, false Christs did arise as Simon
Magnus, who pretended to be the Son of God, who had in appear-
ance been crucified in Judea. Others are mentioned by Luke, Acts
v. 36, 57, and xxi. 38. This Egyptian noticed by Luke, was proba-
ably the same described by Josephus, who led away 30,000 Jews whom
he had deceived; Ant. L. 20, c. 6. But the most distinguished was
Barchocheba whom the Jews crowned king in the city of Bitter.—
This imposter occasioned a greater slaughter of the Jews, than had
happened at the capture of their city by Titus. See Buxtorf on
the words Choziba and Bitter. John says, "Little children, ye have
heard that Anti-Christ should come, even now there are many Anti-
Christs in the world whereby we know that it is the last time; Anti-
Christ of whom ye have heard even now already is in the world." 1
John ii. 18, 20 Epis. 7. Here we find Anti-Christ was in the world
before the destruction of Jerusalem, and consequently the apostacy ex-
isted then also, and we need not labor to find another date. Accord-
ingly, Grotius, Wetstein, Hammond, Le Clerc, and Whitby, all agree to
fix the time of the apostacy before the dispersion of the Jewish na-
tion. Consequently the Jewish people was that man of sin, or as
many good MSS. read anomias of disobedience, who made defec-
tion from the Roman state and religion of Jesus, and were therefore
consumed by the brightness of his coming. Hence we conclude from
the testimony of history, scripture, and the best commentators, that
the signs of Christ's coming, as well as that great event itself, took
place at the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and temple services.

4. The design of Christ's coming, according to the English version
of my text, was to take vengeance on them who knew not God, nor obeyed the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Here Paul refers to the language of Christ, Luke xxi. 22, where describing the awful catastrophe which should befall the Jewish nation, Jesus said, "these be the days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled. Hence the language of our Lord and his apostle must relate to the same event; for Paul referring to the same transaction, uses the same word to express the same idea. By comparing these passages with Luke xvii. 30, we are induced to limit the whole history to the destruction of Jerusalem; and no other interpretation of the text should be admitted. The phrase taking vengeance I have rendered administering justice, of the propriety of the alteration, let those who are qualified to judge determine; but let all who are ignorant, have decency enough to keep silence. The English phrase is most unequivocally a perversion and abuse of the Greek didonis ekdikesin, which signifies to give or administer justice, and consequently cannot mean the reverse or taking. Paul had said in the sixth verse, it was just in God to recompense tribulation to the persecuting Jews, but rest to the persecuted Christians. Here he repeats the same ideas by declaring Christ would administer justice, i. e. tribulation to the persecutor, irreverent, and disobedient. The disobedience of the Jews was strongly marked by Paul, who calls them the "man of sin," or as the MSS. of Stephanus and Lincoln, read anomias of disobedience. In those days the Jews were proverbially disobedient, both in the political and religious sense of that term. Hence the apostle says, 2d Thess. ii. 8, then, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus, will the wicked be revealed; the Jewish nation or man of disobedience, by their rebellion against the Roman government and apostacy from the Christian religion, "whom the Lord will consume with the breath of his mouth and destroy by the brightness of his coming." Jesus predicted that "except these days of vengeance should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's or Christian's sake the days shall be shortened; Mat. xxiv. 22. The banditti who made continual excursions from the mountain, and zealots who murdered all that were averse to the war, greatly contributed to depopulate the country and harass the Christians: but the days were shortened. 1. By the determination of Titus vigourously to push the siege by assault. 2. By the dissensions of the Jews, who accelerated the capture of their city, by intestine divisions and mutual slaughters. 3. By the madness of the factions in burning their store houses, and thereby wasting the strength necessary for the defence of the place. 4. By the extraordinary panic which seized the Jews, when the Romans attacked the upper city, in consequence of which they fled from their strong holds, which Titus afterwards pronounced invulnerable. 5. By the crowded state of the city during the seige, which occasioned pestilential disorders, and hastened the approach of famine; the number of its inhabitants on account of the great festival being swelled to 3,000,000.

The dispersion of the Jewish nation, according to the prediction of
Christ's coming to judgment.

Amos, ch. ix. 9, is called in my text destruction, which word derived from destruo, signifies to unbuild, to decompose, or pull down. John ii. 19, Luke xxi. 6. It may be admitted—Hosea xiii. 9, Mat. xxi. 41, Mark xii. 9, Romans ix. 22, 2 Thess. i. 9, and ii. 3, Philip. i. 29, Heb. x. 39, and 2 Peter iii. 7. For in all these places, the Jewish nation as a collective body, appears to be the subject of destruction or dispersion. But hence we cannot infer the annihilation of their persons for that God who threatened to sift them among all nations, promised that not a grain shall be lost, but all Israel shall be glorified. Amos ix. 9, Isa. xiv. 25. The God of eternal mercy promised to Israel, that though he make a full end of all nations, whether he had scattered them, yet he will not make a full end of them, but correct them in measure, and not leave them wholly unpunished. Jer. xxx. 11, and xlvii. 28. How awfully this prophecy has been fulfilled, and hear its accomplishment in the words of the Jews themselves. "Romans, Persians, Saracens, Christians, Mahometans, every nation and sect, have successively raised their arm against us; and from the Nile to the Vistula, from the Tagus to the Euphrates, every country has seen our blood flowing."

This destruction, oλθρων in my text, is the Kolasis punishment Mat. xxy. 46, into which the unbelieving Jews went away. The aionian judgment or as some MSS. have it, Kolasis, of which they who blasphemed the holy spirit were in danger.—Mark iii. 29.—The blindness which has happened to them till the fulness of the Gentiles come. Rom. xi. 25. This Kolasis is produced by fear and apprehension, John iv. 18, and is the effect of unbelief. The severity of God's judgments upon this unhappy people is set forth under the metaphor of a furnace of fire, Ex. xxii. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, Isa. xxxi. 9, Mat. xiii. 42, into which God predicted "he would gather them as men gather lead and tin, and melt them in the midst of his furnace, which was in Jerusalem." This prophecy was verified at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, the Roman general. Christ foretold, that dreadful period should be "a time of trouble such as never was, or ever should be hereafter." Matt. xxiv. 21. Here permit me to remark, this text alone is sufficient to overthrow the Pagan doctrines of hell and endless misery. If there were not another in the bible opposed to these horrid dogmas, it would be imperative on all men, to deny its authenticity or abandon the terrific doctrine of eternal torture. "If, says Josephus, all the misfortunes of all nations from the beginning of the world were compared with those which befell the Jews, they would appear much less. The destruction of this people, exceeded all the destructions ever God or man brought on the world." He calculates 1,100,000 were destroyed in the siege, 237,000 who perished in other places, besides innumerable multitudes swept away by famine and pestilence, of which no calculation could be made. Above 2,000 laid violent hands upon themselves. 97,000 were sold slaves. 11,000 were starved to death under one leader, and a lady of rank was seen to murder and eat her own child. Manneus, a Jew, who fled to Titus, affirmed that from the beginning of the siege
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on the 14th of April, to the first of July, 115,680 dead bodies had been carried through one gate, of which the keeping had been committed to him. Many respectable deserters assured Titus that not less than 600,000 poor, had been cast out at the different gates; and whilst he beheld the dead piled under the walls, he raised his hands to heaven, and protested he had not been the cause of this deplorable calamity. Moreover, the Jews who had been vanquished by the army of Vespasian, having fled to the ships, were pursued by a horrible tempest, which dashed their vessels against each other, and against the rocks, so that the raging billows were literally stained with blood, and 4,200 dead bodies were strewn along the shore.

On the 10th of August, A. D. 70, 1030 years from the foundation of the first temple by Solomon, and 639 after it had been rebuilt by Haggai; that fatal day on which it had formerly been destroyed by the king of Babylon, a Roman soldier, contrary to the command of Titus, urged as he declared by a divine impulse, threw a flaming brand into the golden window of the temple, which instantly set the buildings in flames. The Romans ranged the streets murdering all without distinction, till the dead bodies choked up the alleys, and the blood literally flowed in streams down the channels of the city.—On the 8th of September, A. D. 70, the siege terminated, leaving Jerusalem, the subject of a thousand prophecies, and once the praise of the earth, destroyed by the flame, and bleeding on every side, and sunk in ruin and desolation. Sixty-four years after the destruction of that capital, the Jews rebelled against the Roman government under the administration of Adrian. He demolished 986 of their best towns, and slew 585,000 by the edge of the sword, besides countless numbers which perished by famine, sickness and fire. Judea was depopulated, and an incredible number of its inhabitants sold like horses, and dispersed over the face of the earth. Surely these were the days of vengeance in which all things that were written were accomplished. Luke xxv. 22.

Some have wildly imagined that the fire in which Christ appeared was a sign of divine vengeance, and will be the very instrument of destruction. But surely if our bodies be changed, or raised incorruptible and immortal, such bodies shall be as able to abide the fire as Christ. If then Christ endure no pain by appearing in fire, neither will we, nor can it torment us more than our Judge! Let such gross ideas be banished from all rational minds.

2. Another design, or transaction of Christ’s coming was to gather his elect, or his saints, i. e. the christians from the four winds of heaven, and cause them to come from the east and from the west; from the north and from the south, and sit down in the kingdom of God. Matt. viii. 11, and xxiv. 31. Our Lord encouraged the christians, on seeing the signs that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, to lift up their heads, for then the day of their redemption draws nigh, and the kingdom of God is at hand. Luke, xxi. 28, 31—Joel (ii. 50,) had foretold that whosoever should call on the name:
of the Lord should be saved from the calamities which should come on the unbelieving Jews. Accordingly, Eusebius Hist. Eccl. L. 3, c. 5, and Epiphanius, Her. Naz. s. 7, inform us that at the beginning of the war the Christians were warned to escape to Pella beyond Jordan, in the country of Perea where they were preserved. Josephus remarks that when Cestius Gallus, President of Syria, had besieged Jerusalem and taken the lower city, and might have taken the upper and immediately put an end to the war, he suddenly quit the siege without any visible cause, and then many fled out of the city, as from a sinking ship. Bell. L. 2, c. 40. Christ forewarned his followers to flee to the mountains as soon as they would see Jerusalem encompassed with arms. They obeyed, and were, as Joel predicted, saved from destruction with a great deliverance. Matthew, Mark, and Paul, are peculiarly careful to connect the time of the gathering of the saints, with that of the coming of the Son of Man. Matt. xxiv. 31, and xxv. 31. Mark xiii. 27; 2 Thess. ii. 1. These passages of scripture may be referred to Ps. l. 5. Gather my saints unto me. Zech. xiv. 5. The Lord shall come and all his saints. Bishop Newton justly observes, Dess. 20, on the prophecies, "This is all in the style and phraseology of the prophets; but stripped of figure only means that after the destruction of Jerusalem, Christ by his angles, or ministers of the gospel, would collect a glorious church and people, having thrust out the Jews from the kingdom of God. Nothing ever tended so powerfully and directly to the establishment of Christianity as the dispersion of the Jewish nation, and abolition of the temple service."

The greater part of the converts to Christianity during the apostolic age, were Jews or proselytes to their religion. Acts xvii. 4.—These being all zealous of the law, Acts xxi. 20, persevered in synagogue worship, in which also many of the Gentiles joined, especially those of Corinth, Galatia, Philippippi, and Thessalonica. Thousands of these Judaizing Christians attended the festival at Jerusalem, beheld the signs of our Lord's coming and the confirmation of all their hopes, by the manifestations of our Saviour's faithfulness and exalted majesty. Perceiving the design of God to abolish the temple and synagogue services, and set up a more pure, simple, and spiritual form of worship, they betook themselves to the more sacred services of the new and better covenant. Thus faith being established in the truth of Christ's Mission, they immediately formed churches and laid the foundation of that kingdom of God and heaven so frequently noticed by the sacred writers. Hence in that day of Christ's triumph over the rebellious Jews, who would not have him to reign over them; in that day of the establishment of Christianity, and gathering of the elect, Christ was glorified by his saints, and admired by all that believed. 2 Thess. i. 10.

This gathering together of the elect at the establishment of Christianity is the first resurrection and the second death or destruction of the apostate Jews had no power over the Christians who fell not away in the general apostacy. Rev. ii. 11. This was the time when
the dead small and great stood before God, and were judged every one out of the books according to his works. Rev. xx. 11, 12.—

The coming of the Son of Man when every one was rewarded according to his works, Matt. xvi. 27. The time when the wicked as goats were sent away into aionian, correction; and the righteous shone forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. Matt. xxv. 46, and xiii. 43. This was the hour in which all that were in their graves heard the voice of the Son of God; and came forth, some to the resurrection of aionian or christian life; others to the resurrection of condemnation, or exclusion from gospel privileges, because of unbelief. John v. 29. Heb. iv. 6, see also Dan. xii. 2, especially the end of the 7th verse. This was the day God had appointed to judge the world by the man whom he had ordained. Acts xvii. 31. I know of no other coming to judgment, no other general judgment according to works, no other general resurrection!!

How absurdly do predestinarians, who believe God predetermined the fate of all men before the foundation of the world, and almost the whole christian world, who believe man's destiny to be fixed at death, talk of a future general judgment. What! Does Jehovah not know the hearts of men, or does he need to summon evidence! Will He compel his holy ones to leave their blissful abodes, and recall from tartarian cells the souls of the damned, to obtain a verdict in favor of the prisoners, or against the Judge who prematurely passed sentence upon them? O rash mortals, accuse not your God of human folly by supposing that he needs to reconsider his past conduct.

Christ plainly declares the Father judgeth no man. John v. 22. He as plainly asserts that He judges no man. John viii. 15, and xii. 47. Who then will hold this fanciful tribunal, before which the whole world must be convoked? Where shall they assemble, or what plain shall be large enough to afford a general view of the convocation? Hear ye deaf the words of Christ. John xii. 48.—

"The word or doctrine that I have spoken, the same shall judge him."

But, cries one, will not the judgment be after death as Paul says, Heb. ix. 27. I answer no. Paul says no such thing. His reasoning determines that Christ died only once as other men. But after this, the death of Christ, the judgment. Hark!—This judgment was an eternal and universal acquittance; for this judgment came upon all men to justification of life! Rom. v. 18. By one offering he perfected forever all that were sanctified and obtained eternal redemption. Heb. ix. 12, and x. 14.

The whole fable of a judgment after death, arose from the Egyptian funeral ceremonies. The corpse was conducted in a boat, over the lake Acherusia, and Charon, the ferryman, having produced the body on the opposite shore, the magistrate passed judgment upon it, whether it should be buried or not. This ceremony administered sufficient data to the fertile genius of Orpheus, for the whole story about hell and judgment after death—see Rollin's Hist. vol. 1, and Chateaubriand's travels. The bible says nothing of
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Judgment after death, nor of Christ's coming to such a judgment.—All is fancy, all tradition, all paganism! The Evangelical judgment is during life. Every day we stand before the judgment seat of Christ, and receive in body according to that which we have done. 2 Cor. v. 10.

We have seen by this discourse, that God recompensed tribulation to the persecuting Jews in this life, and to the troubled followers of Jesus, tranquility. What countless myriads of the former, became the sport of war, horror and destruction? To the latter, the sun of righteousness arises with healing in his wings! Not one Christian perished in the deluge of blood and devastation; for he who knows to deliver the godly out of temptation, and reserve the unjust to the day of judgment, 2 Peter, ii. 9, said not a hair of their heads should perish. Luke, xxi. 13. Who can seriously reflect on these equitable arrangements of Providence, and not exclaim, Verily there is a reward for the righteous; there is a God who judgeth on earth! Ps. lvi. 11. The righteous shall be recompensed on earth, much more the wicked and the sinner! Prov. xi. 31. Let men hence learn, that the just God is impartial in his administration. He will by no means clear the guilty. Impartial justice requires him to correct men for their offences; and no penitence, however acute, can obviate its claims or protract its execution. Blinded vengeance and heathen superstition, look forward to another scene of existence for adjustment of man's accountability; but Omnipresent, Omniscient, and Almighty justice, takes immediate, and adequate cognizance of even the thoughts and intentions of the heart. Let go then your dreams of a Pluto's kingdom and a Minos' tribunal; of an Ixion's wheel and a Tantalus cup: Yield also the sensual pleasures of a Pharasaical or Mahometan Paradise; and in the refinement and purification of your souls, seek, and seek now, that peace which passeth understanding; and that fellowship with the Father and the Son, which constitutes at once, the reward and felicity of the pure in spirit. Thus you shall have a heaven in time, and a pure and impartial heaven in common with the whole family of Adam; through an endless eternity. Amen.
LECTURE 15.

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.

A discourse on Rev. xiv. 6-8, delivered before the Black River Association, convened at Watertown, N. Y. June 8th, 1825.

Respected Brethren in the ministry of the everlasting Gospel, and Christian auditors in general, your candid attention is respectfully requested to the discussion of the most important subject in the Christian Theology: I mean the doctrine of Christ, which is that of Life and Immortality. I do not intend to weary you with ineffectual efforts to scan the enigmatical parts of this book; but I have read this passage in hopes of suggesting to you minds some reflections which may be useful to the Christian world. Your thoughts may not altogether harmonize with mine, nevertheless, I shall rely on your brotherly charity whilst I discourse of a most exalted theme, the doctrine of God our Saviour.

In this discourse, four particulars merit careful examination. 1. The Everlasting Gospel. 2. The preaching of the Gospel. 3. The design of its promulgation. 4. The glorious effects.

1. The meaning of the term Gospel, will be best understood from a careful investigation of the original Euaggelion which our translators have rendered by the Anglo-Saxon term, Gospel or God-spell of which the English reader has but an imperfect or confused idea.—The word is compounded of Eu pleasant, good, or agreeable, and aggelia a message. In order to obtain a still more perfect analysis of the term, let it be observed that aggelia is derived from the word Gal, which signifies to exult or leap for joy. This message therefore must be of such a nature as to occasion rejoicing and exultation in the hearer, or produce emotions imitative of the ebulitions of a spring or fountain, to signify which, the word Gal, is frequently used in the sacred scriptures. According to the best Lexicographers, Eu is always used in a good sense and by the consent of all men, who are capable of judging, never used in an evil. Hence the compound word, Euaggelion, can never without violence or abuse of the term be forced to denote an evil, unpleasant, or alarming message.—Neither can this message be a heterogeneous compound of good and evil, pleasant and unpleasant, mournful and joyful tidings; but it is altogether good and pleasant, pleasant while we live—pleasant when we die, and infinitely good and pleasant throughout the wasteless ages which consummate the reign of the unchanging Jehovah.

But still it may be demanded what is the Gospel. Our reply is ready. It is Jehovah's testimony or record that we have eternal life in his Son. 1 John v. 11 This eternal life is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Rom. v. 21. This free gift came.
upon all men to justification of life. Rom. v. 18 This is the record, the disbelief of which, condemns the sinner and makes God a liar; and if there were a single individual of the whole Adamic race, who has not eternal life in Jesus, that being never could make God a liar, by disbelieving his testimony concerning his Son; but the faith of the unbeliever would be just, and God's testimony false and deceptive. Hear it then, the Gospel is neither more nor less than God's record. 

We have eternal life in Jesus his Son.

Brethren, permit me to arrest your attention to this part of the discourse for a few minutes. On reading the New Testament you cannot have failed to observe the unity and simplicity of the Gospel. There is nothing discordant, complex, unintelligible, or contradictory in the doctrine of Jesus. It is called the Gospel of God, Rom. i. 1; the doctrine of God, Titus ii. 10; because, derived from the Father of lights, it came down from heaven, to give light to the world. It is called the Gospel of the Son of God, Rom. i. 9; and the doctrine of Christ, 2 John 9, because as the Ambassador of heaven, he was sent to publish it to mankind; and moreover because he was its first promulgator. It is called the Gospel of Glory, 1 Tim. i, 11; and the Gospel of Salvation, Eph. i. 12, because it brought the joyful tidings of eternal Salvation from sin and misery and unsnading glory in heaven, as the portion of men through Jesus Christ our Lord. It is likewise denominated the apostles' doctrine, Acts ii. 42, because what they heard from Christ they proclaimed to the world. 1 John i. 1, 2. And in the apostolic days it was called a new doctrine, because it differed in nature, excellence, and glory from all others which ever had been divulged among men. Thus ye see the doctrine of Christ is always spoken of as one and undivided. You read in the plural of the doctrines of men, Col. ii. 23: The doctrines of devils, 1 Tim. iv. 1; divers and strange doctrines, Heb. xiii. 9, but ye have never read, in the sacred volume, of the doctrines of God or of Christ. No! brethren the Father of the universe sent his Son to proclaim only one doctrine, viz. that of life and immortality. All others are the commandments of men; in opposition to which, the Gospel is denominated sound doctrine, Titus ii. 1, and the doctrine according to Godliness, 1 Tim. vi. 3.

The doctrine of immortality is that alone which distinguishes the New Testament from the Old, and gives to it the honorable appellation of an administration of life. Many have imagined that the Jewish scriptures taught a future existence, but this opinion must be either merely conjectural or at best very remotely inferential. Our Lord tells the Jews to search the scriptures for in them they thought they had eternal life: but neither our Lord or his apostles ever speak of the doctrine of immortality as been known or revealed to men before the public ministry of Jesus. Nor can we find from a careful perusal of the Old Testament, any thing to have authorised a sober minded commentator to have inferred the existence of man after death, in either pleasant or unpleasant circumstances. On the other hand, we can find no other doctrine peculiar to the New Tes-
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tament, or any other which had not been promulgated in the world, before the time of Christ. Admit the opinion for which I plead, and you will immediately perceive the propriety of Peter's address to Christ, "Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." John vi. 68. Jesus was the first who came in the name of the Lord to announce free and unconditional salvation to a dying world. All the ancient Hebrews like the modern, had published a limited and imperfect salvation by works. Do and live was the subject of their proclamation. But Christ bore the Divine message of love and mercy, from the Parent of all intelligences, to every member of his vast family. He declared the glad news of life and felicity, eternal, unchangeable, and immortal, as the high bequest of heaven, to all the sons and daughters of Adam. Hence the doctrine of a happy immortality for the whole human family is that, and that alone, which distinguishes the New Testament from all the books which had ever been published in the world, previous to the days of the apostles.

The term Everlasting implies generally an age, but this age may be of long or short duration, according to the circumstances. It here includes the whole extent of that unmeasured period, which commenced with the ministry of Jesus, and will continue till all are taught of God, and none need to teach his brother saying, "know ye the Lord," for all shall know him from the least to the greatest. Is. liv. 15; Heb. viii. 11. At the consummation of this period, the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. Hab. ii. 14.

As an Epithet of the Gospel, the term, everlasting, distinguishes it from all the Ephemeral systems of men, which have made a short lived appearance in the world, but have frequently passed to oblivion with their authors. This is God's message to the world by his own Son. The completion of all that revelation of the being, attributes, and purposes of Jehovah, with which it pleased God, in the plenteous love and mercy, to bless mankind. This is the new and everlasting covenant in which God has developed himself as the Father of all intelligences, covenanting with them to be their God, and they his people. In this affinity of family relationship, the whole offspring of Adam find through faith their peace, joy, heaven, and glory completed. In relation to the unchangeable nature of the Gospel, the apostle speaking of the shaking of earth and heaven, distinguishes the christian doctrine as that which cannot be shaken, and therefore must remain; Heb. xii. 27. Whilst there remains an individual on earth, without the knowledge of Jehovah as his God, his Father, and his eternal portion, the messengers of the everlasting covenant will go forth under the royal commission of Jesus, as the ambassadors of heaven, to publish salvation and say unto Zion, thy God reigneth.

2. We are now prepared to speak of the preaching of the Gospel. There are two words in the original Greek which our trasla-
tors have indiscriminately rendered, preach in the English Version. These are kērussō and euaggelizo. The first signifies to proclaim indiscriminately as a herald, any subject whatever. The Kerukes or heralds of antiquity were the hirelings either of the prince or the people. They received their message and wages from their employers, and were engaged in proclaiming death and destruction as well as life and salvation. Sometimes their message was agreeable, but more frequently alarming and frightful. This description of the kerux or herald, designates the character of all the pretended Evangelical and orthodox preachers of the present age; for their message is multifarious, discordant, alarming and mournful. Brethren the very word which the God of wisdom has chosen to express the message of his Son, seals the condemnation of these mantis kαlōkon, or prophets of evil, who infest society by their cries of the burden of the Lord, and scatter a moral pestilence in the earth by the noxious effusions of their mouths. With hideous representations of Jehovah's person and character, they make the hearts of his people sad, and seem only to be charmed by the yells of despair. Yet in multitudes they overrun the earth proclaiming their dreams and their sacred missions, whereas the Lord has not spoken to them nor sent them at all. He that hath a dream, let him tell his dream, but he that hath my word, let him speak it faithfully for what is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord. Jer. xxiii. 28.

But here is a messenger from heaven, an Evangelist, let us not weary ourselves in conjecture. He speaks with a loud voice, says he, destruction, tribulation, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth; for God comes with vengeance? No! not a word of the kind. But stop—to whom does he bear the message? To all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people. Well then, saith the wisdom of this world, he preaches to a mixed multitude, composed of saints and sinners, believers and unbelievers, precious and vile, the message, must therefore be complex, to suit these different grades in the moral world. O my God, thou hast brought to nought the wisdom of this world; Messengers of heaven speak—glad news, glory, honor, immortality, life eternal, and all without purchase or condition. The gift of God through Jesus Christ! But for whom? For every creature, all souls are mine saith the Lord. Heaven and immortality are bequeathed as the rich legacy of Jehovah to all his intellectual family. Therefore salvation from sin and pain for you, men; for you, women; for you, children. Salvation for the Jew, salvation for the Gentile. Peace to him that is near, and to him that is far off. Salvation for all mankind of every nation, of every tongue, of every people. Salvation for every son and daughter of Adam. Depth of mercy can such favor extend to the vile, the impenitent, the unbeliever, the infidel, the heathen, the blasphemer? Hark, ye that are far from righteousness, behold I bring near my righteousness—my salvation will not tarry. By the Lord shall all men be justified, and in God shall all the seed of Israel be glorified. Is. xliv. 25. Vat. Sept.
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How different from that of the herald, is the office of an Evangelist, whose message is good news alone!—Salvation to the whole world, eternally secure in the purpose of Jehovah, independently of the good or evil words or actions of men—sure, equally sure to them in Christ, whether they believe it or not. The phrase, euaggelion euaggelisai, is peculiarly emphatic, and cannot be made English without losing much of its force and beauty. In a most gladdening and soul cheering manner, he poured out the refreshing streams of inexpressible joy and salvation upon the inhabitants of the world, of every class, name, grade, or kind.

Never did Jehovah honor any being with the office of Evangelist, till he anointed his Son with the holy spirit above measure, and sent him, euaggeliasthan, to preach gladnews to the poor, Luke iii. 18. I admit that Paul declares God, pro-evaggeliasato, preached prematurely or before the time, the gospel to Abraham, saying, in thee and thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. Gal. iii. 8, still Jesus was the first, who under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, as the ambassador of heaven, bore the God-honoring, soul-reviving message of an evangelist to the world. But the redeemer when about to leave the world, would not leave it comfortless—As the Father sent me, said he to his disciples, so send I you, and he breathed on them saying, receive ye the Holy Spirit. John xx. 21. 22.

The apostles thus commissioned by Jesus went forth as a band of Evangelists to proclaim the gospel of Salvation to the whole intellectual world. May the Eternal breathe a celestial influence upon us as ministers of this Everlasting Gospel, that we may imitate Christ our Master, proclaim the blessed message to the whole world, till all flesh see the salvation of the Lord, and rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

3. The design of the gospel is to call men from a state of alienation, moral darkness, and pagan idolatry, to the love, reverence, and adoration of the one only God, the Father of Jesus, and the sole proprietor and governor of the Universe. It has been generally conceded, that at the time of Christ's appearance, the whole world, except a part of the Jewish nation, were practical idolators. Christians still admit that a great part of the human family is, notwithstanding the light of the Gospel and the increase of useful knowledge, prone to the idolatrous practice of former times and darker ages.—Among professing christians, Protestants have frequently accused the Catholics of impure worship, in the reverence of saints, angels, and images; and assumed innocence to themselves, because they worship not the same objects. But as the messenger of heaven, I arraign before the tribunal of the one Jehovah, the great body of christians, whether Protestant or Catholic, and impeach them of the daring crime, which my text reprimands; for whatsoever offers prayer to any other being than the God and Eather of our Lord Jesus Christ, is yet in the gall of bitterness, and bonds of iniquity; and notwithstanding all his pretensions to Christian experience, is without God in the world.
The grand design of modern Pietists, is to produce devotional feelings and numerous genuflections without the least concern as to the object of veneration. But lie on the sensless mummerly; it is unworthy of an intelligent being; and frequently amounts to an insult to the throne of heaven, and a disgrace to human nature.—Were I to seek proof of that total depravity, so far famed among the sanctimonious religionists of the present age, I would refer the sceptic to those prayer meetings and revivals, which are of so great importance to the soul-saving systems, where he could not fail to behold such scenes of gross idolatry, as would rival the impure ceremonies of the Greeks and Romans, when our Master appeared as the advocate of a spiritual service, addressed to the One Eternal and Beneficent Parent of the Universe. Hear, O hear it, ye worshipers of Jews, who, by Paganizing his religion, have become guilty of the same crimes for which you condemn the heathen world! All that can be obtained by proselyting the nations to the spurious Christianity of self-styled Orthodoxy, is only a change in the names, whilst the Proselyte remains as ignorant of God, as he ever was.

I know it is pretended by those who esteem the exercise of reason inimical to religion, that the scriptures say, Jesus and the Father are one. But the meaning they attach to the passage is disavowed by Jesus himself, who declares that there is another, who bears witness of him, the Father who sent him, John v. 32, 37. It is written, the testimony of two men is true. "I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me." John viii. 17, 18. Now what meaning can be applied to the words of Christ, if he and the Father constituted only one person, or one witness? How could Jehovah be Christ and at the same time another? The scripture saith he that planteth and he that watereth are one; but none have hence inferred that Paul and Apollos were names of the same person. Either Christ and God must be two distinct persons, or the testimony of Christ must be false and dangerous. Answer these interrogations to your own consciences, or reject the gratuitous worship of a modern but corrupt and debased Christianity.

I feel that while I pronounce these heaven born truths, and plead the exclusive honors of the One Supreme Eternal, I expose myself to the odium of reputed heresy, and the execrations of those who are conscious of the crime which I reprobate and condemn.—And well if the reproach stopped here! I must also bear the blame of false brethren who court popularity at the expense of delinquency in duty, but as God is my witness, I as much despise the fawning adulation of a time serving brother, as the unrighteous censure of an open and virulent enemy. As a minister of the Everlasting Gospel, I call therefore on all men, to forsake the idolatry of the present age, and to turn from the veneration of idols of every name and species, to the acknowledgement and worship of him, who made heaven and earth, the seas and the fountains of water.

Offences committed against God exclusively, have generally
The doctrine of Christ

been considered by theologians as the most malignant. Moses and Jesus unitedly rank the acknowledgement and worship of One only God, as the first requisition of the Divine Law. He who is guilty of inattention to this first principle of truth and piety, has erossed the foundation of virtue, and is incapable of either piety or religion; he has offended in that one point which renders him guilty of all. To worship God according to the requisitions of scripture, a man’s views must be Unitarian; that is, he must be a believer in One undivided God in one person. The word trinitarian implies no less than a polytheist of a peculiar description, whose reverence must be as really diverted from the only true object of religious adoration as though he believed in all the imaginary gods of the Pantheon!—As I have had an opportunity of explaining my views of this subject in my lecture on the person of Christ, I shall now avoid every tendency to prolixity. Creation belongs alone to the One Eternal, and is never in the scriptures attributed to any other being. The Creator alone should be worshiped—Worship him who made heaven and earth, the sea and the fountains of water. Until a reformation is effected among Christians in this respect, our preaching is vain—they are yet in their sins, and all their pretended piety, and devotion is as a smoke in Jehovah’s nostrils, who says to such worshipers, bring no more your vain oblations, my soul is weary of them!

4. The effects of preaching the Gospel, Babylon is fallen, is fallen. We do not apply this prediction to the ancient city of Babylon, whose noble walls and lofty towers once adored the banks of the Paradisiacal Euphrates. Nay! Mystery Babylon is the subject of the prophecy. To obtain, therefore, a correct notion of the term, we will advert to its origin. At an early period of the world, men formed the ignorant, proud, and fanatical project of mounting to the empyreal throne of unmixed and perennial felicity, by a ladder of their own imagination; and like the orthodox merit-mongers of the present age, to work they went, to erect a tower whose top should reach to heaven! God surveyed their foolish and ineffectual efforts, and in pity confounded their languages. Hence the place was called Babel, that is confusion, because of the confusion of speech which here began. Now I trust you clearly understand my text, and are able to make a correct application of the prophecy therein contained. Mystery Babylon is a mysterious confusion or unintelligible jargon, the meaning or import of which cannot be ascertained. This description applies as clearly as the effulgence of heaven can make it, to every system of pretended orthodoxy, whether it be Protestant or Catholic, since the time of Constantine. At that period, the church, in conflict with the Dragon, obtained the wings or protection of the Roman Eagle, which, alas for her misfortune, carried her to the wilderness, where deluded by the splendor of imperial grandure, she resigned her characteristic ornaments of truth and simplicity, for the confused speculations and gaudy frippery of a national religion, two thirds of which were borrowed from the superstition of
Pagan Rome. Hence mystery and confusion has distinguished her speech, from that time to the present age.

To illustrate these remarks, we shall here adduce two or three examples of that confusion of speech., which we believe attaches to the fallen and degraded church of Christ. There is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit. The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, yet these are not three Gods but one God!! Unity in trinity and trinity in Unity! This is confusion—Add to this, their own acknowledgments, that it is a mystery, and you have the phrase by which the Spirit of God has distinguished the Rhapsodists, namely, mystery Babylon, or a mysterious confusion! Again, Jesus is God-man, not wholly Divine nor wholly human, having two natures in one person, without mixture or confusion! Good God, what a mystery confusion is here! Lastly they tell us God is almighty, yet we can resist him! He is our Saviour, yet we must save ourselves or be damned eternally. This is not only mystery confusion, but wicked confusion, Eternal Father, give effect to these remarks, and let them operate conviction in the consciences of all those, who have forsaken the fountain of living waters.

Brethren, suffer me to boast myself a little. I presume I may claim originality in the discovery of the meaning and application of this important passage of scripture. You will easily perceive that many reasons must have operated with almost all, who have attempted to comment on this book, to conceal its meaning and obviate, if possible, the force of its application. But the interpretation of this text, which I have adopted, firmly fixes on the spurious Evangelists of the past and present ages, the infamous epithets of this book; and from the stains which this discourse will attach to their official character, they will be unable to wash themselves till their heavens be no more.

A brief retrospect of Ecclesiastical history, will induce you to see the propriety of the explanation I have given, and produce in your minds a coincidence of opinion. We learn from Mosheim, that the venerable simplicity of the Christian system was not of long duration; for towards the close of the second century, it was prepared for overthrow. Its beauty was gradually defaced, by the subtilities of imaginary sciences, and several tenets of a chimerical philosophy, which were imprudently incorporated into the religion of Jesus. This unhappy change was chiefly owing to that pride, which induced an eagerness in certain learned men to effect a union between the doctrine of Christ and the opinions of philosophers. Till this unhallowed union took place, Christianity stood a fair celestial temple, enblazoned and illumined by the glory and majesty of her God; but when the well and skilfully hewn stones, which composed the structure, were displaced, or mixed with mouldering, unshapeably masses, without regularity or symmetry, and men began to daub the walls with untempered mortar, the whole became as a house built on the sands, exposed to ruin on every approach of the storm
The gold of the temple being supplanted by hay, wood, and stubble, nearly the whole structure became combustible, and, alas for the religion of Jesus! having lost its beauty, value and glory, it remained as a vessel fitted for destruction!

Another cause which powerfully operated to erect mystery Babylon on the ruins of Christianity, was the recourse of Christians to the sophistical distinctions of their opponents; which produced nothing but perplexity and confusion, until genuine Christianity almost totally disappeared. Nothing tended so powerfully to build and support the temple of confusion, as the double sense of words, whereby every wrangler had an opportunity of affixing to the language of scripture a hidden and mysterious sense, which he could at all times render subservient to his own peculiar views. Among all the visionaries of antiquity, none were so eminently distinguished as the Egyptians, in this new method of interpreting the scriptures. They considered it a noble task, to make deep researches into the hidden meaning of those Divine truths taught by Jesus, with a view to accommodate his celestial doctrine to the precepts of a foolish and visionary philosophy. Hence arose the Mystic Theology or rather Mystery Babylon which engulfed the religion of Jesus, in a vortex of impure, idolatrous, and confused speculations!!

Now the grand effect, produced by preaching the Everlasting Gospel, will be the total overthrow of Mystery Babylon, and the re-establishment of Christianity, on the immovable foundation of Christ and his Apostles. Disengaged from the heterogeneous mass of spurious additions, recovered from the wounds of false friends, having attained pristine beauty, native simplicity, and purification from every stain of Pagan pollution, Christianity will resume its ancient glory, the cloud of Divine presence, will be seen over the ark of the testimony, the voice of parental affection will issue from the Mercy seat, men will recognise the voice of Jesus, and distinguish it from that of false shepherds, Prodigals will return to their father’s house, the steeled heart of relentless partiality, will thaw and melt itself into dew, before the heat and splendor of the Sun of Righteousness, God will be acknowledged as the one common Father and portion of every people, tongue and nation, which inhabit our terrestrial abode.

Brethren, before I conclude, permit me to congratulate you on discovering that the Unitarian Universalist is the only angel that ever preached the Everlasting Gospel—He alone calls men from the idolatrous worship of idols, to the adoration of the Creator—He alone preaches nothing but good news—and he alone is the only messenger that ever preached the good news to all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people. Unitarian Limitarians and Universalian Redemptionists, are alike excluded. The former do not preach the gospel to all, nor do the latter recall men from idolatry. But these are fast disappearing among us. Persevere then in the best of causes: Confusion will soon yield to the plain simple and intelligible doctrine of God, of Christ, of Salvation. In the name of Jesus, let us display our banners, and the Lord will fulfil all our prayers. Amen!
SUPPLEMENT.

Whilst the foregoing discourse was in press, I received the following communication:

Rochester, N. Y., July 9, 1825.

Sir.—I send you a copy of an article which appeared in the 18th number of the Advocate, published in this place. I think it deserves notice; and should you think proper, some remarks on it, from you, would meet with a very good reception. Yours truly.


EXTRACT.

"The far greater part of Christians, since the Gospel was published, have worshiped Jesus Christ. If he is not God, this is idolatry. Now the apostles foresaw many, if not all, the gross errors of the Church, and warned against those errors. If almost all the Christian world was to fall into this error, would they not have warned the church against it?"—Rel. Adv.

REMARKS.

In the above extract are contained the following propositions:

1. The greater part of Christians have worshiped Jesus since the Gospel was published.
2. If Jesus is not God, his worship is idolatry.
3. If the worship of Jesus be idolatry, the Apostles, who foresaw and warned against many gross errors, would have warned the Church against it.

1. The first proposition is partly true and partly false. That the majority of professing Christians have long worshiped Jesus, is too notorious to be denied; but that this practice has prevailed since the Gospel was published, is incapable of proof from the history of the Christian Church. The book called Acts, is allowed to contain a full and authentic history of the Christian Church, till about the year sixty three; yet not one instance occurs, during that period of prayer, being addressed to Jesus, nor of one individual having so far mistaken his person and religion, as to vilify the one by
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the adoration of the other. If then the worship of Christ be neither taught in the sacred writings, nor once exemplified in the conduct of his Apostles, nor in any of the first Christians, until the Church became corrupt by the introduction of the Pagan rites; it clearly follows, that the worship of Jesus is a gratuitous service, an authorised by God and his messengers, and subversive of the design and purity of the Christian Religion.

2. If Jesus be not God his worship is idolatry. We have clearly and repeatedly proved that Christ is not God. This, we assume, we have done in our lectures on the Trinity and on the person of Christ, so successfully as to produce conviction in very sound mind, that does not determinately resist the force of evidence. Whatever personal properties Christ possessed, they were all represented by the pronouns, I, he; and all his fullness comprised under the possessives, his, mine, when used in their utmost extent. Let then Jesus be the speaker. "My Father is greater than I." John 14, 28.—Here the pronoun I, represents the person of Christ in all its fullness and properties, and yet there is another, acknowledged to be greater than he. If then Jesus be God, the doctrine of polytheism must be true; and there may be a multitude of Gods which is denied by the whole concurrent testimony of the Bible. But the person said to be greater than Jesus, is by him acknowledged as his Father. Now to say that Father and Son mean the same person, is to outrage common sense, and abuse the words of scripture. The Father of Christ must therefore be admitted as God, and Jesus an inferior and subordinate being.

Again, either Jesus is not God, or the Christian religion is an imposition! Christ says, "the doctrine is not mine." John vii. 16.—Now if he were God, Christianity must be a cheat; for the Gospel professes to be from God, yet Christ disavows it—hence it follows, that if we are not impostors ourselves, we will admit that if Christianity be true, Jesus is not God, and therefore his worship is manifestly idolatry. Q. E. D.

3. The one God was so well defined and his exclusive worship, so distinctly enjoined, in the Jewish scriptures, that none, who acknowledge these writings as a rule of faith and practice, could possibly mistake. Warnings against idolatry were so reiterated and awful and so many examples of its cursed and pernicious tendency on record, that every man believing these holy books, would consider additional remonstrance unnecessary. Yet Jesus peculiarly cautions against mistake, by declaring that the true worshipers worship the Father. But cries the objector. Christ and the Father are one. This in the sense implied, is either the language of ignorance or of unpardonable obstinacy. The scriptures clearly declare him that planteth and him that watereth to be one, 1 Cor. iii. 7. Yet none believe Paul and Apollos the same man. If to be one with the Father, imply Deity, the prayer of Jesus, John xvii. 11, 21, 22, never can be answered, till all believers be metamorphosed into Gods and the Pagan idolatry established by the sanction of heaven!
Every image or likeness of any being on earth or in heaven above, was expressly prohibited religious worship, by the unchanging law of the One Jehovah, Ex. xx. 4; Deut. iv. 15—20. But none can deny that Jesus was not only the likeness of man on earth, but also of God in heaven. Hence that commandment, which forbids the worship of images, equally prohibits the worship of Jesus. Hence Christians, who offer prayers to Christ, are as practical idolators, as the Jewish and Pagan nations, when they fell down and adored images which they set up. Paul having said, "There be gods many, but to us there is but one God, even the Father," immediately adds, "howbeit there is not in every man this knowledge." No, venerable apostle, there was not in thy days, nor is there in ours, such knowledge in every man—for the great majority of Christians think the most important part of their religion consists in a direct violation of the law of God. Alas! how unfortunate! how long shall it thus be!
Part Fourth.

Anthropology.

Ps. 8. 4. What is man that thou art mindful of him?

Man may be defined a social, omnivorous, and two handed animal of erect attitude, biped progression, and moral sensibility. This definition, we conceive to be peculiar to man, and it distinguishes him from all other animals. Though the separation of man from the class of animals, as is often vulgarly and theologically done, be productive of great and serious mistakes concerning his moral character, yet the confounding him with any genus of animals has often exposed the definitions of the most learned Naturalists to contempt and ridicule. Besides the common properties of animals, man has others which give him a vast superiority. His mind is endowed with faculties of the highest order; and his body differs advantageously, from the bodies of all other animals, in many points of construction. Well might the chief of English poets exclaim; "What a work is man! How noble in reason! In form and motion, how admirable! The beauty of the world! The Paragon of animals!"

The Latin Poet describes man as the only animal, which walks erect, and raises his sublime countenance towards heaven.

Pronaque cum spectant animalia cetera terram,
Os homini sublime sedit; coelumque tueri
Jussit; et erectos ad sidera tollere vultus.—Ovid.

The natural history of man constitutes a subject of immense extent and endless variety. In a complete history of man, it would be necessary, in respect to the individual, to relate the phenomena of his first production; to examine his anatomical structure; his bodily and intellectual functions; his propensities, feeling, and diseases; and to pursue his progress from birth to the grave: in reference to his species, to point out the circumstances that distinguish him from other animals; and determine the precise degree and kind of resemblance or difference, of specific affinity or diversity between them and ourselves; to compare with each other the various tribes of human beings; to delineate the physical and moral characters of the people inhabiting the different portions of the Globe; and to trace their progress from the first rudiments of civilization to that state at which they have now arrived. To write such a history of our
species would demand a familiar acquaintance with almost the whole
circle of human knowledge, and a combination of the most opposite
pursuits and talents. This labor, too extensive for any individual,
is divided into several subordinate branches. The anatomist and
physiologist unfold the construction and uses of the corporeal me-
chanism; the surgeon and physician describe its diseases; while
the metaphysician and moralist exercise themselves with speculations
concerning those functions, which constitute the mind; and in form-
ing theories of moral sentiments. Man in society, his progress in
the various countries and ages of the world, his multiplication and
extension, are the province of the historian and political economis-

A description thus extensive is not our object. All that we in-
tend in this discourse will be confined to a brief dissertation con-
cerning the homogeneous nature of man, a subject equally interest-
ing to the naturalist, physician, metaphysician and theologian; and
cannot be neglected by any of them, without discredit to their in-
dustry and dishonor to their profession. In the progress of our in-
quiry we shall not allow self-love to blind our eyes to the excellen-
cies of other productions, on the same subjects; but will use freely
both the words and ideas of others, when they coincide with our own,
or express the sentiments, which we intended to communicate, more
accurately or in more suitable phraseology than we could otherwise
have attained. Although our researches in this part of anthropo-
logy, have been laborious; and we trust successful; yet when we find
the result of our own inquiries expressed in a clear and perspicuous
manner by such men as Haller, Richerand, Cuvier, Spurzheim, Ab-
ernethy, and Lawrence, men who have raised themselves to the pin-
acle of honor and merit in their profession, names that will go down
to many generations yet to come, and which can only be lost when
Gothic ignorance and barbarism darken the bright and fair days of
science, we glory in the privilege of taking refuge from the vengeful
pursuit of monkish bigotry beneath the shade of their protection.

We would not feel ourselves conscious of having done our duty to
the revered names of Dodwell, Locke, Law, and Priestley, which
have shone as suns in the intellectual firmament, should we be guilty
of passing them in silence. From the above stars of the first mag-
nitude in the intellectual world, we have derived much light con-
cerning what we have here adduced; and it must give a peculiar
force and efficacy to the opinions contained in this discourse, that no
doctrine has been promulgated by the writer, in relation to the com-
position and faculties of man, in which a majority of the above
named authors do not concur.

LIFE OR VITALITY.

Life is that principle of organized matter, which suspends the
laws of chemical affinities, and prevents disorganization: it is the
aggregate of those properties and laws which regulate the animal
economy; and is used to denote the whole powers which animate
living bodies and distinguish them from inert matter. It subjects
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the beings that enjoy it, to a different system of laws from those which govern inanimate objects; and preserves them in nearly equal temperature, whatever may be that of the surrounding atmosphere: and it draws to them, extraneous molecules, which by assimilation, replace the waste of others, and serve for nourishment and growth. Indeed the organic functions constitute life in the proper acceptation of the term, but it should be regarded like the word attraction or repulsion, as merely the expression of a fact, of whose cause we remain ignorant. Like many other principles, we know it only by its properties, which are sensibility and contractility. The first is as essential to the nervous system, in animals, as the power of contraction to the muscular fibre; and life therefore, so far as observation goes, is necessarily connected with organization. Life presupposes organization, as much as the movements of a watch, presupposes the wheels, levers, and other mechanism of the instrument.

Living bodies exhibit a constant internal motion, in which we observe an uninterrupted admission and assimilation of new, and a corresponding separation and expulsion of old particles. The form remains the same; the component particles are continually changing. While this motion lasts, the body is said to be alive; when it has irrecoverably ceased, the body is dead. The organic structure then yields to the chemical affinities of surrounding agents, and is speedily destroyed. During life, the vital powers are continually at war with the powers that govern inanimate bodies. The laws of individual, hold a constant struggle with those of universal nature. Life maintains a successful contest in health, uncertain in disease, and is at an end, the very moment the bodies endowed with it, fall again into the system of inanimate being. Though this constant opposition of vital to physical laws, does not withdraw, altogether, living bodies from the control of chemical and physical laws, yet their effects are constantly influenced, modified and altered by the powers of life.

If we view life in all its variegated forms, we shall see it composed, at first of a small number of phenomena, simple as the apparatus to which it is given in charge, but soon extending itself as its organs or instruments are multiplied. The properties which characterize life, though at first obscure, become more and more manifest in proportion as they increase in development and energy; and the field of existence enlarges from the lowest vegetable up to the sublimity of thought.

What does this plant present to us, that springs up and dies every year? A being whose phenomena are limited to nutrition and reproduction; a machine constructed of a multitude of vessels, straight or winding, capillary tubes, through which the sap is filtrated, and other juices necessary to vegetation. The vegetable liquors ascend, generally from the roots to the summit, where, what remains from nutrition, is evaporated by the leaves; and what the plant could not assimilate to itself, is thrown off by transudation. Two properties direct the action of this small number of functions; a latent sensi-
bility, by which every vessel is affected in its own way by the fluid, with which it comes in contact; and a contractility by virtue of which the vessels, sensible to the impression of liquids, close or dilate themselves to effect their transmission and elaboration. This plant may be reproduced and multiplied by slips, which proves that each part contains all the organs necessary to life, and therefore can live alone, because life is diffused more uniformly than in man.

If we pass to the polypus, which forms the lowest link in the animal chain, we find a tube of soft substance, sensible and contractile in all its parts; a life and an organization as simple as that of the plant. Moisture oozes from the internal surface of the tube, softens and digests the aliments which it finds there; the whole mass draws nourishment from it; the tube then spontaneously contracts, and casts out the residue of digestion. Cut the creature into many parts, each becomes a new polypus, like that to which it originally belonged.

Ascend to the worm, there we behold parcels of contractile fibres, a vessel divided by several constrictions into a series of vesicles, which empty themselves into one another by contraction, beginning at the head and proceeding to the tail. In all probability, from the main vessel, are sent out ramifications, and a spinal marrow, composed of a chain of ganglions; clearly an organization more perfect, sensibility and contractility more distinct, and motions more diversified, some of which seem to indicate choice. The worm too may be divided into many pieces; each will become a separate and perfect worm; a head and a tail growing to each part; but as the substance of the worm is formed of elements more dissimilar, the divisions cannot be pushed so far as in the polypi.

The crustaceous tribes manifest a more complex apparatus of organization. Among them, the lobster displays distinct muscles, an external articulated skeleton, nerves and a spinal marrow; but above all, a brain and a heart. These two organs, assign the animal to an order above that of worms. The first becomes the seat of intelligence, the lobster acts evidently under the impulses of a will. In the latter, the phenomena of life becomes linked together by a stricter necessity, and it is no longer possible to separate the animal into parts, each of which may retain life; yet partial regeneration may be frequently seen.

If from the white blooded, we proceed to the red and cold blooded animals, such as fishes and reptiles, we see the power of reproduction becoming more and more limited, and life more involved in organization. Gills in some and lungs in others, are added to a heart: but the action of these organs is not constantly necessary for the continuance of life. The serpent passes long winters, torpid with cold, in holes where he has no air, without breathing, without any motion of life, and, in all appearance, dead. All reptiles are able to breathe only at long intervals, and to suspend, for a time, the admission of air, without risk of existence. In these animals, the vital powers are distinct and strong, and differ from those of
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man by very slight shades. They have, senses, a brain, nerves, muscles, and hard parts, all adapted to their peculiar mode of existence.

We come at last, to the red and warm blooded animals, at the head of which, are the mammiferæ and man. If we except some slight differences in the extremities, in their external appearances, and in some of the less essential organs, these are entirely the same: All have a vertebral column, four limbs, a brain which fills, exactly, the cavity of the skull, a spinal marrow, nerves of two sorts, five senses, muscles partly obedient to the will, partly independent in their action, a long digestive tube coiled upon itself, furnished at its mouth with agents of saliva and mastication; vessels and lymphatic glands, arteries and veins, a heart with two auricles and two ventricles, lobular lungs, which must act incessantly in impregnating the blood, that passes through them, with the vital part of the atmosphere, which must be perpetual, or life is gone. None of their organs live but while they partake in the general action of the system; and are under the influence of the heart. All die, irrecoverably, when parted from the body of the animal, and are no way replaced, whatever some physiologists may have said of pretended regenerations.

Every thing important to life is found in these animals; and as the most essential organs are within, concealed in deep cavities, a celebrated naturalist was correct in saying, that all animals are essentially the same. Their differences are in their external parts, and chiefly observed in their coverings and extremities.

The human body consists of liquids and solids, the first constitutes about five sixths of its weight. The liquids exist before the solids: for the embryo being at first in a gelatinous state, may be considered as fluid; besides it is from a liquid that all the organs receive their nourishment, and repair their waste. The solids, formed from the liquids, return to their former state, after having for a sufficient length of time, formed a part of the animal, they become decomposed by the nutritive process. Even from this slight view of the subject, fluidity seems to be essential to living matter; since the solids are constantly formed from the fluids and eventually return to their former state. Solidity is therefore only a transient state of organized matter; and this circumstance affords opportunity to the humoral pathologists of embarrassing their opponents. Humidity is indeed necessary in the living solid, for the exertion of vitality: but that vitality exists in the solids, as solid, is proved by instances of animalcules and seeds of plants, which, though long dried, again live and germinate.

Water forms the principal part, and the common vehicle of all the animal fluids. It contains saline substances in a state of solution, and even animal matter is found in its fluid, under three different conditions; gelatine, albumine and fibrine. The first of these solidified, forms the basis of all the organs of a white colour, such as tendons, the aponeurosis, the cellular tissue and membranes,
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Albumine is abundant in almost all the humours; and fibrine is the cement that repairs the waste of the muscular system. Chemists suppose that the animal matter passes, successively, through the different states of gelatine, albumine, and fibrine; and that these different states depend on the progress of animalization of matter, which at first gelatinous, a hydro-carbonous oxide, containing no azote, and acidifiable by fermentation, becomes more closely combined with oxygen, takes up azote, so as to become albumen, subject to putrefaction, and finally fibrine, by a super-addition of the same principle.

The solid parts form different systems, or organic apparatus, which denote a combination of those parts, which concur in the same uses. Of these we reckon ten; the digestive, the absorbent, the circulatory, the respiratory, the secretory, the sensitive, the muscular, the osseous, the vocal, and the sexual systems. In man each of these systems contains four simple tissues, the cellular, nervous, muscular, and horny.

These four substances may be considered as real organic elements, since with our means of analysis, we never can succeed in converting any one of them into another. Bones, cartilages, and tendons by long maceration, may be decomposed into cellular substance; but the muscular fibre is not subject to this alteration, nor can the cerebral pulp ever be converted into the horny, cellular, or muscular substance. We are therefore led to acknowledge these four constituent principles in our organs: and these primitive tissues, variously modified and in various proportions, constitute the substance of our organs. Haller's maxim, that "the elementary fibre is to the Physiologist, what the line is to the Geometer," is chimerical, for we cannot admit of an elementary fibre, while our senses show us four distinct materials in the human organization.

The action of some of those organs is so essential to life, that with its cessation life becomes extinct. None of them can act except the heart send into the brain a certain quantity of blood, vivified by the contact of atmospheric air, in the pulmonary tissue. Every serious wound of the brain or heart, every lasting interruption to the access of blood into the former of these organs, is inevitably attended with death. The oxydation of the blood, and its distribution into all the organs, are consequently, the principle phenomena, on which the life of man and of the most perfect beings depends.

Haller's theory of life was that it depends on irritability. He considered the nervous power the stimulus of all the muscles that are subject to the will. The blood he maintained to be the stimulus of the heart: and alimentary substance the stimulus of the intestine canal. The blood irritating the muscular fibres of the heart, produced systole, and the absence of the blood or the destruction of the stimulus occasioned the diastole. Haller's great object in his dissertations on irritability was to prove, that the motions of the heart are independent of the nervous system. In proof of this theory he alleged three facts. 1. If we intercept all communication
between the brain and the heart, even by decapitation the motion of the heart continues. 2. If we cut out the heart it continues to beat for some time. 3. Irritation of the nerves, produces convulsions in the muscles of voluntary motion, after death, but the irritation of the cardiac nerves have no effect on the heart.

Mr. Le Gallois supposes Haller's system imperfect and exults in having made two grand discoveries: 1. The principle of inspiratory motion, resides in the medulla oblongata: and 2. That of the life of the trunk, in the spinal marrow. With a view to establish his discoveries he made many experiments, and adopted the following theories.

1. Life is produced by an impression of the arterial blood on the brain and spinal marrow, or by a principle resulting from this impression; and is prolonged by the continual renewal of this impression.

2. The nervous power formed in the brain and spinal marrow, through the medium of the nerves, animates all the rest of the body and presides over all its functions.

3. The principal of inspiration resides in that part of the medulla oblongata which gives origin to the eighth pair of nerves.

4. The heart receives its principle of life from the whole spinal marrow, and the principle which animates every part of the body resides in that part of the spinal marrow from which the nerves of the part originate.

5. The great sympathetic arises from all parts of the spinal marrow and subjects all the parts on which it is distributed, to the influence of the whole nervous system.

6. All the organs which receive their nerves from the great sympathetic are not subject to the will. Those which receive nerves from the medulla oblongata and spinalis, receive only a part of the nervous power and are therefore subject to the will.

7. Death is only the extinction of the principle formed in the brain and spinal marrow, and is partial or total in proportion as the extinction is partial or complete: and death inevitably follows the division of the eighth pair of nerves at their origin.

The report of the National Institute of France on the experiments of Dr. Le Gallois, regards as demonstrated numbers, 3. 4. 5. and express their opinion, that the work of M. Le Gallois is the most excellent and important, which has appeared in Physiology since the learned experiments of Haller.

Prompted by the success and honors of Le Gallois, Dr. Philip of the Royal Society, and the College of Physicians, Edinburgh, published an "Experimental inquiry into the laws of the vital Functions," and asks some questions in the 62 page not answerable on the principles of M. Le Gallois. Dr. Philip's experiments partly corroborate those of Haller and partly those of Le Gallois. They show that the power of the heart and vessels of circulation and of the muscles of involuntary motion, is independent of the brain and spinal marrow: and that the nervous influence is capable of acting both
as a stimulus and as a sedative to the heart and circulatory vessels; that the voluntary muscles are more under the influence of the nervous power than the involuntary; that the peristaltic motion of the stomach and intestines is independent of the nervous system; that the function of the secretory system is destroyed by dividing the nerves of the secretory organs; that the sensorial power is not wholly confined to the brain, nor the nervous to the spinal marrow, but both powers in a greater or lesser degree reside in both organs; that death is the ceasing of the sensorial power alone, the nervous and muscular powers still continuing; that in respiration the sensorial, nervous, and muscular powers are combined; that it is owing to the ceasing of respiration that the destruction of the sensorial power is followed by that of the nervous and muscular powers.

For those who think it impossible, that the living organic structures should have vital properties without some extrinsic aid—although they require no such assistance for the equally wonderful affinities of chemistry, for gravity, elasticity or other properties of matter—a great variety of explanations, suited to all tastes and comprehensions, has been provided. Some are contented with stating that the properties of life arise from a vital principle. This explanation has the merit of simplicity, whatever we may think of its profoundness; and it has moreover the advantage of being transferable, and equally applicable to any other subject. Some think an immaterial spirit presides and directs the vital functions. This explanation will perfectly suit those who hold conversation with immaterial beings, and understand how spirit acts on matter and matter on spirit. Others say a material, but invisible and very subtle agent is superadded to the obvious structure of the body, and enables it to exhibit vital phenomena. I know of no description of people likely to profit by this explanation; for subtle matter is still matter; and if this fine stuff can possess vital properties, surely they might reside in a fabric which differs only in being a little coarser.

Plato called the vital principle, an emanation from the soul of the world: an explanation no doubt perfectly satisfactory to those who know what the soul of the world is, and how other souls emanate from it. The Brahmins hold a similar notion, but they make the soul after death pass into other animals, according to its behaviour, admitting however that those of the good are immediately re-absorbed into the Divinity. This theory affords but little inducement to virtue, since its only reward was annihilation or to be absorbed in the person of another.

These are only a few specimens out of a vast assortment. If you do not like any of them, there are plenty more to choose from. As these and a hundred other such hypotheses are all supported by equally good proof, which is neither more nor less, in each instance, than the thorough conviction of the inventor; and as they are inconsistent with each other, and therefore mutually destructive; we need not trouble ourselves further—for of these, as of the numerous religions in the world, only one can be true.
LECTURE 17.

THE MIND.

But a spirit which is in man and the inspiration of the Almighty is to them understanding. Job 32. 8.

Animals, in addition to the properties of vegetables, enjoy Mind, the indispensable attributes of which are, the faculties of perception, volition, and consciousness: and perception and consciousness without volition are like vegetable or organic sensibility, without contractility, useless; and the latter could not exist without the two former, any more than vegetable or organic attraction could occur without sensibility: nor can the existence of mind be conceived without the faculties of consciousness, perception, and volition, any more than the existence of matter without extension and impenetrability.—The possession of mind by animals, necessarily implies the presence of a brain for its performance, and of a nerve or nerves for the purpose of conveying impressions to this brain, and volitions from it, to one or more voluntary muscles. A system which is not thus gifted, certainly deserves not the name of animal. As we cannot conceive an animal without perception and volition, neither can we conceive these in an animal without a brain, any more than the secretion of bile without a liver.

In order to prove that the brain is the seat of sensation, let us observe, that from it are sent forth ten pair of nerves and the spinal marrow. These are covered with thin white membranes and appear like small white cords branching out in all directions as they proceed from the brain to all parts of the body. The ramifications of the nerves are so numerous that you cannot touch the surface of the body by the finest needle without irritating one or more of their infinitely small branches. The nervous system consists of the medullary substance of the brain, cerebellum, medulla oblongata, and spinalis, and continued through the nerves to all parts of the body. Parts of the extremities of the nerves, in which the medullary substance is destitute of the enveloping membranes from the pia mater, being exposed to the action of external bodies, are called the sentient extremities of the nerves. The nervous system is every where the same continuous medullary substance and being the vital solid of animals, is so constituted as to admit of motions being easily propagated from any one part to every other part of the nervous system, so long as the continuity and natural living state of the medullary substance remains. All motions in this system give rise to thought, and there can be no thought without motion in the nervous system. The impulse of external bodies act on the sentient extremities of the nerves and gives occasion to perception or thought, which, when first arising in the mind, is termed sensation, which gives occasion to volition, and volition produces muscular motion by the contraction of fibres. As
the impulse of bodies on the sensient extremities of the nerves, does not occasion any sensation, unless the nerves between the sensient extremity and the brain be free; and as volition cannot produce muscular contraction, unless the nerve between the brain and muscle be free; we conclude that sensation and volition are functions of the brain alone; and that sensation arises only in consequence of external impulse, producing motion in the sensient extremities of the nerves. The brain seems to be fitted for those motions with which sensation and the whole consequent operations of thought are connected. The vascularity and pulpiness of the cortical part of the brain, and of the nerves, give reason to believe, there is a very fine fluid, secreted in the medullary substance. It appears to exhale from the extremities of the nerves as the lassitude and debility of the muscles from too great exercise, and the dulness of the sensorial organs from excessive use, manifestly prove.

There are many glands in the human body, which are fleshy, fibrous or viscid bodies destined to secrete from the blood, different juices designed to serve different purposes in the animal economy. Thus as the liver separates the bile, so the brain secretes from the blood, the nervous fluid; an infinitely subtle or ethereal substance, like electricity, in the rapidity and energy of its motions. This invisible gaseous fluid emitted from the brain through the nerves to all parts of the body, is so infinitely subtle, that it passes through the nerves in so small tubes, that the finest telescopes have never been able to discover the smallest passage. This nervous fluid is the sensient and moving principle, i.e. the animal soul. By it all the phenomena of the mind and body are produced. It is equally the source of thought and spring of action. This fluid has no smell nor taste; for the cerebrine medulla is insipid and inodorous. nor has it any colour, for the cerebrum and nerves are white. It is of so subtle a consistence as never to have been detected. Its mobility is stupendous, for in less than a moment, it is conveyed from the brain to the muscles, like the electric fluid. Whether the nervous fluid be carried from the organ of sense in the sensorial nerves to the brain, and from thence through the motory nerves to the muscles, cannot be positively affirmed. The constituent principles of this liquid are entirely unknown, as they cannot be rendered visible by art, or proved by experiment. When we bind a nerve by a ligature, the motion of the fluid is interrupted, which proves that something corporeal flows through the nerve. It is therefore great weakness to deny its existence because we cannot see it; for who has seen the matter of heat, oxygen, azote and other elementary bodies, whose existence no Physician of the present day will deny. The nervous fluid is not electricity, for the nerves exhibit no signs of spontaneous electricity, neither is it magnetic matter as the experiments of Gavian show; nor is it oxygen, nor hydrogen, nor azote, for the first very much irritates the nerves, and the other two suspend their action. The nervous fluid is therefore an element, sui generis, which exists and is produced in the nerves only, and is known by its effects.
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"there is little inducement, says Lawrence, to compare the various animal structures, to follow any apparatus through the whole animal series, unless the structure were a measure and criterion of the function. Just in the same proportion as organization is reduced, life is reduced; exactly as the organic parts are diminished in number and simplified, the vital phenomena become fewer and more simple: and each function ends, when the respective organ ceases. — This is true throughout zoology; there is no exception in behalf of any vital manifestations.

The same kind of fact the same reasoning, the same sort of evidence altogether, which shew digestion to be the function of the alimentary canal, the motion of the muscles, and various secretions of their respective glands, prove that sensation, perception, memory, judgment, reasoning, thought—in a word, all the manifestations called mental or intellectual—are the animal functions of their appropriate organic apparatus, the central organ of the nervous system. No difficulty nor obscurity belongs to the latter case, which does not equally affect all the former instances: no kind of evidence connects the living processes with the material instruments in the one which does not apply just as clearly and forcibly to the other.

Shall I be told that thought is inconsistent with matter; that we cannot conceive how medullary substance can perceive, remember, judge, reason? I acknowledge that we are entirely ignorant how the parts of the brain accomplish these purposes—as we are how the liver secretes bile, how the muscles contract, or how any other living purpose is effected, as we are how heavy bodies are attracted to the earth, how iron is drawn to the magnet, or how two salts decompose each other. Experience is in all these cases, our sole, if not sufficient instructress: and the constant conjunction of phenomena, as exhibited in her lessons, is the sole ground for affirming a necessary connexion between them. If we go beyond this, and come to inquire the manner how, the mechanism by which these things are affected, we shall find every thing around us equally mysterious, equally incomprehensible—from the stone which falls to the earth, to the comet traversing the heavens—from the thread attracted by amber or sealing-wax, to the revolutions of planets in their orbits—from the formation of a maggot in putrid flesh, or a mite in cheese, to the production of a Newton or a Franklin.

The number and kind of the intellectual phenomena in different animals correspond closely to the degree of development of the brain. The mind of the Negro and Hottentot, of the Calmuck and the Carib, is inferior to that of the European; and their organization is also less perfect. The large cranium and high forehead of the orang-utang lift him above his brother monkeys; but the development of his cerebral hemispheres and his mental manifestations are both equally below the Negro. The gradation of organization and of mind passes through the monkey, dog, elephant, horse, to other quadrupeds; thence to birds, reptiles, and fishes; and so on to the lowest links of the animal chain.
In ascending these steps of one ladder, following in regular succession at equal intervals, where shall we find the boundary of unassisted organization? where place the beginning of the immaterial adjunct? In that view which assimilates the functions of the brain to those of other organic parts, this case has no difficulty. As the structure of the brain is more exquisite, perfect, and complex, its functions ought to be proportionally so. It is no slight proof of the doctrine now enforced, that the fact is actually thus: that the mental powers of brutes, as far as we can see, are proportional to their organization.

If the intellectual phenomena of man require an immaterial principle superadded to the brain, we must equally concede it to those more rational animals which exhibit manifestations differing from some of the human only in degree. If we grant it to these, we cannot refuse it to the next in order, and so on in succession to the whole series—to the oyster, the sea-anemone, the polypi, the microscopic animalcules. Is any one prepared to admit the existence of immaterial principles in all these cases? If not, he must equally reject it in man.

It is admitted, that an idiot with a malformed brain has no mind; that the sagacious dog and half-reasonable elephant do not require any thing superadded to their brains; it is allowed that a dog or elephant excels inferior animals, in consequence of possessing a more perfect cerebral structure; it is strongly suspected that a Newton or a Shakspeare excels other mortals only by a more ample development of the anterior cerebral lobes, by having an extra inch of brain in the right place; yet the immaterialists will not concede the obvious corollary of all these admissions, viz. that the mind of man is merely that more perfect exhibition of mental phenomena which the more complete development of the brain would lead us to expect; and still perplex us with the gratuitous difficulty of their immaterial hypothesis. Thought, it is positively and dogmatically asserted, cannot be an act of matter. Yet no feelings, no thought, no intellectual operation has ever been seen except in conjunction with a brain; and living matter is acknowledged by most persons to be capable of what makes the nearest possible approach to thinking. The strongest advocate for immaterialism seeks no further than the body for his explanation of all the vital processes, of muscular contraction, nutrition, secretion, &c.—operations quite as different from any affection of inorganic substance, as reasoning or thought; he will even allow the brain to be capable of sensation.

Who knows the capabilities of matter so perfectly, as to be able to say that it can see, hear, smell, taste, and feel, but cannot possibly reflect, imagine, judge? Who has appreciated them so exactly, as to be able to decide that it can execute the mental functions of an elephant, a dog, or an orang-utang, but cannot perform those of a Negro or a Hottentot?

To say that a thing of merely negative properties, that is, an immaterial substance, which is neither evidenced by any direct testi-
mope, nor by any indirect proof from its effects, does exist, and can think, is quite consistent in those who deny thought to animal structures, where we see it going on every day.

If the mental processes be not the function of the brain, what is its office? In animals which possess only a small part of the human cerebral structure, sensation exists, and in many cases is more acute than in man. What employment shall we find for all that man possesses over and above this portion—for the large and prodigiously-developed human hemispheres? Are we to believe that these serve only to round the figure of the organ, or to fill the cranium?

They who consider the mental operations as acts of an immaterial being, and thus disconnect the sound state of the mind from organization, act very consistently in disjoining insanity also from the corporeal structure, and in representing it as a disease, not of the brain, but of the mind. Thus we come to diseases of an immaterial being, for which, suitably enough, moral treatment has been recommended.

I firmly believe, on the contrary, that the various forms of insanity, that all the affections comprehended under the general term of mental derangement, are only evidences of cerebral affections, disordered manifestations of those organs whose healthy action produces the phenomena-called mental; in short, symptoms of diseased brain. These symptoms have the same relation to the brain, as vomiting, indigestion, heartburn, to the stomach; cough, asthma, to the lungs; or any other deranged functions to their corresponding organs.

If the biliary secretion be increased, diminished, suspended, or altered, we have no hesitation in referring to changes in the condition of the liver, as the immediate cause of these phenomena. We explain the state of respiration, whether slow, hurried, impeded by cough, spasm, &c. by the various conditions of the lungs, and other parts concerned in breathing. These explanations are deemed perfectly satisfactory.

What should we think of a person who told us that the organs have nothing to do with the business; that colera, jaundice, hepatis, are diseases of an immaterial hepatic being; that asthma, cough, consumption, are affections of a subtle pneumonary matter; or that in both cases the disorder is not in bodily organs, but in a vital principle? If such a statement would be deemed too absurd for any serious comment in the derangements of the liver, lungs, and other organic parts, how can it be received in the brain?

The very persons who use this language of diseases of the mind, speak and reason correctly respecting the other affections of the brain. When it is compressed by a piece of bone, or by effused blood or serum, and when all intellectual phenomena are more or less completely suspended, they do not say that the mind is squeezed, that the immaterial principle suffers pressure. For the ravings of delirium and phrenzy, the excitation and subsequent stupor of intoxication, they find an adequate explanation in the state of the ce-
rebral circulation, without fancying that the mind is delirious, mad, or drunk.

The effect of medical treatment completely corroborates these views. Indeed, they who talk of and believe in disease of the mind, are too wise to put their trust in mental remedies. Arguments, syllogisms, discourses, sermons, have never yet restored any patient; the moral pharmacopoeia is quite inefficient; and no real benefit can be conferred without vigorous medical treatment, which is as efficacious in these affections as in the diseases of any other organs."

The following facts, showing the brain to be the seat of all sensation, have been proved and illustrated by many experiments, both on animals and human beings, and completely demonstrate the proposition of which we treat in this lecture.

1. The parts of the body furnished with nerves, are the only parts endowed with sensibility; and the more nerves that are distributed on any part, the more perfect the sensation: and the fewer nerves the less perfect the sensibility. The parts of the body that have few nerves, have little or no sensation, in their sound state; such are the tendons, ligaments, bones, and cartilages: but if we irritate the brain or spinal marrow, dreadful convulsions take place all over the body: and if we cut the spinal marrow or eighth pair of nerves at their departure from the brain, immediate and inevitable death will follow instantaneously.

2. If we compress or cut a nerve, or tie a ligature round it, all the parts of the body, on which that nerve is distributed, immediately lose all sensation and motion; but recover both as soon as we lose the ligature and permit the animal spirits to descend through the nerve to the parts. Hence it follows that all sensation arises from the impression of some active substance, on some nerve of the body, and is represented to the mind, by means of that nerve's connexion with the brain. This is manifest from a thousand experiments. The torturing pains of a whittow cease, if we bind the arm so strongly as to compress the nerve, which carries the sensation to the brain. A living animal suffers nothing from the most cruel laceration, if we first cut the nerves of the parts on which we operate.

3. Though the nerves, which communicate with the brain, be perfectly free to receive and transmit impressions, yet no sensation will take place, if the brain be diseased or compressed. If only a part of the brain be injured or compressed, the parts of the body, which receive nerves from that part of the brain, become insensible; but if the whole brain be compressed all sensation and motion are lost, but they are restored as soon as the pressure is removed. Therefore we conclude, that the brain is the immediate instrument of sensation, of which the nerves and other organs are only the occasional causes.

4. The place where all the nerves meet is called the common sensorium: here are treasureup all sensations carried to the brain, and retained in proportion to the strength or frequency of the impressions. That the effect of all the senses is preserved in the brain,
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appears from the loss of memory which follows any injury of the brain, and also from the delirium which happens in some diseases, and the stupor, which prevails in others. Solinus informs us of a man, who from a wound on the back part of the head, so effectually lost all memory of the past as not to know his own name. Professor Richerand gives the following account of an experiment on the brain of an aged female whose skull he had occasion to open. "I pressed down the pledget of lint. on the cerebral mass, and the patient, who was answering my questions rationally, suddenly stopped in the midst of a sentence, but she went on breathing and her pulse continued to beat. I withdrew the pledget; she said nothing. I asked her if she remembered my last question; she replied no. Perceiving that the experiment was without pain or danger, I repeated it three times, and thrice I suspended all feelings and all intellect." Hence we also conclude that all idiocy, insanity and disorder of intellect, arise from deficiency, malformation, disorder, or injury of the brain: and the disease is proportionate to the defect or injury.

"I am convinced, says Professor Lawrence, from my own experience, that very few heads of persons dying deranged, will be examined after death, without showing diseased structure, or evident signs of increased vascular activity. I have examined the heads of many insane persons, and have hardly seen a single brain, which did not exhibit obvious marks of disease." Therefore we safely conclude that the brain is the source and seat of intellect.

UNDERSTANDING.

In vain were the organs of sense laid open to all impressions of surrounding objects, and the nerves fitted for their transmission, were there not provided a seat of consciousness in the brain: for light, sound, odour, and taste are not felt in the organs they impress, but in the sensitive centre, the brain, which sees, hears, smells, and tastes. This is manifest, if we interrupt by compression of the nerves, the communication between this organ and the nerves, all consciousness of the impressions of objects, all sensation, is suspended.

The brain acts on impressions transmitted by the nerves as the stomach on aliments: it digests them in its own way; set in motion by the impulse it receives, it begins to react, and that reaction is the perceptive sensation, or perception. From that moment the impression becomes an idea, which enters as an element into thought, and becomes subject to the various combinations that are necessary to the phenomena of the understanding. Here it is proper to observe, that the terms thought and understanding are synonymous; both are alike an abridged expression of the whole operation of the brain or sensitive centre.

Our sensations are only modifications of our being, and are not qualities of the objects; for no object has colour to those who have been blind from birth; the rose has lost its most precious quality to him who has lost his smell; he knows it only by its colour and fig-
ture. We perceive nothing but within ourselves; and it is only by habit and by applying different senses to the examination of the same object, that we become able to separate it from our own existence, and refer to external objects, the sensations that take place within ourselves. Our ideas come to us only by the senses. The child that opens its eyes to the light, is prepared to receive impressions from the objects that surround it, only because it has senses. It has however a sensibility capable of being set in action by two sorts of impressions, for it has the consciousness of those which spring from internal motion, and from these impressions it executes certain spontaneous movements. As the cerebral fibres are acted on with greater or less force by sensations propagated by all the senses, influenced at the same time, we could only acquire confused notions of all bodies that produced them, if one particular and strong perception did not obliterate the others, and fix our attention. In proportion as a sensation or idea has produced a stronger or weaker impression on the brain, the remembrance of it becomes more or less lively or permanent. Thus we have a reminiscence of it, that is, we call to mind that we have once been affected in the same manner; a memory, or the act of recalling the object of sensation, with some of its attributes as colour and volume. When the brain is easily excitable, and at the same time, preserves impressions received, it possesses the power of representing to itself ideas with all their connexions, and all the accessory circumstances with which they are accompanied, and of reproducing them, whilst the memory only gives us an idea of their qualities. This creative faculty is called imagination. When two ideas are brought together, compared, and their analogy considered, we are said to form a judgment; several judgments connected, constitute reasoning.

"To think, says Tracy, is only to feel; and to feel is, for us, the same as to exist; for it is by sensation, we know of our existence. Ideas, or perceptions, are either sensations, properly so called, or recollections, or relations, which we perceive, or the desire excited in us by these relations. The faculty of thought therefore falls into the natural subdivision of sensibility, memory, judgment, and will. To feel, is to be conscious of an impression: to remember, is to be sensible of the remembrance of a past impression: to judge, is to feel relations among our perceptions: and lastly, to will, is to desire something. Of these four elements, sensations, recollections, judgments, and desires, are formed all compound ideas. Attention is but an act of the will; comparison cannot be separated from judgment, since we cannot compare two objects without judging them: and reasoning is only a repetition of the act of judging: to reflect, to imagine, is to compose ideas, analyzable into sensations, recollections, judgments, and desires." So absolutely is sensation the source of all our knowledge, that even the measure of understanding is always according to the number and perfection of the organs of sense; and by successively withdrawing them from an intelligent being, we should lower, at each step, his intellectual nature.
The difference in moral and intellectual faculties, is almost entirely owing to difference of figure and organization. The true sources of immorality are ignorance and appetite. The capacity for attaining knowledge and understanding depends on the figure and development of the brain; for if the brain be the seat of intelligence, it manifestly follows that on its size and soundness depends that variety of capacity for intellectual distinction; and Richerand conjectures, with no small degree of probability, that the want of judgment, the unevenness of humour and character, depend on the want of harmony between the two corresponding halves of the cerebral mass. It has been adopted as a general rule, that the most intelligent animals have the largest brain in proportion to the size of the body; and also in proportion to the spinal marrow and nerves; and vice versa, the larger the spinal marrow and nerves are in proportion to the brain the less intelligent the animal. Hence the reason why women, children, and athletic men, fail in mental capacity. It may also be admitted as a rule, that the difference of size between the skull and the face may be taken as a measure of the understanding; for in proportion to the face man has the most capacious skull.

Whatever opinions may have prevailed, facts demonstrate that the intellectual and moral phenomena of man are closely linked to the physical, and the former are the offspring and result of the latter. Many naturalists have supposed that the diversity of mankind is owing to the influence of climate, customs, education and government, but though our virtues and vices are often modified by these, yet they are generally the result of organization, and our physical holds our moral nature in complete vassalage. The distinction of colour between the white and black races is not more striking than the pre-eminence of the former in moral feelings and mental endowments. Whilst the latter are distinguished by unfeeling barbarity, gross selfishness, want of natural affection and indifference to the pains and pleasures of others. The white races are characterized by bravery, love of liberty, generous and philanthropic feelings, and by superior knowledge and reflection for the accomplishment of the grandest purposes.

The invention of the arts and sciences, their progress in Europe and America, the spirit of liberty, the generous glow of patriotism, equality of political rights, every system of morals from the comparatively rational mythology of the Greeks, the excellent precepts of Zoroaster up to the most glorious and dignified precepts of the Christian religion, are all peculiar to the nobler organizations of the whites, in whom the cerebral hemispheres have received their full development. Whilst rude despotism and the monstrous faith of millions made for one, have never been doubted or questioned in all those extensive regions occupied by human races, with the anterior and superior parts of the cranium flattened and compressed. That these differences are the offspring of natural diversities, and not produced by external causes, is proved by their universality, in respect to time, place, and external influences. It is acknowledged that
some whites have degenerated and others have not made those signal advances in knowledge and civilization, which their superior organization seems to indicate; but they have the capacity if circumstances are favorable. On the other hand, in the dark races, inferior organization renders it almost completely vain to present opportunities or to remove difficulties. The moral and intellectual character of the Negro is decidedly inferior to that of the European; and this inferiority arises from a corresponding difference of organization, which must be regarded as their natural destiny. The perpendicularity and size of the forehead indicate a soil where cultivation may produce an hundred fold; but the retreating forehead and the depressed vertex of the dark varieties of man, causes even hope to sink and engenders dispair. The influences of climate, situation, habits, government, education, and religion are manifestly inadequate to account for the differences, which at all times, in all countries, and under all circumstances, have distinguished the white and dark races; we must therefore look deeper for their causes, and seek them in some circumstances inseparately interwoven in the original constitution of man. But if we refer the variety of moral feeling and of capacity for knowledge and reflection to those diversities of cerebral organization, which are indicated by the difference in the shape of the skull, we shall find in the comparison of the heads of the white and dark races, a sufficient explanation of the inferiority to which the latter have been irrevocably doomed.

Whether men have originated from one stock or not, still remains a subject of disputation among naturalists. The most acute physiologists are notwithstanding agreed, that there exist five varieties; the white Caucasian, inhabiting Europe, the west of Asia and the north of Africa; the yellow or olive Mongolian, inhabiting the centre, and east of Asia and the northern district of both continents; the black Ethiopian, inhabiting the interior and south of Africa; the red or copper coloured American inhabiting both north and south America, except the Esquimaux and the descendants of European colonies; and the brown or twany Malay, who inhabit the Asiatic and south Sea islands, and are so called, because they generally speak the Malay language.

Those who believe all mankind originated from one pair, endeavour to account for the varieties that now exist, from the influence of climate, education, manner of life, government, etc. Blumenbach thinks all the varieties have sprung from the Caucasian; alleging that near the Caucasian mountains the earth first afforded a cradle for the human race; that the present inhabitants of that district still answer to the Caucasian characters; and that most Europeans may be traced to their origin in the west of Asia. Hunter suggests that the first parents of mankind were Negroes, and alleges some facts as evidences of the improvement rather than the deterioration of the human kind. Most certainly the arguments in favor of time meliorating mankind, are at least as strong as those which have ever been adduced for the degeneracy of the human species. Those, who be-
lieve man to have fallen from a higher state of moral and intellectual endowment than he at present possesses, must shut their eyes against all history and experience, and hearken only to the voice of unlettered tradition.

No appeal should be made to the scriptures in this investigation. In Geology and Astronomy men have learned to walk by more sure and safe guides than the traditions of the Mosaic history. Indeed the account by Moses is at war with all modern experience on all these subjects. No modern astronomer fears to speak of the Sun as the fixed centre to the revolving planets, because the Jewish history describes him as rising, running his course, and standing still, only on one occasion, when the wheels of his chariot were stopped by a miraculous impulse. Nor ought we to imagine that historical language, inconsistent with the experience of improved sciences, should at all militate against the authority of scripture; for the scriptures were never designed to teach arts and sciences, but were accommodated to the vulgar, and often very rude notions of the ancient world; and indeed had the holy scriptures been written in accordance with scientific accuracy, they would have remained a sealed book to the world of mankind, for several thousands of years. They were therefore given according to the notions which then prevailed, though these notions be repugnant to modern experience in Astronomy, Geology and Natural history.

We are told that Adam called his wife’s name Eve, because she was the mother of all living; but in both the first and fifth chapters of Genesis, we read that God created man male and female, in the day he created them; and we also find that Cain, after slaying his brother Abel, went to a distant region and took a wife, though no mention is made of Eve having had any daughters previous to that time. The probability is therefore that Moses gives only the history of one tribe or variety of mankind, rather than a description of the origin of all the species. This supposition receives strength from the history of the flood in the days of Noah. The notion that all the parents of the whole animal kingdom were preserved in the Ark in pairs only, is utterly repugnant to all reasonings a posteriori. The present state of historical facts will not admit that the whole animal world was ever concentrated in one place, much less that all animals could be so long in the Ark without the complete annihilation of many of the species. Moreover, how could they ever be dispersed through every continent and island on the earth? How could they have been natives of one clime which are now found only to inhabit the polar regions, the torrid zone, the clement tropics, or some peculiar island of the Sea? Would not the carnivorous animals have preyed on each other in the Ark, and effected the entire extirpation of many kinds? And must not those have died which feed only on vegetables, produced by some isolated spots of the earth?

Many difficulties will disappear, if we admit that at least two or three varieties distinguished the aborigines of the earth. The changes produced by climate are only partial and never universal. The
most intense rays of a vertical sun would not, throughout many genera-
tions, effect one instance of total change in the colour of a single
individual. The parts of the body exposed to the solar influence
would assume a difference of appearance from the others, but the
change would never be universal. The supposition that climate op-
erates the variety of colour, is overthrown by the most obvious facts.
The Moors, who have lived in Africa, since the seventh century,
have not degenerated from their Arabian progenitors; and their
children are as white as those born in Europe. The Abyssinians are
surrounded with Negroes, yet their appearance is very differ-
ent. Europeans have had colonies in Asia and America for three
centuries, yet the colonists have in no instance approached to the
natives; for their descendants have all the characters peculiar to
Europeans. Negroes have inhabited the new world for a long time,
yet they, by no means, assume the copper coloured appearance of
the natives. Negroes, Mongolians, Malay, and Americans have al-
ways lived under the perpendicular rays of the sun, yet they do not
assume the same appearance. Will it be said the same sun dyes
the American red, the Negroe black, and the Malay brown? Can
heat and cold produce the same effects, so that the Laplanders, Es-
quimeaux, and Samoiedes should possess the same characters as the
rest of the Mongolian variety, who inhabit the tropical climate of
southern Asia? Surely not. The most remote records give no evi-
dence that climate has been able to effect any radical change in any
region of the earth. Notwithstanding all the migrations and chang-
es of its inhabitants, the different races still remain distinct, unless
where an intermixture of breeds have produced a change in the off-
spring.

We would not have delayed to notice these things, were we not
convinced, that the colour is, in general, a good index of the state of
organization and moral and intellectual faculties: for it will be
found that the moral character of earth's inhabitants, is no more flex-
ible than their colour and configuration. The degree of impetus of
the passions and intellectual attainment, operates the moral phenom-
ena of mankind universally: and he, who considers well the temper-
aments, propensities, and organization of man, will be at no loss to
account for diversity of moral conduct, without the supposition of
either a Divine or diabolical influence.

The real moral character of a man, can never be estimated by his
conformity or non-conformity to any law, whether human or Divine.
This must not be understood as if the law of God and nations were
insignificant and inefficient. The law, so far as it points out to the
mind the reason and fitness of things, produces a war between the
intellectual and sensual man; and he rises the highest in the moral
scale, who with the worst accoutrements, carries on the most suc-
cessful war against the most intractable propensities and passions.
Hence no correct estimate of the moral character, can be formed
from the conduct or external appearance. With this view of the sub-
ject we can fully understand and duly appreciate the language of the
pious Apostle, in the seventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans: for in it, we behold the virtuous contest of a well instructed mind, with the strong and often predominant propensities of animal nature.

We conclude, therefore, that the difference between men in feelings, propensities and intellectual faculties, is the result of difference in organization: and that the superiority of man, over other animals, in rational endowments, is not more than should be expected from his more exquisite, complicated, and perfectly developed cerebral hemispheres, to which the rest of the animal kingdom offers no parallel, nor even any near approximation. Should the reason of all this be asked, we cannot answer better than in the words of the Poet, sic fata revolvunt.

Hence we also infer that the intellectual worth and dignity of man are measured, not by the truth which he possesses, or fancies that he possesses, but by the sincere and honest pains he has taken to discover truth. This it is, that invigorates his mind; and, by exercising the mental springs, preserves them in full activity. Possession whether real or imaginary, makes us quiet, indolent, and proud: but the ever active impulse, the fond desire and longing after truth, induces that industry and progress in knowledge which aggrandize and exalt humanity.

"The character of variety is stamped on all nature's works. — She has made it a fundamental law that no two of her productions shall be exactly alike; and this law is invariably observed through the whole creation. Each tree, each flower, each leaf, exemplifies it: every animal has its individual character, each human being has something that distinguishes it, in form, proportion, countenance, gesture, voice—in feelings, thought, and temper. And this variety is the source of every thing beautiful and interesting in the external world—and the foundation of the whole moral fabric of the universe. How vain then the attempt to reduce opinions to one supposed standard of perfection, and impose on human thought that dreary sameness and dull monotony, which all the discipline and rigour of a sect have been hardly able to maintain even in the outward garb of its followers. Uniformity is therefore nothing but the blinded fancy of calloused ignorance or frantic enthusiasm. Uniformity of opinion is neither practicable nor desirable. Variety of thought is as great as that of bodily form, and to quarrel with a man for difference of opinion is as unreasonable as to hate him for variety of features. — Let us therefore cease from hostilities against the constitution, scheme, and design of nature."

As in the natural so in the moral world, variety of conduct is as inevitable as difference of thought; and whilst men think differently they will also act differently. Arbitrary rules are therefore just as useless a guide to moral perfection, as forms of faith to infallible orthodoxy. Let us therefore learn from these considerations an important lesson of humility and forbearance. Let us never forget the words of the Apostle, Who made thee to differ, what hast thou which thou didst not receive? 1 Cor. 4, 7.
LECTURE 18.

PSYCHOLOGY.

The first man is of the earth, earthly. 1 Cor. 15. 47.

We have arrived at that part of our discourse, for which the others were preparatory; and know not how to express ourselves here, better than in the words of Professor Lawrence, in relation to the same subject* "you must bring to this question a sincere and earnest love of truth; dismissing from your minds all the prejudices and alarms, which have been so industriously connected with it. If you enter on the inquiry in the spirit of the bigot and partisan, suffering a cloud of fears and hopes, desires and aversions, to hang round your understandings, you will never discern objects clearly; their colours, shapes, and dimensions, will be confused, distorted, and obscured by the intellectual mist. Our business is to inquire what is truth, and we need not fear the result of investigation. When thoroughly discussed, truth will not fail to come like gold tried from the fire. Reason and free inquiry are the only effectual antidotes of error. Give them full scope, and they will uphold the truth, by bringing false opinions, and all the spurious offspring of ignorance, prejudice, and self-interest, before their severe tribunal, and subjecting them to the test of close investigation. Error needs artificial support; truth can stand by itself. In defence of a weak cause, and in failure of direct arguments, appeals to the passions and prejudices have been indulged: attempts have been made to fix public odium on the supporters of this or that opinion: and direct charges of bad motives and injurious consequences, have been reinforced by all the arts of misrepresentation and innuendo.

The peculiar virulence of controversy, in all cases in which religion is supposed to be concerned, is so remarkable, as to have become proverbial: the odium theologicum is the most concentrated essence of animosity and rancour. The Priests of former times used to rain a torrent of abusive epithets, as heretic, infidel, and atheist, on all who had the audacity to differ from them in opinion. This ecclesiastical artillery has been so much used, as to have become in a great measure, unserviceable: sometimes however it frightens and stupefies those who could not have been overcome by weight of argument.

As to the charge of bringing forward doctrines, hostile to the welfare of society or of any other intention than that of displaying the result of my own researches and reflections; I reply in one word, false! And here I take the opportunity of protesting in the strongest terms—in behalf of the interests of science and that free discussion, which is essential to its successful cultivation—against the at-

* See Lectures on the natural history of man.
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tempt to stifle impartial inquiry by an outcry of pernicious tendency. The argument against the expediency of divulging an opinion, although it may be true, from the possibility of its being perverted, has been so much hackneyed, so often employed in the last resort, by the defenders of all established abuses and errors, that everyone, who is conversant with controversy, rejects it immediately, as the sure mark of a bad cause, as the last refuge of retreating error."

The doctrine that man consists of two different substances, a material body and immaterial soul, appears to have originated in the Egyptian mysticism or Eastern Philosophy, which afterwards spread into the western part of the world, through the medium of the Grecian literature. In all probability the word 'soul', was at first only intended to mark the natural affections, or the human intellect, but in due time it was thought to be so independent of the body as that the latter might perish and the former be even a gainer by the awful catastrophe!

Bolinbrooke and others have asserted that this doctrine was the invention of Egyptian mysticism, and was no more than an advantageous trick of Princes to encourage men, more cheerfully, to enter the martial plains, believing death to be the gate to immediate and immortal glory. It has also been affirmed by able and learned men, that Thales was the first who brought the dogma from Egypt into Greece about 600 years before Christ, and taught in the western continent, that the soul is a self moving principle, and therefore immortal. After him we find Pythagoras calling the soul a self-moving number; and Socrates teaching that the soul is immortal, because it has a power of moving both itself and other things. Plato followed the opinion of his master, and Cicero says he admired the writings of Plato so much, that he would rather err with him than be right with other men. Notwithstanding the doctrine never made any deep impression on the mind of Cicero, for though he asserts that souls are immortal by the consent of all nations; yet elsewhere he declares, whilst I read I assent, but when I cease to read, and lay aside the book, all my faith glides away! However the doctrine was very popular in the Heathen schools; and Platonism was the prevailing philosophy of that age in which Christianity made its appearance.

Many of the primitive Fathers were Platonists; and Austin acknowledges that the books of the Philosophers were very useful for the right understanding of Orthodoxy! It is very probable that Paul imbied this doctrine in early life at Tarsus, which then rivalled Rome in learning and politeness, and obtained eminent Philosophers from Alexandria in Egypt, one of the most celebrated academies in the known world.

In the year 245, we find the fathers assembled in council to convert the Arabian Christians to the belief of an immaterial soul.— Though they thundered their anathemas against Origen on other occasions, yet seeing he could platonize much better than they, he was employed to debate with the simple Arabians. Previous to this pe-
period the Arabian church and the great body of the Jewish nation believed the entire mortality of man; with this difference, the Arabs expected a resurrection to immortal glory, but the Jews had no expectation beyond the grave. What are opinions without definition or argument? Even Cicero confesses that the Philosophers assigned no reasons for this doctrine; we need not therefore be surprised, that great variety of sentiment prevailed among mankind, in this inexplicable, incomprehensible dogma.

Thus far have we pursued the history of the human soul, I shall now proceed to assign my reasons for rejecting the doctrine of an immaterial and immortal spirit in man.

There is no such thing as unity or simplicity of mind or thought so essential to the immateriality of the soul. On the contrary, the different parts of the brain are destined for different functions and a variety of ideas is the result of every sensation. In the same person, certain faculties manifest themselves with great energy whilst others are scarcely perceptible. Some excel in verbal memory who cannot combine two philosophical ideas; others will make good painters but miserable poets. If the mind were immaterial and the soul simple, all the faculties would appear and disappear at the same time; but this is not the fact; for smell and taste appear earlier than seeing and hearing. The understanding of different animals increase in proportion as their brains become complicated, but this could not happen, if their brains were not composed of different organs, and the soul dependent on organization. The rest of all the organs of the brain is called sound sleep, but if some of them be roused into action, they produce dreaming, which is the more complicated in proportion to the number of organs that act; dreaming, however, would be impossible if all the brain acted simultaneously, and still more impossible, if the soul consisted of pure and simple thought.

It may not be improper, here to notice that the Spiritualists, having invented an immaterial nothing out of nothing, and modeled it according to their pious fancy, have much perplexed themselves to find it a suitable place of Residence, a common centre in the nervous system, in which all sensations might meet, and from which all acts of volition might emanate. That there must be such a point they are well convinced, having satisfied themselves that the mind is simple and indivisible, and therefore capable of dwelling only in one place. The pineal gland, the corpus callosum, the pons varolii, and several other parts, have been successively suggested. But unfortunately there are many orders of animals with sensation and volition, which have none of these parts; and this unity of the sentient principle becomes very doubtful, when we see animals possessed of nervous systems, which, after being cut in two, form again two perfect animals. Could a simple principle be multiplied by division? Could the immaterial soul be divided by the knife, as well as the body? If not, let us hear no more about simple immaterial souls.

If we receive the dogma of the Philosophers, that whatever thinks is a simple immaterial and indissoluble spirit, and consequently im-
mortal, we must also admit the hypothesis, that all other animals have immortal souls as well as man. Let it not be pretended that there is only a sensitive soul in other animals, but moreover a rational spirit in man; for the power of thinking is as necessary to the smallest degree of perception as to geometrical reasoning. We cannot deny to animals participation in thought and rational endowment, without shutting our eyes to the most obvious facts. Passing the well known instances of reasoning, judgment and sagacity in the Elephant, the Dog, and many other animals, let us read the character drawn by Humboldt of South American Mules. "When they feel themselves in danger on the frightful roads of the Andes, they stop, turn their heads to the right and to the left; and the motion of their ears seem to indicate that they reflect on the decision they ought to take. Hence the mountaineers are heard to say, "I will not give you the Mule whose step is the easiest, but the one who reasons best."

The following anecdote in the words of Darwin, is calculated to produce conviction in the most sceptical. "A wasp on a gravel walk had caught a fly nearly as large as itself. Kneeling on the ground, I observed him separate the tail and the head from the body part, to which the wings were attached. He then took the body in his paws and rose about two feet from the ground with it; but a gentle breeze wafted the wings of the fly, and turned him round in the air, and he settled again with his prey on the gravel. I then distinctly observed him cut off with his mouth, first one of the wings and then the other, after which he flew away with it, un molested by the wind." Cast away then that unmeaning word, instinct, it is only a tawdry veil, prepared by pride to cover the blotted face of assuming ignorance. We press the argument! We hold it conclusive! Either admit the immortal principle to the Dog, the Horse, the Elephant, the Bee, to animals in general, or deny it to man in common with all other animals. No argument that tends to prove a soul in man can fail to prove the existence of the same principle in every living being.

All know that in infancy the mind is in miniature as well as the body. But follow it through the different stages up to manhood, and we shall find the mind or soul grow with the body; and as the limbs expand so does the mind unfold its energies; but in the decline of life, the soul decays with the body till memory, judgment, and intelligence are lost and man returns to dotage, childhood, and death.

Examine the mind, the supposed sole prerogative of man. Where is the mind of the fetus? Where that of the child just born? Do we not see it actually built up before our eyes by the actions of the five senses, and of the gradually developed internal faculties? Do not we trace it advancing by a slow process through infancy and childhood, to the full expansion of its faculties in the adult; annihilated for a time by a blow on the head, or the shedding of a little blood in apoplexy; decaying as the body declines in old age; and finally reduced to an amount, hardly perceptible, when the body
worn out by the mere exercise of the organs, reaches, by the simple
operation of natural decay, that state of decrepitude most aptly term-
ed second childhood?

Where then shall we find proofs of the mind’s independence on
the bodily structure? Of that mind, which like the bodily frame, is
infantile in the child, manly in the adult, sick and debilitated in dis-
ease, phrenzied or melancholy in the madman, enfeebled in the de-
cline of life, doting in decrepitude, and annihilated by death.

Take away from the mind of man, or from that of any other animal,
the operation of the five external senses, and the functions of the
brain, and what will be left behind? Deny to a superior mind, says
La Condamine, “the use of letters, how much knowledge you put
out of his reach, which an ordinary capacity will attain to without
difficulty. Go on, and take from him the use of speech, the lot of
the dumb will show you, how narrow are the limits within which
you confine him. Finally, take from him the use of all sorts of
signs, let him be unable to find the least sign for the most ordinary
thought, and you have an idiot.”

That Life then, with all its phenomena, is immediately dependent
on organization, appears to me as clear as that the presence of the
sun above the horizon, causes the light of day: and to suppose that
we could have light without that luminary, would not be more un-
reasonable than to conceive, that life is independent of the animal
body, in which the vital phenomena are observed.

If the brain be compressed, or too much blood ascend into the
head as in apoplexies or inflamations; or if filled with serum as in
hydrocephalus, sensation is deranged or suspended, but this could
never be the case if the thinking principle were immaterial; for to
compress spirit by matter is absolutely impossible; the weight of all
the globes in the Universe, suspended on the brain, could not affect
the actions of an immaterial inhabitant. Indeed, the manner in
which diseases in general affect the mind demonstrates the soul to
be material and mortal.

The soul, considered as the subject of mental qualities, is noth-
ing but a fluid or gaseous bodily substance, the most lively and reni-
ined part of the blood, secreted in the brain and conveyed by the
nerves to all parts of the body for the reception of impressions from
the senses. It is as liable to exhaustion as the other parts of the
body, and therefore needs daily reparation. Being an invisible, in-
odorous fluid, it cannot become the object of any of the senses, nor
the subject of chemical analysis: but that it is matter, is manifest
from its acting on matter, and vice versa, which could not be,
if it were immaterial.—Epicurus, who lived 340 years before Christ,
held the mind to be the result of a combination of heat, air and
other gases, diffused all over the body, but concentrated in some
parts more than in others; yet so subtle and recondite as to elude
all detection, and therefore only known by its effects. His views
of it were somewhat similar to those entertained by philosophers of
the Oxygen, Caloric, and Galvanic aura of the present day. Nor
were these views peculiar to Epicurus. They were generally believed by all the ancients, if we accept only Socrates and Plato. Aristotle in his second book, de Anima, says "the soul is not body, but it is something belonging to body." Of late many eminent physiologists have thought it to be identified with the nervous fluid and Galvanism. Many believe it to be some modification of electricity. Dr. Valle says, conductors of electricity are also conductors of the nervous fluid: and Pfaff affirms from experiments, made by him, that Galvanism will not affect the muscles of involuntary motion.—Drs. M. Good and W. Philip, think the nervous and galvanic influence to be the same. See Cooke on "the nature and uses of the Nervous System.

Whilst I mention the name of Mason Good, the ablest Medical writer of the present age, I increase in confidence, when I find him saying "there is no necessity for supposing any thing different from the material organization to account for the phenomena of life and understanding; and that at death existence will be continued by the separation of a fine aerial substance from the grosser matter." Indeed, it is certain that the blood forms by the vital action, such a combination from certain constituent principles in the atmospheric air, such as oxygen, and the electric and galvanic fluids, as constitutes the nervous fluid or soul:—and were it not for the changes which these principles undergo in their union with the blood in its vital state, electricity, magnetism, and galvanism would suffice to restore life to an animal recently dead.

The Scriptures nowhere represent the soul of man as distinct from his body, nor do they describe any part of man as immaterial. On the contrary they testify that God alone has immortality,—1st. Tim. 6, 16. Nor can there be a more humbling consideration to the assuming pretensions of men than the declaration of Jehovah, "Dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return." God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul: i. e. in consequence of the lungs being inflated, the blood commenced circulation, and the different kinds of fluids were operated, and the peculiar organization effected, producing all those sensations, which distinguish a living and rational existence.

"No man can prove from the Scriptures, that the human soul is a principle, which lives, acts, or thinks, independently of the body. All arguments for the immortality of the soul, drawn from the nature of its substance, supposing it capable of subsisting or acting separately from the body, are manifestly vain. We can never prove the soul of man to be of such a nature, for all experience shows the contrary. The operations of the mind depend constantly and invariably on the state of the body, particularly of the brain. If some persons dying, have had a lively use of their faculties to the very last, it was because death had invaded some other part whilst the brain remained sound and vigorous." All philosophical arguments, drawn from our notions of matter, and urged against the possibility
of life, thought and activity being connected with a portion of it, or resulting from organization, are founded on ignorance, and would equally disprove plain facts and daily observation on the productions of oviparous animals, and vegetables. He, who carefully observes the operations of nature, and sees how often the several classes of beings run into each other, will find little weight in arguments founded on ontological distinctions. Let those, who who esteem themselves wise, go learn what that meaneth. "Ye do greatly err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God." Mat. 22. 29.

The words translated Soul, Nephesh in Hebrew, Naphsha in Chaldee, Psuche in Greek, and Anima in Latin according to their radical meaning, signify breath, or to use a scriptural phrase, "The breath of life;" and whatever the word may signify, we must admit that all animals of every description possess it, or we must reject the testimony of scripture, as well as the evidence of our own senses. All the living beings, which God made, whether fowls of the air, fish of the sea, or creeping things on the earth, have this Nephesh, Psuche, soul or life, if the history given by Moses be admitted as evidence, Gen. 1. 20. 30; Num. 31. 28: and nothing but the blindness of self-love and the prejudice of education, can induce any man to assume the right of peculiar privilege, and deny it to any other creature, that moves on earth, flies in air, or swims in the waters. This is the living soul, which man possesses in common with all other animals, see Gen. 1. 30. and 2. 7, and 19. There can be no mistake. The Nephesh Chayyah, Psuche Zosa, which God constituted man, Gen. 2. 7. is the Nephesh Caiyah, Psuche Zosa, or living soul, which he also constituted every species of animal, Gen. 2. 19. Hence we justly infer, that Nephesh, Psuche, soul, means, the life of animals in general. So Moses expresses it, Nephesh Caiyah, Psuche Zosa en pase sarki, the living soul, in all flesh that is upon the earth. — Gen. 9. 16.

Agreeably to this discription, we find the terms almost uniformly used in the sacred volume. Thus, sosai ten Psuchen, signifies to save or preserve life. Gen. 19. 17, 20, and 32. 30. 1 Sam. 19. 11. Zetelin ten Psuchen, implies seeking the life to destroy it. Ex. 4. 19. 1 Sam. 29. 1; 1 Kings 19. 10, 14; Jer. 22. 25. Lutrosai ten Psuchen, means to redeem or deliver life or to save and preserve it—2 Sam. 4. 9; 1 Kings 1. 29; Ps. 71. 14; Jer. 44. 20. Psuche anti Psuches, is life for life. Ex. 21. 23. Deut. 19. 21; Jos. 2. 14.

Bishop Law in his "Theory of Religion," well remarks that soul, nephesh, psuche, signifies persons, or animated bodies. Gen. 12. 5; 17. 14; and 46. 27. Lev. 5. 2; and 20. 11; Num. 11. 6. and 15. 30. 31. Accordingly souls, in the language of scripture, are said to eat, Ex. 12. 16; to grow fat, Prov. 11. 25; to be hungry, Ps. 107. 9; to thirst, Prov. 25. 25; to faint, Ps. 107. 5; to be killed or slain, Jos. 10. 28, 30, Gen. 37. 21, Num. 31. 19, Deut. 22. 26; 27. 25; Jer. 40. 14. and Mark 3. 4; to die or be destroyed Josh. 2. 14, Jud. 16. 30, Job 36. 14. Ez. 18. 20. Hence death is the negative of all life, thought, and action. Ps. 6. 5. 30. 9; 88.
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10—12. Eccl. 9, 5, 10, and therefore compared to sleep, Deut. 31, 16, 1 Kings 1, 21, Job 3, 13, and 14, 11, 12.

Even Parkhurst, who has never been accused of being sceptical, but often of being mysterious and visionary, candidly acknowledges, that although "nepesh has been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul; I must for myself confess, that I can find no passage where it has undoubtedly this meaning." Who is he that can find, in the scriptures, a word which denotes an immortal spirit? Where is the man, that can show us a passage, which speaks of an immortal spirit in man? We boldly affirm, that not a word in the Hebrew and Greek scriptures can be found to express the idea, nor a single passage that implies it. No! to the heathens we must go, to learn both the name and the thing: and even among them we find no stability of sentiment on this subject. The scriptures unequivocally and repeatedly declare, that man, man wholly, man universally, is mortal, and must die; and that none can deliver his brother, or give a ransom for him, that he should still live; for the redemption of the soul is precious, and it ceaseth forever. How absurd to talk of the immortality of souls being taught in a book, which speaks of souls dying, being killed, destroyed, lost, and of there being only One, who has immortality, 1 Tim. 6, 16.

But says the objector though Nepesh, psuche, anima, do not express the idea of an immaterial spirit, there are other words which do convey the notion for which we contend; these are ruach pneuma spiri tus. Not so; for to these words most of the remarks made concerning the other class, equally apply. They all signify breath, and are derived from verbs which signify to blow or breathe.

Two texts of Scripture have been frequently adduced to prove an immaterial spirit in man: Job 32, 8, and Eccles. 3, 21. The first says, the spirit in man and the breath of the Almighty is understanding to them. Now let it be clearly understood, that neshamah, translated inspiration, is the very word used, Gen. 2, 7, where it is said God breathed into Adam the breath of lives, and thereby constituted him a living soul, that is an animal, for without the neshamah, he never could have become an animal or living being. Gen. 1, 30, and 2, 19.

The second is a question that is thought to affirm things which it manifestly denies. In it Solomon challenges the pretenders to pneumatological science in his day, for information concerning the distinction, which was then, and is still, made between the soul of man and that of a beast. No commentator of any respectable degree of critical acumen, could have possibly mistaken the meaning of Solomon or have even imagined that in this verse he would teach a doctrine, which the whole context conspired to deny. Look at his reasoning and judge of the conclusion. "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath, ruach; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast. All go un-
to one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Now reader, draw the conclusion, will it be correct to admit that the conclusion should contradict the premises. When Solomon says of man and beast, they have all the same soul, ruach, does he intend they have different souls, ruach, in the next sentence. Instead therefore of the 21st verse being a contradiction of the 19th and 20th, it is a bold reproof of the opposing doctrine. "Who knows the spirit of a man that goeth upward and the spirit of a beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Our reply to this question is, no man ever did or ever can know any distinction as to their nature; for as Solomon declares "They have all one spirit." Here let the reader carefully observe that Solomon uses the same word, ruach, to express the soul of man and that of a beast: and tells us they have all one ruach or breath. If then the ruach of man mean an immortal soul, the ruach of a beast must mean the same, or the testimony of Solomon must be rejected. Moreover, if the spirit of the Lord is said to influence a man, it is also said to influence a beast. Is. 63, 14. So that we see that a man has no pre-eminence above a beast, if we except only his station at the head of the animal kingdom, and the advantages of superior configuration and opportunity.

To conclude, the word, soul, signifying something distinct from the body, is like the primum mobile or element of fire, a name invented to signify what never existed, for it never has nor can be proved, that such a principle subsists independently of the body. It is therefore a mere assumption to suppose it capable of retaining the power of thinking after the dissolution of the body: and the hypothesis of two distinct principles in man, is as inconceivable and absurd as that which denies the existence of a material world. That we have any evidence of the existence of human spirits either in this world or that which is to come, I absolutely deny. The existence of refined material bodies I admit, and such we shall be after the dissolution of the present gross and earthly bodies. Of the existence of any spirit I am entirely ignorant, and verily believe all others just as ignorant as myself on this subject. Had Theologians attended to the dictates of reason and religion, and studied the appearances of nature as much as the reveries of metaphysics, I might have been spared the labor of composing this lecture, and men's ideas would have been free from perplexity and confusion on this and many other subjects.
LECTURE 19.

THE RESURRECTION.

1 Cor. 15. 53. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality.

Man dies at all ages, and if the duration of his life surpasses that of other animals, the greater number of diseases to which he is liable, renders it much more uncertain. About one fourth of children die within the first eleven months; one half before they reach the eighth year; two thirds of mankind die before the fortieth, and three fourths before the fifty first year. Only one out of thirty arrives at the age of eighty, and one out of twelve thousand drags out a languid existence to the age of one hundred. Notwithstanding all that is said to the contrary the mean duration of existence is nearly the same with all men in all ages, countries, and climates. The shepherd of the mountain, who lives happily and breathes the pure air, is subject to the same laws as the inhabitants of populous cities. Nor does life experience a progressive diminution in proportion to the duration of the world. From the earliest records of authentic history among the Egyptians, Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, there were very few persons lived to the age of an hundred years; and instances of longevity are perhaps much more frequent among the moderns. Always equally fruitful, nature exposes every thing to the action of her inexhaustible crucible, maintains every thing in a state of everlasting youth, and preserves a freshness ever renewed. Hence life every where arises in the midst of death.

The close of life is marked by phenomena similar to those with which it began. The circulation first manifested itself and ceases last. The phenomena of nutrition to which the foetal existence is almost entirely limited, continue after the more exalted organs have sunk into a slumber from which they are never to be roused. Man enters on dissolution, first by losing the faculty of associating judgments, then of comparing, bringing together and connecting a number of ideas, so as to judge of their relations. The patient becomes delirious. The memory then fails. His senses vanish in regular succession. The taste and smell cease to give signs of existence whilst the ear is yet sensible to sound. At last he ceases to feel. In his expiring moments he moves his arms, tosses in his bed, and performs motions similar to those of the foetus in the mother's womb.

As soon as life forsakes our organs, they become subject to the laws of Physics, operating on substances that are not organized. Chemistry informs us that the tendency to decomposition of bodies is in exact ratio to the number of their elements, or in proportion as their composition is more simple, and their constituent principles less numerous and volatile. Several circumstances are however necessary to enable putrefaction to effect the human body after death:
these are a mild temperature, a degree of moisture, and the presence of air. Notwithstanding a variety in the phenomena of putrefaction of bodies, all exhale a cadaverous smell, are softened, increase in bulk, acquire heat, change colour, assuming a greenish then a livid and dark brown: a number of gaseous substances are disengaged, of which Ammonia is the most remarkable in quantity, and being emitted from the moment decomposition begins till the period of complete dissolution, produces that pungent and putrid smell which exhales from dead bodies.

Towards the termination of putrefaction, there is disengaged carbonic acid gas, which combining with ammonia, forms a fixed and crystallizable salt. Besides these products, there are also emitted sulphuretted, carburetted and phosphuretted hydrogen, or combined with azote, carbonic acid, and all those substances such as volatile akalis and putrid air, produced by their respective combinations. Finally, animal substances, reduced to a residue containing oils and salts of different kinds form a mould, from which plants draw the principles of a luxuriant vegetation. The bones become dried by the slow combustion of their fibrous parts, and the evaporation of their medullary juices, crumble into dust and fly off on opening the tomb in which they were laid. Thus, in a short time, is effaced all that could recall the idea of our physical existence!

Putrefaction is however but the means nature employs to restore our organs, deprived of life to a more simple composition, in order that their elements may be applied to new creations. Nothing is better proved, than the metempsychosis of matter; which warrants the belief that this religious dogma, like most of the fabulous worship and imaginations of antiquity, is but a veil ingeniously thrown by philosophy, between nature and the ignorant.

According to the representation of many modern writers, we might be induced to believe that the ancients were generally firm believers of the immortality of the soul and a future state of existence. But the fact is far otherwise. Seneca, in his 102 epistle, says the immortality of the soul is that which our wise men promise but they do not prove. Aristotle held that neither good nor evil happened to any man after death. Moral. L. 3. C. 9. Pliny says neither soul nor body has any more sense after death than before it was born. Nat. Hist. L. 7. C. 55. The Poets Sophocles and Euripides represent the dead as insensible, and even Cicero in the first book of Tus. Ques. says which opinion is true, some God must tell us. Yea, even Socrates himself thus speaks at a dying hour. "I hope to go hence to good men, but of that I am not very confident, nor doth it become any wise man to be positive. I must die and you shall live, but which of us shall be in the better state, God only knows." Phoed. p. 48.

O death thou grim relentless monster, when shall thine all devouring ravages cease to alarm! The sages of antiquity pricked into the features of thy physiognomy, and would have fain rent
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the sable curtain wherewith thou veilest that eventful period, which follows in thy train, but the gloom was impenetrable.

Those who have denied the immateriality of the soul, have generally placed their hopes of a future existence in the resurrection of the body; but surely the doctrine, which leaves the hope of immortality to rest on the recombination of disorganized matter, is very gloomy and appalling. The body of man is not permanent, but successive, continually spending, and continually renewing itself. Its particles undergo dispersion, and unite with other bodies. Every day it loses something of the matter it possessed before, and gains something new. Men have new bodies as they have new clothes with this difference, that they change their clothes at once but their bodies by degrees. So much of their food as is every day turned into nourishment, so much of their yesterday’s body is usually wasted. According to the experiments of Sanctorius, above three pounds, or five eighths of all we eat, pass away by insensible perspiration. Now according to this proportion a man must change his body almost annually. Though the bones do not change so often as the fleshy parts, yet seeing they grow, it is certain they change and need reparation. How then can bodies, so dispersed and constituting parts of other bodies, be collected and re-united! Moreover, fish may eat men and convert them into their own substance, these fish may, in turn, be eaten by men and turned into part of their bodies, or men may be eaten by other men as cannibals, and thus one man’s body enter the composition of others; how then shall each recover his own body at the day of resurrection! Indeed there can be no resurrection of the body, on any principles of reason or philosophy. It is continually changing by the laws of nutrition and secretion, so that every particle of the body is completely changed at least once every three or four years. Therefore, if a man live 60 years he will have equal claims to 15 or 20 bodies at the resurrection. Besides, it appears impossible, even for Omnipotence, to restore every one his own body! Such are the laws of transmigration of matter, that what coconstitutes the body of one man, may afterwards enter the composition of many: therefore, no consistent Naturalists will ever expect a collection of the particles when once dispersed. Moreover there is no reason from nature or Scripture to conclude that the present organization is suited for a future existence. This body is only fitted for the present state of being. The intestines and the viscera are of no other use than to decoct and prepare nourishment for the body: the flesh is only a multitude of muscles, destined to move the human frame: the bones are of no other use than to give figure and mobility to the body: and the brain and nerves are adapted to no other purpose than to prepare and circulate the animal spirits: and as soon as life ceases to animate the materials of organized bodies, putrefaction seizes upon them and effects their destruction. But the gloom does not terminate here. The particles enter into new combinations, new bodies are created, and a ceaseless metempsychoses of matter is
maintained, without interruption, throughout the whole universe. Moreover the body of man is not permanent but successive, and so variable that a man of an ordinary age, will have entirely changed bodies at least ten or fifteen times. Which then shall he claim in the resurrection? To say he shall have a new and different body, is to give up the resurrection altogether, and adopt the doctrine of annihilation; for a man could have no more identity with another body in another world, than he can have with a different person in the present. To promise me an existence in another body, totally distinct from the one I possess, is to mock me with delusive hopes that can never be realized. My present body never shall enter the gates of immortality, but yet the body which shall constitute my existence and identity, in another world, must be totally out of this earthly body, or I never can have any existence at all. Yet the present body is little more than a centre of centripetal and centrifugal particles, continually arriving and departing, without any permanent stay. But as the soul's capacity for consciousness and enjoyment depends on organization, and since both feeling and consciousness exist in the soul, its preservation is all that can be necessary for the continuance of identity and consciousness. A change of the material and mortal soul, to a refined incorruptible, and immortal state, may be fitly called a resurrection; such a resurrection I expect, and believe to be clearly taught. 1st. Cor. 15. 20, 52, 54; Phil. 3. 21.

Pliny considered it impossible for God, revocare defunctos, to recall the dead to life again; and Celsus calls the hope of the resurrection, the hope of worms—both abominable and impossible.—Though such language may apply to the vulgar notions of a resurrection, yet of a rational and scriptural resurrection, there is something analogous in the case of the Dragon-fly. Who that first saw the little worm seeking a suitable piece of dry wood, attaching itself to it, and then contemplated the little pendant coffin in which the inanimate insect lay entombed, would ever predict that in a few days or weeks, the skin becoming dry, would burst, and a winged insect push its way through the aperture, expand its wings, and launch into the air with gracefulness. The corruption of grain and process of vegetation is observed annually, but the resurrection of the body from corruption occurs only once. The death like appearance of winter, and the gladsome verdure of spring are fit to teach us what the creator and governor of the Universe is able to effect; and convince us that he is able to loosen the bands of Death. It should not therefore be thought impossible, that God should raise the dead.

But if it be asked with what bodies shall the dead arise, I answer, so much of the configuration and substance shall be preserved as will be necessary to identity of sensation and consciousness. Notwithstanding we shall undergo such a change as will fit us for that new state of existence. It is evident from 1st Cor. 15. 36—36 that our bodies will be incorruptible and consequently indestructible—
At present we are scarcely able to form a correct idea of what we shall be. Col. 4. 4 ; 1st John 3. 2. Our capacity of knowing depends on our constitution. We derive our ideas through the medium of our senses. Our minds are clogged by bodies, borne to the earth by the laws of gravity as well as by those of our propensities. We are soon tired of bodily exertion; our mental attention flags, and our affections cleaving to the dust, impede the operation of body and mind. But then, freed from the influence of gravitation, and the body obeying the volitions of itself with inconceivable celerity from place to place, without the least fatigue. At present man's soul is nothing more than the purest part of the blood. This is equally the declaration of Moses, and the judgment of the best naturalists; but at the dissolution of the body, being refined and provided with organs suitable to its exalted and active state of celestial services, it will wing its way to its God and eternal home: there in all probability to officiate as an angelic spirit forever.

The vulgar notions of a resurrection are very absurd, for such are the laws of nature that no reasonable man will ever expect a collection of the particles of this body when once dispersed. But as whatever constitutes the man exists in the nervous system, not in the nerves themselves but in the fluid they contain, and as each nervous system has completely the size and physiognomy of the individual to whom it belongs. The preservation of that system is all that can be required to identity of consciousness and appearance.—Now this part of the body is not liable to perish as the other parts, for even the cerebral pulp cannot be converted into nourishment, nor the animal spirits be ever intermixed again in organized bodies: and therefore the corporeal soul is not so liable to be lost as the other parts of the body. Its refinement, in a new state of organization at the dissolution of the body, constitutes that change and resurrection, which prepares us for our eternal inheritance.

I neither believe nor expect a resurrection of this body, all the gross particles, constituting this flesh; these bones, these canals, these tubes will fly away and forever maintain the truth of the Pythagorean doctrine in relation to matter. Death I regard as a total cessation of being and eternal destruction of the corporeal fabric. Without this neither the term nor the following Scriptures have any definite signification. "Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Gen 3. 19. "All are of the dust, and all return to dust again." Eccl. 3. 20. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." 1st Cor. 15. 50.

We assert no incredible thing, says Isidor, when we affirm that the resurrection body shall be thin and aerial: for on this account the Apostle calls it a spiritual body. That our future bodies shall be inconceivably light, thin, and aerial, and free from the laws of gravitation is agreeable to the doctrine of the Platonists and Pythagoreans; and such was also the opinion of Origen, Theophylact,
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and Chrysostom among the Fathers. See Whitby on 1st Cor. 15. 44. 

For illustration of death and the resurrection, both our Lord and his great Apostle to the Gentiles refer to the process of vegetation. John 12. 24, 1 Cor. 15. 37. The seed is sown but it is not quickened unless it die. Its loses its external configuration and appears corrupted, but the germ is fed by the death of the rest, and a new vegetation revives and rewards the hope of the husbandman. "It is a physical truth, that the whole body of the grain dies. It is converted into fine mould, which constitutes the first nourishment of the embryo plant. Nothing lives but the germ, which was included in the body of the grain, and which would die also did it not receive nourishment from the putrefaction of the body of the grain, so as to enable it to unfold itself." So in human bodies, death must prepare the way for resuscitation, for so much is implied in the reasoning of our Lord and his Apostle.

From the inherent germs, the identity of plants is preserved, and why may not the analogy be the same in organized animal matter? If then the germ be preserved in a grain of wheat, whilst the component parts of the grain itself sink in dissolution, why not allow the same in relation to the material soul while the component parts of the body obeying the laws of nature, fly away and enter into new combinations.

But does grain lay for years in a state of death and afterwards revive? No, if it rise not when it dies, we never expect it to live again: so if the resurrection take not place at the time of dissolution of the body, we have no analogy that will induce us to believe it ever shall: and the force of our Lord's reasoning as well as that of the Apostle is entirely lost. All analogy, however, favors the doctrine of an instantaneous resurrection: nor is the view of Scripture opposed to this analogy. Our Lord's reply to the Sadducees indicates that the Patriarchs were then living: for if God be the God of Abraham and not of the dead, then Abraham must have been alive. Indeed if the bands of death retain any man for any definite time, that man is lost eternally. God is not his God, therefore annihilation must be his everlasting doom. If this reasoning be not admitted neither can that of our divine Master. Mat. 22. 32, and Luke 20. 38.

Paul distinguishes between the man and his corporeal and earthly tabernacle or outward body; and plainly teaches that the present gross fabric of our body is by no means essential to our existence; nor does he any where insinuate that it ever shall be recovered from the grave. See 1 Cor. 15. 37, 38, 44, 50; 2 Cor. 5. 6—8; Philip. 1. 22, 23; 2 Tim. 4, 6. He moreover tells us that "if the earthly house of this tabernacle, that is the body, were destroyed, we have a building of God eternal in the heavens." Now let it be carefully observed, that Paul believed the body would be destroyed. Secondly, he believed that on the dissolution of the body, the new organization would take place. Mark the language, "We have"—not we will have a building—Language cannot be more conclusive against the doctrine of protracted sleep or insensibility between death and the
resurrection. Nor can the language be more express against the doctrine of an intermediate state, for the building obtained on the dissolution of the body, is eternal in the heavens!

Much might be added but time will not allow. The appearance of Moses and Elias on Mount Taber and the angel, who calls himself one of John's brethren, Rev. 22. 9, seem to confirm the supposition, that a glorious resurrection is still taking place every moment. Nor is there a single objection to the doctrine, that cannot be obviated without offering the least violence to the testimony of Scripture or the analogy of nature.

As to the circumstances in which all men will be raised, the language of the New-Testament is clear and decisive. Jesus, Paul, and John bear their unanimous and combined testimony that they shall all be as the angels of God in heaven, and possess the image and likeness of their gracious redeemer: Mat. 22. 30; Luke 20. 36; 1 Cor. 15. 43, 44; Philip. 3. 21; and 1 John 3. 2. That all without exception shall be admitted into the regions of celestial beatitude cannot be disputed without being guilty of rejecting the testimony of Christ and his apostles.

When Jesus spoke of some coming forth to the resurrection of damnation, John 5. 29, he fixes the time and determines the nature of that resurrection: the hour is coming and now is when the dead, i. e. those morally and figuratively so, shall hear the voice of the Son of God and they that hear shall live; which implies a partial and a figurative resurrection, and therefore must not be referred to the real literal resurrection of which we speak. This is manifest by the 12th verse, where the believer is represented as experiencing this resurrection, or passing from death to life by the very act of faith. The term grave used in the 29 v. is perfectly explained by Ez. 57, 12, 13. and by Paul, Eph. 5. 12, awake thou that sleepest and arise from the dead and Christ will give thee light—see also Rev. 20. 13, which most undoubtedly represents a figurative and not a real resurrection. The words of Christ and John, I hesitate not to affirm, belong to the same event, predicted by Daniel, 12 chap. 2 v. and which both the Man clothed in linen, and Christ interpret of the destruction of the Jewish people and dispensation. See Dan. 12. 7; Matt. 24. 15, 30, 34.

When Jesus speaks of obtaining the resurrection, Luke 20. 35. and Paul of attaining to it, Phil. 3. 11, and believing that there will be a resurrection both of the just and unjust, Acts 24. 15, they manifestly allude to the Pharisee's notion of the resurrection, which supposed only the just, i. e. themselves, could attain such honors; and denied the resurrection of the wicked altogether. Now though Paul asserts the unjust will be raised, he never intimates that they would be punished for sins committed on earth. Far otherwise, the Apostle says men receive in the body i. e. in this life according to the deeds they may have done; but never assumes in all his writings, the dogma of future punishment after the resurrection.

Paul describes the resurrection of the dead, and like his Divine
master makes no distinction between the subjects of Jehovah's creative power. The corrupt becomes incorruptible—The carnal, spiritual—the vile, glorious—the earthly, heavenly—the mortal, immortal—and in one word, all who have borne the image of the earthly shall bear the image of the heavenly. We shall all be changed and obtain bodies like Christ's glorious body, and be forever with the Lord—thus far the great apostle of the Gentiles—oh what heaven born love and unity is unfolded in the evidences of Jesus and his venerable apostles! Not a word, not an intimation of a resurrection to spiritual death or damnation; therefore dumb be the mouth and silent the voice of their opposers. Mark well the discrepancy of Christ's testimony and that of modern divines, who profess to be ambassadors for Jesus. He tells you, all shall be pure, happy and glorious, as Angels of God in heaven, Luke 20. 36: They affirm, the greater part shall be as demons in hell—merciful God, can these pretended ministers of salvation stand before the faithful and true witness, and give an account of their stewardship without shame and consternation?

Were I to tell you of a Father, who had murdered three fourths of his family for no other purpose but that of self-gratification, your minds would rise indignant at the monster who had thus outraged humanity; and the simultaneous cry of every one would be, let the annals of history bear to posterity our righteous contempt and resentment of conduct so unworthy the parental feeling and character.—But what my friends can be the effect, when a libel so foul is preferred against the character of our common Father and God? Would not such vile misrepresentation of the Divine character, under the Jewish law, have exposed the defamer to the infamous punishment of being stoned to death? And shall we still patiently listen to the pretended messengers of heaven, whilst they continue to traduce the character of the most High? No! Let the page of history tell the nations yet unborn, that the nineteenth century did not suffer to pass without rebuke, such base misrepresentation of God and religion!

Hark once more to the words of him who spake as never did any other man—I am the resurrection and the life, the Father hath given all things, i.e. all men, into the hands of the Son, and of all he has given me, I will lose nothing, but will raise it up at the last day—Fie then on those erroneous teachers, who tell us some shall never be raised: and shame and confusion of face be to all, who still more erroneously declare, Jesus will lose the great majority of mankind, or raise them to shame and everlasting contempt.

Brethren I have adduced the witnesses, you have heard them and I cannot but think their evidence satisfactory to all, who admit the authority of our holy religion & the books from which I have collected the testimony. But before I conclude, I shall briefly show you the insufficiency and irrelevant nature of my opponent's plea. You are told of a law pretendedly divine, but which I undertake to prove, entirely human, that "gives sin its damning power," pursues the sinner into another world, and arraigns him before the tribunal of God; there to
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atone for offences committed, during life, in this world, of discipline.

Now to prove to you that these advocates of eternal misery, do greatly err not knowing the Scriptures, I cite again before you the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who most unequivocally tells you, no law has power over a man any longer than he lives, Rom. 7. 1. This appeal of the Apostle was made to adequate judges, who could have determined the case otherwise if it had so required. The same Apostle also tells you, "without the law sin is dead." Chap. 7. 8. Where no law is, there is no transgression, Chap. 4. 15 and Chap. 5. 13. Sin is not imputed where there is no law.—Here you plainly see the law was never designed for the dead, but for the living, as a rule of life.

Another plea set up by them is, that sin outlives the law, that it is something inherent in man's very nature; that men die in sin, and consequently will rise sinners. This plea is futile and absurd in the extreme. Paul declares without the law sin is dead, & where there is no law there is no transgression—Moreover, none but visionaries will imagine sin to be a substance or animated being. The Westminster Divines say "sin is a want of conformity to the law of God." Be it so. When that law has ceased to exist, from that moment sin is annihilated. Sin is no part of the sinner and consequently, when the sinner and the law are dead, sin and all propensities to offend must die also—Hence the propriety and truth of Paul's assertion, "He that is dead is free from sin." Rom. 6. 7.

Another objection is that death, being the wages of sin, will survive it; and in some sense, continue to torment mankind. But Christ is the life, the eternal life, all shall be made alive in him at the resurrection, "then death the last enemy shall be destroyed, shall be swallowed up in victory" and cease to be in all its forms forever and ever.—1. Cor. 15. 26, 54.

Thus the evidence of Paul plainly shows that the strength of sin is the law, and the sting of death is sin. But when the law fails, sin dies, and death losing all its poisoned influence, becomes incapable to injure, and as the last enemy yields up the Ghost. So be it, God of our salvation.

I conclude this summary of evidence, by noticing a subterfuge of the enemies of Universal Salvation, by which they seek to evade the testimony of Christ and his Apostles, viz: they pretend that the evidence of the witnesses is self-contradictory. But surely a discerning court will never admit the same witnesses on both sides of the question. If the evidence is self-contradictory the testimony is lost, on behalf of my opponents as much as on my part, and they may be still arraigned before the court as guilty of blasphemy, and the charge supported by another kind of evidence.

That there will be perfect equality of capacity and attainment by no means follows. There is something outrageous in the very supposition that a Locke and a Newton should not be distinguished from a Hottentot in mental greatness; and that an Abraham and a Daniel should be found on a level with those, who drag out a worthless, ignorant and vicious life to its very close, as was probable in the case of the thief.
Luke 23. The supposition that there will be as great a difference between men in the other world as there has been in this, both in spiritual and intellectual attainment, may be fully admitted, and advantageously taught by the Ministers of Jesus. Separate from man every evil desire, propensity, and passion; banish eternally all vice and misery, and admit of every possible grade of intelligence and beatitude from the lowest degree of positive enjoyment and the knowledge of God as an unchanging father, up to the station of the most exalted seraph that burns with the brightness and splendor of Jehovah's glory; then admit the knowledge and happiness of all to be progressive, and you have a view of heaven, fully consistent with the reason and fitness of things, the doctrines of Revelation, and the attributes of a just and merciful God. The preaching of these views would open a wide scope for exhortation, expostulation, & encouragement, and assist weak minds to behold more easily the justice of God and the advantages of virtue, whilst the belief of them could never obscure, in the least, the doctrine of impartial and sovereign favor. But whatever our individual views may be on this subject, let us all put our full trust and confidence in God. He is our father and we are his children, the tie can never be lost, nor the affinity disannulled.

Through the favor of heaven, I have completed my course of lectures: during which, I have virtually called on my auditors and readers to prove all things, fully confident that the man, who refuses to submit his opinions no critical examination, is, whatever his pretensions to reformation and liberality may be, as much a pope and a bigot as the most stubborn stickler for implicit faith and religious despotism. From the summit of the Theological Temple, I have surveyed its materials, rejected that which was liable to moulder or decay, and preserved only that which appeared indestructible; and with the selection, erected a building of exact symmetry, which shall stand imperishable during the rack of ages, while intellect and science maintain an existence in the world.

THE END.
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