

# CHRIST ALL AND IN ALL.

A discussion of the PERSON AND WORK OF CHRIST, BY TWO BROTHERS.

"Jesus said, Before Abraham was, I Am."—John viii. 58

1878

[www.CreationismOnline.com](http://www.CreationismOnline.com)

## PREFATORY NOTE.

THE object of this little book is twofold. First-it is written with a view to furnish the rising generation' with a few convincing and conclusive arguments, drawn from the sacred Scriptures, proving the real Divinity of Christ, and His death to have been an atoning sacrifice for sin, that so all. young persons who may read the book may be thoroughly established, strengthened, and settled in these two great verities of the gospel. Second—the book is also written with the hope that it may, if possible, convince those who deny the Divinity of Christ and His atoning sacrifice of the error of their views, and lead them to embrace with their whole heart those two fundamental doctrines of the gospel, a full belief in which the Author, regards as essential to the future well being of every soul of man.

## ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

Christ's unprecedented assumptions  
His mastery over all nature  
His miracles; wherein they differed from those wrought by the Apostles  
His death viewed in relation to the past, present, and future  
His sinless, ness declared and corroborated  
His superhuman knowledge  
His power over His own life and death  
His crucifixion and the phenomena which attended it  
His death the theme of Apostolic ministry  
His love surpassing knowledge  
His exalted position in heaven as Ruler .of the universe  
The worship paid Him  
The Judge of the world and the Arbiter of its final destiny  
Four difficult passages explained  
Faith in the Divinity and Atonement of Christ essential to salvation  
The Scriptures the only infallible authority in religion  
A word of exhortation.

## CHRIST ALL AND IN ALL.

My brother-in-law was a Unitarian. He was not always so. In his earlier life he was a Trinitarian, and was a member of the Episcopal Church, on the Sabbath services of which he regularly attended. After a while he formed an acquaintance with a distinguished member of the Unitarian body, and by his influence he was led to associate himself with that body, and soon became a staunch advocate of Unitarian theology.

Kind and friendly in his disposition, he often invited me to his house to partake of his hospitality, and, as my residence was by the sea-side, he not infrequently paid me a visit in the summer season and spent a few days with me and my family.

As might be expected, we had frequent conversations on his change of views touching the person and work of Christ. These conversations were always carried on in the spirit of kindness and in the absence of all that bitterness and temper which too frequently characterize theological discussions. My brother was a gentleman by birth and education, and as such he was gentle in speech and calm in the utterance of his strongest arguments.

Believing as I did that by the adoption of Unitarian views he had departed from the truth, I did my best in the course of our several conversations to convince him of his error and to bring him back to the faith he once espoused but now repudiated.

Soon after his renunciation of the faith he once held I was spending a few days with him at his house in one of the suburbs of London, and as we were alone one evening in the drawing room, I said to him, " How is it that you have given up your old orthodox creed and become Unitarian?"

" I have done so," he replied, " from conviction. can no longer believe that Christ was both human and Divine, nor can I any longer believe that there can be three persons in the Godhead."

" Why not? Where is your difficulty in believing these revealed truths? Did not the Evangelist John believe that Christ was both human and Divine, for does he not say that the word the Logos—was made flesh and dwelt among us? ' And did not St. Paul believe that Christ was both human and Divine, for does he not speak of Him as God manifest in the flesh.' And did he not, moreover, hold that there were three persons in the adorable Godhead, for does he not speak again and again of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost?"

" Yes, I admit all that; but then my difficulty lies here:—I cannot reconcile Trinitarianism with my reason. My reason utterly fails to comprehend how Christ could be both human and Divine, and how there can be three persons in the Godhead; and surely I ought not to believe that which comes not within the reach of my understanding or the limits of my reason."

" What! and do you really and truly think that you ought to believe nothing but what comes within the reach of your understanding and the limits of your reason? Does Creation, the extent of which no telescope can reach, come within the reach of your understanding and the limits of your reason? And yet you believe in Creation. You cannot deny it. There it is confronting you in all its solemn grandeur and profound mysteriousness. Does your own physical, mental, and moral nature come within the reach of your understanding and, the limits of your reason? And yet you believe you have a physical, a mental, and a moral nature. A trinity of being with a unity of life. Does a field of corn ripe for the sickle, which has sprung from seed which has died and, rotted in the ground, come within the reach of your understanding and the limits 'of your reason? And yet you believe in the growth of corn from seed dead and buried, for seed time and harvest are ever before you. Why, then, tell me that you cannot believe in the Divinity of Christ, and in the Trinity, because your reason fails to comprehend the mystery, when you do believe in other things which your reason can no more comprehend than the doctrines in question. If your reason were of such gigantic and God- like power as to be able to comprehend everything else which you see and hear, save and except the Divinity of Christ and the Trinity in unity, then you might reasonably make the objections you do, but when you believe a hundred things which your reason fails to comprehend, it seems to me unreasonable that you should refuse to believe the orthodox creed, and that because you cannot comprehend it. To be consistent, surely you ought to disbelieve everything which comes not within the reach of your finite understanding, and then, if you do that, you will soon believe nothing at all, for what is there throughout the whole range of nature which you can fully understand, and which to you is no mystery?"

" Well, perhaps, I ought not to object to the Divinity of Christ, on the ground of its being a mystery, seeing, as you say, that I do and am obliged to believe many things which my poor reason fails to understand and to comprehend. Still, I cannot believe that Christ was a Divine person, and all the arguments I have ever listened to have failed to convince me that he was Divine. However, I should like to hear what you have to say on the subject, and am prepared to listen to all the arguments you can adduce in favor of a doctrine which, though repugnant to my reason, you think to be a fundamental truth."

" You are right, brother, in saying that I think the Divinity of Christ to be a fundamental truth. I do think so. I regard it as the foundation stone of the building; as the key stone of the arch. Take away the Divinity of Christ and the building falls, the arch collapses. Christianity becomes a heap of ruins, and affords no shelter whatever to the myriads who have fled to it as a refuge from the storm, as a covert from the tempest, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.' As, therefore, you are so willing to listen to what I have to say on the subject, I will, with as much brevity as possible, and without being tedious, give you a summary of those arguments which, in my judgment, place beyond all doubt the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ."

" Thank you. I shall be glad to hear all you have to say in defense and confirmation of your Trinitarian views."

" Now let us clearly understand each other. You say you are prepared to hear all I have to say in defense and confirmation of my Trinitarian views. Now, I am not going this evening to discuss with you the subject of the Trinity, important as that subject is, but the Divinity of Christ. It is true the Trinity involves the Deity of Christ. Still they are distinct subjects, and what I am now anxious to prove to you is not the Trinity, but that Jesus Christ was in very deed Divine as well as human. His humanity is not a matter of disputation. We both believe in his humanity: the point on which we differ is his real Divinity, and right glad and truly thankful shall I be if I can convince you by fair argumentation that He was both human and Divine."

"My first argument for Christ's Divinity is drawn from His unprecedented assumptions—assumptions which it were the highest arrogance and even blasphemy to make if He were only human and not Divine. What would you think of a man, a mere man, assuming supreme authority over a divine Institution, and declaring Himself to be Lord of the Sabbath? What would you think of that same man taking upon himself the Divine prerogative to forgive sins, declaring the sins of a sinner all forgiven him? And what would you say or think if, in addition to these lofty assumptions, he went still higher and claimed equality with God, saying to the people that all men should honor Him even as they honor the Father."

" What should I say of such a man or think of him? I scarcely know what I should say, or what I should think.

I should almost be inclined to think that a man making such pretensions was non compos mentis (not sane of mind), that he was beside himself and was laboring under some mental aberration, for it is scarcely possible to conceive of a man of sane mind assuming a lordship over the Sabbath, taking upon himself the forgiveness of sins, and then, placing himself on an equality with God, asking that equal honor be given to him as to the Father; but then the question is Did the man Christ make these lofty and unwarrantable assumptions? "

" The four Evangelists say that He did, and I presume you do not question the truthfulness of their narrative, and the accuracy of their statements. They also tell us that because Christ made Himself equal with God the Jews charged him with blasphemy, and demanded that for a crime so great he should die. They said We have a law, and by our law He ought to die, because He said God was His Father, making Himself equal with God.' Was Christ guilty of blasphemy? What say you?"

" God forbid that I should for one moment entertain such a thought. You know that I have the highest appreciation of his character, that I regard him as one of the best of men, a man of high morality and of unblemished reputation, a model man whose mission to our world was that he might be a pattern of kindness and good works, to the end that we might copy his example and thereby obtain everlasting life."

" Yes, I know that such are your views of the person of Christ. But how, let me ask, on your supposition that Christ was only a man, can you free Him from the charge of blasphemy? For what greater blasphemy could a man be guilty of than to claim equality with God, and on the ground of such equality to require that the same Divine honor be paid to him as is given to the Father? Either, then, Christ was Divine, or he was guilty of the crime which the Jews laid to his charge. You must, as I think, either admit his Divinity or his blasphemy. Say he was not Divine, and you establish the charge of blasphemy. Admit that he was Divine, and you wipe from off Him the foul charge. Which are you prepared to do? Will you still maintain that he was only a man, and thereby make him a blasphemer, or will you admit that he was Divine, and thereby justify him in all his lofty assumptions, even to that of deeming it no robbery to place himself on an equality with God?"

"You a little confound me in putting me on the horns of such a dilemma. Your argument is so strong that I know not how I can break it or even bend it. You say if I hold that Christ was only a man I make him a blasphemer, and that I can only free Him from the charge of blasphemy by admitting that he was Divine as well as human."

" I do say so, and I further say that if, as you believe, Christ was only a man, he suffered justly the death of the cross. The Jews, according to their law, did right in putting Him to death, and Calvary in that case presented not two robbers only but three, and the greatest of the three was Christ; for while the two thieves who were crucified with Him had robbed their fellow men, Christ had robbed God and usurped the very throne of God, in that he undertook to forgive sins and to pardon the guilty, which is God's high prerogative. I tremble—I stand aghast—when I think of the crimes of blasphemy and robbery which are virtually laid to the charge of Christ, by the denial of the Divinity of His person and the righteousness of His claims."

A pause ensued. Wine was on the table. He took a glass and wished me to do the same. Presently he said, " Well, I have listened attentively to your argument thus far. Have you anything more to say on the subject?"

" Yes, indeed I have, much more to say. My arguments for the Divinity of the Lord Jesus are not yet exhausted. I have not said a half, no, nor a tithe of what may be said in confirmation of the doctrine in question."

" What next have you to say? You have reminded me of Christ's lofty assumptions, even to the making himself equal with God. You have said that on my hypothesis that assumption was blasphemy, and 'that according to Jewish law He deserved to die—a fact which I confess never occurred to me before. What is your next argument in favor of Christ's real Divinity, for, Unitarian as I am, I am desirous of hearing all that you have to say on the subject? "

" My next argument is this:—Christ's perfect mastery over all nature, animate and inanimate. He had a mastery over the wildest storms that ever blew on sea or land. At His bidding the wind ceased to howl and the sea to roar. ' What manner of man is this,' cried the astonished mariners, ' that even the winds and the sea obey him? ' He had a mastery over all diseases. At His pleasure He could

heal all manner of diseases, and at His command lost senses were restored, so that the blind saw, the deaf heard, and the dumb spoke. He had a mastery over demons. At His mandate they yielded up their prey and fled at His presence. He had a mastery over life and death. He had only to say, 'Maid, arise!' 'Lazarus, come forth!' and these dead ones arose and came forth in all the freshness and vigor of life. He had the same mastery over His own life and death. Looking at those who thirsted for His blood, He said, with a consciousness of power which no creature ever possessed, 'No man taketh my life from me. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again.' 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it again.' "

" Now, tell me brother, tell me, was this extraordinary man only a man, only a creature like unto ourselves? Can you in your very heart believe that a man, a mere man, could, by the simple utterance of the word of command, still the tempest and calm the sea? Can you believe that a man, a mere man, had power over all diseases, so that they fled at His touch, and in some cases at the volition of His will? Can you believe that a man, a mere man, had power over demons to expel them at his pleasure, and to hold them in subjection to his will? Can you believe that a man, a mere man, had power over the dead to raise them into life and to restore them to their kindred and friends? Can you believe that a man, a mere man, should say, and that the saying should be fulfilled, 'Kill me, and in three days I'll be alive again?' Can you believe all that of a man, a mere man?"

" It is a little difficult to believe all that, I confess, but then the difficulty is somewhat removed by the recollection that marvelous things have been done by men which at first sight appeared to be nothing less than miracles, but which were nothing more than magical performances which so deceived the senses as to give them all the appearance of being supernatural, when they were only the natural result of natural causes."

" But surely you will not so dishonor Christ as to place side by side the dexterous tricks of the magician with His wonderful works. What! and was Christ then only a conjuror, and did He do all His mighty works by sleight of hand? Was it by sleight of hand that He stilled the tempest, healed the sick, and raised the dead? The idea is monstrous—too monstrous to be entertained for a moment, and I marvel that you should think there is any resemblance between the works of the magician and the miraculous works of Christ."

Seeing that my indignation was a little roused by the dishonor done to Christ in the comparison he had made, he said, " Believe me, I would not for a moment dishonor Christ. I have too high a regard for him as a great and a good man to do anything of the kind; but, as I do not believe in miracles, I am utterly at a loss to conceive how his wonderful works could have been performed except on some occult principle of the magic art."

" Oh, you do not believe in miracles! Pray tell me why you regard miracles as unworthy of credit?"

" I so regard them, because, the laws of nature being perfect, I cannot believe that God would ever act otherwise than in accordance with those laws which He himself has established for the government of the world and the universe."

" As you do not believe in miracles, will you kindly give me your definition of a miracle, and then we shall be better able to see whether miracles have ever been wrought by the power of God, and whether Christ ever worked miracles during His earthly sojourn."

" My definition of a miracle is this:—Some act or deed which involves either a suspension of or a departure from the present existing laws of Nature, and which, in a word, is contrary to Nature."

" Granted. I admit that to be a pretty correct definition of a miracle, and, granting this, I hold that miracles have been wrought, and that too upon a large and extended scale. What say you to the miracles of the Old and New Testament. Were not they a suspension of or a departure from the present existing laws of Nature?"

" I discredit the whole of them. I look upon some of them to be purely fabulous, and others of them, if but rationally understood, would be seen to be only the natural operation of Nature's laws."

" My dear brother, you surprise me, you grieve me. I am pained to hear you thus speak of the miracles of the Old and New Testament. But now, for the sake of the argument, I will suppose for the moment that you are right, and that all the recorded miracles in the Bible are fabulous and ought rather to be transferred to the pages of heathen mythology than retained in the records of Christian theology, yet even then there must have been miracles."

" Never! Never! I cannot admit that. I say again, as I said before, that I cannot believe that God has ever worked otherwise than He now works—that is to say, otherwise than by or through the operation of Nature's perfect, beautiful, and inexorable laws."

" Indeed! You think, then, that God has always worked in all the manifestations of. His power according to the laws of Nature as they now exist."

" I do. I believe He has never deviated from them."

"Allow me, then, to ask you this one question—Was there ever a first man?"

He looked confused, but said nothing. I repeated the question with some emphasis, " Was there ever a first man?" He was evidently staggered by this appeal to his common sense. A member of his family who was standing by and heard the question, said to him, "What do you say to that—how will you answer it?"

" Say," he replied, " What can I say? I must admit, of course, that there was a first man. I do not see how I can deny it."

" As, then, you admit that there must have been a first man, allow me to ask you another question—" Was he born of woman?"

For a while he was silent. I saw he was bewildered by the question, and knew not how to answer it. At length he said, " It is quite certain that neither the first man nor the first woman could have been born of woman."

" Of course they could not. Our first parents could have had no earthly parents. Hence they were brought into existence, not according to what you call Nature's laws, nor according to any law with which we are acquainted, but by miracle—God acting in this case otherwise than He now acts in the perpetuation of the human race. And here let me say that what is true of the first man is equally true of the first of every living thing. Take the bird—Did the first bird come of an egg? Whence, then, came the egg? Take the fish—Did the first fish come of spawn? Whence came the spawn? And so of every living creature. Not one could have come into existence at the first according to the laws by which creatures are now brought forth.

All must have been brought into existence at the beginning altogether independent of those laws on which the perpetuation of animal life now depends, and thus, according to your own definition of a miracle, miracles have been wrought."

" Your argument," he replied, " a little staggers It is, I must candidly confess, conclusive. I can no longer doubt the possibility of miracles, however much I may question their probability. It never occurred to me before, defining, as I did, a miracle to be something done or wrought contrary to existing laws, that all creation was a miracle, the result not of Nature's present laws, but of a power infinitely above all law. I therefore confess to the possibility of miracles, and for the moment will concede that miracles were wrought by Christ; but what proof are they of the Divinity of his person, seeing that miracles were also wrought by his Apostles?"

" I do not say that miracles in themselves, abstractedly considered, are proofs of his Divinity; but this I do say, that as the miracles of Christ were wrought without the recognition of a power greater than his own, they are a presumptive proof that he was a Divine person. The Apostles, when they wrought miracles, said to those who witnessed them, Look not upon us as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk.' Here was a frank and open confession of their weakness and inability to work miracles. No such confession of weakness and inability was ever made by Christ. Conscious of his own inherent power to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of diseases, he said on one occasion, when asked to pity and compassionate a poor sufferer, will come and heal him.' Not I will, Deo volente.' Not I will, by the will of God, or by the help of God, but, 'I will;' showing thereby a consciousness of power in himself to work a miracle whenever he pleased. And so when he performed that stupendous miracle—walking on the sea over its mountainous billows to go to his Disciples in distress, and then commanding the storm to be hushed into a calm,—I say when he wrought that marvelous deed there was no recognition of a power greater than his own. Had he been a mere man surely he had shown the modesty and humility of a man by directing, as the Apostles did, the witnesses of his miracles to the power by which they were wrought; but he did nothing of the kind. He never said, ' Look not upon me as though by my own power or holiness I have healed the sick, cleansed the lepers, raised the dead, stilled the tempest and made calm the sea;' hence it is but fair to conclude that his miracles were wrought by his own power and holiness, and were, therefore, another proof of the Divinity of his person. Miracles are a manifestation of a Divine power, and the man who performs a miracle must either be Divinely endowed or be himself Divine. If Divinely endowed, as the Apostles were, then he is bound to acknowledge the gift Divine, as they very modestly did. If Divine, as I verily believe Christ was, then his power to work miracles was no gift, but an attribute of his Divine nature. Deny his Divinity, and we are at a loss to conceive why Christ did not ascribe his miracles to the power of God—the power, the one power without which miracles are an impossibility."

" You do not hold, then, that miracles in themselves are proofs of his Divinity?"

" Certainly not, because miracles have been wrought by men divinely endowed with the gift of working miracles. The Apostles were but men, and they worked miracles. Stephen, we are told, did great miracles among the people, and God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul."

" But you do hold that the miracle's of Christ were proofs of his Divinity, because they were wrought by the volition of his own will and the putting forth of his own power? "

" I do; and I ask you to account, if you can, for the difference there manifestly is between the miracles of Christ and those wrought by

the Apostles. How came it to pass that they confessed their power to work miracles to be not their own, while Christ recognized no other power than his own in all the miracles he wrought? Does not this great difference show a difference in the very nature of the two parties working miracles? Does it not show that the Apostles were men and that Christ was God?"

To this he replied, " The difference, certainly, is great, very great, and it is difficult to account for the difference in the twat cases, except on your hypothesis, that the Apostles were men and Christ was God. Still I find it most difficult to conceive of a God incarnate."

" No doubt you do, and so do I, and so did the Apostle Paul, for he said, Great is the mystery of godliness: God manifest in the flesh; ' but are not many other things difficult to conceive? Can you conceive how the great solar system was built up and set in motion, moving, as it does, with all the regularity and precision of clock work? Can you conceive how the universe was created, worlds upon worlds? Can you conceive how the myriads of living creatures which fill air, earth, and sea were first brought into existence? Do these things come within the reach of your conception?"

"No I cannot comprehend them."

"And yet you believe them, do you not?"

" I am obliged to believe them—I cannot disbelieve them; there they are before my eyes, they appeal to my senses, and my senses testify to their existence, so that cannot, like Berkley, the celebrated philosopher, deny the existence of a material universe without denying the testimony of my senses."

" As, then, you believe many things which you cannot comprehend, why should you disbelieve the Incarnation of Christ? Surely the Incarnation is no greater mystery than the Creation, and if you believe the one—incomprehensible as it is—why disbelieve the other? If you believe one mystery, why not two; and if two, why not more than two, provided they are founded on solid and substantial evidence. Surely you are a little inconsistent in rejecting the Incarnation because it's a mystery, when the great, and even greater, mystery of Creation you readily admit and firmly believe."

" Well, perhaps I am a little inconsistent here, for I now see that if I reject the doctrine of the Incarnation because of its mystery, I ought, in order to be consistent, to reject every other mystery, and I also see that were I to do that, there would be little or nothing left for me to believe, seeing that almost everything is a. mystery, from a blade of grass and an ear of corn up to the mighty orbs which revolve in the infinitude of space."

" I am heartily glad, brother, to hear you thus speak, and as you are now no longer disposed to reject the Incarnation on account of its mystery, I do hope the argument from miracles, together with that drawn from Christ's assumptions, has satisfied you that Christ was what the Scriptures declare him to be—the incarnate Son of God—Divine as well as human."

· " I cannot say that I am yet fully convinced of Christ's real Divinity, strong and powerful as your arguments are. Have you anything further to adduce in support and confirmation of your views?"

"I have; and my next argument for the Divinity of Christ is His death—His wondrous death, viewed, as it must be, in relation to the past, the present, and the flume."

· "Why, what in the name of reason had the death of Christ to do with the past, 'present, and future? I am anxious to hear what you have to say on this point, inasmuch as I have always regarded the death of Christ as the death of a martyr, who, like many other good and faithful men, died in the defense of the truth which he held to be more sacred than life; but what that death had to do with time past, time present, and time future, I am utterly at a loss to conceive."

" No doubt you are. With your views of the person of Christ and the object of his mission to our world, I am not surprised that you should be unable to conceive what that death had to do with the past, present, and future history of the world; but it had—aye, and with its destiny too. That it had to do with the past is evident from the fact that from the time of Abel, down to the coming of Christ, the death of Christ was typified and foreshadowed by the shedding of blood—the blood of innocent creatures which was offered in sacrifice, and that continually."

"But how do you know that the blood of sacrifice offered on Patriarchal and Jewish altars foreshadowed the death of Christ?"

"I know it from testimony, the testimony of honest and faithful, and, as I believe, inspired men. I know it from the testimony of John, who, when he saw Jesus, cried, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' I know it from the testimony of St. Paul, who declares the whole Jewish ritual to have been a shadow of good things to come,' and as the shedding of blood was a chief part of the ritualistic service of the Jewish Church, that blood must have been a shadow of the precious blood of Christ.' Then I know

it from the testimony of St. Peter, who speaks of Christ as 'A Lamb without spot and without blemish,' and who was therefore the real antitype of the lamb offered in sacrifice under the former economy. Unless, therefore, you deny the testimony of these men, you must believe that the blood offered in sacrifice from the time of Abel, down through all succeeding ages, typified and foreshadowed the blood of Christ offered on Calvary. Besides which, if the blood on patriarchal and Jewish altars did not typify the blood of Christ, for what purpose was that blood shed? Reason alone must have told the patriarchal priests and the whole of the Jewish priesthood that it was not possible that the blood of their sacrifices could take away sin. Why, then, were those sacrifices offered year by year continually? What was their practical end and purpose? Tell me."

" I know not that I can tell you what was the practical end and purpose of sacrifice. I confess it does appear marvelously strange that during the whole of the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations sacrifices were offered, when, as you very justly say, reason alone must have told the offerors that there could be no merit or virtue in the blood of their sacrifices to put away sin. But, even if I admit that sacrifices were typical of the blood of Christ, yet even that would not prove his Divinity."

" Granted; but surely it is a strong argument in its favor: for, on your supposition that Christ was only human, it follows, and you are bound to believe, that blood was shed year by year continually, and that for the space of four thousand years, to typify the shedding of the blood of a poor mortal like ourselves, whose blood possessed no more efficacy to take away sin than the blood of those sacrifices which was shed during that long period. What! and can you suppose for one moment that the antitype was no better than the type; and that there was no more efficacy in the blood of Christ to put away sin than in the blood offered on patriarchal and Jewish altars? To my mind such a supposition is preposterous. Either you must deny that the patriarchal and Jewish sacrifices were types of Christ, or, admitting their typical character, you must admit the expiatory character of his death. Deny the typical character of sacrifices, and why were they offered? Admit their typical signification, and the admission involves the sacrificial character of the death of Christ, and the sacrificial character of his death proves to a demonstration that he was more than man, for No man can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom. "

My brother, I observed, winced a little under this argument, and scarcely knew what to say. However, after a brief pause, he said, " If I understand you rightly the substance of your argument is this:—that if the sacrifices under the former dispensations did not point to Christ, and were not typical of his death, they were useless: they answered no moral purpose; but if they did point to him, and were typical of his death, then his death was sacrificial and expiatory, and being sacrificial and expiatory, he must have been more than a man—Divine as well as human."

" Precisely so. That is the argument, and I now wait your reply."

A pause ensued. Presently he said, " To such an argument as you have now placed before me, I know not how to reply, for if I deny that sacrifices had no typical meaning, I see I must admit that they were morally useless; and if I concede that they were typical and pointed to Christ, then I must admit the sacrificial character of his death; and, admitting this, I must further admit that Christ was more than human, if not Divine, as no mere human sacrifice could take away sin. Allow me, therefore, to suspend my reply to this argument for the present. Indeed, I have no reply to give you just now. I should like to hear what further you have to say on this, your favorite theme."

" I am glad you are so willing to listen to what I have to say still further on what you are pleased to call my favorite theme. With your permission, then, I will proceed. I have shown you that the death of Christ had to do with the past: that for four thousand years it was kept before the eyes of the people as the one sacrifice for sin, to which all their sacrifices pointed. Abel and Abraham, in their sacrifices, saw the day of Christ afar off: they saw it And were glad; and here let me say that it is utterly inconceivable that the blood of a mere man should be foreshadowed by sacrifices during that long period, and more inconceivable still that it should have been foreshadowed as atoning blood, inasmuch as you know there is no more efficacy in the blood of a mere mortal to take away sin than there was in the blood of a mere animal to cleanse the conscience and to purify the heart."

" But now let me ask your attention to what is stated in Holy Scripture about the real efficacy of the blood of Christ and its effects on the present state and condition of those who believe. Paul says, 'We have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace.' Peter says the same thing, namely, 'That we are redeemed not with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ.' John says that 'that blood cleansed from all sin,' and pointed him out as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' Now, if, as you suppose, Christ was only human, then we have redemption through the blood of a man,' a man, be it remembered, who, according to your view, was nothing more than a man. The blood of this man cleansed from all sin, and this man is he which taketh away the sin of the world, and thus opens a way for the salvation of the world. Now you may find no difficulty in believing all this. To my mind the difficulty is insurmountable. I could no more believe that there was virtue in the blood of a mortal man to secure to his fellow men the eternal blessings of redemption, forgiveness, and cleansing, than that there was virtue in the blood of goats and of calves to take away sin."

To all this he replied and said, "Do not suppose that I find no difficulty in believing that the blood of a man could secure to his fellow men the great blessings you have mentioned. The fact is I do find it most difficult to believe this; hence I am driven to ignore the

blessings which you say have accrued from his death. As I do not believe in the Divinity of Christ, I cannot believe in the efficacy of his blood to take away sin."

" Of course you cannot; but then, disbelieving the efficacy of his blood, you disbelieve the typical character of all the sacrifices under the former dispensations, and not only so, you also disbelieve the testimony of such holy men as John, and Peter, and Paul, the faithful and devoted Apostles of the Lord Jesus, who declare most emphatically the atoning and cleansing efficacy of the blood of Jesus, and affirm that without shedding of blood There is no remission of sins.' "

" Yes, I see all that. I see that by denying the Divinity of Christ, I deny the efficacy of his blood, and by denying the efficacy of his blood, I deny the testimony of the Apostles in relation thereto; and, by denying their testimony, I make them false Apostles, preaching to the world a lie and not the truth. I see all this, and I am puzzled. You have again placed me on the horns of a dilemma, and I candidly confess my inability to answer this argument of yours, and will thank you to proceed."

" Well, then, my next point is this—The death of Christ in relation to the future. Not only, as I have shown, was that death foreshadowed by sacrifice during the long period of four thousand years; not only has it secured the invaluable blessings of redemption and forgiveness of sins:

it has done more than this—it has opened to myriads of Adam's race a glorious future, and a multitude which no man can number have already entered upon that glorious future of honor, glory, immortality, eternal life."

" Aye, and how do you know that? How do you know that the death of Christ has obtained for myriads of Adam's race a glorious future? "

" I know it from divine revelations which were made to John in Patmos. To that honored and faithful servant of Christ were revealed and made known the glories of the heavenly world. The veil was uplifted and he looked within the veil, and saw a multitude which no man could number, out of every kindred, and people, and tongue, and nation. To his question, Who are these, and from whence came they? ' the answer was, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' As he looks upon that vast assemblage, clad in their blood-washed robes, he hears the voice of song, And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' Nor was the worship thus paid to Christ confined to the redeemed, for, says John, And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and such as are in the sea and all that are in them, heard I saying—Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sits upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever."

" Here, then, we have all heaven and all earth pouring forth their praises to the Lord Jesus, and that because of the shedding of his blood and redemption thereby. Was, then, Christ only a man? Was his death only that of a martyr who died as other martyrs died, in fidelity to the truth they held. If so, tell me, tell me why the redeemed in heaven ascribe their redemption to His blood? Why sing to Him a new song? Why deem Him worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing—every conceivable honor? If his death was only that of a martyr, then what virtue was there in his blood to redeem? And why is he more worthy of heaven's loftiest adorations than a Paul, a Peter, or a John, each of whom died a martyr's death in the defense and confirmation of truth? Tell me, for I want to know, why this one martyr should be exalted and extolled above all other martyrs?

" I know not that I can tell you for the moment, for I see that if Christ were only a man, and died only as a martyr, it is impossible to account for the fact that redemption is ascribed to his blood, nor is it easy to conceive why he, dying as a martyr, should be the only martyr who is deemed worthy of praise, and honor, and glory, from legions of angels, and the innumerable company of the redeemed."

" I am right glad you admit the impossibility on your hypothesis of accounting for the fact that redemption is ascribed to his blood, and that all heaven is vocal with his praise; but on my hypothesis, that he was both human and Divine, the fact is intelligible enough, and surely it is no marvel that all heaven should honor and adore him, who, being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' Such an act of condescension as can have no parallel, and such a display of love and mercy to a guilty world as can have no equal, may well call forth the adoration of all heaven and fill the whole universe with his praise." " I was not aware," said my brother, " that so much could be said in favor of the Divinity of Christ. Pray, go on, and let me hear still more what you have to say, for although I am, and have been for some years past, an out-and-out Unitarian, I am no Bigot. I am open to conviction, and if you can clearly prove to me that Christ was Divine as well as human, I shall as willingly return to the old orthodox faith as I was ready to leave it when convinced by an old Unitarian friend that Christ was no more divine than I am divine."

It was now late in the evening, and past my usual hour for retiring to rest, so I suggested that our discussion should here close, and that it be resumed the following evening. The supper bell rang, we rose from our seats, left the drawing room, and were soon seated around the table with other members of the family to partake of the evening's repast. My brother's wife and daughters knew that we



had been carrying on a discussion, on the subject of which we so widely differed, and as we sat at supper they expressed a hope that our discussion had been carried on calmly and dispassionately, and without loss of temper. We assured them it had, as we were only anxious that truth should triumph, whichever might suffer defeat. Supper being over, we sat and chatted till the clock struck twelve, when we bade each other good night and retired to rest.

The whole of the day following my brother was engaged in his profession. I went into the city to attend some public religious meetings, for it was the month of May, when the anniversaries of our great religious societies are held. I got back in time enough for tea, and this being over, we went as before into the drawing room that we might resume and carry on our discussion.

I began by saying, that last evening I called his attention to the following particulars:—Christ's lofty assumptions—his perfect mastery over all nature, animate and inanimate—his miracles as differing from those wrought by the Apostles, and his wondrous death—wondrous as having a relation to time past, present, and to come, and as that by which the welfare of myriads of Adam's race is eternally secured. I wished now to call his attention in the first place to the sinlessness of Christ's moral character. "So conscious was he of a purity which no sin had sullied that he could look his bitterest foes in the face and ask, Which of you convinces me of sin? Was there ever such a challenge as that, either before or after the coming of Christ? And what was this challenge but a virtual declaration of the sinlessness of his nature, and the immaculate purity of his life? And was he sinless? Then he was more than human: For there is no man upon earth that doeth good and sinned not.' Was he not sinless? Then he made a vain boast, greater than which no Pharisee on earth ever made,—a boast as wicked as it was vain."

"I wish," said my brother, "to ask here one question, and it is this:—Was the sinlessness of Christ confirmed by any corroborative evidence, or does it rest simply on his own testimony?"

"It does not rest simply on his own testimony, but is confirmed by the testimony of others. The holy Apostles testify to the fact. They declare of him, that He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth,' that He was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,' that He was the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person.' And on the occasion of his baptism there came a voice out of heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' With these testimonies before you, human and divine, need you any further proof of Christ's perfect sinlessness? "

"No, I think not. I think the evidence you have adduced is sufficient to establish that point. His sinless-ness, it would appear, must be admitted; and your argument, if I understand you rightly, is this:—That Christ being sinless, he was more than human, inasmuch as no human being is without sin: For that all have sinned.' "

"Yes, that is my argument. What have you to say to it? "

"I have nothing to say, except honestly to admit that the sinlessness of Christ being established, he must have been more than human, unwilling as I am, at present, to believe him Divine. And now, what is your next point? "

"My next point is this:—The superhuman knowledge which Christ possessed, and which, during his earthly sojourn, he manifested on several interesting occasions."

"Superhuman knowledge I pray, what did Christ know more than other men—more than a Paul, or a Peter, a James, or a John, or more than any man of genius, such as a Shakespeare, or a Milton?"

"I am very glad you have asked me this question, because it will give me great pleasure to tell you of many things which Christ knew, but which no man could possibly have known; e. g., Christ knew the entire history of a certain Samaritan woman whom he had never seen, until he met her at Jacob's well. He then and there told her, face to face, what she had been and what she then was: that she had been a wife five times, had had five husbands, and was now living in adultery with a man who was not her husband. Could any mere man have made such a revelation of this woman's life and character as Christ here made? Could any stranger passing through Samaria have known that this woman had buried five husbands, and was now living with a man who was not her husband? Was not that superhuman knowledge? On another occasion Christ knew where a certain colt was tied, and sent his Disciples to fetch it: he knew what the owner of the animal would say to them, and furnished them with the answer they were to give. He knew that, with some feeling of surprise, the man would say to them.—'What do ye, loosing the colt: the colt is not yours, but mine, what right have you to take him away?' They were to say, 'The Master hath need of him.' They did so, and the owner quietly let the animal go, without further remonstrance. Could any mere man have known such a thing as that? Was not that knowledge superhuman? Christ knew that in a certain city a certain man, in a certain street, would be seen bearing a pitcher of water, and that, upon enquiry, he would show the two Disciples whom Christ had sent into the City a large upper room, furnished, which he would grant the use of for the purpose of preparing and eating the Passover. Could any mere man have known that? Christ knew that there was in the sea, not far from the shore, a fish with a piece of money in its mouth, and that if Peter would go down to the sea with a baited hook he would catch this fish, and find the money in its mouth sufficient to pay the tribute which had been demanded, but which he was too poor to pay. Peter went down to the sea, cast his hook, caught the fish, and paid the tribute money. Christ also knew and told his Disciples the

exact place where a multitude of fish might be caught, and where they were to cast their net. They carried out his instructions, and the haul of fish was so great that they feared their nets would be broken. Who, I ask, but an Omniscient Being could have known that there was a fish in the sea with money in its mouth. And who but the same Omniscient One could have known and pointed out the very place where fish in abundance might be caught, after an unsuccessful night of toil and labor?

Moreover, Christ knew the very thoughts and intents of the heart—named the man that would deny him, pointed out the man that would betray him, and told who they were that would put him to death; and, more than all this, he knew in what hearts love reigned, and in what hearts it did not reign. Appealing to certain Jews, he said, I know you that ye have not the love of God in you.' He knew the death he would die, and the death Peter would die, and foretold both. He knew that Jerusalem would be so utterly overthrown as that not one stone should be left upon another. He knew that his church would be a persecuted and suffering church, hated of all men for his name's sake. He knew the future history of the world and its ultimate destiny, and made a declaration openly as to what would take place before and at the end of the world. Look at these facts, brother, and in them you will see an answer to your question, namely—What did Christ know more than other men? I now ask you—What man save Christ could have known all that he knew, and revealed all that he revealed and made known? You know it requires Divine prescience to look into the depths of the sea—to know what is to be found in a certain village—and what is to be met with in a certain city. And you know it is the Divine prerogative to look into and search the human heart. Christ did all this, and when we see him thus displaying Divine prescience and exercising a Divine prerogative, surely the inference is as logical as any inference can possibly be that he was a Divine person."

" I thank you for thus answering my question, and for so clearly showing me that Christ did indeed know more than other men; hence I am bound to admit that his knowledge was superhuman; but whether it was Divine, and he a Divine person, is still a question. Have you anything else to state as further proof of his real Divinity?"

" I have, and it is this: namely, that His life and death were in his own hands and at his own command and disposal. I have before reminded you of this fact, but it is one of so much importance as to demand your special attention."

" Do you mean to say, then, that Christ had power over his own life and death—to live or not to live, to die or not to die, and when put to death he had power to raise himself from the dead?"

" I do say so, or rather Christ himself says so, for, in the full consciousness of this power, he said No man taketh my life from me. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.' And, again, he said, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it again," by which he meant, as you very well know, Put me to death, and in three days I'll be alive again.' Was not that extraordinary language? Can you conceive of a sane man uttering it? Were a man condemned to die for some capital offence to say to his executioner, Put me to death, and in three days I will raise myself from the dead and will be alive again.' He would be regarded as half an idiot, if not quite idiotic, more fit for 'Earlswood' or 'Bedlam' than a proper subject for capital punishment. But this is what Christ said, and not only what he said, but what he actually did. He was put to death, and on the third day he rose from the dead, and was seen forty days after his resurrection, not only by two or three witnesses, but by above five hundred brethren at once. Was there nothing extraordinary in that? Since the world began, was it ever known of a man, a mere man, declaring his life to be invulnerable, affirming that no human power could take it from him, and that he alone had power to lay it down and take it up again? "

"I don't remember any such case of a man having power over his own life and death."

" You don't remember such a case. The fact is there never was such a case, either before or since the coming of Christ; and the fact, as I humbly conceive, clearly shows that Christ was more than human, and not less than Divine. But, now, let me call your attention to the wonderful phenomena which occurred at the time of his tragic and cruel death. When he died all nature went into mourning.

C The sun was darkened, and a black pall was thrown over the whole face of nature as over the coffin of a dead man. The rocks rent and poured forth their groan. The vail of the temple was parted into two; rent asunder from top to bottom, and the Holy of Holies thrown open to public gaze. Whence this mourning and lamentation on the part of nature? Why were the heavens wrapped in the habiliments of mourning, and the earth, why did darkness cover it from twelve at mid-day till three in the afternoon? Why did the very rocks break; and the vail of the temple, why did that rend in two? Was all this universal mourning and, grief occasioned by the death of one of Adam's guilty sons? The idea is preposterous. Nature weeping, Nature mourning; for whom did she weep, for whom did she mourn? If not for a man, who was he? The answer is that of the Centurion, who was an eye-witness of the awful scene, and exclaimed, Truly this was the Son of God.' " But, extraordinary and unprecedented as was the death of Christ, viewed in relation to all nature weeping at the sight of the Crucified One, it was more extraordinary still in that it was made the theme of the Apostles' ministry and the subject of their exclusive exultation. They went everywhere preaching the death and resurrection of Christ, and so great in their estimation was the value and importance of his death, that they determined to know nothing among men save Jesus Christ and him crucified; ' and as to glorying, they saw nothing in the whole range of their observation worthy of being gloried in but the cross of Christ. God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ,' was the testimony of one and all of the Apostles. In their preaching they made the death of Christ the procuring cause of man's redemption and forgiveness, and declared, We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace; " and boldly affirmed that 'the blood of

Jesus Christ cleansed from all sin.' And here I again ask you, brother, how was it possible that the death of Christ could secure these inestimable blessings if he differed in no respect whatever from other men?"

"That," he replied, "is a very difficult question, for if I deny that these blessings have resulted from his death, I thereby deny the testimony of the Apostles, and make them false teachers, and if I admit that redemption and forgiveness have been secured by the cross, then I virtually admit that Christ was more than human if not Divine. Why, almost thou persuades me to be a Christian '—I mean a Christian of your own school—and again to become what I once was, a believer in the old orthodox creed."

"I would to God that not only almost, but that altogether thou wert such as I am, a firm believer in the real Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the redemptive character of his death, which, I am not ashamed to say, form the basis—the sole basis of my hope of eternal life."

"Well, perhaps before this discussion of ours is over I may become converted to your views; but go on, and let me hear what other arguments you have to adduce."

"My next point is this:—The way in which the Apostles speak of the love of Christ, and the influence which that love had upon their hearts and lives. They speak, as you will probably recollect if you have read their Epistles, of the length, and breadth, and depth, and height of the love of Christ as passing knowledge. They tell us that the love of Christ constrained them. Under the mighty influence of that love they took cheerfully the spoiling of their goods, 'suffered the loss of all things and counted them but dung that they might win Christ and be found in him.' And not only so, they counted not their lives dear to themselves, and even hazarded their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus.' Theirs was a love which no waters could quench, no floods could destroy.

"Now, if Christ were only a man, and his death nothing more than that of a martyr, where, I ask, was the exceeding greatness of his love beyond that of a man like Paul, or a martyr like Stephen? These men and others of their stamp labored for the good of the people, and at length died as martyrs for the truth which they held to be more precious than life. But of what teacher or martyr, either before or after Christ, do you read of the length, and breadth, and depth, and height of a love which passes knowledge? And what death, besides the death of Christ, was ever made the basis of a sinner's hope, and the theme of a public ministry?"

"It is difficult," said my brother, "to answer such questions as these which you have just put. You ask me wherein consisted the exceeding greatness of Christ's love beyond that of other men and other martyrs who suffered as he suffered, and died as he died—the death of the cross? I confess I cannot tell, except on your hypothesis that he was Divine as well as human. You also ask—What death besides the death of Christ was ever made the basis of a sinner's hope and the theme of a public ministry? I confess I know of no other death, and assuredly it is a problem most difficult to solve, why the death of Christ was everywhere preached, and preached not as a martyr's death, but as a sacrificial death, of which, as you say, all the sacrifices under the law were types and shadows."

"Yes, indeed, it is a problem difficult to solve on your hypothesis, but not on mine. Regarding Christ as I do as a Divine person, as God incarnate dying for our sins and rising again for our justification, it is easy to see and to understand why the Apostles made his death the theme of their ministry, and presented it as the only basis of a sinner's hope. Nor is it any marvel that they should speak of his love as extending beyond the reach of human knowledge, seeing, as the Apostle Paul puts it, that being in the form of God, he deemed it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant . . . and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' This solves the problem. This explains the whole matter and gives a reasonable cause for the manner in which the Apostles speak of the exceeding greatness of his love and the sacrificial character of his death; whereas, on your hypothesis, that Christ was only a man, the preaching of the Apostles, both as regards the death of Christ and the love of Christ, is inexplicable, and can never be accounted for on any rational principle whatever. Deny the Divinity of Christ, and wherein did he essentially differ from Paul, or Peter, or John? Did Christ go about doing good? So did they. Was Christ a great teacher? So were they. Did Christ die an ignominious death? So did they. Why, then, I ask, has Christ been for eighteen centuries the theme of a standing ministry? Why has his death been celebrated during the lapse of ages by a perpetual ordinance? And why has his love been represented as without precedent, and as passing the limits of human knowledge? Why all this if Christ were only human and not Divine? If only human I cannot possibly see wherein he essentially differed from the Apostles; nor can I conceive on what principle they could have exalted and extolled him as worthy the homage of their hearts, and the consecration of their lives to his service. Tell me, brother, tell me, why this exaltation of Christ above all other men, if only himself a man?"

"I cannot tell you instantly. Your question requires some little consideration. I confess that I know not, at present, on what principle to account for the fact that the death of Christ was made the theme of the Apostles' ministry, and preached as the sole basis of a sinner's hope; nor can I account for the fact that his love should be spoken of in such exalted strains as that which not only surpasses the love of other men, but transcends the very knowledge of men. And, as with my views of the person of Christ I am not able to account for these facts, I may as well be candid enough to say that they are more in accord with your views than with mine. Still, I find it most difficult to conceive and to understand how Christ could be the incarnate Son of God. What else have you to say in corroboration of your views?"

" Well, I have this to say:—That assuming, as I do, that the New Testament Scriptures contain a faithful record of the truth respecting Christ, and as these Scriptures testify to his present exalted position in heaven and the worship he there receives; and as they also declare him to be the Judge of the world and the Arbiter of man's destiny, I cannot but regard these testimonies as further proofs and illustrations of the Divinity of his person.

" Look, now, in the first place, at His exalted position in the heavenly world. He is there—according to the Scriptures—as the Ruler of the universe, far above all principalities and powers: Head over all things to the Church: 'King of Kings and Lord of Lords.' John, in vision, saw him in all the glory of his power, and heard him say, I am he that lives and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.' Now, if such be Christ's exalted position—if such his authority and power, then to suppose that he was a man of like passions with ourselves and nothing more, is simply childish. What! a man, a mere man, the Ruler of the universe, reigning in the full plenitude of divine power over countless hosts of intelligent beings—' King of Kings and Lord of Lords '—and holding in his hands the keys of death and the grave!' Who can believe this? To my mind it is past belief, and I cannot think you can believe it, brother, for one moment, if you will but calmly reflect on the unreasonableness of the thing; for can anything be more unreasonable than to suppose that a finite creature like man can have the government of the world in his hands, and that over it he now reigns, and will continue to reign, as King supreme, until he has put all enemies under his feet and subjugated all the nations of the earth to his rule and authority."

" I see," he said, " the unreasonableness of the supposition that a mere man can have the government of the world and the universe in his hands, doing whatsoever he pleases in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth; and as I a little pride myself in listening to the voice of reason and think that her dictates ought never to be ignored and set aside, I feel bound in all fairness to acknowledge that, as according to the Scriptures Christ now occupies the exalted position of Monarch of the universe, angels, authorities, and powers being subject unto him, it is more reasonable to suppose that he is Divine than that he is only human."

" I am pleased; more than pleased—I am delighted to hear you make such a confession. By it I am encouraged to proceed with my arguments with the hope that before this discussion closes the truth respecting the person and work of Christ may be fully established, and that you and I may both be established in the truth concerning Jesus.

" My next point is this:—The worship paid to Christ. And here I wish you to observe that if Christ be not Divine, all the worship which is paid to him is idolatry, rank idolatry. Tell me that Christ is only human, and you virtually tell me I am an idolator, for I worship Christ; i.e., according to your view of Christ I worship a human being. And not only am I an idolator, but all Trinitarian Christians are idolators, for they all worship Christ. And not only so, but all the Apostles were idolators, for they not only preached Christ but worshipped him. They baptized their newly made converts in his name, which was an act of solemn worship. They celebrated his death by a holy ordinance, which was another act of worship; and then, recognizing him as the source of all grace, they prayed to him and asked that his grace might be with them and the churches which they had planted, which was a third act of worship paid to Christ, Am I an idolator, think you? Are all Trinitarian Christians idolators? Were the Apostles idolators? What say you—Do you mean to place us in the category of heathens, and say we are all idolators together? If so, then you shut us all out of heaven, for it is written, No idolator hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God.' Again I ask you, are we idolators? "

" No, no; I am not so uncharitable as to think, for a moment, that you are idolators, and that the only true worship of the true God is confined to us Unitarians. No doubt your worship is just as acceptable as ours."

"Acceptable! Acceptable, brother! How can our worship be acceptable, when, according to your views of the person of Christ, we worship a man, a mere man? Our worship, on your hypothesis, instead of being acceptable, must be contemptible, for whether you think us idolators or not the fact remains. We are idolators, if Christ be only human; for what is idolatry if it be not the worship of a creature, however exalted his rank in the scale of created intelligences. Now, if you are not prepared to charge me and my co-religionists with idolatry, you must, I humbly submit, be prepared to admit the real Divinity of Christ, for if Christ be not Divine, we are to all intents and purposes idolators; but if we are not idolators, then Christ is to all intents and purposes Divine."

" Ah, indeed, and does it come to that—that either I must look upon you and your co-religionists as idolators, or else regard Christ as a Divine person."

" Certainly you must—there is no alternative. Either we are idolators or we are not. If Christ be not Divine we are idolators, for we worship a man; but if Christ be Divine we are not idolators, for in that case we worship God:

God manifest in the flesh.' Now, as you said just now you were not so uncharitable as to think us idolators and to classify us with the heathen world, I hope you see that by thus freeing us from the charge of idolatry, you thereby admit the Divinity of Christ."

" I see, yes, I see that, though I did not see it before. And now for your next point, for the further we go into the subject the more interesting does it become, and the more important does it appear; for according to your line of argument, Christ is the Alpha and

Omega of religion/ whereas I have always considered morality to be the very essence of religion, Christ simply being the pattern front which our morality was to be copied. But proceed, proceed."

" I will do so, but before I go on to state my next point, I must say I am greatly pleased to hear that to your Mind the subject increases in interest and importance the further we go into it, and I cannot but hope that the end of this important discussion of ours will be your conversion to the faith you once held, but which you have since rejected. The point to which I now call your attention is the fact that CHRIST IS TO BE THE JUDGE OF THE WORLD AND THE ARBITER OF ITS FINAL DESTINY.

"That Christ is to be the Judge of the world is a fact as clearly laid down in the sacred Scriptures as that he was to be the Savior of the world. Paul declares that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ' Christ himself has told us that before him shall be gathered all nations, and that he will separate them. one from another as a shepherd divides the sheep from the goats; ' also that he will render to every man according to his deeds, and will then wind up the world's history by pronouncing the final award, which will determine and fix the destiny of the race. Now, I ask you, Is it conceivable that a man, a mere man, with his finite powers and capacities, should be able to judge the world, and to judge it in equity? for you must remember that in order to this the Judge must know the motives of men and the thoughts of men. He must weigh in the balances of justice the actions of men: he must know every individual case of the myriads arraigned at his bar, and what each case merits at his hands. To judge the world in equity he must know all the infinite shades of difference in knowledge, character, and conduct which exist among men, from the poor ignorant Hottentot up to the most enlightened and refined of educated society, and all the phases of its religious life. Thus, to judge the world and to fix its destiny would be utterly beyond the power of angel or archangel, and not only beyond their power but their province, too; and if to judge the world is beyond the power and province of an angel, how much more beyond the power and province of a man. Surely you must admit that to judge the world is a Divine act; that to search the heart is a Divine prerogative; and to pass sentence on wicked men, whereby their eternal destiny is fixed, is the act of a Judge Divine. And, if you admit the act to be Divine, and the prerogative to be Divine, and the decision to be Divine, you must, in all fairness, admit the Judge to be Divine; i.e., you must admit the real Divinity of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ."

" Yes, I see I must, unwilling as I am to do so. I do not see how I can set aside your line of argument. You have referred to Christ's exalted position as seated upon the throne of the universe, having the reins of government in his hands. You have reminded me of the worship paid to him by angels and men, and you have shown that he is to be the Judge of the world, and that the destiny of the race will be determined and fixed by him. These, together with your former arguments, have, I frankly confess, greatly shaken my faith in my Unitarian views of the person and work of Christ. From the time that I became a convert to Unitarianism, I have regarded Christ simply . as a man—a good man and a great man—still, nothing more than a man; but now I see how utterly impossible it is to reconcile the simple humanity of Christ with all that he said and with all that he did; with the character of his death and the phenomena which accompanied it; and also with all the honor and glory with which he is now invested as King of Kings and Lord of Lords—Ruler of the universe and Judge of the world. But, now that we are discussing this great subject, and a great subject it is, and one, as you think, of momentous importance, will you allow me to ask you for an explanation of those passages of Holy Writ which seem — taking a prima facie view of them —to teach the inequality of Christ to the Father, and to indicate that he was simply human, and not Divine? "

" Be assured, brother, I will do my best to give you an explanation of any passage or passages which strike you as difficult, and not easy to be reconciled with the real Divinity of Christ. What are they? perhaps you will quote them."

" Well, they are the following, e. g., ' My Father is greater than I.' Why calls thou me good; there is none good but one, that is God.' The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do.' Of that day and hour knows no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' These passages, without quoting others, are among the most difficult to my mind to harmonize with the Deity of Christ, and are, as you know, some of the principal passages on which Unitarianism rests. Again and again have they been quoted by me and others as disproving the Divinity and as favoring our views of the simple humanity of Christ."

" Yes, I know they have; and I also know that again and again have they been shown to be no disproof of the Divinity of Christ, but simply illustrations of his humanity. The humanity of Christ was as real as the Divinity. He was man as well as God; and, being man, he sometimes spoke as man; and, being God, he at other times spoke as never man stake, and as only God could speak.

" But I am quite willing to look at the passages you have quoted, and to give you, so far as I am able, their real meaning. Let us, then, take first the passage where our Lord says, ' My Father is greater than I.' Now, does it not strike you—supposing that our Lord was only human—to be in the last degree puerile that he should make such a confession as this. If any mere man were to say to you in all seriousness, God is greater than I,' you would find it difficult to keep from laughing in the man's face. You would almost fancy him bordering on insanity, if not already insane, when with all gravity he told you that the Infinite and Eternal Creator was greater than he. Why, he might as well have told you that the noonday sun was greater than a midnight taper; that the ocean was greater than a fish pond; that a mountain was greater than a molehill; and that a giant was greater than a dwarf. What man in his senses would ever think of making so foolish an observation? What angel, however great in power, would ever think of saying that God was greater than he. No rational being would have made such a remark, unless there were some approximation in nature, power, and ability to the eternal

and uncreated Jehovah.. Now, Christ had said that He and his Father were one,' and that all men should honor him, even as they honor the Father,' which declarations show, not only an approximation to the Eternal Father, but absolute equality."

" Why, then, did Christ say, My Father is greater than I?"

" Obviously to denote his official position in the great work of human redemption. Before that God sent his Son into the world; not to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved.' He was one with the Father, and equal with the Father; but when Christ came and took upon himself the form of a servant, then, in the capacity of a servant, he could say, 'My Father is greater than I.' Thus, you see, there is perfect harmony in the two declarations, although they seem at first sight to contradict each other. As the Son of God he and his Father were one—one in nature and attributes. As the servant of God his Father was greater than he. A prince of a royal house is equal to his father in all that is physical, mental, and moral, i.e., in physical constitution, mental ability, and moral purpose; indeed, the prince may be the greater man of the two; but if he be sent to a foreign court as an ambassador on an embassy of peace, he may say while presenting his credentials, as the King's son, My father is greater than I.' Even so Christ was equal with the Father in all the attributes of his Divine nature, and deemed it no robbery, no usurpation, to claim and assert his equality with God; but when he came into the world as the Prince of Peace, and as God's ambassador on an embassy of mercy to guilty men, he, who had said with perfect truthfulness, I and my Father are one,' said with equal truthfulness, My Father is greater than I.' Greater in that I am now acting under his instructions and by his authority. What say you to this explanation of your first difficult passage? Is it satisfactory? "

" Perfectly so. My difficulty is removed. I now see what I never saw before—that a man must be a very simpleton gravely to tell his fellow men that God was greater than he. I also see, as you have so clearly pointed out, why Christ made this observation after that he had declared his oneness with the Father. It evidently was, as you say, to denote that while on the one hand he was one with the Father, yet, on the other hand, he, acting as the servant of the Father, the Father was greater than he. I thank you for the explanation, and I shall now be glad to hear your explanation of the second passage in which Christ, after being addressed by a certain Ruler as Good Master,' said to him, Why calls thou me good; there is none good but one, that is God.' Now is it not strange that our Lord should thus have spoken, supposing that he was Divine as well as human?"

"At first sight it does appear strange, but a little consideration of the case in point will remove all the Obscurity which seems to hang over it. Now you must bear in mind that the man who addressed our Lord as Good Master,' looked upon him only as a man, 'a Master in Israel,' a Jewish Rabbi,' and nothing more. Our Lord, knowing this, said to him, Why calls thou me good? ' when in your estimation I am only a man, a Master in Israel: " there is none good but one, that is God;' and as you do not look upon me as Divine, why calls thou me good, when, according to your own Scriptures, there is none good—' none righteous, no, not one.' Our Lord does not, for a moment, deny that he was good; he simply says to the man, Why calls thou me good?" And he puts the question in order to show the inconsistency of the man in calling him good, when he ought to have known that so far as men are concerned, there is none good, none absolutely good, and that God is the only Being who is essentially worthy to be called by this name. The passage thus considered, even a child may see, is no denial by Christ of the Divinity of his person, but is simply a correction of the error of the Ruler in applying to a Master in Israel a term which in its absolute sense belongs only to God."

" I thank you for making clear to my mind the meaning of this second difficult passage which, ever since I became a Unitarian, has been one of my strongholds, but which you have so utterly demolished that I can take refuge in it no longer. And now, what about the third passage, which reads thus, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do.' Now, if Christ had been a Divine person, he possessed the attribute of omnipotence, and, possessing this attribute, one would have thought that instead of doing nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do, he could have done everything of himself, independent of the Father. Was Christ omnipotent? And if so, what did he mean when he spoke of his dependence on the Father?"

" With regard to your first question--Was Christ omnipotent? I reply most emphatically, he was, 'in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' All the attributes of deity centered in him:—omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence. See his omnipotence in the case to which have before referred, when Nature in one of her wildest storms yielded to his command, and the winds and the seas obeyed him. See his omniscience in the cases to which reference has been made when he told his Disciples where they would find a colt tied, and where they would meet with a man bearing a pitcher of water; also when he told Peter where he would find a certain fish with a coin in its mouth sufficient to pay the tribute money; and when, on another occasion, he told him and his fellow fishermen where fish might be found and caught in abundance. Pits omnipresence he asserted in that remarkable passage in John's Gospel, ' No man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven.' Who but an omnipresent Being could thus speak of himself as being in heaven and on earth at the same moment of time. Thus is it clear that these three incommunicable attributes of deity Christ himself possessed."

"With regard to your second question—What did Christ mean when he said, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do?' I reply he evidently meant this—that as he was not only the Son but the servant of the Father, he could do nothing of himself as a servant, but what he saw was the Father's will he should do. When he came into the world he said, Lo, I come to do thy will O God.' Faithfully did he do the will of the Father, and with this ever before him as the great object of his mission, he did nothing of himself independently of the Father, nothing but what he knew was the Father's eternal will and purpose. As an ambassador can do

nothing of himself but what he is instructed by his Sovereign to do, so Christ, as the ambassador of God to men, could do nothing but what he knew was the mind and will of the Father who sent him."

" You think, then, that the passage does not imply personal weakness on the part of Christ, but perfect obedience."

"I do think so. How could Christ speak of personal weakness, when, by the volition of his own will, he could raise the dead and still the tempest? You have only to bear in mind the fact that Christ was both the Son of God and the servant of God, in order to see that as the Son of God he could do whatsoever he pleased, whilst as the servant of God he could do nothing but what the Father did, and what he would have him to do."

" I thank you for making this difficult passage so clear and intelligible, and now for the fourth and last passage with which I will trouble you for an explanation. How do you understand, and how do you explain, our Lord's words when, in reference to the great tribulation which was to come upon the earth, he said, But of that day and hour knows no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father?"

"In answer to this question it is necessary that I again remind you of what I have before said in the course of this discussion, that our Lord was as essentially human as he was Divine. You must not suppose that while I firmly believe in the perfect Godhead of Christ, I do not as firmly believe in his perfect manhood. Believe me, I am no successor of the Gnostics, who, in the first century, denied that Jesus Christ had come in the flesh, who believed that although he had the appearance of a man, he was a man only in appearance and not in reality. In fact they denied his humanity just as you now deny his Divinity. And here let me remind you that the Apostle John in his epistles declared that all those who denied the real humanity of Christ were not of God. And pardon me when, in all kindness, I express my fear that the same Apostle would now declare the same of all those who deny the real Divinity of Christ. Firmly as I believe in Christ's real Divinity, not less firmly do I believe in his real humanity, and this leads me to remark that possessing, as Christ did, a real humanity, being made in all things like unto his brethren, we are not surprised to find, according to St. Luke, that He increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.' Indeed, had he not increased in wisdom and stature his real humanity might have been fairly challenged, but now that can no longer be doubted. The Gnostics have long since died out, and I know of no sect in all Christendom which now questions the real humanity of Christ. Christ, then, being very man as well as very God, it was only to be expected that he would sometimes speak as a man, and, being God, it was equally to be expected that he would at other times speak as God, and as we read the four Gospels these expectations are fully realized. Many things which he said and did only God could say and do, and other things which he said and did only man could say and do. When he said to Lazarus Come forth, and he came forth; and to the tempest, Peace be still, and there was a great calm,' he spoke as God, with unlimited power and authority; but when he said, Of that day and hour knows no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,' he spoke as a man with finite knowledge and limited capacity.

As man he knew not the day nor the hour of any future event. As God he knew everything. He knew the day and hour of his death. He knew the day and hour of his resurrection. He knew the future history of his church, and what she would have to suffer for his name's sake; and as a proof that there was no limit to his knowledge, that his understanding was infinite, he declared that he knew the Eternal Father, that he comprehended the infinite I AM saying, No man knows the Son but the Father, neither knows any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.' And again, As the Father knows me even so know the Father.' One of our poets has said, God only knows the love of God.' This is true, and not less true is it that God only knows the nature of God, by which I mean his eternal and untreated existence. None by searching can find out God, none can find out the Almighty unto perfection,' but Christ knew him to perfection, a fact which, to my mind, clearly demonstrates the Divinity of his person and his equality with the Father. You have only to keep in mind the twofold nature of Christ, the human and the Divine, in order to understand his twofold manner of speaking. Now as not knowing the day and hour of a future event, and anon as knowing the future history of the world and the very nature of the eternal and uncreated Jehovah. This, then, is my explanation of the passage in question. Is it satisfactory? Do you not see that Christ being a man, he would sometimes speak as a man; and, being God, he would at other times speak as God. Bearing this in mind you can have no difficulty in reconciling all the different passages you have quoted with the real Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ."

" Your explanation," he replied, " is satisfactory enough on your hypothesis. Believing, as you do, that Christ possessed a dual nature, human and Divine, there is no difficulty in reconciling all the opposite and apparently contradictory passages which are found in the records of his life with this duality of nature, but then you know Unitarians deny the Divinity altogether."

"Yes, I know they do, and it strikes me as marvelously strange and inconsistent that while they believe in his humanity because in some cases he spoke as a man, yet they refuse to believe in his Divinity, although in other cases he spoke as God, and only as God could speak. If they believe he was a man because he spoke as a man, surely they ought to believe he was God when he spoke as God. Why, I ask, do they make some of Christ's words evidence of his humanity, and take no notice whatever of those words and declarations of his which are proofs of his Divinity? To my mind it is neither fair nor honest to adduce passages from the New Testament as proofs of his real humanity, and then to ignore and keep back other passages which as clearly prove his real Divinity. Either take all the sayings and doings of Christ as proof of what he really was, or none at all."

" I agree with you that it is not fair to take ex parte' statements on any subject, especially on a subject of such vital importance as this now under discussion. Nor is it possible, I frankly admit, to come to any satisfactory conclusion on the subject before us, unless every statement made by Christ and by others respecting him be candidly examined with a view to its legitimate meaning. This, I am free to confess, I have not always done. I have relied solely on those passages which teach the humanity of Christ, and have Left unexamined those which declare his Divinity, and it may be that by thus taking this one-sided view of Christ, I have failed to see that he was Divine as well as human. However, let me now say that, having listened most carefully to your lucid expositions of the four difficult passages I brought before you—passages on which my Unitarianism was principally based, and having thoughtfully pondered all the arguments you have adduced during this discussion in favor of the Divinity of Christ, I shall no longer so boldly deny as I have done this great elementary truth of the gospel, and perchance I may henceforth believe with you that Christ was in very deed Divine as well as human."

I replied, " I am glad, truly glad, that our discussion has led to a result so far satisfactory as to make it probable that henceforth you may become as firm a believer in the Divinity of Christ as you were in the earlier period of your life, and if by the grace of God you should be led to believe in the Divinity, then I trust you will be led to believe in the atonement, of Christ, which you cannot do so long as the Divinity is denied. You, and the whole body to which you belong, know full well the utter impossibility of a man—only a man and nothing more—making an atonement for men, and by that atonement securing their salvation by faith therein; and, knowing this, you have uniformly rejected the atonement as inadmissible with your views of the person of Christ; but as soon as you believe in the Divinity of Christ you are warranted to believe in the atonement of Christ, and to make that atonement, as the Apostles did, the sole basis of your hope of eternal life. And here let me say, it is of little use that you believe in the Divinity of Christ unless you believe in the atonement of Christ. Believing in the Divinity of Christ will not save you, but believing in his atonement will. Many, it is to be feared, believe in the Divinity of Christ and yet are not saved, and that because they do not with the heart believe in the atonement of Christ. All who place their entire dependence on the atoning sacrifice, and say, 'Other refuge have we none,' all such believe to the saving of the soul; but if the Divinity be admitted and the atonement be rejected, the soul cannot be saved, for you must remember it is not Christ the God, nor Christ the man, which according to the Scriptures is the gospel of salvation, but Christ crucified.' We preach,' said Paul, Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

"But could not God save me without faith in the death of Christ as an atoning sacrifice?"

" It is not for me to Say what God could do or could not do. All I know is that even if he could save you without faith in the sacrifice of Christ, you would not be saved, for no words can express more fully the Divine purpose to save by faith, and by faith alone, than those uttered by our Lord himself. that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned' The matter of faith being thus settled by infallible authority, it is vain to ask whether God could not save you without faith."

" It may, perhaps, be vain to ask such a question, after the solemn declaration which Christ has made on the subject; still I cannot see clearly at present why faith in the death of Christ as an atoning sacrifice is essential to my salvation. Can you give me any reason or reasons Why salvation is not possible without faith?"

" I think I can; and first, where there is no faith in the sacrifice, the precious blood of Christ is treated as common blood, its preciousness is denied, and is regarded as of no more value than the blood of Jewish sacrifices which could never take away sin, and thus the unbeliever—to use the strong language of St. Paul—' tramples underfoot the Son of God, and counts the blood of the covenant an unholy thing.' This great sin, the enormity of which language is too feeble to describe, I take to be one reason why salvation is not possible without faith.

" Then, again, where there is no faith in the death of Christ there is no purification of the heart. Faith, according to the Scriptures, is the only thing which can purify the heart. Christ was preached unto the Gentiles to the end that by believing in him their hearts might be purified by faith. God, we are told, put no difference between them and the Jews in both cases, purifying their hearts by faith." Blessed,' says our Lord, are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' Now, as only the pure in heart can see God, and, as faith is the only thing which can produce this purity, it follows that faith is essential to the soul's salvation.

" Nor must it be forgotten that without faith there is no love to Christ, no appreciation of his sufferings and death, consequently no moral fitness to join the spirits of the just made perfect in the worship which they adoringly pay to him, and in the song which they sing to his praise: the song of redemption through his blood. Clustered around his throne, they cry, Thou, O Christ, was slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood.' No unbeliever can possibly unite in this act of adoration and love, and in this I see a third reason why, without faith, salvation is a moral impossibility. I now ask you, as a reasonable man, whether the command to believe on the Son of God is not a reasonable command, as well as a command full of pity and compassion? and I also ask you to tell me, if you can, how, on any just or moral principle, God could save you or any other man if you reject and trample underfoot the very means which, in his infinite wisdom and Mercy, he has appointed for your salvation. As well might a drowning man expect to be saved without making use of the only means of salvation within his reach, as for a sinner to expect to be saved without faith in the Lord Jesus Christ,



God's only appointed method of salvation. Surely you must see the impossibility of salvation without faith, and the absolute necessity of believing; not only in the Divinity of Christ, but in the death of Christ as an atoning and propitiatory sacrifice."

"As you have appealed to me as a reasonable man, and have put to me such solemn questions, I must confess that until now I never saw the absolute necessity of faith in the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin; nor did I ever see as I now see that without faith salvation becomes a moral impossibility. I thank you for the light which you have thrown on this great subject, and for giving me more exalted views of the person and work of Christ than I ever had before. I hope I shall be much profited by all that you have advanced in relation to the two great doctrines which you have attempted so fairly and fully to establish by your appeal to the Scriptures. But here I wish to ask you one question, and it is this:—Ought the Scriptures always to be regarded as the standard, and the only standard, of the Christian's faith and practice?"

"Certainly they ought. What other infallible authority is there to which an appeal can be made in matters of religion? I know of none. Reason is no infallible authority, for the world by wisdom, alias reason, knew not God.' Tradition is no infallible authority, for many a tradition is fiction and not fact. The Church of Rome is no infallible authority, for Pope has differed from Pope, Cardinal from Cardinal, Priest from Priest. The only standard of faith is the Scriptures. What, saith the Scriptures, should be the enquiry of every honest searcher after truth? To the law and to the testimony.' If any dogma of faith or any theory of religion agree not with the inspired records, it is because there is no truth in them, and my last word to you is this:—Believe nothing in religion but what is clearly stated in or fairly derived from the sacred Scriptures."

Here our discussion ended. We often met afterwards, but the subject was never again re-opened. Our subsequent interviews were as friendly as before we discussed the subject on which we so widely differed. There was no reason in the world why it should not be so. Theological discussions are no personal quarrels: they are simply battles for the truth, and, therefore, ought to be conducted without loss of temper or breach of friendship. Such was the manner in which this discussion was begun, carried on, and ended. What was the actual result of the controversy on the mind and heart of my brother it was not my happiness to know. I cannot, however, but cherish the hope that convictions were produced in his mind, both as to the Divinity of Christ and the sacrificial character of his death; but he was reticent. He said nothing afterwards as to what his convictions really were. Whether with the heart he cordially embraced the truths I so earnestly placed before him, or rejected them as before, I am not able to say. Since then he has passed away into the unseen world, and eternity alone will reveal and make known whether he died in the faith of Jesus, and passed into the heavens to be forever with the Lord.

And now for a few words to the readers of this discussion. Believing that the Divinity and atonement of Christ are both clearly revealed in the Scriptures; believing also that the cordial reception of these truths is essential to salvation, let me beseech you, as one concerned for your spiritual welfare, to keep aloof from the teaching of those who deny both these fundamental truths of the Gospel, and by so doing rob the Gospel of all its glory and make it of no effect. Search the Scriptures for yourselves. Look at the prophecies concerning Christ, especially at the 53 chapter of Isaiah's prophecies, where you will see the sacrificial and substitutionary character of Christ's death clearly set forth. Look at the Old Testament types and shadows, extending as they do over the long period of four thousand years, all of which pointed to Christ, who, at the end of the dispensation, appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Read the four Gospels, and mark attentively what Christ says of himself, and his mission to our world—that he came to give his life a ransom for many. Read the Epistles, and see what the holy Apostles say of Christ—how they speak of him as Mediator, Redeemer, and High Priest of our profession, who, after he had made his one offering, entered into heaven itself, with his own blood having obtained eternal redemption for us. Then look into the Apocalypse and see the wonderful visions which John had of Christ, The Patinas exile saw him crowned with Many crowns, and heard him say, "I am He that lives and was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." He looked again and saw all heaven worshipping Him, casting their crowns before him, and saying, "Thou art worthy to receive praise, and honor, and glory." He looked again and saw on "his vesture a name written, King of Kings, Lord of Lords." Again, I say, search the Scriptures, for they testify of Christ. See what they testify, believe what they testify, and, thus believing, you can have not so much as the shadow of a doubt of the Divinity of his person and the atoning efficacy of his death. Believing Scripture testimony instead of robbing him of his glory and placing him on the low level of our fallen humanity, as those do who do not believe the record which God has given of his Son, you will exalt him, you will extol him, you will regard him as worthy your loftiest adorations and highest praise, you will look upon him as infinitely above man or angel, and will henceforth regard him as "God over all, blessed for evermore." With the great Apostle of the Gentiles, you will think of him, and speak of him, and glory in him as "Christ all and in all."

Are the readers of this discussion parents? Make it known to your children that "Christ is all and in all." Are you Sunday School teachers? Teach those committed to your charge that "Christ is all and in all." Let our pulpits testify to the same fact, let there be no uncertain sound in a matter of such vital importance, let the thousands and hundreds of thousands who listen to pulpit instruction Sabbath after Sabbath be distinctly and unequivocally told that "Christ is all and in all." And to every nation, and people, and tribe under heaven, let it be proclaimed that in the economy of salvation deeds of law and works of righteousness avail nothing, and that "CHRIST IS ALL AND IN ALL."

FINIS.

[www.CreationismOnline.com](http://www.CreationismOnline.com)