

There certainly may be, we think there is, legitimate insurance, as there may be and is legitimate speculation; but there is not and cannot be any legitimate gambling. Stripped of every accidental feature, many of which aggravate its enormity a thousand fold; presented in its least objectionable form, it is still obnoxious to one charge: it necessarily involves the use of unrighteous means for the procuring of wealth, and consequently fastens the sin of covetousness on those who adopt them. Whether practised by the black-leg or the Christian, by the merchant or the jockey, by the street Arab or the fine lady, it violates those fundamental principles which underlie all property-rights: "Thou shalt not covet," and "Thou shalt not steal."

ARTICLE VII.

THE PHILANTHROPIC ARGUMENT FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To one who thoroughly believes in the divine authority of the Scriptures, it seems very wonderful that any disciple of Christ should doubt the obligation resting upon the Church to prosecute the work of Foreign Missions. It is conceivable that, in consequence of peculiar conjunctures of providential circumstances, impediments and hindrances may lie in the way of its practical performance. But that there should ever exist a theoretical denial of the duty of the Church to address herself to its accomplishment, or even a trace of scepticism upon that point, is a marvel of marvels. The command of her Lawgiver and King is so express that there would appear to be, when the ability is possessed and the opportunity is furnished to undertake the work of evangelising the nations, no discretion as to interpretation and no option as to obedience. The only alternatives are, unquestioning compliance, or downright disloyalty. The attempt to restrict the command, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," to the apostles themselves, is, for

obvious reasons, entirely unwarrantable. From the nature of the case, they could not compass its complete fulfilment. It was not in their power to reach every human being who was contemporary with themselves, and, of course, succeeding generations lay beyond the labors of those who, although inspired, were mortal men. It is plain that the command must be considered binding upon the Church as an evangelistic institute, as long as any portion of the race remains in ignorance of the provisions of the gospel. Every creature in every generation and in every clime ought to be evangelised; and until that is done, the command must continue to thunder in the ear of the Church: "Preach the gospel to every creature." Now this would be the case, were this command purely a positive one; were there no reason assigned for its imposition. A command may be arbitrary, like the injunction laid upon our first parents in respect to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; but if it proceed from God, his authority is involved, and no room is left for a question as to the duty to obey. A divine precept may be positive, but the duty of the creature to comply with it is moral. Were, then, the command of the Divine Master requiring his subjects to evangelise the world purely positive and arbitrary, the consideration by them of his supreme authority would be sufficient to suppress every rising suggestion of scepticism in regard to the reasons of obedience. The reasons for issuing a command and the reasons for obeying it are very different things.

But the wonder occasioned by the attitude of doubt and hesitancy on the part of some as to the work of evangelising the world, or, what is the same thing, of Foreign Missions, is enhanced, when we reflect that the reasons for the divine command which makes it obligatory are distinctly revealed, and would be conspicuous had they not been assigned. They are clear enough for any but the wilfully blind to see. The glory of God, the honor of Christ, and the advancement of the mediatorial kingdom, are reasons, from the divine side, which palpably underlie and enforce the terms of the Great Commission. They are all wrapped up in obedience to it. The authority of Christ, which sustains and illuminates it, ought to be sufficient to every mem-

ber of a society which has been redeemed by blood, and prepared by grace, for willing subjection to the mediatorial sway. But these patent inducements to obedience, added to the naked command, must serve impressively to commend it to every heart which is jealous for the divine name, and solicitous for the enthronement of Jesus in the affections of the human race. And this is not all. The reasons starting into life from the human side are scarcely less imperious for a prompt, earnest, and unflagging execution of the great command. The spiritual interests and the eternal destinies of mankind are implicated. Philanthropy, as well as piety, hastens the Church in complying with the vocation of her Head to evangelise a world lying in wickedness, and shadowed by death. The salvation of every human soul is conditioned upon its contact with the gospel of the grace of God. It alone is redemption for the lost. The heathen must have the gospel, or perish. The evangelisation of the heathen, and we may add of merely nominal Christians, as necessary to their salvation,—this is the great philanthropic argument for Foreign Missions. If the force and grandeur of an enterprise grounded in philanthropy is to be estimated by the nature of the end which it contemplates, that scheme must be eminently entitled to such a designation, which seeks not chiefly the rescue of men from temporal evils, and the melioration of their secular estate, but their salvation from eternal ruin, and their enjoyment of heavenly bliss. Not civilisation, but redemption; not science, but religion; not literature and the arts, but eternal life; not a remedy for the diseased and dying body, but a sovereign panacea for doomed and wretched souls; not disenfranchisement from human despotism, but emancipation from the tyranny of the devil and of sin; not deliverance from the miseries of earth, but from the pains of hell; not sublunary pleasure, honor, and wealth, but the imperishable glory and joy of heaven,—these are the boons which the foreign missionary—the ambassador of Jesus Christ, the almoner of evangelic blessings—offers, with outstretched hands, to the perishing hordes of our fallen race. This is philanthropy—noble, sublime, Godlike! Who that professes to be a lover of his fellow-men, would hesitate to engage in an enterprise so glorious?

Angels are postponed for human workers in the field of human wretchedness; and he who declines to have a share in this grandest of labors will miss an opportunity as irretrievable as it is splendid, will commit a blunder which must leave an ineffaceable mark upon his immortal career.

All this, it may be said, is but a begging of the question. We shall endeavor to show that it is but the anticipation of an irresistible conclusion. There are no doubt many concurrent causes of the painful, the appalling, indifference of some of the followers of Jesus to the work of Foreign Missions. Want of sufficient instruction by their spiritual guides, the absence of stated opportunities for the contribution of their means to this object, neglect of the study of God's word, the feebleness of the spiritual life, an imaginary inability arising from the straitness of their circumstances, a comparative estimate of the demands of the home and the foreign field, issuing in favor of the former to the entire exclusion of the latter from their regards, in opposition to the plain statement of Christ that the field is the world, and his imperative injunction to his Church to occupy it,—these reasons combine to produce the amazing apathy of many Christians to the noblest cause which can engage the affections, or enlist the energies, of men professing to be redeemed by Jesus' blood and renewed by Jesus' grace. But we have long been persuaded, and time only deepens the conviction, that one of the most potent causes of this strange insensibility to the claims of Foreign Missions is to be found in a want of reflection, or in a scepticism either latent and undefined, or pronounced and definite, in regard to the fact, so clearly disclosed in the Scriptures, that the evangelisation of the heathen is necessary to their salvation. Somehow or other, it is assumed that they can be saved without the gospel. This species of infidelity in the Church, which, so far as it goes, houghs the foreign missionary work, ought to be met, and we propose to make an humble contribution towards its removal. In discussing this subject, we will attempt, in the first place, to prove the necessity to the heathen of the gospel as a scheme of redemption; and, in the second place, the necessity to them of the knowledge of the gospel in order to their salvation.

I. The impression seems to prevail in the minds of some that the scheme of religion under which the heathen live does not necessarily debar them from the hope of salvation; that it need not be supposed to ensure their destruction; and that the benevolence of God will lead him to deal leniently with their failures to comply with its requirements.

1. In estimating the probability or improbability of this hypothesis, it will be requisite, in the first place, to fix as precisely as we can our conception of the religious constitution under which the heathen actually live. What is that form of the moral government of God to which they stand related?

The moral government of God may be considered as either simple and unmodified, or as modified by covenant elements graciously and supernaturally added to it as a naked dispensation of law. There is no evidence to show that under the former of these aspects the divine government has ever been, for any length of time, actually administered in relation to man. He never had an historical existence under a pure regimen of law. We may logically abstract the essential principles of moral government from the peculiar federal arrangements which have been superadded to it; but the Scriptures inform us that in its actual administration it has either been modified by the covenant of works, or by the covenant of grace. While therefore three general schemes of religion were possible, there have been only two under which man has historically existed—Natural Religion, and Supernatural Religion or the Gospel. Natural Religion was that of man as an innocent and unfallen being; and consisted of two elements,—the one naturally, the other supernaturally, revealed. The first comprised those essential principles of religion which were involved in the internal constitution of man—his reason and conscience, and in his relations to external nature as manifesting the existence and perfections of God. These, as they supposed no supernatural communications of God's will, we designate as naturally revealed. They were inlaid in the very nature of the human soul, or inscribed on the exquisite organism of the body and the magnificent fabric of the heavens and the earth. The second element of Natural Religion was the cove-

nant of works, which, as it could never have been reached by the natural reason, but was a product of a free and gracious determination of the divine will, could only have been imparted by a supernatural revelation.

The only other general scheme of religion which has been revealed to man is the Gospel, which is specifically distinguished by the fact that it is a religion of sinners. It contemplates man as fallen and ruined, and its very genius is that of a supernatural redemption. It provides a Saviour for the lost. Jesus incarnate, crucified, risen—this is its peculiar burden, its distinctive glory. As there have been two generic systems of religion, so there have been three distinct dispensations of the Gospel as a specific scheme. First in order came the Patriarchal, in which it pleased God to communicate to fallen man some knowledge of a Saviour by promise, and to preserve it in the minds of men by means of the institution of animal sacrifices. Next came the Jewish Dispensation, in which clearer information was imparted in regard to a Redeemer yet to come, and the sanctions of the law so clearly authenticated, and its requirements so tightly bound upon the conscience, as by their very stringency to drive the soul for deliverance to that promised Saviour. Lastly, inaugurated by our Lord himself, came the Christian Dispensation, in which the indestructible, but obscured and tarnished, truths of Natural Religion are republished and more authoritatively enforced, but the peculiar province of which is, by provisions wholly foreign to that scheme—by the vicarious righteousness of a crucified and risen Redeemer and the regenerating grace of his Spirit—to furnish salvation to condemned and polluted sinners.

Now, the question ought to be met, and, if possible, settled, under which of these modifications of the moral government of God does the case of the heathen fall? Are they to be regarded as living under the operation of one of the dispensations of the gospel, or as remanded to the original scheme of natural religion, or as related to the naked dispensation of law? It is well nigh universally conceded by evangelical writers, that they are neither under the Jewish, nor the Christian, dispensation of the gospel; but the position has been maintained, as by Richard Watson

in his Theological Institutes, that they ought to be considered as living under the Patriarchal; and that, as they may possibly have access, through some fragmentary traditions floating down through the ages, to the fountain of life in the first promise of redemption, they may be saved through faith in it. The first difficulty which this hypothesis encounters, is the fact that when a dispensation of religion has accomplished the temporary office assigned to it, and having reached the culminating point of its development and met the fulfilment of its end in an economy which succeeds and displaces it, it is, from the nature of the case, abrogated and passes away. There would appear to be an analogy, in this respect, between the succession of species in the realm of nature, and that of religious dispensations in the domain of grace. In either case, that which was once living and productive becomes fossilised and effete. It ceases to be an organ of life. If, for example, a Jew should now contend that he may be saved by the mere provisions of the Mosaic dispensation, he would assume that a religious constitution which has discharged its temporary function and has vanished away, is still living and operative. He would commit the mistake of seeking life in death. The same holds true of the supposed case of the heathen under the Patriarchal dispensation. That gave way to the Jewish, as it, in turn, lost its distinctive features and was merged into the Christian. In both instances, there was once held out the promise of a Saviour to come, of an atonement for sin to be made; and faith in that promise was ordained of God as the means of salvation. But that illustrious promise, reposing on the bosom of which patriarchs and prophets and all the saints of old lived in hope and died in peace, has been fulfilled; and its fulfilment was necessarily its extinction as a promise. The first advent of the Redeemer of mankind has been a fact for eighteen centuries, and, consequently, there is no promise of it now extended to the nations of the world. Faith in the first promise, therefore, would be faith in zero. Those who ground the salvability of the heathen in their relation to that promise rest it on a shadowy foundation. It is one thing to say that salvation was possible through a divinely ordained provision while it existed, and quite another

to say that it is possible through the same provision after it has ceased to exist. The Jew may tenaciously cling to the hope of salvation through a Saviour yet to come; and certain Christian writers may claim for the heathen—what, however, they themselves have never actually been known to maintain—that they may be saved in the same way; but that does not alter God's ordination which now conditions salvation upon faith in a Saviour who has already come.

The second difficulty in the path of the hypothesis under consideration, consists in the greater likelihood that the heathen, if they live under any dispensation of the gospel, exist under the Christian than under the Patriarchal. The reason is plain. The Christian religion has, at a time thousands of years subsequent to the promulgation of the first promise, been propagated by the most zealous, indefatigable, and, in all respects, the most extraordinary missionaries that ever published the knowledge of a system. The apostles, moved by the Holy Ghost, went everywhere preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and established distributing centres of evangelical knowledge in widely separated portions of the world. When we take into account, too, the fact that the providence of God seems to have wonderfully prepared the way for its dissemination; when we reflect that philosophy had reached the climax of its efforts and the maximum of its influence, and yet stood convicted as utterly unable to solve the momentous questions connected with the destinies of the race; when we remember the extraordinary facilities for the spread of a system arising out of the intercommunication between the most distant points of a vast empire controlled by a powerful central government: it is not difficult to see how a scheme professing to supply the deficiencies of the dominant religions and to meet the felt necessities of man, a scheme propagated by men, inspired of God, endowed with the gift of tongues, and supported by the most splendid miracles, would soon penetrate into every land, and be freely discussed by the advocates of every creed. If the extensive publication of religion is to be assumed as proof that it is widely known, this evidence of a general acquaintance with the provisions of Christianity by a large portion of the race is abun-

clantly clear. If it be urged that the impression of apostolic labors was not felt outside the limits of the Roman dominion, the answer is obvious, that this is taking for granted what from the nature of the case cannot be proved. The absence of Christian knowledge in any country is no evidence that the gospel was never preached there, for it is certain that the possession of Christianity has been lost in some of the very regions where it was not only originally established, but where for centuries it vigorously flourished. And here the dilemma occurs: either the knowledge of Christianity has been lost in certain parts of the world where it once obtained, or it is in part still preserved. If lost, then, *a fortiori*, it is more probable that the knowledge of the promise given to Adam has perished. If retained, then why contend for the access of the heathen to the provisions of the Patriarchal dispensation, when it is conceded that they are in contact with those of the Christian? But it is confessed that they are not under the Christian. The admission, in view of the facts which have been signalised, is fatal to the supposition that they are under the Patriarchal. If they have lost more distinct and recent knowledge, where is the probability that they possess the more ancient and obscure?

It does not affect this argument to say that the offering of sacrifices by the heathen supposes some acquaintance, through the medium of tradition, with the provisions of the first dispensation of the gospel. For, in the first place, the fact which has been signalised would no more prove their knowledge of the Patriarchal, than of the Christian, economy. In the second place, the sacrifices offered by the heathen are, materially considered, to a great extent at least, different from those which God required. In the third place, the ministers who offer them in behalf of the people were never appointed by God, and as no sinner has a warrant to discharge priestly functions for sinners except in consequence of a divine vocation, these intruders into the sacerdotal office are as profane as their sacrifices are worthless. In the fourth place, no sacrifice ever had any virtue except by reason of a typical relation, divinely ordained, between it and the only intrinsically efficacious sacrifice—that of Christ, the sole Re-

deemer of mankind. And it is needless to show that the sacrificial offerings of the heathen are utterly destitute of any such characteristic. This must have been true of the heathen previously to the first advent of the Saviour; and as no type has a retrospective value, it is nothing less than mockery of the sad condition of the heathen since that event to urge that their caricatures of gospel sacrifices can now possess any pretensions to saving efficacy.

There is another consideration which may be briefly mentioned as damaging to the maintainers of this hypothesis. It flows from their inconsistency with themselves. In the same breath, as could easily be evinced, they hold to the salvability of the heathen in consequence of their access to the first promise, that is, in consequence of their ability to know something of the gospel, and contend that they may be saved through the indirect application to them of the benefits of the atonement, that is, if the language mean anything, without their ability to know anything of the gospel. They are salvable through a knowledge of it: they are salvable without a knowledge of it.

This hypothesis has been discussed at some length, because we regard the supposition that the heathen live under one of the dispensations of the gospel as furnishing the most plausible support for the tenet of their salvability. But it is not necessary to pursue this special argument any further. The fact is, that it is of very little importance whether we can show or not that it is possible for the heathen to know somewhat of the gospel through some lingering fragment of a tradition concerning what has been called the *Protevangelium*, or that a saving knowledge of it was at any time in the past communicated to that portion of mankind which is conceded on all hands to lie under the pall of heathenish darkness, and the actual condition of which is admitted by Mr. Watson himself to be "affectingly bad." Whether they never had any other knowledge of a Saviour than that which sprung like a faint dawn from the first promise, or whether they subsequently received clearer light from Jewish proselytes and Christian missionaries—all this avails nothing. It is sufficient to know that they are now in utter ignorance of the first principles

of the gospel of Christ. This fact the Apostle Paul establishes in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and employs it as lying at the root of his whole succeeding argument. To say that the heathen are under a dispensation of the gospel, even were it so, is to talk of a blind man under the beams of the sun, or a dead man under the light of life.

It deserves to be added, that, if the doctrine were true that the heathen live under one of the dispensations of the gospel, the question as to the salvability of the heathen loses all significance; for the specific difference of the case of those who are denominated heathen is, according to general admission, the fact that they are destitute of the knowledge of the gospel. It is a wretched solecism to talk of the salvability of the heathen, if by the term *heathen* are meant those who live under a dispensation of the gospel and may have access to the promise of salvation which it contains. Who would ever dream of raising the inquiry whether such persons may be saved? It would amount to nothing more than this: Are those in a salvable condition who may be saved by the gospel? The conclusion to which this argument has fairly conducted us is, that the heathen cannot be regarded as living under one of the dispensations of the gospel.

2. But if they do not exist under the gospel, or, what is the same thing, under the operation of the moral government of God as modified by the covenant of grace, the question still presses, under what religious constitution do they live? Two remaining suppositions exhaust the possibilities in the case: Either the heathen are under the provisions of natural religion; that is, as has been shown already, of moral government as modified by the covenant of works; or they are related to a naked dispensation of law; that is of moral government, simple and unmodified by federal arrangements. That they do not live under the operation of the covenant of works may be evinced, in the first place, by a mere statement of the case. Natural religion, as involving in addition to the essential principles of moral government, the element of a covenant, was the religion of Adam in innocence, and potentially the religion of his race. The threatening of death was not in itself considered one of the distinguishing peculiarities

of the covenant, for it is evident that it was common to it with a simple government of law. A breach of the law, no matter how administered, must have issued in death. The effect of the federal arrangement upon that threatening was, in case of the fall of Adam, to entail it upon all his posterity, antecedently to their own conscious and personal transgressions. His guilt would be their guilt. The distinctive features of the covenant were the recapitulation of the race in a federal head and the promise to him and them, in the event of his obedience for a limited time of probation, of an indefectible life. It was a covenant of life, the rewards of which—justification and adoption—were suspended upon the temporary obedience of the federal head and representative. He fell; and the results of his fall to his descendants were the destruction of his federal headship as a ground of hope, and the forfeiture of the promise of eternal life. All that was distinctive of the covenant as one of life was gone. Nothing but the penalty remained as the lamentable inheritance of the race. The covenant having been broken, the execution of the sentence of death became simply a legal measure. The race, swept, by the fall of their head, from the platform of the covenant, were remanded to the original relation of individual subjects to the naked rule of law. But it must be remembered that this subjection of the race to the unmodified sway of law took place under a tremendous disadvantage. They were no longer innocent, with the prospect of enjoying reward so long as they might continue obedient. They were already guilty, and passed under the operation of a violated and condemning law. It is obvious that a covenant, as a purely positive institution, when once broken by a federal head and representative, is abrogated both for himself and his constituency. The failure of one of the parties to comply with its conditions dissolves the bond of the contract. To say, accordingly, that the heathen still live under the covenant of works, or what is the same thing, under the scheme of natural religion, in its integrity, is to say that they still enjoy the promise of life in Adam, their federal head; that sinners exist under a religious constitution which, from the nature of the case, was peculiar to a con-

dition of innocence. That they are under the penalty of the covenant proves nothing. The penalty is not the totality of the covenant. It is clear as day that no heathen man can now be justified under the operation of the covenant of works. That is all for which it is worth while to contend.

The view, however, has been maintained by certain distinguished Calvinistic theologians—as by Edward Fisher in his *Marrow of Modern Divinity*, and his annotator, the celebrated Thomas Boston—that the covenant of works was renewed and republished at Sinai. And even Dr. Charles Hodge, in his great work on *Systematic Theology*, says: “It [the Mosaic covenant] contained, as does also the New Testament, a renewed publication of the original covenant of works.” If by this it is meant that God at Sinai republished the moral law which, of course, had been embodied in the covenant of works, and reënfforced upon sinners the penalty of that covenant, what is said is true; but it is certainly extraordinary to hold that that implied a renewal of the original covenant. Something more is evidently conveyed by this language, to wit, that God has renewed the covenant of works with the individuals of the race, suspending the promise of life upon the condition of personal obedience. From that position we are obliged to dissent, and to maintain the view that the covenant of works never has been renewed with man since its violation by Adam.

The covenant of works cannot be confounded with a simple dispensation of law. It involved a serious modification of pure moral government. It was an arrangement of divine providence superadded to mere law, and containing peculiar and distinctive elements which contradistinguished it from a simple legal economy. The question, therefore, of the renewal of that covenant after its violation, is the question of its renewal as to these peculiar and distinctive features, and not the question whether the provisions which were common between it and naked law were reënfforced. That the covenant, as receiving its denomination from its characteristic elements, has never been republished, will appear from the following considerations:

- (1.) There was no promise made to sinners at Sinai, nor ever

since in the Old Testament or the New. of an indefectible life upon the condition of perfect personal obedience. They were already spiritually dead, and therefore could not obey and live, even in the lowest—the contingent sense. They were already under the curse of the covenant, and therefore could not expect its blessing. Its threatening was already fulfilled upon them, and therefore they could not be subjects of its promise. A promise to the dead that they should live if they would deliver themselves from death; a promise to the condemned that they should be acquitted if they would discharge themselves from condemnation; a promise to the accursed that they should be blessed if they would free themselves from the curse; in a word, a promise contradictory to facts, and suspended upon impossible conditions, is something which passes comprehension. The demand of the law for perfect obedience from those who have disobeyed it, and so have disabled themselves for obedience, is not only conceivable, but legitimate and necessary. But the promise of a broken covenant that it would give life to its violators is quite a different thing. It would be, in the same breath, to curse and to bless.

(2.) The limitations involved in the condition of the covenant of works certainly were not reappointed at Sinai. There was no limitation as to persons in a federal head. Federal head there was, and could be, none. Adam could not be, for he had already failed, and in all probability had himself been saved from the effects of his infidelity to his trusteeship through another federal head—Jesus Christ, the second Adam, the representative of sinners in a different covenant. But God appointed no other federal head of a legal covenant at Sinai; and as he has never dealt with men, in an economy contemplating the acquisition of life, except in a covenant-head, the doctrine that he reinstated the covenant of works at Sinai, or has ever done it since, is destitute of foundation. A covenant without a covenant-head is inadmissible.

Further, there was no limitation as to time. No definite obedience was assigned to man, as at first. God did not say at Sinai, Obey for a limited period, and I will justify you. What

he did was to reënforce the moral law, and then to publish the covenant of grace as the method of escape from its condemning sentence.

(3.) There was no imposition of a specific test of obedience—not a word about the tree of knowledge, nor any other positive institute, unless the position be taken that the positive institutions of the Mosaic economy were appointed as special tests of legal obedience. But that view would be opposed by insuperable difficulties. First, the covenant supposed to be so formed would not have been the original covenant of works, but one entirely new, as embracing characteristic elements different from those of the old. Secondly, it would not have been made through a federal head; for although Moses was in a certain subordinate sense a mediator, he surely was not a covenant-head and representative. Thirdly, a covenant involving as special tests of obedience the positive institutions of Judaism, could have had no practical bearing upon the race in general. And fourthly, the positive ordinances of the Mosaic economy had reference chiefly to the covenant of grace; they were typical of redemption through Christ. They therefore could not have had a peculiar relation to a covenant of a wholly opposite character.

(4.) There was, in the Sinaitic transaction, not a word about the tree of life in connexion with personal obedience. The only Tree of Life of which there was any intimation was one provided by another and a better covenant: one that grows, not in an earthly Eden, but in the paradise of God. God has never given to sinners any sacramental pledge, nor any promise of life, apart from Christ the Redeemer.

If now, as has been sufficiently evinced, there was, in the transaction at Sinai, no reappointment of the distinctive elements which characterised the covenant of works, there could have been no renewal of that covenant with man. All the proofs advanced in favor of its reinstatement amount only to this—that God reënforced by new and impressive sanctions upon the conscience that eternal and indestructible rule of righteousness to which the covenant of works had been superadded, and from which it had been torn away by the progenitor and representa-

tive of the race. The easy conditions of obedience, the facile terms upon which justification and eternal life might have been secured, which exuberant grace had annexed to the moral law, were stripped from it by the reckless infatuation of man; and it was left in its naked majesty and sternness, speaking no longer to the soul in the gentle whispers of love, but in the thunder-tones of retributive justice. The original covenant of works is forever abrogated as a covenant of promise, to all those for whom its condition has not been fulfilled by Christ, the second Adam: to them nothing of it remains but the penalty which entails spiritual and eternal death. In maintaining this view we are sustained by the opinion of Dr. Thornwell, that man, since the fall, is related to the covenant of works only as he is condemned under its penalty, having forfeited all connexion with its promise; and that the race, in their natural sinful condition, are treated as individuals under the general principles of moral government.

Let us now look in the face the mournful conclusion to which the argument thus far has led us. The heathen are not under the gospel scheme, in either of its dispensations; they are not under the scheme of natural religion, in its integrity, as involving the covenant of works; they are not under the simply legal scheme of unmodified moral government, as yet unviolated as to its requirements, and extending the promise of reward so long as obedience is rendered. What then? Nothing remains but to regard them as under the operation of a broken and condemning law.

There is no escape from this conclusion, so far as we can see, except upon one or the other of two suppositions: either that the Adamic race does not include the whole population of the globe, that there are races which did not descend from Adam; or, that the whole human race, although admitted to have sprung from Adam, are not involved in the guilt of his first sin.

In regard to the former of these suppositions, we would remark, in the first place, that it is an unproved hypothesis; and so long as it continues in that posture, it cannot be considered as invalidating the natural and ordinary interpretation attaching to the scriptural account of the origin of man. In the second place, the

evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the scientific hypothesis of the specific unity of the race, as derived from philology, ethnology, anatomy, psychological and moral considerations; and especially from the physical law of hybridity based upon a well-nigh universal induction of facts. In the third place, not only the unbroken *consensus* of the Christian Church, but the *usus loquendi* of the world at large, would have to be revolutionised in order to be accommodated to this hypothesis. The presumption against it, furnished by this consideration, is enormous; and another presumption, springing from the common beliefs and traditions of mankind, is equally powerful in opposition to it. In the fourth place, even were this hypothesis confirmed, it could exert no practical effect upon the conclusion of the preceding argument—that the heathen are under the scope of a violated and condemning law. If any general fact has been derived from a wide and all-embracing collection of particular instances, admitting of no exceptions, it is the universality of original sin. Now this universal effect must have a corresponding cause, and if there be extra-Adamic races, they must have had a relation to their progenitors similar to that which the descendants of Adam sustain to him. They must have sinned and fallen in them. No other conclusion can be entertained in consistency with the justice of God's moral government, unless we fly to the hypothesis of an ante-mundane existence of mankind—an hypothesis contradicted alike by the scriptural record and the facts of human consciousness.

The second supposition—that the whole human race, although conceded to have descended from Adam, are not implicated in the guilt of his first sin—might, did time permit, be disproved by the ordinary arguments, drawn from universal experience and observation, in favor of the fact that original sin is an all-conditioning law affecting the moral attitude of the race; and the irresistible inference, that it must have had its root in the guilt derived from a federal head and representative. It is sufficient to say that the hypothesis is flatly contradicted by the explicit testimony of God's word. No true believer in the authority of that word requires any further proof.

We return, then, to our conclusion, that the religious constitution under which the heathen live is one which relates them to the essential principles of moral government, and the sentence of a broken and condemning law. This is their condition by nature: in it they are born. But the Scriptures do not represent them as simply condemned for their participation in the federal guilt of Adam's sin. They declare that the heathen are condemned also for their own personal and conscious violations of law, and that they perish on that account. No more need be done in establishing this position than briefly to advert to the argument of the Apostle of the Gentiles in the Epistle to the Romans. He starts out with the tremendous assumption that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness." He then convicts the heathen as ungodly and unrighteous, and presents a portraiture of their moral condition which exhibits heathenism, not in the light of a system to be apologised for and excused as the result of weakness, but as the culmination of abominable crime. Not only had they apostatised from God; not only had they deliberately rejected him and spurned the patent evidences of his existence, perfections, and government flaming in the heavens and the earth; but they had proceeded to the last development of iniquity in substituting in the place of their divine Maker the vilest creations of their own debauched imaginations and the most contemptible objects of sense. What was this but to worship themselves, and what further insult is it possible for the creature to fling in the face of his God? The peculiar enormity of sin lies, not simply in the substitution and enthronement of the creature in the place of God, but in making that creature the sinner himself. For he is conscious of the fact of his own guilt, pollution, and degradation. He knows it not by observation, by external perception, or by report; he knows it by the sure, clear, indubitable testimony of his own consciousness. And in spite of such a conviction, to elevate himself to the place of Him whom he ought to be led by the indestructible laws of his being to acknowledge as his Creator and Supreme Ruler; to enthrone himself in the seat of One who is infinite beauty, holiness, and glory—this is the very climax of

outrageous and atrocious wickedness. He who would thus raise himself to the highest summit of heaven deserves to be plunged into the lowest abyss of hell. To worship any creature is bad enough ; but for a conscious sinner to worship himself implies a degree of depravity, the forgiveness of which would almost seem to be incompetent to almighty power and infinite grace. Such is the fearful ungodliness which the Apostle ascribes to the heathen ; and their unrighteousness was akin to it. There is no obligation which binds man to his fellow-man which they did not, like swine, trample into the mire. This picture which Paul so graphically paints of the heathen of his day, universal observation proves to be applicable to the heathen of this age. Now, argues the Apostle, they who sin without law shall perish without law, for they are a law to themselves. Here there is no denial that the heathen are transgressors of law, but only that they are violators of a specific law. They sin not against the requirements which it is the peculiar province of the Scriptures to enforce, since they could have no access to them. But they sin against the moral law inlaid in their nature, and thundering in the judgments of conscience. The standard of right and wrong, by which they judged either their own thoughts or their fellow-men, is the standard by which God will judge them. They transgress the law of God, and, therefore, justly perish.

If, then, the conclusion is irrefragably established, that the heathen live under the operation of a violated and condemning law, the argument against their salvability without the gospel is a short one. It is worthy of note, that Paul in his elaborate argument touching justification, presents the negative branch of it in one brief sentence. The question being, Can a sinner be justified by the works of the law? he answers no, "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." That is all he deemed it necessary to say. And it was enough. A scheme which convicts its subjects of guilt, and provides no relief from its condemnation, is manifestly incompetent to justify. It involves a palpable contradiction to say that the law which condemns can acquit; that the law which kills can make alive; that the law which curses can bless. Salvation from the effects of violated law is only possible

through an extra-legal and remedial scheme. There is but one such scheme. If a competent righteousness is necessary in order to justification, and the gospel alone furnishes it; if there is but one Mediator between God and men, through whom they can be saved, and the gospel alone reveals him; if atonement, regeneration, and sanctification are indispensable to fellowship with God, and the gospel alone provides them: it is perfectly clear that without the gospel there is no salvation to sinners. The heathen are sinners; therefore, the gospel is necessary to their salvation. They who hold the contrary are reduced to the absurdity of maintaining that those who are condemned by an infinite law can deliver themselves from its curse; that those who are dead in trespasses and sins can raise themselves to life; that those who are polluted with lust and stained with crime can exalt themselves to communion with God, and to the society of angels and of saints. Thus, in the strong words of John Owen, "they lay men in Abraham's bosom who never believed in the Son of Abraham; make them overcome the Serpent who never heard of the Seed of the woman; bring goats into heaven who never were of the flock of Christ—never entered by him the Door; make men please God without faith, and obtain the remission of sins without the sprinkling of the blood of the Lamb; to be saved without a Saviour, redeemed without a Redeemer, to become the sons of God and never know their elder Brother."

The attempt would be hopeless to evade the force of this argument by urging that the heathen may repent, and endeavor to furnish sincere obedience to the requirements of the law. Surely such a doctrine ought to be left to Socinians and Pelagians. The very core of a sinner's case is that, apart from a competent atonement and regenerating grace, he cannot repent. He is spiritually dead, and impotence must characterise all his attempts to perform spiritual acts. In regard to the ability of the heathen to render sincere obedience to the law, it is enough to say that it is simply absurd to suppose that a conscious transgressor can furnish any obedience, which could be considered acceptable by the divine Ruler, of a violated and condemning law. But were these suppositions not convicted by the most superficial reflection

of being mere dreams, of what conceivable account would such possibilities be, in the absence of any evidence that they are ever reduced to the semblance of fact in the actual condition of the heathen? The first instance of a penitent heathen, sincerely endeavoring to keep the law of God impressed upon his conscience, has yet to be afforded. It is, therefore, worse than idle to ventilate such views. They can only serve to weaken the efforts which the Church is making, in the face of other and formidable difficulties, to communicate to the pagan world that gospel of the grace of God, without which repentance for sin and obedience to the law are, according to the testimony of Scripture, entirely impossible.

II. We have thus endeavored, by a method of investigation which, to our mind, appeared to be the most satisfactory and conclusive, to consider the awfully interesting subject of the salvability of the heathen world. If, by a careful and painstaking consideration of all the suppositions which are possible in the case, success has been attained in ascertaining precisely the religious constitution under which they live, the way is cleared for a definite and certain answer to the transcendently important question as to the necessity of the gospel to the salvation of millions of our race. And here the discussion might be arrested, were it not for the consideration that it would, in that case, be liable to the charge of being incomplete. It would be urged that the whole issue has not been squarely met.

1. Not sceptics and indifferentists, but evangelical theologians, representing the doctrinal views of large and influential sections of the Church, take the ground that, admitting the necessity of the gospel, as a scheme of redemption, to the salvation of the heathen, it is not proved that the actual knowledge of that scheme is requisite to that end. On the contrary, it is held that they may be saved without it; that the benefits of redemption, though not directly applied to them, which would suppose some acquaintance with them, are rendered indirectly available to their case. The argument seems to be analogous to that which is urged in favor of the salvation of infants dying in infancy. As they are

incapable of knowing the provisions of the gospel and of exercising faith in them, and have never, from the nature of the case, rejected the atonement, they are indirectly saved on the ground of the Saviour's merits. So the heathen, never having heard of Christ, are not capable of unbelief in him and a rejection of his atoning sacrifice, and, therefore, may be saved through the indirect application to them of the virtue of that sacrifice. But what is predicable of infants is not predicable of adults, as the advocates of this theory admit when refuting the objections to infant baptism derived from their inability to believe; and as they grant that adult heathen are voluntary transgressors of moral law, the foundation of the fancied analogy is destroyed. It must be shown that they are indirectly saved by virtue of the atonement notwithstanding their conscious sins. Their actual transgressions must be accounted for; they start up in the path of this hypothesis, and "will not down at its bidding."

If it should be said that, as the merits of Christ's obedience may, according to the representations of the Scriptures, indirectly enure to the benefit of the unfallen angels, the same thing may be true in regard to the heathen; we reply, in the first place, that what may be affirmed of holy beings, may be unsusceptible of affirmation as to sinners. The cases are not parallel. In the second place, if the unfallen angels are benefited by the work of Christ, they know it. They, assuredly, are not ignorant of redemption. The cases, in this respect also, are not alike. In the third place, it is the "elect angels," and not non-elect devils, who would be so benefited, and the Arminian ought to be the last man to press the analogy.

But let us try to get an accurate conception of the view of those who contend that the heathen may be saved without the knowledge of the gospel. What, exactly, do they mean? Our information shall be derived from no less authorities than Mr. Wesley and Mr. Watson. They hold, that the purpose of redemption was not "an after-thought," but that it was a provision against the results of the fall; that Christ's atonement was not offered to secure the salvation of some, but the salvation of all; that the guilt of Adam's sin—that is, the liability of his descend-

ants to the consequences of that sin—is removed from every infant, whether dying in infancy, or surviving to maturity; that “a degree of spiritual life,” according to one writer, is imparted to every man, or, according to another, a portion of spiritual death is removed from every man, and that the grace of the Holy Spirit is communicated to all, sufficient to enable them—to do what? In the case of those who know the gospel, it is sufficient to enable them to believe in Christ. But in the case of those who do not know the gospel, what does this sufficient grace enable them to do? Manifestly, not to believe in Christ, for “how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?” and these writers are conscious of the difficulties in the way of maintaining that position. What then? It enables them to obey, for justification, the moral law as relaxed and accommodated to their moral strength. This, then, according to this doctrine, which has not been caricatured, but fairly represented, is the salvability of the heathen. They may, through atoning provisions, secure their justification by personal obedience to law!

It may be thought that we have not correctly exhibited the doctrine of these writers, inasmuch as the position last indicated is inconsistent with that previously discussed in this article, namely, that the heathen live under the patriarchal dispensation of the gospel, and may therefore be saved by faith in the first promise which revealed Christ as a Saviour. That there has been no misrepresentation of their views will appear from the words of Mr. Watson. In considering the question of the salvability of the heathen nations, he says:*

“The dispensation of religion under which all those nations are to whom the gospel has never been sent, continues to be the patriarchal dispensation. That men were saved under that in former times we know, and at what point, if any, a religion becomes so far corrupted, and truth so far extinct, as to leave no means of salvation to men, nothing to call forth a true faith *in principle*, and obedience to what remains known or knowable of the original law, no one has the right to determine, unless he can adduce some authority from Scripture.”

A little further on, he remarks:

*Theological Institutes, Vol. II., p. 445.

“As we find it a doctrine of Scripture that all men are responsible to God, and that the ‘whole world’ will be judged at the last day, we are bound to admit the accountability of all, and with that, the remains of law, and the existence of a merciful government toward the heathen on the part of God: With this the doctrine of St. Paul accords. No one can take stronger views of the actual danger and the corrupt state of the Gentiles than he: yet he affirms that the divine law had not perished wholly from among them; that though they had received no revealed law, yet they had a law ‘written on their hearts;’ meaning, no doubt, the traditional law, the equity of which their consciences attested; and, farther, that though they had not the written law, yet that ‘by nature,’ that is, ‘without an outward rule, though this also, strictly speaking, is by preventing grace,’ (*Wesley’s Notes in loc.*) they were capable of doing all the things contained in the law. He affirms, too, that all such Gentiles as were thus obedient, should be ‘justified, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, according to his gospel.’ The possible obedience and the possible ‘justification’ of heathens who have no written revelation, are points, therefore, distinctly affirmed by the apostle, in his discourse in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.”

These quotations are sufficient to show, that the inconsistency is not with us, but with those who hold that men may be saved by faith in a promise of the gospel, and at the same time justified by personal obedience to law.

Now, in the first place, it is clear that the whole theory has its root in the doctrine of universal atonement: and that doctrine is liable to the fatal objection that it makes a vicarious atonement secure possible and not actual results—a view which is opposed to the teachings of both the Old Testament and the New, in regard to the nature and effects of atonement. On that consideration we will not dwell; but as the doctrine of universal atonement can only be established by a disproof of the Calvinistic doctrine of Election, and that is pronounced to be a monstrous tenet, we are justified in fighting a battle or two on the soil of Africa. We might urge the unwarrantableness of conditioning an eternal purpose of God upon the contingent acts of men, as is done by those who make the foresight of faith and good works and perseverance therein to the end the condition of the decree of election; we might insist that election is in order to faith and good works, and not they in order to it; we might

show that faith and good works are constituent elements of the salvation to which men are elected, and, therefore, not conditions precedent to it; but we will content ourselves with applying the incisive edge of Occam's razor—the law of parcimony—to the neck of this alleged election. According to that law no more causes are to be postulated for an effect than are necessary to its production, and surely divine wisdom is not chargeable with its violation. Now, if God foresees that some men will persevere in faith and good works unto the end, he foresees that they will get to heaven, for that is the end. What then, we crave to know, would be the use of a decree electing them to get there? Echo answers, what? Further, if God elects those to be saved, who, he foresees, will persevere in faith unto the end, he elects the heathen to be saved on that condition—that is, he foresees that they will persevere in that which they never began to do. For it is conceded that they cannot believe in Christ. Either, then, they are saved without being elected, or there are two elections—one for the Christian and the other for the heathen. Neither of these positions can possibly be true. And as the Arminian and the Calvinistic doctrines of election are the only contestants worth mentioning, the disproof of the former is the proof of the latter. That being established, the doctrine of universal atonement goes by the board, and with it the inference from it of the salvability of the heathen.

In the second place, the supposition of the removal of Adam's guilt from every infant makes it entirely innocent; for, *ex hypothesi*, it is not guilty in Adam, and it cannot contract guilt by voluntary sin. It, therefore, has no guilt. But the evangelical Arminian theory holds that the infant who will live is infected with the corruption of original sin, which will develop into actual transgressions. He is, therefore, entirely innocent and depraved at one and the same time!

In the third place, the supposition of the impartation of a degree of spiritual life, or the removal of a portion of spiritual death, involves a contradiction. It makes a man partly dead and partly alive at one and the same time. Further, it entangles the Arminian theory in fatal inconsistency. For it maintains the

necessity of regeneration, which, if it mean anything, is the communication of spiritual life. Those, then, who are already partly alive, are by regeneration made alive. He is born, who lived before his birth.

In the fourth place, the hypothesis, for it is nothing more, of a relaxation of the moral law, and its accommodation to the strength of the subject, is not only opposed to the plain teachings of Scripture, but may be easily convicted of absurdity. For it represents the eternal and immutable law of God as a variable and fluctuating measure—a mere Lesbian rule. As the degrees of strength possessed by its subjects are innumerable, it becomes a graduated scale upon which are registered as many standards of morality as there are shades of difference in the moral condition of men. Such a doctrine would strain the credulity of the “Jew Apella.”

While, however, we have felt constrained, by what we conceive to be the interests of truth, to resist these views as unscriptural, we rejoice to know that many of those who hold them are active and zealous prosecutors of the work of Foreign Missions. The solution of the apparent anomaly is found in the fact, that though they maintain the opinion of the possible salvation of the heathen through the light which they possess, they see clearly that they are not actually saved in consequence of it. They are true philanthropists, and will not allow a mere theory to withdraw their minds from the real misery of the heathen world, or to render them insensible to the command of their Divine Master to his Church to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. What ought to be the zeal, in that great enterprise, of those who hold not only that the heathen are not, but that they cannot be, saved without a knowledge of the gospel imparted by the Christian Church!

2. In opposition to the doctrine that the heathen may be saved without a knowledge of the gospel, we briefly submit the following explicit declarations of God's word, for the whole question is one of divine testimony: (1.) There is no saving knowledge of God without the knowledge of Christ. “This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ,

whom thou hast sent." Paul, addressing the Ephesian Christians, speaks very precisely to the case of the heathen in their unevangelised condition. The passage is decisive as to the matter in hand. "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." The argument of the apostle is: While you were heathen, you had no connection with the Church of God—you were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel;" therefore you had no knowledge of the gospel as a promissory institute in contradistinction from the law as a condemning scheme—you were "strangers to the covenants of promise;" therefore you had no acquaintance with Christ, and could have had no saving relation to him—you were "without Christ;" therefore you did not know the true God and were destitute of true religion—you were "without God;" and therefore, lastly, you were in a lost and hopeless condition—you had "no hope." These are clearly the steps in the apostle's argument. To be without the Church is to be without the gospel; to be without the gospel is to be without Christ; to be without Christ is to be without God; and to be without God is to be without hope.—no Church, no gospel; no gospel, no Christ; no Christ, no God; no God, no hope. (2.) There is no salvation except by faith in Christ, and no faith in him without some knowledge of him. The very terms of salvation which the Lord Jesus enjoined it upon the Apostles to proclaim to every creature are: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; but he that believeth not shall not see life." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," said the apostle to the pagan jailor, "and thou shalt be saved." The implication is clear that no heathen could be saved in any other way. But none can believe on Christ who have no knowledge of him. "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall

call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" (3.) There is no conversion and no sanctification apart from the word of the gospel, and no salvation without them. "Being born again by the word of God." "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord."

These declarations of the Sacred Scriptures are not to be confined to any section of the race; they are applicable universally to mankind—to the heathen and the nominal Christian alike. The Cross of Christ is the magnet of the world. "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." There are not two gospels, one for us and one for the heathen. "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." There are not two Christs. Than the name of Jesus, "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." There are not different salvations for the Caucasian, the Mongolian, and the Negro. "As I live, saith the Lord, all flesh shall see my glory"—"all flesh shall see my salvation." That glory, that salvation, is Christ. To know him by faith is to be saved; not to know him is to perish.

This, then, is the great philanthropic argument for Foreign Missions—the evangelisation of the heathen as necessary to their salvation. Who is there that loves the Lord Jesus and the souls of his fellow-men who would not respond to this mighty, this irresistible, plea for the diffusion of the gospel, in the profoundest depths of his heart? If myriads of our race depend for their salvation upon their knowledge of the gospel, and we possess the inestimable boon, who would not exclaim, Hold not back the proclamation of redemption from the slaves of sin and death and hell? Let it fly upon the wings of every wind, and be borne upon the crest of every rolling billow, to the utmost limits of the world!