

POSTMASTER: Please send address changes to:
THE BAPTIST HERITAGE
2200 West Michigan Avenue
Pensacola, FL 32526-2379

PERIODICALS
POSTAGE
PAID AT
PENSACOLA,
FLORIDA

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

a good place to visit
but
a better place to belong

THE BAPTIST HERITAGE

JULY 20, 2004

What The Dead Man Wrote

And Its Undeniable Role In The Fooling Of The Foolish

This paper is mailed primarily to preachers, more specifically, to Baptist pastors. It is not the deliberate purpose of this editor to be offensive; yet, there is no desire to be neutral in the issues addressed. The sincere motivation is to challenge believers, especially Baptist pastors, into considering seriously the doctrinal implications of practices that are all too often accepted through an emotional response to apparent numerical success or in humble subservience to the recommendation of that exalted *invisible, universal, spiritual, un-assembled* congregation known as the "The Leadership."

The autonomy of Baptist churches and the independence of Baptist preachers are tenets so proverbial as to be understood axiomatically and yet no collection of humanity is more prone to follow fads and to practice mimicry than Baptist preachers. Creative thinking is generally defined as renewing a subscription to the Sword of the Lord, buying a new set of sermon outlines, attending a conference of new ideas, or following the recommendations of "The Leadership." Wheresoever "The Leadership" decides to cast its mantle, whether program, agency, speaker, or Hollywood movie, the loyalists are determined to follow. Autonomy and independence are easily sacrificed for the next rung of the ladder of promotion or, at least, the retention of the presently occupied step.

Only this mentality of servile partisanship can explain the wide-spread adoption of the methods and practices of Charismatics and Ecumenicists or the acceptance of the doctrines of heretics and cultists by otherwise brain-functioning Baptist pastors. Perhaps, this tendency might be explained in a psychological evaluation as ill-advised hero worship. However, it is more likely to be merely the recognition [voluntarily or involuntarily]

(Continued on page 3)



this and that

Editor and Staff

Jerald L. Manley D. D.

J. Alan Wolf

Gary Roland

This article is submitted after several years of preparation through reading and reviewing the multiple writings of the theologian who is the subject. He came to my attention many years ago, recommended by a friend. My first exposure was to revisions of his works—though they were not presented as having the amount of editing they actually possess. What seemed at first reading to be intriguing produced an inquiring mind on further reading. In the passage of time, I was able to locate more and more of his original material. When the purpose-

driven-seeker-services became the rage, I was involved in working through some of the things that he had written. The similarity was astounding. As I began to trace his influence on Baptist preachers, I determined to write exposing his errors. I finally settled on the use of his words from only this single source because he claimed for it the status of explaining his theology to the world. He should know better than anyone else. —Pastor Manley

This publication is mailed to you on purpose. Someone who knows of you believed that you would profit by receiving and reading it. If you do not agree, we will remove your name from the next possible mailing. We have no desire to intrude or to offend.

Phone: 850-944-5545 * Fax: 850-944-9822

E-mail: JERALD.L.MANLEY@GTE.NET

THE BAPTIST HERITAGE

(428-290)

is published monthly by
THE HERITAGE BAPTIST CHURCH
of PENSACOLA,

2200 West Michigan Avenue,
Pensacola, Florida 32526-2379.

PERIODICALS POSTAGE PAID
AT PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

THE BAPTIST HERITAGE is sent without charge to members of the church and, by request, to interested friends of this church. There are no subscription charges and no paid advertisements are accepted.

VOLUME XXVIII ISSUE NUMBER 7
JULY 20, 2004

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 42)

The Summation

I submit that the theologian whose words (as he wrote them) are cited in this article is unworthy of endorsement or commendation. There is no soundness in him. No Baptist preacher ought to study his writings except to expose his error. No Seminary, Christian university, or Bible college should ever convey to its students that this theologian is an acceptable source for Biblical truth *either in doctrine or in practice*. He ought not to be emulated; he should be repudiated. Instead of using him as an example of a godly sort, a class exposing his terrible influence would be in order.

Since I know human nature and recognize that some will read this page before reading the article—desiring to know the identity of the theologian in question, I have determined not to provide his name in this issue. I challenge my readers to forget who it might be and to decide, not on popularity or personality, but on the merits of the case, whether the writer of this material is worthy or unworthy of your respect and endorsement. Let his words, not his reputation speak the loudest.

I have somewhat more to say regarding this man and those who advocate his theology and/or his practices and will do so in the next *Heritage*. At that time, I will give the source of the material and the name of the author. If any reader finds the suspense too great to wait until next month, that reader is certainly free to call me at 850-944-5545.

We had to expand the issue in order to accommodate the material fairly. The theologian deserved the space to fully reveal his thinking in as much context as possible. I trust that the reader will understand that I did not underline every error or deviation from truth.

If I receive a defense of this theologian, I will include at least some of it in a follow-up article.

—Pastor Manley

Proverbs 14:7 Go from the presence of a foolish man,
when thou perceivest not *in him* the lips of knowledge.

Because of the rapid growth of circulation and the increasing expenses involved, we are considering making the paper available by email to those who could receive it in that format. If you might consider this avenue of delivery, let us know.

This is not a solicitation for gifts. The paper is given as a ministry by this church.

Reprint permission always granted;
acknowledgment is appreciated.

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 41)

there substantially the same motives to keep them that they need and have here. There will there be laws and conditions of continued bliss as here. There will be the same place, and in kind, if not in degree, the same occasion for fear there that there is here. I say again, that the objection we are considering, overlooks both the true philosophy of mind, and of the influence of the sanctions of moral law.

**Let it not be forgotten that this theologian has previously defined God as both a moral being and a holy being. He does not seem to exclude the Godhead from the capacity to sin or from the fear of sinning.*

A heaven that is a place of fear and temptations is certainly not the heaven that this Baptist preacher preaches about. It is not the heaven that my grandparents, my parents, and multitudes of others are dwelling in today. It is not the heaven of the Bible—thank God!

Page 568

As I have said before, there is no hope of any one's preserving, except in so far as free grace anticipates and secures the concurrence of free will. The soul must be called, and effectually called and perpetually called, or it will not follow Christ for an hour. I say again, that by effectual calling, I do not mean an irresistible calling. I do not mean a calling that cannot, or that might not be resisted, a calling that does in fact secure the voluntary obedience of the soul. This is my only hope in respect to myself, or anybody else. This grace . . . is pledged to secure the salvation of those whom the Father has from eternity given to the Son . . . and I have no expectation that any others will ever be saved. There is, there can be no hope for any others. Others are able to repent, but they will not. Others might be saved, if they would believe, and comply with the conditions of salvation, but they will not. Strike out from the Bible the doctrine of God's covenanted faithfulness to Christ—the truth that the Father has given to Him a certain number whose salvation He forsee that He could and should secure, and I despair of myself and of everybody else. Where is any other ground of hope? I know not where.

**This theologian has such a contorted view that he sounds like John Calvin when he begins a sentence and changes to Jacob Arminius by the middle and becomes Calvin Arminius by the time he ends the thought.*

From his introduction to his systematic theology through his final paragraph, there is no soundness in the book or the author; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores abound—such leprous spots that they cannot be closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.

Behold, he stinketh. He is a dead man writing.

(Continued on page 43)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 1)

by the weaker of the most dominant as the leader of the pack. Actually, not only is this the road of least resistance, it is the pathway of least effort, requiring neither thought nor discernment, displaying neither creativity nor originality, and expending neither energy nor time. The attraction of this popular trail is that it demands no time in prayer, necessitates no labor in examination, involves no searching of Scripture, and affords limited exposure to risk. It is certainly user-friendly and definitely time-efficient with guaranteed numerical results and, perhaps most importantly, with the insurance of pack-rank security.

This tendency to follow The Leadership is observed [by the observing observant observer] in the rapid spreading, in almost wildfire fashion, of each new pragmatic or humanistic approach to "changing the world for Christ." The adoption of doctrine and practice that is authorized by the three point pragmatic outline of popularity, practicality, and potentiality is not the mark of Berean Christianity. Practicing pragmatic Christianity places the preacher adrift as one "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness" and his followers are caught and battered in his turbulent wake. While George Barna is likely sincere in his attachment to Christianity by the numbers, Barnaeian is not a synonym for Berean.

Throwing Scriptural precepts into the fickle wind of prevailing public acceptance to discover which beliefs are the more palatable to the masses might have spared Paul the experience of some of his perils, but it would not have produced the Epistle to the Romans or the one to the Galatians—and would have left the Epistle to the Hebrews unwritten. Can a proponent of Barnaeian numerology imagine that the Holy Spirit ought to have the Epistles to the Corinthian church rewritten in purpose-driven, seeker-friendly language?

The most fervent revisionist cannot possibly reinvent John the Baptist (my apologies, most of them know him as the John the baptizer) into the seeker-friendly ringmaster. He preached using strident terms of rebuke—if not straightforward castigation—by the rocks of the Jordan River. He was not found basking under the willows along some creek sipping his Starbucks. He skinned hides; he did not stroke the egos. John personalized sin to the individual and demanded the evidence of fruits of repentance before he baptized the apparent converts. John the Baptist had a different agenda than amassing a crowd and enumerating the conversions.

How did Baptist preachers become the bandwagon crowd they are today? I think the answer is more simple than profound. It is my opinion that Baptist preachers became fearful of isolation and rejection, adopted pragmatic and humanistic methods of self preservation, and fell into the same pathway as did the northern kingdom, Israel—they chose the wrong leaders of the pack.

(Continued on page 4)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 3)

Bear with me as I explore this theme. You may assuredly disagree, but throwing this article in the wastebasket does not answer the question and may be symptomatic. For over forty years, I have asked preachers what books they are reading and which titles they recommend for others to read. Certain names repeatedly are cited as having the greater influence on preacher after preacher. Three names in particular are given time after time—very often without being connected to a specific title. These three men are the key, in my view, to the understanding of how pragmatism overcame spirituality—with one man as the forerunner and the prime mover. On the face of it, it is unbelievable that these three anti-Baptists could achieve so influential a position on Baptists. Compassion requires me to recognize that most of those Baptist who identify these three men as influencers of their belief and practice never actually read the materials in the *original writings* and have totally depended upon the testimony and the selection as provided by "The Leadership." Compassion also requires that an admonishment against the foolish practice of allowing one's self to be manipulated by those who seem to be somebodies. These three "leaders" were false prophets "unawares brought in" (Galatians 2:4)—they did not creep in; they were invited into Baptist schools and Baptist sermons. Sincere men made the grievous mistake of bringing these men in because those sincere men did not compare what they *thought that they saw* in the ministries of these three theologians with the Scriptures. They walked by sight forgetting to "try the spirits whether they be of God."

I realize that the usual response ["some of the things he says might not be right, but I have found so much that was good"] will be offered almost automatically; however, I will insist that the sentiment expressed is undeniably simple pragmatism—no more and no less. It does not evidence brotherly love and assuredly gives no indication of spiritual discernment. Read the following statements taken from the oldest of these three men whose philosophies dominate contemporary Christianity though none of the three lived to see Contemporary Christianity dominate the religious scene of Christianity. Three men, all dead, but who remain alive in the thinking of the promoters of contemporary pragmatic Christianity. These records are not from the popular, well-selling expurgated editions of his works, but from *his original writings*. I will be eagerly awaiting the responses of my readers that might explain how any Baptist preacher could continue to encourage others to read the writings of this man if that Baptist preacher ever actually personally read what the man wrote.

All underlining is mine. My comments are offset from the quotations, marked with an *, and are attempts to focus attention on the specific aspect of the material that is devious and erroneous. I realize that the critics will accuse me of omitting the context. I will simply respond that some state-

(Continued on page 5)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 40)

its sanctions have in heaven the very influence that they ought to have on earth. It is as true in heaven as on earth, that the soul that sinneth shall die. Now, can the sanctions of law exert no influence in heaven? I suppose no reasonable person will doubt the certainty, and the known certainty of the perseverance of all saints there. But if they are certain that they shall not sin and fall, can they not be the subjects of fear in any sense? I answer, yes. They are naturally able to sin, and may be sometimes placed under circumstances where they are tempted to selfishness. Indeed, the very nature of mind renders it certain, that the saints will always have need of watchfulness against temptation and sin. Now, it is the design of the sanctions of law in all worlds to produce hope on the one hand, and fear on the other; in holy beings the hope of reward, and the fear to sin lest they should perish. This hope and fear in a being duly influenced by them, is not selfishness. It is madness and desperate wickedness not to be influenced by them. Our reason affirms that we ought to be influenced by them, that our own salvation is of infinite value, and that our damnation were an infinite evil. It therefore affirms that we ought to secure the one and to avoid the other. This is law both on earth and in heaven. This we are not to do selfishly, that is, to seek our own salvation, or to avoid our own damnation, exclusively or only, but to seek to save as many as possible; to love our neighbor as ourselves, and ourselves as our neighbor. In all worlds the sanctions of law ought to have their influence, and with holy beings they have. Holy beings are really subjects of fear to sin, and to be lost, and are the only beings who have the kind of fear which God requires, and which it is the design of the sanctions of law and of the gospel to inspire. What! Are we to be told that a certainty of safety is wholly inconsistent with every kind and degree of fear? What, then, is the use of law in heaven? Must a man on earth or in heaven doubt whether he shall have eternal life, in order to leave room for the influence of moral law, and of hope, and of fear, or in order to leave play for the motives of moral government? There is room for the same fear in heaven that ought to be on earth. No one has a right to expect to violate the precept, and thereby incur the penalty of law. But every one is bound to fear to do so. The penalty was never designed on earth, any more than it is in heaven, to beget a slavish fear, or a fear that we shall sin and be damned; but only a fear to sin and be damned. A fear to sin and to be lost, will, to all eternity, no doubt, be a means of confirming holy beings in heaven. The law will be the same there as here. Free agency will be the same there as here. Perseverance in holiness will be a condition of continued salvation there as really as here. There may, and doubtless will, be temptations, there as well as here. They will, therefore, need

(Continued on page 42)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 39)

and that we are to repeat this insult to God as often as we pray.

The petition for forgiveness of our trespasses, it is plain, must apply to past sins, and not to sins we are committing at the time we make the prayer; for it would be absurd and abominable to pray for the forgiveness of a sin which we are then in the act of committing.

This prayer cannot properly be made in respect to any sin of which we have not repented; for it would be highly abominable in the sight of God, to pray for the forgiveness of a sin of which we did not repent.

If there be any hour or day in which a man has committed no actual sin, he could not consistently make this prayer in reference to that hour or that day.

But at the very time, it would be highly proper for him to make this prayer in relation to all his past sins, and that too, although he may have repented of, and confessed them, and prayed for their forgiveness, a thousand times before. This does not imply a doubt, whether God has forgiven the sins of which we have repented; but it is only a renewal of our grief and humiliation for our sins, and a fresh acknowledgment of, and casting ourselves upon, His mercy. God may forgive when we repent, before we ask Him, and while we abhor ourselves so much as to have no heart to ask for forgiveness; but His having forgiven us does not render the petition improper.

And although his sins may be forgiven, he ought still to confess them, to repent of them, both in this world and in the world to come. And it is perfectly suitable, so long as he lives in the world, to say the least, to continue to repent, and repeat the request for forgiveness. For myself, I am unable to see why this passage should be made a stumbling block; for if it be improper to pray for the forgiveness of sins of which we have repented, then it is improper to pray for forgiveness at all. And if this prayer cannot be used with propriety in reference to past sins of which we have already repented, it cannot properly be used at all, except "upon the absurd supposition, that we are to pray for the forgiveness of sins which we are now committing, and of which we have not repented. And if it be improper to use this form of prayer in reference to all past sins of which we have repented, it is just as improper to use it in reference to sins committed today or yesterday, of which we have repented.

**Lest the reader might skim the passage and not read it word for word, I call attention to the instruction to pray for sins to be forgiven in the world to come. Do not overlook the call for continued repentance for past sins. Both are abhorrent to the truth of the Gospel*

Page 547

Moral law exists with its sanctions as really in heaven as on earth, and

(Continued on page 41)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 4)

ments cannot be placed into any context that would ever make them biblically sound. I charge the critics with not having seriously read this man's works in their full context. If any have read his writings and wish to defend his heresy, they must accept the fact that they are in agreement with his multiple errors. I expect that some will find the article to be a discordant note. I am sorry that will be so. The theological deviation of this man and the other two members of the traumatizing trio are as great, if not greater, than are those of Joseph Smith, Charles Taze Russell, Judge Rutherford, Ellen G. White, and Mary Baker Eddy. I believe that it is time for some Baptist preacher to say so.

By the way, his spelling and grammatical construction errors are as plentiful as are his theological wanderings and I commit myself only to identifying the more blatant or objectionable.

All statements are taken from Source 1 (to be identified later).

Page 2

My principal design in publishing Systematic Theology at first, was to furnish my pupils with a class or textbook, wherein many points and questions were discussed of great practical importance, but which have not, to my knowledge, been discussed in any system of theological instruction extant.

**A claim of insight denied to others or never understood by others.*

What I have said on "Moral Law" and on the "Foundation of Moral Obligation" is the key to the whole subject. Whoever masters and understands these can readily understand all the rest. But he who will not possess himself of my meaning upon these subjects, will not understand the rest.

**An announcement of special definitions for commonly used terminology. Therefore, beware that when he uses a term, he uses it with his definition and not as believers are normally accustomed to understand the term. In the course of his teaching, he will use regeneration, justification, virtue, grace, and every other theological term with his own meaning and not in compliance with any recognized definition. In plain words, he speaks his own theological language and the reader requires an interpreter or a glossary of his personal definitions operating in simultaneous tandem or else the uninitiated, the unsuspecting, and the unwise will be duped, deceived, and possibly, damned. Within two pages of his beginning, the man has revealed himself as a cultist: (1) he has obtained an understanding of theology denied to all other theologians and (2) he has commanded the commonly used terms and given them new definitions that are known only through his teaching. Gnosticism thrives in his writings. The unwary, untrained reader is in great danger of being drawn into agreement with error without realizing what he has agreed to accept*

(Continued on page 6)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

*(Continued from page 5)**The pattern continues throughout his writings.*

Page 3

I have not yet been able to stereotype my theological views, and have ceased to expect ever to do so. The idea is preposterous. None but an omniscient mind can continue to maintain a precise identity of views and opinions. Finite minds, unless they are asleep or stultified by prejudice, must advance in knowledge. The discovery of new truth will modify old views and opinions, and there is perhaps no end to this process with finite minds in any world. True Christian consistency does not consist in stereotyping our opinions and views, and in refusing to make any improvement lest we should be guilty of change, but it consists in holding our minds open to receive the rays of truth from every quarter and in changing our views and language and practice as often and as fast as we can obtain further information. I call this Christian consistency, because this course alone accords with a Christian profession. A Christian profession implies the profession of candor and of a disposition to know and obey all truth. It must follow, that Christian consistency implies continued investigation and change of views and practice corresponding with increasing knowledge. No Christian, therefore, and no theologian should be afraid to change his views, his language, or his practices in conformity with increasing light. The prevalence of such a fear would keep the world, at best, at a perpetual standstill, on all subjects of science, and consequently all improvements would be precluded.

**Acceptance of continuing revelation and adaptation to the discoveries of science. There is nothing settled beyond the possibility of improvement with "increasing light." I desire to know what "increasing light" there is. The Bible is settled and sealed. The word of God has been delivered; there is no new light that is of God.*

Page 10

The Bible is not of itself, [*italics in original*] strictly and properly a revelation to man. It is, properly speaking, rather a history of revelations formerly made to certain men. To be a revelation to us, its truths must be brought by the Holy Spirit within the field of spiritual vision.

**The Bible becomes the word of God to us through the work of the Spirit. This may be neo-orthodoxy's basic premise, but it is merely borrowed from this man. Careful consideration will discover that the contemporary errors of doctrine and practice find actual introduction in this man—a writer that the leaders of the various movements all acknowledge and attribute as a great influence upon them.*

I am fully convinced that much of the inefficiency of religious teachers is owing to the fact that they do not sufficiently study and comply with

(Continued on page 7)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 38)

love in this world, for the good of men and the glory of God. But nowhere in the Bible is it intimated, that the death of a saint is the termination of his serving the devil.

The Bible representations of death are utterly inconsistent with its being an indispensable means of sanctification. Death is represented in the Bible as an enemy. But if death is the only condition upon which men are brought into a state of entire sanctification, its agency is as important and as indispensable as the influence of the Holy Ghost. When death is represented in the Bible as any thing else than an enemy, it is because it cuts short the sufferings of the saints, and introduces them into a state of eternal glory—not because it breaks them off from communion with the devil! How striking is the contrast between the language of the church and that of inspiration on this subject! The church is consoling the Christian in view of death, that it will be the termination of his sins—that he will then cease to serve the devil and his own lusts. The language of inspiration, on the other hand, is, that he will cease, not from wicked, but from good works, and labors and sufferings for God in this world. The language of the church is, that then he will enter upon a life of unalterable holiness—that he shall then, and not till then, be entirely sanctified. The language of inspiration is, that because he is sanctified, death shall be an entrance into a state of eternal glory.

**As foolish as what this man believed and taught is, as clear as his error is, as courteous as I have been to let him speak his full mind, there will be some who will take issue with me for writing to expose this exalted theologian and, by implication, those who promote him. I will be branded as a schismatic separatist unable to recognize his great contribution to "church growth." I am convinced that the fountain of this man's heart did not send forth both salt water and fresh—light and darkness, truth and error, salvation and damnation. But, we are not finished with his foolishness though I am weary with the task.*

Page 422

Christ has taught us to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." Here it is objected, that if a person should become entirely sanctified, he could no longer use this clause of this prayer, which, it is said, was manifestly designed to be used by the church to the end of time. Upon this prayer I remark:

Christ has taught us to pray for entire, in the sense of perpetual sanctification. "Thy will be done on earth, as it is done in heaven."

He designed, that we should expect this prayer to be answered, or that we should mock Him by asking what we do not believe is agreeable to His will, and that too which we know could not consistently be granted;

(Continued on page 40)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 37)

strength; a man, the strength of a man; and a child, the strength of a child. It comes to every moral being in the universe, just as he is, where he is, and requires, not that he should create new powers, or possess other powers than he has, but that such as his powers are, they should all be used with the utmost perfection and constancy for God.

It is admitted, that the entire sanctification of the church is to be accomplished. It is also admitted, that this work is to be accomplished, "through the sanctification of the Spirit and the belief of the truth." It is also universally agreed, that this work must be begun here; and also that it must be completed before the soul can enter heaven.

Page 390-391

**This next passage is so bizarre that many readers will not believe that it really exists. I assure all that I am not skilled enough to manufacture these words. These are the exact words of the theologian as he wrote them, edited them, and had them printed. They are his words and not someone's interpretation of what the theologian said in some obscure message. If a Baptist preacher can read these words and not want to label the theologian a heretic, then he is made of different stuff than he should be. I will not underline in this passage lest I detract from the absurdity of the teaching. I challenge the supporters of this man to find the Clintonian skill required to give it the positive spin and force it to even sound as if it is Biblical truth. These are more the ramblings of a lunatic than the reasonings of a sane theologian. It is contemptible for Baptist schools to use the perverted writings of this theologian and for Baptist preachers to expose their congregations to his poison.*

The Bible nowhere represents death as the termination of sin in the saints, which it could not fail to do, were it true, that they cease not to sin until death. It has been the custom of the church for a long time, to console individuals, in view of death, by the consideration, that it would be the termination of all their sin. And how almost universal has been the custom in consoling the friends of deceased saints, to mention this as a most important fact, that now they had ceased from sin! Now, if death is the termination of sin in the saints, and if they never cease to sin until they pass into eternity, too much stress never has been or can be laid upon that circumstance; and it seems utterly incredible, that no inspired writer should ever have noticed the fact. The representations of scripture are all directly opposed to this idea. It is said, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, for they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them." Here it is not intimated that they rest from their sins, but from their good works in this life; such works as shall follow, not to curse, but to bless them. The representations of scripture are, that death is the termination of the saint's sufferings and labors of

(Continued on page 39)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 6)

the laws of knowledge and belief to carry conviction to the minds of their hearers.

**Techniques work—learn the proper methodology and numerical success is guaranteed. Pragmatic mechanicalism is the philosophy of this theologian. As the predecessor of the purpose driven ministries, this originator of the seeker friendly service advocated, "Find out what produces results and work that system." He was the original systematizer of Christianity.*

Page 12

What consciousness gives us we know. Its testimony is infallible and conclusive upon all subjects upon which it testifies.

Page 13

I have said that the testimony of consciousness is conclusive for all the facts given by its unequivocal testimony. We neither need, nor can we have, any higher evidence of the existence of a sensation than is given by the consciousness.

**Truth is subject to the apprehension of the individual. The highest court of appeal is the individual consciousness.*

Page 21

It [**MORAL LAW*] must be the law of nature, that is, its precepts must prescribe and require just those actions of the will which are suitable to the nature and relations of moral beings, and nothing more nor less; that is, the intrinsic value of the well-being of God and of the universe being given as the ground, and the nature and relations of moral beings as the condition of the obligation, the reason hereupon necessarily affirms the intrinsic propriety and fitness of choosing this good, and of consecrating the whole being to its promotion. This is what is intended by the law of nature. It is the law or rule of action imposed on us by God, in and by the nature which He has given us.

**Time and space do not permit the inclusion of the multiplied references to the care of the universe—of all creation. The environmentalist movement was birthed in liberal Christianity and is surely a direct descendent of this man's emphasis upon the well-being of all creation as more important to the universe than that of any particular individual.*

The conditions and circumstances being the same, it requires, and must require, of all moral agents, the same things, in whatever world they may be found.

**Later in this volume, he identifies God as "a moral being" [sic] and, therefore, subject to the same laws as all other moral beings.*

Moral law is no respecter of persons—knows no privileged classes. It demands one thing of all, without regard to anything, except the fact that they are moral agents. By this it is not intended that the same course of outward conduct is required of all; but the same state of

(Continued on page 8)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 7)

heart in all—that all shall have one ultimate intention—that all shall consecrate themselves to one end—that all shall entirely conform, in heart and life, to their nature and relations.

It is an eternal and necessary idea of the divine reason. It is the eternal, self-existent rule of the divine conduct, the law which the intelligence of God prescribes to Himself. Moral law, as we shall see hereafter more fully, does not, and cannot originate in the will of God. It eternally existed in the divine reason. It is the idea of that state of will which is obligatory upon God, upon condition of His natural attributes, or, in other words, upon condition of His nature. As a law, it is entirely independent of His will just as His own existence is. It is obligatory also upon every moral agent, entirely independent of the will of God. Their nature and relations being given, and their intelligence being developed, moral law must be obligatory upon them, and it lies not in the option of any being to make it otherwise. Their nature and relations being given, to pursue a course of conduct suited to their nature and relations, is necessarily and self-evidently obligatory, independent of the will of any being.

Page 21-22

Moral law can never change, or be changed. It always requires of every moral agent a state of heart, and course of conduct, precisely suited to his nature and relations. Whatever his nature is, his capacity and relations are, entire conformity to just that nature, those capacities and relations, so far as he is able to understand them, is required at every moment, and nothing more nor less. If capacity is enlarged, the subject is not thereby rendered capable of works of supererogation—of doing more than the law demands; for the law still, as always, requires the full consecration of his whole being to the public interests. . . Moral law invariably holds one language. It never changes its requirement. "Thou shalt love," or be perfectly benevolent, is its uniform and its only demand. This demand it never varies, and never can vary. It is as immutable as God is, and for the same reason. To talk of letting down, or altering moral law, is to talk absurdly. The thing is naturally impossible. No being has the right or the power to do so. The supposition overlooks the very nature of moral law. Moral law is not a statute, an enactment, that has its origin or its foundation in the will of any being. It is the law of nature, the law which the nature or constitution of every moral agent imposes on himself and which God imposes upon us because it is entirely suited to our nature and relations, and is therefore naturally obligatory upon us. It is the unalterable demand of the reason, that the whole being, whatever there is of it at any time, shall be entirely consecrated to the highest good of universal being, and for this reason God

(Continued on page 9)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 36)

terity, of the literal imputation of all the sins of the elect to Christ, and of His suffering for them the exact amount due to the transgressors, of the literal imputation of Christ's righteousness or obedience to the elect, and the consequent perpetual justification of all that are converted from the first exercise of faith, whatever their subsequent life may be—I say I regard these dogmas as fabulous, and better befitting a romance than a system of theology.

**Once again, I must thank the theologian for his clarity of perception. He does indeed preach another gospel from that which Baptists have historically preached and which some Baptists still do. I am grateful that "while" and "unless" are not part of the Gospel.*

Page 382

The true question is, Is a state of entire, established, abiding consecration to God attainable in this life, in such a sense, that we may rationally expect or hope to become thus established in this life? Are the conditions of attaining this established state in the grace and love of God, such that we may rationally expect or hope to fulfil them, and thus become established, or entirely sanctified in this life? This is undoubtedly the true and the greatly important question to be settled.

That entire sanctification is attainable in this life.

It is self-evident, that entire obedience to God's law is possible on the ground of natural ability. To deny this, is to deny that a man is able to do as well as he can. The very language of the law is such as to level its claims to the capacity of the subject, however great or small that capacity may be. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." Here then it is plain, that all the law demands, is the exercise of whatever strength we have, in the service of God. Now, as entire sanctification consists in perfect obedience to the law of God, and as the law requires nothing more than the right use of whatever strength we have, it is, of course, forever settled, that a state of entire sanctification is attainable in this life, on the ground of natural ability.

**Oh, to natural ability, how great a debtor, daily I'm constrained to be. Amazing natural ability, how sweet the sound that saved a wretch like me—excuse me, a naturally capable one like me. This theologian wrote this and still Baptist preachers use his materials and encourage their people to read his books. If it is not done in ignorance, then it is done by wolves in sheep's clothing.*

Mark with what solemn emphasis it says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." This is its solemn injunction, whether it be given to an angel, a man, or a child. An angel is bound to exercise an angel's

(Continued on page 38)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 35)

newed act of faith lay hold on pardon and fresh justification, their remorse, shame, and consciousness of condemnation, do in fact, if I am not much deceived, greatly exceed, as a general thing, the remorse, shame, and sense of condemnation experienced by the impenitent.

**The believer never enters a state of "no condemnation" or eternal security in this theology. Sin may at any moment bring the believer into a position of being condemned as an unbeliever. The words of the LORD Jesus must be re-defined (as they are by this theologian) to read "Come unto Me all ye who are heavy laden and I will give you the added burden of saving yourself by entire obedience unto the end of all the law." How can Baptists promote this man as "the greatest revivalist of all times?"*

Page 372

They [*those who hold to imputed righteousness] seem to have regarded the child of God as no longer under moral government, in such a sense that sin was imputed to him, this having been imputed to Christ, and Christ's righteousness so literally imputed to him that, do what he may, after the first act of faith he is accounted and treated in his person as wholly righteous. If this is not antinomianism, I know not what is; since they hold that all who once believe will certainly be saved, yet that their perseverance in holy obedience to the end is, in no case, a condition of final justification, but that this is conditioned upon the first act of faith alone.

If I have succeeded in understanding it, the following is a succinct and a true account of the matter:

The Godhead, in the exercise of His adorable love and compassion, sought the salvation of sinners, through and by means of the mediatorial death and work of Christ. This death and work of Christ were resorted to, not to create, but, as a result of, the merciful disposition of God and as a means of securing the universe against a misapprehension of the character and design of God in forgiving and saving sinners. To Christ, as Mediator between the Godhead and man, the work of justifying and saving sinners is committed. He is made unto sinners "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption." In consideration of Christ's having by His death for sinners secured the subjects of the divine government against a misconception of His character and designs, God does, upon the further conditions of a repentance and faith that imply a renunciation of their rebellion and a return to obedience to His laws, freely pardon past sin, and restore the penitent and believing sinner to favor, as if he had not sinned, while he remains penitent and believing, subject however to condemnation and eternal death, unless he holds the beginning of his confidence steadfast unto the end. The doctrine of a literal imputation of Adam's sin to all his pos-

(Continued on page 37)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 8)

requires this of us, with all the weight of His authority.

Moral law proposes but one ultimate end of pursuit, to God, and to all moral agents. All its requisitions, in their spirit, are summed up and expressed in one word, love or benevolence.

Page 23

That which is upon the whole most wise is expedient. That which is upon the whole expedient is demanded by moral law. True expediency and the spirit of moral law are always identical. Expediency may be inconsistent with the letter, but never with the spirit of moral law. Law in the form of commandment is a revelation or declaration of that course which is expedient. It is expediency revealed, as in the case of the decalogue, [sic] and the same is true of every precept of the Bible, it reveals to us what is expedient. A revealed law or commandment is never to be set aside by our views of expediency. We may know with certainty that what is required is expedient. The command is the expressed judgment of God in the case, and reveals with unerring certainty the true path of expediency. . . It should never be forgotten that that which is plainly demanding by the highest good of the universe is law. It is expedient. It is wise. The true spirit of the moral law does and must demand it. So, on the other hand, whatever is plainly inconsistent with the highest good of the universe is illegal, unwise, inexpedient, and must be prohibited by the spirit of moral law. But let the thought be repeated, that the Bible precepts always reveal that which is truly expedient, and in no case are we at liberty to set aside the spirit of any commandment upon the supposition that expediency requires it. Some have denounced the doctrine of expediency altogether, as at all times inconsistent with the law of right. These philosophers proceed upon the assumption that the law of right and the law of benevolence are not identical but inconsistent with each other. This is a common but fundamental mistake, which leads me to remark that Law proposes the highest good of universal being as its end, and requires all moral agents to consecrate themselves to the promotion of this end. Consequently, expediency must be one of its attributes. That which is upon the whole in the highest degree useful to the universe must be demanded by moral law. Moral law must, from its own nature, require just that course of willing and acting that is upon the whole in the highest degree useful, and therefore expedient. . . Nothing is or can be suited to their nature and relations, that is not upon the whole promotive of their highest well-being. Expediency and right are always and necessarily at one. They can never be inconsistent. That which is on the whole most expedient is right, and that which is right is upon the whole expedient.

Page 26

(Continued on page 10)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 9)

As God is our creator [sic], we are naturally responsible to Him for the right exercise of our powers. And as our good and His glory depend upon our conformity to the same rule to which He conforms His whole being, He is under a moral obligation to require us to be holy, as He is holy.

Page 28-29

That fact that God is owner [sic] and sole proprietor [sic] of the universe is no reason why He should govern it. Unless either His own [sic] good or the good of the universe, or both together, demand government, the relation of owner cannot confer the right to govern. Neither God, nor any other being, can own moral beings, in such a sense as to have a right to govern them, when government is wholly unnecessary, and can result in no good whatever to God or to His creatures. . . God has no such right.

Page 40

The Bible everywhere either expressly or impliedly recognizes this truth, "If there be a willing mind," that is a right willing or intention, "it is accepted" etc . . . If the intention is right, or if there be a willing mind, it is accepted as obedience. . . if one intends to perform a service of God, which, after all, he is unable to perform, he is regarded as having virtually done it, and is rewarded accordingly. This is too obviously the doctrine of the Bible to need further elucidation.

**Motivation is of greater importance than the actual deed. A bad motive can make a good deed sin and a good motive can make a bad deed righteous. This twisted reasoning is reproduced almost verbatim in C. S. Lewis' The Last Battle, pages 155-157, and on page 177 of The Purposed Driven Life.*

Page 43

Strictly speaking, however, moral character belongs alone to the intention. In strict propriety of speech, it cannot be said that either outward action, or any state of the intellect, or sensibility, has a moral element or quality belonging to it.

**Morality is limited to the intent and is not extended to the act. The concept of selective morality, which became dominant in the 1960's, adapted this tenet—again the error rose in liberal Christianity.*

Page 46

It would be our duty to will the highest good of God and of the universe, even did God not will that we should, or were He to will that we should not.

Page 48

The will of God cannot be the foundation of moral obligation in created moral agents. God has moral character, and is virtuous. This implies

(Continued on page 11)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 34)

with God. By this language in this connection, you will of course understand me to mean, that perseverance in faith and obedience is a condition, not of present, but of final or ultimate acceptance and salvation. Those who hold that justification by imputed righteousness is a forensic proceeding, take a view of final or ultimate justification, according with their view of the nature of the transaction. With them, faith receives an imputed righteousness, and a judicial justification. The first act of faith, according to them, introduces the sinner into this relation, and obtains for him a perpetual justification. They maintain that after this first act of faith it is impossible for the sinner to come into condemnation; that, being once justified, he is always thereafter justified, whatever he may do; indeed that he is never justified by grace, as to sins that are past, upon condition that he ceases to sin; that Christ's righteousness is the ground, and that his own present obedience is not even a condition of his justification, so that, in fact, his own present or future obedience to the law of God is, in no case, and in no sense, a sine qua non of his justification, present or ultimate.

Now this is certainly another gospel from the one I am inculcating. It is not a difference merely upon some speculative or theoretic point. It is a point fundamental to the gospel and to salvation, if any one can be.

**Thank you Theologian, for saying it for me. He has more discernment than the Baptist preachers who follow him. If his concept of salvation is true, then salvation by grace through faith is a false teaching. If salvation is by grace through faith, then this theologian is accursed—at least Paul thought so.*

Pages 370-371

This [*the whole Bible] everywhere represents Christians as condemned when they sin—teaches them to repent, confess, and pray for pardon—to betake themselves afresh to Christ as their only hope. The Bible, in almost every variety or manner, represents perseverance in faith, and obedience to the end, as a condition of ultimate justification and of final salvation.

Observe I am not here calling in question the fact, that all true saints do persevere in faith and obedience to the end; but am showing that such perseverance is a condition of salvation, or ultimate justification.

**His perversion of perseverance makes one wish to remove the subject from the doctrinal statements.*

I may safely affirm that the saints in all time are very conscious of condemnation when they fall into sin. This sense of condemnation may not subject them to the same kind and degree of fear which they experienced before regeneration, because of the confidence they have that God will pardon their sin. Nevertheless, until they repent, and by a re-

(Continued on page 36)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 33)

sanctification a condition of justification. But this we shall see is an erroneous view of the subject. The mistake is founded in a misapprehension of the nature both of justification and of sanctification. To sanctify is to set apart, to consecrate to a particular use. To sanctify anything to God is to set apart to His service, to consecrate it to Him. To sanctify one's self is voluntarily to set one's self apart, to consecrate one's self to God. To be sanctified is to be set apart, to be consecrated to God. Sanctification is an act or state of being sanctified, or set apart to the service of God. It is a state of consecration to Him. This is present obedience to the moral law. It is the whole of present duty, and is implied in repentance, faith, regeneration, as we have abundantly seen. Sanctification is sometimes used to express a permanent state of obedience to God, or of consecration. In this sense it is not a condition of present justification, or of pardon and acceptance. But it is a condition of continued and permanent acceptance with God. It certainly cannot be true, that God accepts and justifies the sinner in his sins. The Bible everywhere represents justified persons as sanctified, and always expressly, or impliedly, conditionates justification upon sanctification, in the sense of present obedience to God.

They only are justified who walk after the Spirit. Should it be objected, as it may be, that the scripture often speaks of saints, or truly regenerate persons, as needing sanctification, and of sanctification as something that comes after regeneration, and as that which the saints are to aim at attaining, I answer, that when sanctification is thus spoken of, it is doubtless used in the higher sense already noticed; to wit, to denote a state of being settled, established in faith, rooted and grounded in love, being so confirmed in the faith and obedience of the gospel, as to hold on in the way steadfastly, unmovably, always abounding in the work of the Lord. This is doubtless a condition of permanent justification, as has been said, but not a condition of present justification. By sanctification being a condition of justification, the following things are intended: That present, full, and entire consecration of heart and life to God and His service, is an unalterable condition of present pardon of past sin, and of present acceptance with God.

That the penitent soul remains justified no longer than this full-hearted consecration continues. If he falls from his first love into the spirit of self-pleasing, he falls again into bondage to sin and to the law, is condemned, and must repent and do his "first work," must return to Christ, and renew his faith and love, as a condition of his salvation. This is the most express teaching of the Bible, as we shall fully see.

Perseverance in faith and obedience, or in consecration to God, is also an unalterable condition of justification, or of pardon and acceptance

(Continued on page 35)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 10)

that He is the subject of moral obligation, for virtue is nothing else than compliance with obligation. If God is the subject of moral obligation, there is some reason, independent of His own [sic] will, why He wills as He does; some reason, that imposes obligation upon Him to will as He does.

**God is subject to a higher law.*

The will of no being can be law.

Moral law is an idea of the divine reason, and not the willing of any being. If the will of any being were law, that being could not, by natural possibility be wrong; for whatever He [*capitalized in original] wills would be right, simply and only because He [*capitalized in original] willed it.

**The will of God is not equivalent to moral law—God, by virtue of His Deity has no power to decree morality.*

Page 49

And can it be so self-contradictory as to affirm that we ought to will the good of God and of the universe, for its own intrinsic value, yet not for this reason, but because God wills that we should will it? Impossible! But in this assertion, the objector has reference to some outward act, some condition or means of the end to be chosen, and not to the end itself. But even in respect to any act whatever, his objection does not hold good. For example, God requires me to labor and pray for the salvation of souls, or to do anything else. Now His command is necessarily regarded by me as obligatory, not as an arbitrary requirement, but as revealing infallibly the true means or conditions of securing the great and ultimate end, which I am to will for its intrinsic value. I necessarily regard His commandment as wise and benevolent, and it is only because I so regard it, that I affirm, or can affirm, my obligation to obey Him. Should He command me to choose, as an ultimate end, or for its own intrinsic value, that which my reason affirmed to be of no intrinsic value, I could not possibly affirm my obligation to obey Him. Should He command me to do that which my reason affirmed to be unwise and malevolent, it were impossible for me to affirm my obligation to obey Him. This proves, beyond controversy, that reason does not regard His command as the foundation of the obligation, but only as infallible proof that which He commands is wise and benevolent in itself, and commanded by Him for that reason.

Page 52

Obligation to use means to do good may, and must, be conditioned upon the tendency of those means to secure the end, but the obligation to use them is founded solely in the value of the end.

**The end justifies the means. Perhaps he had somewhat of a Jesuitical*

(Continued on page 12)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 21)

then, to embody it in a standard of Christian doctrine, to give it the place of an indispensable article of faith, and denounce all who will not swallow its absurdities, as heretics!

Page 268

Why is sin so natural to mankind? Not because their nature is itself sinful but because the appetites and passions tend so strongly to self-indulgence. These are temptations to sin, but sin itself consists not in these appetites and propensities, but in the voluntary committal of the will to their indulgence. This committal of the will is selfishness, and when the will is once given up to sin, it is very natural to sin. The will once committed to self-indulgence as its end, selfish actions are in a sense spontaneous.

The constitution of a moral being as a whole, when all the powers are developed, does not tend to sin, but strongly in an opposite direction; as is manifest from the fact that when reason is thoroughly developed by the Holy Spirit, it is more than a match for the sensibility, and turns the heart to God. The difficulty is, that the sensibility gets the start of reason, and engages the attention in devising means of self-gratification, and thus retards, and in a great measure prevents, the development of the ideas of the reason which were designed to control the will. It is this morbid development that the Holy Spirit is given to rectify, by so forcing truth upon the attention, as to secure the development of the reason. By doing this, He brings the will under the influence of truth. Our senses reveal to us the objects correlated to our animal nature and propensities. The Holy Spirit reveals God and the spiritual world, and all that class of objects that are correlated to our higher nature, so as to give reason the control of the will. This is regeneration and sanctification, as we shall see in its proper place.

**Humanity "does not tend to sin," but tends or leans or is drawn "strongly in an opposite direction." The Holy Spirit works with "our higher nature" in such a way as to "give reason control over the will." This is accomplished by "so forcing truth upon the attention, as to secure the development of the reason." Humanity is basically good and desires to serve God. At least that is what this man taught. There is nothing wrong, according to him, with the nature of man. If you think I am being unfair to this man read a little farther.*

Pages 270-273

Regeneration is, in the Bible, the same as the new birth.

To be born again is the same thing, in the Bible use of the term, as to have a new heart, to be a new creature, to pass from death unto life. In other words, to be born again is to have a new moral character, to become holy. To regenerate is to make holy. To be born of God, no doubt

(Continued on page 23)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 22)

expresses and includes the Divine agency, but it also includes and expresses that which the Divine agency is employed in effecting, namely, making the sinner holy. Certainly, a sinner is not regenerated whose moral character is unchanged. If he were, how could it be truly said, that whosoever is born of God overcometh the world, doth not commit sin, cannot sin, etc? If regeneration does not imply and include a change of moral character in the subject, how can regeneration be made the condition of salvation? The fact is, the term regeneration, or the being born of God, is designed to express primarily and principally the thing done, that is, the making of a sinner holy, and expresses also the fact, that God's agency induces the change. Throw out the idea of what is done, that is, the change of moral character in the subject, and he would not be born again, he would not be regenerated, and it could not be truly said, in such a case, that God had regenerated him.

It has been objected, that the term really means and expresses only the Divine agency; and, only by way of implication, embraces the idea of a change of moral character and of course of activity in the subject. To this I reply: . . . The thing done implies the turning or activity of the subject. It is nonsense to affirm that his moral character is changed without any activity or agency of his own. Passive holiness is impossible. Holiness is obedience to the law of God, the law of love, and of course consists in the activity of the creature.

We have said that regeneration is synonymous, in the Bible, with a new heart. But sinners are required to make to themselves a new heart, which they could not do, if they were not active in this change. If the work is a work of God, in such a sense, that He must first regenerate the heart or soul before the agency of the sinner begins, it were absurd and unjust to require him [*the sinner] to make to himself new heart, until he is first regenerated.

Regeneration is ascribed to man in the gospel, which it could not be, if the term were designed to express only the agency of the Holy Spirit. For though both conversion and regeneration are sometimes in the Bible ascribed to God, sometimes to man, and sometimes to the subject, which shows clearly that the distinction under examination is arbitrary and theological, rather than biblical. The fact is, that both terms imply the simultaneous exercise of both human and Divine agency. The fact that a new heart is the thing done, demonstrates the activity of the subject; and the word regeneration, or the expression "born of the Holy Spirit," asserts the Divine agency. The same is true of conversion, or the turning of the sinner to God. God is said to turn him and he is said to turn himself. God draws him, and he follows. In both alike God and man are both active, and their activity is simultaneous. God works or draws,

(Continued on page 24)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 19)

text to express, not the anti-scriptural and nonsensical dogma of a sinful constitution, but to affirm in his strong, poetic language, that he had been a sinner from the commencement of his moral existence, or from the earliest moment of his capability of being a sinner. This is the strong language of poetry.

Page 257

Again, "By nature the children of wrath, even as others." Upon this text I remark that it cannot, consistently with natural justice, be understood to mean, that we are exposed to the wrath of God on account of our nature. It is a monstrous and blasphemous dogma, that a holy God is angry with any creature for possessing a nature with which he was sent into being without his knowledge or consent. The Bible represents God as angry with men for their wicked deeds, and not for their nature.

Page 261

We deny that the human constitution is morally depraved, because it is impossible that sin should be a quality of the substance of soul or body. It is, and must be, a quality of choice or intention, and not of substance. To make sin an attribute or quality of substance is contrary to God's definition of sin. "Sin," says the apostle, "is *anomia* a [sic] "transgression of, or a want of conformity to, the moral law." That is, it consists in a refusal to love God and our neighbor, or, which is the same thing, in loving ourselves supremely.

To represent the constitution as sinful, is to represent God, who is the author of the constitution, as the author of sin. To say that God is not the direct former of the constitution, but that sin is conveyed by natural generation from Adam, who made himself sinful, is only to remove the objection one step farther back, but not to obviate it; for God established the physical laws that of necessity bring about this result.

But how came Adam by a sinful nature? Did his first sin change his nature? or did God change it as a penalty for sin? What ground is there for the assertion that Adam's nature became in itself sinful by the fall? This is a groundless, not to say ridiculous, assumption, and an absurdity. Sin an attribute of nature! A sinful substance! Sin a substance! Is it a solid, a fluid, a material, or a spiritual substance?

Page 262

I object to the doctrine of constitutional sinfulness, that it makes all sin original and actual, a mere calamity, and not a crime. For those who hold that sin is an essential and inseparable part of our nature, to call it a crime, is to talk nonsense. What! A sinful nature the crime of him upon whom it is entailed, without his knowledge or consent? If the nature is sinful, in such a sense that action must necessarily be sinful, which is the doctrine of the Confession of Faith, then sin in action must

(Continued on page 21)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 24)

We have seen that the subject is active in regeneration, that regeneration consists in the sinner changing his ultimate choice, intention, preference; or in changing from selfishness to love or benevolence; or, in other words, in turning from the supreme choice of self-gratification, to the supreme love of God and the equal love of his neighbor. Of course the subject of regeneration must be an agent in the work.

There are generally other agents, one or more human beings concerned in persuading the sinner to turn. The Bible recognizes both the subject and the preacher as agents in the work. Thus, Paul says: "I have begotten you through the gospel." Here the same word is used which is used in another case, where regeneration is ascribed to God.

Again: an apostle says, "Ye have purified your souls by obeying the truth." Here the work is ascribed to the subject. There are then always two, and generally more than two agents employed in effecting the work. Several theologians have held that regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit alone. In proof of this they cite those passages that ascribe it to God. But I might just as lawfully insist that it is the work of man alone, and quote those passages that ascribe it to man, to substantiate my position. Or I might assert that it is alone the work of the subject, and in proof of this position quote those passages that ascribe it to the subject. Or again, I might assert that it is effected by the truth alone, and quote such passages as the following to substantiate my position: "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of His creatures." "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

It has been common to regard the third person [*the soulwinner] as a mere instrument in the work. But the fact is, he is a willing, designing, responsible agent, as really so as God or the subject is.

Page 275

If it be inquired how the Bible can consistently ascribe regeneration at one time to God, at another to the subject, at another to the truth, at another to a third person; the answer is to be sought in the nature of the work. The work accomplished is a change of choice, in respect to an end [*purpose] or the end of life. The sinner whose choice is changed, must of course act. The end to be chosen must be clearly and forcibly presented; this is the work of the third person, [*the soulwinner] and of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them to the soul. The truth is employed, or it is truth which must necessarily be employed, as an instrument to induce a change of choice.

Those who hold to physical or constitutional moral depravity must hold, of course, to constitutional regeneration; and, of course, consis-

(Continued on page 26)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 17)

ing of their sins by His sufferings.

*Mel Gibson could have used this paragraph as an endorsement for his film—and it may explain the reason why so many Baptists spent money and encouraged others to see *The Passion*. This concept of atonement minimizes the blood of Christ, replacing the shedding of His blood by His physical sufferings. The Old Testament sacrifices were not tortured—their sufferings did not atone; their blood did. MacArthur, Thieme, and others who depreciate the blood of Christ by the substitution of His sufferings or His death simply walk where this man taught them to walk.

Page 218

Christ owed obedience to the moral law, both as God and man. He was under as much obligation to be perfectly benevolent as any moral agent is. It was, therefore, impossible for Him to perform any works of supererogation; that is, so far as obedience to law was concerned, He could, neither as God nor as man, do anything more than fulfil its obligations.

*The righteousness of Christ cannot be imputed to any other moral agent because His righteousness is only sufficient to fulfill for His Own obedience to the moral law.

Page 230

We have seen in former lectures, that God is a moral agent, the self-existent and supreme; and is therefore Himself, as ruler of all, subject to, and observant of, moral law in all His conduct. That is, His own infinite intelligence must affirm that a certain course of willing is suitable, fit, and right in Him. This idea, or affirmation, is law to Him; and to this His will must be conformed, or He is not good. This is moral law, a law founded in the eternal and self-existent nature of God. This law does, and must, demand benevolence in God. Benevolence is good willing. God's intelligence must affirm that He ought to will good for its own intrinsic value. It must affirm His obligation to choose the highest possible good as the great end of His being. If God is good, the highest good of Himself, and of the universe, must have been the end which He had in view in the work of creation.

Page 236

Observe, the end of government is the highest good of human beings, as a part of universal good. All valid human legislation must propose this as its end, and no legislation can have any authority that has not the highest good of the whole for its end. No being can arbitrarily create law. All law for the government of moral agents must be moral law: that is, it must be that rule of action best suited to their natures and relations. All valid human legislation must be only declaratory of this one only law. Nothing else than this can by any possibility be law. God

(Continued on page 19)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 26)

reason is ready to hail with joy, and to try whatever reform seems, from the best light he can get, to bid fair to put down sin, and the evils that are in the world. Even mistaken men, who are honestly endeavoring to reform mankind, and denying their appetites, as many have done in dietetic reform, are deserving of the respect of their fellow men. Suppose their philosophy to be incorrect, yet they have intended well. They have manifested a disposition to deny themselves, for the purpose of promoting the good of others. They have been honest and zealous in this. Now no true saint can feel or express contempt for such reformers, however much mistaken they may be. No: his natural sentiments and feelings will be, and must be, the reverse of contempt or censoriousness in respect to them. If their mistake has been injurious, he may mourn over the evil, but will not, cannot, severely judge the honest reformer. War, slavery, licentiousness, and all such like evils and abominations, are necessarily regarded by the saint as great and sore evils, and he longs for their complete and final overthrow. It is impossible that a truly benevolent mind should not thus regard these abominations of desolation.

*The social gospel followed in the wake of this man. Again, it came to popularity from within the ranks of liberal Christianity. However, it is also not surprising that the founder of the Moral Majority identifies this theologian as one on the great influences upon his ministry.

Page 322

Grace is unmerited favor. Its exercise consists in bestowing that which, without a violation of justice, might be withheld.

Ability to obey God, as we have seen, is the possession of power adequate to the performance of that which is required. If, then, the terms are used in the proper sense, by a gracious ability must be intended that the power which men at present possess to obey the commands of God, is a gift of grace relatively to the command; that is, the bestowment of power adequate to the performance of the thing required, is a matter of grace as opposed to justice.

*This definition of grace as the power that God gives us to please Him is found as the centerpiece of several movements today. It is not the Biblical definition of grace as used in Ephesians 2's marvelous declaration "For by grace are ye saved." Works are expressly denied as a part of grace in that passage.

Page 354

Evangelical faith implies an evangelical life. This would not be true if faith were merely an intellectual state or exercise. But since, as we have seen, faith is of the heart, since it consists in the committal of the will to Christ, it follows, by a law of necessity, that the life will correspond with

(Continued on page 28)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 15)

glects to know what it ought to know. But it should always be understood that the sin lies in this neglect to know, and not in the neglect of that of which we have no knowledge. Entire obedience is inconsistent with any present neglect to know the truth; for such neglect is sin. But is it not inconsistent with our failing to do that of which we have no knowledge.

**Perhaps this is where Dr. Billy Graham and so many others have obtained the teaching that the heathen may be saved in or even by their heathenism. Ecumenicalism flourishes in the teachings of this man.*

Page 147

This attribute of benevolence is gloriously conspicuous in the character of God. His love to sinners alone accounts for their being today out of perdition. His aiming to secure the highest good of the greatest number, is illustrated by the display of His glorious justice in the punishment of the wicked. His universal care for all ranks and conditions of sentient beings, manifested in His works and providence, beautifully and gloriously illustrates the truth, that "His tender mercies are over all His works."

It is easy to see that universality must be a modification or attribute of true benevolence. It consists in good willing, that is, in choosing the highest good of being as such, and for its own sake. Of course it must, to be consistent with itself, seek the good of all and of each, so far as the good of each is consistent with the greatest good upon the whole. Benevolence not only wills and seeks the good of moral beings, but also the good of every sentient existence, from the minutest animalcule to the highest order of beings. It of course produces a state of the sensibility tremblingly alive to all happiness and to all pain. It is pained at the agony of an insect, and rejoices in its joy. God does this, and all holy beings do this. Where this sympathy with the joys and sorrows of universal being is not, there benevolence is not. Observe, good is its end; where this is promoted by the proper means, the feelings are gratified. Where evil is witnessed, the benevolent spirit deeply and necessarily sympathizes.

** Does any reader with "true honesty" of an entire mind accept that the aim of God is "to secure the highest good of the greatest number?" Liberal Christianity has produced the animal rights movement—but it has not yet descended to the level of insect rights—but it most likely will—at least this theologian presents that possibility.*

Page 177

Moral agents are necessarily active. That is, they cannot exist as moral agents without choice.

**Remember that God and the Lord Jesus are termed "moral beings" by*
(Continued on page 17)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 28)

Baptists to endorse this foe of their fathers.

Pages 360-361

There is scarcely any question in theology that has been encumbered with more injurious and technical mysticism than that of justification. Justification is the pronouncing of one just. It may be done in words, or, practically, by treatment. Justification must be, in some sense, a governmental act; and it is of importance to a right understanding of gospel justification, to inquire whether it be an act of the judicial, the executive, or the legislative department of government; that is, whether gospel justification consists in a strictly judicial or forensic proceeding, or whether it consists in pardon, or setting aside the execution of an incurred penalty, and is therefore properly either an executive or a legislative act. We shall see that the settling of this question is of great importance in theology; and as we view this subject, so, if consistent, we must view many important and highly practical questions in theology. This leads me to say: That gospel justification is not to be regarded as a forensic or judicial proceeding.

[Some] hold that it is. But this is certainly a great mistake, as we shall see. The term forensic is from *forum*, "a court." A forensic proceeding belongs to the judicial department of government, whose business it is to ascertain the facts and declare the sentence of the law. This department has no power over the law, but to pronounce judgment, in accordance with its true spirit and meaning. Courts never pardon, or set aside the execution of penalties. This does not belong to them, but either to the executive or to the lawmaking department. . . Gospel justification is the justification of sinners; it is, therefore, naturally impossible, and a most palpable contradiction, to affirm that the justification of a sinner, or of one who has violated the law, is a forensic or judicial justification. That only is or can be a legal or forensic justification, that proceeds upon the ground of its appearing that the justified person is guiltless, or, in other words, that he has not violated the law, that he has done only what he had a legal right to do. Now it is certainly nonsense to affirm, that a sinner can be pronounced just in the eye of law; that he can be justified by deeds of law, or by the law at all. The law condemns him. But to be justified judicially or forensically, is to be pronounced just in the judgment of law. This certainly is an impossibility in respect to sinners. The Bible is as express as possible on this point. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

It is proper to say here, that [these who hold this] do not intend that sinners are justified by their own obedience to law, but by the perfect and imputed obedience of Jesus Christ. They maintain that, by reason

(Continued on page 30)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 13)

obedience.

Page 119

Christ has expressly taught that nothing is regeneration, or virtue, but entire obedience, or the renunciation of all selfishness.

**Regeneration is entirely the work of man and is entire obedience.*

Page 123

A common idea seems to be, that a kind of obedience is rendered to God by Christians which is true religion, and which, on Christ's account, is accepted of God, which after all comes indefinitely short of full or entire obedience at any moment; that the gospel has somehow brought men, that is, Christians, into such relations, that God really accepts from them an imperfect obedience, something far below what His law requires; that Christians are accepted and justified while they render at best but a partial obedience, and while they sin more or less at every moment. Now this appears to me, to be as radical an error as can well be taught. The subject naturally branches out into two distinct inquiries:

(1.) Is it possible for a moral agent partly to obey, and partly to disobey, the moral law at the same time?

(2.) Can God, in any sense, justify one who does not yield a present and full obedience to the moral law?

The first of these questions has been fully discussed in the preceding lecture. We think that it has been shown, that obedience to the moral law cannot be partial, in the sense that the subject can partly obey, and partly disobey, at the same time. We will now attend to the second question, namely:

Can God, in any sense, justify one who does not yield a present and full obedience to the moral law? Or, in other words, Can He accept anything as virtue or obedience, which is not, for the time being, full obedience, or all that the law requires? The term justification is used in two senses:

(a.) In the sense of pronouncing the subject blameless:

(b.) In the sense of pardon, acceptance, and treating one who has sinned, as if he had not sinned.

It is in this last sense, that the advocates of this theory hold, that Christians are justified, that is, that they are pardoned, and accepted, and treated as just, though at every moment sinning, by coming short of rendering that obedience which the moral law demands. They do not pretend that they are justified at any moment by the law, for *that* at every moment condemns them for present sin; but that they are justified by grace, not in the sense that they are made really and personally righteous by grace, but that grace pardons and accepts, and in this sense justifies them when they are in the present commission of an in-

(Continued on page 15)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 30)

life to the highest good of universal being? If not, then benevolence in Him were no virtue, for it would not be a compliance with moral obligation. It was naturally impossible for Him, and is naturally impossible for any being, to perform a work of supererogation, that is, to be more benevolent than the moral law requires Him to be. This is and must be as true of God as it is of any other being. Would not Christ have sinned had He not been perfectly benevolent? If He would, it follows that He owed obedience to the law, as really as any other being. Indeed, a being that owed no obedience to the moral law must be wholly incapable of virtue, for what is virtue but obedience to the moral law?

**The mind that conceived this circuitous reasoning is a mind that is too smart by half.*

But if Christ owed personal obedience to the moral law, then His obedience could no more than justify Himself. It can never be imputed to us. He was bound for Himself to love God with all His heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and His neighbor as Himself. He did no more than this. He could do no more. It was naturally impossible, then, for Him to obey in our behalf. There are, however, valid grounds and valid conditions of justification.

**Yes, he did previously make a major distinction between "ground" and "condition" and did insist that there are many conditions and only one ground for justification. But, it is very unkind for you to nit-pick the writings of so great a man.*

The vicarious suffering or atonement of Christ is a condition of justification, or of the pardon and acceptance of penitent sinners. It has been common either to confound the conditions with the ground of justification, or purposely to represent the atonement and work of Christ as the ground, as distinct from and opposed to a condition of justification. In treating this subject, I find it important to distinguish between the ground and conditions of justification and to regard the atonement and work of Christ not as a ground, but only as a condition of gospel justification. By the ground I mean the moving, procuring cause; that in which the plan of redemption originated as its source, and which was the fundamental reason or ground of the whole movement. This was the benevolence and merciful disposition of the whole Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This love made the atonement, but the atonement did not beget this love. The Godhead desired to save sinners, but could not safely do so without danger to the universe, unless something was done to satisfy public, not retributive justice. The atonement was resorted to as a means of reconciling forgiveness with the wholesome administration of justice. A merciful disposition in the Godhead was the source, ground, mainspring, of the whole movement, while the atone-

(Continued on page 32)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 11)

background, perhaps, he was simply just as misguided as they.

Page 92

Anyone, therefore, who holds that God is not the subject of moral law, imposed on Him by His own [sic] reason, but on that contrary, that His sovereign will is the foundation of moral obligation, must, if consistent, deny that He has moral character; and he must deny that God is an intelligent being, or else admit that He is infinitely wicked for not conforming His will to the law of His intelligence; and for not being guided by His infinite reason, instead of setting up an arbitrary sovereignty of will.

Page 101-102

A single eye to the highest good of God and the universe, is the whole of morality, strictly considered; and, upon this theory, moral law, moral government, moral obligation, virtue, vice, and the whole subject of morals and religion are the perfection of simplicity. If this theory be true, no honest mind ever mistook the path of duty. To intend the highest good of being is right and is duty. . . . So, upon this theory, no one who is truly honest in pursuing the highest good, ever did or can mistake his duty in any such sense as to commit sin.

**Sinless perfection was the keystone to his doctrine. "Truly honest"—opens the door to always question the degree of true honesty that a given person possesses.*

Page 105

But I at the same time contend, that the law of God does not require that the will, or any other faculty, should be at every moment upon the strain, and the whole strength exerted at every moment. If it does, it is manifest that even Christ did not obey it. I insist that the moral law requires nothing more than the honesty of intention, assumes the honesty of intention will and must secure just that degree of intensity which from time to time, the mind in its best judgment sees to be demanded. The Bible everywhere assumes that sincerity or honesty of intention is moral perfection; that it is obedience to the law. The terms sincerity and perfection in Scripture language are synonymous. Uprightness, sincerity, holiness, honesty, perfection are words of the same meaning in Bible language.

**A backhanded way of suggesting that Jesus of Nazareth did not completely will or perfectly do the will of God. At the same time, placing the human mind as the supreme authority, infallible in function, as to the honesty of intention. The Bible nowhere assumes anything! It certainly does not state that "sincerity or honesty of intention" is "moral perfection"—the fulfillment of the law.*

Page 111

(Continued on page 13)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 32)

use the term condition, in the sense of a "not without which," and not in the sense of a "that for the sake of which" the sinner is justified. It must be certain that the government of God cannot pardon sin without repentance. This is as truly a doctrine of natural as of revealed religion. It is self-evident that, until the sinner breaks off from sins by repentance or turning to God, he cannot be justified in any sense. This is everywhere assumed, implied, and taught in the Bible. No reader of the Bible can call this in question, and it were a useless occupation of time to quote more passages.

**Remember that this theologian uses his definitions for common terms. While this paragraph might seem reasonable, it is teaching salvation by works. Read on.*

Faith in Christ is, in the same sense, another condition of justification. We have already examined into the nature and necessity of faith. I fear that there has been much of error in the conceptions of many upon this subject. They have talked of justification by faith, as if they supposed that, by an arbitrary appointment of God, faith was the condition, and the only condition of justification. This seems to be the antinomian view. The class of persons alluded to speak of justification by faith; as if it were by faith, and not by Christ through faith, that the penitent sinner is justified; as if faith, and not Christ, were our justification. They seem to regard faith not as a natural, but merely as a mystical condition of justification; as bringing us into a covenant and mystical relation to Christ, in consequence of which His righteousness or personal obedience is imputed to us. It should never be forgotten that the faith that is the condition of justification, is the faith that works by love. It is the faith through and by which Christ sanctifies the soul. A sanctifying faith unites the believer to Christ as His justification; but be it always remembered, that no faith receives Christ as a justification, that does not receive Him as a sanctification, to reign within the heart. We have seen this repentance, as well as faith, is a condition of justification. We shall see that perseverance in obedience to the end of life is also a condition of justification. Faith is often spoken of in Scripture as if it were the sole condition of salvation because, as we have seen. From its very nature it implies repentance and every virtue.

**"This repentance"—here is the special application of his system of theology. He declares that a repentance that does not persevere in sanctification is not saving repentance. Read on.*

Page 368-369

Present sanctification, in the sense of present full consecration to God, is another condition, not ground, of justification. Some theologians have made justification a condition of sanctification, instead of making

(Continued on page 34)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 31)

ment was only a condition or means, or that without which the love of God could not safely manifest itself in justifying and saving sinners. Failing to make this distinction, and representing the atonement as the ground of the sinner's justification, has been a sad occasion of stumbling to many. Indeed, the whole questions of the nature, design, extent, and bearings of the atonement turn upon, and are involved in, this distinction.

Page 364

Those who hold that the atonement and obedience of Christ were and are the ground of the justification of sinners, in the sense of the payment of their debt, regard all the grace in the transaction as consisting in the atonement and obedience of Christ, and exclude grace from the act of justification. Justification they regard as a forensic act. I regard the atonement of Christ as the necessary condition of safely manifesting the benevolence of God in the justification and salvation of sinners. A merciful disposition in the whole Godhead was the ground, and the atonement a condition of justification. Mercy would have saved without an atonement, had it been possible to do so.

That Christ's sufferings, and especially His death, were vicarious, has been abundantly shown in treating the subject of atonement. I need not repeat here what I said there. Although Christ owed perfect obedience to the moral law for Himself, and could not therefore obey as our substitute, yet since He perfectly obeyed, He owed no suffering to the law or to the Divine government on His own account. He could therefore suffer for us. That is. He could, to answer governmental purposes, substitute His death for the infliction of the penalty of the law on us. He could not perform works of supererogation, but He could endure sufferings of supererogation, in the sense that He did not owe them for Himself. The doctrine of substitution, in the sense just named, appears everywhere in both Testaments. It is the leading idea, the prominent thought, lying upon the face of the whole scriptures.

**No one can possibly misunderstand that this theologian is basing the atonement on the sufferings of Jesus Christ and not upon the blood of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. No wonder that those who are disciples of this theologian purchased entire showings and otherwise worked tirelessly to pack the theaters of America to see *The Passion of Christ*. How strange that Baptist preachers and the Roman Pontiff are endorsing the same doctrine of the atonement. This "doctrine of substitution" is not the Biblical presentation of substitution; it is antithetical to Biblical doctrine and neither harmonious nor compatible.*

Pages 366-367

Repentance is also a condition of our justification. Observe, I here also

(Continued on page 33)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 12)

The law of God requires us to will, or intend the promotion of every interest in the universe, according to its perceived value, for its own sake; in other words, that all our powers shall be supremely and disinterestedly devoted to the glory of God and the good of the universe.

**The good of the universe is mentioned so often that merely listing the page numbers would strain my space.*

Page 113

If any feeling or outward action is inconsistent with the existing ultimate intention, it must be so in spite of the agent. But if any outward action or state of feeling exists, in opposition to the intention or choice of the mind, it cannot, by any possibility have moral character. Whatever is beyond the control of a moral agent, he cannot be responsible for. Whatever he cannot control by intention, he cannot control at all.

**No responsibility for any action that is beyond the control of a person's intention. This convoluted reasoning defies every aspect of personal accountability.*

Page 115

Now virtue consists in intending to do all that good that I possible can, or in willing the glory of God and the good of the universe, and intending to promote them to the extent of my ability. Nothing short of this is virtue.

**Remember to add this definition to your understanding of 2 Peter 1:5. Intention is the fulfillment of the law.*

Page 116

Does a Christian cease to be a Christian, whenever he commits a sin? I answer

Whenever he sins, he must, for the time being, cease to be holy. This is self-evident. Whenever he sins, he must be condemned; he must incur the penalty of the law of God. . . The Christian, therefore, is justified no longer than he obeys, and must be condemned when he disobeys. . . Until he repents, he cannot be forgiven. In these respects, then the sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are upon precisely the same ground.

Page 117

Can a man be born again, and then be unborn? I answer

If there were anything impossible in this, then perseverance would be no virtue. . . it is plain that an individual can be born again, and afterwards cease to be virtuous. That a Christian is able to apostatize, is evident, from the many warnings addressed to Christians in the Bible. A Christian may certainly fall into sin and unbelief, and afterwards be renewed, both to repentance and faith.

**The security of the believer is totally the result of his faithfulness and*

(Continued on page 14)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 29)

of the obedience to law which Christ rendered when on earth, being set down to the credit of elect sinners, and imputed to them, the law regards them as having rendered perfect obedience in Him, or regards them as having perfectly obeyed by proxy, and therefore pronounces them just, upon condition of faith in Christ.

Pages 362-363

A condition as distinct from, a ground of justification, is anything without which sinners cannot be justified, which, nevertheless, is not the procuring cause or fundamental reason of their justification. As we shall see, there are many conditions, while there is but one ground, of the justification of sinners. The application and importance of this distinction we shall perceive as we proceed.

As has been already said, there can be no justification in a legal or forensic sense, but upon the ground of universal, perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to law. This is of course denied by those who hold that gospel justification, or the justification of penitent sinners, is of the nature of a forensic or judicial justification.

**As with so much of his error, he surrounds it with such verbiage as to sneak it by the casual reader. Are there indeed "many conditions" to justification? Is justification not by faith but is found through compliance with the "many conditions?"*

The doctrine of an imputed righteousness, or that Christ's obedience to the law was accounted as our obedience, is founded on a most false and nonsensical assumption; to wit, that Christ owed no obedience to the law in His own person, and that therefore His obedience was altogether a work of supererogation, and might be made a substitute for our own obedience; that it might be set down to our credit, because He did not need to obey for Himself.

**Do not let this slip by your consciousness, Reader. Baptists have been preaching "a most false and nonsensical assumption" when they proclaim, as did Paul, that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."*

I must here remark, that justification respects the moral law; and that it must be intended that Christ owed no obedience to the moral law, and therefore His obedience to this law, being wholly a work of supererogation, is set down to our account as the ground of our justification upon condition of faith in Him. But surely this is an obvious mistake. We have seen, that the spirit of the moral law requires good will to God and the universe. Was Christ under no obligation to do this? Nay, was He not rather under infinite obligation to be perfectly benevolent? Was it possible for Him to be more benevolent than the law requires God and all beings to be? Did He not owe entire consecration of heart and

(Continued on page 31)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 14)

definite amount of sin; that grace accounts them righteous while, in fact, they are continually sinning; that they are fully pardoned and acquitted, while at the same moment committing sin, by coming entirely and perpetually short of the obedience which, under the circumstances the law of God requires. While voluntarily withholding full obedience, their partial obedience is accepted, and the sin of withholding full obedience is forgiven. God accepts what the sinner has a mind to give, and forgives what he voluntarily withholds. This is no caricature. It is, if I understand them, precisely what many hold.

**This is his explanation [and renunciation] of salvation by grace and of justification by faith without the works of the law. Needless to say, he has a distorted view to which he is responding.*

Page 126

But again, to the question, can man be justified while sin remains in him? Surely, he cannot, either upon legal or gospel principles, unless the law be repealed. That he cannot be justified by the law, while there is a particle of sin in him, is too plain to need proof. But can he be pardoned and accepted, and then justified, in the gospel sense, while sin, any degree of sin, remains in him? Certainly not.

Page 127

God cannot repeal the law. It is not founded in His arbitrary will. It is as unalterable and unrepealable as His own [sic] nature. God can never repeal nor alter it. He can for Christ's sake dispense with the execution of the penalty, when the subject has returned to full present obedience to the precept, but in no other case, and upon no other possible conditions.

Page 132-133

Christ had all the constitutional appetites and susceptibilities of human nature.

**So much for the impeccability of Jesus Christ. It would not do for the mind to long dwell favorably on this theme. Can The Last Temptation of Christ not come to mind? Perhaps that author mediated on this theologian's concept of Christ.*

Page 134

We cannot believe anything about God of which we have neither evidence nor knowledge. Our faith must therefore be limited by our intellectual perceptions of truth. The heathen are not under obligation to believe in Christ, and thousands of other things of which they have no knowledge. Perfection in a heathen would imply much less faith than in a Christian.

Page 135

If there is sin in such a case as this, it lies in the fact, that the soul ne-

(Continued on page 16)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 27)

the faith. Let this be kept in perpetual remembrance.

Evangelical faith implies repentance towards God. Evangelical faith particularly respects Jesus Christ and His salvation. It is an embracing of Christ and His salvation. Of course it implies repentance towards God, that is, a turning from sin to God. The will cannot be submitted to Christ, it cannot receive Him as He is presented in the gospel, while it neglects repentance toward God; while it rejects the authority of the Father, it cannot embrace and submit to the Son.

**Faith is repentance and turning from sin—all sin. The Lordship Salvation teachers have a champion in this theologian. He would have delighted in the "if He is not Lord of all, then He is not Lord at all" slogan.*

Page 355

Present evangelical faith implies a state of present sinlessness. Observe, faith is the yielding and committal of the whole will, and of the whole being to Christ. This, and nothing short of this, is evangelical faith. But this comprehends and implies the whole of present, true obedience to Christ. This is the reason why faith is spoken of as the condition, and as it were, the only condition, of salvation. It really implies all virtue. Faith may be contemplated either as a distinct form of virtue, and as an attribute of love, or as comprehensive of all virtue. When contemplated as an attribute of love, it is only a branch of sanctification. When contemplated in the wider sense of universal conformity of will to the will of God, it is then synonymous with entire present sanctification. Contemplated in either light, its existence in the heart must be inconsistent with present sin there. Faith is an attitude of the will, and is wholly incompatible with present rebellion of will against Christ. This must be true, or what is faith?

Faith implies the reception and the practice of all known or perceived truth. The heart that embraces and receives truth as truth, and because it is truth, must of course receive all known truth. For it is plainly impossible that the will should embrace some truth perceived for a benevolent reason, and reject other truth perceived. All truth is harmonious. One truth is always consistent with every other truth. The heart that truly embraces one, will, for the same reason, embrace all truth known. If out of regard to the highest good of being, any one revealed truth is truly received, that state of mind continuing, it is impossible that all truth should not be received as soon as known.

**I submit that it is difficult to miss the fact that this man taught sinless perfection was the only way to achieve salvation. This means that he taught that salvation is the result of our efforts. That concept has never been a Baptist distinctive. Multitudes of our forefathers died simply because they preached salvation by grace. It is unbecoming for alleged*

(Continued on page 29)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 16)

this theologian.

Self-love is simply the constitutional desire of happiness. It is altogether an involuntary state. It has, as a desire, no moral character, any more than has the desire for food. It is no more sinful to desire happiness, and properly to seek it, then it is wrong to desire food, and properly to seek that.

**The self-esteem, self-love, movement of the 1980-1990's rose within liberal Christianity. Its roots are right here in his writing.*

Page 205

We have seen that sin is selfishness, that it consists in preferring self-gratification to the infinite interests of God and of the universe.

**The universe is always considered by this theologian above God or as bigger and more important than God and of placing obligation upon God to insure and to defend its well-being. Carl Sagan's cosmos may well have originated in the writings of this man.*

Page 210

11. Whatever will as fully evince the lawgiver's regard for his law, his determination to support it, his abhorrence of all violations of its precepts, and withal guard as effectually against the inference, that violators of the precept might expect to escape with impunity, as the execution of the penalty would do, is a full satisfaction of public justice. When these conditions are fulfilled, and the sinner has returned to obedience, public justice not only admits, but absolutely demands, that the penalty shall be set aside by extending pardon to the offender. The offender still deserves to be punished, and, upon the principles of retributive justice, might be punished according to his deserts. But the public good admits and requires, that upon the above condition he should live; hence, public justice, in compliance with the public interests and the spirit of the law of love, spares and pardons him.

**The public good, not grace, pardons the sinner, but only when he returns to full obedience to the law.*

Page 211

The English word atonement is synonymous with the Hebrew word *cofer*. This is a noun from the verb *caufar*, to cover. The *cofer* or cover was the name of the lid or cover of the ark of the covenant, and constituted what was called the mercy-seat. The Greek word rendered atonement is *katallage*. This means reconciliation to favor, or more strictly, the means or conditions of reconciliation to favor; from *katallasso*, to "change, or exchange." The term properly means substitution. An examination of these original words, in the connection in which they stand, will show that the atonement is the governmental substitution of the sufferings of Christ for the punishment of sinners. It is a cover-

(Continued on page 18)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 25)

tency compels them to maintain that there is but one agent employed in regeneration, and that is the Holy Spirit, and that no instrument whatever is employed, because the work is, according to them, an act of creative power; that the very nature is changed, and of course no instrument can be employed, any more than in the creation of the world. Page 277

It [*regeneration] implies an entire present change of moral character, that is, a change from entire sinfulness to entire holiness. We have seen that it consists in a change from selfishness to benevolence. We have also seen that selfishness and benevolence cannot coexist in the same mind; that selfishness is a state of supreme and entire consecration to self; that benevolence is a state of entire and supreme consecration to God and the good of the universe. Regeneration, then, surely implies an entire change of moral character.

Again: the Bible represents regeneration as a dying to sin and becoming alive to God. Death in sin is total depravity. This is generally admitted. Death to sin and becoming alive to God, must imply entire present holiness.

The scriptures represent regeneration as the condition of salvation in such a sense, that if the subject should die immediately after regeneration, and without any further change, he would go immediately to heaven.

Again: the scriptures require only perseverance in the first love, as the condition of salvation, in case the regenerate soul should live long in the world subsequently to regeneration.

When the scriptures require us to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, this does not imply that there is yet sin remaining in the regenerate heart which we are required to put away by degrees.

**Sinless is required for entrance into heaven. Entire holiness, the perseverance in "entire present holiness" is the condition of salvation. The entire responsibility is upon the individual to regenerate his heart by changing his will to one of universal benevolence.*

Page 296

True saints love reform, it is their business, their profession, their life to promote it; consequently, they are ready to examine the claims of any proposed reform; candid and self-denying, and ready to be convinced, however much self-denial it may call them to. They have actually rejected self-indulgence, as the end for which they live, and are ready to sacrifice any form of self-indulgence, for the sake of promoting the good of men and the glory of God. The saint is truly and greatly desirous and in earnest, to reform all sin out of the world, and just for this

(Continued on page 27)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 18)

puts forth no enactments, but such as are declaratory of the common law of the universe; and should He do otherwise, they would not be obligatory. Arbitrary legislation can never be really obligatory.

**He includes in his declarations regarding wrongful legislation a strong anti-war policy (pages 238-242). This too is propagated in our times largely through liberal Christianity.*

Page 245

It [*moral depravity] cannot consist in anything back of choice, and that sustains to choice the relation of a cause. Whatever is back of choice, is without the pale of legislation. The law of God, as has been said, requires good willing only; and sure it is, that nothing but acts of will can constitute a violation of moral law. Outward actions, and involuntary thoughts and feelings, may be said in a certain sense to possess moral character because they are produced by the will. But, strictly speaking, moral character belongs only to choice, or intention.

It was shown in a former lecture, that sin does not, and cannot consist in malevolence, properly speaking, or in the choice of sin or misery as an end, or for its own sake. It was also shown, that all sin consists, and must consist in selfishness, or in the choice of self-gratification as a final end. Moral depravity then, strictly speaking, can only be predicated of selfish ultimate intention.

Moral depravity, as I use the term, does not consist in, nor imply a sinful nature, in the sense that the substance of the human soul is sinful in itself. It is not a constitutional sinfulness. It is not an involuntary sinfulness. Moral depravity, as I use the term, consists in selfishness; in a state of voluntary committal of the will to self-gratification. It is a spirit of self-seeking, a voluntary and entire consecration to the gratification of self. It is selfish ultimate intention; it is the choice of a wrong end of life; it is moral depravity, because it is a violation of moral law. It is a refusal to consecrate the whole being to the highest well-being of God and of the universe, and obedience to the moral law, and consecrating it to the gratification of self.

**There is no sin nature inherited from Adam and this writer devotes pages upon pages to proving this new insight. If you doubt this, continue reading.*

Page 256

He [*David] was deeply convinced of sin, and was, as he had good reason to be, much excited, and expressed himself, as we all do in similar circumstances, in strong language. His eye, as was natural and is common in such cases, had been directed back along the pathway of life up to the days of his earliest recollection. He remembered sins among the earliest acts of his recollected life. He broke out in the language of this

(Continued on page 20)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 23)

and the sinner yields or turns, or which is the same thing, changes his heart, or, in other words, is born again. The sinner is dead in trespasses and sins. God calls on him, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." God calls; the sinner hears and answers, Here am I, God says, Arise from the dead. The sinner puts forth his activity, and God draws him into life; or rather, God draws, and the sinner comes forth to life.

As the distinction is not only arbitrary, but anti-scriptural and injurious, and inasmuch as it is founded in, and is designed to teach a philosophy false and pernicious on the subject of depravity and regeneration, I shall drop and discard the distinction; and in our investigations henceforth, let it be understood, that I use regeneration and conversion as synonymous terms.

What regeneration is not:

It is not a change in the substance of soul or body. If it were, sinners could not be required to effect it. Such a change would not constitute a change on moral character. No such change is needed, as the sinner has all the faculties natural attributes requisite to render perfect obedience to God. All he needs is to be induced to use these powers and attributes as he ought. The words conversion and regeneration do not imply any change of substance, but only a change of moral state or of moral character. The terms are not used to express a physical, but a moral change. Regeneration does not express or imply the creation of any new faculties or attributes of nature, nor any change whatever in the constitution of body or mind.

Regeneration then is a radical change of the ultimate intention, and, of course, of the end or object of life. We have seen, that the choice of an end is efficient in producing executive volitions, or the use of means to obtain its end. A selfish ultimate choice is, therefore, a wicked heart, out of which flows every evil; and a benevolent ultimate choice is a good heart, out of which flows every good and commendable deed.

Regeneration, to have the characteristics ascribed to it in the Bible, must consist in a change in the attitude of the will, or a change in its ultimate choice, intention, or preference; a change from selfishness to benevolence; from choosing self-gratification as the supreme and ultimate end of life, to the supreme and ultimate choice of the highest well-being of God and of the universe; from a state of entire consecration to self-interest, self-indulgence, self-gratification for its own sake or as an end, and as the supreme end of life, to a state of entire consecration to God, and to the interests of His kingdom as the supreme and ultimate end of life.

Page 274

(Continued on page 25)

WHAT THE DEAD MAN WROTE

(Continued from page 20)

be a calamity, and can be no crime. It is the necessary effect of a sinful nature. This cannot be a crime, since the will has nothing to do with it. Of course it must render repentance, either with or without the grace of God, impossible, unless grace sets aside our reason. If repentance implies self-condemnation, we can never repent in the exercise of our reason. Constituted as we are, it is impossible that we should condemn ourselves for a sinful nature, or for actions that are unavoidable. The doctrine of original sin, or of a sinful constitution, and of necessary sinful actions, represents the whole moral government of God, the plan of salvation by Christ, and indeed every doctrine of the gospel, as a mere farce. Upon this supposition the law is tyranny, and the gospel an insult to the unfortunate.

Page 263

The fact that Christ died in the stead and behalf of sinners, proves that God regarded them not as unfortunate, but as criminal and altogether without excuse. Surely Christ need not have died to atone for the misfortunes of men. His death was to atone for their guilt, and not for their misfortunes. But if they are without excuse for sin, they must be without a sinful nature that renders sin unavoidable. If men are without excuse for sin, as the whole law and gospel assume and teach, it cannot possibly be that their nature is sinful, for a sinful nature would be the best of all excuses for sin.

This doctrine is a stumbling-block both to the church and the world, infinitely dishonorable to God, and an abomination alike to God and the human intellect, and should be banished from every pulpit, and from every formula of doctrine, and from the world. It is a relic of heathen philosophy, and was foisted in among the doctrines of Christianity by Augustine, as every one may know who will take the trouble to examine for himself. This view of moral depravity that I am opposing, has long been the stronghold of Universalism. From it, the Universalists inveigh with resistless force against the idea that sinners should be sent to an eternal hell. Assuming the long-defended doctrine of original or constitutional sinfulness, they proceeded to show, that it would be infinitely unreasonable and unjust in God to send them to hell. What! Create them with a sinful nature, from which proceed, by a law of necessity, actual transgressions, and then send them to an eternal hell for having this nature, and for transgressions that are unavoidable! Impossible! They say; and the human intellect responds, Amen.

Page 267

The dogma of constitutional moral depravity, is a part and parcel of the doctrine of a necessitated will. It is a branch of a grossly false and heathenish philosophy. How infinitely absurd, dangerous, and unjust,

(Continued on page 22)