

LECTURE V.

THE FALL OF MAN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

SECTION I.—THE ORIGINAL STATE AND FALL OF MAN.

EVERY man is born a citizen and a member of some government. Adam was created a citizen and a member of the government of God, under which probably other and higher beings had for many ages been protected and governed. The physical conditions and laws had been fixed, the surroundings provided for, and the moral government from all eternity established without the voice or knowledge of the subject who was now to accept of the situation, adapt himself to his environment, and obey the government and enjoy its advantages.

As everywhere else in nature, two distinct forces are established in his being, impelling forces and restraining forces, upon the harmony of which all true life and development depend. The first parents had appetites and passions demanding animal gratification, curiosity and love of knowledge requiring intellectual satisfaction, and love of action and success urging to ceaseless activity. Nature seems to recognize the principle of the division of labor and economizes instrumentalities. Each bone, muscle, nerve, and sense has its specific work and function. The eye does not hear nor the ear see, but each and every force continues its action until limited or restrained by other forces.

So the impelling forces of human nature have no other use

but the demand for gratification. To balance these and secure perfect symmetry and development, three restraining forces were supplied. Intelligence and reason see the nature and relations of things and the force of motives. Conscience sees the moral quality of actions, gives warning of evil, and urges to the right. And the will is to direct these forces, control the impulses, and thus keep the whole man in complete symmetry.

The first pair were created precisely in this condition. Exactly balanced, perfectly symmetrical, free from pain and disease, and from all excessive appetites and purposes, they stood in the midst of their earthly dominion in the grandeur of innocence and the peace of love. But two possibilities could in the least endanger this state of things: restraint without gratification, or gratification without restraint. If the centripetal force of the earth should overcome its antagonistic force, the earth would quickly plunge into the sun, leaving scarcely a cloud spot upon its disk. And if the centrifugal force should by a little exceed the centripetal, the earth would soon start from its orbit in a tangent into the frigid regions of space and barren waste with all life extinct. So with human nature. With restraints weakened and impulsive forces increased, the soul is wrecked. So it was in Eden. In looking upon that which was forbidden and listening to temptation, the restraints were loosened and man fell. Not because it was decreed or foreordained that he should fall, not because he was created with that tendency or predisposition to sin, not because he was overpowered by Satanic strength, but God had power and wisdom enough to create a being who would himself be a cause of his own actions.

A man scarcely understands the philosophy and processes of his own mind, and he need not attempt to explain the philosophy of Adam's choice. But some will ask, "Why did God make a man capable of such a choice?" We do not know. But it is easy to see that such power of choice

is what distinguishes men from animals. If men wish to question the Creator, they might as well ask why men were created at all. Why not have left the world with animals and trees only? Why were barren rocks, useless marshes, and naked deserts created? Why was the earth made with its volcanic fires, earthquakes, and floods? Why are carnivorous animals, poisonous reptiles, and stinging insects placed here? Questions respecting the support, activity, and life of the body, the nature and laws of the mind, man's exposure to accidents, disease, and death, are just as mysterious as the origin of the race or the facts of their experience. There is nothing reasonable nor honest with reference to God or man for a person to leave the mysteries of his own being, life, and character, and go back over the thousands of unsolved problems of nature and history to Eden and ask why the Almighty made man as he did.

We must in every subject of thought and investigation begin with cause, whether it is physical or moral cause. Man is a second cause, but nevertheless a cause, and the cause of his own actions and character. Beginning with man as we find him, these are the simple facts of his early experience and history.

1. He was created in the image of God. Not a material or bodily image, for "God is a spirit" (John 4: 24), and a "spirit hath not flesh and bones" (Luke 24: 39). Not an official image as ruler over animals or men. Animals rule over one another, and men never rule like God. Not in holiness, which is not created, but consists in character attained, practices followed, and "fruits" of experience, (Rom. 6: 19; Titus 2: 2; Heb. 12: 14.) But man in creation has intelligence, sense of right and wrong, the power of choice, and by these three characteristics is distinguished from all other earthly beings; and in these traits he has the image of God.

2. With these attributes he is capable of virtue or vice.

3. Satan, through the agency of an animal, stimulated his

impulsive faculties by tempting the appetite, exciting his curiosity or love of knowledge, and inducing love of independent action outside of Divine authority. Respecting the tempter we know but little, but he is termed "Satan," "Devil," and that "old serpent." (Rev. 12: 9; 20: 2.) We know that angels "fell," and "those that kept not their first estate" were still left in existence, and, as an inference from the nature of the facts and the revelations of the Bible, one of that character must have been the tempter in Eden.

Respecting the animal employed in this temptation, there is much mystery. The Hebrew word *nachash*, translated serpent, means sometimes a serpent in the generic sense. Sometimes it means brass and instruments made of brass. But sometimes it simply means a keen view and attentive looking into things, also indicating brightness and sagacity. Catching at the thought of the serpent, it is thus translated as in the Septuagint.

But there are some questions about this matter. Was it an animal who talked naturally, or did he here speak by supernatural agency? Did it naturally stand erect? If not, what significance can we see in the curse? Did the curse mean a literal going upon the dust like a snake? The language would bear either signification. Is it true that the common, or any, species of the snake is more subtle than the monkey, the beaver, or even the dog? If an orang-outang was constituted so as originally to walk erect, utter distinct sounds of speech, and under spiritual inspiration hold converse with Eve, would not all the circumstances and history favor the conclusion of Dr. Clark that Satan probably employed some species of the ape?

But at all events, since the animal is only an instrument, these questions cannot be considered important in our present discussion. The fact of the temptation and result is the main question. Respecting this there have been different views. Some have considered this whole history purely imaginary, and by the same mode of reasoning could consid-

er, and generally have considered, the whole Bible mythical. Some have considered it allegorical, representing real facts in morals and experience, but wholly in figurative terms. Others have looked upon it as partly allegorical and partly historical, leaving the distinctions between these two departments to readers and thinkers for themselves. Others look upon this history as a simple statement of facts, only using language in the figurative sense, as elsewhere in the Bible and other books, for a complete presentation of the truth. As there seems to be no reason against this assumption, as statements are always to be taken in their literal sense unless something in the nature of the case or language necessarily gives other meaning, there seems to be no reason for discrediting this piece of history, or transferring it to regions of fiction. It involves something supernatural, to be sure. So does the whole Bible. To discredit this or any other portion because of supernatural agency, is to relegate the whole Bible to the regions of imagination and falsehood.

There is nothing improbable in the facts of this history. That God would give a moral law to man, forbidding excessive and erroneous gratification, and that such a law would be simple and plain, seems natural, if not within the range of *a priori* reasoning. That there were devils with dispositions and power for tempting men, and that they would do so, is quite as probable. Such has been the belief generally of Jews and Christians, most of whom have looked upon these facts, and the doctrines involved, as natural, physical, and Scriptural. With other portions of Scripture too abundant to quote, it might be profitable to consider Isa. 2 : 3 ; Ezck. 36 : 35 ; Joel 2 : 3 ; John 8 : 44 ; 2 Cor. 11 : 3 ; 1 Tim. 2 : 4 ; 1 John 3 : 8 ; Rev. 12 : 9, and especially the account of the temptation of Christ in Matt. 4 : 3, 5, 9.

4. Under these circumstances the restraining forces of reason, conscience, and will were weakened, and man fell. It was not an accident nor a necessity, but a voluntary violation of law, and as there was but one law, its violation

was rebellion against the government; *i. e.*, treason. No matter how simple, trivial, or innocent an action may appear in itself, if it gives "aid and comfort" to an enemy and refuses allegiance to a legitimate power, it is treason in human or Divine government, and necessarily cuts off a criminal from all further favor and protection from the government rejected. And as there was but one law, the violation of that law was the rejection of the whole government — rebellion and treason.

In this catastrophe there were certain direct, *personal* consequences unavoidably experienced.

1. Conviction and guilt of conscience. This being the first transgression, the conscience not being blinded or hardened by sinful habit, this feeling must have been intense, and especially so in view of the recognized and searching eye of the eternal King. The brevity and simplicity of the language scarcely gives us full opportunity to realize how deep and terrific must have been the moral convictions in that fearful hour. With the crime committed, the conscience alive, the frown of God, the penalties inflicted, the necessary and terrible results of sin begin to appear.

2. The intellect was thus brought into a disordered state. The natural and necessary consequences of this crime could not have been confined exclusively to the conscience and moral feelings, but, as in all instances of great crime, the power of consecutive thought was broken, logical processes confused, and all capabilities of intellect weakened. This crime must have affected the whole mind. Therefore

3. General derangement of the appetites, passions, and instincts must have ensued. They were not the same innocent, pure impulses they were before. With this moral and intellectual derangement and abnormal action of the appetites and passions

4. Disease and pain must have ensued. The body would just as naturally have become disturbed by these moral, intellectual, and instinctive derangements as by such

violations it is now. It is a fact beyond all dispute that now, while all the world is more or less deranged, great crimes and excessive violations of law tend to produce, directly and indirectly, disease and death.

5. Necessarily and naturally death is thus brought before us. Death is not only a part of the penal code, but it is a consequential part, and so death "passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,"—passed not only as a penalty, but as a necessary consequence of causes which involved this fatal end. We thus see that this guilty pair died to God and morality. They died to happiness and hope. They died physically and naturally. It was really a moral and physical death, and would have been immediate and endless but for God's provision of mercy immediately announced.

6. Death must include the penal infliction which God's government ordains and executes, whatever the nature of that death may be. And with these personal consequences there are general consequences to the race which must now be considered.

Three different views are entertained respecting these consequences. Some affirm that they are wholly physical, leaving the mind and even the passions the same as in Adam. Others take the opposite extreme, that the consequences of the fall are not only physical and mental, but penal, so that all men are born guilty of the sin of Adam, who as the head of the race left the guilt of his sin upon his posterity. The first is contrary to natural law, history, and experience. The last is contrary to reason, justice, and the Bible. Others affirm, according to the laws of nature, reason, justice, experience, and the Bible, that the real consequences of the fall are inherited universally in the body and its instincts, affecting the regularity and balance of the mind, but without guilt until there is knowledge and choice of wrong-doing.

In early life, John B. Gough at a wedding took one glass of wine. It was his first glass. In thinking of the matter the next day, a desire for tasting it again sprang up, and so

to see how it would taste, and settle the question whether it was agreeable or otherwise, he repeated the taste a few times, stimulated an appetite, became a drunkard and a wreck; and but for a special interposition of reformatory forces, he must have been lost. This process is more or less the experience of all men in some direction,—a single taste, appetite, habit. These results are not exclusively personal. Ordinarily, children and children's children to the third and fourth generation, show the influence of ancestry; and although after three or four generations effects become so mixed that they are not generally traceable farther except in whole races and nationalities, yet it is unquestionably true that the law of heredity continues the influence of ancestry indefinitely. "Like produces like" in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and in human nature as well. The first transgression and its consequences upon the transgressor would lead to serious consequences to his posterity. It needs no history or revelation to prove this fact. The laws of nature justify the utmost confidence in the proposition that the descendants of our first parents must have experienced more or less of the evils of that catastrophe in the garden. But history illustrates the truth established in science; and in universal experience, disease, and sufferings of mankind we see the natural results of that early transgression. Let us notice some of these general consequences which must have been expected, and actually do appear.

1. There is a natural derangement of the body. But one human being has ever been born on earth since the fall with a perfect body. The body is out of symmetry; some parts are too strong, others are too weak. Powers and parts of the body are unsymmetrical. Not only is every human body abnormal, but there is a degree of physiological imperfection, and even the most healthy men on the earth at times feel more or less of this natural physical derangement. The liability and the tendency to disease are seen everywhere; and the simple fact that over half of the human race die be-

fore they are fifteen years of age shows that death like some poisonous seed is in every human system. It is sometimes said that if parents would do their duty, and children obey nature's laws, these diseases and ills might be avoided. But that hypothesis shows the very difficulty. These conditions have never been so complied with, and they never will be. Man does not now know enough to obey the laws of nature perfectly, and if he did he would not escape death.

2. Universally the animal instincts are deranged. They are connected with the body, and this diseased and deranged state of the body affects the instincts, so that the appetites and passions are just as much deranged as the material powers, and more so. Characteristics of parents are seen in their children and descendants in this quite as much as in their physical appearance and habits. And in the varied circumstances and multiplicity of generations, each generation in its turn keeps up these inherited influences, and so, as a matter of fact, we see that appetites are too strong or too weak, passions too impulsive or too sluggish, mere sympathy too soft or the feelings too dull, so that everywhere human beings are in this regard naturally imperfect. And thus the charges brought against society and governments for these ills, only show that society and the governments are themselves depraved. This natural depravation is not only seen in the body and the instincts of the body, but

3. Even the intellect exhibits that lack of balance, strength, and logical acumen for which the mind was originally intended. The dullness of perception, the mistakes of judgment, the extravagant imagination, the slowness of appreciation, the lack of memory or its action at the expense of other mental action, the inordinate strength of love and sympathy which often leads to ruin, and the lack of it which more frequently prevents happiness, show that the organs through which the mind acts are so disordered that the activities of the soul in all its highest powers and more general

operations are deranged ; not really insane, but really destitute of full strength and harmonious activity. All this is natural, but not sinful necessarily ; yet with this intellectual lack of symmetry and perfection are seen the consequences of sin.

4. The sensibilities are also deeply affected. Men complain a great deal of the hard-heartedness of the world, but they may as well complain of the soft-heartedness. The feelings of the human soul are never exactly right. They are too easily moved or too dull, too strong for reason or too weak for utility. We talk a great deal about good-hearted men, but no man has a heart constitutionally right. His sensibilities are too much alive in some directions and too dull in others. This same natural depravity extends even to the conscience. Not that the voice of conscience is itself ever to be refused, for there is no other standard by which it could be denied ; but everybody knows that while there are some cases of excessive susceptibility of the conscience, producing intense anxiety, and often unnecessary anxiety about moral qualities, the general fact is that the power of conscience is terribly weakened, that it fails to recognize moral qualities where they do exist, fails to give the impulse which the nature of the case justifies, fails to command the entire soul in the principles of right and wrong as was originally intended. Some men seem naturally to lack keenness of conscience, moral susceptibilities ; and upon this ground charity is, and ought to be, often extended with reference to men whose conduct could not be excused in other men. This natural depravity, if so we may term it, extends even to man's religious and moral nature. It is true that man's religious nature exists and continues frequently in spite of moral depravity, and in connection with the most immoral character. It is true also that sometimes these religious impulses are exceedingly strong, excessively so, cutting off the normal activity of other impulses. And, worse still, in their exercise religious nature seems to be almost lost to good-

ness. But, as a whole, there is nothing that more clearly shows and proves the natural depravity of the human soul than the perversion and abuses of man's religious nature. His objects of worship, his religious customs and habits, his superstitions, fears, and false hopes, show how terribly natural depravity has affected the being, and perverted human nature.

In these different fields of human life and experience we only have been tracing the natural consequences of the fall. There is no guilt in the existence of any of these perversions. This "crookedness" of human nature, which is the real central meaning of the word depravity, naturally and necessarily exists, but does not necessarily imply guilt, which is only exhibited when men voluntarily yield to these natural, abnormal impulses. So man is not only born in the midst of circumstances somewhat deranged, but these deranging forces are within him, and just as long as the law of nature and heredity continues, and "like produces like," these imperfections will exist; and only "when this mortal shall have put on immortality, and this corruption shall have put on incorruption," will the body and its instincts, the organs of the soul, be correct and symmetrical.

There being no personal responsibility for the existence of these things, duty being always regarded "according to what a man hath," guilt must be found with volition and seen in the voluntary perversion of the laws of God and nature.

There are some objections presented to this view of the world's natural derangement.

1. It is said, if this be true, one suffers for another's sin.

But (1) such suffering is a necessity, and undeniable and unavoidable in nature. Whatever may be believed or disbelieved about the Bible and its truths, everybody knows that everybody suffers by the influence of others. It is a fact in nature and universal experience that one man must suffer for the evils of another. No man lives or can live

so isolated and retired as to be beyond the reach of evil influences. Some cause of trouble will come upon him. The burdens of our legislative and charitable institutions come mainly through the error and faults of others, and not from the faults of those who have to pay the expenses and bear the burdens. In the family untold burdens come upon the innocent parties from those around them. The same is true in civil society and all kinds of methods of human association. What is so universally true beyond help cannot be a matter of complaint against God or religion. (2) We cannot conceive of society or social relations without such liability. Ability to bless implies ability to injure others. We cannot conceive of human beings as living in any kind of society and association or relations in which one must not be liable to suffer for the wrong of another. It is necessary in our constitution and organization. (3) Guilt and condemnation are not transmitted nor imputed. Where there is no law there is no transgression. (Rom. 4: 15; 5: 13, 20; John 3: 4.) "Sin is the transgression of the law." So, while man is compelled to bear the ills of another's character, he is not compelled to take the character upon himself, and can live upright in spite of all, if he will. (4) These necessary evils from society, like all other involuntary sufferings, may be so met that they will prove ultimately beneficial; so that what is intended for our harm becomes a good. (2 Cor. 4: 17.) "And thus all things may work together for good." No man suffers ultimately for another's wrong which conditionally may be made a blessing to him in spite of the evil of natural depravity.

2. It is objected that if man is not a sinner in his physical depravity, Christ is not his Saviour, and infants, therefore, are saved without Christ.

In reply to this, let it be observed (1) that Christ gives existence to the race. There is no reason in any sound government for delaying penalty after conviction. There was no reason in the demands of justice for continuing man long-

er in his probationary state after the fall, unless some system of mercy had proposed another trial. "But for the seed of the woman"—the promised Christ—the first transgressors ought to have been cut off and the race terminated. But because of the "lamb slain from the foundation of the world" life was continued, and so every human being owes his existence to the work of Christ. (2) Christ provides resurrection for all, not only giving a present existence to each one, but a resurrection state in another life. In him is the "resurrection power" and he is the "first fruits of the resurrection." (3) He gives the spirit by which the "soul is sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 1: 13; 4: 30), and by which the image of God is stamped upon the mind. "Without the Spirit of Christ we are none of his" (Rom. 8: 9). Thus the infant in heaven will sing praises to Christ for his existence, his resurrection, and the Divine influence which adds the seal of the Divine image in addition to innocence.

3. With this view of the innocent condition of children, why may they not be so trained and educated as to grow up pious without a change of heart?

(1) As previously explained, man is an animal. At first the animal instincts prevail with no indications of reason or conscience. And the first development of the moral powers is in such weakness that the animal nature still predominates. These instincts are hereditarily, necessarily, and universally like the body, deranged and active in tendencies and preferences which would be sinful if practiced by the moral powers. The first impressions upon the moral faculties must be through these disordered instincts, and therefore sure to be wrong in direction or degree. (2) The physical and animal nature is the instrument of the mind, and by its influence or otherwise the mental powers are perverted, irregular, and unsymmetrical in their capabilities and actions, and are sure to err, if not to be sinful. (3) With a perfect, symmetrical physical and moral nature,

the physical universe with all of its adaptations to animal nature would be an occasion and means of moral development and increase of spiritual happiness. But with our present weakened and perverted powers the world with its animal supplies and temptations, and the depraved state of society, renders the expectation of natural or educational piety without Divine help, groundless. (4) The infant is innocent, for moral character without moral powers is just as impossible as sight without eyes. But pure religion before God and the Father is something more than innocency. It is not a mere negation, the absence of sin, but something positive in experience and action. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his" (Rom. 8: 9). "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3: 3). The saved are "sealed unto the day of redemption" "by the Holy Ghost" (Eph. 4: 30; 2 Cor. 1: 22). The "image of Christ" effected by the Spirit is a necessary condition of heaven (Rom. 8: 29; 2 Cor. 3: 18). This direct influence of the Spirit is just as necessary upon the innocent heart of the infant as upon the heart rendered innocent by pardon. But this work is in this life by faith, and therefore when the "well trained" child comes to the life of piety his first work is so to believe as to be "baptized by the Spirit" "into the body of Christ." If he does this he is "created anew in Christ Jesus." If not he chooses the way of sin. If taken before becoming guilty, the depraved animal and its environments are left, and in the immediate presence of Christ without sin or hindrance he receives the Divine image. Christ saves all who do not reject him.

Proofs of such depravity.

1. Universal history, revealing the selfishness, wars, and crimes of human beings generally, almost leaves other proofs unnecessary. Nations are born in blood and die in selfish ambition and strife. Universal greed reaches constantly for possessions regardless of right, and the misery and wretchedness of the poor and sick, and especially crimi-

nals, show the results of the universal derangement of the world.

2. Personal experience may be taken upon this point without any question. Everybody knows man is a sinner, and every honest man will confess it. It is only by desperate wickedness and wonderful subtlety in metaphysics that any man will have the boldness to stand up and claim that he is perfectly right. No man has any fear of death by stoning or otherwise, if the first stone is to be "thrown by him who is without sin."

3. The Bible so commonly and universally, incidentally and intentionally, presents this doctrine that no man can dare to dispute it if the Bible is believed. Gen. 5: 3: "Adam begat a son in his own likeness." And thus early in the Bible is declared the law of nature and the sequences of the fall. Matt. 15: 19: "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts." In Rom. 3: 19, it is declared that all are under sin. James 3: 12. The natural result in human character is illustrated by the fruit of the fig. 1 John 1: 8, 10; and 5: 19. John is said to be the loving disciple and apostle, exceeding all others in this wonderful grace, and yet he declares that the "whole world lieth in wickedness."

SECTION II.—MORAL DEPRAVITY.

THE root of the word depravity means crooked, perverse. To be depraved in a moral sense is to be sinful. Moral depravity is the darkest cloud in the universe. In reality it embraces all that is ultimately evil. Every other evil may result in higher happiness and goodness, but sin is evil, only evil, and never changes in its character.

I. THE CONDITIONS IMPLIED IN DEPRAVITY OR SIN.

1. There can be no moral depravity in any being who has no moral nature. Things and animals may be deranged and decay, but they cannot be sinful or guilty. It is only a being who has intelligence, conscience, and will, that is

capable of sinning. We cannot conceive in the present state of being, with the world and its appurtenances as they are, and these powers and relations of man being what they are, how such a being could be created and placed here without such liability. But relations are just as necessary as the nature, so there must be some relations existing or there can be no sin.

2. With these relations there must be obligations, and it is only against a being to whom obligations are due that sin is possible. There is no sin against things, not even against truth except as truth represents being. All moral depravity, or transgression of every kind and degree, is, in the nature of the case, violation of obligation to some being. Human transgressions must always be a violation of obligation to God, and in human relations a violation of obligation to man. Without being placed where one could affect the other, there could be no such thing as obligation or sin.

3. There must be knowledge of law. Where there is no law, there is no transgression. Without the knowledge of these claims from others upon us, it is impossible to violate the claims or commit a sin. Sin is not that imaginary something in the abstract sometimes claimed. It is a reality, a real moral state or action with reference to some being to whom relations are sustained. Frequently, in common use of language, violations of obligations are called immoralities. Duties to men are considered virtue and morality, being in accordance with man's moral impulses towards his fellow-men. Violation of obligation to God is considered as sin in a deeper sense, and obedience to those laws as piety.

II. THE NATURE OF SIN AND MORAL DEPRAVITY.

From time immemorial this has been a serious question in the field of philosophy and religion, theoretical and practical. That there is something wrong in this world is a matter of universal observation and consciousness. That this wrong is the opposite of right is universally known, whatever mistakes may be made with reference to its explanation.

Different views of sin have been entertained at different times by different classes of philosophers and religionists. Some in former times identified sin with matter. They saw clearly a distinction between mind and matter. They saw as clearly the distinction between right and wrong. Finding a duality in both fields, they imagined that there was some special relation in sin to matter. But this mistake was so radical, gross, and absurd that it has passed away.

The Manicheans saw darkness and light distinguished, and right and wrong, and they identified the right with light, and darkness with crimes, so that all sin, in their estimation, was simply darkness; darkness, therefore, gave birth to all the crimes of earth. Another class of men, more numerous and extending over vast periods of the world's history, have believed simply in blind fate with reference to this subject. For the very good reason that it is impossible to do so, they never explained fate, except as affirming that things are necessarily what they are. There were no alternatives, second causes, or possible choice in the world. According to their idea, fate governed everything, sin not excepted, so that in reality there was no sin. It was only the fiction of the mind; it was fixed in the nature of things that some did one act and some another, as the water runs down hill and the vapor rises by the heat. Men saw there were many things they could not do nor change, and, therefore, they argued that all things were of that character.

This idea contradicts common consciousness, which always has and always will condemn wrong and justify right and recognize a clear distinction between the two, assigning just penalties to the one and rewards to the other.

Others, unable to blind their own common sense by fatalism, recognized the clear fact of common experience, that there was a good worthy of pursuit, and declared that sin with all its apparent evil and misery was to be an ultimate good, affirming either that it was an occasion for personal discipline, development, and ultimate well-being of the indi-

vidual, or, in the more general sense, it was to be for the good of the whole, the greatest good for the greatest number, whatever might seem to be the wrong or suffering individually.

The fact that certain individuals have to suffer for the wrong of others is unquestionably affirmed in every well-reasoned theory of philosophy or government, in history and experience. But these men overlooked the fact that whatever one individual suffers for another, he might so improve the opportunity as ultimately to secure good in the suffering. Overlooking this fact, they leave the burden of sin and grief upon the innocent forever, and thus deny personal justice.

In opposition to all these views and their modifications, developed in the shadows and shades of human speculation, we are able to see in the nature of sin the plain, simple facts which cover most of the grounds of discussion.

1. It is a violation of moral and not physical law. This distinction between moral and physical laws as explained in a preceding chapter, is developed in everybody's consciousness and in all history. The law that guides the machinist is not the same as the law that guides the machine. Sin is not the violation of the mechanical laws of nature, but it is a violation of the moral law, or rule of right. It is true that many of the violations of the laws of nature are sinful because violated under the direction of the mind. But no violation of physical law is a sin condemned as such anywhere by intelligent men, unless such violations are controlled by intelligence and will. The violation of physical law in eating and drinking may ruin the health and become a great evil in various ways. It is a sin, however, only as the mind is concerned in its perpetration. And only in this fact and condition is guilt ever attached. The nature and consequences of the violation of physical law are not sin; it may be pain and even death, but it is not sin, and it is never recognized as such in public feeling or civil law, unless purposed by the will.

2. Therefore, all sin is purely spiritual, not material, and consists in the state of mind, not in the conditions of matter nor of the instincts. The existence of appetites and passions is not a sin. The failure to control them by the mind, as originally intended, is sin. They are inferior to the intellect. The mind should direct and control them. If it does not, sin and guilt belong to the mind. The existence even of the strongest hereditary appetites is not a sin. It is their gratification by the consent of the mind that constitutes the crime. This failure to make a proper distinction between the instincts and the intellect, this identifying of what is really physical as much as bone and muscle, with the moral nature, has led to the many very serious errors upon this, as well as other ethical and religious subjects. But sin is never in the animal nature, which in itself is as incapable of moral character as the color of a man's hair.

3. Moral depravity is human, not divine. Some moral being is concerned in this evil. If it is divine, God is the author, and he alone is responsible. If God is the author of sin and is responsible, man cannot be. It is said that God created all things and, therefore, must have created sin. This is only a shallow sophistry. Sin is not a thing nor a creation. It is an action and state of a created being, and because God created being and created him capable of personal action and responsibility, he is not, therefore, an actor in that being's action, and the sin of man does not belong to God. Any affirmation to that effect is contrary to the Bible, which everywhere presents sin as the opposite of God and goodness, and presents God as the opposite of sin. "He is angry with the wicked every day." His inspired one "hates vain thoughts," and "they that love the world cannot love God." The antagonism is such that no man can serve God and the world. Nothing can be more plainly taught in the Bible than this distinct and direct antagonism between God and sin.

To affirm that sin is the work of God is to declare the Bible a fiction and a falsehood. But this assumption is just as much opposed to reason and philosophy as it is to the Bible. In the first convictions of the human mind, in the continued experience of individuals and society, in universal, social, and civil organizations, in all literature, laws, and judicial decisions everywhere by everybody, there is the universal knowledge, and admitted knowledge, of the fact that man is responsible for his own actions. This view is brought out in universal literature, which in fiction, poetry, and history everywhere brings out this great fact, that sin and guilt belong to the man. Sin is human and not divine.

4. It is an executive action, not an infliction. Something wrought by and not upon the individual. Evils, as universally classified and recognized, are evils performed or evils endured. Accidents, disease, and death are looked upon as evils because they are opposed to our natural feelings. There are evils to suffer. We must escape what we can, endure what we must, and make choice of the less instead of the greater in all these evils to be suffered.

Evils performed are sins. They belong to the executive forces of the individual, and sin itself is the manifestation of such executive force of the individual as is contrary to his obligation to God and his fellow-men. Sin, therefore, is an executive action and state, and not an infliction. It is never executed as a penalty for law nor a punishment for itself. It is sometimes said that sin punishes itself. The consequences of sin frequently come around as an evil to be suffered. The suffering is the consequence and not the sin. Sin punishes itself only by producing evil consequences or securing penalties assigned, but the sin itself is in the action or state of mind.

5. Moral depravity is personal, not hereditary, nor national. Some things, and many things in each individual, are hereditary, as distinctly expressed in the chapter upon Natural Depravity. Man inherits many of his characteristics,

material and instinctive ; but to suppose that he inherits sin is a supposition as contrary to nature as it is to the Word of God. He may inherit a disposition to that which, when voluntarily performed, is sinful. He may inherit the bias of that which would be wrong if performed by his own mind.

But to suppose that this is a violation of law, incurring the penalty of that law, is contrary to nature and reason and the Bible. It implies that man is held responsible for what he does not do, is condemned for that to which he never consented, and punished eternally for that which he could not avoid. Such a doctrine is too monstrous for a believer in the Christian's God, and too absurd for the believer in human responsibility. If man is thus responsible for hereditary evils, what may he not be responsible for ? His father and father's father may have committed crime of which he never heard, may never know unless it is revealed in the day of judgment, when sentenced to eternal punishment for the crime he never heard of. Some governments have inflicted certain kinds of suffering and certain penalties for treason and other crimes of parents upon children, but yet everybody knows they were not guilty ; and in modern civilization a government with that practice is looked upon as absurd and cruel. To suppose that men universally are thus loaded and burdened, condemned and damned, for the faults of Adam is a supposition inconsistent with the character of God. But we have said that sin was personal and not national. There is a sense in which nations as such are held guilty of wrongs and crimes. But this only refers to those national faults which are destructive to national existence and civilization, and not to personal character within the nation. Nobody believes or can believe that such national crimes and sufferings fall upon individuals as personal penalties. Individuals in this case suffer as in any other case of social wrong, the consequences of general evils, but not the penalty of sin.

Combinations of human society must necessarily be so

constituted that one must bear the burdens of others. But the system of grace is so arranged that every individual, in these sufferings as well as in his actions, may find that it works for good. But to make no distinction between social and national character and sufferings, and personal crimes and sufferings, is a great failure in moral reasoning. God deals with individuals as well as nations, and does not blot his own character nor defeat justice by having no general plan of justice with reference to nations as such. Sin belongs to the individual. National sins are such only because generally perpetrated, and because they are countenanced by government, and bring that defeat and ruin which is characteristic of wrong. In every phase of the subject we are compelled to feel that sin belongs to the individual and is not hereditary or national.

6. Moral depravity is voluntary action or state of mind. Its specific point is the volition against God's law, and yet that volition may lead to a continuousness in certain cases. For instance, in the commission of the crime a man may become insane. Of course, criminal character continues during the period of that insanity unchanged. A man deliberately identifies himself with an organization, civil or otherwise, and in a kind of pledge or oath of allegiance continues his identity, and thus is in a state of continuous rebellion against God. An individual may voluntarily decide against duty and allegiance to the throne of God and without further specific choice continue in the state of rebellion. Or, what is more common, he may make the choice of the course that blinds to truth and reality, and thus disqualify himself for seeing truth and duty, and continue in the state of rebellion as thus entered without any specific purpose further. Thus Saul of Tarsus put himself in a false relation to God and truth. In that state of mind he could not see the light of the Gospel, but yet was not innocent though sincere, because he was guilty of a past transgression that perverted and blinded his mind. So he "verily thought he ought to

do many things contrary to the will of Jesus," and yet was the "chief of sinners" notwithstanding that supposition. His general character as a transgressor attaches to those earlier sins which darkened his understanding, perverted his heart, and stupefied his conscience. It was a sinful state for which he was personally responsible, in which personal acts were sinful although sincere.

But in reality sin consists in the "transgression of the law." 1 John 3: 4: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." The fact that sinful acts are frequently connected and associated in the general and permanent state does not destroy the specific action of sin nor change the responsibility of the sinner back to Adam or to God. The action is his own in multiplicity as well as in the single act. A general state of mind, if voluntary, is an extended action.

7. In one sense this depravity may become total. When in sin a man rejects the government of God as such, and accepts of the principle of selfishness in opposition to the divine government, it becomes sin against government as well as law. It is thus treason, and deserves capital punishment. That state of "mind is rebellion and is not subject to the law of God." Rom. 8: 7: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." It is total rebellion against God's government. Jefferson Davis was a total rebel against the government, regardless of personal and social qualities.

All men have some leading purpose or intention. The primary intention may be to serve God in spite of specific variations from duty, or it may be a general purpose to serve self and disregard God in spite of certain traits and actions which are right in themselves. A man, therefore, may be totally a rebel against the government of God and not totally wrong in every particular and characteristic of his being and life. Total depravity as applied subjectively and

specifically is false: total depravity as applied to the citizen in the divine government is true. Rom. 6: 19: "For as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness." Every man is loyal to the government of God, or a rebel. This passage and many others show that man cannot "serve God and mammon," and while serving self and the world he rejects the government of God. It is only in that sense that total depravity may be considered true. (Rom. 3: 23.) We thus arrive at the conclusion that sin in its nature is wholly evil and opposed to God, is human in its origin, and fatal in its consequences unless remedied by some act of mercy.

That this is the true statement of the case with reference to the nature of sin, is evident from the following conclusions:

1. Otherwise sin is merely physical like disease, and if this be true there is no sin. It is disease or misfortune, and not sin. There is no moral depravity if it does not rest in the voluntary purpose of man.

2. If this view is not true, there is not, and cannot be, any guilt. Men may feel regret for what has been for which they are not responsible, and sorrow for sufferings which they endure; but whoever imagines that that regret or sorrow is repentance, makes a fatal mistake respecting one of the most important duties of religion. The feeling of guilt is entirely another thing, and never was and never can be experienced with reference to actions for which a man is not responsible. It is only by a false explanation and assumption that any man can pretend to feel guilty or to repent for Adam's sin. There is no sin where there is no responsibility. "Where there is no law there is no transgression."

3. If this be not true, punishment of sin is cruelty. For the father to punish a child for the transgression of an older child would be looked upon with horror and condemnation by every rational man; and to suppose that God

would hold one man guilty for the actions of another would charge God with a course of conduct which no one could charge to a good man on earth. Punishment is cruelty, or there must be no punishment, or it must rest upon the individual who is responsible for crimes punished. There may be disciplinary punishments for warning or notification of evil, which are not ultimate punishments. There are other disciplinary restraints, and for suffering those inflictions there is provision for relief. Benevolent, voluntary substitution of labor or happiness for others is another matter altogether.

4. Such is the universal belief of mankind. There have been hair-splitting, metaphysical arguments in behalf of some philosophical and theological dogmas, which have looked like the belief in punishment for the sins of ancestors. But in the ordinary relations of life men believe that punishment is only due to those responsible for the crimes for which the punishment is inflicted, unless some voluntary substitute pays the penalty.

5. This is according to the common consciousness of the world. (1) In the case of children. They are not condemned by themselves or others unless the act or result could have been avoided. Whenever the child can say honestly and sincerely, "I did not know," or, "I could not help it," he is held free from guilt. Sometimes those who accidentally take the lives of others, and of their friends, are not only held guiltless but receive a very large degree of sympathy in their misfortune. And if the accident be purely accidental without any weakness or carelessness of intention, they are held free from guilt. (2) Literature of all kinds vindicates this principle by assuming the sinlessness of innocency, the deserved freedom from punishment of those who are good, and the desert of evil only by those who are criminal. (3) Civil jurisprudence throughout all Christendom is based upon this principle. A judge who should pronounce sentence against a man who is proved

innocent would be impeached in office. In some few cases *ex post facto* laws, and laws against families in which great criminals have been active, would seem to contradict this statement; but generally such laws are based upon the safety of society, and largely now in civil governments are abandoned. (4) Every man's personal experience is conclusive upon this point. No man ever did or ever can condemn himself for what he is not responsible, nor condemn others because of their sufferings when irresponsible; but feelings of commiseration and pity are excited rather than condemnation. Every man of every shade of character naturally and intuitively feels that sin deserves punishment; and that it is deserved by those who commit the sin, and that if others suffer for the sins of association and ancestors it is looked upon only as one of the accidents of human society, temporary in its extent, and to be remedied by dispensations of benevolence.

6. To the law and to the testimony we make the final appeal on this subject. (1) The divine law requires only what a man can do. (Luke 12: 48; 19: 23.) (2) Its threatenings are for disobedience. And in repeating the admission before made, that men may suffer temporarily by the order of heaven in this life for two or three generations, still penal punishment for sin is threatened to the disobedient. The threatenings are of the same character, evil for sin, suffering for crime, death for transgression, and everywhere from the first law given in Eden to the last law violated on earth the threatenings of God's Word attach the penalty only to the perpetrator of the crime. (3) The same is true of history. Sometimes for a season the wicked seem to triumph and penalties fall only incidentally upon those around them, and things look strange to human eye until there is a higher view given by the Bible, as in the seventy-third Psalm. The Psalmist thought there was injustice. The "wicked had more than heart could wish" and "no bands in their death." When he thought to know

that, "it was too painful," until he went into the sanctuary of God and understood "their end." Then he saw them in "slippery places," and said he was as a "beast before God" because he had come to these strange and short-sighted conclusions. There are many declarations in the Word of God bearing upon this point, and bearing so distinctly that it seems strange there ever could have been any misunderstanding about it. Deut. 30: 19; Josh. 24: 15; Isa. 31: 29, 30; Ezek. 3: 17-20; 18: 1-20; 33: 8, 9; John 5: 40; 8: 34; Luke 12: 40; Rom. 6: 16; James 4: 17; 1 John 3: 4.

III. THE UNIVERSALITY OF MORAL DEPRAVITY.

1. Its probability. (1) As before explained, in early life the appetites and passions are active for gratification without the restraining influence of the reason, conscience, and will, and thus render it certain that the first, weak forces of these restraining powers will be insufficient. Just when these forces are so developed that their inefficiency is criminal is unknown to us, but that they will yield for a while when they ought to control, and especially with the general derangement of human nature, is probable, if not morally certain. (2) From the nature and degree of animal or instinctive depravity it becomes certain that the first influence upon the mind will not be pure or uplifting. So far as we can see mind is awakened to consciousness by externality. These external influences upon the animal nature to which it is susceptible are so perverted, and the medium through which these influences come to the soul so far changed from the original perfection, that it seems probable the mind will bend universally at first in the wrong direction. The probability is seen (3) from the derangement of the powers of the mind, which must prevent symmetrical action and incline to the doing of that which, if performed voluntarily, will be sin. (4) Until the soul by faith and prayer takes hold of God's promises and receives his Spirit, which "seals unto the day of redemption," and regenerates

the heart into that image, it has no Divine influence to aid in holy living. Therefore, probably all men will sin.

2. History and observation reveal the character of the world in such a light that the universal prevalence of sin must be admitted. Persons are not always against their fellow-men or civil governments; but the general state of the world, and especially as left without the influence of Christian civilization and Christian doctrine, shows that the whole world has gone "out of the way." 1 John 5: 19: "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." This general view of the world given us by history and by our own observation becomes a simple and plain argument with reference to the general depravity of mankind.

3. The personal experience of every man. Each man when questioned, or when questioning himself, sees and feels the fact of native depravity. He finds in his earliest experiences tendencies which in all voluntary pursuits are sinful.

4. The universality of sin is certainly the doctrine of the Bible. 1 Kings 8: 46; Job 15: 14; 25: 4; Psa. 51: 5; John 8: 7; Rom. 3: 9, 23; 5: 12. "And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." We are thus told that death and sin are co-extensive. Gal. 3: 20; 1 John 1: 8, 10.

IV. SIN IS FATAL IN ITSELF, REMEDILESS IN ITS NATURE.

1. In its subjective consequences in the being himself, remediless so far as the man is concerned or human agency employed. (1) There is a loss of time which cannot be recovered. There is no ultimate good to be realized, no real profit attained, in any course of sin. Its perpetration occupies time of immense value; but time once lost can never be recovered. The loss is remediless. In a certain sense this is true, taking whole nations into contemplation, but so far as individuals are concerned they cannot, even with the sacrifice of other things at other times, regain the loss. There are seed-times in human life, and sin seems to

be effectually at work at such times ; so it often happens that in the earlier part of life, when the memory is most active, the heart most susceptible, opportunities for improvement the most numerous, time is lost. Some things thus thrown away may be recovered by the sacrifice of other things, but time, never. And if opportunities lost at that period are regained, it must be at the sacrifice of some time which had its appropriate work. (2) In sin there is a loss of symmetry which cannot be restored. No amount of skill, purpose, or industry can re-arrange the disturbed and perverted powers of mind which sin occasions. Man may make improvement in his condition by study, intelligence, and effort ; but he cannot remedy the lack of symmetry occasioned by sin. Unless some higher power shall reach his case, he is eternally disordered. (3) In sin there is a loss of strength which cannot be regained. Strength comes from exercise as well as nourishment ; and strength of mind comes from mental exercise as well as acquisition of ideas. (4) In transgression there is a loss of innocence and the approval of conscience which cannot be, by any amount of effort, regained. The conscience condemns not only for the crime perpetrated, but for the waste of time and energy, and remedy is impossible so far as human agency is concerned ; and that these are remediless is apparent from the failure of the means employed for relief. These losses and disturbances and consequences of sin have been realized with more or less keenness by all men ; and in some way they generally try in vain to remedy the difficulty. (5) Animal gratification has been tried universally and almost constantly with continued hope and anticipation, but with universal failure. It is only for the moment that conscience may be stupefied and the consequences of sin thrown out of sight while the animal is gratified ; but instead of remedying, it only makes the evil greater, and the case more hopeless. Animal gratification has its place in human experience, is proper in its appropriate sphere, but when used to save the individual from the

consequences of sin it is worse than useless. It becomes sin itself. The relief is only temporary and in the end aggravates the difficulty. (6) Others, conscious of the failure in this direction, become stupidly indifferent, and with a kind of animal courage and reckless daring seek to overcome the difficulties which sin has produced. It is not true heroism, nor real courage, nor sound judgment. The recklessness, apparent boldness, and wild daring sometimes exhibited in such cases only show the fearful straits into which the mind is thrown by sins which cannot be remedied. It indicates real weakness and proves beyond a doubt that man has no power for extinguishing fires which his own sins have kindled, no power for recovering from the mental degradation into which wickedness has plunged him. (7) A more plausible and equally useless remedy is sought in reform. Conscience cannot but approve of every good effort, and so many by this are led to believe that the approval of the present effort will relieve from all past guilt, as though a man who in sin had lost an eye might hope to have it replaced by reform; or a criminal who had stolen a horse might think he could escape the penalty by ceasing his criminality. But the evils of the past are not remedied by present reform. Guilt is not removed by the cessation of the action; if so, every counterfeiter and thief and murderer would cease to be guilty when he ceased the perpetration of his crimes. The universal judgment of the world in legislation and judicial decisions continues to hold men guilty for the past; and continues, by social ostracism or judicial sentence, to place the results of their crimes upon the individuals, even though they have reformed. When a man does the best he can he only does what is his duty at that time, but past neglect is unprovided for, unatoned for, by future obedience. If he has ever been guilty of sin, he does not remedy it by subsequent reform. Reformation is not to be condemned nor spoken of lightly, nor in human pride and self-reliance to be considered a remedy for evils against humanity and God.

2. Sin is remediless in its subjective and public influence and consequences. We are social beings, and wrongs are not only experienced in the wrong-doer, but in the influence they have upon others; and such influences once set in motion are entirely beyond the reach of the actor. A word once spoken has parted from the lips and is now beyond the reach of the speaker. An action performed is let loose, like the carrier pigeon, and takes its flight into other fields. These consequences are wider than imagined, more subtle and efficient than supposed. The actor cannot control them, and neither can the combined action of society remedy them. A fire started burns on until all is consumed or some other agency stops it. The embankment or dam may give way and the floods rush in spite of human efforts. Decay goes on with the flowers and the fruits, and so it is in human society. Deception, pride, drunkenness, and unbelief never remedy themselves. It must be wholly from the outside, and the divine forces. From time immemorial men, individually and in various organizations, have endeavored to find a remedy for social and public consequences of crime. Restraint by penalty and individual cases of reform have indicated some degree of success; but upon the whole there have never been found remedies for these general evils in society. (1) Men have tried hygienic principles, and by diet and care of the body and its health have attempted the general reformation of society. But good health has not secured goodness, and these forces and influences have only been partial with reference to health and life. Men may be good eaters and good livers and good drinkers, and still be great sinners. This remedy has never been sufficient for any general improvement in society, and the hope of making the moral world good by laws of diet and good habits is not well founded. (2) Schools and knowledge, in this respect, have always been a failure. Knowledge is secular good, and schools are worth more than money. But no amount of mental culture has ever proved a security against sin, nor

a relief from its consequences. Corinth was, perhaps, the most cultured city of its time, and the basest in morals. Greece grew in knowledge and philosophy and improved in culture, and grew in crime at the same time. Rome, with all its great achievements in the literary world and statesmanship, grew luxurious, proud, selfish, vain, sensuous, and died at last of imbecility superinduced by its own crimes. These object-lessons of the past, with some of the highest cultured cities in modern times, present a most humiliating view of the world's efforts for attempting a remedy of human faults and sins. The sins increase with their culture and the people die with their own improvements. A higher remedy must be found, or these evils are fatal, and moral and universal death sure. (3) Socialism and social reform have been suggested and tried in certain cases with a great deal of perseverance and confidence. Half a century ago the world was quite astir with the prospect of organizing communities and incorporating societies that would remedy the great evils of the world. Many were started in Europe and America, and there is scarcely one left to tell the tale of their failure. (4) Civil governments with more hope and show of success have been tried for five thousand years. They are in themselves a necessity, and they have their utility principally in their principal design—the restraint of criminals. They have made improvements in many things. They have attempted improvements in morals; and a very large number of good citizens, educated rulers, and philanthropists have tried, and tried with hope, to make civil government a reformatory agency. It fails in this. It simply makes the external restraints and does not change the heart, and so some of the best governments on earth have sheltered and promoted some of the greatest crimes the earth has ever seen. Rome had a government and laws beyond what some of the other nations have seen, and stands a model for legislation and legal processes for all the world; and yet, human society sunk away in spite of its legal knowl-

edge and enlightened administration. All this effort to remedy the social and public consequences of sin conspicuously fails. About all law can do is to restrain sinners from injuring others, and that is only partially done. There is no hope of absolute relief from the consequences of iniquity by civil administrations. Civil government is an agency in this matter and must do its own work, but the real evil of sin is not remedied by its legal processes.

3. But the most serious and the most remediless difficulty in transgression is seen in its relation to the Divine government. Here is where its hopelessness is more apparent and its difficulty most serious. That God is a ruler cannot be questioned. That man is his lawful subject, we know. That his laws are for public good, cannot be denied. That all sin is a violation of wholesome laws and opposition to the God of all goodness, is true. But God is as just and true as he is good. He has arranged those laws for public good and annexed such penalties and such consequences as are best for the good of being. This general good of all his subjects we term public justice; and God, by his love and justice, and by his truthfulness, is bound to execute those laws which are for the public good, and those penalties which are necessary for the vindication of such laws. And even if the individual could free himself from personal guilt, the good of the subjects elsewhere under the entire government must be considered in dealing with him, and the sequences of one's own crime must remain until public justice is satisfied, the law vindicated, and pardon secured. Sin is hopeless in this direction. The more a man sins, the more guilt he has and more certain of increased penalty; and no matter what goodness he may practice for the remission of guilt, he can never be more than good nor more than right. Being good at one time and right in one instance cannot free him from the evils of the past, nor the condemnation incurred. A man may have been guilty of assaulting another citizen, disturbing the peace, and doing harm

generally. He may then reform, but the crime stands there, and the government has stated that for that crime there must be some penalty, there must be some satisfaction to the government to show the continued love of law and regard for the rights of the whole, as protected by such laws and their appropriate penalties. Unless he can pay his fine, which would be impossible, for he has not a surplus beyond what is justly due to the government and others, there must be a substitute who can pay that fine for him, or his case is hopeless. He must meet his doom. So, then, the case of every sinner is hopeless in his sin unless some plan of mercy suggests a substitute for the penalty.

Regardless of the magnitude of the crime or the obscurity of the transgression, its penalty continues, its consequences remain, until (1) public justice is satisfied, and the claims of the universal public for wholesome laws and their faithful execution are met. The man cannot meet that himself. Every sinner, therefore, is hopeless, his case remediless, so far as human agency is concerned. God alone can decide what will be best for all beings concerned, and what plan will meet the demands of public justice. And it is only in that mercy and plan of his that there can be the least hope for the sinner. (2) In accordance with this plan pardon must be secured or there is no hope. Sin is not a distinct member that can be cut off, nor a physical evil that can be remedied with medicine. It must be forgiven, and the sinner cannot pardon himself, neither can all men combined pardon in behalf of God and his government. (3) This evil affects the bias and the affections of the heart, the specific and general purposes of life, and the undercurrents of human feeling and love, devotion and purpose; and without some change in these life currents, these deeper currents and forces of the heart and feelings and purpose, there is no remedy. A sick man may be stimulated and feel well for the moment; unless disease is removed he is still a sick man and doomed to die. A sinner may in his conceit for the moment forget his sins, but

without change of heart he has still the fatal disease upon him; he is still in a remediless condition. This provision for the pardon of sin and the regeneration of the heart is found in grace, which gives the only hope to man in that solemn and touching declaration, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." In the great system and plan of atonement we see the only hope of the diseased and ruined world.

**Return to course main page
and take Lesson 5 Test.**