

the essential doctrine of the Bible, according to the philology of the Evangelical Alliance. It is perspicuous, definite, and brief, and therefore free from ambiguity. But is there any identical or even similar proposition in the Christian Scriptures! Not one. It is therefore a philological deduction—an interpretation of some one passage, or of several passages. We have sundry declarations of scripture upon this subject. We shall, therefore, collate them as the premises from which this conclusion or doctrine is deduced:—

1. "By his knowledge" (or *by the knowledge of him*) "my righteous servant shall justify many." Isaiah liiii. 11.
2. "The just shall live by faith." Heb. x. 38.
3. "All that believe are justified from all things." Acts xiii. 39.
4. "Being justified freely by his grace." Rom. iii. 24.
5. "Being now justified by his blood." Rom. 4. 9.
6. "You are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus." 1 Cor. 6, 11.
7. "You see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." James ii. 24.

Such are the causes, reasons, or instruments of a sinner's justification, assigned by Prophets and Apostles. Why, then, in the name, or by the authority of philology, give a new proposition, or a proposition different from any and every one of these? To say that the just shall live by faith, is the breadth of the heavens different from saying the just shall live by faith *alone*. A man lives by breathing; but who but a simpleton would thence infer that a man lives by breathing alone!

But the proposition of the Alliance in the form of its enunciation amounts to a literal contradiction of an apostolic proposition.

The Alliance says, *a man is justified by faith alone*.

James says, "A man is justified by works, and not by faith only." Is not the predicate '*by faith alone*,' and the predicate '*not by faith only*,' literally a contradiction? The Apostle James, then, and the Alliance are clearly at issue.

When, then, the divine oracles assign evangelical justification to six distinct causes, why should the Alliance choose to assign it to one only, and that one so ambiguously expressed as in its simple form, to amount to a flat contradiction! I presume they rely much upon such sayings as these: "By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight"—"Knowing that a man is not justified by the deeds of the law"—"Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith; for before *faith* came," (i. e. before *Christ* came,) "we were kept under the law," &c. But, as before said, a man's being justified by faith without circumcision or by any legal observance whatsoever, is very different from saying that a man is "justified by faith *only*," or "faith *alone*." I still ask why, according to all the laws of philological interpretation—six causes—such as, 1, the *grace* of God—2, the *blood* of Christ—3, the *name* of Christ—4, *knowledge*—5, *faith*, and 6, *works*—should be compressed or resolved into *faith alone*? Are *grace*, *blood*, *name*, *knowledge*, *faith*, *works*, logically or philologically equal to *faith alone*!!

If they had said the moving or *original* cause of a sinner's justification is the favor of God—the *meritorious* or procuring cause, the *blood* of Christ—the *instrumental* causes, the application of the *name* of the Lord,