

# LECTURE LXI.

## THE SACRAMENTS.

### SYLLABUS.

1. What is a sacrament ?  
See Conf. of Faith, ch. 27, § 1. Turretin, Loc. xix, Qu. 1. Hill, bk. v, ch. 5, § 4. Dick, Lect. 86. Ridgley, Qu. 162. Council of Trent. Sess. 7. Can. 1-13, and Catechism. Rom. pt. ii, Qu. 2, 3.
2. Are the sacraments mere symbols or badges, as say the Socinians, or also seals of the Covenant ?  
Turretin, Qu. 5. Hill and Ridgley, as above.
3. What the parts of the sacrament ? And what the qualities requisite in the material parts ?  
Turretin, Qu. 3. Dick, Lect. 86. Ridgley, Qu. 163. Conf. of Faith, ch. xxvii, § 2.
4. What is the sacramental union between these parts ?  
Turretin, Qu. 4. Dick, as above.
5. How many sacraments under the New Testament ?  
Conf. of Faith, as above, § 4. Turretin, Qu. 31. Council of Trent, as above, and Rom. Catechism, pt. ii, Qu. 11, 12. Dick, Lect. 87. Burnett, on the Thirty-nine Articles, Art. 25. So. Presbn. Rev., Art. i, Jan. 1876.
6. How many sacraments under the Mosaic dispensation ; and what their relation to those of the New ?  
Conf. of Faith, as above. § 5. Rom. Cat., pt. ii, Qu. 9. Dick, Lect. 87. Turretin, Qu. 9. Calvin Institutes, bk. iv, ch. 14, § 23-end.

**T**HE doctrine of the sacraments is closely dependent on that of the Church ; and is treated by many authorities, as strictly consequent thereon ; as by Turretin. It may also be remarked, that the doctrine of the Church is a head of the theology of redemption ; and may be treated as such, as well as a source for practical rules of church-order. But as that doctrine is ably treated in another department of this Seminary, I shall assume its main principles, and use them as foundations for the discussion of the sacraments, without intruding into that circle of inquiry.

Let us remember then, that the true Church of Christ is invisible, and consists of the whole body of the effectually called : That the same name is given, by accommodation, in the Scriptures, to a visible body, consisting of all those throughout the world, who make a credible profession of the true religion, together with their children : That the essential properties of unity, holiness, indefectibility, catholicity, belong to the invisible, and not the visible Church : That God has defined the visible Church catholic, by giving it, in all its parts, a ministry, the Word, the sacraments and other ordinances, and some measure of His sanctifying Spirit : That this visible Church is traced back at least to the family of Abraham, where it was organized by God's own authority on a gospel and ecclesiastical cov-

Definition of Church and its Attributes.

enant: That this visible Church is substantially the same under both dispensations, retaining under the New, the same membership and nature, though with a suitable change of circumstances, which it had under the Old Dispensation; and that out of this visible Church catholic there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. In this visible Church, the sacraments are both badges of membership, and sealing ordinances. They also represent, apply, and seal, the chief truths of redemption. Hence, the importance of their discussion. They will be found to bear a close relation to our whole system, both of doctrine and church-order.

When one examines the Scriptures, and sees the brief and simple statements there given concerning the sacraments, he will be very apt to feel that the place assigned them in many Protestant, and all Romish systems of divinity, is inordinately large. This is an evidence of the strong tendency of mankind to formalism. In our treatment of the subject, much of the length assigned it will arise from our attempts to rebut these formal and superstitious tendencies, and reduce the sacraments to their Scriptural simplicity.

1. Bible Ideas of Sacrament Simple.

According to the definition of the Confession of Faith, ch. 27, § 1, 2, there are four things which concur to constitute a sacrament. (a.) A visible material element. (b.) A covenanted grace of graces, aptly symbolized and represented to the senses by the element. (c.) A mutual pledge and seal of this covenant between God and the soul. (d.) And an express divine institution. The usual patristic definition was, "a sacrament is a sensible sign of an invisible grace." But this is too indefinite, and leaves out the federal feature. All ceremonies are not sacraments because they are of divine appointment; for they may not have this material element as symbol of a spiritual grace; nor are all symbols of divine appointment therefore sacraments; because they may not be seals of a covenant.

Constituted of Four Things.

One of the most important features is the express divine appointment. Sacraments are acts of worship. All worship not instituted by God is will-worship, and therefore offensive, because He is infinite and inscrutable to finite minds, as well as our absolute Sovereign; so that it is presumption in man to devise ways to please Him any farther than the appointment of His word bears us out, and because the devices of depraved and short-sighted man are always liable to be depraved and depraving. These reasons, of course, apply in full force to sacraments of human device. But there is an additional one. A sacrament is God's pledge of some covenanted grace to the true participant. Now, by the same reason that nobody can put my sign and seal to my bond save myself, no other than God can institute a

God's Appointment Most Essential.

sacrament. It is the most aggravated form of will-worship.

The remarks of Dick and Hill concerning the etymology and usage of the word, *sacramentum*, have been sufficient; (as meaning first, a suitor's money placed in pledge; second, a soldier's oath of enlistment; third, some holy secret, the usual vulgate translation of *μυστήριον*.) It has been plausibly suggested, that the latter is the sense primarily attached to it by the Latin Fathers, when they used it in our technical sense; as *μυστήριον* is the word usually employed therefor by the Greeks. This is reasonable: yet the other idea of oath of enlistment to Christ was, we know, early attached to it. For in the earliest literature of the martyrs, e. g., Tertullian, and thenceforward generally, we find the ideas enlarged on, that the Christian is a soldier enlisted and sworn, in the Lord's Supper, to die for Jesus.

Much of the remainder of this Lecture will consist of an attempt to substantiate the parts of our definition of a sacrament. The Socinians (and as Lutherans and Papists charged, the Zwinglians), being outraged by the unscriptural and absurd doctrine of Rome, concerning the intrinsic efficacy of sacraments, *ex opere operato*, adopted this view, that a sacrament is but an instructive and commemorative symbol of certain facts and truths, and a badge of profession. This we hold to be true so far as it goes, but to be insufficient. They are also pledges and seals on God's part of covenanted gospel blessings, as well as pledges of service and fidelity on our part (which is implied in their being badges of profession). And here we oppose the Papists also, because they also repudiate the sphragistic nature of the sacraments, in making them actually confer and work, instead of signing and sealing, the appropriate graces.

The arguments for our view are the following: It is expressly said, Rom. iv: 11, that circumcision, one of the sacraments of the Old Testament, was to Abraham a sign and "seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had while yet uncircumcised." It must have been equally a seal to all other genuine believers of Israel; for the ground of its application to them was no other than their coming under the very covenant then instituted with Abraham, and inheriting the same promises. But baptism is the circumcision of the New Testament, the initial sign of the same covenant; and baptized believers are children of Abraham's promises by faith. Matt. xxviii: 19; Acts ii: 38, 39; Rom. iv: 11, 16, &c. It seems very obvious therefore, that Baptism is as much a seal as circumcision was. So the passover, at its first institution, was a pledge (as well as sign) of a covenanted immunity. See Exod. xii: 13, 23. When we establish a similar identity between the Passover and the Supper, the same argument will appear, that the latter also is a seal.

Etymology and Meaning.

2. Sacraments are Seals as well as Signs.

(a.) Because Circumcision was a Seal.

But second. The pledge contained in the sacraments is plainly indicated in the outward or ecclesiastical privileges, into which they immediately induct the partaker. He who received the sign, was thereby at once entitled to the enjoyment of certain privileges, the signs and means of saving graces. How can the idea of pledging be avoided here? And the sacramental union expressed in the Bible language implies the same. In Gen. xvii : 10, 13, circumcision is called the covenant. In Jno. iii : 5; Tit. iii : 5; baptism is called regeneration; and in Acts xxii : 16, remission of sins. In Exod. xii, *et passim*, the lamb is called the passover. In 1 Cor. xi : 24, 25, the bread and wine are called the body and blood. Now, this intimate union, implied in such language, must be either *opus operatum* (which we shall disprove), or a sealing pledge. For illustration, by what usage of human language could that symbolical act in a feudal investiture, handing to the tenant a green sod cut from the manor conveyed, be called "Livery of seizin;" unless it was understood to represent the conveying and guaranteeing of possession in the land?

And third. When we remember that a sacrament symbolizes not any kind of fact or truth, but one peculiar sort, viz: a covenant; we see that in making a sacrament a symbol and badge, we make it a seal and pledge. For the latter idea is necessarily involved in a federal symbol, which is just the idea of the sacrament. When I shake hands as an indication only of general good will, the act may be merely symbolical; but when I give my hand on a bargain, the symbol inevitably conveys a sealing meaning.

Both the Popish and Protestant Scholastics have defined the sacraments as consisting in matter, and form. This proceeds upon the Peripatetic analysis, adopted by the scholastic divines. They supposed that the most accurate definition of every object was made by stating, first the matter, *ὕλη*, constitutive of the object, and then the form, *σχῆμα* which, when superinduced, discriminated that object from every other that was constituted of the same *ὕλη*. This answers quite correctly, for a concrete object. Thus: a sword may be defined. Its matter is steel. But any steel is not a sword; there may be steel in a plough-share, or in an ingot, or in a bar. Add the special shape and fashion of the weapon, the form; and we have the idea of a sword. The student will see, that the attempt to extend this mode of definition to spiritual and ecclesiastical concepts is very questionable: such, however, is the point of view, on which this definition turns. But here the student must note that, by form is not meant the shape of a material thing, or the formulary, or mode of observance outward; but (the idea of a sacrament being complex) that trait which, when superinduced on the trans-

(b.) The Sacraments Confer Outward Privilege.

A Federal Sign is necessarily a Seal.

3. Matter of the Sacrament what? Natural Foundation for it.

action, distinguishes it as a sacrament. Both agree that the matter of the sacrament consists of a sensible symbol, and of a federal truth of religion symbolized. The trait of human nature to which the institution of sacraments is accommodated is evidently this: that man being a sensuous being, suggestions prompted by a sensible object, are much more vivid and permanent than those prompted by mental conceptions merely, whether the associated suggestion be of thought, or emotion. Society offers many illustrations of this mental law, and of useful social formalities founded on it. What else is the meaning and use of friends, shaking hands? Of civic ceremonials? Of the symbolical acts in forming matrimonial vows? Of commemorative monuments, painting and statues? On this principle rest also the attractiveness of pilgrimages, the ties of all local associations, and the sacredness attached to the graves of the dust of those we love.

Hence, it is obvious that there will be in every sacrament, some material element, palpable to the senses, and especially to our eye-sight. This element should also be not merely an arbitrary, but a natural sign of the grace signified; that is, it should have some natural analogy to suggest the related grace. By arbitrary agreement, soldiers have bargained that a certain blast of the trumpet shall signify advance, and algebraists, that a certain mark (+) shall represent addition. There is no previous analogy. But in circumcision, the removal of the *preputium* aptly and naturally represents putting away carnality; and results in a hidden, yet indelible mark, graphically signifying the inward renewal of the heart. In baptism, water, which is the detergent element in nature, as aptly signifies cleansing of guilt and carnality. In the passover, the sprinkled blood represented the atonement: and the eating of the sacrificed body of the lamb, faith's receptive act, in embracing Jesus Christ for the life of the soul. In the Lord's Supper, the same symbols almost, are retained; i. e., eating something that nourishes; but not in this case animal food, because the typical nature of the passover, contained in "the life which maketh atonement for our sin," had already terminated on Christ the antitype. But it must be added, that a mere natural analogy does not constitute a sacrament. The analogy must be selected, and consecrated by the express institution of God.

The Protestant scholastics very properly (if the extremely artificial analysis of the Peripatetics is to be retained at all) declared that the form which constitutes the element and theological truth a sacrament, is the instituted signification. The Papists make the form of sacrament to consist in the words of institution. Those words are indeed, in each case, expressive of the appointed signification; whence it may be supposed, that the difference of definition is unimpor-

tant. But we shall see that the Papists are thereby smoothing the way for their idea of the sacramental union, involving an efficiency by *opus operatum*, and the power of the canonical priest to constitute the ceremonial a sacrament or not, at his will.

Our Confession declares, c. 27, § 2, that "there is, in every sacrament, a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other." Instances of this sacramental language have been already given, (p. 302.) Others may be found, where the grace is named by the sign, in Matt. xxvi: 27, 28; 1 Pet. iii: 21; Rom. vi: 4; Col. ii: 11, 12, &c. This sacramental union is defined by the Confession as "spiritual relation," and by Turretin, as a "relative and moral union." The latter repudiates the proposition, that it is a "spiritual union;" but he repudiates it in the sense in which it is asserted by Papists, who mean by it a literal connection of the spiritual benefit with the material element, such that it is conferred wherever the element is *ex opere operato*. Turretin's "moral relation" means the same with our Confession's "spiritual relation." Both, of course, imply that this relation only is real in those cases in which the recipient partakes with proper state of heart. In such cases (only), the elements are the means and channels of gracious benefits, not in virtue of a physical union of the grace to the elements, but of their adaptation and God's appointment and purpose, and the Holy Ghost's influence.

Should any one assert a different union from that of the Confession, he would be refuted by common sense, which pronounces the absurdity of the whole notion of the conveyance of spiritual benefits by a physical power through a physical union. It is nothing better than an instance of a religious jugglery. He is opposed by the Old Testament, which declares its sacraments to be only signs and seals of grace embraced through faith. He is contradicted by the general tenour of the New Testament, which always conditions our participation of saving blessings on our state of heart. And he is inconsistent with himself; for if the tie connecting the grace with the element were a physical tie, the grace ought to go wherever the element goes. It is so with the tie between substance and attributes, in every other case. If it is the nature of fire to burn, then fire surely burns him whom it touches, whether it be conveyed to him by friend or foe, by design or chance, in anger or in friendship. Then, the intention of the priest, and the state of mortal sin in the recipient ought to make no difference whatever as to the gracious efficacy. In placing these limitations, the Papist has really given up his position; he has virtually admitted that the

The Union not  
Physical.

sacramental union is only a relation of instituted moral influence. But if it is such, then its efficacy must be tested just like other moral influence exerted by the Holy Ghost. Are any of them exerted, can they be exerted, any otherwise than through the intelligent embracing and acting upon the truth by the soul of the subject? The same topic will be more fully discussed when we consider the claim of *opus operatum*.

All Protestants are agreed that among the religious rites instituted by God for the New Testament Churches, there are but two, which meet the definition of a sacrament: Baptism and the Lord's supper. As they obviously present all the requisites, and as there is no dispute concerning their claim, we shall not argue it, but proceed to consider the pretensions of the five other so-called sacraments of the Romish Church: confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction. To prove that the sacraments are seven, the Roman Catechism seems to rely chiefly on this argument: As there are seven things in physical life which are essential to the propagation and well-being of man and of society, that men be born, grow, be nourished, be healed when sick, be strengthened when weak, have rulers to govern them, and rear children lawfully; so in the analogous life of the Spirit, there are seven essential wants, to each of which a sacrament answers. In baptism the soul is born unto Christ, by confirmation we grow, in the eucharist we are fed with heavenly nourishment, in penance the soul is medicined for the returns of the diseases of sin, in extreme unction it is strengthened for its contest with the last enemy, in orders the spiritual magistracy is instituted, and in matrimony the production of legitimate offspring is secured. The answer to all this trifling is obvious, that by the same argument it would be as easy to make a dozen sacraments as seven: one to answer to man's home and shelter, one to his raiment to cover him, one to his fire to warm him, &c., &c., for these also are necessaries. But to proceed to details.

I. Confirmation is not a sacrament of the New Testament, because it utterly lacks the divine institution. The imposition of hands practiced in Acts viii: 17, and xix: 6, and mentioned in Heb. vi: 2, was a rite intended to confer the miraculous charisms of the Holy Ghost, and therefore peculiar to the apostolic age, and purely temporary. The evidences of this fact are presented in the exposition of Acts.\* Let Rome or Canterbury so confer the Holy Ghost, by their imposition of hands, that they shall make men prophesy and speak with tongues (Acts xix: 6), and we will believe. Again: It is the sheerest blunder to pretend to find this rite of confirmation in any of those pass-

\* See a crucial investigation of this point in my essay, "Prelacy a Blunder."—*Southern Presbyterian Review*. January 1876.

ages where apostles are said to "confirm" (Acts xiv : 22, *στηνίζω*) the churches, or the souls of the brethren. The context, dispassionately viewed, will show that this was merely the instructions and encouragements addressed to them by the apostles' prayers and preachings. For these reasons, and because the Scriptures direct us to expect in baptism and the Lord's Supper all the increments of grace which Christians receive through any sacramental channel, we do not hold modern confirmation to be a scriptural rite at all. But if it were, it could not be a sacrament, for two fatal reasons: that it has no material element (for the oil or chrism is of purely human addition, without one syllable of scriptural authority); and it has no promise of grace attached to it by any divine institution. It seals no pledge God has given.

2. Papists profess to find the matter of the sacrament of penance in the penitent's three exercises, of contrition, confession and satisfaction; and its form in the priest's absolution. Now, in the case of sins which scandalize the Church openly, a confession to man is required by the New Testament, and a profession of contrition. And when such profession is credible, it is proper for the minister to pronounce the acquittal of the offending brother from Church censure. And this is the only case in which anything like confession and absolution is enjoined as an ecclesiastical rite in the New Testament. The only plausible case cited by Rome, that of Jas. v : 16, is non-ecclesiastical, because it is mutual confession, and its object is mutual prayers for each other's forgiveness. That would be a queer sacrament in which recipient should turn the tables on administrator, giving him the elements and conferring the grace! Having limited scriptural confession and absolution to the single case defined above, we find overwhelming reasons why, in that case, they cannot compose a sacrament. There is no element to symbolize the grace promised; for by what title can a set of feelings and acts in the penitent be called a material element? If this be waived, there is no analogy between this pretended element, and a symbolized grace; for contrition and confession do not represent, they are themselves graces, if genuine. There is no divine warrant, in words of institution, authorizing the minister to announce a divine grace; for all he is authorized to announce is acquittal from Church discipline. "Who can forgive sins but God only?" And last: It is the nature of a sacrament to be partaken by all alike who are within the covenant. But scriptural penance is appropriate only to the exceptional cases of those communicants who have scandalized their profession. The additions which the Papists have made, of auricular confession and satisfaction, greatly aggravate the objections.

3. The formulary for extreme unction may be found de-

Extreme Unction  
No Sacrament.

scribed in Turretin and others. The only places of Scripture cited in its support are Mark vi : 13, and Jas. v : 14. These cases so obviously fail to bear out the Popish sacrament that many of their own writers confess it. The objects were different; the apostles anointed to heal the bodies; the priests do it to prepare them for dying. The apostles anointed all sick persons who called on them, baptized, unbaptized, those in mortal sin; sacraments are properly only for Church members. The effect in the apostles' case was miraculous: can Rome claim this? And there can be no sacrament, because the priest has no divine institution and promise on which to proceed.

4. Orders cannot be a sacrament, although when stripped of its superstitious additions, a New Testament rite. For it has no element. The imposition of hands with prayer (chrism, &c., is all extra-scriptural) is but an action, not an element. It has no saving grace connected with it, by any promise or word of institution. As has been shown by my colleague, in his course, ordination confers no grace, but only recognizes its possession. According to Rome, the action which she preposterously elevates into a matter, is not uniform; but as there are seven orders of clergy, there are several different ceremonials enjoined in the different cases. And last: only one Christian out of a number is ordained to any office: whereas a sacrament is for all equally, who are in the covenant.

5. For the sacramental character of matrimony, the only showing of scriptural defence is the vulgate translation of Eph. v : 32: "*Hoc est sacramentum magnum.*" Surely a mistranslation of a bad version is a bad foundation on which to build a Bible-claim! And then, as has been well remarked, the great *μυστήριον* on which Paul remarks, is not the marriage relation at all, but the mystical union of Christ to His people. In matrimony there is no sacramental element at all, no divine warrant for sacramental institution, no grace of redemption signed and sealed to the recipients. And to crown the absurdity, the rite is not limited to God's people, but is equally valid among Pagans! Indeed, marriage is a civil contract, and not an ecclesiastical one. Yet Rome has found it to her interest to lay her hand on the rite, and thus to elevate the question of divorce into an ecclesiastical one, and a *causa major*.

As to the number of sacraments under the Old Testament dispensation Calvinistic divines are not agreed. Some seem inclined to regard any or every symbolical rite there found as a sacrament. Others, far more correctly, as I conceive, limit them to two: circumcision and the passover. The claim of these two to be sacraments need hardly be much argued, inasmuch as it is not disputed. They are symbols

6. Sacraments of Old Testament Two. Sacrifices Not Sacraments, and Why.

instituted by God; they have each their elements, bearing a significant relation to the grace represented: the thing represented was in each case federal, so that they not only signified, but sealed or pledged the benefits of a covenant.

But the various typical sacrifices of the Hebrews cannot be properly regarded as sacraments, for the very reason that they were mere types. (The passover also was a type, in that it was a sacrifice proper, but it was also more than a type, a commemorative and sealing ordinance). For a type points forward to an antitype to come. A sacrament points back to a covenant already concluded. The type does not actually confer the good symbolized, but holds the soul in suspense, waiting for it. The sacrament seals a present possession to the worthy receiver. This was as true of the two Old Testament sacraments as of the New. See Rom. iv: 11; Exod. xii: 13. To the obedient and observant Hebrew, the passover was, on the night of its institution, the sign and seal of the remission of death, bodily and spiritual death, the proper penalty of sin, visited that night on a part of the Egyptians; and doubtless, in all subsequent ages, the truly believing Hebrew found it the consoling pledge of a present and actual (not typical) remission and spiritual life, through the merit of the "Lamb of God." Again, a sacrament is a holy ordinance, to be observed alike by all who are within the covenant. But many of the sacrifices were adapted only to exceptional cases: as the Nazarites, the trespass offering, the sacrifice for the purification of women, &c.

The question whether the sacraments of the Old and New Testaments are the same substantially in their signification and efficacy will be found in the sequel one of prime importance. The grounds on which we assert their substantial identity are these.

(a.) Presumptively: The covenant of grace is the same under the two testaments, offering the same blessing, redemption; through the same agencies, justification and sanctification through the work of Christ and the Holy Ghost. Hence, it is natural to suppose that sacraments, especially when sealing the same covenant graces, should operate in substantially the same way. (b.) The identity of the covenant, and of the means of sealing it, is strongly implied by Paul, 1 Cor. x: 1-4, when he says there was a sense in which the Hebrew Church possessed baptism and the Lord's supper. Turretin very strangely argues from this, and deals with objections, as though he understood the Apostle to teach that the Hebrews of the Exodus had literally and formally a real sacrament of baptism, and the supper, in the passage of the Red Sea, and the eating and drinking of the Manna and water of Massah. This seems to me to obscure the argument; and it would certainly have this effect: that we must teach that Israel had four sacraments instead of two. The scope of the Apostle is, to show that par-

ticipation in sealing ordinances and ecclesiastical privileges does not ensure salvation. For Israel all shared these wondrous sealings to God, yet many of them perished. And to strengthen the analogy he compares them to the New Testament sacraments. Now, if Israel's consecration to God in this Exodus was virtually a baptizing and a Eucharist, we infer that the spirit of the Israelitish ordinances was not essentially different from that of the New Testament. The scope of the Apostle necessitates this view. His design was, to stimulate to watchfulness, by showing that sacraments alone do not guarantee our salvation. This premise he proves, from the case of the Israelites who, though enjoying their sacraments, perished by unbelief. If the New Testament sacraments differed from the Old in possessing *opus operatum* power, as Rome claims they do, then the logic of the Apostle would be shameful sophism. (c.) The supper is called by the name of the passover. 1 Cor. v: 7, 8. And the baptism is declared to be, Col. ii: 11, 12, the New Testament circumcision. (d.) The supper came in the room of the passover, as is manifest from the circumstances of its institution, and the baptism came in the room of circumcision; compare Gen. xvii: 11, with Matt. xxviii: 19. See Acts ii: 38, 39. And, last, circumcision and baptism signify and seal the same graces. This will be manifest from a comparison of Gen. xvii: 13, 14, with Acts ii: 41; Deut. x: 16, or xxx: 6, with Jno. iii: 5, or with Titus iii: 5, and Eph. v: 26; Acts vii: 8, with Rom. vi: 3, 4; Rom. iv: 11, with Acts ii: 38, and xxii: 16. We here learn that each sacrament signified entrance into the visible Church, remission of sin, regeneration, and the engagement to be the Lord's. So the passover and the supper signify substantially the same. In our passover, the Lamb of God is represented as slain, the blood as sprinkled, our souls feed upon Him by faith, and the consequence is that God's wrath passeth over us, and our souls live.