

CHRISTIANITY RESTORED

The Principal Extras
of the
Millennial Harbinger,
Revised and Corrected

by A. Campbell

[COPY-RIGHT SECURED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS.]

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Part I. Principles of Interpretation	15
1 Written Revelation	18
2 Authors of the Bible	19
3 Inspiration of the Bible	20
4 Language of the Bible	21
5 Meaning of Words	22
6 Literal Meaning of Words	23
7 Figurative Meaning of Words	24
8 Metaphor	25
9 Allegory	26
10 Metonymy	27
11 Synecdoche	28
12 Irony	29
13 Hyperbole	30
14 Catachresis	31
15 Figures of Speech	32
16 Usage of Words	33
17 Subject-matter	Context
	Scope
	Analogy of Scripture
	Analogy of Faith
	Hieroglyphics
	Symbols
	Ensigns and Devices
	Mystical Allegory
	Mystical Actions
	Type
	Parable
	Proverb
	Emphasis
	Chapters, Verse, Punctuation
	Three Dispensations
	Rules of Interpretation
Part II. Foundations of Christian Union	101
Part III. Elements of Original Christianity (general essays)	129
Kingdom of Heaven	129
Remission of Sins	183
Breaking the Loaf	311
Dialogue on the Holy Spirit	343
Conclusion—Address to the Citizens of the Kingdom	381
Index	405

Blank Page

PREFACE.

Since the full development of the great apostacy foretold by prophets and apostles, numerous attempts at reformation have been made. Three full centuries, carrying with them the destinies of countless millions, have passed into eternity since the Lutheran effort to dethrone the *Man of Sin*. During this period, many great and wonderful changes have taken place in the political, literary, moral and religious conditions of society. The Protestant Reformation is one of the most splendid eras in the history of the world, and will long be regarded by the philosopher and the philanthropist as one of the most gracious interpositions in behalf of the whole human race.

That the nations composing the western half of the Roman empire have already been greatly benefitted by that effort, scientifically, politically and morally, no person acquainted with either political or ecclesiastical history can reasonably doubt. Time, that great arbiter of human actions, that great revealer of secrets, has long since decided that all the reformers of the papacy, have been public benefactors.

We Americans owe our national privileges and our civil liberties to the protestant reformers. They achieved not only an imperishable fame for themselves, but a rich legacy for their posterity. When we contrast the present state of these United States with Spanish America, and the condition of the English nation with that of Spain, Portugal, and Italy, we begin to appreciate how much we are indebted to the intelligence, faith, and courage of Martin Luther and his heroic associates in that glorious reformation.

He restored the Bible to the world, A. D. 1534, and boldly defended its claims against the impious and arrogant pretensions of the haughty and tyrannical See of Rome. But, unfortunately, at his death, there was no Joshua to lead the people who rallied under the banners of the Bible, out of the wilderness in which Luther died. His tenets were soon converted into a new state religion, and the spirit of reform-

ation which he excited and inspired, was soon quenched by the broils and feuds of the protestant princes, and the collisions of rival political interests both on the continent and islands of Europe.

While protestant hatred to the Roman pontiff and the papacy continued to increase, a secret lust in the bosoms of protestants for ecclesiastical power and patronage worked in all the members of the protestant states, and ultimately introduced a swarm of protestant popes, who gradually assimilated the new church to the old. Creeds and manuals, synods and councils, soon shackled the minds of men, and the spirit of reformation gradually forsook the protestant church, or was supplanted by the spirit of the world.

Calvin renewed the speculative theology of Saint Augustine, and Geneva in a few years became the Alexandria of modern Europe. The power of religion was soon merged in debates about forms and ceremonies, in speculative strifes of opinion, and in fierce debates about the political and religious right of burning heretics. Still, however, in all these collisions, much light was elicited; and had it not been for these extremes, it is problematical, whether the wound inflicted upon the Man of Sin, would have been as incurable as it has since proved itself to be.

Reformation, however, became the order of the day; and this assuredly was a great matter, however it may have been managed. It was a revolution, and revolutions seldom move backward. The example that Luther set was of more value than all the achievements of Charles the Fifth, or the literary and moral labors of his cotemporary, the erudite Erasmus.

It is curious to observe how extremes begot extremes in every step of the reformation cause, to the dawn of the present century. The penances, works of faith, and of supererogation of the Roman church, drove Luther and Calvin to ultraism of "faith alone."

After the protestants had debated their own principles with one another till they lost all brotherly affection, and would as soon have "communed in the sacrament" with the catholics as with one another; speculative abstracts of Christian Platonism, the sublime mysteries of Egyptian theology, became the bond of union and the apple of discord, among the fathers and friends of the reformation.

The *five* great dogmas of the Geneva reformer were carried to Amsterdam, and generated in the mind of James

Arminius in 1591, five opposite opinions; and these at the synod of Dort in 1618, formed a new party of Remonstrants.

Into Britain, with whose history we are more immediately concerned, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Arminianism, were soon imported; and like all raw materials there introduced, were immediately manufactured anew. They were all exotics, but easily acclimated, and soon flourished in Britain more luxuriantly than in their native soil. But the beggarly elements of opinions, forms, and ceremonies to which they gave rise, caused the "*Spirit alone*" to germinate in the mind of George Fox, _ in little more than half a century after the introduction of the Leyden theology.

In Lord Chatham's days, the Episcopal church, as his lordship declares, was a singular compound;—"a Popish liturgy, Calvinistic articles, and an Arminian clergy." But every few years caused a new dissension and reformation, until the kirk of Scotland and the church of England have been compelled to respect, in some good degree, the rights of conscience even in dissenters themselves.

Abroad, it was no better. The Saxon reformer had his friends. John of Picardy, lived in the grateful remembrance of the Geneva family; and James of Amsterdam, speculated in a very liberal style amongst all the Remonstrants, at home and abroad. In Sweden, Holland, Germany, England, Scotland, the debate varied not essentially: the Pope and the Protestants;—the Lutherans and the Calvinists;—the Calvinists and the Arminians;—the Bishops against the Presbyters, and the Presbyterians among themselves, until by the potency of metaphysics and politics, they are now frittered down to numerous parties.

While philosophy, mysticism, and politics drove the parties to every question into antipodal extremes;—while justification by catholic works originated justification by metaphysical faith alone;—while the forms and ceremonies of all sects begat the "*Spirit alone*" in the mind of George Fox; —while the Calvinian five points generated the Arminian five points;—and while the Westminster creed, though unsubscribed by its makers, begot a hundred others;—not until within the present generation did any sect or party in Christendom unite and build upon the Bible alone.

Since that time, the first effort known to us to abandon the whole controversy about creeds and reformations, and to *restore* primitive Christianity, or to build alone upon the

Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief corner, has been made.

Tired of new creeds and new parties in religion, and of the numerous abortive efforts to reform the reformation; convinced from the Holy Scriptures, from observation and experience, that the union of the disciples of Christ is essential to the conversion of the world, and that the correction and improvement of no creed, or partizan establishment in Christendom, could ever become the basis of such an union, communion, and co-operation, as would restore peace to a church militant against itself, or triumph to the common salvation,—a few individuals, about the commencement of the present century, began to reflect upon the ways and means to restore primitive Christianity.

This led to a careful, most conscientious, and prayerful examination of the grounds and reasons of the present state of things in all the protestant sects. On examination of the history of all the platforms and constitutions of all these sects, it appeared evident as mathematical demonstration itself, that neither the Augsburg articles of faith and opinion, nor the Westminster, nor the Wesleyan, nor those of any state creed or dissenting establishment, could ever improve the condition of things, restore union to the church, peace to the world, or success to the gospel of Christ.

As the Bible alone was said and constantly affirmed to be the religion of protestants, it was for some time a mysterious problem;—why the Bible alone, confessed and acknowledged, should work no happier results than the strifes, divisions and retaliatory excommunications of rival protestant sects. It appeared, however, in this case, after a more intimate acquaintance with the details of the inner temple of sectarian Christianity, as in many similar cases, that it is not the acknowledgment of a good rule, but the walking by it, that secures the happiness of society. The Bible alone in the lips, and the creed in the head and in the heart, will not save the church from strife, emulation, and schism. There is no moral, ecclesiastical, or political law, that can effect any moral, ecclesiastical or political good, by simply acknowledging it in word. It must be obeyed.

In our ecclesiastical pilgrimage we have occasionally met with some vehement declaimers against human written creeds, and pleaders for the Bible alone, who were all the while preaching up the antiquated opinions of St. Arius or

St. Athanasius. Their sentiments, language, style, and general views of the gospel were as human, as auricular confession, extreme unction, or purgatorial purification.

The Bible alone is the Bible only, in word and deed, in profession and practice; and this alone can reform the world and save the church. Judging others as we once judged ourselves, there are not a few who are advocating the Bible alone, and preaching their own opinions. Before we applied the Bible alone to our views, or brought our views and religious practices to the Bible, we plead the old theme,—"the Bible alone is the religion of protestants." But we found it an arduous task, and one of twenty years labor, to correct our diction and purify our speech according to the Bible alone. And even yet, we have not wholly practically repudiated the language of Ashdod. We only profess to work and walk by the rules which will inevitably issue in a pure speech, and in right conceptions of that pure, and holy, and celestial thing, called Christianity—in faith, in sentiment, and in practice.

A deep and an abiding impression that the power, the consolations and joys—the holiness and happiness of Christ's religion were lost in the forms and ceremonies, in the speculations and conjectures, in the feuds and bickerings of sects and schisms, originated a project many years ago for uniting the sects, or rather the *Christians* in all the sects, upon a clear and scriptural bond of union; upon having a "*thus saith the Lord*," either in express terms, or in approved precedent, "for every article of faith, and item of religious practice." This was offered in the year 1809, in the "Declaration and Address" of the Washington Association, Pennsylvania, it was first tendered to the parties that confessed the Westminster creed; but equally submitted to all protestants of every name, making faith in Christ and obedience to him, the only *test* of Christian character, and the only *bond* of church union, communion, and co-operation. It was indeed approved by all, but adopted and practised by none; except the few, or part of the few, who made the overture.

None of us who either got up or sustained that project, was then aware of what havoc that said principle, if faithfully applied, would have made of our views and practices on various favorite points. When we take a close retrospective view of the last thirty years, (for we have a pretty distinct recollection of our travel's history for that

period,) and of the workings of that principle in heart and life, with which we commenced our public career in the work of the Lord; we know not how to express our astonishment better than in the following parable:—

A citizen of the west had a very promising young vineyard on a fruitful hill. He had no practical knowledge in the cultivation of the grape, hut had read much and theorized largely, upon the dressing, pruning, and managing of the vine. He built himself a wine-vat, and prepared all the implements for the vintage. But he lacked practical skill in using the pruning-knife. His vines flourished exceedingly, and stretched forth their tendrils on every side; but he had no vintage.

A vine-dresser from Oporto one day presented himself as he was musing upon his disappointments. He was celebrated in his profession, and the most skillful in all the affairs of the vineyard. The owner of the vineyard having employed him to dress and keep his vineyard, set out on a long journey for a few weeks. On his return and visit to his farm, he walked out one day to his vineyard; when to his amazement, he saw the ground literally covered with prunings of his vines. The vine-dresser had very skillfully and freely used the pruning-hook, and had left little more than the roots and naked stems of the vines, standing by the frames.

"My vineyard is ruined, my hopes are blighted! I am undone, I am ruined!" exclaimed the unhappy husbandman. "Unhappy wretch I you have deceived me; you have robbed me of the labors of five years, and blasted, in one single moon, all my bright hopes for years to come!" The vine-dresser stood appalled, but soon as the tempest subsided, ventured to say: "Master, I will serve you five years for nothing, if we gather not more grapes and have not a better vineyard this year, than you have gathered in all the years since you planted these vines." The proprietor of the vintage withdrew, saying: "It is impossible—it is impossible!" and visited it not again till invited by his vine-dresser, about the middle of autumn—when to his still greater astonishment, and much more to his gratification, he found incomparably more grapes than hitherto gathered from his vines, and of a much more delicious quality.

So in the case before us, the application of the principle already stated trimmed us so naked, that we strongly inclined to suspect its fallacy, and had well nigh abandoned

it as a deceitful speculation. Time, however, that great teacher, and Experience, that great critic, have fully assured us that the principle is a salutary one; and that although we seemingly lose much by its application, our loss consists only of barren opinions, fruitless speculations, and useless traditions, that only cumber the ground and check the word, so that it is in a good measure unfruitful.

We flatter ourselves, that the principles are now clearly and fully developed, by the united efforts of a few devoted and ardent minds, who set out determined to sacrifice every thing to truth, and follow her wherever she might lead the way: I say, the principles on which the church of Jesus Christ—all believers in Jesus as the Messiah—can be united with honor to themselves, and with blessings to the world;—on which the gospel and its ordinances can be restored, in all their primitive simplicity, excellency, and power, and the church shine as a lamp that burneth, to the conviction and salvation of the world: I say, *the principles* by which these things can be done, are now developed; as well as the *principles themselves*, which together constitute *the original gospel and order of things* established by the Apostles.

The object of this volume is to place before the community in a plain, definite, and perspicuous style, the *capital principles* which have been elicited, argued out, developed, and sustained in a controversy of *twenty-five* years, by the tongues and pens of those who rallied under the banners of the Bible alone. The principle which was inscribed upon our banners when we withdrew from the ranks of the sects, was;—"*Faith in Jesus as the true Messiah, and obedience to him as our Lawgiver and King, the ONLY TEST of Christian character, and the ONLY BOND of Christian union, communion, and co-operation; irrespective of all creeds, opinions, commandments, and traditions of men.*"

This cause, like every other, was first plead by the tongue; afterwards, by the pen and the press. The history of its progress corresponds with the history of every other religious revolution, in this respect;—that different points, at different times, almost exclusively engrossed the attention of its pleaders. We began with the *outposts* and *vanguard* of the opposition. Soon as we found ourselves in possession of one post, our artillery was turned against another; and as fast as the smoke of the enemy receded, we advanced upon his lines.

The first piece that was written on the subject of the great position, appeared from the pen of Thomas Campbell, Senior, in the year 1809. An association was formed that year for the dissemination of the principles of reformation, and the piece alluded to was styled, "The Declaration and Address of the *Christian Association* of Washington, Pennsylvania."

The constitutional principle of this "Christian Association" and its object, are clearly expressed in the following resolution:—"That this society, formed for the sole purpose of promoting simple evangelical Christianity, shall, to the utmost of its power, countenance and support such ministers, and such only, as exhibit a manifest conformity to the *Original Standard*, in conversation and doctrine, in zeal and diligence;— only such as reduce to practice the *simple original* form of Christianity, expressly exhibited upon the sacred page, without attempting to inculcate any thing of human authority, of private opinion, or inventions of men, as having any place in the constitution, faith, or worship of the Christian church;—or any thing as matter of *Christian faith or duty*, for which there cannot be produced a '*thus saith the Lord*' either in express terms, or by approved precedent." The ground occupied in this resolution afforded ample documents of debate. Every inch of it was debated, argued, canvassed, for several years, in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Ohio. On this bottom we put to sea, with scarcely hands enough to man the ship. We had head winds and rough seas for the first seven years. A history of which would be both curious and interesting.

But to contradistinguish this plea and effort from some others almost contemporaneous with it, we would emphatically remark that—while the remonstrants warred against human creeds, evidently because those creeds warred against their own private opinions and favorite dogmas, which they wished to substitute for those creeds,—this enterprize, so far as it was hostile to those creeds, warred against them, not because of their hostility to any private or favorite opinions which were desired to be substituted for them; but because these human institutions supplanted the Bible, made the word of God of non-effect, were fatal to the intelligence, union, purity, holiness, and happiness of the disciples of Christ, and hostile to the salvation of the world.

Unitarians, for example, have warred against human creeds, because those creeds taught trinitarianism. Arminians, too, have been hostile to creeds, because these creeds supported Calvinism. It has, indeed, been alleged, that all schismatics, good and bad, since the days of John Wickliff, and long before, have opposed creeds of human invention, because those creeds opposed them. But so far as this controversy resembles them in its opposition to creeds, it is to be distinguished from them in this all essential attribute, viz: that our opposition to creeds arose from a conviction, that *whether the opinions in them were true or false, they were hostile to the union, peace, harmony, purity, and joy of Christians; and adverse to the conversion of the world to Jesus Christ.*

Next to our personal salvation, two objects constituted the *summum bonum*, the supreme good, worthy of the sacrifice of all temporalities. The first was, the union, peace, purity and harmonious co-operation of Christians—guided by an understanding enlightened by the Holy Scriptures; the other, the conversion of sinners to God. Our predilections and antipathies on all religious questions arose from, and were controlled by, these all absorbing interests. From these commenced our campaign against creeds. We had not at first, and we have not now, a favorite opinion or speculation, which we would offer as a substitute for any human creed or constitution in Christendom.

We were not indeed at first apprized of the havoc which our *principles* would make upon our *opinions*. We soon, however, found our principles and opinions at war on some points; and the question immediately arose, *Whether shall we sacrifice our principles to our opinions, or our opinions to our principles.* We need not say that we were compelled to the latter; judging that our principles were better than our opinions. Hence, since we put to sea on board this bottom, we have been compelled to throw overboard some opinions, once as dear to us as they now are to those who never thought of the difference between principle and opinion.

Some of those opinions—as the most delicate and tender buds are soonest blighted by the frost—immediately withered, and died under the first application of our principles, Infant baptism and infant sprinkling, with all infantile imbecility, immediately expired in our minds, soon as the *Bible alone* was made the only measure and standard of

faith and duty. This foundation of the paidobaptist temple being instantly destroyed, the whole edifice, leaning upon it, became a heap of ruins. We explored the ruins with great assiduity, collected from them all the materials that could be worked into the Christian temple; but the piles of rubbish that remained were immense.

Other topics became the theme of discussion; and as the public mind became more intelligent and candid, the great principles of the law and gospel, the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and Christian institutions, were gradually unfolded. To the development of these, other publications in 1816 and 1820 greatly contributed, and so fully explored were ancient and modern Christianity, that in 1823, the design was formed of commencing a periodical, and establishing a press, to contend for the original faith and order, in opposition to all the corruptions of fifteen centuries.

As we are not writing a history of this struggle from its commencement till the present time, but simply informing the reader that the principles stated in the following pages have been maturely considered, and have passed through a long, complicated, and vigorous opposition,—we shall hasten to the object of this book, which is to lay before the reader a miniature view of the principles already noticed.

To say nothing of the periodicals which have already been commenced, and which have been for some time our fellow-laborers in this all-important work, beside our debates of 1820, 1823 and 1829, four editions of the new version of the New Testament, with prefaces, various tables, notes, criticisms, &c.; there have issued from our press *twelve* volumes in illustration and defence of these principles; in hearing and answering objections from all sects, and from many of the most learned and talented of our country.

The Christian Baptist, in *seven* annual volumes, being the first of these publications, and affording such a *gradual* development of all these principles, as the state of the public mind and the opposition would permit, is, in the judgment of many of our brethren, that have expressed themselves on the subject, better adapted to the whole community as it now exists, than our other writings. In this judgment I must concur: and to it especially, as well as to all other publications since commenced, I would refer the reader, who may be solicitous to examine these principles more fully, and to consider the ordeal through which they have passed.

Having paid a very candid and considerate regard to all that has been offered against these principles, as well as having been admonished from the extremes into which some of our friends and brethren have carried some points, I undertake this work with a deep sense of its necessity, and with much anticipation of its utility, in exhibiting a concentrated view of the whole ground we occupy—of rectifying some extremes—of furnishing new means of defence to those engaged in contending with this generation, for primitive Christianity.

Having also attentively considered the most vulnerable side of every great question, and re-examined the terms, and phrases which have occasioned most opposition and controversy, whether from our own pen or that of any of our brethren,—our aim is now to offer to the public a more matured view of such cardinal principles as are necessary to the right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures—both in acquiring and communicating a correct knowledge of the Christian institution, of such principles as are requisite to the discovery of truth, and the exposure of error; as well as in a revised and corrected republication of the principal Extras of the Millennial Harbinger, to lay before the reader the elements of the gospel itself, and of the worship most acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

This work, then, naturally divides itself into three parts. The first, *the principles by which the Christian institution may be certainly and satisfactorily ascertained*; the second, *the principles on which all Christians may form one communion*: and the third, *the elements or principles which constitute original Christianity*. Whether this arrangement be most in the order of nature, or of importance, is not the question; it is the order in which we have from necessity been compelled to consider these subjects.

Our views and attainments in the knowledge of Christianity, such as they are, are, we think, the necessary results of our premises and principles of interpretation. Certain it is, that by them we were led into those views of the ancient gospel and order of things, which we were enabled to exhibit in the publications of the year 1623. While we state this fact distinctively to arrest the attention of the reader to a candid and jealous examination of them, we would not be understood as alleging, that all who have since embraced these views, or who now contend for them, are indebted to our labors for their knowledge of original

Christianity. The same principles of interpretation have led others to the same conclusions from the same premises; and thus have we been mutually helpers to one another. The momentous importance of some of our conclusions, we humbly think, entitle our premises and principles of interpretation, to a strict and impartial consideration; and this is all the favor we petition from any reader into whose hands this volume may happen to fall.

For his sake we commence with the principles of interpretation themselves, that he may examine them on their own merits, and that of the documents which sustain them, irrespective of the results to which they have led us. And as we would not take him by surprise, we request him not only to be honest to himself, but to be exceedingly scrupulous of us, in examining and in receiving the following principles and rules of reading and interpreting the oracles of God: for if he adopt the following rules—admit the facts stated—and faithfully apply the principles propounded to the premises to which we invite his attention—he may, in spite of his efforts to the contrary, happen to be blessed with a discovery, for which he would not accept in exchange the united wealth of both the Indies! Should such be the happy consummation of his enquiries, I am confident he will not be ashamed of me, nor will I blush to see him in the day when the Lord descends with all the glory of the Heavens to judge the living and the dead, and to recompense every man according to his works.

A. CAMPBELL.

BETHANY, VA., *January 2*, 1835.

Principles of Interpretation.

CHAPTER I.

WRITTEN REVELATION.

The whole Christian religion;—its facts, its doctrine, its promises, its threatenings,—is presented to the world in a *written record*. The *writings* of prophets and apostles contain all the divine and supernatural knowledge in the world. Now, unless these sacred *writings* can be certainly interpreted, the Christian religion never can be certainly understood. Every argument that demonstrates the necessity of such a written document as the Bible, equally demonstrates the necessity of fixed and certain principles or rules of interpretation: for without the latter, the former is of no value whatever to the world.

All the differences in religious opinion and sentiment, amongst those who acknowledge the Bible, are occasioned by false principle of interpretation, or by a misapplication of the true principles. There is no law, nor standard— literary, moral, or religious—that can coerce human thought or action, by only promulging and acknowledging it. If a law can effect any thing, our actions must be conformed to it. Were all students of the Bible taught to apply the same rules of interpretation to its pages, there would be a greater uniformity in opinion and sentiment, than ever resulted from the simple adoption of any written creed.

Great unanimity has obtained in some of the sciences, in consequence of the adoption of certain rules of analysis and synthesis; for all who work by the same rules, come to the same conclusions. And may it not be possible, that in this divine science of religion, there may yet be a very great degree of unanimity of sentiment, and uniformity of practice amongst all its friends? Is the school of Christ the school, in which there can be no unanimity —no proficiency in knowledge? Is the book of God the

only volume, which can never be understood alike, by those who read and study it? It cannot be supposed, but by dishonoring God: for as all the children of God are taught by God—if they are necessarily unintelligent in his oracles, and discordant in their views, the deficiencies must rather be imputed to the teacher, than to the taught; for the pupils in this school, can be taught other sciences in other schools, with such uniformity and harmony of views, as to make it manifest to all, that they are the disciples of one teacher.

God's book is, however, put into the hands of men, as it was first spoken to men; but they have, by some unpropitious cause, been taught not to receive it from God, but from men. They do not consider, that the *written* book as well as the *spoken word*, is tendered to us under the stipulations of human language—according to the contract between man and man, touching the value or meaning of the currency of thought: that every word and sentence is to be weighed and tested, by the constitutional laws and standards of the currency of ideas.

When one person addresses another, he supposes the person addressed competent to interpret his words; and therefore, all wise and benevolent men select such words and phrases, as in their judgment, can be interpreted by those addressed. Every speaker proceeds in all his communications, upon the principle that his hearer is an interpreter—that he has not first to be taught the science of interpretation; and that he is bound so to express himself, that his hearer may interpret and understand his words, by an art which is supposed to be *native*,—which is indeed universal—common to all nations, barbarous as well as civilized.

Now, as God is infinitely wise and benevolent in all his oral communications to men, he proceeded upon the principle, that they were, by this native art, competent interpreters of his expressions; for otherwise, his addresses could be of no value. He could not even begin to teach them a new art of interpretation, as respected his communications, but by using their own words in the stipulated sense; unless we imagine a miracle in every case, and suppose that all his words were to be understood by a miraculous interposition. And this idea, if carried out, would make a verbal revelation, of no value whatever to the children of men.

If human language had never been confounded,—if a

multitude of different dialects had not been introduced,— no occasion for translating language, as a matter of course, would ever have existed. Again, if words and phrases, and the manners and customs of mankind were unchangeably fixed, or universally the same at all times and in all countries, the art of interpreting would have been still more simple than it is: for so far as it is *artificial*, it is owing to different dialects, idioms, manners, customs, and all the varieties which the ever changing conditions of society have originated, and are still originating.

At present, however, we would only impress upon the mind of the reader, that the very fact that we have a *written* revelation, that this revelation was first *spoken*, then written, supposes that there is somewhere, a native or an acquired art of interpretation: that the persons addressed were already in possession of that art: for without such an understanding, there would have been neither wisdom nor benevolence, in giving to mankind any verbal communication from God.

To unfold the principles of this art, whether we may regard it as native or acquired,—and to deduce from those principles some plain precepts, is the object of the first part of this book: for as before observed, unless the sacred *writings* can be certainly interpreted, the Christian religion never can be certainly understood. We only add, that we will not assume a principle, nor suggest a precept of interpretation, that is not sustained by all the masters of this science, whose judgment is regarded, and whose decisions are acquiesced in, by all the authorities in the republic of letters.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORS OF THE BIBLE.

The *Oracles of God*, commonly called the Bible, or THE BOOK, including the Old and New Testaments,—contemplated in a *literary* point of view, is the work of at least *thirty-five* independent authors. This volume was on hands for the long period of about fifteen hundred and fifty years; from the giving of the law by Moses, to the close of the vision and prophecy by John the Apostle. Some of its

authors were shepherds, kings, priests, fishermen, and of other callings in society. They spoke and wrote in different languages; at least, in Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek; and lived in countries considerably remote from each other.

As authors, some of them appear in the character of historians, orators, poets, biographers, moralists, letter-writers, &c. And although under an infallible superintendence and inspiration in all their communications to mankind, each of them preserves, in his speeches and writings, every thing peculiar to himself as a man. Like the fishermen of Galilee, on the day of Pentecost, though supernaturally gifted with a perfect knowledge of all the languages then spoken in Jerusalem, so that they could speak with the utmost facility, yet every man retained his own provincialisms; so that the splendid gift of tongues which they displayed, could not conceal from the multitude their Galilean extraction.

There cannot be less than *thirty-five* varieties of style in a work composed by thirty-five authors, even had they all written in the same language, upon the same subject, and at the same time. But when we reflect that these thirty, five authors lived in countries far remote, at different periods of time, through all the fluctuations of more than fifteen centuries, wrote in different languages, on different Subjects, full of allusion to the views manners, and customs of those addressed, and of contemporary neighboring nations; may we not say, that no volume in the world can surpass the Bible, in all the varieties and peculiarities of style; and that no book demands so much discrimination on the part of the student, who would accurately understand, and intelligibly interpret, its ancient and venerable compositions? Informing rules for the easy and certain understanding and interpreting the sacred writings, so far as it is a *literary* performance, these considerations must have due weight.

CHAPTER III.

INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.

Revelation and inspiration, properly so called, have to do only with such subjects as are supernatural, or beyond

the reach of human intellect, in the most cultivated and elevated state. In this sense, "Holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." But besides this inspiration of original and supernatural ideas, there was another species of Supernatural aid attended the saints who wrote the historical parts of the sacred Scriptures. There was a revivescence in their minds, of what they themselves had seen and heard; and in reference to traditions handed down, such a superintendency of the Spirit of wisdom and knowledge, as excluded the possibility of mistake, in the matters of fact which they recorded. The promise of "leading into all truth," and the promise of "bringing all things before known to remembrance," by the Holy Spirit, include all that we understand by inspiration, in its primary and secondary import.

But while this inspiration precluded the selection of incorrect or unsuitable words and sentences, the inspired men delivered supernatural communications in their own peculiar modes of expressing themselves. To illustrate my meaning, by another reference to the gift of tongues: the subjects of that splendid gift, in a moment, understood those foreign languages, as well as they knew their own. But in expressing themselves, they selected such terms, as in their judgment, most fitly and intelligibly communicated their ideas. In other words.—their own judgment or taste in the selection of terms, was not suspended by the new language. They used the terms of the new dialect, as they used the terms of their native tongue: chose such as in their judgment, would most clearly and forcibly reveal the mind of the Spirit to their hearers.

To give our ideas of the inspiration of the Prophets and Apostles, we would use such a comparison as the following: —There are some human sciences which may be perfectly understood; for example—the science of arithmetic. Suppose that A, by his own personal exertions, had made himself master of the whole science of numbers; and that B, without any exertion of his own, was instantly gifted with a perfect knowledge of the same science. In teaching that science to those ignorant of it, they would both proceed according to their own judgment and taste, and according to the capacity of their pupils. Neither A, who acquired his knowledge from books—nor B, who received his by inspiration, would feel himself obliged to use the words of the author of his knowledge; but would, from the treasures of

which he was possessed, give rules, and precepts, and examples, suited to a full development of his knowledge, to the need of the student. Neither of them would always speak in the same set phrase, but would, nevertheless, always impart correct and certain instruction on every topic in that science, until the student had a full and accurate view of the whole of it.

We regard the apostles of Jesus Christ, as gifted with a full and perfect knowledge of the Christian institution; which entitled them, without the possibility of error, to open to mankind the whole will of their Master, whether in the form of doctrine, precept, promise, or threatening; and as furnished with such a knowledge of the signs of those ideas in human language, as to express this knowledge clearly, accurately, and infallibly, to mankind. But from what they have spoken and written, we are authorized to think that they were as free in the selection of words and phrases, as I am in endeavoring to communicate my views of their inspiration.

My reasons for this opinion are, that neither the Prophets nor the Apostles, exhibit any sort of solicitude in always expressing themselves in the same words, upon the same subject. Nor does any one of them seem at all concerned, to be consistent with himself on all occasions, in using the same words; either in delivering precepts, uttering promises, or in giving a narrative of any of the incidents of his own life, or that of his companions. We have no less than three accounts of Paul's conversion and mission to the Gentiles; one from Luke, and two from himself: one delivered to the Jews in Jerusalem, and one before Agrippa;—yet no two of them agree in *word*, though in sense they are uniformly the same.* We have two accounts of the conversion of the Gentiles; one by Luke, and one by Peter; † and these are as diverse in words, though as accordant in sense, as the narratives of Paul's conversion. We have four memoirs of Jesus Christ, brief records of his sayings and doings; and yet no two of them agree in words, in narrating a single speech, or in describing a single incident of his life, though there is, as far as they severally relate, a most perfect harmony in sense.

Peter's allusion to the epistles of Paul, fully expresses all that we desire to teach on this subject. "Paul wrote,"

* Acts, 9th, 22nd, 24th, chapters.

† Acts, 10th, 11th chapters.

says he, "*according to the wisdom given him.*" Paul's epistles are, then, the development and application of that wisdom given to him, expressed in his own style, It may, indeed, be said, that guided by that wisdom, it was impossible for them to select on any occasion, words or phrases in accurate, or not clearly and fully expressive of the ideas suggested; so that as Paul himself says, he explained *spiritual things* in spiritual words, or in words taught by the Spirit. We must, therefore, regard these words as the words of the Spirit. It was God's spirit speaking in them, through such words as were natural to them from education and habit. According to these views, the English, or German, or French "New Testament," is as much the word of the Spirit as the Greek original, if that original is faithfully translated, but in any other view of inspiration, we have not the word of God, nor the teachings of his spirit, only in the Hebrew and Greek originals of the two covenants.

Before we dismiss this subject it may be observed, that we find many things in these writings, which are quite natural and common, for which inspiration is neither claimed nor pretended; many specimens of which will occur to the reader, when one is fairly examined. "Make haste to come to me soon; for Demas having loved the present world has forsaken me, and is gone into Thessalanica, Crescens into Galatia, and Titus into Dalmatia. Only Luke is with me. Take Mark and bring him with you, for he is very useful to me in the ministry. But Tychycus I have sent to Ephesus. The cloak which I left at Troas with Carpus, bring when you come, and the books, but especially the parchments."*

Concerning every thing in these sacred writings, even the most common and trivial matters as we might call them, there is but one observation we shall offer, and with that close this chapter.

The Apostles, acting under the high authority and commission of Jesus Christ, and inspired with all divine and supernatural knowledge, exhibited in doctrine, in precepts, ordinances, promises, threatenings, and developments of things spiritual, celestial, eternal, are, in consequence of these endowments and authority, worthy of all respect and regard, even when writing upon the most common matters; and these apparently uninteresting things, are to the stu-

* 2 Timothy iv. 8—12.

dent of the Living Oracles of great value, and of indispensable importance, in giving a full development of the religion of Christianity, in all its condescensions and adaptations to the most minute and common concerns and business of this life.

CHAPTER IV.

LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE.

God has spoken by men, to men, for men. The language of the Bible is, then, *human* language. It is, therefore, to be examined by all the same rules which are applicable to the language of any other book, and to be understood according to the true and proper meaning of the words, in their current acceptance, at the times and in the places in which they were originally written or translated.

If we have a *revelation* from God in human language, the words of that volume must be intelligible by the common usage of language:—they must be precise and determinate in signification, and that signification must be philosophically ascertained; that is,—as the words and sentences of other books are ascertained, by the use of the dictionary and grammar. Were it otherwise, and did men require a new dictionary and grammar to understand the book of God,—then, without that divine dictionary and grammar, we could have no *revelation* from God: for a revelation that needs to be revealed, is no revelation at all.

Again, if any *special rules* are to be sought, for the interpretation of the sacred writings; unless these rules have been given in the volume, as a part of the revelation, and are of divine authority,—without such rules, the book is sealed; and I know of no greater abuse of language, than to call a *pealed book*, a revelation.

But the fact, that God has clothed his communications in human language, and that he has spoken by men, to men, is *prima facie* evidence that he is to be understood, as one man conversing with another. Righteousness, or what we sometimes call *honesty*, requires this; for unless he first made a special stipulation when he began to speak, his words

were, in all candor, to be taken at the current value; for, he that would contract with a man for any thing, stipulating his contract in the currency of the country, without any explanation, and should afterwards intimate, that a *dollar* with him meant only *three franks*, would be regarded as a dishonest and unjust man. And shall we impute to the God of truth and justice, what would blast the reputation of a fellow-citizen, at the tribunal of political justice!

As then, there is no divine dictionary, grammar, or special rules of interpretation for the Bible, then that book, to be understood, must be submitted to the common dictionary, grammar, and rules of the language in which it was written; and as a living language is constantly fluctuating, the true and proper meaning of the words and sentences of the Bible, must be learned from the acceptance of those words and phrases, in the times and countries in which it was written. In all this, there is nothing special; for Diodorus, Herodotus, Josephus, Philo, Tacitus, Sallust, &c., and all the writers of all languages, ages, and nations, are translated and understood in the same manner.

Enthusiasts and fanatics of all ages, determine the meaning of words, from that knowledge of things which they imagine themselves to possess, rather than from the words of the author,—"They decide by what they suppose he ought to mean, rather than by what he says."

To adopt any other course, or to apply any other rules, would necessarily divest the sacred writings of every attribute that belongs to the idea of revelation. It must never be forgotten in perusing the Bible, that in the structure of sentences, in the figures of speech, in the arrangement and use of words, it differs not at all from other writings, and must, therefore, be understood and interpreted as they are.

CHAPTER V.

MEANING OF WORDS

Every word in the Scriptures has some idea attached to it, which we call its sense, or meaning. But this meaning is not natural, but conventional. It is agreement, usage, or

custom, that has constituted a connexion between words, and the ideas represented by them; and this connexion between words and ideas has become necessary by usage.

How this originated, is not the question before us: the fact is all that now interests us. We are not at liberty to affix what meaning we please to words, nor to use them arbitrarily; inasmuch as custom has affixed, by common consent, a meaning to them.

The meaning of words is, therefore, now to be ascertained by *testimony*;—and that testimony we have collected in those books called dictionaries, which, by the consent of those who spoke that language faithfully, represent the meaning attached to those terms, or the ideas of which those words were the signs. "The fact," says Professor Stuart, "that usage has attached any particular meaning to a word, like any other historical fact, is to be proved by adequate testimony. That testimony may be drawn from books in which the word is employed, or from daily use in conversation. But the fact of a particular meaning being attached to a word when once established, can no more be changed or denied, than any historical event whatever. Of course, an *arbitrary* sense, can never with propriety be substituted for a *real* one. All men in their daily conversations and "writings, attach but *one sense to a word at the same time, and in the same passage*, unless they design to speak in enigmas. Of course, it would be in opposition to the universal custom of language, if more than one meaning should be attached to any word in Scripture, in such a case;" that is,—in the same passage and at the same time.

But, although a word has but one meaning at the same time, and in the same passage,—it may at another time, and in another passage, have a different meaning; for, many words have, by common consent, more meanings than one. This is what has caused so much ambiguity in language, and so much difficulty in ascertaining the meaning of some sentences and passages in all authors, and in the sacred writings.

Every word, indeed, had but one meaning at first; but to prevent the multiplication of words to an indefinite extent, and to obviate the difficulties which would thence arise in the acquisition of the knowledge of a language; words, in process of time, were used to represent different meanings. A question then arises, *How shall we always ascertain the meaning of any particular word?* If it have

but one meaning, testimony or the dictionary decides it at once; but if it have more meanings than one, the proximate words used in construction with it, usually called the context, together with the design of the speaker or writer, must decide its meaning. Usage and the context, will generally decide. If these fail, the design of the speaker. and parallel passages must be summoned. These are the aids, which the canons of interpretation authorize in such cases.

That there is generally perfect certainty, in the proper interpretation of a word—that is, in ascertaining or communicating its meaning, (for this is what is properly called the *act* of interpretation,) is felt and acknowledged on all hands. But the foundation, or reason of this certainty, is a matter which should be evident to all.

Now, unless we are compelled by necessity, arising from the laws of language, to any particular meaning, there can be no certainty. Therefore, this compulsion is the very cause of certainty. Philological necessity, or that necessity which the *common usage* of a word, *the context*, *the design of the writer* create, in giving a particular meaning to a word in a sentence, is the ground of that complete certainty, which, whether he can or cannot explain, every one feels in the meaning of language. And as a very eminent critic has said, "if any one should deny, that the above precepts lead to certainty, when strictly observed,—he would deny the possibility of finding the meaning of language with certainty." These remarks would be sufficient to guide us in acquiring the meaning of words, if they had only one class of meanings. But there is the *literal*, and the *tropical* or figurative meaning of words, which must be distinguished, before we can feel ourselves competent to decide, with perfect certainty, the true and proper meaning of any composition.

CHAPTER VI.

LITERAL MEANING OF WORDS.

As has been observed, every word at first had but one meaning; and this, of course, which was first, was the na-

tural, or the literal meaning. Some of our most approved philologists and grammarians define the literal sense of words, to be, "the sense which is so connected with them, that it is first in order, and is spontaneously presented to the mind, as soon as the sound of the word is heard." "The *literal sense* does not differ," says the celebrated Ernesti, "among the older and valuable writers, from the *sense of the letter*." But better defined by Professor Stuart, of Andover,—"The literal sense is the same as the *primitive*, or original sense; or, at least, it is equivalent to that sense which has usurped the place of the original one: for example,—the original sense of the word *tragedy*, has long ceased to be current; and the literal sense of this word, now, is that which has taken the place of the original one." Popular writers, in speaking of the sense of words, are wont to substitute grammatical for literal, as equivalent; because literal, in its Latin extraction, and *grammatical*, in its Greek extraction, exactly represent the same thing. But in a shade differing from these, they use the word *historical*, in reference to the interpretation of the Scriptures. "Since," says T. H. Home, in his Introduction, "it is not sufficient to know *grammatically*, the different expressions employed by writers, to interpret ancient works, so it is necessary that we add *Historical Interpretation*, to our grammatical or literal knowledge. By historical interpretation, we are to understand, that we give to the words of the sacred author, the sense which they bore in the age when he lived, and which is agreeable to the degree of knowledge which he possessed, as well as conformable to the religion professed by him, and to the sacred and civil rights or customs, that obtained in the age when he flourished."

When, however, we speak of the literal or *grammatical* sense of a word, we mean no more than its primitive meaning. And when we speak of the *historical* meaning of a word, we mean its meaning at any given time. The *figurative* meaning of words belongs to another chapter.

In no book in the world, is the literal sense of words the only sense; and still less in the Bible. But no book in the world, either among the ancients or the moderns, has been interpreted, quoted, and applied, so licentiously, as the Bible. Learned and unlearned, have quoted and applied its words, as if its authors were outlaws and rebels in the common-wealth of letters. Some of the ancient Jews said, that every letter in a word in the Old Testament, had a special

meaning; and the very openings of the mouth to pronounce them, was significant of something sacred. The Rabbinic maxim used to be, and perhaps, still is, "On every point of the Scriptures, hang suspended mountains of sense." The Talmud says, "God so gave the law to Moses, that a thing can be shewn to be clean and unclean, forty-nine different ways." Little more than a century ago, Cocceius, of Leyden, maintained, "that all the possible meanings of a word are to be united." He raised a considerable party upon this principle.

But an opposite extreme, and quite as dangerous, into which some have run, is, that "some passages of the Scriptures, have no literal meaning at all." If, by this it were understood, that some passages have only a tropical, or figurative meaning, it might be admitted, without much detriment to our knowledge of the will of Heaven; but as it is understood by many, a license is taken to allegorize, not only the historical part of both Testaments, but also the miracles of Moses, of Christ, and of the Apostles,—the paradisaical state, the flood, and even the precepts and promises of the gospel institution: so that the whole revelation of God, is thrown into the laboratory of every man's imagination; and the key of knowledge forever taken from the people. That the words of the sacred writings are taken both literally and figuratively, as the words of all other books, is now, almost universally conceded; and that the true sense of the words, is the true doctrine of the Bible, is daily gaining ground amongst the most learned and skillful interpreters: in one word,—that the Bible is not to be interpreted arbitrarily, is the most valuable discovery or concession of this generation. This, indeed, was confessed by our most distinguished reformers. Melancthon said, "The Scripture cannot be understood *theologically*, until it is understood *grammatically*." And Luther affirmed, "That a *certain* knowledge of Scripture, depends only upon a knowledge of its words."

CHAPTER VII.

FIGURATIVE MEANING OF SCRIPTURE.

The turning of a word from its original or primitive meaning, styled the literal, is called *trope*, or figure of a

word; because standing in a new attitude before the mind. When words are used not in their proper or literal sense, they are called figurative. In this sort of language, the ancient writings abound more than the modern; and the eastern more than the western.

In ancient times, language was comparatively poor; and as the poor mechanist who has but few tools, has to apply them to many uses,—so in the poverty of language, orators and writers had to use the same words in various acceptations. This is the philosophy of the exuberance of tropes and figures, in the rudest and most ancient languages of the world.

In the east, nature is more gay, rich, variegated, beautiful, and gorgeous, than in the west. It is not only in the superior luxuriance of her soil, the number, variety, and beauty of her vegetable and animal productions; the richness and extent of her metallic dominions; the splendor and brilliancy of her gems and precious stones;—but in the sweet serenity and delicious fragrance of her air; the loftiness, grandeur, and magnificence of her heavens, that Asia excels the other quarters of our globe, and becomes the Eden of the whole earth. It is not for us now to trace the connexion between country, climate, and language; but this much we may say, that it is not in the power of man, constituted as he is, to be placed in the midst of such a combination of happy circumstances, and not to partake of them, more or less, in his constitution, mental and physical. The eye and the ear, those two senses, through which mind has all its perceptions of beauty and harmony, of grandeur and sublimity; through which it has its clearest, brightest, most vivid, and lasting images of things, cannot be constantly feasted upon such objects, without being deeply imbued in all its powers and capacities, by them; and excited to adorn itself in all its manifestations, according to the splendid model constantly before it. As, then, the palaces of the eastern princes greatly excel those of the western, in all the gorgeousness of imperial grandeur; so the oriental languages, in the fulness, splendor, and richness of their imagery; the number, variety, and beauty of their tropes and figures, greatly transcend the occidental.

When standing either at the base or on the summit of the hills and mountains, once frequented by Ossian, the seats and scenes of his poetic effusions;—while I surveyed the rugged cliffs of cloud-capt mountains, or viewed the temp-

est-beaten-ship, riding amidst the foam of conflicting waves; —while I listened to the roarings of the mountain stream, as it tumbled from the precipice into the sea; and the rush of the swelling billows, as they dashed themselves to pieces upon the rocks,—I felt the spirit of the son of Fingal rising within me, and my soul labored for words, to give utterance to the feelings of my heart. It was then I began to learn why Homer, the contemporary of Elijah, was so familiar with the sublime, and Virgil with the beautiful. It was then I *experienced* the truth of that philosophy, which assigns to the different scenes of nature, most of the various charms of song.

This is not so trivial a matter as the speculating mystic would affect to represent it; for it scientifically explains the reasons, why the oriental languages are so luxuriant in all the flowers of rhetoric; and why the Bible, reaching so far back into remote 'antiquity, and coming from the east— from the land of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, so far excels every other book in the richness and variety, the beauty and splendor of its figurative language.

But to resume the fact, that the Bible is written in human language, and in the language of countries abounding in all the figures of speech,—in developing the principles of interpretation of this book, a due regard must be paid to figurative language. The rankest error in the business of interpreting Scripture, will be found to consist in confounding the figurative meaning of words, with the literal: or the literal, with the figurative. Enthusiasm has two extremes:—the one, literalizes every thing; the other extreme, spiritualizes everything. The Romanist says the Saviour literally meant what he said, when he said of the loaf, "*This is my "body,"*" and of the cup, "*This is my blood.*" And hence originated the doctrine of transubstantiation. A lady in New England some time since, said, that Jesus literally meant what he said, when he said to his disciples, "*If your right hand offend you, cut it off, and throw it away.*" Her right hand having offended her, she literally cut it off, and threw it away. This is one extreme: the other consists in making words figurative, which are not so; thus,—"*The walls of Jericho fell down,*" means, "*that the arguments which sustain false religion, were demolished before the approach of the new church of God under Jesus.*" "*And they blew the trumpets seven times,*" means, "*that*

the divine truth was brought down upon the bulwarks of error, complete and perfect;" &c. &c.

Here, then, we have the two extreme systems: the former making "the Scriptures always mean what they literally say;" the other making them never literally mean what they literally say, but always speaking in figurative analogy. Both these systems are alike hostile to the Bible, as a revelation from God; for they both represent its language as unlike the language of every other book,—as a language to be interpreted arbitrarily by special rules, in which, neither words nor phrases are to be understood according to the dictionary, grammar, or rhetoric of human language. Our position, it will be remembered, is, that the language of the Bible is human language. *That God spoke by men to men, for men.* That this volume has in it all the peculiarities of language,—is constructed upon the ordinary principles of language,—has in it all the tropes, figures, and forms of speech, found in the language of the age and country in which it was written,—and is to be interpreted by the laws of interpretation, universally acknowledged in the commonwealth of letters. We shall, therefore, apply to the tropes and figures of speech found in the Bible, the same canons and principles of interpretation, which are applied to the tropes and figures of other books.

CHAPTER VIII.

METAPHOR.

We cannot explain figurative language more intelligibly, than by a close analysis of the principal figures, and by adducing examples.

We have said that a *trope*, is the change of a word from its original signification. Of tropes, then, there are just as many in a language, as there are changes in sense, made upon its words. But these changes or tropes, are called by different names according to their nature.

A *metaphor* is the name of that trope, which puts the *resemblance*, in place of the proper word. It is a *comparison* expressed in one word, without the form of drawing it;—a comparison in epitome.

So common is the metaphor in all languages, that it has given a name to figurative language. Hence, *metaphorical* language is commonly used, as equivalent *in figurative* language. There is such a force and beauty in expressing a comparison in a single word, drawn from a clear, apposite, and striking resemblance, between the subject and that by which it is presented to the mind, that it equally pleases and captivates the rudest and most polished mind. The Scriptures abound with the richest variety of metaphors. The most beautiful and bold, as well as the most rude and simple, which the oriental languages afford, are found in the Bible.

By a copious exhibition of examples drawn from the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, we shall not only illustrate this figure of speech to the dullest apprehension, but also explain, and set in a new light, numerous passages, frequently misunderstood, and as frequently misapplied. To begin with a few of the plainest, we shall instance the following:—

'I am the *light* of the world.' Here, then, is a comparison between Jesus and light. On drawing the comparison, there was discovered a resemblance between Jesus, the subject of comparison, and the object, *light*, to which he was compared. Now, the metaphor, (or *translation*,) consists in substituting that resemblance,—or the thing to which he was compared, because of the resemblance found in it,—for the proper word which would literally express the quality, attribute, or character, set forth in the thing to which he was compared. Instead of saying, 'as light dissipates the darkness of this world, so does Jesus scatter the ignorance of men;' instead of a tedious comparison in many words, we substitute the term *light*, without any of the signs of comparison; and in a single word, forcibly and beautifully convey to the mind, all that could be taught in a long comparison. A metaphor is, therefore, a comparison in epitome. But it ought to be observed, that the word *light*, is not here taken in its literal signification, but is made to represent something similar to its literal signification, which resemblance constitutes the metaphor.

Again,—'I will take away your heart of *stone*, and give you a heart of *flesh*.' Here, *stone* and *flesh* do not literally mean stone and flesh, but something that resembles them. For on comparing the coldness, hardness, and insensibility of the heart of an unbelieving, ungrateful, and unfeeling

Jew to a stone, a resemblance was discovered, and the thing which contained that resemblance, is put for the subject, of comparison, and is all expressed in a single word;— so of the *heart of flesh*. These remarks are all applicable to, and may easily be illustrated by the following examples: —'Behold the *Lamb* of God,'—'You are the *salt* of the earth,'—'You are the *light* of the world,'—'The Lord is my *rock*, and my *fortress*, and *deliverer*; my God, my strength, in whom [will put my trust; my *buckler*, and the *horn of my salvation*, and my *high tower*.* Here we have six beautiful metaphors in one period. 'Go you and tell that *fox*,' namely, Herod. In these it must be evident, that there is a "similitude between the thing from which the metaphor is drawn, and that to which it is applied," which is the essential attribute of a good metaphor.

BEAUTIFUL METAPHORS.

We shall give a few examples of beautiful metaphors. These are generally, though not always, drawn from the works of nature, or from the natural appearance of things, 'The Lord God is a *sun* and *shield*,'—'The wilderness and the solitary place shall be *glad* for them—and the desert shall *rejoice* and *blossom* as the rose,'—'Awake and sing, you that dwell in *dust*, for thy *dew* is the dew of herbs—and the earth shall cast out her dead,'—'The *stars* of heaven and the *constellations* thereof shall not give their *light*: the *sun* shall be *darkened* in his going forth, and the *moon* shall not cause her *light to shine*,'—'We wait for *light* but behold *obscurity*; for *brightness*, but we walk in *darkness*,'—'The *sun of righteousness* shall arise with *healing* in his *wings*? —'Her *sun* has *gone down* while it is yet *day*? The prophet's word is 'a *light shining* in a *dark place*,'—'I am the *bread of life*,'—'Cast not your *pearls* before *swine*,'—'The *eyes* of the *blind* shall be *opened*, and the *ears* of the *deaf* shall be *unstopped*,'—'Then shall the *lame* man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the *dumb* shall *sing*,'—'In the *wilderness* shall *water* break out, and *streams* in the *desert*.'

BOLD METAPHORS.

'The voice of thy brother's blood *crieth* to me from the ground,'—'Their throat is an open *sepulcher*,'—'He washed

* The words *italicized* shew the metaphor.

his clothes in the *blood* of grapes,'—'His wife looked back from behind him, and she became a *pillar of salt*,'—'I have made thee a *defenced city*, and an *iron pillar*, and *brazen walls* against the whole land,'—'It is a covenant of *salt* forever before the Lord,'—'The Lord gave the kingdom over Israel to David for ever, even to him and his sons by a covenant of safe,'—'Let your speech be always *seasoned* with *salt*,'*—'Thou hast made us to drink the *wine of astonishment*,'—'Man did eat angel's *food*,'—'The plowers *ploughed* upon my back, they made long their *furrows*,'—'The mountains shall be *melted* with their blood.'—'And all the hosts of heaven shall be *dissolved*, and the heavens shall be *rolled together as a scroll*,'—'The sword of the Lord is *filled* with blood, it is made *fat* with fatness,'—'I will sweep it with the *besom* of destruction.'

Many have thought, that the conceptions of the Hebrews concerning God, were too human and low, because they described him as having *eyes, ears, hands, and feet*. But a rational and intelligent regard to ancient and oriental metaphors, would have corrected them. Examine the following metaphors:—'They heard the *voice* of the Lord God *walking* in the garden in the cool of the day,'—'I will *look* upon the bow,'—'Thy *right hand*, O Lord, has *dashed* in pieces the enemy,'—'He bowed the heaven and *came down*, and darkness was under his *feet*,'—'He *rode* upon a chariot, and did *fly* upon the *wings* of the wind,'—'The *eyes* of the Lord are over the righteous, and his *ears* are open to their cry; but the *face* of the Lord is against them that do evil.'

METAPHORS BOTH RUDE AND BOLD.

'With the blast of thy *nostrils* the waters were gathered together,'—'There went up a smoke out of his *nostrils*, and fire out of his *mouth* devoured; coals were kindled by it,'—'It *repented* the Lord that he had made man upon the earth, as it *grieved* him at his heart,'—'Thou sentest forth thy *wrath*, and consumed them as stubble,'—'I, the Lord thy God, am a *jealous* God,'—'The Lord *revenge*th and is *fierce*,'—'He will take *vengeance* on his adversaries; and he reserveth *wrath* for his enemies,'—'God *rested* on the seventh day,'—'The Lord *smelled* a sweet savor,'—'I will *go down*

* *Salt*. This metaphor demonstrates, that as one subject or substance may have many qualities, any one of these qualities may be translated to another subject by comparison, and thus become a metaphor.

and *see* whether Sodom and Gomorrah have done according to the *cry* of it which has *come up* to me,'—'He that *sits* in heaven shall *laugh*,'—'The Lord shall have them in derision,'—'Then the Lord *awoke* as one out of sleep, and like a man that *shouteth* by reason of wine.'

The anthropomorphists, and other excessive literalists, from a disregard to the highly metaphorical language of the Scriptures, which is both their strength and beauty, and the only language in which things supernatural could be communicated to us, have imagined a human figure for the Deity. On their own principles of interpreting the Scriptures they might, from the following metaphors, imagine him to be like a great fowl:—'Hide me under the shadow of thy *wings*,'—'In the *shadow of thy wings* I will make my refuge, until these calamities be overpast,'—'I will trust in the covert of thy *wings*,'—'He shall cover thee with his *feathers*, and under his *wings* shall thou rest.'

It is to no purpose to multiply examples, farther than to give an accurate and complete idea of this most common and most beautiful trope. So rich are the Scriptures in this figure, that many thousand examples might be adduced. We have said that there are some of these metaphors both rude and simple; and as the Bible reaches into the most remote antiquity, and exhibits and addresses human nature, in its most simple and unadorned state, it must be expected that it would bear the impress of the people among whom it was written, and to whom it was addressed. When we speak of *simple* metaphors, we have in our eye such as the following:—'*Bowels* of compassion,'—'Tender mercies,'—'*Hunger* and *thirst* after righteousness,'—'They shall be *filled*,'—'My soul *breaketh*,'—'Yea, *panteth* after God,'—'The glory of Joseph is like the firstling of his bullock,'—'Hear this you *kine* of Bashan,'—'Issacher is a *strong ass*,'—'Naphtali is a *hind* let loose,'—'Joseph is a fruitful *bough*,'—'Judah is a *lion's whelp*?

To relish and to understand a metaphor, we must always ascertain the point of resemblance. In comparing the tribe of Joseph to the *firstling of a bullock*, allusion is to its strength and power, for here is the point of resemblance. When the prophet Amos compares the matrons of Samaria to the *kine of Bashan*, he has their *luxury and wantonness* flowing from their wealth in his eye: and the point of resemblance between Issachar and an ass, is *bodily strength and vigor*; for the Hebrew notion, drawn from the type of an

oriental ass, wag strength and durability: our idea is that of slowness and stupidity. We repeat, then, that the beauty, and force, and sense of a metaphor, requires us to observe with all attention, the point or points of resemblance. But this will be still more fully illustrated, after we have examined a few other tropes, which are of frequent occurrence in the sacred writings.

CHAPTER IX.

ALLEGORY.*

In the figurative language of Scripture, the *allegory*, which, "under the literal sense of the words, conceals a foreign or distant meaning," next claims our attention. While some writers on Scripture allegories have divided them into three classes,—"*the allegory properly so called which is a continuation of metaphors, or indeed, one continued metaphor; the parable, or similitude; and the mystical allegory, in which a double meaning is couched under the same words:*" we shall, under this head, confine the attention of the reader to the allegory proper.

"An allegory tropes continues still,
Which with new graces every sentence fill.

In the rhetoric of the schools, the following example of allegory is given:—"Venus grows cold without Ceres and Bacchus," I. e. Love grows cold without bread and wine. Here are three tropes in one sentence, constituting an allegory. But they are not proper metaphors. Some of them are rather *metonymies*. Thus Ceres, came to denote *bread*; Bacchus, *wine*; Venus, the *amorous affection*; Neptune, the *sea*; Pallas, *wisdom*; Mars, *war*; and Pluto, *hell*,

But, leaving these tropes and allegories to the admirers and students of the classics, we shall give a few examples of scripture allegories.

* "*Allegooria* is derived from *allo agoreitai*; I. e. a different thing is *said* from what *is meant*. It differs from a metaphor in this respect,—that it is not confined to a single word, but continued to a whole thought, or it may be to several thoughts." Horne, Vol. 2, p. 604.

'A little leaven leaveneth the whole mass,'—'Cleanse out therefore, the old leaven, that you may be a new lump, seeing you are without leaven, for even our passover, Christ, is sacrificed for us: therefore, let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with unleavened sincerity and truth.'

Here it ought to be observed, that the proper or literal meaning of the primary or leading term in an allegory, when ascertained, explains the whole allegory. *Leaven* is here the metaphor of a corrupting principle. One person in Corinth of corrupt principles, might he injurious to the whole church, if retained in it, on the same principle that a little leaven leavens the whole mass. This metaphor being understood, the allegory is easily apprehended.

'The whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick,'—'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will rear it up again,'—'Most assuredly I say to you, in your youth you girt yourself and went whither you would; but in your old age you shall stretch out your hands, and another will gird you, and carry you whither you would not,'—'According to the favor of God which is given to me, as a skillful architect, I have laid the foundation, and another builds upon it. But let every one take heed how he builds upon it: for other foundation can no one lay except what is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now, if any one build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every one's work shall be made manifest: for the day will make it plain, because it is revealed by fire: and so the fire will try every one's work, of what sort it is. If the work of any one remain which he has built upon the foundation, he shall receive a reward. If the work of any one shall be burned, he will suffer loss: himself, however, shall be saved; yet so as through fire.'

So recondite, is the meaning of some allegories that it is not easy to find the proper meaning of the whole, nor even of the primary metaphor. This seems to be the case here; for amongst the commentators whom we have consulted, and to whom reference is made, there seems to be a general mistake of the meaning of this allegory. I am not a little astonished to find Hammond, Dr. Whitby, Bishop Hall, Dr. Wells, Bishop Mant, Archbishop Seeker, Archbishop Tillotson, Locke, Dr. Adam Clarke, the continuators of Matthew Henry, Home, &c., mistaking, as we judge, the primary metaphor, and consequently, the mean-

ing of the whole passage. With them, 'gold, silver, and precious stones,' are sound doctrines; 'wood, hay, and stubble,' erroneous or false doctrines; 'the trial by fire,' the day of judgment; &c., &c. Now the figure before the Apostle, is a *house* or building; for he begins with the foundation, and represents himself as a skillful architect, and ends in dividing or destroying the temple of God. The metaphors which constitute this allegory are, then, all taken from a building. Jesus Christ is *laid* the foundation; the Apostles are master builders; other teachers and preachers are builders. Gold, silver, precious stones, are the materials built into the wall, genuine Christians. Wood, hay, and stubble, metaphors not of doctrines, but of light, vain, wicked, hypocritical persons, and false professors. *Fire*, the symbol and metaphor of persecution,—'the fiery trial' of Peter. The folly of those foolish builders, wise in their own conceits, will then be seen and felt; and if saved themselves, it will be like one that escapes out of the fire; his life alone is saved, while the labors of his life, his property, is lost.

If any one, then, divide or destroy the temple of God, God will destroy him! All this is in good keeping with the primary metaphor; and according to the well established rules of interpreting allegories, every subordinate metaphor must be understood, in conformity to the principal one. So we have been accustomed for many years, to view this allegory. But it is with some hesitancy, that we dissent from so many great names. MacKnight, however, is with us here; and he quotes Jerome, Chrysostom, and some other ancient commentators, as concurring with him. I should add, that the Pope and his party take the last part of it *literally*, and build upon it their doctrine of purgatorial fire!!

'You are the salt of the earth: if the salt become insipid, how shall its saltness be restored. It is thenceforth fit only to be cast out, and trodden by men.'

'In a great house, there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earth; and some to honor, and some to dishonor.'

These examples will serve to define and explain the allegory proper: and as we only now aim at pointing out and distinguishing the more common tropes and figures, we shall reserve any further remarks we may have to offer on

the allegory, till we come to speak of the parable and mystical allegory.

CHAPTER X. METONYMY.

Metonymy etymologically imports, *changing of names*. It is defined in the compends of rhetoric for schools,—

"A metonymy does new names impose,
And things for things, by near relation shews."

Next to the metaphor, this is the most common trope; and next to it, it imparts the greatest vivacity and beauty to the effusions of the poet and the orator. It is of very frequent occurrence in the sacred writings.

It is usually exhibited under four forms:—as when we give the name of the *cause* to the *effect*, or the name of the *effect* to the *cause*;—as when we give the name of the *subject* to the *adjunct*, or the name of the *adjunct* to the *subject*. Hence it is defined by many, in the following words:—"A metonymy is a trope, by which we substitute one name or appellation, for another:—as the *cause* for the *effect*, the *effect* for the *cause*; the *subject* for the *adjunct*, and the *adjunct* for the *subject*?"

A few examples of each shall be given; and first, of the cause put for the effect.

METONYMY OF THE CAUSE.

'*Moses* is read every sabbath day in the synagogue.' Here, the *author*, (Moses) is put for his writings. 'The *letter* kills, but the *spirit* gives life.' Here, the *letter* is put for the law written on stone; and the *spirit*, for the gospel declared by the Spirit of God. 'The words that I speak to you are *spirit*, and they are *life*,'—'You have not so learned *Christ*? that is, his doctrine. 'Though you have ten thousand instructors in *Christ*?—'Salute Urbanas, our helper in *Christ*,'—'Your heavenly father will give his *Holy Spirit* to them that ask him,' I. e. his effects; called in the paral-

lel passage, '*good things*;' I. e. spiritual favors. 'Let a double portion of thy *Spirit* rest upon me,'—'Quench not the *Spirit*,'—'Be not *shaken in mind*—neither by *Spirit*?

Mr. Home alledges, that under this species of metonymy, the Holy Spirit is put for his *effects*, for his *operations*, for his *influences* or *gifts*, for revelations, visions, and ecstasies, in very numerous passages.*

The cause and instrument, too, are often put for the thing effected by either of them. 'His *tongue* defends him,' I. e. his eloquence. 'By the *month* of two or three witnesses,' I. e. the testimony. 'An unknown *tongue*,' I. e. a foreign language. 'The salutation of me, Paul, with my own *hand*,' I. e. writing.

METONYMY OF THE EFFECT.

Examples of the *effect* put for the *cause*. 'I am the resurrection and the life.' Here the effect gives a *name* to the cause. 'The Lord is my strength, my salvation,'—'The Lord is thy *life*, and the *length of thy days*,'—'He is our *peace*,'—'A *dumb* demon,'—'Glad tidings,'—'Dead works,'—'This is the *condemnation*? I. e. the cause of it. 'I have set before thee *life* and *death*? (the cause or means of both.) 'Is the law sin?' (the cause of it.) '*Cold* death,' I. e. death, which makes cold. 'To be carnally minded, is *death*? I. e. the cause of death. 'To be spiritually minded, is *life* and *peace*. Instances of metonymy of the effect for the cause, are, in the sacred writings, innumerable.

METONYMY OF THE SUBJECT.

By the *adjunct* is here meant, some appendage or circumstance belonging to the subject. The putting of the subject for the adjunct, is giving the name to the subject which properly belongs to the adjunct; for example:—

Thus the *heart*, is used for the understanding mind, thought, and affections. 'Consider in thy *heart*,'—'That your *heart* be not deceived,'—'The Lord has not given you a *heart* to perceive,'—'She spoke in her *heart*."

For the *memory*, 'Lay up his words in thy *heart*,'—'Commune with your *heart*,'—'But his mother kept all these sayings in her *heart*?

* Horne's Introduction, Vol. 2, pp. 590, 591.

For the *will* and *affections*, 'With all thine *heart* seek the Lord,'—'The king's *heart* is in the hands of the Lord; as the rivers of water, he turneth them about whithersoever he will,' —'My son, give me thy *heart*.'

For the *conscience*, 'David's *heart smote* him,'—'Because thy heart was *tender*?

The *reins* are also put for thoughts; 'The righteous God trieth the heart and *reins*.'

The thing containing is put for the thing contained; 'The earth also is corrupt,' I. e. the people in it. 'The *house* of Israel,' I. e. the people of Israel. The possessor, for the things possessed; as, 'To possess nations greater and mightier than thou,' I. e. their land and property.

An action is said to be done, when it is only declared, foretold, or permitted; for example: '*Me, he restored*,' said the chief butler, speaking of the interpretation of his dream by Joseph. 'Lord, thou hast greatly *deceived* this people,' I. e. permitted the false prophets to impose on them. 'I have set thee, Jeremiah, over the nations, to *root* out and pull down,' I. e. to prophesy thus of them: I gave them *statutes which, were not good, and polluted them* in their own gifts. 'Whatsoever thou shalt *bind* on earth, shall be bound in heaven,'—'Lead us not into temptation,' I. e. abandon us not to temptation.

Sometimes an object is put for that about which it is conversant. Thus we have *sin* for sin-offering, more than one hundred times in both Testaments; and sometimes we have the thing signified put for the sign. Thus the *ark* is called the strength of God. See 1 Chron. xvi. 11; Psalm cv. 4; cxxxii. 8.

The occasioning of an action, is called the doing of it. 'Whether thou shalt *save* thy husband,'—'Thou mayest *save* thy wife,' —'Jeroboam *made Israel to sin*,' occasioned it, &c.

METONYMY OF THE ADJUNCT.

The adjunct is put for the *subject*; 'Circumcision nor uncircumcision,' I. e. Jews and Gentiles. 'The *election* obtained it,' I. e. the elect. 'The *strength* of Israel,' I. e. the God of Israel. 'Outer darkness,' I. e. hell. 'Golden incense,' I. e. golden censor. 'Eat the passover,' I. e. the paschal lamb.

Under this figure, things are sometimes named or de-

scribed as they appear, and not as they are; or according to popular opinion, and not according to fact. Hananiah, the opponent of Jeremiah, is called a *prophet*. 'The foolishness of preaching,'—'Another gospel,'—'His enemies shall lick the dust,'—'A *prophet* of their own has said,' a certain philosopher, namely, Epimenides. 'Coming from the end of heaven,'—'The sun goeth down,'—'Ends of the earth.'

The action or affection, conversant about an object, is put for the object itself. The *senses* are thus put for the objects perceived by them. 'Whom shall he make to understand doctrine,' *hearing*, in the Hebrew. 'Lord, who has believed our report,' *hearing* in the Hebrew. The manna was as coriander seed, and the color (eye) thereof, as the color (eye) of bdellium. 'The priests became obedient to *the faith?* (the gospel preached.) 'Thou art the *hope* of the ends of the earth, and of those afar off upon the sea,'—'For the *hope* of the promise,'—'For which *hope's* sake,'—'Why dost thou seek *love,*'—'Come my love,'— 'Let him be thy *fear,*' —'The lusts of the *eye?*

The sign is often put, by the metonymy of the adjunct, for the thing signified. War is denoted by *bows, spears, chariots, and swords.*

The putting of the badge for the office, is one of the most common and beautiful metonymies. Thus the *mitre*, for the priesthood; the *sword*, for the military; the *gown*, for the literary profession; and *the crown*, for royalty.

'To bow the knee,'—'To kiss the hand,'—'To put on sackcloth,'—'To beat swords into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks,'—'To give the hand,' are all metonymies of this class.

And, finally, the metonymy of the adjunct often puts the name of a thing for the thing itself; 'The number of the *names* was one hundred and twenty,'—'Thou shalt be called the city of righteousness; thou shalt be called the faithful city.' It should be so in fact. 'The *name* of the God of Jacob defend thee,' I. e. God himself. 'The *name* of the Lord is a strong tower,'—'Whosoever shall call upon the *name* of the Lord,' I. e. the Lord himself.

This trope takes in the most comprehensive range: for, indeed, in all cases *where the name of any thing relative to a subject is substituted for the subject*, it is a *metonymy*. And although there are but *four* general ways of doing this, the varieties under each render it difficult, at first

view, to assign each metonymy to its proper chapter. This is, however, more necessary to relish the beauty of a trope, than to understand its meaning.

CHAPTER XI. SYNECDOCHE.*

The trope called *synecdoche*, is also of frequent occurrence in the inspired writings.

"A synecdoche the whole for part doth take, Or, of a part for whole, exchange doth mane."

A synecdoche I?, by writers on the figurative language of Scripture, defined to be a trope, which "puts the *whole* for a *part*, a *part* for the *whole*; a certain number, for an uncertain; a *general* name, for a *particular* one; and *special* words, for *general* ones." A few illustrations will suffice; 'They have taken away my Lord,' I. e. his body.

The whole put for a part. Thus the *world*, is put for the Roman empire, and for the earth, which is only a part of it. 'The *world* wondered after the beast,'—'A mover of sedition among the Jews throughout the whole *world*?— 'An *everlasting* priesthood,' I. e. while the Jewish state continued. 'He shall serve him forever,' Ex. xxi. 6; i. e. to the year of Jubilee.

The plural number is sometimes put for the singular, as when Jesus speaks of himself in the plural, John iii. 11; 'We speak what we do know,'—'Cities of Gilead,' for one city; Judges xii.7. 'The sons of Dan,' for one son; Gen. xlvi. 23. 'The daughters of Israel,' for one daughter; Gen. xlvi. 7.

A *part* is sometimes put for the whole. 'The evening and the morning were the first day.' The soul, for the whole man. The ox and ass, for oxen and asses: Isaiah I. 3. I have lived under this *roof* ten *summers*, I. e. I have lived in this house ten years.

Very often, a definite number is put for an indefinite.

* Comprehension.

Thus Paul puts *ten thousand*, for a great many; and *five*, for a few: 1 Cor xiv. 19. 'I would rather speak five words intelligibly, than ten thousand.' *Double*, for much, or sufficient; 'She has received of the Lord's hands, *double* for all her sins. *Twice*, for several times; 'God has spoken once, *twice* have I heard this,—that power belongs to the Lord.'

A *general* name is put for a *particular* one; 'Preach the gospel to *every creature*? I. e. all mankind. 'All *flesh* had corrupted its way upon the earth.' *Man*, for the whole species, male and female; 'The man that does this.'

Particular names and special words are often put for general. *Bread* denotes all the necessaries of life; 'Give us each day our daily *bread*,'—'I am a debtor to the Greek,' I. e. the Gentiles as well as the Jews.

Brother, for kinsman; 'Abraham said to Lot, we are *brethren*. Gen. xiii. 8; xiv. 14. *Many*, sometimes denotes *all*; 'The *many* died,'—*Many* of them that sleep in I dust of the earth, shall awake.'

This figure is of very common occurrence in our daily intercourse; for example: 'There are five *hands* at work, managing seven *head* of horses,'—'We descried a *sail* approaching the harbor,'—'Some follow *the plough*, and some drive the *shuttle*,'—'All *the world* are employed, and yet there are not so many *mouths* to support in America, as in France.'

CHAPTER XII.

IRONY.*

"An irony, dissembling with an air,
Thinks otherwise than what the words declare."

'Well done!' I. e. badly done. 'Good boy!', I. e. bad boy. 'An irony is a figure, in which we say one thing and mean another; in order to give the greater vehemence and force to our meaning.' The accent, air, and gesture of the speaker, or the extravagance of the praise, or the character

* Dissimulation.

of the person, distinguish the irony, and explain what the speaker intends. Of this figure, there are numerous instances in the Scriptures.

Elijah, to the Prophets of Baal, said—'Cry aloud, for he is a God; either, he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey; or, peradventure, he sleeps, and must be awaked.' 1 Kings, xviii. 27. 'No doubt but you are the people, and wisdom shall die with you.' Job xii. 2. 'Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thine heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes.' Eccle. xi. 9. 'Go, and *cry to the gods* which you have chosen; let them *deliver* you in the time of your tribulation.' Judges x. 14. '*Full well* you reject the commandments of God, that you may keep your traditions.' Jesus thus addresses the doctors of the Jews; Mark vii. 9. 'Now you are *full*, now you are *rich*; you have *reigned as kings* without us.' 1 Cor. iv. 5. 'You suffer *fools* gladly, seeing *yourselves are wise*.'

Under the head of irony, we generally class the sarcasm; which is only an irony, of "superlative keenness and asperity." 'Hail, king of the Jews!'—'Let Christ, the king of Israel, descend from the cross, that we may see and believe.'

CHAPTER XIII.

HYPERBOLE.*

"An hyperbole soars too high, or creeps too low;
Exceeds the truth, things marvelous to shew."

"This trope either magnifies or diminishes the objects or things which it represents, beyond or below their proper limits. It is common in all languages, and is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures." We need only give a few examples: 'The mountains and the hills shall *break forth before you into singing*; and all the trees of the field shall *clap their hands*.' Isaiah lv. 12. In describing leviathan, Job xli. 18, it is said, 'His breath *kindleth coals*, and a *flame* goeth out of his mouth. His eyes are like the *eyelids*

* Excess.

of the morning.' 'Thy seed shall be as the *sands* of the sea—the *dust* of the earth—as the *stars* of heaven.' 'Saul and Jonathan were *swifter than eagles*—they were stronger than lions.' 2 Samuel I. 23. 'I make my bed to *swim*'— '*Rivers of tears* run down my eyes.' Psalm cxix. 136. 'If these should hold their peace, *the stones would cry out?*

CHAPTER XIV.

CATACHRESIS.*

"A catachresis words too far doth strain;
Rather from such abuse of speech refrain."

Even this figure, in common with all others, is found in the sacred writings: for, indeed, every figure of words, and every figure of speech, whether belonging to the poet, the orator, the historian;—to the plain, unlettered swain, or to the more polished scholar,—is found in the sacred writings. A few examples will render farther definition unnecessary. 'I turned to *sec* the *voice* that spoke with me,' —'And thou didst, drink the pure *blood* of the grape,'— 'Let my right hand *forget* her cunning,'—'That thy days may be *long* in the land.'

We have a few instances of this figure, by a sort of necessity, interwoven in many words and sentences, because of the changes in *things*, as well as in words. A *candle-holder* was formerly made of *wood*, and then it was properly a *candle-stick*; but a brass or silver *candle-stick*, is a catachresis. The same may be said of an *ink-horn*, made of steel or silver. Brass *looking-glasses*, Exodus xxxviii. 8, is of the same class. But still more remarkable the phrase, 'Workmanship of God.' But even the poet Young says,

"His voice is but the *shadow* of a sound."

These are the *seven principal tropes*; and concerning them we may say, there is a great analogy and relation between them all; and in them all, we use a foreign or

* Excess.

strange word instead of a proper. "When we say one thing, and mean another like it, it is a *metaphor*. A metaphor continued, and often repeated, becomes an *allegory*. When we say one thing, and mean another mutually depending, it is a *metonymy*. When we say one thing, and mean another almost the same, it is a *synecdoche*. When we say one thing, and mean another opposite or contrary, it is an *irony*. When a metaphor is carried to a great degree of boldness, it is an *hyperbole*: and when at first sound it seems a little harsh or shocking, and may be imagined to carry some impropriety in it, it is called a *catachresis*."

Before dismissing these *seven tropes*, or figures of words, we would still more emphatically observe, that as man is always contemplated as endowed with imagination, as well as with reason; and as his reason can be most agreeably and effectually applied to a subject, when his imagination is engaged,—figurative language has this advantage over literal,—that it not only affords clearer and more impressive views of things, but it also captivates the imagination, and thus pleases while it instructs. "The qualities in ideas," as Dr. George Campbell well observes, "which gratify the fancy, are vivacity, beauty, sublimity, novelty. Nothing contributes more to vivacity, than striking resemblances in the imagery, which convey besides, an additional pleasure of their own."*

When we philosophically trace that superior pleasure, of which every one is conscious, when his fancy rather than his reason is addressed, to its proper source; if we are not greatly deceived, it will be found that it is derived from the discovery of the resemblance, which the imagery employed bears to the subject addressed to the understanding. If that resemblance be too obvious or familiar, no pleasure is received; but if it be such as escapes the notice of the great mass of society, and yet exhibits a strong likeness of the subject; then the pleasure of discovery is heightened, in proportion to the boldness of the imagery, and to the justness and delicacy of the point of resemblance.

* Philosophy of Rhetoric, p. 87.

CHAPTER XV.

FIGURES OF SPEECH.*

Rhetoricians distinguish between figures of *words*, called *tropes*; and figures of *thought* and *expression*, called *figures of speech*. "A *figure* of speech, is the fashioning or dressing of speech, being an emphatic way of speaking—different from the way that is ordinary and natural; either expressing a *passion*, or containing a *beauty*? Of these there are about *twenty*, which are regarded as principal.

Perhaps this chapter will be considered as more curious than edifying: nevertheless, we shall give a definition of these twenty figures, from one of the best systems of rhetoric, which fell into our hands during our academic years. And that the reader may be still more fully convinced, that in the Bible we have all tropes, figures, and flowers of rhetoric, we shall give one example, at least, of every figure, drawn from the inspired writings. To assist the memory, every figure is defined in a couplet.

By *ecphonesis* † straight the mind is raised,
When by a sudden flow of passion seized.

As: —'My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me!' Math. xxvii. 46.

Aporia, ‡ in words and actions, doubts;
And with itself, what may be best, disputes.

As: 'Whither shall I go from thy Spirit; or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'
Psalm cxxxix. 7.

Epanorthosis § doth past words correct,
And, only to enhance, seems to reject.

As:—'I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me.' 1 Cor. xv. 10.

* *Figure*: derived from the Latin, *fungo*, I fashion. † Exclamation.

‡ Doubting. § Correction.

*Aposiopesis** leaves imperfect sense;
Yet such a silent pause speaks eloquence.

As:—'Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I into the world.' John xii. 27.

Apophasis † pretending to conceal
The whole it meant to hide, must needs reveal.

As:—'I, Paul, have written it with my own hand; I will repay it. *Albeit, I do not say to thee*, how thou owest to me, even thy own self beside.' Philemon 19.

Apostrophe‡ from greater themes to less,
Doth turn aside, to make a short address.

As:—'The wild beast shall tear them. O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself.' Hosea xiii. 8, 9.

Anastrophe§ makes words, that first should go.
The last in place: verse oft will have it so.

As:—'*Now to him* that is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us: *to him be glory?*' Eph. iii. 20.

By *Erotesis* || what we know, we ask;
Prescribing to ourselves a needless task.

As:—'Doth God pervert judgment?—or doth the Almighty pervert justice?' Job viii. 3.

Prolepsis ¶ your objection doth prevent,
With answers suitable and pertinent.

As:—'But some man will say, How are the dead raised up; and with what body do they come? Thou simpleton! that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die,' 1 Cor. xv. 35.

A *Syncorhesis*** grants yon all your claims,
And by concession a sure conquest gains.

As:—'Thou wilt say, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well: because of unbelief, they were broken off.' Rom. xi. 12.

* Suppression. † Omission, or passing over. ‡ Turning aside to address.

§ Inversion, or suspension. || Interrogation. ¶ Prevention. ** Concession.

*Periphrasis** of words doth use a train,
Intending one thing only to explain.

As:—'I go the way of all the earth,' i.e. I die. 'The disciple whom Jesus loved,' I. e. John.

A *Climax* † by gradation still ascends,
Until the sense with finish'd period ends.

As:—'Add to your faith, courage; and to courage, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, love to all mankind.' 2 Peter I. 5—7.

In *Oxymoron* ‡ contradictions meet,
And jarring epithets and subjects greet.

As:—'But she that liveth in pleasure, is *dead* while she *liveth*.'" 1 Tim. v. 6.

Enantiosis § poiseth different things,
And words and sense as into balance brings.

As:—'The *wise* shall inherit *glory*, but *shame* shall be the promotion of *fools*.'" Prov. iii. 35.

Prosepopoeis || a new person feigns,
And to inanimates, speech and reason deigns.

As:—'Doth not *wisdom* cry, and *understanding* send forth her voice? She standeth in the top of high places; by the way in the places of the paths. She crieth at the gates, at the entry of the city; at the coming in of the doors.' Prov. viii. 1.

Hypolyposis ¶ to the *eye* contracts,
Things, places, persons, times, affections, acts.

As:—'Hast thou given the horse strength? Hast thou clothed his neck with thunder? Canst thou make him afraid as a grasshopper? The glory of his nostrils is terrible. He paweth in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength. He goeth on to meet the armed men. He mocketh at fear, and is not affrighted; neither turneth he back from the sword. The quiver rattleth against him; the glittering

* Circumlocution, † Gradation, ‡ Seeming contradiction. § Contrariety, || Something inanimate represented as a living person. ¶ Lively description.

spear and the shield. He swalloweth the ground with fierceness and rage; neither believeth he that it is the sound of the trumpet. He saith among the trumpets, Ha! Ha! and he smelleth the battle afar off; the thunder of the captains, and the shouting.' Job xxxiv. 19—25.

*Paronomasia** to the sense alludes,
When words but little varied it include?.

As:—'As unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed.' 2 Cor. vi. 9.

Antanaclisis † in one sound contains,
More meanings; which the various sense explains.

As:—'Jesus said to him, Let the *dead* bury their deed.' Matt. viii. 22.

Synonymy ‡ doth diverse words prepare,
Yet each of them one meaning doth declare.

As.—'The *fishes* also shall *mourn*; they *that cast angles into the brook*, shall *lament*; and they *that spread nets upon the waters*, shall *languish*? Isaiah xix. 8.

Epanalepsis § words doth recommend,
The same at the beginning and the end.

As:—'Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, *Rejoice*.'" Phil. iv. 4.

CHAPTER XVI.

USAGE OF WORDS.

That words have a proper and figurative meaning; that this meaning is not always the same; that there are several tropes of words and figures of sentences, which place the same ideas in different attitudes before the mind,—has been already stated, illustrated, and impressed upon the attention of the reader.

The point now before us, is, to show *how* the particular meaning of any word or sentence is to be ascertained, in

* A resemblance in the sound, but opposition in the sense, † The same word in different senses. ‡ Putting together words of like signification. § The first word, also the last.

any given place. We have seen that words, in the lapse of time, like every thing human,—change not only in their orthography and orthoepy, but also in their sense. Time, that great innovator, and country, and all the ever varying circumstances of society, imperceptibly mould and fashion words anew, both in form and sense.

Many learned treatises have, within the past and present century, appeared upon the subject of historical interpretation. But all these which we have examined, (and we have examined many of them,) are designed for, and adapted much more to the translator, than to the practical and devout student of the sacred writings. It is these that we propose to serve in the present treatise; and, therefore, we wish to confine the attention of the student of the Bible, to those matters that will further his knowledge in the Revelation of God, rather than in the art of translating these communications from one language to another.

To translate the sense into his own mind, he will then please reflect, that much more is necessary, than to perceive that words have a proper and figurative sense, and to understand all the tropes of words, and figures of speech; though these are of much value to him who would attain to a critical knowledge of the book. A more difficult lesson is yet to learn, with respect to figurative language; and that is, to know certainly when it is figurative, or to be understood figuratively; and how to interpret a figurative passage, by corresponding and appropriate terms.

A very superficial reader of the New Testament will observe, that many errors were committed by the contemporaries of the Messiah and his Apostles, from supposing them to speak without a figure, when they spoke figuratively. For example:—Jesus said, 'Unless you eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man, you have no life in you.' This occasioned some of his disciples to stumble and desert him. 'How,' said they, 'can this man give us his flesh to eat!' Again, 'Destroy this temple,' said Jesus, 'and in three days I will raise it up again.' The Jews understood the word *temple*, literally. Even some of the Apostles themselves, erred in this way. 'If I will,' said he, 'that he (John) *tarry till I come*, what is that to you? follow me.' They understood him to speak of his literal coming in person; and reported that John would never die.

The Samaritan woman, also, made the same mistake when she said, 'The well is deep, and you have no bucket

to draw. Whence, then have you this living water?' Hence, we may learn, that much depends on our being able to decide when words are to be understood figuratively, and when literally.

It is true, indeed, that the figurative meaning of many words has, by custom or constant usage, become their only proper meaning. Indeed, some words are now never used in their original and literal import: such as the terms tragedy, comedy, pagan, villain, knave. And of others, the figurative use is so common and natural, that we do not perceive the figure; such as, when we say, the *head* of a river, the *foot* of a mountain, the *bed* of a creek, *glad* tidings, *sweet* child, *cold* heart, *inflamed* mind, &c.

We may also, add, with Ernesti, "That those words are not to be regarded as tropical, which have lost their original and proper signification, and are used no longer in any but a secondary sense."

But to answer the question, How shall we ascertain when any thing said or written, is to be taken in a tropical or literal sense? we observe first, that:—

The literal meaning is not to be deserted, without evident reason or necessity.

But this necessity occurs in the following cases:— *First*. When the literal meaning involves an impropriety or an impossibility; such as, Isaiah I. 25, 'I will purge away thy dross, and take away all thy tin.' This applied to the Jews, would be *literally* impossible. 'I have made thee, Jeremiah, a defenced city, an iron pillar, and brazen walls, against the whole land.' This, again, would literally involve an impossibility, and must therefore be taken figuratively.

Second. The literal meaning must be given up, if the predicate (or that which is affirmed,) be incompatible with, or contrary to the subject of which it is affirmed.

'Hear this word, O you kine of Bashan, that are on the mountains of Samaria; that oppress the poor and crush the needy; that say to their masters, Bring, and let us drink." Amos iv. 1. Now, if the *subject*, viz., *the lane of Bashan*, be understood literally of cattle, the predicates to oppress, *crush*, and *say*,—cannot possibly apply to it: but taken figuratively, of the luxurious matrons of Samaria, they do apply and make good sense.

Third. When the literal meaning of words is contrary, either to common sense, to the context, to parallel passages,

or to the scope of a passage, it must be given up. 'Awake, why *sleepest* thou!' '*Sleepest*' cannot literally apply to God; for David, who thus speaks, Psalm xlv. 23, says in another Psalm, 'He that keeps Israel does not *sleep*?' In Isaiah lxiv., the words 'filth of the daughters of Zion,' from the scope of the passage, which immediately speaks of the blood of Jerusalem,' must be understood figuratively. To change night into day' is a moral impossibility; therefore, Job xvii. 12, must be taken tropically.

As I prefer in cases of this sort, when much depends on the subsequent use of certain premises and principles of reason or interpretation, to express my views in the words of others, who cannot be suspected of any partiality or leaning to, what some may call, a favorite opinion or principle, I will here introduce Ernesti, and Stuart of Andover, in their own proper persons: from the former of whom, and from Morus, Mr. Home gives, if not verbally, at least substantially, the three preceding rules. These extracts from Ernesti and Stuart, are of much value on this topic.

"We may commonly understand, at once, whether a word is to be taken tropically or not, by simply examining the object spoken of, either by the external or internal senses, or by renewing the perception of the object. To judge of figurative language, in such cases, is very easy; and in uninspired writings, it very rarely happens that there is any doubt about it; because the objects spoken of are such as may be examined by our senses, external or internal, and therefore it may easily be understood.*

"In the Scriptures, however, doubts have frequently arisen from the nature of the subjects there treated; which are such as cannot be subjected to the examination of our senses. Thus, the divine nature, divine operations, &c., are subjects beyond the scrutiny of our senses: and the question whether the language that respects such things is to be understood literally or tropically, has given rise to fierce controversies, which are still continued. In these, the parties have often disputed about tropical diction, in a way which savored more of metaphysical or dialectical subtilty than truth.

"To the language which respects God and his operations,

* Thus, *Inflamed mind* we understand tropically, by repeating the perception of the idea of *mind*, and taking notice that the literal meaning of *inflamed* is incongruous with it. In interpreting the phrase *snowy locks*, we appeal to the external senses, which determine that the meaning of *snowy* here must be tropical.— *Stuart*. † *Morus*, p. 275, XL Ernesti.

may be added all that respects the invisible things of a future state, I. e. heaven, hell, &c. The controversy whether descriptions of this nature are to be literally and tropically understood, is by no means at an end. One of the things which the human mind learns very slowly, is to detach itself from conceptions that arise from material objects, and to perceive that in *all* the descriptions of a future state?, words are of absolute necessity employed which originally have a literal sense, because language affords no other. Even the internal operations of our own mind, we are obliged for the same reason, to describe in language that of necessity must be tropically understood; Almost all men, indeed, now allow that most of the language employed to describe God and his operations,, is necessarily to be understood as tropical. Most men will allow that the language which respects the heavenly world may be so considered; but what regards the day of judgment, or the world of woe, they would strenuously contend, must be literally understood. There is indeed sufficient inconsistency in this, and it betrays no small degree of unacquaintance with the nature and principles of interpretation; but as it is productive of no consequences specially bad, the error is hardly worth combating. The motive no doubt may be good, which leads to the adoption of this error. The apprehension is, that if you construe the language that respect the day of judgment, or the world of woe figuratively, you take away the *reality* of them. Just as if reality did not, of course, lie at the basis of all figurative language, which would be wholly devoid of meaning without it. But how inconsistent too is this objection! The very person who makes it, admits that the language employed to describe God and his operations, and also to describe the heavenly world, is *tropical*; that it must of *necessity* be construed so. But does this destroy the *reality* of a God and his operations, and of the heavenly world?

"Who is ignorant of the innumerable controversies that have arisen, about the tropical and literal sense of a multitude of passages in the sacred writings? Almost all the enthusiasm and extravagance that have been exhibited in respect to religion, have had no better support than gross material conceptions of figurative language; or, not unfrequently, language that should be *properly* understood, has been *tropically* construed. There is no end to the mistakes on this ground. Nor are they limited to enthusiasts and

fanatics. They develop themselves not unfrequently in the writings of *men*, grave, pious, excellent, and in other parts of theological science very learned. Indeed, it is but a recent thing, that it has come to be considered as a science, and a special and essential branch of theological science,—to study the nature of language, and above all, the nature of the oriental biblical languages. Long has this been admitted in respect to the classics, and all works of science in ancient languages. But in regard to the Bible, the most ancient book in the world, and written in a language, the idiom of which is exceedingly diverse from our own, it seems to have been—very generally taken for granted, that no other study was necessary to discover its meaning, than what is devoted to any common English book. At least, a Bible with marginal references, studied by a diligent and careful use of these references, might surely be understood in a most satisfactory manner. In very many cases, the *first* thing has been to study theology; the *second*, to read the Bible in order to find proofs of what had already been adopted as matter of belief. This order is now beginning to be reversed. The nature of language, of Scripture language, of figurative language, and of interpretation, is now beginning to be studied as a science, the acquisition of which is one of the greatest ends of study; as it is the only proper mode of leading a theologian to the knowledge of what the Bible really contains. Here too, is a common arbiter of the disputes that exist in the Christian world. The nature of language and of tropical words thoroughly understood, will remove from among all intelligent and candid men, who really love the truth, a great part of all the diversities of opinion that exist."—*Stuart*.

But when it is decided that any passage is to be understood figuratively, the next point is to *interpret metaphorical expressions by corresponding and appropriate terms*.

In doing this, Home says: "We must enquire in what respects the thing compared, and that with which it is compared, respectively agree; and also, in what respects they have any affinity or resemblance: for as a similitude is concealed in every metaphor, it is only by diligent study that it can be elicited; by carefully observing the points of agreement, between the proper and the figurative meaning," How often do the Jewish prophets charge the Israelites with deserting their husband Jehovah, playing the harlot, and committing adultery? A slight inspection of all these

passages, evinces that idolatry is intended. Now the origin of this metaphor, is to be sought in that particular notion in which there is agreement between adultery, and the worship paid by the Jews to strange gods. But to carry this principle out into detail:—In such cases where the resemblance between the things compared is so clear, as to be immediately perceived,—or when the writer himself explains it, or the context, or parallel passage, in which the same thing is expressed without a figure,—sets it so evidently before the mind as to remove all suspense, and this very frequently happens, then there is no need for any special rules. But when these fail to decide, the sacred history is to be considered. For example: Christ says he came not to send peace but a *sword*.

Now we shall suppose, first, that the resemblance concealed in the metaphor *sword*, is not so plain as to be immediately perceived. In the second place, we shall suppose the speaker does not himself explain it. In the third place, the context does not decide. And in the last place, there is no parallel passage in which the same thing is expressed, without a figure. I say we shall suppose that all these four expedients have failed to decide the resemblance, and to explain the metaphor; we then turn over to the history, and from that we learn, that in consequence of the spread of the gospel, nations and families became divided, some embracing and some rejecting it; and that the former were persecuted by the latter, on account of their having embraced the gospel; then the figure is satisfactorily explained.

Another expedient is often successfully employed to ascertain the point of resemblance, on the liberal import of a trope, which some would dignify with the name of a *rule*. It is this: "*Consider the connexion of doctrine, as well as the context of a figurative passage.*" This will sometimes lead to the origin of the figures: for frequently some word precedes or follows, or some synonyme is annexed, that plainly indicates whether the expression is to be taken properly or figuratively. For example; Paul says, Christians are '*living stones*, a spiritual house, a royal priest-hood,' &c. The sentiment or doctrine expressed in these metaphors, is found either from the passage to which allusion is made, Exodus xix. 5, 6; or from the words preceding and succeeding, which show the sentiment the Apostles designed to communicate.

"But in deciding the sense exhibited by a trope, the com-

parison ought never to be extended too far, or into any thing which cannot be properly applied to the person or thing represented."

Every comparison has ordinarily but *one particular view*, and ought not to be strained in order to make it agree in other respects, where it is evident that there is not a similitude of ideas. For example: *All flesh is grass*—not in *shape or color*; but in this respect, that men soon *wither and decay*. Now to push it farther than this *one particular view* would be to strain it.

Jesus Christ is compared to a lion—so is Satan—so are wicked men: but each of them in one particular view. Jesus Christ, in that he is noble, heroic, and invincible:—Satan, in that he is rapacious, roaring, and devouring;—wicked men, in that they are fierce, outrageous, and cruel to weaker men.

This leads to another rule, which ought also to be regarded in its proper place, viz.—"*That in the interpretation of figurative expressions generally, and those which particularly occur in the moral parts of Scripture, the meaning of such expressions ought to be regulated by those which are unfigurative, clear, and plain.*"

As illustrative of this rule, Mr. Home adduces Matth. v. 38—42. Matt. vi. 19, 31, 34. The former respects retaliation—the latter thoughtfulness about worldly concerns. The auditors seem to have understood this discourse upon the Mount much better than the moderns: for they were delighted with it: but many of the moderns think, because they do not rightly interpret figurative language, that the duties enjoined are *impracticable, inconsistent with natural instinct, law, and destructive of society.*"

The inhabitants of the East frequently *put the action for the disposition*, and this gives a boldness to their metaphors almost unknown to the people of the West. But the manner in which these instructions are introduced, and the conduct of our Lord when he mildly reproved the officer who struck him at his trial, intimate their true meaning. Although he voluntarily gave himself up—bade Peter sheathe his sword, and cured Malchus whose ear Peter struck off, he reprimanded him who struck him; all of which was in accordance with the proper meaning of his precepts.

"*Not to lay up treasures on earth, but in heaven;*" "*to hate father and mother and one's own life,*" are, in the Hebrew idiom, equivalent to preferring heavenly treasures to earthly; and Jesus Christ to father, mother, and one's own self.

In the last place, in explaining metaphorical expressions, "we must not judge of the application of imagery from modern usage, because the ancients and the people of the East attached to those images, or metaphors, very different ideas." With us it is disgraceful to be compared to *oxen* and *asses*: with the ancients it was honorable; because those creatures in the East in many of their attributes differ exceedingly from those of Europe and America. Princes in the East ride upon asses. They are robust, more beautiful, and quicker in their pace than the same creature is with us. Proverbs and figures drawn from the ancients must be *historically* interpreted. A single instance will sustain this as well as a volume:—In the region of the *trade winds*, a man, steady to his purpose, is said to "as *steady as the wind*:" with us an inconstant man is said to be "as *fickle as the wind*." The metaphors are reconciled when the history of the wind in the regions where these proverbs are used is understood.

These rules and observations for ascertaining and explaining figurative language, must suffice for this chapter. They will be still farther illustrated and enforced in the chapters that follow.

CHAPTER XVII.

SUBJECT-MATTER.

"Although, in interpreting words that have various meanings, some degree of uncertainty may exist as to which of their different senses is to be preferred; yet the ambiguity in such cases is not so great but that it may in general be removed, and the proper signification of the passage in question may be determined: for the *subject-matter*—that is, the topic of which the author is treating—plainly shows the sense that is to be attached to any particular word. For there is a great variety of agents introduced in the Scriptures, whose words and actions are recorded. Some parts of the Bible are written in a responsive or dialogue form; as the twenty-fourth Psalm, Isaiah vi. 3, and Rom. iii. 1—9. And the sense of a text is frequently mistaken.

by not observing who is the speaker, and what is the specific topic of which he treats. One or two examples will illustrate the necessity of considering the subject-matter.

"The Hebrew word *be-shen*, literally signifies the *skin*; by a metonymy, *the flesh* beneath the skin; and by a synecdoche it denotes *every animal*, especially man considered as infirm or weak, as in Jer. xvii. 5. 'Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh *flesh* his arm;' there are also several other meanings derived from these, which it is not material now to notice. But that the word *flesh* is to be understood of *man* only in Gen. vi. 12, Psalm lxxv. 2, and Job x. 4, will be evident on the slightest inspection of the subject matter. 'All flesh had corrupted his way'—that is, all men had wholly departed from the rule of righteousness, or had made their way of life abominable throughout the world. And, in the Psalm above cited, who can doubt but that by the word *flesh*, men are intended: 'O thou that nearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh,' that is, all mankind, 'come.' In like manner also, in Job x. 4, it is evident that *flesh* has the same meaning: if indeed the passage were at all obscure, the parallelism would explain it, 'Hast thou the eyes of a man (Heb. *of flesh*)? or seest thou as man seest?'

"But it is not merely with reference to the meaning of particular passages that a consideration of the *subject-matter* becomes necessary to the right understanding of Scripture. It is further of the greatest importance in order to comprehend the various dispensations of God to man, which are contained in the sacred writings. For although the Bible comprises a great number of books, written at different times, yet they have a mutual connexion with each other, and refer, in the Old Testament, with various but progressively increasing degrees of light and clearness, to a *future* Saviour, and in the New Testament, to a *present* Saviour. With reference therefore, to the several divine dispensations to man, the subject-matter of the whole Bible ought to be attentively considered; but, as each individual book embraces a particular subject, it will also be requisite, carefully to weigh its subject-matter, in order to comprehend the design of the author."

CHAPTER XVIII

CONTEST.

"Another most important assistance, for investigating the meaning of words and phrases, is the consideration of the *context*, or the comparison of the preceding and subsequent parts of a discourse.

"If we analyse the words of an author, and take them out of their proper series, they may be so distorted as to mean any thing but what he intended to express. Since therefore, words have several meanings, and consequently, are to be taken in various acceptations, *a careful consideration of the preceding and subsequent parts will enable us to determine that signification, whether literal or figurative, which is best adapted to the passage in question.*

"A few instances will illustrate this subject, and show not only the advantage, but also the necessity, of attending to the context.

"It has been questioned whether those words of the prophet Micaiah (1 Kings xxii. 15,) 'Go and prosper, for the Lord shall deliver it (Ramoth) into the hand of the king,' are to be understood affirmatively according to their present meaning, or are to be taken in an ironical and contrary sense? That they are to be understood in the latter sense, the consideration of the context will plainly show, both from the prophet's intention, and from the prophetic denunciation afterwards made by him. Hence it may be inferred, that some sort of ironical gesture accompanied Micaiah's prediction, which circumstance ought to be borne in mind by the interpreter of Scripture.

Further, there is a difference of opinion whether the address of Job's wife, (Job ii. 9,) is to be understood in a good sense, as '*Bless (or ascribe glory to) God, and die;*' or in a different signification, '*Curse God, and die?*' as it is rendered in our authorized version. Circumstances show that the last is the proper meaning; because as yet, Job had not sinned with his lips, and consequently, his wife had no ground for charging him with indulging a vain opinion of his integrity.

"Job xli. Whether the leviathan is a whale or a crocodile, has also divided the judgment of commentators. That the latter animal is intended, is evident from the circumstances described in the context, which admirably agree with the crocodile, but can in no respect be applied to the whale: for instance, chap. xli. 17, &c., relative to the hardness of his skin, and verses 13—16, concerning his teeth and impenetrable scales.

"Once more: it has been doubted whether our Lord's command to his disciples. 'To provide neither gold nor silver in their purses,' Matt. x. 9, be a rule of perpetual observation. That it was only a temporary command, is evident from the preceding and subsequent parts of the chapter, which prove *that* particular mission to have been only a temporary one; and that as they were to go for a short time through Judea, and then to return to Jesus, he therefore forbade them to take any thing that would retard their progress.

"The context of a discourse or book, in the Scriptures, may comprise either one verse, a few verses, entire periods, or sections, entire chapters, or whole books.

"Sometimes a book of Scripture comprises only one subject or argument, in which case the whole of it must be referred to precedents and subsequents, and ought to be considered together.

"To investigate the context of a passage, it will be desirable to investigate each word of every passage; and as the connexion is formed by *particles*, these should always receive that signification which the subject-matter and context require.

"If the meaning of a single verse is to be ascertained, the five, six, or seven verses immediately preceding, should first be read with minute attention.

"A verse or passage must not be connected with a remote context, unless the latter agree better with it than a nearer context.

"Examine whether the writer continues his discourse, lest we suppose him to make a transition to another argument, when in fact he is prosecuting the same topic.

"The parentheses which occur in the sacred writings should be particularly regarded; but no parenthesis should be interposed without sufficient reason.

"Parentheses, being contrary to the genius and structure

of the Hebrew language, are, comparatively, of rare occurrence in the Old Testament.

"In the New Testament, however, parentheses are frequent, especially in the writings of Paul; who, after making numerous digressions, (all of them appropriate to, and illustrative of, his main subject,) returns to the topic which he had begun to discuss.

"Additional instances might be offered, to show the importance of attending to parentheses in the examination of the context; but the preceding will abundantly suffice for this purpose. The author has been led to discuss them at greater length than may seem to have been requisite, from the circumstance, that less attention appears to be given to the parenthesis, than in any other species of punctuation, in the different works on the study of the Scriptures in our language, that have fallen under his notice.

"Where no connexion is to be found with the preceding and subsequent parts of a book, none should be sought.

"From the preceding remarks it will be evident, that, although the comparison of the context will require both labor and unremitting diligence, yet these will be abundantly compensated by the increased degree of light which will thus be thrown upon otherwise obscure passages."

CHAPTER XIX.

SCOPE.

"A consideration of the *Scope*, or *Design* which the inspired author of any of the books of Scripture had in view, essentially facilitates the study of the Bible: because, as every writer had some design which he proposed to unfold, and as it is not to be supposed that he would express himself in terms foreign to that design, it therefore is but reasonable to admit, that he made use of such words and phrases as were every way suited to his purpose. To be acquainted, therefore with the scope of an author, is to understand the chief part of his book. The scope, it has been well observed, is the soul or spirit of a book; and that being once ascertained, every argument and every word appears

in its right place, and is perfectly intelligible: but, if the scope be not duly considered, every thing becomes obscure, however clear and obvious its meaning may really be.

"The scope of an author is either *general* or *special*; by the former we understand the design which he proposed to himself in writing his book; by the latter, we mean that design which he had in view, when writing particular sections, or even smaller portions, of his book or treatise.

"The means, by which to ascertain the scope of a *particular* section or passage, being nearly the same with, those which must be applied to the investigation of the *general* scope of a book, we shall briefly consider them together in the following observations.

"The *Scope* of a book of Scripture, as well as of any particular section or passage, is to be collected from the writer's express mention of it, from some conclusion expressly added at the end of an argument; from history, from attention to its general tenor, to the main subject and tendency of the several topics, and to the force of the leading expressions; and especially from repeated, studious, and connected perusals of the book itself.

First. "When the scope of a whole book, or of any particular portion of it, is expressly mentioned by the sacred writer, it should be carefully observed.

Second. "The scope of the sacred writer may be ascertained from the known occasion on which his book was written.

Third. "The express conclusion, added by the writer at the end of an argument, demonstrates his general scope,

Fourth. "The scope of a passage may further be known from history.

Fifth. "A knowledge of the time when a book was written, and also of the state of that church at that time, will indicate the scope or intention of the author in writing such a book.

Sixth. "If, however, none of these subsidiary aids present themselves, it only remains that we *repeatedly and diligently study the entire book, as well as the whole subject, and carefully ascertain the scope from them, before we attempt an examination of any particular text.*"

CHAPTER XX.**ANALOGY OF SCRIPTURE.**

That there are passages of Scripture parallel or analogous to each other, is universally conceded. The same words, the same sentences, the same incidents, the same allusions, are sometimes found in different writers; and sometimes in different places, in the same writers. That various circumstances connected with the same word, the same sentence, the same incident, the same allusion in different places may often, and do often, decide the proper acceptation of a word, or sentence, or incident, is also generally conceded. For this is common to all contemporaneous authors, and to authors who write intelligently upon the same subject

The number of parallel passages is, however, very generally overrated by the authors of marginal references; for it is confessed by those most studious in the Holy Oracles, that the number of passages precisely parallel, is comparatively small. While certain words and phrases are of frequent occurrence, and while the meaning is uniformly the same; still the number of *contexts* precisely parallel to each other, is by no means great.

We have many words nearly equivalent or synonymous in our language, yet the most learned philologists affirm, that the number of perfect synonymes is very small: and even some doubt whether any two words are perfectly alike in meaning. Still, however, there are some passages parallel in many prominent items; and to consult these in order to ascertain the precise meaning of a word, sentence, or action, is always profitable and wise.

Marginal references are usually much esteemed, on account of the facilities which they offer to such comparisons and consultations. The student, ought indeed, to be as cautious how implicitly he allows his mind to follow in the train of these references, as in following the glosses and comments of a paraphrast, or commentator on the Bible.

We have seen some Bibles with marginal references,

which differed little or nothing from a commentary. The author of the references as adroitly and as certainly gave his own opinions of the sense to the reader, as the most prosing and verbose commentator. Of these now in use, while Scott is the most profuse, the Polyglott is the most judicious. I should, however, be very reluctant to make either, or both of them, an implicit guide in determining parallel passages. They are helps to those who know how to use them: but as there is no substitute for the daily and constant reading of the Bible, in order to piety; so there is no substitute for the habitual study of it, in order to the discovering of parallel passages, and the meaning of them. God, in his infinite wisdom and goodness, has laid us under an indispensable necessity continually to converse with him, through his word, in order to our intelligence, purity, ' and happiness.

The following hints on the proper method of consulting parallel passages may, perhaps, be useful to those who are determined to understand the divine communications:—

First. Remember that the authors of the New Testament were Jews, and well versed in the Jewish Scriptures; and that an intimate acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures, is indispensable to your knowledge not only of the ancient communications, but to an acquaintance with the style and phraseology of the New Testament authors.

Second. In order to an accurate acquaintance with the words, and phrases, and style of any one author in either Testament, you must study his style by itself; or, in other words, you must repeatedly read all his writings by themselves.

Third. Those of them who write upon the same subjects will, as a matter of course, have most parallel passages; and on these topics they are especially to be compared with each other.

Fourth. "When the mind is arrested by any resemblance, consider whether it is a good resemblance; and whether the passages are sufficiently similar, that is, whether the *things* as well as the *words*, do at all correspond."

Fifth. "When two parallel passages appear, the clearer and more copious must be selected, to illustrate one that is more briefly and obscurely expressed."

Sixth. "Other things being equal, a nearer parallel is preferable to one that is more remote."

To these three last rules, extracted from Home, others

are added, but of little or no use to an English reader of an English translation.

It is of more importance to pay special attention to the acceptation of words in each writer's own-compositions, by a diligent comparison of them in all places where they occur; than to seek for explanation in other writer's, even should they be contemporary with him. This, however, not to the exclusion of the other rules and observations here offered.

CHAPTER XXI.

ANALOGY OF FAITH.

Great emphasis has formerly been laid upon the analogy of faith, as a rule of interpreting the Scriptures. When any passage appeared to be ambiguous, that meaning was to be preferred which best suited the analogy of faith. But this always supposed the interpreter to be in full possession of a perfect knowledge of the faith; and consequently the work of interpreting Scripture with him was at an end. To suppose any thing else, would indicate that a person might fully understand the faith; that is, the meaning of all the Scriptures,—without a knowledge of all that is written! A person interpreting Scripture by the analogy of faith, resembles a certain Roman gentleman who first commanded Paul to be bound, and afterwards enquired what he had done. So the theologian, interpreting Scripture by the analogy of faith,—first decides what is the faith, and then proceeds to examine what the Scriptures say.

As Dr. G. Campbell well observes,—with every sect, "*the analogy of faith*, is their own system alone."

"In vain," adds that excellent critic, "do we search the Scriptures for their testimony concerning Christ, if, independently of these Scriptures, we have received a testimony from another quarter, and are determined to admit nothing, as the testimony of Scripture, which will not perfectly quadrate with that formerly received. This was the very source of the blindness of the Jews in our Saviour's time. They searched the Scriptures as much as we do; but, in the

disposition they were in, they would never have discovered what that sacred volume testifies of Christ. Why? Because their great rule of interpretation was *the analogy of faith*; or, in other words, the system of the Pharisean scribes, the doctrine then in vogue, and in the profound veneration of which they had been educated. This is that veil by which the understandings of that people were darkened, even in reading the law; of which the Apostle observed, that it remained unremoved in his day, and of which we ourselves have occasion to observe, that it remains unremoved in ours."

"When a Lutheran tells you, 'You are to put no interpretation on any portion of Scripture, but what perfectly coincides with *the analogy of the faith*?' sift him ever so little on the import of this phrase, and you shall find that, if he mean any thing, it is, that you are to admit no exposition that will not exactly tally with the system of his great founder Luther. Nor is he singular in this. A Calvinist has the same prepossession in favor of the scheme of Calvin, and an Arminian of that of Arminius. Yet they will all tell you with one voice, that their respective doctrines are to be tried by Scripture, and by Scripture alone. '*To the law and, to the testimony,*' is the common cry: only every one of them, the better to secure the decision on the side he has espoused, would have you previously resolve, to put no sense whatever on the law and the testimony, but what his favorite doctor will admit. Thus they run on in a shuffling circular sort of argument, which, though they studiously avoid exposing it, is, when dragged into the open light, neither more nor less than this: 'You are to try our doctrine by the Scripture only. But then you are to be very careful that you explain the Scripture solely by our doctrine.' A wonderful plan of trial, which begins with giving judgment, and ends with examining the proof, wherein the whole skill and ingenuity of the judges are to be exerted in wresting the evidence, so as to give it the appearance of supporting the sentence pronounced beforehand."

In this way all the sects proceed. They seem not to know or feel that they act the part of a judge, who judges not the parties by the law, but judges the import of the law by the interpretation of one of the parties, in whose favor he is already biased.

While then we admit there may be some assistance de-

rived from the *analogy of the Scriptures*, in deciding the meaning of some ambiguous words and sentences from marginal references, and from concordances,—we can find little or no use for the *analogy of faith* in its popular use, unless all parties first agree that such is the faith; and then having learned the faith without the Bible, all will agree to interpret the Bible by the analogy of faith.

Still however, there is a perfect harmony; and consequently, a perfect resemblance: I might add,—a complete unity of faith, doctrine, or sentiment, in all the divine communications to men. And therefore we must say, "*that the WHOLE SYSTEM of revelation must be explained, so as to be consistent with itself;*" and therefore, "*when two passages APPEAR to be contradictory, if the sense of the one can be clearly ascertained, in all such cases that must regulate our interpretation of the other.*" For example: John says, 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' Again he says, 'Whosoever is begotten of God, does not sin.' Here is an apparent contradiction. Now, the first quotation expresses a truth very often and very clearly asserted in Scripture, and in accordance with every Christian's experience, and therefore the latter must be regulated by the first; or so explained, -as not to contradict the first. The style indeed, itself, of the latter quotation, when closely considered, imports sinning *habitually* —as the slave of sin; and this is incompatible with the Christian's relation to God.

We may therefore, affirm in one sentence, that no interpretation of Scripture can be rationally received, which contradicts these capital points of piety and morality which are so repeatedly asserted in the Scriptures,—and that by necessity, all obscure, ambiguous, or figurative words and sentences, must never be interpreted in a sense that will contradict those that are plain;—and that all opinions, doctrines, and practices, which are founded upon a single word, or a sentence or two, contrary to the general scope and repeated declarations of the Holy Spirit, are to be wholly repudiated. Of this class, are "auricular confession" to a priest, "extreme unction," the building of the church on Peter, Purgatorial fire, &c. &c. of the Roman sect. I would in conclusion add, that, in my judgment, not one of those words and sentences of rare occurrence, and on which these notions and practices are

founded, such as James v. 14, 15. James 5. 16, 1 John I. 9, &c., can logically and grammatically be interpreted to give the least countenance to those absurd dogmas; for nothing can be rationally inferred from any verse in the Bible that is not in it; and whatever can be logically deduced from any sentence in the Book, is as much the revelation of God as any thing clearly expressed in it. But we have much reason of gratitude, that every thing necessary to our acceptance with God, to religion and morality, is so often repeated and so clearly expressed, that no honest mind can possibly err, who will apply himself to what is written; and as Doddridge somewhere says, "I am more and more convinced, that the *vulgar sense* of the New Testament, that is, the sense which an honest man of plain sense would take it on his first reading the *original* or any *good translation*, is almost every where the true general sense of any passage; though an acquaintance with *language* and *antiquity*, with an attentive meditation of the text and context, may illustrate the spirit and energy of a multitude of passages, in a manner which could not otherwise be learned."

CHAPTER XXII.

HIEROGLYPHICS.

Men have but two ways of communicating their ideas: the one by *sounds*, the other by *figures*. Sounds are fugitive, momentary, and confined to a very limited space. Figures are more permanent, and capable of being perpetuated and extended to a great distance.

The first objects on which men think and speak, are *sensible* objects: therefore their conceptions concerning these would be the first subjects of communication, whether by sounds or figures. Now, the most natural way of communicating men's conceptions by figures or marks, is by picturing out the images of the things. Hence, as all antiquity attests, the first kind of writing was by delineating the forms of the objects of sense, or making the *pictures* of

things. Thus, to express the idea of a roan or a tree, the writer delineated a figure of them.*

But this was a tedious, voluminous, and expensive way of writing; and as necessity has ever been the mother of invention, improvements were soon found. Of these improvements, the Egyptian hieroglyphics were the most famous. This was a sort of abridgment, on which various improvements were afterwards made. The first hieroglyphics made the principal attributes or circumstance in the subject, stand for the whole. Thus says Warburton: "When they would describe a battle, or two armies in array, they painted *two hands; one holding a shield, and the other a bow*:—a tumult, or popular insurrection, by—*an armed man casting arrows*;—a siege—by *a scaling ladder*."

The second method of contraction or abridgment, was by *putting the instrument of the thing, whether real or metaphorical, for the thing itself*. Thus, an eye and a serpent, represented a monarch:—*a ship and pilot*, the governor of the universe.

The third and still more artificial method of abridging picture writing, was by "making one thing stand for, or represent another, when any plain analogy or resemblance in the representative, could be collected from their observation of nature, or their traditional superstitions." "Sometimes this kind of hieroglyphic was founded on their observations on the *form*, and real or imaginary *natures and qualities* of beings. Thus, a client flying for relief to his patron, and finding none, was represented by a *sparrow and an owl*;—an inexorable king, by an *eagle*;—a man who exposes his children through poverty, by a *hawk*;—children who injure their mother, by a *viper*;—a person initiated into a secret, by a *grasshopper*, which was thought to have no mouth."

But the obscurity which attended the scantiness of hieroglyphic characters, joined to the enormous bulk of picture volumes, impelled ingenuity still forward, and originated the fourth change in the art of writing. The Chinese characters furnish an example of this. "Ad the ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic was an improvement on a more ancient manner, resembling the rude picture writing of the Mexicans, and joined *characteristic marks* to images,—the

* In proof of this, the Mexicans may be adduced. When the inhabitants of the sea coasts first saw the Spanish ships arrive, they sent expresses to Montezuma with the news. "Their advices were delineated in large paintings upon cloth."

Chinese writing advanced a step farther,—threw out the images, and retained only the *contracted marks*, which they increased to a prodigious number. In their writing, every distinct idea has its proper mark; and is still, like the universal character of picture writing, common to diverse neighboring nations of different languages. The shapes and figures of these marks, however much disguised, do yet betray their original from pictures and images."

"Thus have we brought down the general history of writing, by a gradual and easy descent, from a picture to a letter; for Chinese marks, which participate of the nature of Egyptian hieroglyphics on the one hand, and of letters on the other; just as these hieroglyphics equally partook of that of Mexican pictures, and of the Chinese characters, are on the very borders of letters,—an alphabet being only a compendious abridgment of that troublesome multiplicity, of which this is a proof, that some alphabets, as the Ethiopic, have taken in those very characteristic marks to compose their letters, as appears both from their shapes and names. This is further seen by the names which express letters and literary writing in the ancient languages: thus the Greek words *semeia* and *semata*, signify as well the images of natural things, as artificial marks or characters; and *grapho*, both to paint and to write. The not attending to this natural and easy progress of recording the thoughts, made some of the wisest among the ancients, as Plato and Tully, when struck with the wonderful artifice of Letters, conclude that they were no human invention, but a gift of the immortal gods."*

All that is known of the inventor of *letters* is, that he was secretary to an Egyptian king, but his name is to all the world unknown. The transition however, was easy, from a *mark* for a distinct idea, to a *letter* for each of the simple *sounds* of the human voice.

The precise era of this invention cannot even be guessed. Some have made it contemporary with Joseph, with Moses, with Joshua, &c, but no authentic data exists from which it can be inferred. Had one invention disappeared after a better was introduced, then it might have been more easy to have ascertained the origin of letters; but it is a fact worthy of note, that the picture writing continued long after the hieroglyphic, and the hieroglyphic long after the inven-

* Warburton's Divine Legation, Vol. 1, pp. 77,78.

tion of letters, though for different purposes employed, than those which gave them birth: for while *necessity* originated them as means of communicating knowledge, after letters were introduced, they were perpetuated for the sake of concealing knowledge from the vulgar. The priests of Egypt, having made a religious use of them for concealing their mysteries from the uninitiated, they were chiefly appropriated to superstition. Hence the name *Hieroglyphics*, signifies *sacred delineations*.

Our object in noticing them here is, to arrest the attention of the student of the Bible, to the origin, meaning, and use of symbols, of which we have so many in the sacred writings. The frequent use of symbols in the Holy Scriptures, occasioned not merely from the high antiquity of the book, but from the fact that symbolic language is the most suitable to prophecy,—renders an accurate acquaintance with them of indispensable importance to a correct interpretation of large portions of these sacred records.

CHAPTER XXIII.

SYMBOLS.

We have the true foundation of symbolic language in the ancient hieroglyphics. All the Asiatic languages partake of them; and, in the judgment of our most reputable antiquarians, are found upon the model of the Egyptian hieroglyphic. Bishop Warburton, in his bold and masculine style, calls "the prophetic style, a speaking hieroglyphic."

As we have found in ancient history three kinds of hieroglyphics,—so we find three sorts of symbols, answering to these hieroglyphics. We have symbols of the first sort, which are simply contracted representations of things, without regard to analogy. Hence the creeds of ancient times were, and by some of the learned still are, called symbols; because abridged representations of Bible doctrine. We have also *tropical* symbols, founded upon the second class of hieroglyphics,—formed from some imaginary or far-fetched resemblance; as in putting the instru-

ment by which any thing is acquired for the thing acquired. But we have also a more perfect class of symbols founded upon actual analogies, or natural resemblances; and these are the representation of any one object, by the figure or properties of another. These are the *images of things*. In this class, the image of a thing is put for the thing itself; and to it belongs, almost Exclusively, the symbols found in the Bible.

All symbols may, indeed, be called signs of things, as words are signs of ideas. The symbol is to the thing intended, what the word is to the idea. And as words are used figuratively, so are symbols; for we have symbols of the idea which we form of the thing, as well as symbols of the thing itself. For example:—the word *tyrant*, is the sign of the idea of a despotic and oppressive ruler; but the symbol of this person named a tyrant, is a *wild beast*. There is no analogy between the word *tyrant*, and a cruel, arbitrary prince; but there is an analogy between a *wild beast*, and such a person: yet this analogy is not in the figure of the wild beast, but in some of its qualities or attributes. The word *lamb*, is the name of a very gentle, innocent, and harmless creature; but a *lamb* itself, is the symbol of a very gentle, innocent, and inoffensive person. Hence, Jesus Christ is metaphorically called, 'The *Lamb of God*;' but a lamb itself, is the symbol of him: and, therefore, a *slain lamb* is the symbol of Christ crucified. It would not, perhaps, be transcending the bounds of propriety to say, that such symbols are to things, what metaphors are to proper words.

"A metaphor in place of proper words
Resemblance puts, and dress to speech affords."

And may we not say,—

A symbol puts the *image* for the thing,
As priests, for sin, did put the offering.

Symbolic writing introduced into the ancient languages the boldest, and, to speak according to the taste of us Americans, the most extravagant metaphors. A few instances from the Hebrew prophets, which may illustrate a hundred dark sayings, shall be adduced.

First. A man with four wings, in symbolic writing, represented a supreme ruler. His lieutenants, or princes, were pictured out by a man with two wings. The stretch-

ing out the wings, was the symbol of imperial action or design. Now the names of these symbols, were anciently used for the thing signified.

Isaiah, predicting the invasion of Judea by the Assyrian chief, thus speaks:—'The stretching out of his *wings*, shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel!' Jeremiah, in the same style, predicts the desolations of Moab:—'He shall fly as an eagle, and shall spread his *wings* over Moab.' 'Woe to the land,' says Isaiah, 'shadowing with *wings*? See Daniel's vision of the *two-winged* beasts.

From this we may learn, how God's power in protecting his people, came to be termed—*his feathers, his wings, the covert of his wings.*

Second. A *crocodile*, was one of the ancient symbols of Egypt. In Psalm lxxiv. 13, 14, the Egyptians are styled, *dragons in the waters*; and their king, *leviathan*. 'The great *dragon* that lieth in the midst of his rivers,' Ezekiel xxix. 3. And Isaiah xxvii. 1, says, 'In that day the Lord with his sore, and great, and strong sword, shall punish *leviathan, the piercing serpent—even leviathan, that crooked serpent*; and he shall slay the *dragon*?'

The king of Ethiopia, probably from the same cause, was called a *fly*; and the king of Assyria, a *bee*. 'The Lord shall hiss for the *fly* that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the *bee* that is in the land of Assyria.' Isaiah vii. 18. He will call for the Ethiopian and Assyrian king to avenge his quarrel.

Third. A *star*, was anciently the symbol of the Deity. Thus said Balaam, 'There shall come a *star* out of Jacob, and a scepter shall arise out of Israel.' A *star* was also the image of a God. 'The *star* of your God which you made to yourselves,' Amos v. 26, I. e. the material image of your God. 'The *star* of your God, Remphan.' Acts vii. 7. The king of Babylon is called 'Lucifer, the Morning Star, Son of the morning.' Hence the sun, moon, and stars, came to be the symbols of patriarchs, princes, and nobles. See Joseph's dream, Gen. xxxviii. 9.

CHAPTER XXIV.
ENSIGNS AND DEVICES.

Of the antiquity of ensigns, Moses is a witness, Num. ii. 2. 'Every man of the children of Israel shall pitch by his own *standard*, with the *ensign* of their father's house.' The ensign of each tribe is not now known. But because our Lord, who sprang from Judah is called, 'The lion of the tribe of Judah,' it is conjectured, that from Jacob's blessing, in which he termed Judah a '*lion's whelp*,' he chose a lion for his ensign.

However this may be, "it is highly probable, that in the ensigns by which tribes and nations were distinguished, they painted the figures of such animals, trees, &c., as were emblematic of those qualities, circumstances, or events, by which they thought themselves most honored." Hence, in symbolic writing, the ensign, or painted device, stood for the nation. Jeremiah, therefore, likens Egypt to a *very fair heifer*; either, because the Egyptians carried on their ensigns the image of a heifer, the symbol of *Isis*, their tutelar deity;—or, because in sculpture they were represented by that device. In Pharaoh's dream, Egypt was symbolically represented by *kine*. It is thought that the Assyrians had the Euphrates on their ensigns, emblematic of their irresistible force; because Isaiah calls them, 'The waters of the rivers,' alluding to the Tigris and Euphrates. Hence, the New Testament Mistress of Babylon, is represented as 'sitting upon many waters,' I. e. ruling many populous nations.

Because of the institutions, laws, and discipline, peculiar to cities and nations, designed to form the manners of the people, they were anciently set forth on coins and in sculpture, by a "*young woman* sitting on a throne, magnificently attired; and surrounded with emblems, expressive of the attributes by which that nation or city was distinguished." Hence, the Jewish prophets in allusion to this symbol, when addressing nations and cities, named them *daughters*, and *virgin daughters*. 'I will weep bitterly, because of the

spoiling of the *daughters* of my people.' Isaiah xxii. 4. 'Deliver thyself O Zion, that dwellest with the *daughters* of Babylon.' Zachariah ii. 7. 'Let my eyes run down with tears night and day, for the *virgin daughter* of my people is broken with a great breach.' Jeremiah xlvi. 11. 'Take balm, O Virgin, the *daughter* of Egypt: in vain shall thou use many medicines; for thou shalt not be cured.'

Because princes and great men were likened to trees in the ancient symbols, we read of 'the *tall cedars* of Lebanon;' and of the common people, as 'the choice *fir trees* thereof;' of the '*oaks* of Bashan.' The *forest*, in Jeremiah, represents a whole nation. 'I will kindle a fire in the *forest* thereof.' But of Judah he says, 'The Lord called thy name a *green olive tree*, fair, and of goodly fruit.' Hence, Messiah is foretold as 'THE BRANCH.' I will raise up to David a righteous *branch*, '—Behold the man whose name is *the branch*? Zechariah vi. 12. 'There shall come forth a *rod* out of the *stem* of Jesse, and a *branch* shall grow out of his *roots*; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.'

CHAPTER XXV.

MYSTICAL ALLEGORY.

From the ancient usage of substituting the *symbol* for the *device*, and the *metaphor* for the thing signified thereby; and the thing signified, having by the same usage obtained the name of the thing by which it was signified,—it was natural to describe the condition, the qualities, and the actions of the thing signified, by the condition, the qualities, and the actions of its symbol. Hence arose that species of composition, called *allegory*; because, in it one thing was expressed, and another, entirely different from it, meant. The following description and history of the allegory, is from MacKnight,—from whom, already, we have borrowed much.

"The Egyptians, who are supposed to have invented picture writing, are thought also to have invented the allegorical method of communicating their sentiments. But, by

whomsoever invented, it came early into general use, and was greatly delighted in by the orientals, for the following reasons: *First*. A well formed allegory, by its striking images and vivid coloring, never failed, when understood, to make a strong impression on those to whom it was addressed. *Second*. Being a narration of things which are objects of sense, and between which there is a natural or supposed connexion, it was easily remembered, and could be translated from one language into another with the greatest precision. *Third*. Professing to contain an important hidden meaning, those to whom it was proposed, were led by curiosity to search out that meaning. *Fourth*. The discovery of the meaning of an allegory, as an exercise of one's mental powers, afforded great pleasure to the discoverer, especially if it contained a moral lesson useful for regulating life and manners: for a person, by the discovery, being led to instruct himself, he was spared the pain of having instruction forced upon him. *Fifth*. Allegory being a kind of speech which none but the learned understood, it was an excellent vehicle for conveying to them the knowledge of such matters, as were thought improper for the common people to know. These reasons led the priests, with whom the whole learning of Egypt was lodged, to teach their religion, their laws, and their politics, under the veil of allegory, both to their own countrymen, and to those strangers who came to be instructed in the wisdom of Egypt. And such well informed strangers, on their return to their own country, in imitation of their teachers, communicated the knowledge which they had acquired in Egypt, to their disciples in allegories: by which means allegory came in a little time to be the most approved method of instruction, all over the east.

"Allegories being in great repute, when the Jewish prophets were commissioned to instruct the people, and to foretell future events, it need not surprise us to find them delivering most of their prophecies in allegories; especially when we consider, that at the time these were delivered, it was proper to conceal the events foretold, under the veil of allegory, that they might not be understood till they were explained by their accomplishment. But, notwithstanding the ancient Egyptian allegory was attended with the advantages above mentioned, its extreme darkness occasioned it to be laid aside, after the gift of prophecy ceased. A new species, however, has been substituted in its room,

better fitted to convey instruction, because it is formed on symbols more obvious than those used in the ancient allegory. Of this new species, the writings of the moderns furnish many beautiful examples, none of which need be mentioned here, in regard they are generally known.

"Of the ancient allegory there were four kinds. 1. The proper allegory. 2. The apologue, or fable. 3. The parable. 4. The enigma.

"The *proper allegory*, was a discourse, in which the *condition*, the *qualities*, and the *actions* of a person or thing, were represented by the condition, the qualities, and the actions of the symbol, device, or metaphor, by which it was represented in picture writing. It was, therefore, a representation of real matters of fact, under feigned names and feigned characters.

"The *apologue* or *fable*, was a narration of speeches and actions attributed, sometimes to men, sometimes to brute animals, and sometimes to things inanimate, according to their natural or supposed qualities. But, these speeches and actions had no existence, except in the imagination of the author of the fable, who contrived them in the manner he judged fittest, for conveying the moral he had in view to inculcate. Of this kind was Jotham's fable of the *trees* going forth to anoint a king, Judges ix. 8. And Joash's fable of the *thistle*, which desired the *cedar* to give his daughter as a wife to his son. 2 Chron. xxv. 18.

The *parable*, or *similitude*, was a discourse in which one thing was compared with another which had a resemblance to it, so that the thing compared was more clearly understood, by means of the qualities of the thing to which it was compared, and made a strong impression on the mind of the hearers. Of this kind were many of our Lord's parables. But, although the apologue and parable were thus distinguished, we find them sometimes confounded with each other.

"Lastly. The *enigma*, or *riddle*, was a mysterious assemblage of different symbols, set forth, either in a verbal discourse, or, by presenting the symbols themselves to the eye. Either way exhibited, the meaning of the assemblage was so dark, that it required the greatest ingenuity to discover it. Of the verbal enigma, Sampson's riddle is an example. Of the symbolical enigma, Herodotus has recorded a remarkable instance, Hist. lib. iv. 128, 130, where he tells us, that when Darius Hystaspes invaded Scythia,

the Scythian king sent him a present, of a *bird*, a *mouse*, a *frog*, and *five arrows*. This, Gobryas, one of Darius' generals, considering as an enigma, interpreted it in the following manner: That unless the Persians could fly through the air like birds, or hide themselves in the earth like mice, or swim through the lakes like frogs, they should not return to their own country, but be slain by the arrows of the Scythians.

"All allegories have two senses. *First*. The *literal* sense exhibited in the verbal description, or in the visible symbol. *Second*. The remote sense concealed under the literal sense, or under the visible symbol. Wherefore, in every allegory, the first or literal sense is itself the sign of the second or hidden meaning, called the figurative sense of the allegory. And this figurative sense should be as distinctly represented by the literal sense of the allegory, as the literal sense is exhibited, whether by the verbal description, or by the visible symbol. Properly speaking, therefore, the first or literal sense constitutes *the body* of the allegory, and the second or figurative sense, its *soul*. In compositions of this kind, if rightly formed, the literal sense ought to be perfectly plain; and the only exercise of one's ingenuity ought to lie, not in understanding the literal sense, but in finding out its concealed meaning.

"Some of the ancient fables and parables, exhibited such striking representations and reproofs of the common follies of mankind, that by their frequent application they became proverbs. In allusion to this use of the parable, Habbakkuk says, chap. ii. 6, 'Shall not all these take up a parable against him, and a taunting proverb against him.' And Micah ii. 4. 'In that day shall one take up a parable against you, and lament with a doleful lamentation.' "*

Two examples of the allegory set forth in a verbal description:—

'Come down and sit in the dust, *O virgin daughter of Babylon*. There is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldean?; for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. —Take the millstones and grind meal; uncover the locks; make bare the leg; uncover the thigh; pass over the rivers.—Thy nakedness shall be uncovered; yea, thy shame shall be seen. I will take vengeance, and I will not meet thee as a man. As for our Redeemer, the Lord of

* MacKnight on the Epistles, Vol. 6. p. 238.

hosts is his name.—Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans, for thou shall no more be called the lady of kingdoms.—Therefore, hear now this, thou that art given to pleasures, that dwellest carelessly, that sayest in thine heart, I am, and none else besides me, I shall not sit as a widow, neither shall I know the loss of children,' &c. Isaiah xlvi.*

'Son of man, set thy face against Pharaoh king of Egypt, and prophesy against him, and against all Egypt.—Speak and say, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I am against thee Pharaoh king of Egypt, the *dragon* that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself.—But I will put hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause the fish of thy rivers to stick into thy scales.—And I will leave thee thrown into the wilderness, thee and all the fish of thy rivers: thou shall fall upon the open fields, thou shalt not be brought together nor gathered: I have given thee for meal to the beasts of the field, and to the fowls of heaven,' &c., to verse 17. Ezekiel xxix. †

Those desirous of studying the complexion of such allegories, will find other examples. Ezekiel xxxii. 2; Isaiah hi. 1,2; xxiii. 15, 16, 17; xiii. 10; Joel ii. 31,32; Ezekiel xx. 46—49.

Examples of the allegory set forth in dreams and visions, will be found in Genesis xli. 17; Daniel iv; Ezekiel I; iv. 28.

To *allegorize*, is to turn a true history into symbol, and make it represent another subject,—as Paul allegorized the history of Hagar and Ishmael, and Sarah and Isaac, because of their aptness to picture out the two Testaments, and the people under them. Galatians iv.124—31.

CHAPTER XXVI.

MYSTICAL ACTIONS.

"To render speech forcible and affecting, mankind in all ages and countries, have been accustomed to accompany

* † Mcknight on the Epistles, Vol. 6, pp. 242, 245.

their words with corresponding gestures and actions." This custom prevailed more in ancient times, when words were less copious and expressive; and especially amongst the eastern nations. It still obtains amongst most of the savage tribes. The Scriptures furnish many examples of it.

Abraham said to Eleazer of Damascus, 'Put thy hand under my thigh and swear.' Genesis xxiv. 2. Jacob, before his death, made his son Joseph put his hand under his thigh and swear. Genesis xlvii. 29. This action was intended to make these promissory oaths more solemn and binding.

Jacob, when he saw Joseph's coat, 'rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned many days.' When Ahab heard Elijah's words, 'he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly.' 1 Kings xxi. 27. These actions were symbolic of great affliction and distress.

Moses slew an Egyptian to show (as Stephen explains it,) 'that God would by him, deliver Israel out of the hands of the Egyptians.' Acts vii. 25. Ahijah caught Jeroboam's mantle, and rent it in twelve pieces, and said, 'Take thee *ten* pieces, for thus saith the Lord, I will rend the kingdom out of the hands of Solomon, and will give *ten* tribes to you.' 1 Kings xi. 30. Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, made him *horns of iron*, and said, 'Thus saith the Lord, With these shalt thou push the Syrians, till thou hast consumed them.' 2 Kings xiii. 18.

Elisha said to the king of Israel, 'Smite upon the ground: and he smote three times, and staid. And the man of God was angry with him and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times; then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it; but now thou shalt only smite it three times.' 2 Kings xiii. 18. The king did not understand this symbolic action. 'I shook my lap, and said, So God shake every man out of his house and from his labor, that performeth not this promise; even thus be he shaken.' Nehemiah xv. 13. 'Sigh, son of man, with the breaking of thy loins; sigh with bitterness before their eyes; and when they ask you, Why sighest thou? say to them,—For the tidings, because it comes, and every heart shall melt, and all hands shall be feeble.' Ezekiel xxi. 6.

'Jesus called a little child to him, and placed him in the midst of them, and said, Indeed, I say to you, unless you

be converted, and become as little children, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven.' 'Whosoever shall humble himself as this little child.' Matt, xviii. 2. 'And he *cursed* the barren fig tree:' for, according to the Jewish idea, whatever was barren, was cursed. Thus he intimated the destruction coming upon Jerusalem. Mark xi. 13—21. 'Jesus rose from supper, laid aside his garments, took a towel and girded himself. After that, he poured water into a basin, and began to wash his disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel. *Do you know what I have done to you?* said he. If I, your Lord and Master, have thus washed your feet, you ought also to wash one another's feet.' *He laid his hands* upon little children, and blessed them.' 'Neglect not the gift in thee, by the imposition of my hands,' said Paul to Timothy. Agabus took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, *Thus* saith the Holy Spirit: So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owns this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.'

These instances of the fact, that many mystical or symbolic actions, prophetic and representative in their nature, were performed from the days of Abraham to Agabus,— go far to explain many of those singular commandments given to the Prophets, which have so long served for a jest to infidels. They were all in conformity to the manners of the age; and like symbols, were a brief and forcible way of communicating information. We shall give a few examples of these.

Isaiah was commanded to walk three years, not only barefoot, but *naked*; I. e. without the upper garment—the hairy mantle generally worn by the prophets: and this was to be a *sign* and a *wonder*, upon Egypt and Ethiopia. Isaiah xx. 23. This intimated that the king of Assyria should lead away captive the Egyptian and Ethiopian, naked and barefoot; 'even with their buttocks uncovered to the shame of Egypt.'*

Jeremiah, chap. xix. 1, was commanded to get a potter's earthen bottle, and with the ancient of the priests and people, to go to the valley of Hinnom, and *break the bottle* in the sight of those men, while he foretold the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. 'So will the Lord break

* Bishop Lowth, with great probability supposes, that *days* has been lost from verso 2d, and that the term was *three days*, to -denote three years,—the interval between the defeat of the Egyptians, and the sacking of the town.

this people and this city, as one breaks a potter's vessel, which cannot be made whole again.' He was also ordered to make bonds and yokes, and put them on his own neck; and to send them to all the neighboring kings by their own messengers, whom they had sent to Jerusalem, to persuade Zedekiah to join their confederacy: and by this symbolic action, the Prophet was to show them that this confederacy would be captivity to them all. Hananiah took the yoke off Jeremiah, and having broken it, said, 'Thus saith the Lord, Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, from the neck of all nations, within the space of two full years.' Jeremiah xxvii. 2.

Serajah was ordered, when he came to Babylon with Zedekiah, to read the prophecy of Jeremiah against Babylon—then to bind a stone to it, and to cast into the midst of the Euphrates, and to say, 'Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her.'

In the same style, Ezekiel was ordered to delineate Jerusalem upon a tile, and to besiege it for four hundred and thirty days; his bread was to be prepared with dung, (I. e. upon a fire made of dry ordure, it was to be baked,) to prefigure the grievous famine during the siege. He was also ordered to shave his head and beard, and by a balance to divide the hairs into three parcels, &c.; all of which is explained, Ezekiel v. This symbol is found in Isaiah vii. 20. 'In the same day the Lord will shave with a razor, that is hired, (by the king of Assyria,) the head and the hair of the feet, and it shall also consume the beard.'

Bishop Lowth says, "In eastern symbols, the hairs of the head, represent the highest order in the state; those of the feet, the common people. This, therefore, denotes a general destruction."

To conclude these examples, already numerous enough, —to illustrate what is intended by mystical actions,—we shall only add,—that, when God commanded Abraham to offer his son Isaac—although he does not state the purpose —yet from Paul's' denominating the revocation of the order, a 'receiving of Isaac from the dead *for a parable?* Heb. xi. 19, we learn, that by the command to sacrifice Isaac, and by the suspension of it, the death and resurrection of God's only son, were prefigured. Perhaps, also, our Lord alludes to this transaction, when he says, 'Abraham saw my day and was glad.'

"One thing is certain,—that in the appointment of the

passover, there is no hint of any allusion to the sacrifice of Christ; yet the, legs of Jesus were not broken, in allusion to the paschal lamb; and the law of the passover is quoted and applied in this case, as symbolic of the fact, that not a bone of him was to be broken."*

CHAPTER XXVII.

TYPE.

Type is well defined by Paul, without intending it, in his comment on the Jewish institution. 'The law,' says he, 'contained only a *shadow* of good things to come, and *not the exact image* of those things.' A *type* originally denoted a rude draft—an outline, or general figure of some object. When I turn my eyes to the rising sun, and a person happens to approach me, his shadow first reaches my eye. It gives me a general idea, but not an exact image of his person. As the sun ascends and he approaches, the shadow becomes more and more descriptive; but at best, it never gives an exact resemblance. Jesus came from the east—from the gates of the morning: his shadow reached us four thousand years before we saw his person. Thus, all the figures or types of him, were distant, shadowy representations of his person, offices, character, and wondrous works.

A *type* is frequently called a symbol; and it may be considered as a symbol of a specific character. It differs from a symbol, only in its comprehension. It merely comprehends a figure prospective and adumbrative of some future person or thing; whereas, a symbol comprehends all figurative representations of persons or things, whether past, present, or future. Whatever is prefigured by a type, is called the *antitype*.

A *type* differs from a simile in this respect,—that it was designed by God to represent its antitype: for many things are, or may be compared to others, which were not made to resemble, for the purpose of representing them. When

* MacKnight.

man is compared to grass, a resemblance is discovered: but no person imagines that grass was designed to be a type of man. But when Melchizedeck and Christ are compared, a resemblance appears, not from accident, but because the former was prepared by God to represent the latter. This is essential to all Scripture types:—therefore, imagination must be bounded in seeking for types, by the clear and unequivocal intimations of the record itself.

Such rites and observances among the Jews, as were commendatory of virtues to be practised by themselves, are properly symbols; and such as were of a mixed nature, if such there were, ought to be regarded both as types and symbols: for types are confined to those things which were wholly future.

We are authorized, by Paul especially, in his letter to the Hebrews, as well as some other of his epistles, to regard the whole legal institution as typical of the Messiah, his kingdom, and gospel blessings. From their bondage in Egypt, to their settlement in Canaan, their travel's history appears to have been typical, as well as the whole Levitical institution. We are, indeed, taught that the things that happened to the people themselves, happened to them for types,—and are full of instruction to us. But this is not the place to insist on this matter.

There are typical persons, typical places, typical times, typical actions, and typical things, in rich abundance, in the law and in the prophets of the Jewish institution.

The following rules for the right application and interpretation of types, have received the approbation of the most learned expositors of Scripture:—

First. The chief position on the subject of types to prevent mistake, is,—*that there must be something more than mere resemblance. The type must be preordained, to resemble its antitype, and preparatory to its exhibition.* When there is not *previous design* and *preordained connexion* manifest, there is no authority for regarding any thing as a type. Bellarmine contended, that the secession of the ten tribes under Jeroboam, was a type of the secession of the Protestant states under Luther; while the Lutherans contended, by way of reprisal, that Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin, was a type of the pope. Both parties erred. No such person or thing was intended.

In interpreting types, symbols, parables, and metaphors, the same rules obtain. Every circumstance is not to be

regarded as typical; for often, there is more in the type than in the antitype; and as often, more in the antitype than in the type.

Second. The type must be explained according to its literal sense; if any obscurity, it must be removed.

Third. The analogy between the thing prefiguring and that prefigured, must be clearly and rationally pointed out.

Fourth. When there are many partial types of one and the same thing, we estimate the antitype from all of them combined; and not from one of them alone.

Fifth. One thing is sometimes the type of two different and even contrary things. "Thus," says Home, "the deluge was to believers, a type of baptism; but to the unbelievers, a type of the general ruin that awaits them."

Sixth. Sometimes the type assumes the name of the antitype, and the antitype the name of the type.* Thus the Christian church is called *Mount Zion*; and Christ is called *David*. Hosea iii. 5. Ezekiel xxxiv. 23.

Of typical actions, or prophetic types, instances have already been given in the preceding chapter.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

PARABLE.

A *parable* is a similitude, taken from natural things to instruct us in things spiritual. This, at least, is its current acceptation in the New Institution. But in the Jewish writings, it is found to denote a *proverb*, a *dark saying*, an *emblem*, a *grave discourse*. Bishop Lowth defines it to be, "that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a fictitious event, applied by way of simile, to the illustration of some grave and important truth." Similitude, or comparison, is, for the New Testament, as good a definition as any other. It is of great antiquity, and is

* This licence of rhetoricians is called *enallage*; I. e. *change of words*,—and is thus defined:—

Enallage doth alter person, tense,
Mood, gender, number, on the least pretence.

one of the most insinuating, pleasing, and impressive methods of communicating instruction; and for the great mass of society, it greatly excels dry argumentative reasoning, for which few have capacity, and still fewer have taste. Mrs. More, in her "Christian Morals" correctly observes, "Little reaches the understanding of the mass, but through the medium of their senses. The faculty by which a right conclusion is drawn, is, in them, the most defective: they rather *feel* strongly, than *judge* accurately; and their feelings are awakened by the impression made on their senses." Hence, the Great Teacher abounds in this method of teaching, in his popular addresses.

He seems to have regarded the parable, as not only best adapted to the capacity of the common people, but also, as a veil to hide from his proud and contemptuous opponents, the views and prospects which he opened to his disciples, and the more docile part of his hearers. He explained his parables to all, who from proper motives, desired to understand them: but when he saw in the hearts of his audience, a determination to resist and entammel him, he reserved his interpretation to a private interview with his friends.

From his own explanations, as well as from the established usage of all antiquity, the following rules for the interpretation of parables, are to be strictly regarded by those who would not misunderstand and misapply them:—

First. There is one great object or design in every parable, which may be learned from the context, or from some circumstance connected with it; and to this object, the interpreter must have supreme regard.

Second. Some of the ancients taught that there were *three* things in the construction of a parable, necessary to its perfection:—these are the *root*, or design; the *sap or fruit*, or the meaning contained in the figures employed; and the *bark*, or literal import of the imagery under which the hidden or mystical meaning is concealed. Hence, they said, "the literal sense must be first explained, in order that the correspondence between it and the mystical sense may be the more readily perceived." But in close connexion with this, a most important rule is deduced, viz:

Third. In the interpretation of a parable, it is not necessary that we should insist upon every word or incident in it, as containing some mystical meaning; for many cir-

cumstances are introduced for ornament, to make the similitude more pleasing and interesting.

Fourth. No one part of an allegory or parable is to be interpreted literally, and another part figuratively: the whole parable must be first understood literally, and then its mystical meaning must be uniform in all its parts.

Fifth. It may be observed, that it is not necessary that all the actions of men introduced into a parable, should be just or morally correct: it is only necessary that they should serve to illustrate the object of the teacher. Therefore the end or object of the parable, as it justifies the imagery introduced, must be regarded with reference to the *moral* which it communicates:—of such, the parable of the *unjust steward* is a good example.

The application of these rules to the interpretation of a single parable, must for the present suffice for an example. We select the parable of the *unjust steward*.

'He said likewise to his disciples, A certain rich man had a steward, who was accused to him of wasting his estate. Having, therefore, called him, he said, What is this that I hear of you? Render an account of your management, for you shall be steward no longer. And the steward said within himself, What shall I do? My master takes from me the stewardship; I cannot dig, and am ashamed to beg. I am resolved what to do, that when I am discarded, there may be some who will receive me into their houses. Having, therefore, sent severally for all his master's debtors, he asked one, How much do you owe my master? He answered, A hundred baths of oil. Take back your bill, said the steward, sit down directly, and write one for fifty. Then he asked another, How much do you owe? He answered, A hundred homers of wheat. Take back your bill, said he, and write one for eighty. The master commended the prudence of the unjust steward; for the children of this world are more prudent in conducting their affairs, than the children of light.' Luke xvi. 1—8.

First. The object of this parable is learned from the application of it by its author, in verses 9—12. It teaches, that as all men are stewards of God's blessings, they ought to manage the whole estate entrusted them, with a special reference to the will of the proprietor—with a provident regard to their own future interests. The wisdom of consideration and forecast, and preparation for a time of necessity, is the point inculcated in the parable. The Master

commended not the *injustice*, but the *wisdom* of the unjust steward.

Second. The unjust steward is represented as a real character, and all the circumstances of his administration, are related with all the appearance of true history. This is its literal meaning. But under this imagery, a comparison is drawn between a *wise* steward and a *wise* disciple, which places in an impressive light the folly of those, who profess to expect a day of reckoning, but make no preparation for it; nay, indeed, are wasting and consuming the bounties of heaven upon their lusts.

Third. He would proceed most irrationally with respect to the *design* of this parable, who would seek for a hidden meaning in the steward's saying, 'To dig I cannot, and am ashamed to beg;' in 'the two debtors,' who are introduced to set off his policy; or in 'the hundred measures of wheat,' and 'hundred baths of oil' These are the mere dress of the parable.

Fourth. The whole parable must be so interpreted, as to coincide with the point—'the master commended the unjust steward,' *because he acted wisely*, not because he acted *unjustly*.

But the application of the parable has, from inattention to the Saviour's manner, and to the proper import of figurative expressions, been more perplexing to some minds, than the parable itself. The metaphors—'mammon of *unrighteousness*? 'friends? 'when you *fail*? 'that *they may receive* you,' 'into everlasting *habitations*,'—are all in congruity with the imagery in the parable. 'Mammon of unrighteousness,' is a bold metaphor; and is well interpreted *deceitful* riches *Deceitful* is, however, itself a metaphor, though less bold, when applied to riches. Riches *promise* happiness, and because they break that promise, they are *deceitful* and *unrighteous*. It is not ill-gotten gain by which men are to make friends for themselves, to which the Saviour calls the attention of his hearers. It is riches lawfully obtained—it is the property which God has committed to the stewardship of men: for as Moses long ago taught, 'It is the Lord your God, that giveth you power to get wealth.' This wealth, however, will *deceive* those who expect happiness from it, in any other way than as they manage it according to the Master's will. The *true* riches, is also metaphorical. True riches, or the *true mammon*, is that which breaks no promises, nor unrighteously violates a

pledge. 'Make to yourselves friends,' is a phrase in conformity to the parable; and the whole stripped of the metaphor, means—"Be provident and forecasting in the use of all the means of doing good which God has bestowed upon you, and so appropriate all God's bounties, that after death you may be joyfully received into the mansions of bliss; for if you are not faithful in the management of the present portion assigned you, you need not expect the blessings of immortality: and if you are unfaithful as *stewards*, you need not expect to have any thing vested in you, as a possession of your own." Paul gives a similar admonition, without a parable, 1 Tim. vi. 17—19.

CHAPTER XXIX.

PROVERB.

A *proverb* is a concise, sententious, common saying, founded on a close observance of men and things. The method of teaching by proverbs, is of great antiquity; and at one time, generally prevailed over the east. A proverb professes not to dispute, but to command; not to persuade, but to compel. In order to give charms and interest to this method of instruction, the ancients decorated proverbs with metaphors, comparisons, allusions, and sometimes with the graces of harmony, and all the embellishments of style.

Solomon, so renowned for his proverbs, gives us in a proverb, one of the best definitions of the principal excellency of this method of instruction.

'Apples of gold in a net-work of silver,
Is a word seasonably spoken.' Prov. xxv. 1.

Beauty and *elegance* are the essential attributes of acceptable proverbs. The most forcible and elegant proverbs are expressed in ten or twelve words; that is, the discriminating sentiment in a good proverb, rarely excels that number of words. 'Physician, heal thyself,' is a beautiful example of one in three words. 'It is more happy to give than to receive,' is not so concentrated, and therefore does

not strike the mind with such force, though it is equally beautiful.

'The words of the wise are like goads,
And like nails that are firmly fixed.' Eccl. xii. 10.

The more concentrated, the stronger the impulse to the mind, and the deeper the impression made upon it.

But we have proverbial sentences and phrases, which are sometimes called proverbs, because they have passed into current use. Many of these are found in the Old and New Testaments: such as, '*The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom,*'—'*The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the washed hog to its wallowing in the mire?*' Many sayings like these, which have acquired the form and use of proverbs, are not, however, correctly called proverbs. A proverb should always force itself upon the mind by a single effort, and not by a tedious process.

A proverb in one period tries to teach,
A short, instructing, and a nervous speech.

Proverbs occurring in the New Testament, are to be explained partly by the aid of similar passages from the Old Testament, and from the context and scope of the passages in which they are found.

CHAPTER XXX.

EMPHASIS.

Emphasis comes from *Emphanein*, which signifies to show, or make conspicuous. "It is," says Stuart, "to language, what a nod or a sign is to looks; I. e. it makes more significancy. When the Jews spoke of Moses as *the prophet*; or the Greeks say *the orator, the philosopher, the poet*, meaning Demosthenes, Plato, and Homer, their respective appellations are *emphatic*." Emphasis, then, may be defined—"An accession to the ordinary signification of a word, either as to the extent or force of its meaning." Therefore, no word is of itself emphatic: every word has

its own native force, and designates a certain idea of a thing, whether great or small, in which there can be no emphasis. Emphasis of words is, therefore, *occasional*.

Emphasis in the Greek language, is generally expressed by the definite article. Thus, when the Saviour gave the cup to his disciples, he uses the article three times, as if he had said—For this is *that* blood of mine—*that* blood of the New Institution—*the* blood ready to be poured out for the multitudes (Jews and Gentiles,) for the remission of sins. Again, in Peter's confession, it is not "Thou art Christ, Son of God;" but, 'Thou art *the* Christ, *the* Son of God.' With the Greeks, the article was both definite and emphatic; and not only gave a definite, but an emphatic meaning to words.

The knowledge of emphasis is more necessary to a translator, than to a practical reader of the sacred writings. But still it is of use to every student of the Book, to know that words are sometimes used emphatically, with an accession of significance beyond their proper meaning; and this generally occurs, when the affections or feelings of the writer are more than ordinarily excited, or when there is any debate upon any subject: in such cases, the writer gives a sort of *intensity* to words and sentences, which carries them beyond their ordinary import, and which ought to be regarded by the reader; and may always be ascertained by the context, or by *observing the peculiar feelings or excitement of the writer upon any subject*.

An instance of false emphasis will better explain the necessity of a proper regard to the true emphasis, than a number of examples of the true. 'As you have therefore, received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk you in him.' Some emphasize on *as* and *so* thus—"As you received Jesus Christ in the spirit of faith and of humility,—*so* in the spirit of faith and humility, walk in him." However true this may be, it is a perversion of the word, for there is no *so* in the Greek Testament; and as Dr. MacKnight renders it very correctly, it suggests another idea:—"Since you have received Jesus Christ the Lord, walk in him." So common are errors of this sort, that Home and others lay it down as a rule, that *emphases* are not to be sought in *versions*.

I once heard a preacher make the best part of his sermon upon a false emphasis. His text was, 'I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.' He

emphasized upon *all*; and being a Calvinist of the high school, he thought it would have been presumptuous for Paul to have said, that he had declared *all* the counsel of God—for he could not himself know it *all*. "But," said he, "apply the word *all* to the congregation, and then it is both true and edifying: for Paul taught *all* the brethren without partiality, the counsel of God." Unfortunately, however, for the preacher, the word *all* in the original must be applied to *counsel*, and not to the members of the congregation or its elders, by a law, which, in the Greek language, is of infallible certainty.

In any version of the Scriptures, if the reader will attend to the above rule, of *observing the context, the topic of debate, or the peculiar feelings or excitement of the writer, upon every occasion*,—he will be able, satisfactorily to ascertain the emphatic words, and to escape the errors committed in false emphasis.

CHAPTER XXXI.

CHAPTERS, VERSES, PUNCTUATION.

The various divisions and subdivisions of the sacred Scriptures, into chapters, verses, and members of sentences, are of human authority, and to be regarded as such. Anciently, all the books of the sacred Scriptures were written in one continuous manner,—without a break, a chapter, or a verse. The division into chapters that now universally obtains in Europe, derived its origin from Cardinal Cairo, who lived in the twelfth century:—The subdivision into verses, is of no older date than the middle of the sixteenth century, and was the invention of Robert Stevens. Whatever advantages these divisions may have been in the way of facilitating references, they have so dislocated and broken to pieces the connexion, as not only to have given to the Scriptures the appearance of a book of proverbs, but have thrown great difficulties in the way of an easy intelligence of them. The punctuation, too, being necessarily dependent on these divisions, is far from accurate; and taken altogether, it affords a demonstration, that there

is no more divinity in the chapters, verses, commas, semicolons, colons, and periods of the inspired writings, than there is in the paper on which they are inscribed, or in the ink by which they are depicted to our view.

From all of which facts, the following rule is of essential importance:—*In reading the historical and epistolary parts of the sacred writings, begin at the beginning and follow the writer in the train of his own thoughts and reasonings, to the end of the subject on which he writes—irrespective of chapters and verses.* This rule must be observed in all cases, when we read for the sake of understanding any of the sacred books or letters.

CHAPTER XXXII.

THREE DISPENSATIONS.

It must always be remembered by him who would be a scribe, well instructed in the kingdom of Heaven, that the whole Bible comprehends *three* distinct dispensations, of religion; or three different administrations of mercy to the human race. These are the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian ages of the world.

There are three high priesthods, viz: that of Melchizedek, that of Aaron, and that of Jesus the Messiah; and under each of these, there will be found a different economy of things. A knowledge of the leading peculiarities of each, is essential to an accurate knowledge of any one of them, and the right interpretation of the Bible.

It is a standing maxim in religion, that the priesthood being changed, *there is of necessity* a change of the law, pertaining to *acceptable* worship.

After the close of one dispensation and the commencement of a new one, no man could be accepted in his approaches to God by the precedent economy. Moses, nor Aaron, nor the people of the Jews, after they departed from Sinai, dare approach God by sacrifice,—as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were wont to do.

The sovereignty and wisdom of God is most conspicuous in these arrangements. But it is our present duty only to

say, that before we can feel any confidence in our interpretations of any law, commandment, or institution of religion, a previous question must always be decided, viz: *To what dispensation did it belong?*

CHAPTER XXXIII.

RULES OF INTERPRETATION.

In the preceding chapters of this work, which are designed rather to develop the *principles*, than to state and illustrate the *rules* of interpretation, we have borrowed much from the most popular and approved writers on the science of biblical interpretation. And although we have not always quoted directly, we have quoted enough to satisfy the reader that these are not *private* rules, introduced for any private purpose, but that they are *the by law established* (that is, the law of the republic of letters) *principles*, universally acknowledged in all the schools of the nineteenth century.

We have preferred to select and borrow from the works of others, rather than to appear in the character of an original writer upon the subject. We have chosen, for reasons which will be obvious to the intelligent reader, to express our own views, gathered from observation and reflection, in the words of standard authors, even when in our judgment, they did not express themselves in the most felicitous manner.

It was with emotions of no ordinary pleasure, that some two years ago, we saw it asserted from the first theological seminary in America, and from the pen of one of the most erudite biblical critics of this century, either in Europe or America,* that the time was at hand, or was now arrived, (for I quote from memory,) when it will be acknowledged by all men of sense, that *true theology is the true meaning of the words and sentences of the Bible*; and that the best standard of orthodoxy, is *the application of the principles and rules of interpretation to the Bible, which are applied*

* Professor Stuart, of Andover.

to all other writings of the age in which they appeared. Having worked by this rule for many years, to see it promulged from so respectable a source, and acquiesced in by all the literati of the age, induced me to do as it is said of Paul, on a certain occasion, 'He thanked God, and took courage.'

In January, 1832, an article of unusual merit appeared in the Biblical Repository, from the pen of the Andover Professor, on the question—"Are the same principles of interpretation to be applied to the Scriptures, as to other books?" This article was immediately copied into the Millennial Harbinger, for February and March of the same year. A short time before, we had just commenced a series of essays, to prove that "*the doctrine of Christ*, is the meaning of the words and phrases of the Saviour and his Apostles." These essays were entitled, "Laws of Interpretation." A more perfect coincidence of views on any subject could not be easily imagined, than I find to exist between that school and myself, on all questions of this sort.

In re-examining this matter on this occasion, and on extending my researches, I feel myself happy in assuring the reader, that I do not know a single *principle* asserted, that is not already approved by the following: Doctors Campbell, of Aberdeen; MacKnight, of Edinburgh; Doddridge, of England; Michaelis, of Gottingen; Horne, of Cambridge; Stuart of Andover; Ernesti, Lowth, Calmet, Glassius, Harwood, and many others of equal celebrity. There are some things on the interpretation of prophecy, and on the double sense of prophecy, in which there might, perhaps, be some little differences between us and some of the above: but on that subject we have not touched on the present occasion, as it is not immediately connected with our design.

We shall now conclude this summary view of the Principles of Interpretation, by stating in order, seven general rules of interpretation of primary importance, deduced from the preceding chapters.

Rule 1. On opening any book in the sacred Scriptures, *consider first the historical circumstances of the book. These are the order, the title, the author, the date, the place, and the occasion of it.*

The *order* in historical compositions, is of much importance; as, for instance,—whether the first, second, or third,

of the five books of Moses, or any other series of narrative, or even epistolary communication.

The *title* is also of importance, as it sometimes expresses the *design* of the book. As *Exodus*—the departure of Israel from Egypt; *Acts of Apostles*, &c.

The peculiarities of the *author*—the age in which he lived—his style—mode of expression,—illustrate his writings. The date, place, and occasion of it, are obviously necessary to a right application of any thing in the book.

Rule 2. In examining the contents of any book, as respects precepts, promises, exhortations, &c., *observe who it is that speaks, and under what dispensation he officiates.* Is he a Patriarch, a Jew, or a Christian? *Consider also the persons addressed: their prejudices, characters, and religious relations.* Are they Jews or Christians—believers or unbelievers—approved or disapproved? This rule is essential to the proper application of every command, promise, threatening, admonition or exhortation, in Old Testament or New.

Rule 3. To understand the meaning of what is commanded, promised, taught, &c., *the same philological principles. deduced from—the nature of language; or the same laws of interpretation which are applied to the language of other books, are to be applied to the language of the Bible.*

Rule 4. *Common usage, which can only be ascertained by testimony, must always decide the meaning of any word which has but one signification;—but when words have according to testimony (I. e. the dictionary,) more meanings than one, whether literal or figurative, the scope, the context, or parallel passages, must decide the meaning: for if common usage, the design of the writer, the context, and parallel passages fail, there can be no certainty in the interpretation of language.*

Rule 5. *In all tropical language, ascertain the point of resemblance, and judge of the nature of the trope, and its kind, from the point of resemblance.*

Rule 6. In the interpretation of symbols, types, allegories, and parables, this rule is supreme: *ascertain the point to be illustrated; for comparison is never to be extended beyond that point—to all the attributes, qualities, or circumstances of the symbol, type, allegory, or parable.*

Rule 7. For the salutary and sanctifying intelligence of the Oracles of God, the following rule is indispensable

We must come within the understanding distance.

There is a distance which is properly called *the speaking distance*, or the *hearing distance*; beyond which the voice reaches not, and the ear hears not. To hear another, we must come within that circle which the voice audibly fills,

Now we may with propriety say, that as it respects God, there is an understanding distance. All beyond that distance, cannot understand God; all within it, can easily understand him in all matters of piety and morality. God, himself, is the centre of that circle, and humility is its circumference.

The wisdom of God is as evident in adapting the light of the Sun of Righteousness to our spiritual or moral vision, as in adjusting the light of day to our eyes. The light reaches us without an effort of our own; but we must open our eyes, and if our eyes be sound, we enjoy the natural light of heaven. There is a sound eye in reference to spiritual light, as well as in reference to material light. Now, while the philological principles and rules of interpretation, enable many men to be skillful in biblical criticism, and in the interpretation of words and sentences,—who neither perceive nor admire the *things* represented by those words: the sound eye contemplates the things themselves, and is ravished with the moral scenes which the Bible unfolds.

The moral *soundness* of vision consists in having the eyes of the understanding fixed solely on God himself, his approbation, and complacent affection for us. It is sometimes called a *single eye*, because it looks for one thing supremely. Every one, then, who opens the Book of God with *one aim*, with one ardent desire,—intent only to know the will of God; to such a person, the knowledge of God is easy: for the Bible is framed to illuminate such, and only such with the salutary knowledge of things celestial and divine.

Humility of mind, or what is in effect the same, contempt for all earth-born pre-eminence, prepares the mind for the reception of this light, or what is virtually the same, opens the ears to hear the voice of God. Amidst the din. of all the arguments from the flesh, the world, and Satan; a person is so deaf, that he cannot hear the still small voice of God's philanthropy. But receding from pride, covetousness, and false ambition; from the love of the world; and in coming within that circle, the circumference of which is unfeigned humility, and the Centre of which is God him-

self,—the voice of God is distinctly heard and clearly understood. All within this circle are taught by God; all without it are under "the influence of the wicked one. 'God resisteth the proud, but he giveth grace to the humble.' He, then, that would interpret the Oracles of God to the salvation of his soul, must approach this volume with the humility and docility of a child, and meditate upon it day and night. Like Mary, he must sit at the Master's feet, and listen to the words which fall from his lips. To such a one, there is an assurance of understanding, a certainty of knowledge, to which the man of letters alone never attained, and which the mere critic never felt.

O that I could forever sit
With Mary at the Master's feet;
Be this my happy choice:
My only care, delight, and bliss,
My joy, my heav'n on earth be this,
To hear the Bridegroom's voice!

Blank Page

Foundation of Christian Union.

'I pray———for those who shall believe on me through their teaching, *that all may be one*; that as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, *they also may be one in us*, *that the world may believe* that thou hast sent me, and that thou gavest me the glory, which I have given them, that *they may be one*, as we are one; I in them, and thou in me, *that their union may be perfected*: and that *the world may know* that thou hast sent me, and that thou lovest them, as thou lovest me.' Thus Messiah prayed; and well might he pray thus, seeing he was wise enough to teach that; 'If a kingdom be torn by factions, that kingdom cannot subsist. And if a family be torn by factions, that family cannot subsist. By civil dissensions, any kingdom may be desolated; and no city or family, where such dissensions are, can subsist.'

If this be true—and true it is; if Jesus be the Messiah— in what moral desolation is the kingdom of Jesus Christ!— Was there at any time, or is there now, in all the earth, a kingdom more convulsed by internal broils and dissensions, than what is commonly called the church of Jesus Christ! Should any one think it lawful to paganize both the Greek and Latin churches—to eject one hundred millions of members of the Greek and Roman communions, from the visible and invisible precincts of the Christian family or kingdom of Jesus Christ; and regard the Protestant faith and people, as the only true faith and the only true citizens of the kingdom of Jesus;—what then shall we say of them, contemplated as the visible kingdom, over which Jesus presides as Prophet, Priest, and King! Of forty millions of Protestants, shall we constitute the visible kingdom of the Prince of Peace? Be it so, for the sake of argument; and what then? The Christian army is forty millions strong. But how do they muster? Under forty ensigns?— Under forty antagonist leaders? Would to God there were but forty! In the Geneva detachment alone, there is almost that number of petty chiefs. My soul sickens at the details!

Take the English branch of the Protestant faith,—I

mean England and the United States, and all the islands where the English Bible is read; and how many broils, dissensions, and anathemas, may we compute? I will not attempt to name the antagonizing creeds, feuds, and parties, that are in eternal war, under the banners of the Prince of Peace. And yet they talk of love and charity, and of the conversion of the Jews, the Turks, and Pagans!!!

Shall we turn from the picture, lay down our pen, and languish in despair? No! For Jesus has said, 'Happy *the peace makers*, for they shall be called *Sons of God*.'" But who can make peace, when all the elements are at war? Who so enthusiastic, as to fancy that he can stem the torrent of strife, or quench the violence of sectarian fire! But the page of universal history whispers in our ears, If you tarry till all the belligerent armies lay down their arms, and make one spontaneous and simultaneous effort to unite; you will be as very a simpleton, as be that sat by the Euphrates, waiting till all its waters ran into the sea.

We are so sanguine—perhaps, many will say, so visionary, as to imagine that a *nucleus* has been formed, or may be formed; around which may one day congregate all the children of God. No one, at all events, can say that it is either impious or immoral,—that it is inhuman or unchristian, to think about the present state of Christ's kingdom; or to meditate upon the possibility or practicability of any scheme of gathering together the children of God, under the ensign of the Cross alone. No one can say that such an enterprize is absolutely chimerical, unless he affirms the negative of the Messiah's proposition, and declares that the present wars and strifes must extend and multiply through all time, and that God will convert the whole world, *without answering the prayer of his Son*; or rather, on a plan adverse to that promulged by him, and in despite of all the moral desolations which have ensued upon all the Broils and battles of five hundred sects, in fifteen hundred years!

Dare any one say, or even think it unphilanthropic or malevolent, to make an effort to rally the broken phalanxes of Zion's King, and to attempt to induce them to turn their arms from one another, against the common foe' With such a one, it were worse than hopeless to reason, or to exchange a single argument. Shall we not rather esteem it to be the most honorable, acceptable, and praiseworthy enterprize, that can be dared or undertaken by mortal man on thus earthly stage of action? And as God has ever effected

the most splendid revolutions by the most humble agents, and by means the most unlikely in the wisdom of all human schools; we think it not amiss or incongruous to make an effort, and to put our hands to the work of peace and love.

From Messiah's intercession above quoted, it is incontrovertible that union is strength, and disunion, weakness; that there is a plan founded in infinite wisdom and love, by which, and by which alone, the world may both *believe* and *know*, that God has sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world. And like all the schemes of Heaven, it is simple to admiration. No mortal need fancy that he shall have the honor of devising either the plan of uniting Christians in one holy band of zealous co-operation, or of converting Jews and Gentiles to the faith, that Jesus is that *seed*, in whom all the families of the earth are yet to be blessed. The plan is divine. It is ordained by God; and better still, it is already revealed. Is any one impatient to hear it? Let him again read the intercessions of the Lord Messiah, which we have chosen for our motto. Let him then examine the two following propositions, and say whether these do not express Heaven's own scheme of augmenting and conservating the body of Christ.

First. Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world, but the union and co-operation of Christians.

Second. Nothing is essential to the union of Christians, but the Apostles' teaching or testimony.

Or does he choose to express the plan of the Self-Existent in other words? then he may change the order, and say,

First. The testimony of the Apostles, is the only and all-sufficient means of uniting all Christians.

Second. The union of Christians with the Apostles' testimony, is all-sufficient, and alone sufficient, to the conversion of the world.

Neither truth alone, nor union alone, is sufficient to subdue the unbelieving nations; but truth and union combined, are omnipotent. They are *omnipotent*, for God is in them and with them, and has consecrated and blessed them for this very purpose.

These two propositions have been stated, illustrated, developed,—and shall I say proved, in the *Christian Baptist*, and *Millennial Harbinger*, to the conviction of thousands. Indeed, one of them is as universally conceded, as it has been proposed, viz; *That the union of Christians is essential*

to the conversion of the world: and though, perhaps, some might be found who would question, whether, if all Christians were united, the whole world could be converted to God; there is no person, of whom we have heard, who admits a general or universal prevalence of the gospel—in what it is usually called the millennial age of the world—and who admits that moral means will have any thing to do with its introduction, who does not also admit that the union of Christians is essential to that state of things. Indeed, to suppose that all Christians will form one communion in that happy age of the world, and not before it; is to suppose a moral effect without a cause.

The second proposition, viz; *That the word or testimony of the Apostles is itself all-sufficient, and alone sufficient, to the union of all Christians,* cannot be rationally doubted by any person acquainted with that testimony, or who admits the competency of their inspiration to make them infallible teachers of the Christian institution. And, indeed, all who contend for those human institutions called creeds, contend for them as necessary only to the existence of a party, or while the present schisms, contentions, and dissensions exist. Therefore, all the defences of creeds, ancient and modern, while they assert that the Bible alone is the only perfect and infallible rule of faith and morals; not only concede that these symbols called creeds, are imperfect and fallible,—but, also, that these creeds never can achieve what the Bible, without them, can accomplish.

But how to do without them, appears to be an insuperable difficulty to many well disposed Christians. To labor this point would be foreign to our present purpose; especially as it has already been fully discussed in the present controversy.*

It is, perhaps, altogether sufficient at present to propose the question, How has, what is called the church, done with them? Have they not been the fruitful cause or occasion of all the discords, schisms, and parties, now existing in Christendom? And will not a very superficial observation, and a little experience, convince every man that the rivers tend not more certainly to the sea, than creeds and human devices in religion, tend to discords and divisions. Take, for example, two of the most popular creeds of the present day—the Westminster, and that of

* Christian Baptist, Vol. 2, pp. 66, 67. Essays on the Westminster creed, Vol. 2. Review of Dr. Noel's Circular, Vol. 5.

the Methodists—with whose history American society is better acquainted than with that of any other, and test the tree by its fruits,—judge their tendency by their practical effects upon society. To say nothing of the lesser schisms in the party, that once formed one communion on the platform of the Westminster creed, we can now enumerate no less than nine separate communions—all professing the Westminster articles, in substance or in form. These are the General Assembly in Scotland and the United States, the Cameronians or Solemn League and Covenant Presbyterians, the Burghers or Unionists, the Anti-Burghers or Seceders, the Relief Presbyterians, the Cumberland Presbyterians, and the New School, now upon the eve of being born. To these might be added those called English Presbyterians, who are now more generally known by the name of Independents and Congregationalists; and, indeed, the Glassites or Sandemanians, who came out of the synod of Angus and Mearns in the year 1728. Thus in one hundred and ninety years, have nine or ten distinct communions originated out of the Westminster creed. Some of them, too, as discordant and aloof from each other, as were the Jews and Samaritans.

Nor have the Methodists in England, Canada, and the United States, done much better for their age. They now form five or six separate communions, under different names. To say nothing of the Whitfieldite Methodists, those of John Wesley, are, the Wesleyan Methodists, the New Connexion of Methodists, the Methodist Episcopal church, the O'Kelly Methodists, the Radicals, &c.

And what shall I say of the twelve or fourteen sects of Baptists—many of whom have as much affection for the Greek or Roman church, as for one another! It were useless to furnish other evidence in proof that human opinions, inferential reasonings, and deductions from the Bible, exhibited in the form of creeds, can never unite Christians; as all their fruits are alienation, repulsion, bickering, and schism. *No human creed in Protestant christendom can be found, that has not made a division for every generation of its existence.* "And I may add—the more thinking, inquisitive, and intelligent the community which owns a creed, the more frequent their debates and schisms.

But the Bible will do no better, if men approach it with a set of opinions, or a human symbol in their minds. For then it is not the Bible, but the opinions in the mind, that

form the bond of union. Men, indeed, had better have a *written* than an *unwritten* standard of orthodoxy, if they will not abandon speculation and abstract notions, as any part of Christian faith or duty.

But all these modes of faith and worship, are "based upon a mistake of the true character of Revelation, which it has long been our effort to correct. With us, Revelation has nothing to do with opinions, or abstract reasonings; for it is founded wholly and entirely upon *facts*. There is not one abstract opinion, not one speculative view, asserted or communicated in Old Testament or New. Moses begins with asserting facts that had transpired in creation and providence; and John ends with asserting prophetic or prospective facts, in the future displays of providence and redemption. Facts, then, are the *alpha* and the *omega* of both Jewish and Christian revelations.

But that the reader may have before his mind in one summary view, the whole scheme of union and co-operation, which the Living Oracles and the present state of the Christian religion in the world demand; which has been, at different times and in various manners, Illustrated and sustained in the present controversy, against divisions,—we shall here submit it in one period.

Let THE BIBLE be substituted for all human creeds; FACTS, for definitions- THINGS, for words; FAITH, for speculation; UNITY OF FAITH, for unity of opinion; THE POSITIVE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD, for human legislation and tradition; PIETY, for ceremony; MORALITY, for partizan zeal; THE PRACTICE OF RELIGION, for the profession of it;—and the work is done.

For the illustration of the leading terms, and their correlates found in this *projete*, and for a full development of our meaning; as we may not be understood, if interpreted by the polemic vocabulary of this age,—we shall introduce some extracts from the *Christian Baptist*, and *Millennial Harbinger*, developing our meaning, and containing some of the capital positions which have been fully elicited and canvassed, in a controversy of twelve years.

FACT.

Fact means something done. The term *deed*, so common in the reign of James the First, is equivalent to our term *fact*. Truth and fact, though often confounded, are not

the same. All facts are truths, but all truths are not facts. That God exists, is a truth, but not a fact; that he created the heavens and the earth, is a fact and a truth. That Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles, is a truth, but not a fact; and that he preached Christ to the Gentiles, is both a fact and a truth. The simple agreement of the terms of any proposition with the subject of that proposition, or the representation of any thing as it exists, is a truth. But something must be done, acted, or effected, before we have a fact. There are many things in religion, morals, politics, and general science, which are not facts; but these are all but the correspondence of words and ideas with the things of which they treat.

Facts have a power which logical truth has not; and therefore, we say, that facts are stubborn things. They are *things*, not *words*. The power of any fact, is the meaning; and therefore the measure of its power is the magnitude of its import. All moral facts have a moral meaning; and those are properly called moral facts, which either exhibit, develop, or form moral character. All those facts, or works of God, which are purely physical, exhibit what have been commonly called his natural or physical perfections; and all these facts, or works of God, which are purely moral, exhibit his moral character. It so happens, however, that all his works, when properly understood, exhibit both his physical and moral character, when viewed in all their proper relations. Thus the deluge exhibited his power, his justice, and his truth; and, therefore, displayed both his physical and moral grandeur. The turning of water into wine, apart from its design, is purely a demonstration of physical power; but when its design is apprehended, it has a moral force equal to its physical majesty.

The work of redemption is a system of works, or deeds, on the part of Heaven, which constitute the most splendid series of moral facts which man or angel ever saw. And they are the proof, the argument, or the demonstration, of that regenerating proposition which presents God and *love* as two names for one idea.

When these facts are understood, or brought into immediate contact with the mind of man, as a moral seal or archetype, they delineate the image of God upon the human soul. *All the means of grace are, therefore, only the means of impressing this seal upon the heart; of bringing these*

moral facts to make their full impression on the soul of man. Testimony and faith are but the channel through which these facts, or the hand of God, draws his image on the heart and character of man. If then the fact and the testimony are both the gift of God, we may well say that faith and eternal life are also the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

To enumerate the gospel facts, would be to narrate all that is recorded of the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ, from his birth to his coronation in the heavens. They are, however, concentrated in a few prominent ones, which group together all the love of God in the gift of his Son. He died for our sins, He was buried in the grave, He rose from the dead for our justification, and is ascended to the skies to prepare mansions for his disciples, comprehend the whole, or are the heads to the chapters which narrate the love of God, and display his moral majesty and glory to our view.

These moral facts unfold all the moral grandeur of Jehovah, and make Jesus the effulgence of his glory, the express image of his substance. These are the moral seal which *testimony* conveys to the understanding, and *faith* brings to the heart of sinners, by which God creates them anew, and forms them for his glory. It is the Spirit which bears witness—the Spirit of God and of Christ which gives the testimony, and confirms it in the disciples. But let us next proceed to *testimony*.

TESTIMONY.

The Romans, from whom we have borrowed much of our language, called the witness the *testis*. The declaration of this *testis* is still called testimony. In reference to the material system around us, to all objects and matters of sense, the eye, the ear, the smell, the taste, the feeling, are the five witnesses. What we call the evidence of sense, is, therefore, the testimony of these witnesses, which constitute the five avenues to the human mind from the kingdom of nature. They are figuratively called witnesses, and their evidence, testimony. But the report or declaration of intelligent beings, such as God, angels and men, constitute what is properly and literally called *testimony*.

As light reflected from any material object upon the eye, brings that object into contact with the eye, or enables the

object to make its image on the eye, so testimony concerning any fact, brings that fact into contact with the mind, and enables it to impress itself, or to form its image upon the intellect, or mind of man. Now, be it observed, that as by our five external senses we acquire all information of the objects of sense around us, so by testimony, human or divine, we receive all our information upon all facts which are not the objects of the immediate exercise of our five senses upon the things around us.

To appreciate the full value of testimony in the divine work of regeneration, we have only to reflect, that all the moral facts which can form moral character, after the divine model, or which can effect a moral or religious change in man, are found in the testimony of God; and that no fact can operate at all, where it is not present, or where it is not known. The love of God in the death of the Messiah, never drew a tear of gratitude or joy from any eye, or excited a grateful emotion in any heart among the nations of our race to whom the testimony never came. No fact in the history of six thousand years, no work of God in creation, providence, or redemption, has ever influenced the heart of man or woman, to whom it has not been testified. Testimony is, then, in regeneration, as necessary as the fact of which it speaks.

The real value of any thing, is the labor which it cost, and its utility when acquired. If reason and justice arbitrated all questions upon the value of property, the decision would be, that every article is worth the amount of human labor which is necessary to obtain it; and when obtained, it is again to be tried in the scales of utility. Now, as all the facts, and all the truth, which can renovate human nature, are in the testimony of God; and as that testimony cost the labor and the lives of the wisest and best that ever lived, that testimony, to us, is just as valuable as the facts which it records, and the labors and the lives which it cost, and just as indispensable in the process of regeneration, as were the labors and the lives of Prophets, Apostles, and the Son of God.

History, or narrative, whether oral or written, is only another name for testimony. When, then, we reflect how large a portion of both Testaments is occupied in history, we may judge of how much importance it is in the judgment of God. Prophecy, also, being the history of future facts, or a record of things to be done, belongs to the same

chapter of facts and record. Now if all past facts, and all future facts, or all the history or testimony concerning them, was erased from the volumes of God's inspiration, how small would the remainder be! These considerations, added together, only in part exhibit the value and utility of testimony in the regeneration of mankind. But its value will be still more evident, when the proper import of the term *faith* is fully set before us.

FAITH.

No testimony, no faith: for faith is only the belief of testimony, or confidence in testimony as true. To believe without testimony, is just as impossible as to see without light. The measure, quality, and power of faith, are always found in the testimony believed.

Where testimony begins, faith begins; and where testimony ends, faith ends. We believe Moses just as far as Moses speaks or writes: and when Moses has recorded his last fact, or testified his last truth, our faith in Moses terminates. His five books are, therefore, the length and breadth, the height and depth, or, in other words, the *measure* of our faith in Moses. The *quality* or value of faith is found in the quality or value of the testimony. If the testimony be valid and authoritative, our faith is strong and operative. 'If,' says John, 'we receive the testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater,' stronger, and more worthy of credit. The value of a bank bill, is the amount of the precious metals which it represents, and the indisputable evidence of its genuineness; so the value of faith is the importance of the facts which the testimony presents, and the assurance afforded that the testimony is true. True, or unfeigned faith, may be contrasted with feigned faith; but true faith is the belief of truth: for he that believes a lie, believes in vain.

The *power* of faith is also the power, or moral meaning of the testimony, or of the facts which the testimony represents. If by faith I am transported with joy, or overwhelmed in sorrow, that joy or sorrow is in the facts contained in the testimony, or in the nature and relation of those facts to me. If faith purifies the heart, works by love, and overcomes the world, this power is in the facts believed. If a father has more joy in believing that a lost son has been found, than in believing that a lost sheep has

been brought home to his fold, the reason of this greater joy is not in the nature of his believing, but in the nature of the facts believed.

Here I am led to expatiate on a very popular and pernicious error of modern times. That error is, that the nature, or power and saving efficacy of faith, is not in the truth believed, but in the *nature* of our faith, or in *the manner of believing* the truth. Hence all that unmeaning jargon about the nature of faith, and all those disdainful sneers at what is called "historic faith,"—as if there could be any faith without history, written or spoken. Who ever believed in Jesus Christ, without hearing the history of him? *'How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?'* Faith never can be more than the receiving of testimony as true, or the belief of testimony; and if the testimony be written, it is called history—though it is as much history when flowing from the tongue, as when flowing from the pen.

Let it be again repeated, and remembered, that there is no other manner of believing a fact, than receiving it as true. If it is not received as true, it is not believed; and when it is believed, it is no more than regarded as true. This being conceded, then it follows that the efficacy of faith is always in the fact believed, or the object received, and not in the nature or manner of believing.

"Faith was bewildered much by men who meant
To make it clear, so simple in itself,
A thought so rudimental and so plain,
That none by comment could it plainer make.
All faith was one. In object, not in kind,
The difference lay. The faith that saved a soul,
And that which in the common truth believed,
In essence, were the same. Hear, then, what faith.
True, Christian faith, which brought salvation, was:
Belief in all that God revealed to men;
Observe, in all that God revealed to men,
In all he promised, threatened, commanded, said,
Without exception, and without a doubt."*

This holds universally in all the sensitive, intellectual, and moral powers of man. All our pleasures and pains, all our joys and sorrows, are the effects of the objects of sensation, reflection, faith, &c., apprehended or received, and not in the nature of the exercise of any power or capacity with which we are endowed. We shall illustrate and confirm this assertion by an appeal to the experience of all.

* Pollock's Course of Time, Book viii. p. 189.

Let us glance at all our sensitive powers. If, on surveying with the eye a beautiful landscape, I am pleased, and on surveying a battle field strewn with the spoils of death, I am pained,—is it in accordance with truth to say, that the pleasure or the pain received was occasioned by the nature of vision, or the mode of seeing? Was it not *the sight*, the thing seen, the object of vision, which produced the pleasure and the pain? The action of looking, or the mode of seeing, was in both cases the same; but the things seen, or the objects of vision, were different;—consequently, the effects produced were different.

If on hearing the melody of the grove I am delighted, and on hearing the peals of thunder breaking to pieces the cloud, dark with horror, hanging over my head, I am terrified,—is the delight or the terror to be ascribed to the manner or nature of hearing, or to the thing heard? Is it not the thing heard, which produces the delight or the terror?

If I am refreshed by the balmy fragrance of the opening bloom of spring, or sickened by the fetid effluvia of putrid carcasses,—are these effects to be ascribed to the peculiar nature or mode of smelling, or to the thing smelt? Or when the honey and the gall come in contact with my taste.—is the sweet or the bitter to be regarded as the effect of my manner of tasting, or to the object tasted? And when I touch the ice, or the blazing torch,—is the effect or feeling produced to be imputed to the manner of feeling them, or to the thing felt? May we not, then affirm that all the pleasures and pains of sense; all the effects of sensation; are the results, not the manner in which our five senses are exercised, but of the objects on which they are exercised? It may be said, without in the least invalidating this conclusion, that the more intimate the exercise of our senses is with the things on which they are exercised, the stronger and more forcible will be the impressions made: but still it is the object seen, heard, smelt, tasted, or felt which affects us.

Passing from the outward to the inward man, and on examining the powers of intellection one by one, we shall find no exception to the law which pervades all our sensitive powers. It is neither the faculty of perception, nor the manner of perception, but the thing perceived, that excites us to action: it is not the exercise of reflection, but the thing reflected upon: it is not memory, nor the exercise of recollection, but the thing remembered: it is not imagi-

nation, but the thing imagined: it is not reason itself, nor the exercise of reason, but the thing reasoned upon, which affords pleasure or pain—which excites to action—which cheers, allures, consoles—which grieves, disquiets, or discommode?! us.

Ascending to our volitions and our affections, we shall find the same universality. In a word, it is not choosing, nor refusing; it is not loving, hating, fearing, desiring, nor hoping; it is not the nature of any power, faculty, or capacity of our nature, nor the simple exercise of them, but the objects or things upon which they are exercised, which give us pleasure or pain; which induce us to action, or influence our behaviour. Faith, then, or the power of believing, must be an anomalous thing; a power *sui generis*; an exception to the laws under which every power, faculty, or capacity of man is placed, unless its measure, quality, power, and efficacy be in the facts which are testified, in the objects on which it terminates.

There is no connexion of cause and effect more intimate; there is no system of dependencies more closely linked; there is no arrangement of things more natural or necessary, than the ideas represented by the terms *fact*, *testimony*, *faith*, and *feeling*. The first is for the last, and the two intermediates are made necessary by the force of circumstances, as the means for the end. The fact, or the thing said or done, produces the change in the frame of mind. The testimony, or the report of the thing said or done, is essential to belief; and belief of it, is necessary to bring the thing said or done to the heart. The change of heart, is the end proposed in this part of the process of regeneration; and we may see that the process on the part of Heaven is, thus far, natural and rational: or, in other words, consistent with the constitution of our nature.*

CONFIRMATION OF THE TESTIMONY.

All revealed religion is based upon facts. Testimony has respect to facts only; and that testimony may be credible, it must be confirmed. These points are of so much importance as to deserve some illustration, and much consideration. By *facts*, we always mean something said or done. The works of God and the words of God, or the

* Millennial Harbinger—Extra, No. 6, pp. 340—345.

things done and spoken by God, are those facts which are laid down and exhibited in the Bible as the foundation of all faith, hope, love, piety, and humanity. All true and useful knowledge is an acquaintance with facts. And all true science is acquired from the observation and comparison of facts. But he that made the heart of man and gave him an intelligent spirit, knows that facts alone can move the affections, and command the passions of man. Hence the scheme of mercy which he has discovered to the world, is all contained in, and developed by, *the works of mercy* which he has wrought.

Facts have a meaning which the understanding apprehends, and the heart feels. According to the meaning or nature of the fact, is its effect upon us. If a friend have risked his life, or sacrificed his reputation or fortune to relieve us, we cannot but confide in him and love him. If an enemy have attempted our life, invaded our property, or attacked our reputation, we cannot, naturally, but hate him. Nothing but the command of a benefactor, or the will of some dear friend who has laid us under obligation to himself, can prevent us from hating our enemies. If a beloved relative have sustained some great misfortune, we must feel sorry; or if he have been rescued from some impending calamity, we must feel glad. Our joy in the latter case, and our sorrow in the former, arise from the meaning or nature of the fact. The feelings corresponding with the nature of the fact, are excited or called into existence the moment the fact is known or believed. It is *known* when we have witnessed it ourselves, and it is *believed* when reported to us by credible persons who have witnessed it. This is the chief difference between faith and knowledge.

As existences or beings must precede knowledge, so facts must precede either knowledge or belief. An event must happen before it can be known by man—it must be known by some before it can be reported to others—it must be reported before it can be believed, and the testimony must be confirmed, or made credible, before it can be relied on.

Something must be done before it can be known, reported, or believed. Hence, in the order of nature, there is first the fact, then the testimony, and then the belief. A was drowned before B reported it—B reported it before C believed it, and C believed it before he was grieved at it. This is the unchangeable and universal order of things as

respects belief. In this example when we reason from effect to cause, it is *grief, belief, testimony, fact*—and from cause to effect, it is *fact, testimony, belief, grief*. We ascend from grief to belief—from belief to testimony—from testimony to fact. We descend from fact to testimony— from testimony to belief—and from belief to grief. To this there is no exception, more than against the universality of the law of gravity. If, then, there was nothing said or done, there could be no testimony, and so no faith. Religious affections spring from faith; and, therefore, it is of importance that this subject should be disintricated from the mysticism of the schools.

Laws call for obedience, and testimony for belief. Where there is no law, there can be no obedience; and when there is no testimony, there can be no faith. As obedience cannot transcend law, so faith cannot transcend testimony. John's testimony went to so many facts. On his testimony we can believe only as far as he has testified. And so of all the other witnesses. The certainty of faith depends upon the certainty or credibility of the witnesses. But not so its effects. The *effects* depend upon the facts believed—the *certainty* upon the evidence. I may be equally certain that John was beheaded—that Jesus was crucified. Nay, I may be as certain of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, as I am of his death on Calvary. The testimony may be equally credible, and the faith equally strong; but the effects produced are not the same; The facts believed have not the same meaning, are not of the same nature, and do not produce the same feelings or effects. I may be as certain of the assassination of Caesar in the Senate House, as I am of the crucifixion of Jesus on Calvary: but as the facts believed are as diverse in their nature, meaning, and bearings upon me, as the East and the West; so the effects or fruits of my faith, are as different as Julius Cesar and Jesus Christ.

The more ordinary the fact, the more ordinary the testimony necessary to establish it. That A B, aged 90, and confined for some time with sickness, died last night, requires only the most ordinary testimony to render it credible. But that C D lived to 140, enjoying unabated vigor of mind and body, requires stronger testimony. But still, all facts happening in accordance with the ordinary and natural laws of things, require but good human testimony to make them worthy of credence. It is only extraordina-

ry and supernatural facts which require supernatural testimony, or testimony supernaturally confirmed. This is the point to which we have been looking in this essay. And now that we have arrived at it, I would ask, *How has the testimony of the Apostles and Evangelists been confirmed?*

To *confirm a testimony*, is neither more nor less than to make it credible to those to whom it is tendered; or, to express the same idea in other words, it is to give men power to believe. Now it will not require the same amount of evidence to persuade an astronomer that the earth's shadow struck the moon last eclipse, as it would to convince an Indian; or it would not require the same amount of evidence to convince a chemist that combustion was effected by pouring water on a certain composition of mineral substances, as it would an unlettered swain. To make any testimony credible to any order of beings, regard must therefore be had to the capacity, attainments, and habits of those beings. To confirm the testimony of the Apostles concerning the Messiah's death, resurrection, ascension into heaven, and coronation as the Lord and King of the Universe, imports no more nor no less than that it should be rendered every way credible to such beings as we are, or that we should be made able to believe it. A testimony *confirmed*, and yet *incredible* to those to whom it is tendered, is a contradiction in terms. But why emphasize on the word *confirmed*? Because the holy Apostles have emphasized upon it. It is therefore necessary that we should pay a due regard to the confirmation of the testimony. The testimony is one thing, and the confirmation is another. It is necessary, in all important occasions in human affairs, that the testimony which is received between man and man should be confirmed by some sanction. Hence an oath for confirmation of testimony is an end of all strife. The highest confirmation which men require in all questions of fact, is a solemn oath or affirmation that the things affirmed are true.

But supernatural facts require supernatural confirmations. Hence when the confirmation of the gospel is spoken of in the apostolic writings, it is resolved into the doings or works of the Holy Spirit. '*Demonstrations of the Holy Spirit*,' are the confirmatory proofs of the gospel. When Paul delivered the testimony of God, or the testimony concerning Jesus, to the Corinthians, he says, '*It was confirmed*

among them? And if we examine into the confirmation of the testimony as Paul explained it, we shall find that he makes the spiritual gifts, or those extraordinary and miraculous powers which the Apostles themselves displayed, and which so many of their converts also possessed, an assurance or confirmation of what he promulged.

We shall only attend to the light which one of his epistles to the Corinthians throws upon this subject. After thanking his God for the favor bestowed upon the disciples in Corinth when he first visited them, he proceeds to specify the special favors bestowed upon the disciples in that renowned city. 'You were enriched (says he, chap. I. ver. 5.) with every gift by him, even with *all speech* and *all knowledge* when the testimony of Christ was confirmed among you: so that you come behind in *no gift?* 'There are diversities of gifts, (says he, chap, xii.) 'To one disciple is given *the word of wisdom*; to another, *the word of knowledge*; to another, *faith*, (to be healed; to another, *the gift of healing*; to another, *the ability of working in others the power of working miracles*; to another, *prophecy*; to another, *discerning of spirits*; to another, *diverse kinds of foreign tongues*; and to another, *the interpretation of foreign tongues*.'—Now the Corinthians were put in possession of these (for they came behind in no gift) 'when the testimony of Christ was confirmed among them.' For, says Paul, I came not to you with the excellency of speech, or the persuasive eloquence of the schools, but with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power; that your belief of my testimony, or your faith, might not rest, or be founded upon human wisdom or eloquence, but upon the power of God evinced in the demonstrations of the Spirit which confirmed my testimony among you. For had it not been for these demonstrations of the Spirit and of power, your faith could not have rested upon an immoveable basis.

To those desirous to understand this subject, an examination of this first letter to the Corinthians cannot fail to be most instructive; for it most clearly and unequivocally teaches us that the *visible, audible, sensible* demonstration of the Spirit and of power, was that supernatural attestation of the testimony of Christ which made it credible, so that no man could have acknowledged Jesus of Nazareth to be the Almighty Lord, but by this demonstration of the Holy Spirit. Thus was the testimony confirmed—thus was Jesus demonstrated to be the only begotten Son of God—

and thus, and thus only, are men enabled to believe in him.*

FUNDAMENTAL FACT. †

Amidst the uncertainty, darkness, and vice, that overspread the earth, the Messiah appears, and lays a foundation of hope, of true religion, and of religious union, unknown, unheard of, unexpected among men. The Jews were united by consanguinity, and by an agreement in a ponderous ritual. The Gentiles rallied under every opinion, and were grouped, like filings of steel around a magnet, under every possible shade of difference of thought, concerning their mythology. So long as unity of opinion was regarded as a proper basis of religious union, so long have mankind been distracted by the multiplicity and variety of opinions. To establish what is called a system of orthodox opinions as the bond of union, was, in fact, offering a premium for new diversities in opinion, and for increasing, *ad infinitum*, opinions, sects, and divisions. And what is worse than all, it was establishing self-love and pride as religious principles, as fundamental to salvation; for a love regulated by similarity of opinion, is only a love to one's own opinion; and all the zeal exhibited in the defence of it, is but the workings of the pride of opinion.

When the Messiah appeared as the founder of a new religion, systems of religion consisting of opinions and speculations upon matter and mind, upon God and nature, upon virtue and vice, had been adopted, improved, reformed, and exploded time after time. That there was always something superfluous, something defective, something wrong, something that could be improved, in every system of religion and morality, was generally felt, and at last universally acknowledged. But the grandeur, sublimity, and beauty of the foundation of hope, and of ecclesiastical or social union, established by the author and founder of Christianity, consisted in this, that THE BELIEF OF ONE FACT, *and that upon the best evidence in the world, is all that is requisite, as far as faith goes, to salvation. The*

* Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 1, pp. 8—12.

† The fundamental proposition *is—that Jesus is the Christ*. The *fact*, however, contained in this proposition is—that God has anointed Jesus of Nazareth as the only Saviour of sinners. He is the promised Christ: ' God has constituted him Lord and Christ.'—PETER.

belief of this ONE FACT, and all submission to ONE INSTITUTION expressive of it, is all that is required of Heaven to admission into the church. A Christian, as defined, not by Dr. Johnson, nor any creed-maker, but by one taught from Heaven, is one that believes this *one fact*, and has submitted to *one institution*, and whose deportment accords with the morality and virtue of the great Prophet. The one fact is expressed in a single proposition—*that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah.* The evidence upon which it is to be believed is the testimony of *twelve men*, confirmed by prophecy, miracles, and spiritual gifts. The *one institution* is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Every such person is a disciple in the fullest sense of the word, the moment he has believed this one fact, upon the above evidence, and has submitted to the above mentioned institution; and whether he believes the five points condemned, or the five points approved by the synod of Dort, is not so much as to be asked of him; whether he holds any of the views of the Calvinists or Arminians, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, or Quakers, is never once to be asked of such a person, in order to admission into the Christian community, called the church. The only doubt that can reasonably arise upon these points, is, whether this *one fact*, in its nature and necessary results, can suffice to the salvation of the soul, and whether the open avowal of it, in the overt act of baptism, can be a sufficient recommendation of the person, so professing, to the confidence and love of the brotherhood. As to the first of these, it is again and again asserted, in the clearest language, by the Lord himself, the Apostles Peter, Paul, and John, that he that believes the testimony that Jesus is the Christ, is begotten by God, may overcome the world, has eternal life, and is, on the veracity of God, saved from his sins. This should settle the first point; for the witnesses agree that whosoever confesses that Jesus is the Christ, and is baptized, should be received into the church; and not an instance can be produced of any person being asked for any other faith, in order to admission, in the whole New Testament. The Saviour expressly declared to Peter, that upon this fact that he was the Messiah, the Son of God, he would *build his church*; and Paul has expressly declared, that 'other foundation can no man lay (for ecclesiastical union) than that JESUS IS THE CHRIST.' The point is proved that we have as-

sumed; and this proved, every thing *is* established requisite to the union of all Christians upon a proper basis.

It must strike every man of reflection, that a religion requiring much mental abstraction or exquisite refinement of thought, or that calls for the comprehension or even apprehension of refined distinctions and of nice subtleties, is a religion not suited to mankind in their present circumstances. To present such a creed as the Westminster, as adopted, either by Baptists or Paids Baptists; such a creed as the Episcopalian, or, in fact, any sectarian creed, composed, as they all are, of propositions, deduced by logical inferences, and couched in philosophical language, to all those who are fit subjects of the salvation of Heaven—I say, to present such a creed to such for their examination or adoption, shocks all common sense. This pernicious course is what has paganized Christianity. Our sects and parties, our disputes and speculations, our orders and casts, so much resemble any thing but Christianity, that when we enter a modern synagogue, or an ecclesiastical council, we rather seem to have entered a Jewish sanhedrin, a Mahometan mosque, a Pagan temple, or an Egyptian cloister, than a Christian congregation. Sometimes, indeed, our religious meetings so resemble the Areopagus, the Forum, or the Senate, that we almost suppose ourselves to have been translated to Athens or Rome. Even Christian orators emulate Demosthenes and Cicero; Christian doctrines are made to assume the garb of Egyptian mysteries, and Christian observances put on the pomp and pageantry of pagan ceremonies. Unity of opinion, expressed in subscription to voluminous dogmas imported from Geneva, Westminster, Edingburgh, or Rome, is made the bond of union, and a difference in the tenth, or ten thousandth shade of opinion, frequently becomes the actual cause of dismemberment or expulsion. The New Testament was not designed to occupy the same place in theological seminaries that the carcasses of malefactors are condemned to occupy in medical halls—first doomed to the gibbet, and then to the dissecting knife of the spiritual anatomist. Christianity consists infinitely more in good works than in sound opinions; and while it is a joyful truth that he that believes and is baptized shall be saved, it is equally true that he that says, 'I know him, and keeps not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.*

* Christian Baptist, Vol. 1, pp. 167—169.

END OF SECTS.

Will sects ever cease? Will a time ever come when all disciples will unite under one Lord, in one faith, in one immersion, in one hope, in one body, in one spirit, and in adoring one God and Father of all? Will divisions ever be healed? Will strife ever cease among the saints on earth? To these questions, all who pray for the millennium, all who long for its appearance, answer, *Yes*. How, then, shall the union be accomplished? Will all be converted to any one sect? Will all become Unitarians, Trinitarians, Arians, or Socinians? Will all become Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists? Will all become members of any one of the hundred sects of this century? I presume no person of common intelligence will say, *Yes*. All sects know they have some opinions, or some customs, which must be dispensed with. How then shall it be introduced? I answer unequivocally in one sentence, By abandoning opinions, and founding all associations upon the belief of gospel facts. Let every sect give up its opinions as a bond of union, and what will remain in common? The gospel facts alone. Every sect, Catholic and Protestant, admits all the historic facts recorded in the *five* historical books of the New Testament. Their various interpretations, additions, subtractions, and new modifications of opinions concerning these facts, and not the truth or falsehood of the narratives, create all the confusion, build the whole Babel, and set all the machinery of the contending interests in motion. Now, will not the slowest to apprehend see that, if, by any means, they could be induced to abandon their opinions, and retain the plain incontrovertible facts, the strife would be over?

But men cannot give up their opinions, and, therefore, they never can unite, says one. We do not ask them to give up their opinions;—we ask them only not to impose them upon others. Let them hold their opinions; but let them hold them as private property. The faith is public property; opinions are, and always have been, private property. Men have foolishly attempted to make the deductions of some great minds the common measure of all Christians. Hence the deductions of a Luther, and a Calvin, and a Wesley, have been the rule and measure of all who coalesce under the names of these leaders. It is cruel to

excommunicate a man because of the imbecility of his intellect. We have been censured long and often for laying too much stress upon the assent of the understanding; but those who have most acrimoniously censured us, have laid much more stress upon the assent of the mind, than we have ever done. We never did, at any time, exclude a man from the kingdom of God for a mere imbecility of intellect; or, in other words, because he could not assent to our opinions. All sects are doing, or have done this. Their covenants and creeds are deductions, speculative and abstract, from the crucible of some strong skull, and those who would not or could not subscribe to them as the oracles of God, have been given over to Satan. The Baptists are doing this now, in many parts of the country, with an unrelenting hand. They will make a sect, another sect, if they can. But they will not be able to make a sect of those who advocate the ancient order of things; provided they who are now contending for the gospel, will be true to their own cause.

I will now show how they cannot make a sect of us. We will acknowledge all as Christians who acknowledge the gospel facts, and obey Jesus Christ. But, says one, will you receive a Unitarian? No; nor a Trinitarian. We will have neither Unitarians nor Trinitarians. How can this be! Systems make Unitarians and Trinitarians. Renounce the system, and you renounce its creatures. But the creatures of other systems now exist, and some of them will come in your way. How will you dispose of them? I answer, We will unmake them. Again I am asked, How will you unmake them? I answer, By laying no emphasis upon their opinions.

What is a Unitarian? One who contends that Jesus Christ is not the Son of God. Such a one has denied the faith, and therefore we reject him. But, says a Trinitarian, many Unitarians acknowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God in a sense of their own. Admit it. Then I ask, How do you know they have a sense of their own? Intuitively, or by their words? Not intuitively, but by their words. And what are these words? Are they Bible words? If they are, we cannot object to them—if they are not, we will not hear them; or, what is the same thing, we will not discuss them at all. If he will ascribe to Jesus all Bible attributes, names, works, and worship, we will not fight with him about scholastic words: but if he will not ascribe to him every thing that the first Christians ascribed,

and worship and adore him as the first Christians did, we will reject him, not because of his private opinions, but because he refuses to honor Jesus as the first converts did, and withholds from him the titles and honors which God and his apostles have bestowed upon him.

In like manner we will deal with a Trinitarian. If he will ascribe to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, all that the first believers ascribed, and nothing more, we will receive him—but we will not allow him to apply scholastic arid barbarous epithets to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit. If he will dogmatize and become a factionist, we reject him—not because of his opinions, but because of his attempting to make a faction, or to lord it over God's heritage.

And will you receive a Universalist too? No; not as a Universalist. If a man, professing Universalist opinions, should apply for admission, we will receive him, if he will consent to use and apply all the Bible phrases in their plain reference to the future state of men and angels. We will not hearken to those questions which gender strife, nor discuss them at all. If a person say such is his private opinion, let him have it as his private opinion; but lay no stress upon it: and if it be a wrong private opinion, it will die a natural death much sooner than if you attempt to kill it.*

PURITY OF SPEECH.

If I were to classify in *three* chapters the whole Christian institution, after the fashion of the modern schools, for the sake of being understood, I would designate them Christian *faith*, Christian *worship*, and Christian *morality*. To these the moderns have added two others, which, using the same licence, I would call human *philosophy*, and human *traditions*. Now, in the first chapter, we, and all Christians, are agreed: for as Christian faith has respect to *the matters of fact* recorded—to the direct testimony of God found in the New Testament concerning himself—concerning his Son and Spirit—concerning mankind—what he has done, and what he will do, there is no debate. I find all *confessions of FAITH*, properly so called, like the *four* gospels, tell the same story so far as matters of fact or faith are concerned.

* Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 1, pp. 145—147.

In the second chapter we are also agreed, that God is to be worshiped through the Mediator—in prayer, in praise, public and private—in the ordinances of Christian baptism, the Lord's day, the Lord's supper, and in the devotional study of his word and of his works of creation and providence.

In the third chapter we all acknowledge the same moral code. What is morality, is confessed and acknowledged by all; but in the practice of it there are great subtractions.

We repudiate the two remaining chapters as having any place in our faith, worship, or morality; because we think that we have discovered that all the divisions in Protestant Christendom—that all the partyism, vain jangling, and heresies which have disgraced the Christian profession, have emanated from human philosophy and human tradition. It is not faith, nor piety, nor morality; but philosophy and tradition that have alienated and estranged Christians, and prevented the conversion of the world. Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, deserved not the reputation of philosophers, if Calvin, Arminius, and Wesley, were not worthy of it. The former philosophised morally on nature and ancient tradition—the latter, on the Bible, and human society.

Religious philosophers on the Bible have excogitated the following doctrines and philosophical distinctions:—

'The Holy Trinity,' 'Three persons of one substance, power, and eternity,' 'Co-essential, consubstantial, coequal,' 'The Son eternally begotten of the Father,' 'An eternal Son,' 'Humanity and divinity of Christ,' 'The Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son,' 'God's eternal decrees,' 'Conditional and unconditional election and reprobation,' 'God out of Christ,' 'Free will,' 'Liberty and necessity,' 'Original sin,' 'Total depravity,' 'Covenant of grace,'* 'Effectual calling,' 'Free grace,' 'Sovereign grace,' 'General and particular atonement,' 'Satisfy divine justice,' 'Reconciled God,' 'Active and passive obedience of Christ,' 'Common and special operations of the Holy Ghost,' 'Imputed righteousness,' 'Inherent righteousness,' 'Progressive sanctification,' 'Justifying and saving faith,' 'Historic and temporary faith,' 'The direct and reflex acts of faith,' 'The faith of assurance, and the assurance of faith,' 'Legal repentance,' 'Evangelical repentance,' 'Perseverance of the saints,' † and 'Falling from grace,' ‡

* † ‡ These are examples of scriptural phrases misapplied: for the corruption of Christianity has been consummated by the incursions of barbarian language, and by the new appropriations of the sacred style.

'Visible and invisible church,' 'Infant membership,' 'Sacraments,' 'Eucharist,' 'Consubstantiation,' 'Church government,' 'The power of the keys,' &c. &c. &c.

Concerning these and all such doctrines, and all the speculations and phraseology to which they have given rise, we have the privilege neither to affirm nor deny—neither to believe nor doubt; because God has not proposed them to us in his word, and there is no command to believe them. If they are deduced from the Scriptures, we have them in the facts and declarations of God's Spirit; if they are not deduced from the Bible, we are free from all the difficulties and strifes which they have engendered and created.

We choose to speak of Bible things by Bible words, because we are always suspicious that if the word is not in the Bible, the idea which it represents is not there; and always confident that the things taught by God are better taught in the words, and under the names which the Holy Spirit has chosen and appropriated, than in the words which man's wisdom teaches.

There is nothing more essential to the union of the disciples of Christ than *purify* of speech. So long as the earth was of one speech, the human family was united. Had they been then of a pure speech as well as of one speech, they would not have been separated. God, in his just indignation, dispersed them; and before he scattered them, *he divided their language*. One of his Prophets, who lived in a degenerate age, who prophesied against the corruptions of his day, when he spoke of better times, of an age of union and communion, was commanded to say in the name of the Lord, 'Then will I turn to the people a *pure language*, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him *with one consent*.'* Purity of speech is here declared to be prerequisite to serving the Lord with one consent.

'The words of the Lord are pure words. † To have a pure speech we must choose the language of Canaan, and abandon that of Ashdod. And if we would be of one mind, we must 'speak the same thing.' This was Paul's scheme of union, and no man can suggest a better.

It requires but little reflection to discover that the fiercest disputes about religion, are about what the Bible does *not*

* Zephaniah iii. 9. † Psalm xii. 6.

say rather than about what it *does say*—about words and phrases coined in the mint of speculative theology. Of these the *homousios* and the *homoousios* of the ever-memorable Council of Nice are a fair sample. Men are neither wiser, more intelligent, nor better, after, than before, they know the meaning of these words. As far as known on earth, there is not in 'the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,' the name of any person who was either converted or sanctified to God by any of these controversies about human dogmas, nor by any thing learned from the canons or creeds of all the Councils, from that of Nice to the last Methodistic Conference.

It is a virtue, then, to forget this scholastic jargon, and even the name of the dogmas which have convulsed Christendom. It is a concession due to the crisis in which we live, for the sake of peace, to adopt the vocabulary of Heaven, and to return the borrowed nomenclature of the schools to its rightful owners—to speculate no more upon the opinions of Saint Augustine, Saint Tertullian, Saint Origen—to speak of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—of the gospel, of faith, of repentance, of baptism, of election, of the death of Christ, of his mediation, of his blood, of the reconciliation, of the Lord's supper, of the atonement, of the church of God, &c. &c., in all the phrases found in the Record, without any partiality—to learn to love one another as much when we differ in opinion as when we agree, and to distinguish between the testimony of God, and man's reasonings and philosophy upon it.

The Apostle says, 'There is one body, one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one immersion, one God and father of all.' But no where is it said in the sacred book, *There is one opinion*. If, however, unity of opinion were desirable, to attain it, we must give the greatest liberty of opinion; for though once theory with us, it is now matter of experience, that the more stress is laid upon unity of opinion, the less of it, and the more division; and the less regard paid to it, the less emphasis laid upon it, the more we will have of it. This is founded in a law of the human mind, on which it is unseasonable and unnecessary to expatiate.

We have good reason to say, that there exists not the same number of professors in any department of Christendom, amongst whom unity of opinion as much as unity of

faith is the bond of union, so much of one opinion in all matters pertaining to the Christian institution, as amongst the brethren who have agreed cordially 'to receive one another without regard to difference of opinion.' They have not laid so much stress upon it, and therefore they have the more of it.

Amongst Christians there is now, as there was at the beginning, a very great diversity in the knowledge of the Christian institution. There are babes, children, young man, and fathers in Christ now, as well as in the days of the Apostle John. This, from the natural gifts of God, from the diversities of age, education, and circumstances, is unavoidable. And would it not be just as rational and as scriptural to excommunicate one another, because our knowledge is less or greater than any fixed measure, as for differences of opinion on matters of speculation?

Indeed, in most cases where proscription and exclusions now occur in this country, the excluded are the most intelligent members of the society; and although no community will accuse a man because he knows more of his Bible than his brethren, and on this account exclude him from their communion; yet this, it is manifest, rather than heresy, (of which, however, for consistency's sake, he must be accused,) is, in truth, the real cause of separation.

If God has bestowed better gifts or better opportunities on one man than another, by which he has attained more knowledge, instead of thanking God for his kindness to the community, they beg God to take him away; and if he will not be so unkind, they will at length put him from among them under the charge of heresy. In most instances the greatest error of which a brother can be guilty, is to study his Bible more than his companions—or, at least, to surpass them in his knowledge of the mystery of Christ.

I need not say much upon the chapter of *human traditions*. They are easily distinguished from the *Apostles' traditions*. Those of the Apostles are found in their writings, as those of men are found in their own books. Some human traditions may have a show of wisdom, but it is only an appearance. So long as it is written, 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,' so long will it be presumptuous folly to add the commandments of men to the precepts of Jesus Christ. I know of but one way in which all the believers in Jesus Christ, honorably to themselves, honorably to the Lord, and

advantageously to all the sons of Adam, can form one communion. All have two chapters too many in their present ecclesiastic constitutions. The contents of the aforesaid two chapters are various and different in all the sects, but they all have these two chapters under some name. In some they are long, and in some they are short; but whether long or short, let every one agree to tear them out of his book and burn them, and be satisfied with *faith, piety, and morality*. Let human philosophy and human tradition, as any part of the Christian institution, be thrown overboard into the sea, and then the ship of the church will make a prosperous, safe, and happy voyage across the ocean of time, and finally, under the triumphant flag of Immanuel, gain a safe anchorage in the haven of eternal rest.

I would appeal to every honorable, good, and loyal citizen of the kingdom of Heaven—to every one that seeks the good of Zion, that loves the kingdom and the appearing of our common Lord and Saviour, whether such a concession be not due to the Lord, to the saints in heaven and on earth, and to the whole human race in the crisis in which we are now placed; and whether we could propose less, or ought to demand more, than to make one whole burnt offering of all our "empty and deceitful philosophy,"—our "science, falsely so called,"—and our traditions received from our fathers. I would leave it to the good sense of every sane mind to say, whether such a whole burnt offering would not be the most acceptable peace offering, which, in this our day, could be presented on the altar of the Prince of Peace; and whether, under the teachings of the Apostles of the Great Prophet, the church might not again triumphantly stand upon the holy ground which she so honorably occupied before Origen, Augustine, Athanasius, or the first Pope was born!*

* Millennial Harbinger, Vol. 6, pp. 109—113.

Kingdom of Heaven.

GENERAL ESSAYS *

PATRIARCHAL AGE OF THE WORLD.

The world had its infancy as well as man. Families preceded nations. Family worship was, therefore, the first religious institution.

At the head of this institution naturally stood *the Father of every Family*. From necessity, and from choice, he was the prophet, the priest, and the king of his household. As a *prophet*, he instructed his household in the knowledge of God, and in the history of man. As a *priest*, he officiated at the family altar, interceded for those under his care, and pronounced benedictions upon his children. As a *lawgiver* and *king*, he commanded his children and servants, and rewarded them according to merit. By a divine ordinance, the *first fathers of mankind* were thus constituted prophets, priests, and kings. Hence the first religions and political institution is properly called '*the Patriarchal*.'

Family worship was, then, the *first social worship*; and during the first ages of the world (for at least 2500 years) it was the *only social worship*, of divine authority. Though other institutions have since been added, this has never been superseded. Having its foundation in the matrimo-

* These essays do not appear in the order in which they were written and published. We place the last written, first; because, in the natural order of things, general views of the nature of the Christian kingdom, ought to precede the special development of its peculiar institutions. They appeared first in the form of *Extras* to the regular series of the Millennial Harbinger; and as we thought it expedient to preserve them, as much as possible, in their original form, this will apologize for several repetitions which may appear in them.

All the leading and characteristic principles of that reformation for which we plead, as far as the gospel institution is concerned, may be learned from them. Much, indeed, of the proof of some of the propositions found in these essays, lies scattered over the face of several volumes; but such a miniature view of the evidence by which they are sustained, as, in most cases, is sufficient to the conviction of the reader, will be found embodied in them. Those, however, who may not be perfectly satisfied with the arguments offered, must be referred to the various discussions of these principles, found in the Christian Baptist, and Millennial Harbinger.

nial compact, the most ancient of all religious and political institutions, and this being founded on nature itself, it never can be superseded. While the forms of this worship have always been adapted to the genius of the various revelations of God vouchsafed to mankind, it has continued through all the changes of six thousand years, and will continue till the day when men, like the angels of God, shall neither marry nor give in marriage.

Family worship, so long as it continued the only social worship, underwent no material change; and this is the period which is properly called *the Patriarchal Age of the World*. So long as the descendants of one man and one woman continued under the paternal roof, or until they became heads of families themselves, they continued under this religious and political administration. And if, after marriage, they did not migrate to a great distance from the patrimonial inheritance, the paternal authority was still acknowledged and acquiesced in. Thus, in process of time, he who at first was only the head of a single family, if his days were prolonged and his progeny multiplied, became the paternal prince or chief patriarch of a tribe.

In the youth of time and freshness of human nature, families soon became large; and as the father and head could not be always present while he lived, and as he might die before all his children could have become heads of families, it became necessary that a substitute in his absence, and a successor in case of his premature death, should be appointed to fill his place and administer the affairs of the family. Nature and reason alike pointed to the first born son, and religion consecrated him his viceregent. Hence the privileges and honors of the first born son were both religious and political; and thus the duties devolving upon him gave him a right to a double portion of the inheritance. Esau was, therefore, both *prodigal* and *profane* in selling his birthright for a meal of pottage.

The antiquity of this arrangement appeared from the envy and jealousy of Cain, roused at the rejection of his offering, and the acceptance of that of Abel. That jealousy seems to have been kindled into rage because of his birthright. This is fairly implied in God's address to Cain, when that address is fairly translated and understood. 'If you do well, shall you not have the excellency; and if you do not well, sin precludes you (from the excellency.) And

(Abel shall be subject to you) to you shall be his desire and you shall rule over him.*

The moral and religious institutions of the patriarchal or family worship, which continued from the fall of Adam to the covenant of circumcision, were the Sabbath, the service of the altar, oral instruction, prayer, praise, and benediction. With the addition of circumcision in the family of one patriarch, for special purposes, these were the parts of that system which continued for two thousand five hundred years.

The religious observance of weeks or Sabbaths in commemoration of Creation, and prospective of an eternal rest, to arise out of the sacrificial and typical institution, was religiously observed to the giving of the law, or the erection of the Jewish institution. Thus the law of the Sabbath commences with the words, '*Remember the Sabbath.*' The righteous always remembered the weeks, and regarded the conclusion of the week as holy to the Lord. Hence even after the Apostacy, which issued in the neglect of family worship, in consequence of the sons of God intermarrying with the daughters of men, and which brought a flood of water upon the world of the ungodly—we find Noah religiously counting his weeks even while incarcerated in the Ark. In the wilderness of Sin, before the giving of the law, we also find the Jews observing the Sabbath. And to facilitate the observance of it, God wrought three special miracles during the peregrinations of Israel. He gave two days' portion of manna on the sixth day—none on the seventh—and preserved from putrefaction the portion laid up for the Sabbath. †

Sin-offerings and thank-offerings, on altars both of stone and earth, were presented to the Lord—the former, in faith of the promise concerning the bruising of the Serpent's head by the offspring of the woman—the latter, in grateful acknowledgment of the goodness of God in creation and providence. Cain, without faith in the promised redemption, like many deists and natural religionists in our time, did acknowledge the goodness and care of God by a thank-offering; but Abel, *by faith in that promise*, not only offered his thank-offering, but a lamb as a sin-offering; therefore, while God respected not Cain's oblation without faith in

* Genesis iv. 7. † Exodus xvi, 15—27.

that promise, he testified in favor of the *gifts* of Abel—he accepted his sin-offering and his thank-offering.

In the very brief and general outlines of almost two thousand five hundred years given us in the book of Genesis, we find sundry allusions to this part of the patriarchal institution. Immediately after his egress from the Ark, we find Noah rearing his altar upon the baptized earth, and of every clean bird and beast offering to the Lord whole burnt offerings. Thus began Noah, after the deluge, to worship the Lord according to the patriarchal institution. And thus we find Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, and other patriarchs presenting their sacrifices to the Lord, while the family worship was the only religious institution in the world.

Even libations, drink-offerings, and anointing as tokens of gratitude and consecration, are found in this most ancient and venerable institution. 'Jacob rose up early in the morning, took the stone which he had put for his pillow, set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it.'* 'And Jacob set up a pillar in the place where God talked with him, even a pillar of stone, and he poured a drink-offering thereon, and he poured oil thereon.' †

A beautiful and instructive instance of ancient family worship, and of the sacerdotal functions, as exercised by the patriarchs in reference to *the Altar*, we have in that most ancient of books, supposed by many to have been written by Moses while in the land of Midian; but, according to others, by Job himself, who was certainly contemporary with *Eliphaz the Temanite*. Eliphaz was the son of Teman, who was the son of Eliphaz, who was the first son of Esau, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, He therefore lived before Moses, Thus we find him also officiating at the altar. We are told that 'his sons went and feasted in each other's houses, every one his day, and sent and called for their sisters to eat and to drink with them. And it was so, that when the days of their feasting had gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all; for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts. Thus acted Job continually.' ‡

The same Job, by divine appointment, acted as priest or intercessor in behalf of his three friends, princes of Edom:

* Genesis xxviii. 18. † Genesis xxv. 14. ‡ Job I. 4, 9.

for having spoken amiss, they were commanded to take seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to Job the servant of God, and to offer them up for themselves; and 'Job my servant shall pray for you.' 'Job prayed for them, and the Lord accepted his prayer, and forgave Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar.' 'The Lord also accepted and blessed Job after he had prayed for these his friends, and the Lord turned again the captivity of Job.'*

During this period of the world there was but one high or general priest, specially called and sent by God. 'He was King of Salem and Priest of the Most High God.' To him the patriarch Abraham paid tithes or gave the tenth of the spoils taken in war, and Melchisedeck blessed him. He was of an order *sui generis*. He had no predecessor, successor, nor equal in the age of family worship.

From all these facts and documents, we learn that the service of the altar belonged first to the father of the family—next, to his eldest son;—that it consisted in presenting sin-offerings and thank-offerings of various sorts in behalf of himself or family—that all pious sons and individuals might *for themselves* erect altars, offer sacrifices, and pour out libations and thank-offerings to the Lord;—that these sacrificial observances were generally, if not always, accompanied with prayer, intercession, and thanksgivings;— and that intercession in behalf of those under the care of any father or patriarch was a part of the first institution.

Benediction also was one of the duties of this office. Fathers pronounced blessings on their children. Superiors in age and standing blessed their inferiors. Melchisedeck blessed Abraham, Isaac blessed Jacob, and Jacob blessed the twelve patriarchs. The invocation of blessings and the imposition of hands upon the head, were pans of the family worship institution.

Concerning prayer and praise, as we cannot imagine a religion without them, it is unnecessary to speak particularly of them as parts of the patriarchal institution. Jubal soon taught men to handle the harp and the organ, and piety soon consecrated them to the praise of God. The melodies of nature soon taught man to tune his voice to God. Isaac went out into the fields at eventide for secret prayer. Abraham interceded for Sodom until he was ashamed to push his importunities farther; and for Abimelech, king of

* Job xlii. 8—10.

Egypt, and his family, he made his requests to God. Of him and his patriarchal character God said, 'I know Abraham that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the ways of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he has spoken of him.'*

Prophets of a public character were occasionally raised up to bring men back to the primitive simplicity of the patriarchal institution, as well as to lead them forward to the future developments of God's purposes in reference to the work of redemption. Amongst these the most conspicuous were Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. To all these were given new visions of the future, and thus they were all preachers of righteousness and reformers in their respective generations.

From these gleanings from the book of Genesis, one may learn that the family worship institution, which was divinely instituted in the first age of the world, embraced the observance of the Sabbath, the service of the altar, oral instruction, prayer, intercession, thanksgiving, and benediction. It contemplated no other bond of union than the marriage covenant and the relations springing out of it. Doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God, were enforced in all its maxims, and in the examples of those whom God honored and approved.

There was, during the long; period of this family institution, no community separated from the world larger than a single household—no public altars—no temples—no established order of public teachers; therefore, there was no initiating or separating institutions. There was no *circumcision* for the infant, nor *washing of regeneration* for the instructed. These institutions of later times had respect to public professing communities; and, therefore, for two thousand years there was no initiating rite or ordinance amongst men.

Wherever the family curtains were spread and a tent erected, the devout father built his own altar to the Lord, gathered his own children and domestics around him, instructed them in the knowledge of God the creator and preserver of all; and in the history of man, his origin and destiny, as far as revealed to them. They offered their thank-offerings, acknowledgments of favors received; and when

* Genesis xviii. 19.

conscious of sin, they presented their sin-offering, with confessions, and, in faith of God's promise, supplicated pardon, Such are the essential attributes of the patriarchal institution, and of the family worship, as learned from the writings of Moses.

But as the root of all the subsequent dispensations of God's mercy and favor to man was planted in the patriarchal institution, it is necessary to our plan, before we advance farther, to pay some attention to one of these patriarchs, whose fame is eternal, on whom God bestowed an honor above all earthly honor, and who stands enrolled in the annals of time, as THE FRIEND OF GOD. The intelligent reader needs not to be informed that we now call his attention specially to

ABRAHAM.

Reader, attend! 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial to all generations.' And shall not the name, the calling, the blessing, and the history of Abraham always occupy a large space in the records of God's government of man, and in all the details of his redemption!

Because of his unprecedented faith in God's promises and exalted piety, he was constituted the *father of all believers*; and his whole life is made a model for all the children of God, as far as walking by faith in God's promises is an ornament to human character.

Sufficient then to our present purpose, we observe, that *during the family worship institution*, a little after the commencement of the third Millennium, about the 75th year of his life, God appeared to Abraham while he yet lived in Ur of Chaldea, and commanded him to depart out of that country, and that he would do for him certain things. Abraham obeyed. God gratuitously tendered to him *two promises*, not only interesting and valuable to Abraham himself, but to all the human race.

These two promises were intended to be the basis of a two-fold relation to God, and the foundation of two distinct religious institutions called "the Old Testament and the New," "the Old Covenant and the New," "the Two Covenants," and "the Covenants of Promise." There are contemplated in them the constitution for a temporal and spirit-

ual kingdom of God—a kingdom of God of this world, and a kingdom of God not of this world. Be it, therefore, always remembered, when we attempt to form correct views of the whole economy of God's redemption, that these two promises were made while the patriarchal institution was yet standing and several centuries before its close. What, then, it will be asked, are these

TWO PROMISES.

We find them in their most simple form in the beginning of the 12th chapter of Genesis. The first—

'I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great, and thou shall be a blessing. I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee.'

The second—*'In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.'*

These promises when fully developed contained numerous blessings. They are, however, in all their details separate and distinct from each other. Abraham's family alone are personally concerned in the first—all families of the earth in the second. Temporal and earthly are the blessings of the former—spiritual and eternal are the blessings of the latter. Paul calls the second, 'The gospel preached to Abraham,' and 'The covenant confirmed by God in reference to the Messiah, four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law.' The Jewish kingdom in all its glory was but the development of the first—the Christian kingdom in its present and future blessings is the consummation of the second.

COVENANT OF CIRCUMCISION.

In pursuance of the first promise, and in order to its exact and literal accomplishment, about twenty-four years after its promulgation the '*Covenant of Circumcision*' was established. This 'covenant in the flesh,' marked out and defined the natural descendants of Abraham, and gave to the world a full proof of the faithfulness of God, putting it in the power of every one to ascertain how God keeps his covenants of promise with all people. This gave to the descendants of Abraham the title of '*The Circumcision*,' and beautifully represented the separation of God's people from the children of this world.

The land of Canaan, as *the inheritance* of this nation, is repeatedly promised to Abraham; and as soon as Isaac, the child of promise, is born and circumcised, the promise of the 'SEED,' in which all nations were to be blessed, is con-fined to him. Not in Ishmael, but 'in Isaac shall *thy seed* be called.'*

After the death of Abraham and towards the close of the life of Isaac, his father's God gave him a second edition of these two promises. The first is considerably amplified in its details, while the second is repeated almost in the same words. That which was first to be accomplished is first developed, and its provisions pointed out. 'I will be with thee and will bless thee; for unto thee and to thy seed I will give all these countries, and I will perform all the oath which I swear to Abraham thy father; and I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give to thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: because Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.' †

The same two promises are repeated in almost the same words to Jacob the son of Isaac at the time he had the vision of the ladder reaching from earth to heaven, while in obedience to a command given him by his parents, he was on his way to Padan-aram in quest of a wife. On these *three* great occasions—to Abraham—to Isaac—to Jacob—these two promises are solemnly pronounced; always standing in the same order—never confounded; but as distinct as earth and heaven—as time and eternity.

Four hundred and thirty years after the first solemn declaration of these promises, the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in virtue of the promise, were redeemed out of bondage in Egypt, and saved from the tyranny and cruelty of Pharaoh. Then, in order to the *full completion* of its stipulations, God, by the hand of Moses, proposed a covenant with all Israel at Sinai; in which he guaranties to do all for them contemplated in the promise, confirmed by an oath to Abraham, in being a God to his seed after him. This

SINAITIC COVENANT

constituted them a kingdom of God, a holy nation, a peculiar people. All the blessings comprehended in the first

* Genesis xxi. 12. † Genesis xxiv. 3, 5.

promise to Abraham, or that could grow out of the relation to God which it contemplated, were in full detail carried out into this transaction, and secured to the whole nation. The relation was, however, temporal, and its blessings temporal and earthly. The second promise made no part of the Jewish institution or covenant at Sinai, more than it did of the patriarchal or antecedent institution. The typical or figurative part of the family worship, enlarged and improved, was translated into the *national* institution and made a part of it; and whatever *spiritual* privilege was enjoyed by the Jew, was enjoyed upon the same principle with the patriarch—by faith in the second promise, and by an intelligent and believing attendance upon all the appointed means which either prefigured the coming redemption, or realized the blessings which were to be derived through the promised seed.

The SEED in which all the families of the earth were to be blessed, was in the nation, but in no other sense than as it was in the people while in Egypt, or in the patriarchs before they went down into Egypt. It was in the nation, but no element of the national institution. They had the second promise made to their fathers, and all the faithful and approved among them believed that promise, and acted conformably to it. Thus amongst the Jews, even before the coming of the Messiah, there were

TWO SEEDS.

The natural and the spiritual children of Abraham. The whole nation were his literal and natural children; and such of them as believed the second promise and understood it, were not only his natural children, but his children in the same sense in which all *believing Gentiles* are by virtue of the second promise constituted the children of Abraham. The first, like Ishmael, were born according to the flesh—the fleshly seed of Abraham; the second, like Isaac, were the children of faith in the promise: and thus Abraham is the constituted father of all who believe in that promise, whether of his flesh or not.

But the second promise was not fulfilled for nearly one thousand five hundred years after the first, or after the national institution was confirmed at Sinai; and therefore

THE BLESSING OF ABRAHAM,

Which was to come on the nations through his seed, through faith in the accomplished promises, was to be the basis and the substance of a new institution. This 'blessing of Abraham' includes all the spiritual and eternal blessings which were laid up in his seed, who is the ark of this new constitution, in whom all the promises of God are verified, and in whom they are deposited for all the comfort and salvation of all the children of God. Whatever concerned the family of Abraham coming through the first promise, descended upon the family principle, which is only *flesh*; but whatever concerns all saints of all nations, descends up the new principle of *faith*. 'They who are of faith,' says Paul, 'are blessed with believing Abraham.' And 'If you be Christ's then, and only then, 'are you Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise.'

The blessing of Abraham was then promised in the patriarchal age antecedent to the Jewish national institution, and independent of it; therefore, that institution cannot affect, much less disannul, the blessings promised in the covenant, confirmed before by God, respecting the Messiah, in the time of family worship, and four hundred and thirty years before the Jewish institution began.

In calling Abraham, and in making him the father of many nations, and the depository of still more precious promises and revelations, God did not supersede the family worship. He only added to the stock of religious knowledge, strengthened the faith, and enlarged the hopes of that single family. The family institution continued without the slightest change, except in one particular specified in the covenant of circumcision, as respected the single family of Abraham, for four hundred and thirty years after the charter concerning his seed and that concerning the Messiah were secured to this renowned patriarch. Thus we have traced the continuance of the family religion, or patriarchal economy, for two thousand five hundred years, and are now prepared to make a few remarks on the Jewish national institution, though we have already anticipated almost all that is necessary to our present object. Still, however, we shall make it the subject of a distinct notice.

THE JEWISH INSTITUTION.

In this age of improvement of divine institutions, we read and hear much of "two dispensations of the covenant of grace;" thus making the Jewish and the Christian institutions dispensations of one "covenant of grace." Why not make the patriarchal, (still more venerable for its antiquity, and which continued a thousand years longer than the Jewish,) also a dispensation of the covenant of grace, and then we should have had *three* dispensations of one covenant! This is but 'a *show* of wisdom,' The Holy Spirit calls them 'two covenants,' or 'two institutions,' and not two modifications of one covenant; and it speaks of each as established upon promises. The Jewish was established upon temporal and earthly promises, contained in the first promise made to Abraham; but the new, says Paul, 'is established upon *better promises*," growing out of that concerning *the blessing of the nations* in the promised seed.*

The Jewish institution commenced and continued about 1500 years before the Reign of Heaven began. It was not substituted for the family worship, but added to it; affecting, however, the patriarchal institution in some respects, as far as concerned the single family of Abraham. The individual families of the nation of the Jews, *as such*, had still their family worship—still the worship of God was heard in the dwellings of the righteous; and, like Joshua, every good Israelite said, 'As for me and my family, we will serve the Lord.'

In four hundred years the family of Abraham had, in the line of Isaac and Jacob, in fulfilment of the first promise, grown up into millions. Not less than two millions† came up out of Egypt under the conduct of Moses. The heavenly Father, in progressive development of his plan of blessing all nations, leaves all the world under the family worship institution, and erects the whole progeny of Abraham that came up out of Egypt into one great national institution. He condescends to appear in the character of *King of the Jews*, and to make them a *kingdom of God*, as preparatory to the appearance of his *Son*, who is predestined to be the King of the whole earth, and to have a kingdom which shall ultimately embrace all the nations of the world.

* Jeremiah xxxi. 31.

† Men fit for war are never more than the third or fourth of any population. There were six hundred thousand men of this class when they came to Mount Sinai.

The twelve tribes were brought into the form of one great worshipping family, presenting through one common High Priest their united worship to God. This gave rise to the erection of one public house consecrated to the Lord, as the place of meeting in their social and national character. A constitution, political, moral, and religious, was submitted to the people; and on their adoption of it, they became the covenanted people of God. This constitutional kingdom was built upon precepts and promises; and its worship when fully developed was little more than the extension of the family worship to one great national family. They had one king, one high priest, one national altar, one national house of God, one morning and evening sacrifice, one great national sacrifice, and one great annual atonement. The nation was a family of families, and whatever pertained to a single family in its family worship was extended and accommodated to this great confederate family.

Various mystic and significant institutions distinguished this nation from all others; for it was one principal object of its institution to keep its subjects separate and distinct from all other people till Messiah (the promised seed) should come. Another object was, to figure out in appropriate types the spiritual worship of the kingdom of heaven, and to exhibit the great doctrine of faith, repentance, remission, adoption, and inheritance, by picturesque images, ingeniously devised to figure out the whole doctrine of reconciliation and sanctification to God.

The Jewish institution is not to be regarded only in its political, moral, and religious aspect, but especially in its figurative and prospective character. God so wisely and benevolently contrived it from its origin to its close, that its whole history—the fates and fortunes of its subjects from their descent into Egypt, their travels thence to Canaan and settlement in the land of promise—their fortunes in that land to their final catastrophe, should exactly and impressively shadow forth the new institution with the fates and fortunes of the subjects of this new and more glorious order of things. 'All these things happened to them for *types*, (examples,) says Paul, 'and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world come.' The same great commentator on this institution not only presents the history of its subjects as instructive to the citizens of the new institution, but of the tabernacle he says, 'It was a figurative representation for the time then present,' and the

furniture thereof 'the pattern of things in the heavens.' 'The law,' he adds, 'contained only a shadow of the good things to come.' A shadow, indeed, proceeding from a man, a house, a tree, is not, and cannot be, an exact image or representation of them; yet, when explained by a verbal description, it greatly facilitates an easy and correct conception of them.

So full of the doctrine of the new institution was the old, that we find all the Apostles and Christian writers unceremoniously applying everything they quote from the law, the prophets, and the psalms, to the Messiah, his kingdom, and the fortunes of his people; as if the Jewish writings had no other object than to unfold the kingdom of heaven. Jesus' begins with Abraham seeing his day on Mount Moriah in the typical resurrection of Isaac. Paul regards Hagar, Ishmael, Sarah, Isaac, as the best illustration of the *two institutions*; and John ends with the description of the descent of Jerusalem from heaven.

Every one, then, who would accurately understand the Christian institution must approach it through the Mosaic; and he that would be a proficient in the Jewish, must make Paul his commentator. While the mere politician, moralist, or religionist contemplates the one without the other, though he may find much to admire in both, he will never understand either. A veil, thick as that which concealed the glory of the face of Moses from the Israelites, will hide the glory of the Jewish and Christian institution from his view.

Not only did the tabernacle, the temple, their furniture, the service of both, the priests, the sacrifices, the festivals, the convocations, and all the ordinances of that Ritual, together with the history of that people, assume the picturesque and figurative character, but almost all the illustrious and highly distinguished personages of that institution were made prophetic or typical of the Messiah, or of the great incidents of his life, sufferings, and triumphs, and the leading affairs of his government. Amongst *persons* in the patriarchal and Jewish ages, who, in one or more prominent characters or incidents, or in their general history adumbrated the Messiah and his reign, the following group occupy a lofty eminence:—Adam, Abel, Noah, Melchisedeck, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Samson, David, Jonah. Of *things* of this class, as well as persons highly figurative and instructive, are the vision of Jacob's

ladder—the burning bush—the pillar of cloud and fire—the manna—the rock Horeb, a fountain of living water in the wilderness—the veil of Moses—the brazen serpent—the victory over the nations of Canaan, and the land of Canaan itself. And of *ordinances*, the passover, the scape goat, the red heifer, the year of jubilee, the law of the leper, the kinsman redeemer, the cities of refuge; together with all the sacrifices, washings, anointings, and consecrations of the *holy* nation.

But a third object of the Jewish institution, of paramount importance to the world, was the furnishing of a new alphabet and language (the elements of heavenly science,) without which it would appear to have been almost, if not altogether, impossible to learn the spiritual things, or to make any proficiency in the knowledge of those relations which Christianity unfolds. The language of the new institution is therefore explained by that of the old. No one can understand the dialect of the kingdom of heaven who has not studied the dialect of the antecedent administrations of heaven over the patriarchs and Jews. The most striking and characteristic attribute of the sacred dialect is, that the elements of it are composed of the incidents of history, or what we call *remarkable providences*.

I cannot explain myself better, nor render my readers, a more essential service, than by illustrating by an actual detail of sacred history, the following proposition, viz:— *That sacred history, or the remarkable instances of God's providences to the Jews and Patriarchs, are the foundation of the sacred dialect of the new institution.* Or, if the" — reader will understand it better, it may be thus expressed— *All the leading words and phrases of the New Testament are to be explained and understood by the history of the Jewish nation and God's government of them.* Take the following as a mere specimen:—

God *called* Abram out of Ur, and changed his name into *Abraham*; and the name of his wife Sarai into *Sarah*. He *promised* Isaac as the person in whom his *seed* should be *called*. God did *tempt* Abraham, commanding him to *offer* Isaac for a burnt-offering—Isaac had two sons—Esau the elder, and Jacob the younger. Esau *despised* his *birthright* and *sold* it to Jacob. Jacob wrestled with God, and *prevailed*; he obtained a blessing, and was therefore called *Israel*. He had *twelve* sons: of these Joseph was his favorite. His brethren *envied* him, and *sold* him for twenty

pieces of silver. Joseph *found grace* in the sight of his master. *The Lord was with Joseph*. He was cast into prison, and from thence was elevated to be the *governor* of Egypt under Pharaoh. A famine in Canaan compelled Jacob and his sons into Egypt for bread, and Joseph was *made known* to his brethren. Joseph died in Egypt and left his father's house in that land. They multiplied exceedingly, and the Egyptians greatly *afflicted* and *oppressed* the] Israelites. *Moses* was born and exposed: Pharaoh's daughter found him and *adopted* him for a son. Moses fled into Midian, and married the daughter of the priest or prince of Midian, and kept his father-in-law's flock in the *desert*, and came to Horeb, *the mountain of God*. The Lord appeared to him in *a flame of fire* in a bush. The bush burned and was not consumed. Moses *drew near*, and then first stood on *holy ground*. God *sent* him to Egypt to lead *his* people out of *bondage*.

God bade him say to the *children of Israel*, 'I AM has sent me to you. Gather the *elders* of Israel, and say to them, *The Lord God* of your fathers, the God of Abraham,' &c., 'has sent me to you. I will *smite* Egypt with my *wonders*, and *bring you up out of the afflictions* of Egypt. Tell Pharaoh, Israel is *my son—my first born*. Take Aaron with thee, and thou shall *put words into his mouth*; and I will be *with thy mouth* and with his mouth: he shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shall be to him *instead of God*. Take thy *rod* in thy hand. The Lord *sent* Aaron to Moses: he met him in the mount and *kissed* him. And the Lord *visited* his people. And the people *believed when they heard* that the Lord had *looked upon* their affliction. Pharaoh oppressed them still more. The Lord said with a *strong hand* shall he let them go. I will *redeem* them with a stretched out arm arid with great *judgments*. I will give you Canaan for a *heritage*: I will take you to me *for a people*. I will be *your God*?

Moses said, I am a man of *uncircumcised lips*, and how shall Pharaoh *hearken* to me? I have made thee *a God* to Pharaoh, and Aaron *thy prophet*. I will multiply my *signs*, and bring out *my people*, and *harden* Pharaoh's heart. When he says, 'Show me a miracle,' cast your rod before him, and *it shall become* a serpent. Still Pharaoh refused, and *hardened his heart*. The magicians overcome with the *signs*, said, *This is the finger of God*. The *God of the Hebrews* said, Let *my people* go. I have *roused* thee up

(as a lion) to show in you my power and to make *my name known* through *all the earth*. The Lord slew all the *first born* of Egypt after he had *plagued* them exceedingly. Pharaoh commanded them to depart; but he pursued them to the Red Sea. Israel fainted at the sight before and behind them. Moses said, Stand still and see *the salvation of God*. The sea was divided. Covered with a cloud, Israel marched through as on dry ground. The waters stood on either side as a wall. Pharaoh pursued with his chariots and horsemen, but the waters returned and they were drowned. Thus the Lord *redeemed, saved, delivered, and brought Israel out of bondage*.

After this deliverance, Moses and the children of Israel sang, 'The Lord is become *my salvation*] he is *my God*. Thou hast overthrown them that *rose up against thee*. Thou hast *led forth thy people* whom thou *hast redeemed*. Thou *hast guided them* in thy strength to thy *holy habitation*. The inhabitants of Canaan shall be still as a stone till *thy people* pass over, O Lord! the people *thou hast purchased*. Thou shall plant them in the mountain of *thine inheritance* — in the *sanctuary* which *thy hands* have *established*.'

They came into *the wilderness of Sin*. They cried for bread, and God *rained bread from heaven upon them*, that he might *prove* them whether or no they would *walk in his law*: and they did eat manna forty years, till they came to the borders of Canaan.

They complained for water, and tempted God. And Moses *smote the rock* in Horeb, and water gushed out. But Moses was wroth, and smote the rock twice; and he and Aaron thus *rebelled* against God, and fell in the wilderness. The Lord made a covenant with the whole nation at Sinai, and made them a *peculiar treasure* above all people—a *kingdom of priests, a holy nation*; and God *spake* all the words of the law, written on two tables of stone; and *spake to Israel from heaven*.

The Lord by Moses gave them directions for rearing a *tabernacle*, and a pattern for all its furniture. And as *a ransom, for his soul*, every man, rich and poor, was to pay half a shekel as an *offering to the Lord*, to *make an atonement* for his soul; and it was given for *the service* of the tabernacle. When the tabernacle! was reared and finished, *the glory of the Lord* filled the tabernacle and the *cloud* covered it. And when the cloud *was taken tip* they journeyed; but until it was taken up they journeyed not. The

cloud was on the tabernacle by day, and *fire* was on it by night, in the sight of all Israel throughout all their journeys.

And before Moses died he *laid his hands* upon Joshua, and gave him a *charge* as the *Lord commanded*; and thus put *honor* upon him, that the children of Israel might be *obedient* to him as their *saviour*. 'As I was *with Moses*, so will I be *with thee*,' saith God; 'I will not fail thee *nor forsake* thee.'

Could we thus proceed with the history of this people, and add to their history the observances of their religious institutions, we should find out the true meaning of the sacred style of the New Testament with more accuracy and certainty, than from all the commentators of ancient and modern times. This, as a sample, must suffice for our present purpose.

From the premises now before us, the specifications of the outlines of the Sinaitic and national institution, and the terms and phrases found in the history of this people, we may discover in what *relation* they stood to God, and what *favours* he bestowed upon them in that relation.

They were the *called* and *chosen*, or the *elect* of God as a nation. As such, they were *delivered*, *saved*, *bought*, or *purchased*, and *redeemed*. God is said to have *created*, *made*, *formed*, and *begotten* them. As such, he is called their *Father*, their *God*, their *Redeemer*, their *King*, their *Saviour*, their *Salvation*; and they are called his *children*, *sons*, and *daughters*, *born to him*, his *house*, *people*, *inheritance*, *family*, *servants*.

As a *chartered* and congregated people, they are called *the city*, *the holy city*, *the city of the Lord*, *Jerusalem*, *Zion*, *Mount Zion*, *the city of David*. Other nations, in contrast with them, are called, *not a people*, *aliens*, *strangers*, *enemies*, *far off*, *unclean*,

Various similitudes expressive of the kind relation in which they stood to God, are also found on the pages of the ancient institution—such as *husband* and *wife*, *shepherd* and *flock*, *vine* and *vineyard*, *mother* and *children*. They are said to be *written* or *enrolled* in *the book of God*; to be *planted*, *washed*, *sanctified*, *clean*, *separated to God*; they are called *the house*, *building*, *sanctuary*, *dwelling place* of God; *a kingdom of priests*, *a holy nation*, *a peculiar people*, *saints*, &c.

Those who are curious to trace these phrases descriptive

of the relation and privileges of this ancient kingdom of God, had better (in addition to the passages quoted in their history from Egypt to the Jordan,) examine the following passages:—Exodus xiv. 30. xv. 10. xix. 6. Deuteronomy iv. 37. vii. 6. x. 15. xiv. 1. I. 31. vii. 5. xxxii. 6, 18, 19. xviii. 7. iii. 18, 20. xii. 9. 1 Kings iii. 8. Psalms cv. 6. xxxiii. 12. cv. 43. cvi. 5, 21. lxxiv. 2. cxlix. 2. Isaiah xli. 8, 9. xliii. 1, 3, 5, 7. li. 2, 4. xli. 1, 6, 7. xxviii. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Psalms of David throughout, &c. &c.

Unless we should write a full treatise on these antecedent institutions, we cannot with propriety descend farther into details. The outlines, as far as subordinate to the theme of this essay, are now before the reader; and with this preparation we shall now invite his attention to THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

And why, an *American* will say, is it not called the *Republic* of Heaven, and the Chief called the *President* of a Celestial Republic? Certainly there were the Republics of Greece and Rome before the doctrine of this Kingdom was first promulged, and the Gentiles as well as the Jews could have understood the figure of a Republic as well as that of a Kingdom. It was not, then, because there was not in society a model or type of this sort; but because such a type would have been inapposite to the nature of this institution.

History testifies that Republics are better adapted to peace than war, and that they are forced and unnatural organizations of society. Aristocracies and Republics owe all their attractions to the excessive corruptions of the governments under which they have originated. They are the reaction of force and fraud, of cruelty and oppression, and are sustained by the remembrance and apprehension, of the evils which occasioned them. They have always been extolled and admired either in contrast with the vices and enormities of degenerate and profligate monarchies, or in the freshness of the recollections of the wrongs and outrages which occasioned them; and men have generally tired of them when they became corrupt and forgetful of the oppressions and crimes which forced them into being. So that the corruptions of Monarchies have given birth to Republics, and the corruptions of these have originated Monarchies again.

In these last days of degeneracy, Republics are great blessings to mankind, as good physicians are blessings in

times of pestilence; but yet it must be confessed that it would be a greater blessing to be without plagues and doctors. While men are, however, so degenerate, and while selfishness and injustice are so rampant in society, republican officers are better than kings—because we can get rid of them sooner. They are, indeed, kings under another name, with a short-leased authority; and our experience fully demonstrates that in these degenerate days the reigns of our republican kings are nearly long enough. Till the King of kings comes, we Christians ought to be good republicans, under the conviction that human governments seldom grow better, and that the popular doctrine of our country is true—that political authority generally makes a man worse, and public favors almost invariably corrupt the heart. Rapid rotation in office is the practical influence of the republican theory; and the experiment proves that, brief as republican authority is, it is sometimes too long for republican virtue to sustain without deterioration. Now if this be true of republican virtue, the brightest and the best, what earthly virtue can long resist the contamination of long protracted authority!

Monarchy is the only form of government, however, which nature recognizes. It was the first, and it will be the last. A government with three or thirty heads is a monster; and therefore the beast that represents it comes out of the sea with a plurality of horns as well as heads.

The most approved theory of human nature and of human government now current wherever the English language is spoken, either in the Old World or in the New, is, that a monarchy would be always the best government, because the cheapest, the most efficient, and the most dignified; provided only, that the crown was always placed on the wisest head and the scepter wielded by the purest hands. Could we always secure this we would all be monarchists: because we cannot, we are all republicans.

But after this apology for the phrase *Kingdom of Heaven*, we would recall the attention of the reader to the concession, made by republicans themselves, that a kingdom is better adapted to a state of war, than a republic; and that this beautiful, though most appropriate-figure, which occurs in the New Testament more than one hundred and fifty times, and very often in the Old, presupposes a state of war as existing in the universe. But for the reason assigned in preference of monarchy, the *natural* government of the

universe, always was, is, and evermore shall be monarchy. God himself is of necessity absolute monarch of the universe. Had he not essentially sustained that relation to all his creatures, there never could have been rebellion nor sin in his dominions. The systems of nature are all after this model. Every sun is a king over the system which it controls; and in every sphere there is one controlling and supreme principle. It will be the last government; for when the episode in the great drama of *rational* existence which sin occasioned, shall have been completed, the government of the universe will assume its ancient order, and God be supreme monarch again. But this will not be till Jesus gives up the kingdom to God, which a preternatural state of things put into his hands. This cannot be till he has subdued man to his rightful allegiance, or destroyed forever every opponent to the absolute monarchy of the Eternal Supreme: 'for Jesus must reign till all his enemies be put under his feet.'

The kingdom which Jesus has received from his Father, however heavenly, sublime, and glorious it may be regarded, is only temporal. It had a beginning, and it will have an end; for he must reign only *till* all enemies are put under his feet. But the transition of the scepter into the hands of Emanuel has not changed the government. He is now the hereditary Monarch of the universe, as well as the proper King of his own kingdom. He now reigns as absolutely over all principalities, hierarchs, and powers, celestial and terrestrial, as did the great God and Father of the universe, before he was invested with the regal authority.

We have said it was a preternatural state of things which originated the kingdom of Jesus: therefore the object of this remedial reign is to destroy that preternatural state of things—to put down sin. Now as all human governments presuppose disorder, and as the kingdoms of this world generally have arisen out of confusion and war, this kingdom of heaven of which we are to speak owes its origin to the celestial and terrestrial apostacies—the revolt of Satan and of Adam. Were there not injustice within, or violence without, civil government would be wholly unnecessary, and its appendages an excrescence upon society. Had there not been such a revolt and rebellion as sacred history records, there would have been no such kingdom of heaven as that over which Jesus the Messiah *now* presides. Now

as both this King and kingdom, and all that appertains to them, were occasioned by such a preternatural state of things, we must view them in all their attributes and details, with reference to those circumstances which called them into being.

THE ELEMENTS OF A KINGDOM.

We must understand the type, or we cannot understand the antitype. We must understand that which is natural before we can understand that which is spiritual. What, then, are the essential elements of a kingdom as existing among men? They are five, viz: King, Constitution, Subjects, Laws, and Territory. Such are the essential parts of every political kingdom, perfect in its kind, now existing on earth.

In *forming a state*, the essential elements are people and country. The people make a constitution, and this makes a President or King, citizens or subjects, and every thing else belonging to a state. It is, then, the relation into which the people resolve themselves, which makes it a republic, an aristocracy, a monarchy. Do they choose a monarchy? They first make a constitution, and this places one upon the throne—makes them subjects, and he gives them laws. Although the constitution is first, in the order of nature, of all the elements of a kingdom, for it makes one man a king and the rest subjects; yet we cannot imagine a constitution in reference to a kingdom, without king and subjects. In speaking of them in detail, we cannot then speak of any one of them as existing without the others—we must regard them as correlates, and as coming into existence contemporaneously. There is no husband nor wife before marriage, neither can there be a husband without a wife; yet one of the parties must be made before the other. Marriage makes a husband out of the bridegroom, and a wife out of the bride. So the constitution makes the king or the governor; the citizens or subjects, out of the people, as the case may be: for there never can be a king or subject without a constitution, or, what is the same thing, an agreement, verbal or written, for certain privileges stipulated and conditioned. In every well regulated political kingdom, *in the order of nature*, the elements stand thus: 1. Constitution; 2. King; 3. Subjects; 4. Laws; 5. Territory.

In the kingdom which God set up by Moses, the elements stood in this order. The constitution was first proposed under which God condescended to be their King, and they were to be regarded as his people or subjects; he then gave them laws and established them in the territory before promised.

But in the kingdom of nature, or in the original kingdom of God, the elements are only four, and the order in which they stand, are: 1. King; 2. Subjects; 3. Laws; 4. Territory. As Father and Creator of that kingdom, God himself was absolute Sovereign, whose will is the supreme law of the whole realm of nature.

Having ascertained the essential elements of a *kingdom*, and marked the order in which they stand, before we particularly attend to these elements in order, we shall be able, Why this kingdom is called the Kingdom of *Heaven*?

THE NAME

Heaven, and the Kingdom of Heaven are not one and the same thing. God is not the Kingdom of God. But as the kingdom of God is something pertaining to God, so the kingdom of heaven is something pertaining to heaven, and consequently to God. Whether always the phrases 'the kingdom of God' and 'the kingdom of heaven' exactly represent the same thing, certain it is that both phrases are often applied to the same institution.*

This is true of them, whether translated *reign* or *kingdom*; and it is very evident, that frequently the original word *basileia* ought in preference to be rendered *reign*, inasmuch as this term better suits all those passages where *coming* or *approaching* is spoken of: for while reigns or administrations approach and recede, kingdoms have attributes and boundaries which are stationary. Reign and Kingdom of God, though sometimes applicable to the same subject, never contemplate it in the same light. They are, indeed, as intimately connected as the reign of King William and the Kingdom of Great Britain. The former represents the administration of the kingdom, and the latter the state over which this administration extends.

* If the following; passages are carefully examined and compared, it will appear that both these phrases often represent the same thing:—Matt. iii. 7. Mark I. 14. Luke iv. 43.—Matt. viii. 12. Mark iv. 11. Luke viii. 10.—Matt. xi. 11. Luke vii. 28. To these three distinct evidences many more might be added. What Matthew calls 'the Kingdom of *Heaven*,' Mark and Luke call 'the Kingdom of God.'

Two good reasons may be offered why Matthew, the oldest Christian writer, generally prefers Kingdom or Reign *"of Heaven*, to the phrase Kingdom or Reign of *God*: I say *generally*, for he occasionally uses *both* designations.* He wrote to Jews in Judea who expected a Messiah, a King, and a kingdom of God on *earth*, a mere improvement of the Jewish system; and, therefore, to raise their conceptions he delights to call it the Reign or Kingdom of *Heaven*, in contrast with that earthly kingdom of God, of which they were so long in possession.

He also found a good reason in the idiom of the Jewish prophets for using the word *Heaven* (both in the singular and plural form) for God. Daniel told the Assyrian monarch that his kingdom would be sure to him when he should have learned that 'the *Heavens* do rule;' yet, in the preceding verse he says, 'Till thou knowest that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men'—thus using *Heavens* and *the Most High* as synonymous. The Psalmist says, 'The wicked set their mouths against the *Heavens*.' The Prodigal confesses that he had 'sinned against *Heaven*,' and Jesus himself asked whether the baptism of John was 'from *Heaven* or from men.' Thus he was authorized from the Jewish use of the word to regard it as equivalent to *God*. If, then, Matthew had meant no more by the phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' than the 'Kingdom of God,' he was justified by the Jewish use of the word *heaven*, to apply it in that sense. Some may object to all these remarks upon Matthew's manner, that it was Jesus Christ and the preachers he, commissioned who called it the Kingdom of Heaven, and not Matthew Levi. To such we reply, that the other sacred writers uniformly, in reciting all the same parables and incidents, use the phrase 'Kingdom of God,' and *never* the phrase 'the Kingdom of Heaven.'

From his use of the phrase 'Kingdom of God,' we must, I think, regard him as having special reference to the reason first assigned. He does not say the Kingdom of *Heaven* shall be taken from the Jews; but, 'The Kingdom of *God* shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits of it:' for although it might with propriety, in his acceptance, be said, that the Jews already had the kingdom of God, it could not be said that they had the kingdom of *Heaven* as proclaimed by Matthew.

†

* See chapters vi. 33. xii. 28. xix. 24. xxi. 31,43. † Matt. xxi. 43.

When compared with the earthly kingdom of God among the Jews, it is certainly the kingdom of *Heaven*; for Jesus alleges that his kingdom is not of this world; and Daniel affirmed that in the days of the last worldly empire the God of Heaven would set up a kingdom unlike all others then on earth; in which, as Paul teaches, men are 'blessed with every spiritual blessing in heavenly places in Christ: '* for he has *raised* us Jews and Gentiles, and 'has set us down together in the heavenly places by Christ Jesus.' †

There is, in the superior and heavenly privileges and honors bestowed upon the citizens of this kingdom, the best reason why it should have first been presented to the world under this title, rather than any other; and, for the same reasons which influenced Matthew to usher it into notice in Judea, under this designation, we ought now to prefer it; because many of our contemporaries, like the ancient Jews, see as much of heaven and glory in the veiled grace of the Mosaic institution, as in the unveiled grace of the Christian kingdom. The pertinency of this title will appear still more evident as we develop the constitutional privileges of this kingdom.

But most evidently the kingdom of Heaven is '*the kingdom of Christ and of God.*' ‡ It is the kingdom of God, because he set it up, || gave the constitution and King, and all the materials out of which it is erected. § It is the kingdom of Christ, because God the Father gave it to him as his Son, and as the *heir of all things*; and therefore, 'all that is the Father's is mine,' says Jesus, 'and I am his.' ¶ '*God created all things BY Jesus Christ and FOR him.*' "

Having, then, noticed the reasons for the characteristic *titles* of this kingdom, and having already ascertained what are the elements absolutely essential to a kingdom, distinguished from those merely circumstantial or accidental, we shall now proceed to consider, in the order suggested, the Constitution, King, Subjects, Laws, and Territory of the Kingdom of Heaven.

CONSTITUTION.

God himself, after the gracious counsels of his own will, proposed and tendered the constitution of this kingdom to his own Son. This 'glory he had with the Father before

* Eph. I. 3. † Eph. ii. 6. ‡ Eph. v. 5. || Daniel ii. 44. § Jer. xxxi. 31-34. ¶ John xvii. 18.

the world was.' He that was 'in the beginning with God' —'*the wisdom and power of God*'—was set up [constituted] from everlasting, or ever the earth was. 'Then was I with God, as one brought up with him; I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him—rejoicing in the habitable parts of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men.'* Therefore, he who was to be '*ruler in Israel*' was with God in counsel 'in the beginning of all his ways;' for 'his goings forth were from old, even from the days of eternity.' †

It was TO DO THE WILL, or fulfil the items in this constitution, that '*the WORD* was made flesh and dwelt among us.' 'I came to *do the will* of him that *sent* me,' and to finish 'the work *given* me to do.' 'I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to resume it; this commandment I received from my Father.' The Father 'commissioned and sent him forth into the world.' He 'came down from heaven.' 'Thou hast given me power over all flesh, that I might give eternal life to all that thou hast given me.'

These, and many other passages which the reader will easily remember, unequivocally evince that an understanding and agreement existed ere time began between God and the WORD of God—or, as now revealed, between the FATHER and the Sox, respecting the kingdom. In consequence of which, 'the *Word* was made flesh and dwelt among us'—in consequence of which, 'he divested himself of his antecedent glory—'took upon him the form of a bondservant'—'was made in the likeness of sinful flesh'—'took part with us in flesh and blood.' In consequence of which agreement, and the promised glory, for 'the joy set before him in the promise,' of 'seeing his seed, the travail of his soul, and being satisfied,' 'he endured the cross, despising the shame,' and 'was made perfect through sufferings to lead many sons to glory.'

To the stipulations concerning eternal life, propounded in the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, frequent allusions are made in the Apostles' writings. Thus the believers were 'elected in *him* before the foundation of the world,' and 'eternal life was promised before the times of the ages,' 'according to the benevolent purpose which *he purposed in himself* for the administration of the fulness of

* Prov. viii. 23—31. † Micah v. 21.

the appointed times, to gather together all under Christ— all in the heavens and all on the earth, tinder him.' He formerly marked us out for an adoption through Jesus Christ to himself, according to his purpose, who effectually works all things according to the counsel of his will.*

From all these sayings and allusions, we must trace the constitution of this kingdom into eternity—before time began. We must date it from *everlasting*, and resolve it into the absolute gracious will of the eternal God. In reference to all the prospective developments of time, 'known to God from the beginning,' it proposed to make the WORD flesh, and then to make the incarnate Word, called Emanuel, or Jesus Christ, the *King*, to give him all who should be reconciled to God by him for *subjects*, to put under him ail the angelic hosts, and constitute him monarch of earth, *lawgiver* to the universe; and thus make him heir and Lord of all things.

As a constitution brings all the elements of a kingdom into a new relation to one another, so it is the measure and guarantee of all the privileges, immunities, and obligations accruing to all the parties in that relation. It prescribes, arranges, and secures all the privileges, duties, obligations, honors and emoluments of the King and the subjects. Neither of them can claim more than it stipulates and guaranties, and neither of them can rightfully be deprived of any of them.

From the premises now before us, and the light given to us in these scriptures and those in the margin, we learn—

First. That God is the author of the constitution of the kingdom of heaven; that he propounded it to the WORD that was made flesh, before the world was, in prospect of all the developments of creation.

Second. That the WORD accepted it, because the will of God was always his delight; therefore he said, 'I come to do thy will, O God!' Hence '*God* has so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on him may not perish, but obtain eternal life.'

Third. That in consequence 'all *authority* in heaven and earth' was given to Jesus Christ, and all orders of intelligence subjected to him, that he might be *King* over all, and have the power of giving eternal life to his people.†

Fourth. That the earth is now the Lord's, the present

* Eph. I. 3—12.

† Matt, xxviii. *ib.* ii. 44 vii. 27.

temporal territory of his kingdom; that the heathen people are given to him for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; that all ends of the earth are his, and all dominions, kindreds, tribes, tongues, and people shall yet serve him on earth, and glorify him in heaven.*

Fifth. That all that he redeems are his seed—his subjects: that he will have their faith, confidence, esteem, admiration, and gratitude forever: that he will be worshiped, honored, and revered by them in a world without end: that God, angels, and saints will delight in him for ever and ever.† He has, therefore, to raise the dead, judge the world, and to present the redeemed pure, holy, happy, and triumphant before his Father, and then to give up the kingdom to God.

To comprehend, in any adequate degree, the constitution of this kingdom, we must learn more than its history, or the way in which it was introduced and propounded. We must regard all the elements of the kingdom as *constitutional elements*—the King as a constitutional King; the subjects, laws, and territory, including the ultimate inheritance, as constitutional subjects, laws, territory, inheritance; and, therefore, we shall speak of them in detail.

THE KING.

The Lord Jesus Christ is the constitutional monarch of the kingdom of heaven. The privileges guaranteed to him in reference to the kingdom are the following:—

As King, he is to be the *oracle* of God—to have the disposal of the Holy Spirit—to be Prophet and High Priest of the Temple of God—to have the throne of his Father—to be Governor of all nations on earth, and head of all hierarchs and powers in heaven—the supreme Lawgiver, the only Saviour, the resurrection and the life, the ultimate and final Judge of all, and the Heir of all things.

These honors, privileges, and powers, are secured to him by the irrevocable grant of the God and Father of all; therefore, as said Isaiah, 'The Lord cometh with a strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him. Behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him.' 'I have set my

* Psalms ii. 6—8. lxxii. 2—18. Daniel † Rev. v. 9—14, xiv, 1—5. xvi. 3, 4. xxi. 9-27. Eph. I. 20, 21.

King upon my holy hill of Zion.' 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.' 'I have made him a leader and commander of the people'—'a light to the Gentiles'—'salvation to the ends of the earth'—'a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck.' 'Sit thou at my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool.' 'The government shall be upon his shoulders.' 'All things are delivered to me of my Father.' 'He is Lord of the dead and living.' 'Angels, authorities, and powers are subjected to him.' 'The Father gave the Spirit without measure to him.' 'He received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit' 'The kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the governor among the nations.' He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth.' 'They shall fear thee as long as sun and moon endure to all generations.' 'The Father has committed all judgment to the Son.'

But, not to weary the reader with quotations and proofs, we shall give but another:—'Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my elect, in whom my soul delights. I have put my Spirit upon him. He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not fall nor be discouraged till he have set judgment in the earth; and the Isles shall wait for his law.—I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand and keep thee, and give thee for a *covenant* [a CONSTITUTION] of the people for a *light* to the Gentiles—to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house.'*

THE SUBJECTS OF THE KINGDOM.

They are all born again. Their privileges and honors are the following:—

First. Their constitutional King is the only begotten Son of God; whose title and honors are—image of the invisible God—Effulgence of the Father's glory—Emanuel—Upholder of the universe—Prophet of the Prophets—High Priest of the Temple of God—King of kings—Lord of lords—the only Potentate—Commander and Covenant of the people—Captain of Salvation—Counselor, Lawgiver,

* Isaiah xlii. 1-7, xlix.8.

Redeemer, Deliverer, Mediator, Saviour, Advocate, Judge. He is Sun of Righteousness, Prince of Peace, Lamb of God, Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root and Offspring of David, the Bright and Morning Star, Light of the World, the Faithful and True Witness, Bishop of Souls, Great Shepherd of the Sheep, Head of the Church, Lord of all, Heir of the Universe, the Resurrection and the Life, the Son of Man, the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End, the Amen, &c. &c. Such is the Christian's King, whose assistance in all these characters, offices, and relations, as exhibited under all these figures, is guarantied to him in the Constitution. Indeed it is all expressed in one promise—'*I will be your God, and you shall be my people.*'

Second. It is guarantied that 'their sins and iniquities are to be remembered no more.' 'There is no condemnation to them who are under Christ.' 'Sin shall not have dominion, nor lord it over them.' The Lord imputeth to them no sin. They are all pardoned, justified, and saved from sin.

Third. They are adopted into the family of God; made sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty; children of God, and heirs—joint heirs with Christ. They have an Advocate in the heavens, through whom their persons and prayers are accepted.

Fourth. They all know the Lord. 'All thy children shall be taught of God.' The Holy Spirit of God writes the law of God upon their hearts, and inscribes it upon their understanding; so that they need not teach every one his fellow-citizen to know the Lord, 'for they all know him from the least to the greatest.' They are all sanctified through the truth—separated and consecrated to God.

Fifth. They have the promise of a resurrection from the dead, and eternal life; an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading—new heavens and a new earth, in which righteousness alone shall dwell forever.

Such are the constitutional rights and privileges of the citizens of the kingdom of heaven. And these have obtained for them the following titles and honors:—Kingdom of heaven; Israel of God; chosen generation; body of Christ; children of God; habitation of God; family of God; Jerusalem from above; Mount Zion; peculiar people; the elect of God; holy nation; temple of the Holy Spirit; house of God; city of the living God; pillar and ground of

the truth; living stones; seed of Abraham; citizens of heaven; lights of the world; salt of the earth; heirs of God; joint heirs with Christ, &c. &c. &c.

These privileges, honors, and emoluments belong to every citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Indeed, they are all comprehended in the summary which Paul (from Jeremiah) lays before the believing Hebrews:—'This is the constitution which I will make with the house of Israel after those days: I will put my laws into their mind, and inscribe them upon their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know him, from the least of them to the greatest of them; because I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more.* To this summary the reader may add those scriptures in the margin, as confirmatory of the above. †

THE LAWS OF THE KINGDOM.

The supreme law of this kingdom is *love*—love of the King and love of each other. From this law all its religious homage and morality flow. Precepts and examples innumerable present this to the mind of all the citizens. The kingdom of heaven is divided into small societies, called *churches*, or *congregations of the Lord*. Each of these communities in the reception of members, in the education and discipline of them, or in excluding them when necessary, is to be governed by the apostolic instructions: for to the Apostles the Saviour committed the management of his kingdom. After they had made citizens by preaching the gospel and baptizing, they were commanded to teach them to observe whatsoever the Saviour had commanded them.

These laws and usages of the Apostles must be learned from what the Apostles published to the world, after the ascension and coronation of the King, as they are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles: for we shall see in the sequel that the gospel was fully developed, and the

* Hebrews viii. 10—13. † Rom. vi. 5, 6, 14. viii. 1, 33—39. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Eph. I. 7. ii. 6, 19, 21, 22. Col. I. 13, 14. 1 Peter ii. 5—7. 2 Peter I. 10, 11. 1 John ii. 2.

whole doctrine of the Reign of Christ *began* to be proclaimed in Jerusalem on the first Pentecost after the ascension. The old, or Jewish constitution, was promulged first on Sinai on the first Pentecost after the redemption of Israel from Egyptian bondage; and from that day, and what is written after it in Exodus and Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, all the laws, manners, and customs authorized by the national constitution are to be found. They are not to be sought after in Genesis, nor in the antecedent economy. Neither are the statutes and laws of the Christian kingdom to be sought for in the Jewish scriptures, nor antecedent to the day of Pentecost; except so far as our Lord himself, during his life time, propounded the doctrine of his reign. But of this when we ascertain the *commencement* of this kingdom.

There is one universal law of naturalization, or for making citizens, out of all nations, enjoined upon those citizens of the kingdom who are engaged in the work of proselytism; but the laws of this kingdom, like the laws of every other kingdom, are obligatory only on the citizens.

The weekly celebration of the death and resurrection of Jesus, and the weekly meeting of the disciples of Christ for this purpose, and for the edification of one another in their most holy faith, are the only positive statutes of the kingdom; and, therefore, there is no law, statute, or observance in this kingdom, that in the least retards its extension from East to West, from North to South, or that can prevent its progress in all the nations of the world.

It is, however, worthy of observation, that every part of the Christian worship in the small communities spread over the territory of the kingdom of heaven, like so many candlesticks in a large edifice, are designed to enlighten and convert the world; and, therefore, in all the meetings of the family of God, they are to keep this supremely in view; and to regard themselves as 'the pillar and ground of the truth.'

Concerning the details of the laws of the kingdom, we cannot now speak particularly. 'The favor of God which brings salvation, teaches all the citizens of heaven, that, denying all ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, expecting the blessed hope—namely, the appearing of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all

iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.' These things the Bishops of every community should teach and enforce; for such is the spirit and such is the object of all the laws and statutes of the kingdom of heaven.

THE TERRITORY.

In all other kingdoms, except the kingdom of heaven, the territory is the national domain and inheritance. It was so in the first kingdom of God under the constitution from Sinai. But in, the typical kingdom they lived at a distance from their inheritance for one generation. During these forty years, in which they pitched their tents in the wilderness, *God was their inheritance*. He rained bread from heaven upon them, and sent them flesh upon the east wind. He made the flinty rock Horeb a living spring,

whose stream followed them all the way to Jordan. He renewed their garments every day, so that for forty years they grew not old, nor needed a single patch. A pillar of fire by night and a cloud by day guided them towards Canaan, the land of their inheritance.

The whole earth is the present territory of the kingdom of heaven, but the new heavens and earth are to be its *inheritance*. The earth, indeed, is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; but the children of God and the children of the wicked one—the *wheat* and the *darnel*, are both planted in it, and must grow together till the harvest. The righteous have their bread and water guaranteed to them while they live; for 'godliness is profitable to all things, having promise *of the life that now is*, as well as of that which is to come.' But the joint heirs of Christ are never taught to regard the earth as their inheritance. They may indeed say, though poor and penniless, 'All things are ours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come—all are ours, and we are Christ's, and Christ is God's.' But, like the Jews on their journey to Canaan, 'they seek a better country'—'they seek a city yet to come.' 'My kingdom,' says Jesus, 'is not of this world.' And, therefore, in the world Christians are strangers and pilgrims, and may expect tribulation.

The earth is the present *theatre of war*; therefore all Christians in the territory are *soldiers*. Their expenses,

their rations are allowed, the arms and munitions of war are supplied them from the magazines in Mount Zion, the strong hold and fortress of the kingdom; where the King, the heads of departments, and all the legions of angels are resident. So that on entering the Army of the Faith every soldier is panoplied with the armor of God; and when inducted into the heavenly tactics under the Captain of Salvation, he is expected to be a good soldier of Jesus Christ, and to fight the good fight of faith courageously and victoriously.

The kingdom of heaven on this territory is greatly opposed by the kingdom of Satan, which ever seeks to make an *inheritance out* of the territory of the militant kingdom of righteousness; and, therefore, the citizens have not to wrestle with flesh and blood, but with the rulers of the darkness of this world—with spiritual wickedness in high places.

Ever since the commencement of this kingdom, the governments of this world have either been directly opposed to it, or, at best, pretended friends; and, therefore, their influence has always been opposed to the true spirit and genius of the Christian institution. Christians have nothing to expect from them except liberty of conscience and protection from violence, while leading peaceable and quiet lives, in all godliness and honesty, till Jesus take to himself his great power, and hurl all these potentates from their thrones, and make his cause triumphant—a consummation devoutly to be wished, and which cannot now be regarded as far distant.

MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

Touching *the manners and customs* of the kingdom of heaven, they are such as generally obtained in the land of Judea and in the East at the time of its erection; or, rather, they are the simple manners and customs of the *family worship age* of the world. These are consecrated by simply performing them with a regard to Jesus Christ, or from the motives prompted by the doctrine of the Reign of Heaven. As we treat our natural brothers and sisters in public and in private—as we address, salute, and converse with them—as we transact all family business, and conduct the affairs of the household—so are Christians to treat one

another. There is no other virtue or utility in these, than as they cherish brotherly kindness and love, and are regarded to the Lord.

INDUCTION INTO THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

Into every kingdom, human or divine, there is a legal door of admission. This is, in the statute book of Heaven, called a *birth*. Into the kingdom of nature we are born. Into the future and ultimate kingdom of glory we enter, soul and body, by being born from the grave. As Christ, the first born from the dead, entered the heavenly kingdom, so must all his brethren. And as to this kingdom of which we speak, as now existing in this world, Jesus himself taught that into it no person can legally enter who is not born again, or '*born of water and the Spirit*.'* The analogy is complete between the kingdoms of nature—of grace—and of glory. Hence we have natural birth, metaphorical or spiritual birth, and supernatural birth. There is a being born of the flesh—born of the Spirit—born of the grave; and there is a kingdom for the flesh—a kingdom for the Spirit—and a kingdom for the glorified man.

This second, or new birth, which inducts into the kingdom of God, is always subsequent to a death and burial, as it will be into the everlasting kingdom of glory. It is, indeed, a literal death and burial before a literal resurrection, into the heavenly and eternal kingdom. It is also a metaphorical or figurative death and burial, before the figurative resurrection or new birth into the kingdom of heaven. Water is the element in which this burial and resurrection is performed, according to the constitutional laws of the kingdom of heaven. Hence Jesus connects the water and the Spirit when speaking of entering this kingdom of God.

In naturalizing aliens, the commandment of the King is first to submit to them the Constitution, or preach to them *the gospel of the kingdom*. Soon as they understand and believe this, and are desirous of being translated into the kingdom of Christ and of God, that 'they may receive the remission of sins and inheritance among all that are sanctified,' they are to be buried in water, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and raised out of it confessing their death to sin, their faith in Christ's sacrifice and resur-

* John iii. 5. Titus iii. 5.

rection; and thus they are born of water and the Spirit, and constituted citizens of the kingdom of heaven. *To as many as thus receive him he gives privilege to become the children of God;* for they are *'born of God'*—born of God, when born of water and the Spirit, because this is the institution of God.

In these days of apostacy men have sought out many inventions. Some have attempted to get into the kingdom of heaven without being born at all. Others imagine that they can be born of the Spirit, without water, and that the King is as well pleased with them who have been born without a mother, as those who are lawfully born of father and mother. Others think that neither Spirit nor water is necessary; but if they are politically born of the flesh, they can enter the kingdom as rightfully as the Jewish circumcised infants enter the earthly kingdom of Israel. But as we have no faith in any modern improvements of the gospel, change or amendment of the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, we must leave them to account to the King himself, who *'have transgressed the law, changed the ordinance, and broken the everlasting covenant;'** and proceed to the question,

THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM.

When did the kingdom of heaven commence? 'With the ministry of John' says one: 'With the ministry of Jesus,' says another: 'With the first sending out of the Twelve Apostles,' says a third: 'At the resurrection of Jesus,' says a fourth: 'At none of them; but by degrees from the baptism of John to the fall of Jerusalem,' says a fifth.

The reader will please remember that there are at least *five elements* essential to a perfectly organized kingdom, and that it may be contemplated in reference to one or more of these component parts. Hence the numerous and various parables of the Saviour. Sometimes he speaks of the administration of its affairs—of its principles in the heart—of its subjects—of its King—of its territory—of its progress—of various incidents in its history. Hence the parable of the sower—of the wheat and darnel—of the leaven —of the merchant seeking goodly pearls—of the grain of

* Isaiah xxiv. 5.

mustard seed—of the sweep net—of the marriage of a king's son—of a nobleman going into a far country—of the ten virgins—of the talents—of the sheep and goats, present to our view the kingdom of heaven in different attitudes, either in its elements or in its history—its commencement or its close.

The approaching or the coming of the reign of heaven, can properly have respect only to one or two of the elements of a kingdom; or to the formal exhibition of that whole organization of society which we call a *kingdom*. It can have no proper allusion to its territory; for that was created and located before man was created. It cannot allude either to the persons who were constituted subjects, for they too were in existence before the kingdom commenced. It cannot allude to the birth or baptism of the King, for it was not till after these that Jesus *began* to proclaim its coming or approach. It cannot have reference to the ministry of John or of Jesus, any more than to the patriarchal or Jewish dispensations; because Jesus did not begin to proclaim the coming of this reign *till after John was cast into prison*. This is a fact of so much importance, that Matthew, Mark, and Luke distinctly and circumstantially declare, that in conformity to ancient predictions, Jesus was to begin to proclaim in *Galilee*, and *that he did not commence to proclaim the doctrine or the gospel of the coming of the Reign, 'till after John's ministry ceased and he was cast into prison*. In this assertion the Evangelists agree:—'Now Jesus [after his baptism and temptation in the wilderness] hearing that John was imprisoned, retired into Galilee; and having left Nazareth, resided at Capernaum. For thus saith the Prophet,' &c. From that time Jesus *began* to proclaim, saying, '*Reform, for the Reign of Heaven approaches;*' or, 'The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand,' as says the common version.*

Some Baptists, for the sake of *immersion*, and some of our brethren in the Reformation, for the sake of *immersion for the remission of sins*, seem desirous to have John in the kingdom of heaven, and to date the commencement of the Christian dispensation with the first appearance of John the Immerser. They allege in support of this hypothesis that Jesus said, 'The Law and the Prophets continued till John,' (the only instructors of men;) 'since that time the

* Matt. iv. 12. Mark I. 14. Luke iii. 30. iv. 14.

kingdom of God is preached, and every man presses into it.' 'Publicans and harlots show you the way into the kingdom of heaven,' said Jesus to the Pharisees. Again, 'Alas! for you Scribes and Pharisees! for you shut the kingdom of heaven against men, and will neither enter yourselves, nor permit others that would, to enter.' 'The kingdom of God is within you.' 'The kingdom of heaven has overtaken you.' From these premises they infer that the kingdom of heaven was actually set up by John the Baptist: 'For,' *Bay* they, 'how could men and women *enter into a kingdom* which was *not* set up? And did not John immerse for the remission of sins, and call upon men to repent and reform in order to baptism?'

The Paidobaptists, too, will have Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, David, and all the circumcised Jews in the kingdom of heaven, because Jesus said, 'Before Abraham was, I am;' 'Abraham saw my day and was glad;' and Paul says Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures of Egypt, and forsook Egypt in faith of the Christian recompense of reward. Yes, and Paul affirms that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their families, who dwelt in tents in the promised land, looked not only to the rest in Canaan, but they sought a heavenly country, and expected the city of foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Thus the Jews had Christ in the manna and in the rock, and baptism in the cloud and in the sea.

The mistake is specifically the same. Christ was promised and prefigured before he came, and the kingdom of heaven was promised and preached by John, by Jesus, the Twelve, and the Seventy, (who went about proclaiming the glad tidings of the Reign) before the reign of Christ, or kingdom of heaven, commenced. Because Christ was promised and prefigured in the patriarchal and Jewish ages, the Paidobaptists will have the kingdom of heaven on earth since the days of Abel; and because the glad tidings of the reign and kingdom of heaven and the principles of the new and heavenly order of society were promulgated by John, the Baptists will have John the Baptist in the kingdom of heaven, and the very person who set it up.

Let us, then, examine this matter with all candor: and first, we shall place the passages above quoted out of the testimonies of the Evangelists on one side, and the following passages on the other side; and then see if we can reconcile them. John says, 'Reform, for the reign of God ap-

preaches.' Jesus began to proclaim, saying, 'Reform, for the reign or kingdom of heaven is at hand.' He also commanded the Twelve and the Seventy to peregrinate all Judea, making the same proclamation.* Of John the Baptist he said, though greater than all the Prophets, 'The least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.'

Thus after John was beheaded, we have some eighty-four preachers daily proclaiming the nigh approach of the reign of God; and Jesus often assuring his disciples that the kingdom of God was soon to appear, and that some of his companions would see him enter upon his reign before they died—and yet the kingdom was set up by John! Scribes and Pharisees were shutting the kingdom against men, when Jesus had only given the keys to Peter! John the Baptist was in the kingdom, and the least in the kingdom is greater than he! More than eighty preachers say, 'Reform, for the Reign of heaven is at hand;' and John the Baptist before he died, introduced all Judea and Jerusalem into it! How, then, shall we reconcile these apparent contradictions? Make both sides figurative, and it may be done. Regard both sides literally, and it cannot be done! To say that the kingdom came in one point of view at one time, and in another point of view at another time, is only to say that it came in different senses—literally and figuratively. For our part we must believe that the kingdom of heaven began, or the reign of heaven literally and truly commenced in one day.

Many of its principles were developed by the ancient Prophets: David, Isaiah, and others wrote much concerning it; John the Baptist proclaimed its immediate and near approach, and more fully developed its spiritual design; therefore, he was superior to them. Jesus often unfolded its character and design in various similitudes; and everyone who understood and received these *principles* were said to 'press into the kingdom,' or to have 'the kingdom within them;' and wherever these principles were promulged, 'the kingdom of heaven' was said to 'come nigh' to that people, or to 'have overtaken them;' and those who opposed these principles and interposed their authority to prevent others from receiving them, were said to 'shut the kingdom of heaven against men;' and thus all those scriptures must of

* Matt. x. 8. Luke x. 1—11. When eating the last supper he distinctly said that the reign of God was then future. Luke xxii. 18.

necessity be understood from the contexts in which they stand: for it was impossible that the reign of heaven could 'literally commence *'till Jesus was glorified,'* 'received the promise of the Holy Spirit,' was 'made Lord and Christ,' and 'sat down with his Father upon his throne'—for he left this earth *to receive a kingdom.**

To make this, if possible, still more evident, we ask, *When did the kingdom of God, established by Moses amongst the seed of Abraham, cease?* This question penetrates the whole nature and necessity of the case: for will any one suppose that there were two kingdoms of God on earth at one and the same time? Certainly the one ceased before the other began.

Now that the kingdom of God, ministered by Moses, had not ceased during the personal ministry of the Messiah on earth, is, we think, abundantly evident from the following facts and documents:—

First. Jesus was to have appeared, and did appear, *'in the end of the world,'* or last days of the first kingdom of God. 'In the conclusion of the age has he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' The 'world to come' was one of the names of the gospel age. He has not subjected 'the world to come' to the angels, as he did the world past, says Paul to the Hebrews. He appeared, then, not in the beginning of the gospel age, but in the end of the Jewish age.

Second. The Temple was the house of God to the very close of the life of Jesus. For it was not till the Jewish ministry conspired to kill him that he deserted it. At the last festival of his life, and immediately before he fell into their hands, on walking out of the Temple, he said, 'Behold your house is deserted, for you shall not see me henceforth till you shall say, Blessed be he that comes in the name of the Lord!' It was his Father's house, the house of God till that moment. Then, indeed, the glory departed.

Third. The Jewish offerings and service, as a divine institution, continued till the condemnation of Jesus. He sent the cleansed leper to the priest to make the offering commanded in the law. He commanded the people to hear the doctors of the law who sat in Moses' chair. He paid the didrachma. He was a minister of the circumcision. He lived *under*, not *after* the law. He kept all its ordi-

* Luke xix. 11—15.

nances, and caused all his disciples to regard it in its primitive import and authority to the last passover. *Indeed, it could not be disannulled, for it was not consummated till on the cross he said, 'IT IS FINISHED!'*

Fourth. When he visited Jerusalem the last time, and in the last parable pronounced to them, he told them plainly 'the kingdom of God should be taken from them' and given to a nation who should make a better use of the honors of the kingdom; consequently at that time the Jews had the kingdom of God.

Fifth. It was not until his death that the veil of the Temple was rent; that the things 'which could be shaken were shaken.' It was then, and not till then, that he nailed the legal institution to his cross. Then, and not till then, was the middle wall of partition broken down. The last Sabbath he slept in the grave. *From the moment of his death there was no life in the old kingdom of God.* The Temple was deserted, its veil rent, its foundation shaken, the city devoted, the ritual abolished, and as after death the judgment,—the Temple, city, and nation waited for the day of his vengeance.

The kingdom of God was evidently in the Jewish institution till Jesus died. Hence the kingdom of heaven came not while Jesus lived. In anticipation, they who believed the gospel of the kingdom received the kingdom of God, just as in anticipation he said, 'I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do' before he began to suffer; and as he said, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood, shed for the remission of the sins of many,' before it was shed. So while the doctrine of this reign—faith, repentance, baptism, and a new principle of sonship to Abraham were promulging by John, the Twelve, the Seventy, and by himself, the kingdom of heaven was approaching; and those who received these principles by anticipation were said to enter into the kingdom, or to have the kingdom within them.

The principles of any reign or revolution are always promulged, debated, and canvassed before a new order of things is set up. A party is formed upon these principles before strength is acquired, or a leader obtained competent to the commencement of a new order of things. In society, as in nature., we have first the blade, next the stem, and then the ripe corn in the ear. We call it wheat, or we call it corn, when we have only the promise in the blade. By such a

figure of speech the kingdom of God was spoken of, while as yet only its principles were promulging.

When these American states were colonial subjects of the King of England, and long before the setting up of a Republic, republican doctrines were promulged and debated. The believers and advocates of these doctrines were called Republicans, while as yet there was not a republic on this continent. He who dates the commencement of the kingdom of heaven from the ministry of John the Baptist, sympathizes with him who dated the American Republics from the first promulgation of the republican principle, or from the formation of a republican party in the British colonies. But as a faithful and intelligent historian, in writing the history of the American Republics, commences with the history of the first promulgation of these principles, and records the sayings and deeds of the first promulgers of the new doctrines; so the sacred historians began their history of the kingdom of heaven with the appearance of John in the wilderness of Judea, preaching the Messiah, faith, repentance, a holy life, and *raising up a new race of Israelites on the principle of faith rather than of flesh*; for this in truth was 'the blade' of the kingdom of heaven.

Having from all these considerations seen that until the death of the Messiah his kingdom *could not* commence; and having seen from the record itself that it *did not* commence before his resurrection, we proceed to the development of things after his resurrection, to ascertain the day on which this kingdom was set up, or the reign of heaven began.

The writer to whom we are most indebted for an orderly and continued narrative of the affairs of the kingdom of heaven, is the Evangelist Luke. His history begins with the angelic annunciations of the nativity of John and Jesus, and ends with the appearance of the great standard-bearer of the Cross in Imperial Rome, A. D. 64. That part of his history to which we now look as a guide to the affairs of the commencement of the Reign, is the notices which he makes of the *forty days* which the Lord spent in his crucified body, previous to his ascension. The reader Ought not to be told (for he ought to know) that Jesus rose in the same body in which he was crucified, and in the reanimated fleshly body did eat, drink, and converse with his Apostles and friends for forty days, That body was not

changed till, like the living saints who shall be on the earth at his second personal coming, it was made spiritual, incorruptible, and glorious at the instant of his ascension. So that the man Christ Jesus was made like to all his brethren in his death, burial, resurrection, transfiguration, ascension, and glorification; or rather, they shall be made to resemble him in all these respects.

The Apostles testify that they saw him ascend—that a cloud received him out of their sight—that angels descended to inform them that he was taken up into heaven, not to return for a long time—that he ascended far above all the visible heavens, and now fills all things. Stephen, when dying, saw him standing on the right hand of God.

Much attention is due to all the incidents of these forty days—as much, at least, as to the forty days spent by Moses in the Mount with God in the affairs of the preceding kingdom of God. For the risen Messiah makes the affairs of his approaching kingdom the principal topic of these forty days.* Towards the close of these days, and immediately before his ascension, he gave the commission to his Apostles concerning the setting up of this kingdom. 'All authority in heaven and in earth is given to me: go, *therefore*,' said he, 'convert the nations,' [announce the gospel to every creature,] 'immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe *all the things* which I have commanded you; and behold! I am with you always, even to the conclusion of this state.' † 'But continue in the city of Jerusalem until you be invested with power from on high.' Thus according to his promise and the ancient prophecy, it was to '*begin at Jerusalem.*' ‡

The risen Saviour thus directs our attention to Jerusalem as the *place*, and to a period distant 'not many days,' as the *time* of the beginning of his reign. The great facts of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, not being yet fully developed to his Apostles, they were not qualified to take any steps to the setting up of a kingdom which was to be *founded upon Christ crucified*. They needed an interpreter of these facts, and a supernatural advocate of the pretensions of the King, before they could lay the foundation of his kingdom.

* Acts I. 3. † Matt. xxviii. 17, 20. Mark xvi. 16. Luke xxiv. 47, 48. ‡ Isaiah ii. 3. Micah iv. 2.

Again, the King himself must be glorified before his authority could be established on earth; for till he received the promise of the Spirit from his Father, and was placed on his throne, the Apostles could not receive it; so that Christ's ascension to heaven and coronation were indispensable to the commencement of this reign of Heaven.

Here let us pause for a moment—leave the earth, and on the wings of faith in the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, the two witnesses for Jesus, let us follow him to heaven and ascertain his reception into the heaven of heavens, and exaltation to the right hand of God.

THE ASCENSION OF THE MESSIAH.

Prophets and Apostles must now be heard. David, by the Spirit, says, 'The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels; the Lord is among them as in Sinai in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious, that the Lord God might dwell among them.'* The same Prophet, in speaking of the solemn and joyful procession at the carrying up of the ark of the ancient constitution into Mount Zion, turns his eyes from the type to the antitype, and thus describes the entrance of the Messiah into heaven:—'Who shall ascend into the hill of God?' The attendant angels in the train of the Messiah, approaching the heaven of heavens, shout, 'Lift up your heads, O you gates', be lift up, you everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in.' Those within, filled with astonishment that any one should so confidently demand admission into those gates so long barred against the sons of men, responsive shout, 'Who is the King of Glory?' The angels in attendance upon the Messiah reply in strains as triumphant, 'The Lord, strong and mighty! the Lord, mighty in battle!' and still more exultingly triumphant, shout, 'Lift up your heads, O you gates', even lift them up, you everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this king of glory? He is the Lord of Hosts', he is the King of glory!' †

* Psalm lxxviii. 8 † Psalm xxiv,

CORONATION OF THE MESSIAH.

Every thing in its proper order. He that ascended first descended. Jesus died, was buried, raised from the dead, ascended, and was crowned Lord of all. In the presence of all the heavenly hierarchs, the four living creatures, the twenty-four seniors, and ten thousand times ten thousand angels, he presents himself before the throne. So soon as the first born from the dead appears in the palace royal of the universe, his Father and his God, in his inaugural address, when anointing him Lord of all, says, 'Let all the angels of God worship him'—'Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thy enemies thy footstool.' 'Jehovah shall send out of Zion [Jerusalem] the rod of thy strength: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies, [the city of thy strongest foes.] 'Thy people, willing in the day of thy power, shall come to thee. In the beauty of holiness, more than the womb of the morning, shall thou have the dew of thy progeny. The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedeck. The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings [that oppose thee] in the day of his wrath.' 'Thy throne, O God, endures forever: the scepter of thy kingdom is a scepter of rectitude. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, thy God, has anointed thee with the oil of joy above thy fellows. Thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thy hand: they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they shall all grow old as does a garment, and as a vesture shall thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.'*

Thus God highly exalted him, and did set him over all the works of his hands, and gave him a name and an honor above every name in heaven and on earth, that at the name of Jesus glorified every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess, to the glory of God.

'Now we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, that he might taste death for all, on account of the sufferings of death, crowned with glory and honor'—Now 'angels, authorities, principalities, and powers are subjected

* Psalms xc. c. and Hebrews I.

to him.' 'His enemies will I clothe with shame, but upon himself shall his crown flourish,'

The Holy Spirit sent down by Jesus from heaven, on the Pentecost after his resurrection, to the disciples in attendance in Jerusalem, informs the Apostles" of all that had been transacted in heaven during the week after his ascension, and till that day. Peter now filled with that promised Spirit, informs the immense concourse assembled on the great day of Pentecost, that God had made that Jesus whom they had crucified both Lord and Christ—exalted him a PRINCE and a Saviour to grant repentance to Israel and remission of sins.

The first act of his reign was the bestowment of the Holy Spirit, according to the prophecy of Joel and his own promise. So soon as he received the kingdom from God his Father, he poured out the blessings of his favor upon his friends; he fulfilled all his promises to the Apostles, and *forgave three thousand of his fiercest enemies*. He received pardons and gifts for them that did rebel, and shed forth abundantly all spiritual gifts on the little flock to whom it pleased the Father to give the kingdom. Thus commenced the Reign of Heaven, on the day of Pentecost, in the person of the Messiah, the Son of God, and the anointed Monarch of the Universe. Under him, his people, saved from their sins, have received a kingdom which cannot be shaken nor removed.

But as the erection of the Jewish tabernacle, after the commencement of the first kingdom of God, was the work of some time, and of united and combined effort, on the part of those raised up and qualified for the work; so was the complete erection of the new temple of God. The Apostles, as wise master builders, laid the foundation— promulged the constitution, laws, and institutions of the King, and raised the standard of the kingdom in many towns, cities, and countries, for the space of forty years. Some of them not only saw 'the Son of Man enter upon his reign,' and the kingdom of God commence on Pentecost, and carry its conquests over Judea, Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth; but they saw the Lord 'come with power' and awful glory, and accomplish all his predictions on the deserted and devoted temple, city, and people. Thus they saw a bright display of the golden scepter of his grace in forgiving those who bowed to his authority, and an appalling exhibition of the iron rod of his

wrath in taking vengeance on his enemies who would not have him to reign over them.

PRESENT ADMINISTRATION OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

During the personal absence of the King, he has committed the management of this kingdom to stewards. These were, first, Apostles; next in them, Prophets; next, teachers; then, assistants, or helpers; then directors or presidents, all furnished with gifts, knowledge, and character, suited to their respective functions. Besides these, many persons possessed of miraculous powers—gifts of healing and speaking foreign languages, were employed in setting up and putting in order the communities composing the kingdom of heaven. Angels also were employed, and are still employed, under the great King in administering to them who are heirs of salvation. For Jesus now, as Lord of all, has the Holy Spirit at his disposal, and all the angels of God; and these are employed by him in the affairs of his kingdom.*

The Apostles were plenipotentiaries and ambassadors for Jesus, and had all authority delegated to them from the King. Hence every thing was first taught and enjoined by them. They were the first preachers, teachers, pastors, overseers, and ministers in the kingdom, and had the direction and management of all its affairs.†

The communities collected and set in order by the Apostles were called *the congregations of Christ*, and all these taken together are sometimes called *the kingdom of God*. But the phrases 'church of God,' or 'congregation of Christ,' and the phrases 'kingdom of heaven,' or 'kingdom of God,' do not always nor exactly represent the same thing. The elements of the kingdom of heaven, it will be remembered, are not simply its subjects, and therefore not simply the congregations of disciples of Christ. But as these communities possess the oracles of God, are under the laws and institutions of the King, and therefore enjoy the blessings of the present salvation, they are, in the records of the kingdom, regarded as the only constitutional citizens of the kingdom of heaven; and to them exclusively belongs *all the present salvation*. Their King is now in

* 1 Cor. xii.28. Eph. iv. 11. Heb. I. 14. † 2 Cor. iii. C. v. 18—20.

heaven, but present with them by his Spirit in their hearts and in all the institutions of his kingdom.

Every immersed believer, of good behaviour, is, by the constitution, a free and full citizen of the kingdom of heaven, and entitled to all the social privileges and honors of that kingdom. Such of these as meet together stately in one place in obedience to the King, or his ambassadors the Apostles, for the observance of all the institutions of the King, compose a family, or house, or congregation of Christ; and all these families or congregations, thus organized, constitute the present kingdom of God in this world. So far the phrases *kingdom of heaven* and *the congregation or body of Christ* are equivalent in signification.*

Now in gathering these communities, and in setting them in order, the Apostles had, when alive, and when dead, by their writings still have, the sole right of legislating, ordering, and disposing of all things. But it is not the will of Jesus Christ, because it is not adapted to human nature, nor to the present state of his kingdom as administered in his absence, that the church should be governed by a *written* document alone. Hence in every city, town, and country where the Apostles gathered a community by their own personal labors, or by their assistants, in setting them in order, for their edification, and for their usefulness and influence in this world, they uniformly appointed Elders, or overseers, to labor in the word and teaching, and to preside over the whole affairs of the community. To these also were added *Deacons*, or public *ministers* of the congregation, who, under the direction of the overseers, were to manage all the affairs of these individual families of God. This the very names *Bishop* and *Deacon*, and all the qualifications enjoined, fairly and fully import.

But as all the citizens of the kingdom are free men under Christ, they all have a voice in the selection of the persons whom the Apostles appoint to these offices. The Apostles still appoint all persons so elected, possessing the qualifications which they, *by the Holy Spirit*, prescribed. *And if a congregation will not elect to these offices the persons possessing these qualifications; or if by a waywardness and selfishness of their own, they should elect those unqualified, and thus disparage those marked out by the possession of those gifts; in either case, they despise the authority of the*

* Rom. xii. 4-8. 1 Cor. xii. 27. Heb. iii. 6.

Ambassadors of Christ, and must suffer for it. It is, indeed, the Holy Spirit, and not the congregations, which creates Bishops and Deacons. The Spirit gives the qualifications, both natural and acquired, and, speaking to the congregations in the written oracles, commands their ordination or appointment to the work.*

In the present administration of the kingdom of God, *faith is the PRINCIPLE, and ordinances the MEANS of all spiritual enjoyment.* Without faith in the testimony of God, a person is without God, without Christ, and without hope in the world. A Christless universe, as respects spiritual life and joy, is the most perfect blank which fancy can create. Without faith, nothing in the Bible can be enjoyed; and without it, there is to man no kingdom of heaven in all the dominions of God.

In the kingdom of nature *sense is the principle, and ordinances the means of enjoyment.* Without sense, or sensation, nothing in nature can be known or enjoyed. All the creative, recuperative, and renovating power, wisdom, and goodness of God, exhibited in nature, are contained in ordinances. The sun, moon, and stars—the clouds, the air, the water, the seasons, day and night, are therefore denominated the *ordinances* of Heaven, because God's power, wisdom, and goodness are *in* them, and felt by us only *through* them. † Now sense, without the ordinances of nature, like faith, without the ordinances of religion, would be *no principle* of enjoyment; and the ordinances of nature, without sense, would be *no means* of enjoyment. These are the unalterable decrees of God. There is no exception to them; and there is no reversion of them. To illustrate and enforce the doctrine of this single paragraph is worthy of a volume. The essence, the whole essence of that reformation for which we contend, is wrapped up in this decree as above expressed. If it be true, the ground on which we stand is firm and unchangeable as the Rock of Ages; if it be false, we build upon the sand. *Reader, examine it well!*

In the kingdom of heaven, faith is, then, the *principle*, and ordinances the *means* of enjoyment; because all the wisdom, power, love, mercy, compassion, or *grace of God*, is in the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven; and if all

* Acts vi. 2—7. xiv. 23. xx. 17—36. Philip, I. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 1—16. Titus I. 5—10. Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24.

† Jeremiah xxxi. 35, 36 Job xxxviii. 31—33. Jeremiah xxxiii. 23.

grace be in them, it can only be enjoyed through them. What, then, under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven, are the ordinances which contain the grace of God? They are, preaching the gospel—immersion in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—the reading and teaching the Living Oracles—the Lord's day—the Lord's supper—fasting—prayer—confession of sins—and praise. To these may be added other appointments of God, such as exhortation, admonition, discipline, &c.; for these also are ordinances of God; and, indeed, all statutes and commandments are ordinances:* but we speak not at present of those ordinances which concern the good-order of the kingdom, but of those which are primary means of enjoyment. These primary and sacred ordinances of the kingdom of heaven are the means of our individual enjoyment of the present salvation of God.

Without the sun, there is no solar influence; without the moon, there is no lunar influence; without the stars, there is no sidereal influence; without the clouds, there can be no rain; and without the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven, there can be no heavenly influence exhibited or felt. There is a peculiar and distinctive influence exerted by the sun, moon, and stars; yet they all give light. So in the ordinances of the kingdom of heaven—although they all agree in producing certain similar effects on the subjects of the kingdom, there is something distinctive and peculiar in each of them, so that no one of them can be substituted for another. Not one of them can be dispensed with—they are all necessary to the full enjoyment of the reign of heaven.

In nature and in religion, all the blessings of God bestowed on man are properly classed under two heads. These may be called, for illustration, *antecedent* and *consequent*. The antecedent include all those blessings bestowed on man to prepare him for action and to induce him to action. The consequent are those which God bestows on man through a course of action correspondent to these antecedent blessings. For example, all that God (did for Adam in creating for him the earth and all that it contains, animal, vegetable, mineral; in forming him in his own image; giving him all his physical, intellectual, and moral powers, and investing him with all the personal and real estate

* James I. 25.

which elevated him above all sublunary beings, were antecedent to any act of Adam; and these furnished him with inducements to love, honor, and obey his creator and benefactor. All that God did for Abraham in promises and precepts before his obedience—all that he did for the Israelites in bringing them up out of Egypt, and redeeming them from the tyranny of Pharaoh, were antecedent to the duties and observances which he enjoined upon them. And all the blessings which Adam, Abraham, the Israelites enjoyed through conformity to the institutions under which they were placed, were consequent upon that state of mind and course of action which the antecedent favors demanded and occasioned. *God never commanded any being to do any thing, but the power and motive were derived from something God had done for him.*

In the kingdom of heaven the antecedent blessings are the constitution of grace, the King, and all that he did, suffered, and sustained for our redemption. These were finished before we came upon the stage of action. This is all favor, pure favor, sovereign favor: for there can be no favor that is not free and sovereign. But the remission of our sins, our adoption into the family of God, our being made heirs and inheritors of the kingdom of glory, are consequent upon faith and the obedience of faith.

Organization and life of any sort are of necessity the gifts of God; but health and the continued enjoyment of life, and all its various and numerous blessings, are consequent upon the proper exercise of these. He that will not breathe, eat, drink, sleep, exercise, cannot enjoy animal life. God has bestowed animal organization and life antecedent to any action of the living creature; but the creature may throw away that life by refusing to sustain it by the means essential to its preservation and comfort.

God made but one man out of the earth, and one earthly *nature* of every sort, by a positive, direct, and immediate agency, of wisdom, power, and goodness. He gave these the power, according to his own constitution or *system* of nature, of reproducing and multiplying to an indefinite extent. But still this life is transmitted, diffused, and sustained by God operating through the system of nature. So Jesus, in the new creation, by his Spirit sent down from heaven after his glorification, did, by a positive, direct, and immediate agency, create one congregation, one mystical, or spiritual body; and, according to the constitution or sys-

tem of the kingdom of heaven, did give to that mystical body created in Jerusalem, out of the more ancient earthly kingdom of God, the power of reproducing and multiplying to an indefinite extent. But still this new and spiritual life is transmitted, diffused, and sustained by the Spirit of God, operating through the constitution, or system of grace, ordained in the kingdom of heaven.

Hence in setting up the kingdom of heaven, as in setting up the kingdom of nature, there was a display of divinity, compared with every thing subsequent, properly supernatural. Hence the array of apostles, prophets, extraordinary teachers, gifts, powers, miracles, &c. &c. But after this new mystical body of Christ was created and made, it had, and yet has, according to the system of grace under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven, the power of multiplying and replenishing the whole earth, *and will do it*; for as God breathed into the nostrils of Adam the spirit of life after he had raised him out of the dust; and as he bestowed on his beloved Son Jesus, after he rose out of the water, the Holy Spirit, without measure; so on the formation of the first congregation, figuratively called *the body of Christ*, Jesus did breathe into it the Holy Spirit to animate and inhabit it till he come again. The only temple and habitation of God on earth, since Jesus pronounced desolation on that in Jerusalem, is the body of Christ.

Now this first congregation of Christ, thus filled with the Spirit of God, had the power of raising other congregations of Christ; or, what is the same thing, of causing the body of Christ to grow and increase. Thus we see that other congregations were soon raised up in Judea and Samaria by the members of the Jerusalem body. Many were begotten to God by the Spirit of God, through the members of the first congregation. And since the Spirit himself ceased to operate in all those splendid displays of supernatural grandeur, by still keeping the disciples of Christ always in remembrance of the things spoken by the holy' Apostles, and by all the arguments derived from the antecedent blessings bestowed, working in them both to will and do according to the benevolence of God, he is still causing the body of Christ to grow and increase in *stature*, as well as in knowledge and favor of God. Thus the church of Christ, inspired with his Spirit, and having the oracles and ordinances of the reign of heaven, is fully ade-

quate to the conversion of the whole world if she prove not recreant to her Lord.

In the work of conversion, her Evangelists, or those whom she sends beyond the precincts of her weekly meetings, have, under the influence of the Spirit of God, simply to propose the constitution, or the glad tidings of the reign, to those without; and by all the arguments which the oracles of God, and the times and occasions suggest, to beseech and persuade men to be reconciled to God, to kiss the Son, to accept the constitution, to bow to him who is ordained a Prince and a Saviour to grant repentance and remission of sins to all who submit to his government. Thus they, and the congregation who sends them forth and sustains them in the work, beget children to God by the gospel, and enlarge the body of Christ.

With all these documents before us, may we not say, that, as Eve was the mother of all living, so 'Jerusalem is the mother of us all'? And thus, to use the language of Paul, 'Men are begotten to God by the gospel' through the instrumentality of the congregations of Christ.

Under the present administration of the kingdom of heaven a great apostacy has occurred, as foretold by the Apostles. As the church, compared to a city, is called 'Mount Zion,' the apostate church is called 'Babylon the Great.' Like Babylon the type, 'Mystery Babylon' the antitype, is to be destroyed by a Cyrus that knows not God. She is to fall by the sword of infidels, supported by the fierce judgments of God. 'The Holy City' is still trodden under foot, and the sanctuary is filled with corruptions. It is, indeed, a den of thieves; but strong is the Lord that judges the apostate city. Till that great and notable day of the Lord come, we cannot, from the prophetic word, anticipate a universal return to the original gospel, nor a general restoration of all the institutions of the kingdom of heaven in their primitive character; and, consequently, we cannot promise to ourselves the universal subjugation of the nations to the scepter of Jesus.

But were we to enter upon the consideration of the administration of the affairs of the kingdom after the fall and overthrow of the apostate city and the conversion of the Jews, we should have to launch upon a wide and tempestuous ocean, for which our slender bark is not at this time sufficiently equipped. This may yet deserve the construction of a large vessel in a more propitious season. Mean-

while, the original gospel is extensively proclaimed, and many thousands are preparing for the day of the Lord; and these are taught by the 'Faithful and True Witness' that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, and that their happiness and safety alike consist in being prepared for his second advent.

Remission of Sins.

Luther said that the doctrine of justification, or forgiveness, was the test of a standing or falling church. If right in this, she could not be very far wrong in any thing else; but if wrong here, it was not easy to suppose her right in any thing. I quote from memory, but this was the idea of that great reformer.* We agree with him in this as well as in many other sentiments. Emerging from the smoke of the great city of mystical Babylon, he saw as clearly and as far into these matters as any person could in such a hazy atmosphere. Many of his views only require to be carried out to their legitimate issue, and we should have the ancient gospel as the result.

The doctrine of remission is the doctrine of salvation: for to talk of salvation without the knowledge of the remission of sins, is to talk without meaning. To give to the Jews 'a knowledge of salvation by the remission of then-sins,' was the mission of John the Immerser, as said the Holy Spirit. In this way he prepared a people for the Lord. This doctrine of forgiveness was gradually opened to the people during the ministry of John and Jesus, but was not fully developed until Pentecost, when the secrets of the Reign of Heaven were fully opened to men.

From Abel to the resurrection of Jesus, transgressors obtained remission at the altar, through priests and sin-offerings; but it was an *imperfect* remission as respected the conscience. 'For the law,' says Paul, (more perfect in this respect than the preceding economy,) 'containing a shadow only of the good things to come, and not even the very image of these things, never can, with the same sacrifices which they offer yearly for ever, make those who come to them perfect. Since being offered, would they not have ceased? because, the worshippers being once purified, should have no longer conscience of sins.'

* The reformer also said:—" If the article of justification he once lost, then is all true Christian doctrine lost.' Preface to the Ep. Gal. p. 28. Phil. cd. 1800.

The *good things* to come were future during the reign of Moses and his institution. They have come; and a clear, and full, and perfect remission of sins, is the great result of the new economy in the consciences of all the citizens of the kingdom of Jesus. The perfection of the conscience of the worshippers of God under Christ, is the grand distinguishing peculiarity in them compared with those under Moses. They have not only clearer views of God, of his love, of his character, and of immortality; but they have consciences which the Jewish and Patriarchal ages could not produce.

If faith only were the means of this superior perfection and enjoyment, and if striking symbols or types were all that were necessary to afford this assurance and experience of pardon, the Jewish people might have been as happy as the Christian people. They had as true testimony, as strong faith, and as striking emblems as we have. Many of them through faith obtained a high reputation, were approved by God, and admired by men for their wonderful achievements.

The difference is in the constitution. They lived under a constitution of *law*—we under a constitution of *favor*. Before the law their privileges were still more circumscribed. Under the government of the Lord Jesus there is an institution for the forgiveness of sins, like which there was no institution since the world began. It was owing to this institution that Christians were so much distinguished at first from the subjects of every former institution.

Our political happiness in these United States is not owing to any other cause than to our political institutions. If we are politically the happiest people in the world, it is because we have the happiest political institutions in the world. So it is in the Christian institution. If Christians were, and may be, the happiest people that ever lived, it is because they live under the most gracious institution ever bestowed on men. The meaning of this institution has been buried under the rubbish of human traditions for hundreds of years. It was lost in the dark ages, and has never been, till recently, disinterred. Various efforts have been made, and considerable progress attended them; but since the Grand Apostacy was completed, till the present generation, the gospel of Jesus Christ has not been laid open to mankind in its original plainness, simplicity, and majesty.

A veil in reading the New Institution has been on the hearts of Christians, as Paul declares it was upon the hearts of the Jews in reading the Old Institution towards the close of that economy.

The object of this essay is to open to the consideration of the reader, the Christian institution for the remission of sins; to show by what means a person may enjoy the assurance of a personal and plenary remission of all his sins. This we shall attempt to do by stating, illustrating, and proving, the following *twelve* propositions.

PROP. I.—*The Apostles taught their disciples, or converts, that their sins were forgiven, and uniformly addressed them as pardoned or justified persons.*

John testifies that the youngest disciples were pardoned. 'I write to you, little children, because your sins *are forgiven you* on account of his name.* The young men strong in the Lord, and the old men steadfast in the Lord, he commends for their attainments: but the *little children*, the youngest converts, he addressed as possessing this blessing as one common to all disciples, 'Your sins are forgiven you, *on account of his name.*'

Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, asserts, that one of the provisions of the New Institution is *the remission of the sins of all under it.* 'Their sins and iniquities I will remember no more.' † From this he argues as a first principle in the Christian economy. 'Now where remission of these is, no more offering for sin is needed.‡ The reason assigned by the Apostles why *Christians* have no *sin offering* is, because they have obtained remission of sins as a standing provision in the New Institution.

The same Apostle testifies that the Ephesian disciples had obtained remission. 'Be to one another kind, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God for Christ's sake *has forgiven you.*'|| Here, also, in the enumeration of Christian privileges and immunities under Christ, he asserts forgiveness of sins as the common lot of all disciples. 'In whom we have redemption through his blood, even *the forgiveness of sins*, according to the riches of his favor.' § In his letter to the Colossians, he uses the same words—'By whom we have *the forgiveness of sins.*' ¶

* 1 John ii. 12. † Heb. viii. 12, x. 17. ‡ Heb. x. 18. || Eph, iv. 32. § Eph. I. 7. ¶ Col. I. 14.

Figurative expressions are used by the same Apostle, expressive of the same forgiveness common to all Christians. 'And such (guilty characters) were some of you; but *you are washed*; but *you are sanctified*; but *you are justified* by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Peter, also, is a witness here. 'Seeing *you have purified your souls* by obeying the truth through the Spirit.' †

But there is no need of foreign, or remote, or figurative expressions, when so literally and repeatedly the Apostles assert it as one of the adjuncts of being a disciple of Jesus. Had we no other testimony than that found in a single letter to the Colossians, it would be sufficient to sustain this position. The command given in chapter iii. 13, assumes it as a principle. '*As Christ forgave you, so also do you.*' But in the second chapter, he makes this an inseparable adjunct of being in Christ. 'You are *complete* in him—circumcised—buried with him—raised with him—made alive with him—HAVING FORGIVEN YOU ALL TRESPASSES.'

These explicit testimonies from the most illustrious witnesses, sustain my first proposition. On these evidences I rely, and I shall henceforth speak of it as a truth not to be questioned, viz.; that all the disciples of Christ converted in the apostolic age, were taught by the Apostles to consider themselves as pardoned persons.

PROP. II.—*The apostolic converts were addressed by their teachers as justified persons.*

We know that none but innocent persons can be legally justified; but it is not in the forensic sense this term is used by the Apostles. Amongst the Jews it imported no more than *pardoned*; and when applied to Christians, it denoted that they were acquitted from guilt—discharged from condemnation, and accounted as righteous persons in the sight of God.

Paul in Antioch in Pisidia assured the Jews, that *in* or *by* Jesus all that believed were justified from all things, (certainly here it is equivalent to pardoned from all sins) from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses. The disciples are said to be justified by faith. ‡ By favor or grace.|| *In* or *by* the blood of Christ. § By the name of the Lord Jesus. ¶ By works.** It is God who justifies. ††

* 1 Cor. vi. 11. † 1 Peter I. 22. ‡ Rom. v. 1. || Rom. iii. 24. § Rom. v. 9. ¶ I Cor. vi. 11. ** James ii. 24. †† Rom. viii. 33.

Christians are said to be justified by God, by Christ, by favor, by faith, by the blood of Jesus, by the *name* of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God—also by works. Pardon and acquittal are the prominent ideas in every application of the term. God is the justifier. Jesus also, as his Messiah, justifies, and the Spirit declares it. As an act of favor it is done, by *the blood of Jesus* as the rightful and efficient cause—by *faith* as the instrumental cause—by *the name* of Jesus the Lord as the immediate and connecting cause, and by *works* as the demonstrative and conclusive cause. Nothing is more plain from the above testimonies, than that all Christians are declared to be justified under the Reign of Jesus Christ.

PROP. III.—*The ancient Christians were addressed by the Apostles as sanctified persons.*

Paul addressed all the disciples in Rome as saints or sanctified persons. In his first letter to the Corinthians, he addresses them all as *the sanctified* under Christ Jesus. 'To the congregation of God which is at Corinth, to *the sanctified* under Christ Jesus.' Paul argues with the Hebrews that 'by the will of God we are sanctified by the offering of Jesus Christ once only.' 'For by this one offering he has for ever *perfected* (the conscience of) the *sanctified*.' So usual was it for the Apostles to address their disciples as sanctified persons, that occasionally they are thus designated in the inscription upon their epistles. Thus Jude addressing indiscriminately the whole Christian community, inscribes his catholic epistle—'To *the sanctified* by God our Father, and to the preserved (or saved) by Jesus Christ, to the called.' 'The sanctifier and the sanctified are all of one family,' says the Apostle to the Gentiles. And therefore the sanctifier addressed the sanctified as his brethren, and the brethren the disciples as sanctified. But once more we must hear Paul, and hear him connecting his sanctification with the *name* of the Lord Jesus. He says, 'But now you are sanctified by *the name* of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God.'*

* 1 Cor. iv. 16.

PROP. IV. —*The ancient Christians, the apostolic converts, were addressed as 'reconciled to God?'*

Paul repeatedly declares that the disciples were reconciled to God. 'When enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* To the Corinthians, he says, 'God has reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ;† and to the Colossians, he asserts, 'It pleased the Father by him to *reconcile* all things to him, having made peace by the blood of his cross; I say, whether they be things on the earth or things in the heavens. Even you [Gentiles] who were formerly alienated in mind, and enemies by works which are wicked, *he has now, indeed, reconciled* in the body of his flesh through death.' ‡ To the Ephesians he declares, that though 'once they were without God and without hope in the world, far off, they are now, through the blood of Christ, *made nigh.*' He has made the believing Jews and Gentiles one, that he might, under Christ, *reconcile both in one body to God*, through the cross, having slain the enmity between both thereby. Indeed, he represents God as in Christ, *reconciling a world to himself*; and so all under Christ are frequently said to be reconciled to God through him: which was the point to be proved.

PROP. V. —*The first disciples were considered and addressed by the Apostles, as 'adopted into the family of God.'*

This adoption is presented by the Apostle as the great reason which called forth the Son of God. 'God,' says he, sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might buy off those under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.' 'And because you *are sons*, he has sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, *Abba, Father.*|| 'You are, therefore, now sons of God.'

Indeed, the same writer, in his letter to the Ephesians, goes still farther, and represents this adoption of Jews and Gentiles into the rank and dignity of sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, as the great object contemplated in God's predestination. 'Having,' says he, 'predestinated, or beforehand determinately pointed us out, for an *adoption*

* Rom. v. 10. † 2 Cor. v. 18. ‡ Col. 1. 21. || Gal. iv. 6.

into the number of children by Jesus Christ, *for himself*, according to the good pleasure of his will.* Another testimony must suffice on this point. 'Beloved,' says the Apostle John, '*now are we the sons of God*; and what manner of love God has bestowed upon us that we should be called *sons of God*! If sons, then we are heirs of God —joint heirs with Christ.'

PROP. VI —*My sixth proposition is, that the first Christians were taught by the inspired teachers to consider themselves as saved persons.*

Because of some ambiguity in the popular import of the term *saved*, when applied to the disciples of Christ, we shall define it as used in this proposition. I need not here descant upon the temporal saviours and temporal salvations which are so conspicuous in sacred history. I need not state that Noah and his family were saved from the judgment inflicted upon the Old World; the Israelites from the Egyptians, and from all their enemies—that Paul's companions were saved from the deep, and God's people, in all ages, in common with all mankind, from ten thousand perils to which their persons, their families, and their property have been exposed. It is not the present salvation of our bodies from the ills of this life; but it is *the salvation of the soul* from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin. 'Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins.' It is the salvation of the soul in this present life of which we speak. And here it ought to be clearly and distinctly stated that there is a *present* and a *future* salvation, of which all Christians are to be partakers. The former is properly *the salvation of the soul*, and the latter is *the salvation of the body*, at the resurrection of the just. There are few professing Christianity, perhaps none, who do not expect a future salvation—the glory or salvation to be revealed in us at the last time. Peter, who uses this expression in the beginning of his first epistle, and who invites the saints to look forward to the salvation yet future, in the same connexion reminds them that they have *now* received the salvation of the soul. Indeed, the salvation of the soul is but the *first fruit* of the Spirit, and but an earnest until the adoption, 'the redemption of the body'

* Eph. I. 5.

from the bondage of corruption. It was in this sense of the word that salvation was announced to all who submitted to the Lord Jesus, and hence it is in this connexion equivalent to a deliverance of the soul from the guilt, pollution, and dominion of sin. Having thus defined the present salvation of the soul, I proceed to the proof of my sixth proposition, viz.; that the first Christians were taught by their inspired teachers to consider themselves as *saved persons*.

Peter, on Pentecost, exhorted the Jews to *save themselves* from that untoward generation, by reforming and being 'immersed for the remission of their sins in the name of the Lord Jesus.' Luke, in recording the success attendant on Peter's labors, expresses himself thus. 'And the Lord added, daily, *the saved* to the congregation.'* Those who obeyed the gospel were recorded by Luke as '*the saved*.'" The King's translators supplied out of their own system the words '*should be*.' They are not in any copy of the Greek scriptures. Such is the first application of the words '*the saved*' in the Christian scriptures.

Paul uses the same words to the first letter to the Corinthians, and applies them to all the disciples of Jesus. 'To the destroyed, the doctrine of the cross is foolishness; but to us, *the saved*, it is the power of God.† In the same letter, he says of the gospel, 'By which *you are saved* if you retain in your memory the word which I announce to you.‡ In his second letter he uses the same style, and distinguishes the disciples by the same designation: 'We are through God a fragrant odor of Christ among *the saved*, and among the destroyed.' The Ephesians he declares *are saved* through favor; and to Titus, he says, 'God has *saved* us not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy'—by what means we shall soon hear Paul affirm. Promises of salvation to the obedient are to be found in almost every public address pronounced by the Apostles and first preachers. For the Saviour commanded them to assure mankind that every one who believed the gospel, and was immersed, should be saved. And, connecting faith with immersion, Peter averred that immersion *saved* us, purifying the conscience through the resurrection of Jesus.||

While Christians are taught to expect and hope for a *future* salvation—a salvation from the power of death and

* Acts ii. 42. † 1 Cor. I. 18. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 2. || 1 Peter iii. 21.

the grave—a salvation to be revealed in the last time—they receive the first fruit of the Spirit, the salvation of the soul from guilt, pollution, and the dominion of sin, and come under the dominion of righteousness, peace, and joy. This is what Peter affirms of all the Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, and Bithynia, to whom he thus speaks: 'Jesus, having not seen, you love; on whom, not now looking, but believing, you rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the reward of your faith, *the salvation of your souls.*'*

These six propositions being each and every one of them, clearly sustained by the unequivocal testimony of God, now adduced, and as is well known to the intelligent disciple, by many more passages, equally plain and forcible, not adduced; we shall now engross them into one leading proposition, which we shall in this essay consider as not to be questioned—as irrefragably proved.

The converts made to Jesus Christ by the Apostles were taught to consider themselves pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and were addressed as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved persons, by all who first preached the gospel of Christ.

While this proposition is before us, it may be expedient to remark that all these terms are expressive not of any quality of mind—not of any personal attribute of body, soul, or spirit; but each of them represents, and all of them together represent *a state or condition*. But though these terms represent state and not character, there is a relation between state and character, or an influence which state has upon character, which makes the state of immense importance in a moral and religious point of view.

Indeed, the strongest arguments which the Apostles use with the Christians to urge them forward in the cultivation and display of all the moral and religious excellencies of character, are drawn from the meaning and value of the *state* in which they are placed. Because forgiven, they should forgive; because justified, they should live righteously; because sanctified, they should live holy and unblameably; because reconciled to God, they should cultivate peace with all men, and act benevolently towards all; because adopted, they should walk in the dignity and purity of sons of God; because saved, they should abound in

* 1 Peter I. 8.

thanksgivings, praises, and rejoicings, living soberly, righteously, and godly, looking forward to the blessed hope.

As this essay is designed for readers of the most common capacity and most superficial education, I trust I may be permitted to speak still more plainly upon the difference between *state* and *character*. Childhood is a state: so is manhood. Now a person in the state of childhood may act sometimes like a person in a state of manhood, and those arrived at the state of manhood may in character or behaviour resemble those in a state of childhood. A person in the state of a son, may have the character of a servant; and a person in the state of a servant, may have the character of a son. This is not generally to be expected, though it sometimes happens. Parents and children, masters and servants, husbands and wives, are terms denoting relations or states. To act in accordance with these states or relations, is quite a different thing from being in any one of these states. Many persons enter into the state of matrimony, and yet act unworthily of it. This is true of many other states. Enough, we presume, is said to contradistinguish state and character, relations and moral qualities.

It is scarcely necessary to remark here, that, as the disciples of Christ are declared to be in a pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved state, they are the only persons in such a state; and all others are in an unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost state.

When, then, is a change of state effected, and by what means? This is the great question soon to be discussed.

We are constrained to admit that a change in any one of these states necessarily implies, because it involves, a change in all the others. Every one who is *pardoned* is justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved; and so every one that is *saved* is adopted, reconciled, sanctified, justified, and pardoned.

To illustrate what has already been proved, let us turn to some of the changes which take place in society as at present constituted. A female changes her state. She enters into the state of matrimony. So soon as she has surrendered herself to the affectionate government and control of him who has become her husband, she has not only become a wife, but a daughter, a sister, an aunt, a niece, &c.; and may stand in many other relations in which she before stood not. All these are connected with her becoming the wife

of a person who stands in many relations. So when a person becomes Christ's, he is a son of Abraham, an heir, a brother, or is pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted and saved.

To be *in* Christ, or *under* Christ, then, is to stand in these new relations to God, angels, and men: and to be out of him, or not under his mediatorship or government, is to be in, or under Adam only. It is to be in what is called the state of nature, unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, and an alien from the family of God, lost in trespasses and sins.

These things premised, the question presents itself, *When are persons in Christ?* I choose this phrase in accommodation to the familiar style of this day. No person is in a house, *in* a ship, in a state, in a kingdom, but he that has gone or is introduced *into* a house, into a ship, *into* a state, *into* a kingdom; so no person is *in* Christ but he who has been introduced *into* Christ. The scripture style is most religiously accurate. We have the words '*in Christ*' and the words '*into Christ*' often repealed in the Christian Scriptures; but in no one place can the one phrase be substituted for the other. Hence in all places, when any person is said to be *in Christ*, it refers not to his conversion, regeneration, or putting on Christ, but to a state of rest or privilege subsequent to conversion, regeneration, or putting on Christ. But the phrase '*into Christ*' is always connected with conversion, regeneration, immersion, or putting on Christ. Before we are justified in Christ, live in Christ, or fall asleep in Christ, we must come, be introduced, or immersed into Christ. *Into* belongs only to verbs implying motion towards; and *in* to verbs implying rest, or motion in. He eats, sleeps, sits in the house. He walks into the field; he rides into the city. '*Into Christ*' is a phrase only applicable to conversion, immersion, or regeneration, or what is called putting on Christ, translation into his kingdom, or submission to his government.*

* To prevent mistakes I shall here transcribe a part of a note found in the Appendix to the 2d edition of the *newt version* of the Christian Scriptures, p. 452.

"I am not desirous of diminishing the difference of meaning between immersing a person in *the name* of the Father, and *into the name* of the Father. They are quite different *ideas*. But it will be asked, Is this a correct translation? To which I answer most undoubtedly it is. For the preposition *eis* is that used in this place, and not *en*. By what *inadvertency* the King's translators gave it *in* instead of *into* in this passage, and elsewhere gave it *into* when speaking of the same ordinance, I presume not to say. But they have been followed by most modern translators, and with them they translate it *into* in other places where it occurs, in relation *to this*

Presuming on the intelligence of our readers, so far as to suppose them assured that this is no mere verbal criticism, but a discrimination that detects one of the pillars of an apostate church, I proceed to another preliminary proposition which I choose to submit in the following words, *to wit*:—

PROP. VII.—*A change of views, though it necessarily precedes, is in no case equivalent to, and never to be identified with, a change of state.*

In all the relations of this life, in all states or conditions of men, we feel the truth of this; and I would to Heaven that our readers could see as plainly what is of infinitely more importance to them, that no change of heart is equivalent to, or can be substituted for, a change of state! A change of heart is the result of a change of views; and whatever can accomplish a change of views may accom-

institution: For example—1 Cor. xii. 13. For by one spirit, we are all immersed *into* one body; Rom. vi. 3. Don't you know that so many of you as were immersed *into* Christ, were immersed *into* his death? Gal. iii.27, As many of you as have been immersed *into* Christ, have put on Christ. Now for the same reason they ought to have rendered the following passages the same way. Acts viii. 16. Only they were immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus, xix. 3. *into* what name were you then immersed? When they heard this, they were immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus. 1 Cor. 1.13. Were you immersed *into* the name of Paul? Lest any should say, I had immersed *into* my own name. 3 Cor. x. 1. Our Fathers were all immersed *into* Moses in the cloud and in the sea. Now in all these places it is *eis* and *en* is clearly marked in the last quotation. They were immersed *into* Moses—not *into* the cloud, and *into* the sea, but in the cloud, and in the sea. To be immersed *into* Moses is one thing, and *in* the sea is another. To be immersed *into* the name of the Father, and in the name of the Father, are just as distinct. '*In the name*' is equivalent to, *by the authority of*. In the name of the king, or commonwealth, is by the authority of the king or commonwealth. Now the question is, Did the Saviour mean that the disciples were to be immersed by the authority of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? If by the authority of the Father, for what purpose were they immersed? The authority by which any action is done is one thing, and the object for which it is done is another. None who can discriminate, can think that it is one and the same thing to be immersed in the name of the Lord, and to be immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus. The former denotes the authority by which the action is performed—the latter the object for which it is performed. Persons are said to enter *into* matrimony, to enter *into* an alliance, to go *into* debt, to run *into* danger. Now to be immersed *into* the name of the Lord Jesus was a form of speech in ancient usage, as familiar and significant as any of the preceding. And when we analyze these expressions, we find they all import that the persons are either under the obligations or influence, of those things into which they are said to enter, or into which they are introduced. Hence those immersed into one body, were under the influences and obligations of that body. Those immersed into Moses, assumed Moses as their lawgiver, guide, and protector, and risked every thing upon his authority, wisdom, power, and goodness. Those who were immersed into Christ, put him on, or acknowledged his authority and laws, and were governed by his will: and those who were immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, regarded the Father as the fountain of all authority—the Son as the only Saviour—and the Holy Spirit as the only advocate of the truth, and teacher of Christianity. Hence such persons as were immersed into the name of the Father, acknowledged him as the only living and true God—Jesus Christ, as his only begotten Son, the Saviour of the world—and the Holy Spirit, as the only successful advocate of the truth of Christianity upon earth."

plish a change of heart or feeling, but a change of state always calls for something more.*

Lavinia was the servant of Palemon, and once thought him a hard master. She changed her views of him, and her feelings were also changed towards him; still, however, she continued in the state of a handmaid. Palemon offered her first his heart, and then his hand, and she accepted them. He vowed and she vowed before witnesses, and she became his wife. Then, and not till then, was her state changed. She is no longer a *servant*—she is now a *wife*. A change of views and of feelings led to this change in state; but let it be noted that this might not have issued in a change of state; for Maria, who was another handmaid of Palemon, and changed her views of him and her feelings towards him as much—nay, more than did Lavinia; yet Maria lived and died the servant maid of Palemon and Lavinia.

William Agricola and his brother Thomas, both Canadians, were once much opposed to the constituted government of New England. They both changed their views, and, as a matter of course, their feelings were changed. William became a citizen of Rhode (bland; but Thomas, notwithstanding his change of heart, lived and died a colonial subject of a British King.

John and James Superbus became great enemies to each other. They continued irreconciled for many years. At length a change of views brought about a change of heart: but this change for more than a year was concealed in the

* *State* here has respect to the whole person. It may be argued that state is as pertinently applied to the mind or heart as to the whole person; and that when the state of the mind is changed by a belief of God's testimony, the subject of that change is brought into as near a relation to God as he can be in this life; and as the kingdom of Jesus is a spiritual kingdom, he is as fit for admission into it, and for the enjoyment of its blessings, whenever his heart is changed from enmity to love, as he ever can be: nay, in truth, is actually initiated into the kingdom of Jesus the moment his mind is changed,—and that to insist upon any personal act as necessary to admission, because such acts are necessary to admission into all the social and political relations in society, is an over-straining the analogies between things earthly and things heavenly. Not one of our opponents, as far as we remember, has thus argued. We have sometimes thought that they might have thus argued with incomparably more speciosity than appears in any of their objections.

But without pausing to enquire whether the state of the heart can be perfectly changed from enmity to love, without an assurance of remission, on some ground, or in consequence of some *act of the mind*, prerequisite thereunto;—without being at pains to shew that the truth of this proposition is not at all essential to our argument, but only *illustrative* of it; we may say, that as Christ has redeemed the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, by his obedience even to death,—so in coming into his kingdom on earth, and in order to the *enjoyment* of all the present salvation, the *state of the whole person* must be changed; and this is what we apprehend Jesus meant by his saying, 'Unless a *man* is born of *malar and spirit* he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,' and what we mean in distinguishing a change of heart, or of views and feelings, from a change of state.

heart, and by no overt act appeared. They were not reconciled until mutual concessions were made and pledges of a change of feeling were tendered and reciprocated. From enemies they became friends.

A thousand analogies might be adduced, to shew that though a change of state often—nay, generally results from a change of feelings, and this from a change of views, yet a change of state does not necessarily follow, and is something quite different from, and cannot be identified with, a change of heart. So in religion, a man may change his views of Jesus, and his heart may also be changed towards him; but unless a change of state ensues, he is still unpardoned, unjustified, unsanctified, unreconciled, unadopted, and lost to all Christian life and enjoyment. For it has been proved that these terms represent states and not feelings, condition- and not character; and that a change of views or of heart, is not a change of state. To change a state is to pass into a new relation, and relation is not sentiment, nor feeling. Some *act*, then, constitutional, by stipulation proposed, sensible, and manifest, must be performed by one or both the parties before such a change can be accomplished. Hence, always, in ancient times, the proclamation of the gospel was accompanied by some instituted act proposed to those who changed their views, by which their state was to be changed, and by which they were to stand in a new relation to Jesus Christ.

This brings us to '*the obedience of faith.*' From the time the proclamation of God's philanthropy was first made, there was an act of obedience proposed in it by which the believers of the proclamation were put in actual possession of its blessings, and by conformity to which act a change of state ensued.

To perceive what this act of faith is, it must be remarked that where there is no *command*, there can be no *obedience*. These are correlate terms. A message or proclamation which has not a command in it, cannot be obeyed. But the gospel can be obeyed or disobeyed, and therefore in it is a command. Lest any person should hesitate in a matter of such importance, we will prove,

PROP. VIII.—*That the gospel has in it a command, and as such must be obeyed.*

And here I need only ask, Who are they who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of

the Lord? Paul replies, 'They who know not God, and *obey not the gospel of his Son*.* To 'obey the gospel,' and 'to become obedient to the faith,' were common phrases in the apostolic discourses and writings. 'By whom we have received apostleship, in order to the *obedience of faith* in all nations, on account of his name.'† 'By the commandment of the everlasting God, the gospel is made known to all nations for the *obedience of faith*' ‡ 'A great company of the priests became obedient to the faith.'|| 'But they have not all obeyed the gospel;' § and, 'What shall be the end of them who *obey not the gospel*?' ¶ From these sayings it is unquestionably plain, that either the gospel itself, taken as a whole, is a command, or that in it there is a command through the obedience of which salvation is enjoyed.

The obedience of the gospel is called the obedience of faith compared with the obedience of law. Faith in God's promise through Jesus Christ being the principle from which the obedience flows. To present the gospel in the form of a command is an act of favor, because it engages the will and the affections of men, and puts it in their power to have an assurance of their salvation from which they would be necessarily excluded if no such act of obedience was enjoined.

Whatever the act of faith may be, it necessarily becomes the line of discrimination between the two states before described. On this side, and on that, mankind are in quite different states. On the one side, they are pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved: on the other they are in a state of condemnation. This act is sometimes called immersion, regeneration, conversion; and that this may appear obvious to all, we shall be at some pains to confirm and illustrate it.

That a relation or a state can be changed by an act, I need scarcely at this time attempt to prove; especially to those who know that the act of marriage, of naturalization, adoption, and of being born, changes the state of the subjects of such acts. But rather than attempt to prove that a state is or may be changed by an act, I should rather ask if any person has heard, knows, or can conceive of a state being changed without some act? This point being con-

* These. I. 8. † Romans I. 5. ‡ Romans xvi. 26. || Acts vi. 7.

§ Romans x. 8. ¶ I Peter iv. 17.

ceded to us by all the rational, we presume not to prove. But a question may arise whether *faith* itself, or an act of obedience to some command or institution, is that act by which our state is changed.

PROP. IX.—*That it is not faith, but an act resulting from faith, which changes our state, we shall now attempt to prove.*

No relation in which we stand to the material world—no political relation, or relation to society, can be changed by believing, apart from the acts to which that belief, or faith, induces us. Faith never made an American citizen, though it may have been the cause of many thousands migrating to this continent, and ultimately becoming citizens of these United States. Faith never made a man a husband, a father, a son, a brother, a master, a servant, though it may have been essentially necessary to all these relations, as a cause, or principle preparatory, or tending thereunto. Thus, when, in scripture, men are said to be justified by faith, or to receive any blessing through faith, it is because faith is the principle of action, and as such, the cause of those acts by which such blessings are enjoyed. But the principle without those acts is nothing, and it is only by the acts which it induces to perform, that it becomes the instrument of any blessings to men.

Many blessings are metonymically ascribed to faith in the sacred writings. We are said to be justified, sanctified, and purified by faith—to walk by faith, and to live by faith, &c. &c. But these sayings, as qualified by the Apostles, mean no more than by believing the truth of God, *we have access* into all these blessings. So that as Paul explains, 'by faith *we have access* into the favor in which we stand.' These words he uses on two occasions,* when speaking of the value of this principle, contrasted with the principle of law; and in his letter to the Hebrews, when he brings up his cloud of witnesses to the excellency of this principle, he shews that *by it* the ancients obtained a high reputation—that is, as he explains, by their acts of faith in obedience to God's commands.

That faith by itself neither justifies, sanctifies, nor purifies, is admitted by those who oppose immersion for the for-

* Romans v. 2. Ephesians iii. 12.

giveness of sins. They all include the idea of the *Mood of Christ*. And yet they seem not to perceive, that in objecting to immersion as necessary to forgiveness in connexion with faith, their own arguments preclude them from connecting the blood of Christ with faith. If they admit that faith, apart from the blood of Christ, cannot obtain pardon, they admit all that is necessary to prove them inconsistent with themselves in opposing immersion for the remission of sins; or immersion, as that act by which our state is changed.

The Apostle Peter, when first publishing the gospel to the Jews, taught them, that they were not forgiven their sins by faith; but by an act of faith, by a believing immersion into the Lord Jesus. That this may appear evident to all, we shall examine his Pentecostian address, and his Pentecostian hearers.

Peter now holding the keys of the kingdom of Jesus, and speaking under the commission for converting the world, and by the authority of the Lord Jesus, guided, inspired, and accompanied by the Spirit—may be expected to speak the truth, the whole truth, plainly and intelligibly, to his brethren the Jews. He had that day declared the gospel facts, and proved the resurrection and ascension of Jesus to the conviction of thousands. They believed and repented—believed that Jesus was the Messiah, had died as a sin-offering, was risen from the dead, and crowned Lord of All. Being full of this faith, they enquired of Peter and the other Apostles, *what they ought to do* to obtain remission. They were informed, that though they now believed and repented, they were not pardoned; but must '*reform and be immersed for the remission of sins.*' Immersion for the forgiveness of sins, was *the command* addressed to these believers, to these penitents, in answer to the most earnest question; and by one of the most sincere, candid, and honest speakers ever heard. This act of faith was presented as that act by which a change in their state could be effected; or, in other words, by which alone they could be pardoned. They who 'gladly received this word were that day immersed;' or, in other words, that same day were converted, or regenerated, or obeyed the gospel. These expressions in the Apostles' style, when applied to persons coming into the kingdom, denote the same act, as will be perceived from the various passages in the writings of Luke and Paul. This testimony, when the speaker, the occasion,

and the congregation are all taken into view, is itself alone sufficient to establish the point in support of which we have adduced it.

But the second discourse, recorded by Luke from the lips of the same Peter, pronounced in Solomon's Portico, is equally pointed, clear, and full in support of this position. After he had explained the miracle which he had wrought in the name of the Lord Jesus, and stated the same gospel facts, he proclaims the same command—'Reform and be converted that your sins may be blotted out;' or, 'Reform and turn to God, that so your sins may be blotted out; that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come, and that he may send Jesus whom the heavens must receive till the accomplishment of all the things which God has foretold,' &c. Peter, in substituting other terms in this proclamation, for those used on Pentecost, does not preach a *new* gospel, but the *same* gospel in terms equally strong. He uses the same word in the first part of the command, which he used on Pentecost. Instead of '*be immersed,*' he has here '*be converted,*' or '*turn to God;*' instead of '*for the remission of your sins,*' here it is, '*that your sins may be blotted out;*' and instead of '*you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit,*' here it is, '*that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come.*'* On Pentecost, it was, 1. 'Reform.' 2. 'Be immersed.' 3. 'For the remission of sins.' And 4. 'You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' In Solomon's Portico, it was, 1. 'Reform.' 2. 'Be converted.' 3. 'That your sins may be blotted out.' And 4. 'That seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come;' that 'you may have righteousness, peace, and joy, in a holy spirit.' So read the different clauses in those two discourses to the Jews, expressive of the same acts.

There is yet, in this discourse in the Portico, a very strong expression, declarative of the same gracious connexion between, immersion and remission. It is the last period in the discourse. 'Unto you, first, brethren of the

* There is no propriety in the common version of this member of the sentence —*when*, instead of *that*, 'seasons of refreshment.' Some make modern *revivals* 'seasons of refreshment,' such as these here alluded to. Then it would read, 'That your sins may be blotted out in the times of revivals'—when revivals shall come! The term is *opos*, which, in this construction, as various critics have contended, is equivalent to '*that*' in our tongue. To promise a future remission is no part of the gospel, nor of the apostolic proclamation. All Christians experience seasons or refreshment in cordially obeying the gospel.

Jews, God having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to *bless you*, every one of you, in the act of turning from your iniquities;' or, as we would say, in the act of conversion. Why the Apostle Peter should have used 'converted,' or 'turning to God,' instead of 'be immersed,' is, to the candid and unprejudiced reader of this narrative, very plain. After Pentecost, the disciples immersed on that day, *having turned to God* through Jesus, were spoken of by their brethren as *discipled* or *converted* to Jesus. The unbelieving Jews, soon after Pentecost, knew that the disciples called the immersed '*converted*;' and immersion being the act of faith which drew the line of demarcation between Christians and Jews, nothing could be more natural than to call the act of immersion the converting of a Jew. The time intervening between these discourses was long enough to introduce and familiarize this style in the metropolis; so that when a Christian said, '*Be converted*,' or, '*Turn to God*," every Jew knew, the act of putting on the Messiah to be that intended. After the immersion of some Gentiles into the faith, in the house and neighborhood of Cornelius, it was reported that the Gentiles were converted to God. Thus, the Apostles, in passing through the country, gave great joy to the disciples from among the Jews, 'telling them of the conversion.' or immersion of the Gentiles.* Indeed, in a short time it was a summary way of representing the faith, reformation, and immersion of disciples, by using one word for all. Thus, 'All the inhabitants of Sharon and Lydda turned,' or 'were converted to the Lord.' †

While on the subject of conversion, we shall adduce, as a fourth testimony, the words of the Lord Jesus to Paul, when he called him. Paul is introduced by Luke in the Acts, telling what the Lord said to him when he received his apostleship. 'I send you Paul, by the faith that respects me, to open their eyes; to *turn* or *convert* them from darkness to light; and from the power of Satan to God; that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among the saved.' ‡ Every thing to be accomplished among the Gentiles was to be effected by the faith or truth in Christ. The Saviour connected that, with opening their eyes; their conversion from the ignorance and tyranny of sin and satan; their forgiveness of sins; and finally, an inheritance among the saved or sanctified. First, faith or

* Acts xv. 3. † Acts ix. ‡ Acts xxvi. 17, 18.

illumination; then, conversion; then, remission of sins; then, the inheritance. All these testimonies concur with each other in presenting the act of faith—Christian immersion, frequently called *conversion*, as that act, inseparably connected with the remission of sins; or that change of state, of which we have already spoken.

One reason why we would arrest the attention of the reader to the substitution of the terms *convert* and *conversion*, for *immerse* and *immersion*, in the apostolic discourses and in the sacred writings, is not so much for the purpose of proving that the forgiveness of sins, or a change of state, is necessarily connected with that act of faith called 'Christian immersion;' as it is to fix the minds of the biblical students upon a very important fact, viz.; that no person is altogether disciplined to Christ until he is immersed. It true, that this view of the matter bears strongly upon the question; but it bears upon other great matters pertaining to the present and ancient order of things.

Discovering that much depends upon having correct views on this point, we have carefully examined all those passages where 'conversion,' either in the common version, or in the new version, or in the original, occurs; and have found an uniformity in the use of this term, and its compounds and derivatives, which warrant the conclusion, that no person was said to be converted until he was immersed; and that all persons, who were immersed, were said to be converted. If any apostatized, and were again converted, it was in that sense in which our Lord applied the word to Peter, 'When you are *converted*, strengthen your brethren;' or, as James used it in his letter when he said, 'If any of you err from the truth, and one convert him, let him know that he who converts a transgressor from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins.'

The commission for converting the world teaches that immersion was necessary to discipleship; for Jesus said, 'Convert the nations, immersing them into the name,' &c., and 'teaching them to observe,' &c. The construction of the sentence fairly indicates that no person can be a disciple, according to the commission, who has not been immersed: for *the active participle in connexion with an imperative, either declares the manner in which the imperative shall be obeyed, or explains the meaning of the command.* To this I have not found an exception:—for example,—

'Cleanse the house, sweeping it.' 'Cleanse the garment, washing it,' shews the manner in which the command is to be obeyed, or explains the meaning of it. Thus, 'Convert (or disciple) the nations, immersing them, and teaching them to observe,' &c., expresses the manner in which the command is to be obeyed.

If the Apostles had only preached and not immersed, they would not have converted the hearers according to the commission: and if they had immersed, and not taught them to observe the commands of the Saviour, they would have been transgressors. A disciple, then, according to the commission, is one that has heard the gospel, believed it, and been immersed. A disciple, indeed, is one that continues in keeping the commandments of Jesus.*

PROP. X.— *I now proceed to show that immersion and washing of regeneration are two Bible names for the same act, contemplated in two different points of view.*

The term *regeneration* occurs but twice in the common version of the New Testament, and not once in the Old Testament. The first is Matt. xix. 28. "You that have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, you also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Dr. George Campbell, following the punctuation adopted by Griesbach, and substituting the word *renovation* instead of *regeneration*, renders it, "That, at the *renovation*, when the Son of Man

* The following examples of the above general rule, illustrate its value and certainty:—'Let us offer up the sacrifice of praise to God, *confessing* to his name.' Heb. xiii. 13. 'Let us go forth to him out of the camp *bearing* his reproach.' Heb. xiii. 13. 'Be an approved workman, *rightly dividing* the word of truth.' 2 Tim, ii. 15. 'Guard the precious deposit *avoiding* profane babblings.' 1 Tim. vi. 20. 'Observe these things without prejudice, *doing* nothing by partiality.' 1 Tim. v. 21. 'Pray every where *lifting* up holy hands.' 1 Tim. ii. 8. 'Walk in wisdom to them that are without, *gaining* time.' Col. iv. 5. 'Do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, *giving thanks* to God.' Col. iii. 17. 'Speak the truth, *putting* away lying.' Eph. iv. 25. 'Be not vain glorious, *provoking* one another.' Gal. v. 26. 'Convert the nations, *baptizing* them,' &c. &c. Now do not all these participles define their respective imperatives, or shew the way or manner in which the command should be obeyed! Many similar examples may be found in all the sacred writings.

This rule has passed through a fiery trial. I have only been more fully convinced of its generality and value. There is no rule in the English syntax more general in its application. I would only add that the participle does not always express every thing in the command; but it always points out something emphatically in the intention of the imperative, and without which the injunction cannot be suitably and fully performed.

We have, however, no need of this rule, nor of any thing not generally conceded to establish the point before us: for the New Testament and all antiquity teach, that, so long as the Apostles lived, no one was regarded as a disciple of Christ who had not confessed his faith, and was immersed.

shall be seated on his glorious throne, you, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones," &c. *Genesis*, being the term used for *creation*, *palingenesia*, denotes the new creation—either literally at the resurrection of the dead, or figuratively, at the commencement of the Christian era, or at the commencement of the Millennium. Josephus, the Jew, called the return of Israel to their own land and institution, "The Regeneration," or "Palingenesia."

No writer of any note, critic, or expositor, supposes that *regeneration* in Matt. xix. applies to what is, in theology, called the *new birth*, or *regeneration of the soul*—not even the Presbyterian Matthew Henry, nor Dr. Whitby, Campbell, MacKnight, Thompson; nor, indeed, any writer we recollect ever to have read. Regeneration in this passage denotes a state, a new state of things. In the same sense we often use the term. The American revolution was the regeneration of the country or the government. The commencement of the Christian era was a regeneration—so will be the creation of the new Heavens and new Earth. As this is so plain a matter, and so generally admitted, we proceed to the second occurrence of this term.

'God has saved us by *the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Spirit.* God has saved us through the *bath of regeneration*, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit. This is the second time the word *regeneration* is found in the New Testament; and here it is conceded by the most learned Paidobaptists and Baptists, that it refers to immersion. Though I have been led to this conclusion from my views of the Christian religion, yet I neither hold it myself, nor justify it to others on this account. I choose rather to establish it by other testimonies, than by those who agree with me in the import of this institution. Amongst these I shall place Dr. James MacKnight, formerly prolocutor or moderator of the Presbyterian church of Scotland, and translator of the Apostolic Epistles. One of his notes upon Titus iii. 5, is in the following words:— 'Through the bath of regeneration.' "Through *baptism*, called the bath of regeneration, not because any change in the nature" (but I would say in the *state*) "of the baptized person is produced by baptism; but because it is an emblem of the purification of his soul from sin." He then quotes in proof, (Acts xxii. 16.) 'Arise, and be immersed,

* Titus iii. 5.

and wash thee from thy sins.'—*Paul*. He supports this view also from Ephesians v. 26, and John iii. 5. 'The bath of regeneration,' is then, according to this learned Paidobaptist, Christian immersion.

Parkhurst, in his Lexicon, upon the word *loutron*, connects this same *phrase*, the washing or bath of regeneration, with Ephesians v. 26, and John iii. 5, as alluding to immersion. So say all the critics, one by one, as far as I know. Even Matthew Henry, the good and venerable Presbyterian commentator, concedes this point also, and quotes Ephesians v. 26, Acts xxii. 16, and Matthew xxviii. 19, 20, in support of the conclusion, that the *washing of regeneration* refers to baptism.

Our opponents themselves being judges, we have gained this point, viz.; that the only time the phrase *washing of regeneration* occurs in the New Testament, with a reference to a personal change, it means, or is equivalent to, immersion. *Washing of regeneration and immersion, are therefore, two names for the same thing*. Although I might be justified in proceeding to another topic, and in supposing this point to be fully established, I choose rather, for the sake of *the slow to apprehend*, to fortify this conclusion by some other testimonies and arguments.

As regeneration is taught to be equivalent to "*being torn again*," and understood to be of the same import with a new birth, we shall examine it under this metaphor. For if immersion be equivalent to regeneration, and regeneration be of the same import with being born again, then being born again, and being immersed are the same thing; for this plain reason, that things which are equal to the same thing, are equal to one another. *All must admit, that no person can be born again of that which he receives*. For as no person is born naturally—so no person can be born again, or born metaphorically—of that which he receives. It destroys the idea, the figure, the allusion, and every thing else which authorises the application of those words to any change which takes place in man, to suppose that the subject of the new birth, or regeneration, is born again of something which he has received. This single remark shews the impropriety, and inaccuracy of thought; or, perhaps, the want of thought, which the popular notions of regeneration sanction, and sanctify.

In being born naturally there is the begetter, and that which is begotten. These are not the same. The act of

being born is different from that which is born. Now the scriptures carry this figure through every prominent point of coincidence. There is the begetter. 'Of his own will he has begotten, or impregnated us;' says James the Apostle. '*By the word of truth,*' as the incorruptible seed; or, as Peter says, 'We are born again, not from corruptible, but from incorruptible seed, the word of God which endureth forever.' But when the act of being born is spoken of, then the water is introduced. Hence, before we come into the kingdom, we are born of water.

The Spirit of God is the begetter, the gospel is the seed; and being thus begotten, and quickened, we are born of the water. A child is alive before it is born, and the act of being born only changes its state, not its life. Just so in the metaphorical birth. Persons are begotten by the Spirit of God, impregnated by the Word, and born of the water.

In one sense a person is born of his father; but not until he is first born of his mother. So in every place where water and the Spirit, or water and the Word, are spoken of; *the water stands first*. Every child is born of its father, when it is born of its mother. Hence the Saviour put the mother first, and the Apostles follow him. No other reason can be assigned for placing the water first. How uniform this style! Jesus says to Nicodemus, 'You must be born again, or you cannot discern the reign of God.' *Born again!* What means this? 'Nicodemus, unless you are born of water, and of the Spirit, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' So Paul speaks to the Ephesians, v. 26, 'He cleansed the church,' or the disciples, '*by a bath of water, and the Word.*' And to Titus he says, 'He saved the disciples *by the bath* of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit.' Now, as soon as, and not before, a disciple, who has been begotten of God, is born of water he is born of God, or of the Spirit. *Regeneration is, therefore, the act of being born** Hence its connexion always with water. Reader, reflect—what a jargon, what a confusion, have the mystic doctors made of this metaphorical expression, and of this topic of regeneration. To call the receiving of any spirit, or any influence, or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the

* See the following essay on Regeneration.

Holy Spirit, *who calls nothing personal regeneration, except the act of immersion.**

Some curious criticisms have been offered, to escape the force of the plain declaration of Jesus and his Apostles, upon this subject. Some say, that the words, 'Except a man be born of water and Spirit,' are not to be understood literally. Surely, then, if to be born of water does not mean to be born of water, to be born of the Spirit, must mean something else than to be born of the Spirit. This is so fanatical and extravagant as to need no other exposure. He who cannot see the propriety of calling immersion a being born again, can see no propriety in any metaphor in common use. A resurrection is a new birth. Jesus is said to be the *first born* from the dead; because the first who rose from the dead to die no more. And, surely, there is no abuse in speech, but the greatest propriety in saying, that he who has died to sin, and been buried in water, when raised up again out of that element, is born again, or regenerated. If Jesus was born again, when he came out of a

* That John iii. 5, and Titus iii. 5, refer to immersion, is the judgment of all the learned Catholics and Protestants of every name under Heaven.

The authors and finishers of the Westminster creed,—one hundred and twenty-one divines, ten Lords, and twenty Commissioners of the Parliament of England, under the question 165, "*What is baptism?*" quote John iii. 5, Titus iii. 5, to prove that baptism is a washing with water, and a "*sign of remission of sins.*"

Michaelis, Horne, Lightfoot, Beveridge, Taylor, Jones of Nayland, Bp. Mant, Whitby, Burkit, Bp. Hall, Dr. Wells, Hooker, Dr. G. Ridley, Bp. Ryder:—but why attempt a list of great names. There are a thousand more assert it.

Bp. White says, that "regeneration, as detached from baptism, never entered into any creed before the 17th century."

Whitby, on John iii. 5, says, "That our Lord here speaks of baptismal regeneration, *the whole Christian church* from its *earliest times* has *invariably taught,*"

Our modern "great divines" even in America, have taught the same. Timothy Dwight, the greatest Rabbi of Presbyterianism the New World has produced, says, Vol. iv. pp. 300, 301, "*to be born again.*, is precisely the same thing as to be born of water and the Spirit."—"To be born of water is to be baptized." And how uncharitable!—He adds, "He who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, WILL NEVER ENTER INTO THE VISIBLE NOR INVISIBLE KINGDOM OF GOD." Vol. iv. p. 302. So preached the president of Yale.

George Whitfield, writing on John iii. 5, says, "Does not this verse urge the *absolute necessity of water baptism?* Yes, when it may be had. But how God will deal with persons unbaptized, *we cannot tell.*" Vol. iv. p. 355. I say with him, *we cannot tell with certainty.* Bull am of opinion, that when a neglect proceeds from a simple mistake or sheer ignorance, and when there is no aversion, but a will to do every thing the Lord commands, the Lord will admit into the everlasting kingdom those who by reason of this mistake, never had the testimony of God assuring them of pardon or justification here, and consequently, never did fully enjoy the salvation of God on earth. But I will say with the renowned President of Yale, that "he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter the visible nor invisible kingdom of God." By the "visible and invisible kingdom," he means the kingdom of grace and glory. He adds on the same page, "He who persists In this act of rebellion against the authority of Christ, will never belong to his kingdom." Vol. iv. p. 302.

John Wesley asserts, that "by baptism we enter into *covenant with God*, an everlasting covenant, are admitted into the church, made members of Christ, made the children of God. By *water* as the *means*, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again." [Preservative, pp. 146—150.]

sepulcher, surely he is born again who is raised up out of the grave of waters.

Those, who are thus begotten, and born of God, are children of God. It would be a monstrous supposition, that such persons are not freed from their sins. To *be born of God, and born in sin, is inconceivable*. Remission of sins is as certainly granted to '*the born of God;*' as life eternal, and deliverance from corruption, will be granted to the *children of the resurrection*, when born from the grave.

To illustrate what has, we presume to say, been now proved, we shall consider *political regeneration*. Though the term *regeneration* is laxly employed in this association; yet, by such a license of speech, we may illustrate this subject to the apprehension of all. Yes, the whole subject of faith, change of heart, regeneration, and character.

All civilized nations and kingdoms have constitutions; and in their constitutions, they have declared who are members of the social compact. Besides those who constitute the community at the time a constitution is adopted, they say who shall compose the community in all time coming; that is, who shall be admitted into it, and by what means they shall become members of it. They have always decreed, that their own posterity shall inherit their political rights and immunities. But they have, also, ordained that foreigners; that is, members of other communities, may become, by adoption, or naturalization, citizens, or fellow members, of the same community. But they have, in their wisdom and benevolence, instituted a rite or form of adoption, which form has much meaning; and which, when submitted to, changes the state of the subject of it. Now, as the Saviour consented to be called a *King*, and to call the community over which he presides, a *Kingdom*, it was because of the analogy between these human institutions and his institution; and for the purpose, not of confounding, but of aiding the human mind in apprehending and comprehending the great object of his mission to the world. And it is worthy of the most emphatic attention, that it was WHEN SPEAKING OF A KINGDOM, HE SPOKE OF BEING BORN AGAIN. Yes; on that occasion, and on that occasion only, when he spoke of *entering into his Kingdom*, did he speak of the necessity of BEING BORN AGAIN. And had he not chosen that figure, he would not have chosen the figure of a *new birth*. With these facts and circumstances before us,

let us examine political regeneration as the best conceivable illustration of religious regeneration.

A. B. was born in the island of Great Britain, a native subject of George 111. King of Great Britain. He was much attached to his native island, to the people, the manners and customs of his ancestors and kinsmen. With all these attachments still increasing, he grew up to manhood. Then he heard the report of this good land, of this large, fertile, and most desirable country. The country, the people, and the government, were represented to him in the most favorable light. Sometimes these representations were exaggerated; but still he could separate the truth from the fable; and was fully persuaded not only of the existence of these United States, but, also, of the eligibility of being a citizen thereof. He believed the testimony which he heard, resolved to expatriate himself from the land of his nativity, to imperil life and property, putting himself aboard of a ship, and bidding adieu to all the companions of his youth, his kinsmen, and dear friends. So full was his conviction, and so strong his faith, that old Neptune and King Eolus, with all their terrors, could not appal him. He sailed from his native shores, and landed on this continent. He was, however, ignorant of many things pertaining to this new country, and government; and on his arrival, asked for the rights and immunities of a citizen. He was told, that the civil rights of hospitality to a *stranger* could be extended to him as a *friendly alien*; but not one of the rights, or immunities of a *citizen*, could be his, unless he were born again. "*Born again!*" said he, in a disappointed tone, to Columbus, with whom he had his first conversation on the subject. "What do you mean by being born again?"

Columbus.—You must be *naturalised*, or adopted as a citizen; or, what we call *born again*.

A. B.—I do not understand you. How can a man be born when he is grown?

Col.—That which is born of Great Britain is British, and that which is born of America is American. If, then, you would be an American citizen, you must be born of America.

A. B.—"Born of America!" You astonish me! I have come to America, well disposed towards the people and the country. I was once attached to England, but I became attached to the United States; and because of my faith, and attachments, I have come hither; and will you not receive

me into your kingdom, because I could not help being bora in England?

Col.—Well disposed as I am, and we are, to receive you, most assuredly, I say to you, unless, you are regenerated in a court-house, and be enfranchised by and before the judges, you can never become a citizen of these United States.

A. B.—Yours is an arbitrary and despotic government. What airs of sovereignty you have assumed!

Col.—By no means. Right reason, wisdom, policy, and benevolence for you; as well as the safety, dignity, and happiness of the whole community, require that every alien shall be naturalized, or made a citizen, before he exercise, or enjoy the rights of a citizen.

A. B.—You are certainly arbitrary—if not in the thing itself, of regeneration—in the place and manner in which it shall be done. Why, for instance, say, that it must be done in a *court-house*?

Col.—I will tell you: because there are the *judges*, the *records*, and the *seal* of the government.

A. B.—I understand you. Well, tell me, how is a man born again? Tell me plainly and without a figure.

Col.—With pleasure. You were born of your mother and of your father, when you were born in England; and you were born *legitimately*, according to the institutions of England. Well, then, you were born *of* England, as well as born *in* it; and were, therefore, wholly English. This was your first birth. But you have expatriated yourself, as your application here proves—I say, *sentimentally* you have expatriated yourself; but we must have a formal, *solemn pledge*, of your renunciation; and we will give you a formal, solemn pledge, of your adoption. You must, *ex ammo*, in the presence of the Judges, and the Recorders, renounce all allegiance to every foreign prince and potentate; and, especially to His Majesty the King of Great Britain.

A. B.—Is that the thing? I can, with all my heart, renounce all *political* allegiance to every foreign prince and government. Is that all? I have, then, no objection to that.

Col.—There is this also:—You are not only to renounce all political allegiance; but you must also, from the soul, solemnly vow, in the presence of the same Judges and Re-

corders, that you will adopt, and submit to, the constitution and government of these United States.

A. B.—I can do that also. I can renounce, and I can adopt. Nor do I object to the place where it shall be done. But, pray, what solemn pledge will *you give me*?

Col.—So soon as you have vowed renunciation, and adoption, in the presence of the Judges and Recorders; we will give you a certificate, with a *red seal*, the *seal of state*, attached to it; stating that you, having now been naturalized, or born according to our institutions, are born *of America*; and are now a son, an adopted son, of America. And that *red seal* indicates that the blood, the best blood of This government, will be shed for you, to protect you and defend you; and that your life will, when called for, be cheerfully given up for your mother, *of whom* you have been politically born; as it would have been for your own natural political mother, of whom you were first born.

A. B.—To this I must subscribe. In my mother tongue it all means, that I give myself up politically to this government, and it gives itself up to me, before witness too. How soon, pray, after this new birth, may I exercise and enjoy all the rights of a citizen?

Col.—They are yours the first breath you breathe under your new mother. It is true, we have not, in these United States, any *symbol* through which a person is politically regenerated. We only ask a solemn pledge, and give one. Other nations have symbols. But we understand that the moment the vow is taken, the person is politically born again. And as every other child has all the rights of a child which it can exercise, so soon as it inhales the air; so have all our political children all political rights, so soon as the form of naturalization is consummated. But, remember, *not till then*.

A. B.—You say other nations had their symbols. What do you mean by these?

Col.—I mean, that the naturalized had to submit to some emblematic rite, by which they were symbolically detached from every other people, and introduced among those who adopted them, and whom they adopted. The Indian nations wash all, whom they adopt, in a running stream; and impose this task upon their females. The Jews circumcised and washed all whom they admitted to the rights of their institutions. Other customs and forms have obtained in

other nations; but we regard simply the meaning of the thing, and have no symbol.

A. B.—In this I feel but little interested. I wish to become a citizen of these United States; especially as I am informed I can have *no* inheritance among you, nor a *voice* in the nation, nor any immunity, unless I am born again.

Col.—You must, then, submit to the institution: and I know, that so soon as you are politically born again, you will feel more Of the importance and utility of this institution, than you now can; and will be just as anxious as I am, to see others submit to this wise, wholesome, and benevolent institution.

A. B.—As my faith brought me to your shores; and as I approve your constitution and government, I will not (now that I understand your institutions) suffer an opportunity to pass. I will direct my course to the place where I can be born again.

I ought here to offer an apology for a phrase occurring frequently in this essay and in this dialogue. When we represent the subject of immersion as active, either in so many words, or impliedly, we so far depart from that style which comports with the figure of '*being born.*' For all persons are passive in being born. So in immersion, the subject buries not himself, raises not himself; but is buried and raised by another. So that in the act the subject is always passive. And it is of the act alone of which we thus speak.

From all that has been said on *regeneration*, and from the illustration just now adduced, the following conclusions, must, we think, be apparent to all: —

First, Begetting and quickening necessarily precede being born.

Second. Being born imparts no new life; but is simply a *change of state*, and introduces into a *new mode of living*.

Third. Regeneration, or immersion—the former referring to the import of the act; and the latter term to the act itself—denote only the act of being born.

Fourth. God, or the Spirit of God, being the author of the whole institution, imparting to it its life and efficiency, is the *begetter*, in the fullest sense of that term. Yet, in a subordinate sense, every one, skillful in the word of God, who converts another, may be said to have begotten him whom he enlightens. So Paul says, 'I have begotten Ones-

imus in my bonds:'—and 'I have begotten you, Corinthians, through the gospel.'

Fifth. The gospel is declared to be *the seed*; the power and strength of the Holy Spirit to impart life.

Sixth. And the great argument, pertinent to our object, in this long examination of conversion and regeneration, is that which we conceive to be the most apparent of all other conclusions, viz.—that remission of sins, or coming into a state of acceptance, being one of the present immunities of the kingdom of heaven, cannot be enjoyed by any person before immersion. As soon can a person be a citizen before he is born, or have the immunities of an American citizen while an alien; as one enjoy the privileges of a son of God before he is born again. For Jesus expressly declares, that he has not given the privilege of sons to any but to those born of God.* If, then, the present forgiveness of sins be a privilege, and a right of those under the new constitution, in the kingdom of Jesus; and if being born again, or being born of *water* and of the Spirit, is necessary to admission; and if being born of *water* means *immersion*, as clearly proved by all witnesses; then, remission of sins cannot, in this life, be received or enjoyed previous to immersion. If there be any proposition, regarding any item of the Christian institution, which admits of clearer proof, or fuller illustration than this one, I have yet to learn where it may be found.

But before we dismiss the sixth evidence, which embraces so many items, I beg leave to make a remark or two on the propriety of considering the term "immersion," as equivalent to the term "conversion."

"Conversion" is, on all sides, understood to be a turning to God. Not a thinking favorably of God, nor a repenting for former misdeeds; but an actual turning to God, in word and in deed. It is true, that no person can be said to turn to God, whose mind is not enlightened, and whose heart is not well disposed towards God. All human actions, not resulting from previous thought or determination, are rather the actions of a machine, than the actions of a rational being. 'He that comes to God,' or turns to him, 'must believe that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of every one who diligently seeks him.' Then he will seek and find the Lord. An "external conversion" is no conversion at

* John I, 12.

all. A turning to God with the lips, while the heart is far from him, is mere pretence and mockery. But though I never thought any thing else, since I thought upon religion; I understand the 'turning to God,' taught in the New Institution, to be a coming to the Lord Jesus—not a *thinking* about doing it, nor a *repenting* that we have not done it;—but an *actual coming* to him. The question then is, Where shall we find him? Where shall we meet him? No where on earth, but in his institutions. "Where he records his name," there only can he be found; for there only has he promised to be found. I affirm, then, that the first institution in which we can meet with God, is, the institution for remission. And here it is worthy of notice, that the Apostles, in all their speeches, and replies to interrogatories, never commanded an enquirer to pray, read, or sing, *as preliminary to coming; but always commanded and proclaimed immersion as the first duty, or the first thing to be done, after a belief of the testimony.* Hence, neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, nor waiting to be better, was the converting act. Immersion *alone* was that act of turning to God. Hence, in the commission to convert the nations, the only institution mentioned after proclaiming the gospel, was the immersion of the believers, as the divinely authorized way of carrying out and completing the work. And from the day of Pentecost, to the final *Amen* in the revelation of Jesus Christ, no person was said to be converted, or to turn to God, until he was buried in, and raised up out of the water.

If it were not to treat this subject as one of doubtful disputation, I would say, that, had there not been some act, such as immersion, agreed on all hands, to be the medium of remission and the act of conversion and regeneration; the Apostles could not, with any regard to truth or consistency, have addressed the disciples as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted, and saved persons. If all this had depended upon some mental change, as faith; they could never have addressed their congregations in any other way than as the moderns do: and that is always in the language of doubt and uncertainty—hoping a little, and fearing much. This mode of address and the modern compared, is proof positive, that they viewed the immersed through one medium, and we through another. They taught all the disciples to consider not only themselves as saved persons; but all whom they saw, or knew to be immersed into the

Lord Jesus. They saluted every one, on his coming out of the water, as *saved*, and recorded him as such. Luke writes, 'The Lord added *the saved* daily to the congregation.'*

Whenever a child is born into a family, it is a brother or a sister to all the other children of the family; and its being born of the same parents, is the act causative and declarative of its fraternity. All is mental and invisible before coming out of the water: and as immersion is the first act commanded, and the first constitutional act; so it was in the commission, *the act* by which the Apostles were commanded to turn, or convert those to God, who believed their testimony. In *this* sense, then, it is the converting act. No man can, scripturally, be said to be converted to God until he is immersed. How ecclesiastics interpret their own language is no concern of ours. We contend for the pure speech, and for the apostolic ideas attached to it.

To resume the direct testimonies declarative of the remission of sins by immersion, we turn to the Gentiles. Peter was sent to the house of Cornelius to tell him and his family 'words by which they might be saved.' He tells those words. He was interrupted by the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit. But it is to be noticed, that the testimony, to which the Holy Spirit there affixed its seal, was the following words:—'To *him* gave all the prophets witness, that every one, who believes on him, *shall receive remission of sins by his name.*' While speaking these words, concerning remission of sins by, or through, his name, the Holy Spirit, in its marvelous gifts of tongues, fell upon them.

Many, seeing so much stress laid upon faith or belief, suppose that all blessings flow from it *immediately*. This is a great mistake. Faith, indeed, is the principle, and the distinguishing principle, of this economy: but it is only the principle of action. Hence, we find the name, or person of Christ always interposed between faith and the cure, mental or corporeal. The woman, who touched the tuft of the mantle of Jesus, had as much faith before as after; but though her faith was the cause of her putting forth her hand, and accompanied it; *she was not cured until the touch*. That great type of Christ, the brazen serpent, cured no Israelite simply by faith. The Israelites, as soon as they were bitten, believed it would cure them. But yet they

* Acts ii.

were not cured as soon as bitten; nor until *they looked* to the serpent. It was one thing to believe that looting at the serpent would cure them; and another to look at it. It was *the faith*, remotely; but, *immediately, the look*, which cured them. It was not faith in the waters of Jordan that healed the leprosy of Naaman the Syrian. It was immersing himself in it, according to the commandment. It was not faith in the pool of Siloam, that cured the blind man, whose eyes Jesus anointed with clay'; it was his washing his eyes in Siloam's water. Hence, the imposition of hands, or a word, or a touch, or a shadow, or something from the persons of those anointed with the Holy Spirit, was the *immediate* cause of all the cures recorded in the New Testament. It is true, also, that without faith it is impossible to be healed; for in some places Jesus could not work many miracles, because of their unbelief. It is so in all the moral remedies and cures. It is impossible to receive the remission of sins without faith. In this world of means, (however it may be in a world where there are no means) it is as impossible to receive any blessing through faith without the appointed means. *Both are indispensable*. Hence, *the name* of the Lord Jesus is interposed between faith and forgiveness, justification and sanctification, even where immersion into that *name* is not detailed. It would have been unprecedented in the annals of the world, for the historian always to have recorded all the circumstances of the same institution, on every allusion to it; and it would have been equally so for the Apostles to have mentioned it always in the same words. Thus, in the passage before *us*, the *name* of the Lord is only mentioned. So in the first letter to the Corinthians, the disciples are represented as saved, as washed, as justified, sanctified *by the name* of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God. The frequent interposition of the name of the Lord between faith and forgiveness, justification, sanctification, &c., is explained in a remark in James' speech in Jerusalem.* It is the application of an ancient prophecy, concerning the conversion of the Gentiles. The Gentiles are spoken of as turning to, or seeking the Lord. But who of them are thus converted? 'Even all the Gentiles *upon whom* my name is called.' It is, then, to those *upon whom* the name of the Lord is called,

* Acts xv. 17.

that the name of the Lord communicates remission, justification, &c.

Some captious spirits need to be reminded, that as they sometimes find forgiveness, justification, sanctification, &c. ascribed to grace, to the blood of Christ, to the name of the Lord, without an allusion to faith; so we sometimes find faith, and grace, and the blood of Christ without an allusion to water. Now, if they have any reason and right to say, that faith is understood in the one case; we have the same reason and right to say, that water or immersion is understood in the other. For their argument is, that in sundry places this matter is made plain enough. This is, also, our argument—in sundry places this matter is made plain enough. This single remark cuts off' all their objections drawn from the fact, that immersion is not always found in every place where *the name* of the Lord, or *faith* is found connected with forgiveness. Neither is grace, the blood of Christ, nor faith, always mentioned with forgiveness. When they find a passage where remission of sins is mentioned without immersion, it is weak, or unfair, in the extreme, to argue from that, that forgiveness can be enjoyed without immersion. IF THEIR LOGIC BE WORTH ANY THING, IT WILL PROVE, THAT A MAN MAY BE FORGIVEN WITHOUT GRACE, THE BLOOD OF JESUS, AND WITHOUT FAITH: FOR WE CAN FIND PASSAGES, MANY PASSAGES, WHERE REMISSION, OR JUSTIFICATION, SANCTIFICATION, OR SOME SIMILAR TERM OCCURS, AND NO MENTION OF EITHER GRACE, FAITH, OR THE BLOOD OF JESUS. As this is the pith, the marrow, and fatness of all the logic of our most ingenious opponents on this subject, I wish I could make it more emphatic, than by printing it in capitals. I know some editors, some of our Doctors of Divinity, some of our most learned declaimers, who make this argument, which we unhesitatingly call a genuine sophism, the alpha and the omega of their speeches against the meaning, and indispensable importance of immersion, or regeneration.

The New Testament would have been a curious book, if, every time *remission of sins* was mentioned, or alluded to, it had been preceded by *grace, faith, the blood of Jesus, immersion, &c. &c.* But now the question comes, which, to the rational, is the emphatic QUESTION—WHETHER DO THEY THINK, BELIEVE, TEACH, AND PRACTISE MORE WISELY AND MORE SAFELY; WHO THINK, BELIEVE, AND TEACH,

THAT GRACE, FAITH, THE BLOOD OF JESUS, THE NAME OF THE LORD, AND IMMERSION, ARE ALL ESSENTIAL TO IMMEDIATE PARDON AND ACCEPTANCE;—OR THEY WHO SAY, THAT FAITH ONLY, GRACE ONLY, THE BLOOD OF CHRIST ONLY, THE NAME OF THE LORD ONLY—AND IMMERSION, NOT AT ALL? To all men, women, and children, of common sense, this question is submitted.

It is, however, to me admirable, that the remission of sins should be, not merely unequivocally, but so repeatedly declared through *immersion*, as it is in the apostolic writings. And here I would ask the whole thinking community, one by one, whether, if the whole race of men had been assembled on Pentecost, or in Solomon's Portico, and had asked Peter the same question, which the convicted proposed, would he, or would he not, have given them the same answer? Would he not have told the whole race to reform, and be immersed for the remission of their sins? or, to reform and *be converted*, that their sins might be blotted out? —to arise, and be immersed, and wash away their sins? If he would not, let them give a reason; and if they say he would, let them assign a reason why they do not go, and do likewise.

Some have objected against the 'seasons of refreshment,' or the comforts of the Holy Spirit being placed subsequent to 'conversion,' or 'regeneration,' or 'immersion;' (for, when we speak Scripturally, we must use these terms as all descriptive of the same thing,) because the gifts of the Holy Spirit were poured out upon the Gentiles before immersion. They see not the design of thus welcoming the Gentiles into the kingdom. They forget the comparison of the Gentiles to a returning prodigal, and his father going out to meet him, even while he was yet a good way off. God had welcomed the first fruits of the Jews into his kingdom, by a stupendous display of spiritual gifts, called *the baptism of the Holy Spirit*, before any one of the Jews had been immersed into the Lord Jesus. And, as Peter explains this matter in Cornelius' case, it appears that God determined to make no difference between the Jews and Gentiles in receiving them into his kingdom. Hence, says Peter, 'he gave them *the same gift* which he gave to us Jews *at the beginning*,' (never since Pentecost.) Thus Peter was authorized to command those Gentiles to be immersed by the authority of the Lord, no man daring to forbid it. But these gifts of the Holy Spirit, differed exceedingly from the sea-

sons of refreshment, or the righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit, the common enjoyment of all who were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sins.*

Let it be noted here, as pertinent to our present purpose, that as the Apostle Peter was interrupted by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, when he began to speak of the forgiveness of sins by *the name of the* Lord Jesus; so soon as he saw the Lord had received them, he commanded them to be immersed by the authority of the Lord. And here I must propose another question to the learned, and the unlearned. How comes it to pass, that though once, and only once, it is commanded that the nations who believe should be immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; and though we read of no person being immersed into this name in this way; I say, how comes it to pass, that all sects use these words without a scruple, and baptize or sprinkle in this name; when more than once persons are commanded to be immersed *for the remission of sins*, and but a few of the proclaimers can be induced to immerse for the remission of sins, though so repeatedly taught and proclaimed by the Apostles? Is one command, unsupported by a single precedent, sufficient to justify this practice of Christians; and sundry commands and precedents from the same authority insufficient to authorize, or justify us in immersing for the remission of sins? Answer this who can; I cannot, upon any other principle than, that the tyrant Custom, who gives no account of his doings, has so decreed.

I come now to another of the direct and positive testimonies of the Apostles, showing that immersion for the remission of sins is an institution of Jesus Christ. It is the address of Ananias to Saul: 'Arise and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.' On this testimony we have not as yet descanted in this essay. It has been mentioned, but not examined.

Paul, like the Pentecostian hearers, when convinced of the truth of the pretensions of the Messiah, asked what *he* should do. He was commanded to go into Damascus, and it should be told him there what to do. It was told him in the words now before us. But, say some, this cannot be understood literally.

For experiment, then, take it figuratively. Of what was

* See Christian Baptist, Vol. 6, p. 268.

it figurative? Of something already received? Of pardon formerly bestowed? A figure of the past?! This is anomalous. I read one writer, and but one, who converted this into a *commemorative* baptism, like Israel's commemorating the escape from Egypt, or Christians commemorating the Lord's death. And, if I do not mistake, some preacher said it was a figurative expression, similar to '*This is my body*'! One, whom I pressed out of all these refuges, was candid enough to say he really did not know what it meant; but it could not mean that Paul was to 'be baptized for the remission of his sins!'

'To wash away sins' is a figurative expression. Like other metaphoric expressions, it puts the resemblance in place of the proper word. It necessarily means something analogous to what is said. But we are said to be washed from our sin in, or by, the blood of Christ. But even '*washed in blood*' is a figurative expression, and means something analogous to washing in water. Perhaps we may find in another expression a means of reconciling these strong metaphors. Rev. vii. 14. 'They have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.' Here are two things equally incomprehensible—to wash garments *white* in blood, and *to wash away* sins in water! An efficacy is ascribed to water which it does not possess; and, as certainly, an efficacy is ascribed to blood which it does not possess. If blood can *whiten* or cleanse garments, certainly water can *wash away* sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to wafer; and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood. This is a plain solution of the whole matter. God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power, of water to blood; and the absolving or pardoning power of blood to water. This is done upon the same principle as that of accounting faith for righteousness. What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension far and wide as sin has spread—far and wide as water flows. Wherever water, faith, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are, there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Jesus. Yes; as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water. This, as was said, is figurative; but it is not a figure which misleads, for the meaning is given without a figure, viz. immersion for the remission of sins. And to him that made the washing of clay from the eyes, the washing away of

blindness, it is competent to make the immersion of the body in water efficacious to the washing away of sin *from the conscience*.

From the conscience, I say; for there its malignity is felt; and it is only in releasing the conscience from guilt, and its consequences,—fear and shame, that we are released from the dominion of sin, or washed from its pollution in this world. Thus immersion says Peter, *saves us*, not by cleansing the body from its filth, but the conscience from its guilt; yes, immersion saves us by burying us with Christ, raising us with him, and so our consciences are purified from dead works to serve the living God. Hence our Lord gave so much importance to immersion in giving the commission to convert the world—'*He that believes and is immersed shall be saved.*'

But, while viewing the water and the blood as made to unite their powers, as certainly as Jesus came by water and blood, we ought to consider another testimony given to this gracious combination of powers, by Paul the Apostle: "Being sprinkled in heart from an evil conscience, and being washed in body with clean water."* The application of water, the cleansing element, to the body, is made in this gracious institution to reach the conscience, as did the blood of sprinkling under the law.

Some ask, How can water, which penetrates not the skin, reach the conscience? They boast of such an objection, as exhibiting great intellect, and good sense. But little do they think, that in so talking, they laugh at, and mock the whole Divine Economy, under the Old and New Institutions: for, I ask, did not the sacrifices, and Jewish purifications, some way reach the conscience of that people!! If they did not, it was all mere frivolity throughout. And can eating bread, and drinking wine, not influence, nor affect, the soul! And cannot *the breath* of one man pierce the heart of another, and so move his blood, as to make his head a fountain of tears! He, who thus objects to water, and the import of immersion, objects to the whole remedial institution, as taught by Moses and by Christ, and insults the wisdom and goodness of God in the whole scheme of salvation. And he, who objects to water, because it can only take away the filth of the flesh, ought rather to object to blood; because it rather besmears and

* Hebrews x. 24.

pollutes, than cleanses the body, and cannot touch the soul. But all such reasoners are foolish talkers. To submit to God's institution is our wisdom, and our happiness. The experience of the myriads who were immersed for the remission of their sins, detailed in the Christian scriptures, to say nothing of those immersed in our times, is worth more than volumes of arguments from the lips and pens of those who can only regard, and venerate the traditions of their fathers; because it is presumed their fathers were wiser, and more able to judge correctly, than their sons.

But as it is not our object to quote, and expatiate upon, all the sacred testimonies, direct and allusive to immersion for the remission of sins, we shall close the proof and illustration of this proposition with an incidental allusion to the cleansing efficacy of this institution, found in the 2d Epistle of Peter.* After enumerating the additions to faith necessary to secure our calling and election, of which *courage* is the first; and charity, or universal love, the last; the Apostle says, that 'he who has not these things is blind, shutting his eyes, and forgetting that he was *purified from his old sins*.' I need not here say, that this is, perhaps, (and certainly as far as I know,) universally understood to refer to Christian immersion. The '*old sins*,' or '*former sins*,' can, we presume, mean no other sins than those washed away in immersion. No person has yet attempted to shew that these words can import any thing else. It is one of the most unequivocal, and, because incidental, one of the most decisive proofs, that, in Peter's judgment, all former sins were remitted in immersion. With Peter we began our proof of this position, and with Peter we shall end our proof of it. He first proclaimed reformation for the remission of sins; and in his last and farewell letter to the Christian communities, he reminds them of that purification from sin, received in, and through immersion; and in the strongest terms cautions them against forgetting that they were so purified.

Were any person to reason upon the simple import of the action commanded by Jesus, I think it might be made apparent from the action itself, in its two parts, *the burial and the resurrection*, that it must import every thing which we have heard the Apostles ascribe to it. Corruption goes down into the grave literally; but does corruption come

* 2 Peter I. 9.

forth out of it? Is there no change of state in the grave? Who is it that expects to come forth from the grave in the same state in which he descends into it? The first born from the dead did not; nor shall any of them who fall asleep in him. How, then, can it be, that any person, buried with Christ in immersion, can rise with Christ, and not rise in a new state!! Surely the Apostle exhorts to a new life from the change of state effected in immersion. 'Since, indeed, you have *risen* with Christ, set your affections on things above. Walk in a new life.'

Again, and in the last place here—Is a child in the same state after, as before its birth? Is not its state changed? And does it not live a new life, compared with its former mode of living? As new born babes desire the milk of the breast, so let the newly regenerate desire the unadulterated milk of the Word, that they may grow thereby. Call immersion, then, a new birth, a regeneration, a burial and resurrection, and its meaning is the same. And when so denominated, it must import that change of state which is imported in putting on Christ, in being pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, reconciled, saved, which was the great proposition to be proved and illustrated, and which, we think, has been proved and illustrated by the preceding testimonies and reflections.

Though no article of Christian faith, nor item of Christian practice, can, legitimately, rest upon any testimony, reasoning, or authority, out of the sacred writings of the Apostles, were it only one day after their decease; yet the views and practices of those who were the contemporaries, or the pupils, of the Apostles and their immediate successors, may be adduced as corroborating evidence of the truths taught, and the practices enjoined, by the Apostles; and, as such, may be cited; still bearing in mind, that where the testimony of the Apostles ends, Christian faith necessarily terminates. After this preliminary remark, I proceed to sustain the following proposition:—

PROP. XI.—*All the Apostolical Fathers, as they are called; all the pupils of the Apostles; and, all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four Christian centuries, whose writings have come down to us; allude to, and speak of, Christian immersion, as the 'regeneration' and 'remission of sins' spoken of in the New Testament.*

This proposition I shall sustain by the testimony of those who have examined all Christian antiquity, and by citing the words of those usually called the Apostolic Fathers, and other distinguished writers of the first four hundred years. We shall first summon one whose name is familiar throughout Christendom. Whether the writing be genuine or spurious, it is on all hands admitted to be a fragment of the highest antiquity:—

BARNABAS,

In his Catholic Epistle, chapter xi. says, "Let us now enquire whether the Lord took care to manifest any thing beforehand, concerning water and the cross. Now, for the former of these, it is written to the people of Israel, how they shall not receive that baptism which brings to forgiveness of sins; but shall institute another to themselves that cannot. For thus saith the Prophet, 'Be astonished, O Heavens! and let the Earth tremble at it; because this people have done two great and wicked things: They have left me, the fountain of living waters, and have digged for themselves broken cisterns that can hold no water. Is my holy mountain, Zion, a desolate wilderness? For she shall be as a young bird when its nest is taken away.'—'Consider how he hath joined both the *cross* and the *water* together. For this he saith, '*Blessed are they, who, putting their trust in the cross, descend into the water;* for they shall have their reward in due time: then, saith he, will I give it them.' But as concerning the present time, he saith, 'Their leaves shall not fail.' Meaning thereby, that every word that shall go out of your mouth, shall, through faith and charity, be to the conversion and hope of many. In like manner does another Prophet speak: 'And the land of Jacob was the praise of all the earth;' magnifying thereby the vessels of his Spirit. And what follows? 'And there was a river running on the right hand, and beautiful trees grew up by it; and he that, shall eat of them shall live for ever.' The signification of which is this:— *that we go down into the water, full of sins and pollutions; but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which are in Jesus by the Spirit:* 'And whosoever shall eat of them shall live for ever.' That is, whosoever shall hearken to those that call them, and shall believe, shall live for ever."

CLEMENT AND HERMAS.

The former gives no testimony on the subject. The latter deposes as follows.*

In speaking of a tower, built upon the water, by which he signified the building of Christ's church, he thus speaks:—"Hear, therefore, why the tower is built on the waters:— Because your life is saved, and shall be saved by water." In answer to the question, "Why did the stones come up into this tower out of the deep?" he says, "It was necessary for them to come up by (or *through*) water, that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God: for before any one *receives the name of the Son of God*, he is liable to death; but when he receives that *seal*, he is delivered from death, and assigned to life. Now that seal is *water*, into which persons go down, liable to death; but come out of it, assigned to life: for which reason to these also was this seal preached; and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God."

Both Clement and Hermas wrote about the end of the first, or beginning of the second century.

Hermas, moreover, deposes as follows, in another work of his, called "The Commands of Hermas."†

"And I said to him, I have even now heard from certain teachers, that there is no other repentance besides that of *baptism*; when we go down into the water, and *receive the forgiveness of sins*; and after that we should sin no more, but live in purity. And he said to me, *Thou hast been rightly informed.*"

Having closely and repeatedly examined the Epistles of Clement; of Polycarp, to the Philippians; of Ignatius, to the Ephesians; that to the Magnesians; that to the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, the Smyrnians, and his Epistle to Polycarp; together with the Catholic Epistle of Barnabas, and the genuine works of Hermas, I can affirm that the preceding extracts are the only passages, in all these writings, that speak of immersion.

Having heard the Apostolic Fathers, as they are called, depose to the views of the pupils of the Apostles, down to A. D. 140; I will summon a very learned Paidobaptist antiquarian, who can bring forward every writer and Father,

* Book of Similitudes, chap. xvi. † Com. 4. chap. iii.

down to the fifth century; and before we hear any of his witnesses, we shall interrogate him concerning his own convictions after he had spent years in rummaging all Christian antiquity:—

**TESTIMONY OF DR. W. WALL. AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF
INFANT BAPTISM.**

Pray, Doctor, have you examined all the primitive writers, from the death of John down to the fifth century?

W. Wall—I have.

And will you explicitly avow what was the established and universal view of all Christians, public and private, for four hundred years from the nativity of the Messiah, on the import of the saying, (John iii. 5,) 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God?'

W. Wall.—"There is not any one Christian writer, of any antiquity, in any language, but who understands it of *baptism*; and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of *water*, any more than born of *wood*."*

Did all the Christians, public and private, and all the Christian writers from Barnabas to the times of Pelagius, (419,) as far as you know, continue to use the term *regenerate* as *only* applicable to immersion?

W. Wall.—"The Christians did, in all ancient times, continue the use of this name '*regeneration*,' for *baptism*; so that they *never* use the word '*regenerate*,' or '*born again*,' but they mean, or denote by it, *baptism*. And almost all the quotations which I shall bring in this book, shall be instances of it." †

Did they not also substitute for '*baptism*' and '*baptize*,' the words *renewed*, *sanctified*, *sealed*, *enlightened*, *initiated*, as well as *regenerated*?

W. Wall.—"For to *baptize*, they used the following words:—Most commonly, *anagennao*, to regenerate; sometimes, *kainopoieo*, or *anakainizo*, to renew; frequently, *agiazo*, to sanctify. Sometimes they call it *the seal*; and frequently, *illumination*, as it is also called, Heb. vi. 4, and sometimes, *teliosis*, initiation."‡ "St. Austin, not less than

* 4th London edition, p. 116, Vol. 1. A. D, 1819. † Vol. 1. p. 24. ‡ Vol. 1. p. 8.

a hundred times, expresses *baptized* by the word *sanctified*."*

We shall now hear some of W. Wall's witnesses; and I choose rather to introduce them from his own pen, as he cannot be supposed partial to the views I have presented in this essay:—

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin Martyr wrote about forty years after John the Apostle died, and stands most conspicuous among the primitive Fathers. He addressed an apology to the Emperor Antoninus Pius. In this apology he narrates the *practices* of the Christians, and the reasons of them. Concerning those who are persuaded and believe the things which are taught, and who promise to live according to them, he writes—

"Then we bring them to some place where there is water, and they are *regenerated* by the same way of *regeneration* by which we were *regenerated*: for they are washed in water (*en to udati*) in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit: for Christ says, Unless you be regenerated you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven; and every body knows it is impossible for those who are once generated (or born) to enter again into their mother's womb."

"It was foretold by Isaiah, as I said, by what means they who should repent of their sins might escape them; and was written in these words, 'Wash you, make you clean, put away the evil,' &c.

"And we have been taught by the Apostles this reason for this thing. Because we being ignorant of our first birth, were generated by necessity (or course of nature) and have been brought up in ill customs and conversation; that we should not continue children of that necessity and ignorance, but of will (or choice) and knowledge, and should obtain *forgiveness of the sins* in which we have lived, by water (or in water.) Then is invoked over him that has a mind to be *regenerated*, the name of God the Father, &c. And this washing is called *the enlightening*."

As you trace the history of infant baptism, Mr. Wall, as

nigh the apostolic times as possible, pray why do you quote Justin Martyr, who never mentions it?

W. Wall.—"Because his is the most ancient account of *the way of baptizing*, next the scripture; and shews the plain and simple manner of administering it. Because it shews that the Christians of those times (many of whom lived in the days of the Apostles) used the word '*regeneration*' (or '*being born again*') for *baptism*; and that they were taught to do so by the Apostles. And because we see by it that they understood John iii. 5. of water baptism; and so did all the writers of these 400 years, NOT ONE MAN EXCEPTED."—p. 54.

Did any of the ancients use the word *matheteuio* (to disciple) as it is used in the commission; or did they call the baptized *discipled*?

W. Wall.—"Justin Martyr, in his second apology to Antoninus, uses it. His words are:—'Several persons among us, of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes, *who were discipled (matheteuio)* to Christ, in or from their childhood, do continue uncorrupted.' "—p. 54.

So soon as they began to mysticise, they began to teach that immersion *without faith* would obtain remission of sins, and that immersion *without faith* was regeneration. Then came the debates about *original sin*: and so soon as original sin was proved, then came the necessity of infant immersion for the remission of original sin. And so undisputed was the import of baptism for remission, that when the Pelagians denied original sin, pressed with the difficulty, "why immerse those who have no sins?" they were pushed to invent *actual sins* for infants; such as their crying, peevishness, restlessness, &c., on account of which sins they supposed that infants might, with propriety, be immersed, though they had no original sin.

TERTULLIAN.

Tertullian, the first who mentions infant baptism, flourished about A. D. 216. He writes against the practice: and among his most conclusive arguments against infant immersion, (for then there was no sprinkling,) he assumes, as a fundamental principle not to be questioned, that immersion was for the remission of sins; and this being universally conceded, he argues as follows:—

"Our Lord says, indeed, 'Do not forbid them to come to

me;' therefore let them come when they are grown up—let them come when they understand—when they are instructed whither it is that they come. Let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need their *guiltless* age make such haste to *the forgiveness of sins*? Men will proceed more warily in worldly goods; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall have heavenly! Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear to have given to one that asketh."—p. 74.

ORIGEN.

Origen, though so great a visionary, is, nevertheless, a competent witness in any question of fact. And here I would again remind the reader, that it is as witnesses in a question *of fact*, and not of *opinion*, we summon these ancients. It is not to tell their own opinions, nor the reasons of them; but to depose what were the views of Christians on this institution in their times. There was no controversy on this subject for more than four hundred years, and therefore we expect only to find incidental allusions to it; but these are numerous, and of the most unquestionable character. Origen, in his homily upon Luke, says:—

"Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of their sins. Of what sins? Or when have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the law, in their case, hold good, but according to that sense that we mentioned even now? (that is) none is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth."

And in another place he says, that—

"The baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins."

And again—

"If there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."

In another place he says—

"But in the *regeneration*, (or new birth,) by the *laver*, (or baptism,) every one that is born again of water and the Spirit, is clear from pollution: clear (as I may venture to say) as by a glass darkly."—p. 82.

But now let me ask Dr. Wall—Do Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and St. Austin, concur with

all their predecessors in those views of regeneration and remission?

W. Wall.—Yes, exactly. "I have observed, among the several names which the ancients give to *baptism*, they often, by this phrase, '*the forgiveness of sins*,' do mean the sacrament of baptism."—p. 179. And as for Chrysostom, he expressly says, "In baptism, or the spiritual circumcision, there is no trouble to be undergone but to throw off the load of sins, and receive pardon for all foregoing offences."—p. 182. And again; "There is no receiving or having the bequeathed inheritance before one is baptized; and none can be called *a son* till he is baptized."—p. 183.

The controversy about infant baptism and original sin were contemporaneous; and just so soon as they decided the nature and extent of original sin, baptism for the remission of sins was given to infants because of this pollution, and defended because of the necessity of regeneration and forgiveness to salvation; and because immersion was universally admitted to be the scriptural regeneration and remission. In this way, there is no reasonable doubt, but infant baptism began; and for convenience sake, as Dr. Wall contends, it was substituted by infant sprinkling.

Unless we were to transcribe all the testimonies of antiquity, one by one, no greater assurance can be given, that, for more than four hundred years after Christ, all writers, orthodox and heterodox, Pelagius and Austin not excepted, concurred in the preceding views. Were I to summon others—Eusebius, Dupin, Lightfoot, and Hammond, *cum multis aliis*—will depose the same.

This proposition we will dismiss with the testimony of the most renowned of the Bishops of Africa. I extract it from a work now generally read, called the "History of the Martyrs." It is from the account Cyprian gives of his conversion.—p. 317.

CYPRIAN.

"While (says he) I lay in darkness and uncertainty, I thought on what I had heard of a second birth, proposed by the divine goodness; but could not comprehend how a man could receive a new life from his being immersed in water, cease to be what he was before, and still remain the same body. How, said I, can such a change be possible? How can he, who is grown old in a worldly way of living, strip

himself of his former inclinations, and inveterate habits? Can he, who has spent his whole time in plenty, and indulged his appetite without restraint, ever be transformed into an example of frugality and sobriety? Or he who has always appeared in splendid apparel, stoop to the plain, simple, and unornamented dress of the common people? It is impossible for a man, who has borne the most honorable posts, ever to submit to lead a private and an obscure life: or that he who was never seen in public without a crowd of attendants, and persons who endeavored to make their fortunes by attending him, should ever bear to be alone. This (continues he) was my way of arguing: I thought it was impossible for me to leave my former course of life, and the habits I was then engaged in, and accustomed to: but no sooner did the life-giving water wash the spots off my soul, than my heart received the heavenly light of the Holy Spirit, which transformed me into a new creature; all my difficulties were cleared, my doubts dissolved, and my darkness dispelled. I was then able to do what before seemed impossible; could discern that my former life was earthly and sinful, according to the impurity of my birth; but that my spiritual birth gave me new ideas and inclinations, and directed all my views to God." Cyprian flourished A. D. 250.

PROP. XII.—*But even the reformed creeds, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist, substantially avow the same views of immersion, though apparently afraid to carry them out in faith and practice.*

This proposition will be sustained by an extract from the creed of each of these sects.

EPISCOPALIAN.

The clergy are ordered, before proceeding to baptize, to make the following prayer.*

"Almighty and everlasting God, who, of thy great mercy, didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel thy people through the Red Sea; figuring thereby thy holy-baptism; and by the baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus

* Common Prayer, p. 105.

Christ in the river Jordan, didst sanctify the element of water, to the mystical washing away of sin; we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt mercifully look upon *these* thy *servants*; wash *them* and sanctify *them* with the Holy Ghost; that *they*, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the Ark of Christ's Church; and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally *they* may come to the land of everlasting life; there to reign with thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

After reading a part of the discourse with Nicodemus, they are ordered to make the following exhortation.*

"Beloved, ye hear in this gospel the express words of our Saviour Christ, that except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had. Likewise, immediately before his ascension into heaven, (as we read in the last chapter of St. Mark's Gospel,) he gave command to his disciples, saying, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. Which also showeth unto us the great benefit we reap thereby. For which cause St. Peter the Apostle, when upon his first preaching of the gospel many were pricked at the heart, and said to him and the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? replied, and said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words exhorted he them, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. For, as the same Apostle testifieth in another place, even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe that he will favorably receive *these* present persons, truly repenting, and coming unto him by faith; that he will grant *them* remission of *their* sins, and bestow upon *them* the Holy Ghost; that he will give *them*

* Page 165.

the blessing of eternal life, and make *them partakers* of his everlasting kingdom."

This, I need not add, is in accordance with the sentiments advanced in this essay. What a pity that the Episcopal Church does not believe and practise her own creed!

PRESBYTERIAN.

The Presbyterian Confession, on Baptism, chap, xxviii. sect. 1. declares that—

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church; but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his en grafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world."

"*A sign and seal of remission of sins!!*" This is much nigher the truth than this church seems to be apprized of. However, she cannot believe her own creed; for she does not believe that baptism is a sign and a seal of remission of sins, nor of regeneration, in her own sense of it, to her baptized or sprinkled infants. But in paying any regard to the Scriptures, she could not say less than she has said. It is no wonder that many sectaries cannot be persuaded to think, that the Scriptures mean what they say: for they are so much accustomed to say what they do not mean, that they cannot think God does mean what he says.

METHODIST.

The Methodist Creed says—

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, (and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and they that are in the flesh cannot please God, but live in sin, committing many actual transgressions:) and that our Saviour Christ saith, None shall enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate, and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous goodness he will grant to *these persons*, that which by nature *they* cannot have: that *they* may be baptized with

water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be made lively *members* of the same."

Then it is ordained that the minister say, or repeat the following prayer: —

"Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all that need, the helper of all that flee to thee for succor, the life of them that believe, and the resurrection of the dead: We call upon thee for *these persons*; that *they* coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of *their sins*, by spiritual regeneration. Receive *them*, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you. so give unto us that ask; let us that seek, find; open the gate unto us that knock; that *these persons* may enjoy the everlasting benediction of the heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"—*Dis. p. 105.*

Thus the Methodist Creed and Church are nearly as scriptural as the church from which they sprang. She prays for those to be baptized, that in baptism they may receive remission of sins! Does she believe what she says?

BAPTIST.

Chapter xxx. Section I.—"Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being engrafted into him; of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life."

The Baptist follows the Presbyterian church as servilely as the Methodist church follows the English hierarchy. But she avows her faith that immersion is a *sign* of remission. A sign of the past, the present, or the future! A sign accompanying!

The Confession of Bohemia.—"We believe that whatsoever by baptism—is in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all *that* doth the Lord God perform inwardly. That is, he washeth away sin, begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him: for the bestowing of these excellent fruits was holy baptism given and granted to the church."

The Confession of Augsburg.—"Concerning baptism, they teach that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony

ordained of Christ: also, by baptism the grace of God is offered."

The Confession of Saxony.—"I baptize thee—that is, I do witness that by this dipping, thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God."

The Confession of Whittenburg.—"We believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the Prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins."

The Confession of Helvetia.—"To be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, for to lead a new and innocent life."

The Confession of Sueveland.—"As touching baptism, we confess that it is the font of regeneration, washeth away sins and saveth us. But all these things we do understand as St. Peter doth interpret them. 1 Peter iii. 21."

Westminster Assembly.—"Before baptism the minister is to use some words of instruction—showing that it is instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our engrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, and life eternal."

The Roman Catholic and the Greek church say, "We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins."

Calvin makes remission the principal thing in baptism.*

"Baptism," says he, "resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are canceled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all, who believe, to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the *principal* thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise—'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.' "

"The ancient Christian church, from the highest antiquity,

* Inst. l. 4, cxv. p. 327.

after the apostolic times, appears generally to have thought that baptism is absolutely necessary for all that would be saved by the grace of Jesus Christ."*

"Most of the ancients concluded that baptism was- no less necessary unto salvation than faith or repentance itself."!

John Wesley, in his comment on the New Testament, (page 350,) speaks plainer than either the Methodist Discipline or the Regular Baptist Confession. His words are:—"Baptism administered to real penitents, is both a *means* and a *seal* of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily, in the primitive church, bestow this (pardon) on any, unless through this means." This is almost, if not altogether, as much as we have said on the forgiveness of sins through immersion.

May we not say, that we have sustained this last proposition to the full extent of the terms thereof?

With the testimony of John Wesley, the last of the reformers, I close my list of human vouchers for the import of Christian immersion. This list I could swell greatly; for, indeed, I have been quite disappointed in looking back into creeds, councils, commentators, and reformers, ancient and modern. I begin to fear, that I shall be suspected to have come to the conclusions, which I have exhibited from consulting human writings, creeds, and reformers. My fears are not that we, who plead for reformation, may appear to have nothing *original* to offer in this reformation; that we are mere gleaners in the fields which other minds have cultivated. It is not on this account our fears are excited for the reformation we plead is not characterized by new and original ideas, or human inventions; but by a return to the original ideas and institutions developed in the New Institution. But we fear lest any should suspect the views offered, to be a human invention or tradition; because we have found so much countenance for them in the works of the most ancient and renowned Christian writers, and the creeds of ancient and modern reformers. We can assure our readers, however, that we have been led to these conclusions from the simple perusal, the unprejudiced and impartial examination of the New Testament alone. And, we may add, that we are as much astonished, as any reader of this essay can be, to find such a cloud of witnesses to the truth and importance of the views offered. —The propositions now proved, and illustrated, must con-

* Vitranga, Tom, 1. 50, ii. c. 6, 9. † Owen on Justification, c. ii. p. 183.

vince all, that there is *some connexion* between immersion, and the forgiveness of sins. What that connexion is, may be disputed by some: but that such a connexion exists, none can dispute, who acknowledges the New Testament to contain a divine communication to man. With John Wesley we say, it is "to the believing the *means* and *seal* of pardon for all previous offences;" and we not only say we *think* so, but we preach it as such, and practise it as such. Those who think of any other connexion, would do well to attempt to form clear ideas of what they mean: for we are assured there is no meaning in any other connexion. To make it a commemorative sign of past remission is an outrage upon all rules of interpretation, and a perfect anomaly in all the revelation of God. To make it, prospectively, the sign of a future remission, is liable to the same exceptions. Nothing remains, but that it be considered, what it is in truth, the accompanying sign of an accompanying remission; the sign and the seal, or the means and the seal, of remission then granted through the water, connected with the blood of Jesus by the divine appointment, and through our faith in it.

We have heard some objections, and we can conceive of others which may be presented to *immersion for the remission of sins*. There can be objections made to any person, doctrine, sentiment, or practice, natural, moral, political, or religious, that ever existed. But notwithstanding all the objections made to every thing, there are thousands of matters and things we hold to be facts and truths indubitable. Amongst those certain and sure things, not to be shaken, is this Christian institution.

We will state and examine some objections partially noticed already; but, because they are the most common, or may become common, we will bestow upon them a formal statement, and a formal refutation.

Objection 1.—"To make the attainment, and the enjoyment of *present salvation*, pardon, justification, sanctification, reconciliation, adoption, dependent upon the contingency of water being present, or accessible, is beneath the dignity and character of a salvation from God."

And to make the attainment, and the enjoyment of present salvation, pardon, &c., dependent upon the contingency of faith being present or accessible—upon the blood of Jesus Christ being heard of, or known, is equally objectionable:—for what is faith but the belief of testimony? Or

what is it in the most popular sense but something wrought in the heart, a compound of knowledge and feeling, of assent and consent? And are not both blood and faith less accessible to mankind than the element of water? How much more water than faith, or than candidates for immersion? And is there not as much power, wisdom, and goodness of God in creating water, as in creating air, words, letters, faith, &c. Is not water more universal than language, words, books, preachers, faith, &c. This objection lies as much against any one means of salvation as another; nay, against all means of salvation. Whenever a case shall occur of much faith and little water; or of a little faith and no water, we will repel it by other arguments than these.

Objection 2.—"It makes void the value, excellency, and importance of both faith and grace." By no means. If a man say, with Paul, we are justified by faith; does it follow that grace is made void? Or, if one say we are justified by grace; does it make the blood of Christ of non-effect? Or, if, with Paul, a man say we are justified by his blood; does it make faith, repentance, and grace of no effect? Nay, indeed, this gives to faith its proper place, and its due value. It makes it the principle of action. It brings us to the water, to Christ, and to heaven. *But it is as a principle of action only.* It was not Abel's faith in his head, or heart; but Abel's faith at *the altar* which obtained such reputation. It was not Enoch's faith in principle, but Enoch's faith in his *walk with God*, which translated him to heaven. It was not Noah's faith in God's promise and threatening, but his faith exhibited in *building an ark*, which saved himself and family from the Deluge, and made him an heir of a new world, an heir of righteousness. It was not Abraham's faith in God's call, but his *going out* in obedience to that call, that first distinguished him as a pilgrim, and began his reputation. It was not faith in God's promise that Jericho should fall, but that faith carried out in the *blowing of rams' horns*, which laid its walls in ruins, &c. It is not our faith in God's promise of remission, but our *going down* into the water that obtains the remission of sins. But any one may see why faith has so much praise, and is of so much value. Because, without it, Abel would not have offered more sacrifices than Cain; Enoch would not have walked with God; Noah would not have built an ark; Abraham would not have left Ur of the Chaldees, nor offered up his son upon the altar. Without it, Israel would not have passed through the

wilderness, nor crossed the Jordan; and without it, none receive the remission of their sins in immersion. And, again, we would remind the reader, that when he talks of being saved by faith, he should bear in mind, that grace is not lost sight of; nor blood, nor water, nor reformation, discarded.

We enter the kingdom of nature by being born of the flesh. We enter the kingdom of heaven, or come under the reign of Jesus Christ, in this life, by being born of water, and the Spirit. We enter the kingdom of eternal glory by being born again from the earth, and neither by faith, nor the first regeneration. Neither by faith, nor baptism; but by being counted worthy of the resurrection of the just. 'I was hungry, and you fed me.' Not because you believed, or were born of water; but, because 'I was hungry, and you fed me,' &c.

There are three births, three kingdoms, and three salvations. One from the womb of our first mother, one from the water, and one from the grave. We enter a new world on, and not before, each birth. The present animal life, at the first birth; the spiritual, or the life of God in our souls, at the second birth; and the life eternal in the presence of God, at the third birth. And he, who dreams of entering the second kingdom, or coming under the dominion of Jesus, without the second birth—may, to complete his error, dream of entering the kingdom of glory without a resurrection from the dead.

Grace precedes all these births—shines in all the kingdoms, but will be glorified in the third. Sense is the principle of action in the first kingdom; faith, in the second; and sight spiritual, in the third. The first salvation is that of the body from the dangers and ills of life, and God is thus 'the Saviour of all men.' The second salvation is that of the soul from sin. The third is that of both soul and body united, delivered from moral and natural corruption, and introduced into the presence of God, when God shall be all in all.

Objection 3.—"It is so uncharitable to the Paidobaptists!" And how uncharitable are the Paidobaptists to Jews, Turks, and Pagans!! Will they promise present salvation from the guilt, pollution, and the dominion of sin, with the well grounded hope of heaven, to Jews, Turks, Pagans, or even Roman Catholics? Or will the Roman Catholics to them!! How uncharitable are they who cry

"*uncharitable*" to us! Infants, idiots, deaf, and dumb persons, innocent Pagans wherever they can be found, with all the pious Paidobaptists, we commend to the mercy of God. But such of them as wilfully *despise* this salvation, and who, having the opportunity to be immersed for the remission of their sins, wilfully *despise* or refuse, we have as little hope for them, as they have for all who refuse salvation *on their own terms of the gospel*. While they inveigh against us for laying a scriptural and rational stress upon immersion, do we not see that they lay as great, though an unscriptural and irrational stress, upon their baptism or sprinkling; so much so, as to give it *without faith*, even to infants, so soon as they are born of the flesh?

Objection 4.—"But do not many of them enjoy the present salvation of God?" How far they maybe happy in the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, I presume not to say. And we know so much of human nature as to say, that he, that *imagines* himself pardoned, will feel as happy as he that is really so. But one thing we do know, that none can *rationally*, and with *certainty*, enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who intelligently, and in full faith are born of water, or immersed for the remission of their sins. And as the testimony of God, and not conceit, imagination, nor our reasoning upon what passes in our minds, is the ground of our certainty, we see and feel, that we have an assurance which they cannot have. And we have this advantage over them, we once stood upon their ground, had their hopes, felt their assurance; but they have not stood upon our ground, nor felt our assurance. Moreover, the experience of the first converts shews the difference between their immersion, and the immersions, or sprinklings, of modern gospels.

Objection 5.—"This has been so long concealed from the people, and so lately brought to our view, that we cannot acquiesce in it."

This objection would have made unavailing every attempt at reformation, or illumination of the mind, or change in the condition and enjoyments of society, ever attempted. Besides, do not the experience of all the religious—the observation of the intelligent—the practical result of all creeds, reformations, and improvements—and the expectations, and longings of society, warrant the conclusion that either some new revelation, or some new development of the revelation of God, must be made, before the hopes and

expectations of all true Christians can be realized, or Christianity save and reform the nations of this world. We want the old gospel back, and sustained by the ancient order of things: and this alone, by the blessing of the Divine Spirit, is all that we do want, or can expect, to reform and save the world. And if this gospel, as proclaimed and enforced on Pentecost, cannot do this, vain are the hopes, and disappointed must be the expectations of the, so called, Christian world.

RECAPITULATION.

As Christian faith rests upon, and Christian practice proceeds from, *the testimony of God*, and not from the reasonings of men;—I will, in this recapitulation, only call up the evidences on one single proposition, assumed, sustained, and illustrated in the preceding pages; and that is the *ninth proposition*, as sustained by the apostolic testimony. We wish to leave before the mind of the diligent reader the great importance attached to Christian immersion, as presented in the Evangelists, the Acts, and the Epistles.

1. *In the Evangelists*—It is called *the forgiveness of sins*. Matthew and Mark introduce the Messiah in his own person in giving the commission. Luke does not. Matthew presents Jesus, saying, 'Go, convert the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you.' This, of course, in order to salvation. Mark presents him, saying, 'Go into all the world, proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation: he who believes, and is immersed, shall be saved; and he who believes not, shall be condemned.' Luke, however, does not introduce the Lord in his own person in giving the charge; but records it, in his own conception of it, in the following words:—That 'reformation and forgiveness of sins should be announced in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.' No person, we presume, will question but that Luke thus records the commission;—and, if so, then it is indisputable that, as Luke neither mentions faith nor immersion, he substitutes for them the received import of both, when and where he wrote. Metonymically he places repentance, or rather *reformation*, for faith; and *remission of sins*, for immersion. In Luke's acceptation and time forgiveness of sins stood for immersion, and reformation for

faith—the effect for the means or cause. The only reference to the commission found in John, occurs xx. 21. 'As the Father has sent me, so send I you:—whose sins soever you remit, are remitted to them; and whose sins soever you retain, are retained.' Here is neither faith, repentance, nor baptism) but the object, *remission of sins*, is literally proposed. In the commission, salvation is attached by the Lord Jesus to faith and immersion into his name. He that believes, and is immersed, shall be saved. Thus immersion is taught in the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

2. *In the Acts of the Apostles*—Sermon 1, Peter says, 'Reform and be immersed, every one of you, into the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' Sermon 2, he says, 'Reform and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; that seasons of refreshment from the presence of the Lord may come, and that he may send Jesus,' &c. In the same discourse, he says, 'God having raised up his Son Jesus, has sent him to bless you, every one of you, turning from his iniquities.' In his 3d Sermon, recorded Acts x. he says, 'To him all the Prophets bear witness, that every one who believes in him shall receive remission of sins *by his name.*' Paul at Antioch, in Pisidia, declares, that through Jesus was proclaimed the remission of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things. Ananias commanded Paul to arise and be immersed, and to wash away his sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. Thus it is spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles.

3. *In the Epistles*—The Romans are said to have been immersed into Christ Jesus—into his death; to have been buried with him, and consequently to have risen with him, and to walk in a new life. The Corinthians are said to have been washed, justified, and sanctified by the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God,. The Galatians 'were immersed into Christ, and had put him on.' The Ephesians were married to Christ by immersion, as brides were wont to be washed in order to their nuptials. The assembly of the disciples, called *the congregation of the Lord*, making tire bride of Christ, were said to be *cleansed by the bath of water and the word*. The Colossians were *buried with Christ, raised with him*, and are said to have been *forgiven all trespasses*, when they were raised with him, where their resurrection with Jesus and their hav-

ing all sins forgiven are connected.* All the saints are said to be saved by immersion, or 'the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.' † The believing Jews had their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and their bodies washed with clean water, or water which made clean. Peter taught all the saints in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, that the water of baptism saved them, as the water of the deluge saved Noah in the Ark; and that in immersion a person was purged from all his former sins. And John the Apostle represents the saved as having 'washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,' and all the baptized little children as 'having their sins forgiven.' Such are the evidences found in the Epistles. How numerous! how clear! and how unequivocal! Are we not, then, warranted to say, Except a man be regenerated of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' and that all who, believing, are immersed for the remission of their sins, have the remission of their sins in and through immersion?

CONCLUSION.

A word to the regenerated.—You have experienced the truth of the promise; and being introduced by that promise, you have become, like Isaac, children of promise. You heard the testimony of God concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and you believed it. You were, in consequence of your faith, so disposed towards the person of Jesus, as to be willing to put yourselves under his guidance. This faith, and this will, brought you to the water. You were not ashamed, nor afraid to confess him before men. You solemnly declared you regarded him as God's only Son, and the Saviour of men. You vowed allegiance to him. Down into the water you were led. Then the name of the Holy One upon your faith, and upon your person, was pronounced. You were then buried in the water under that name, it closed itself upon you. In its womb you were concealed. Into the Lord, as in the water, you were immersed. But in the water you continued not. Of it you were born, and from it you came forth, raised with Jesus, and rising in his strength. There your consciences were released; for there your old sins were washed away. And although you re-

* Colossians ii. 11, 13, 14. † Titus iii. 5.

ceived not the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which confirmed the testimony to the first disciples, you felt the powers of the world to come, were enlightened, and tasted the bounty of God: for seasons of refreshment from the presence of God came upon you. Your hearts were sprinkled from evil consciences, when your bodies were washed in the cleansing water. Then into the kingdom of Jesus you entered. The King of righteousness, of peace, and joy, extended his scepter over you, and sanctified in state, and in your whole person, you rejoiced in the Lord with joy unspeakable and full of glory. Being washed, you were sanctified, as well as acquitted. And now you find yourselves under the great Advocate, so that sin cannot lord it over you; for you always look to the great Advocate to intercede for you, and thus, if sin should overtake you, you confess and forsake it, and always find mercy. Adopted thus into the family of God, you have not only received the name, the rank, and the dignity; but also the spirit of a son of God, and find, as such, that you are kings, priests, and heirs of God. You now feel that all things are yours, because you are Christ's; and Christ is God's. The hope of the coming regeneration of the heavens and the earth, at the resurrection of the just, animates you. You look for the redemption, the adoption of your bodies, and their transfiguration. For this reason, you purify yourselves even as he is pure. Be zealous, then, children of God; publish the excellencies of him, who has called you into this marvelous light and bliss. Be diligent, that you may receive the crown that never fades, and that you may eat of the tree of life, which grows in the midst of the Paradise of God. If you suffer with Jesus, you will reign with him. If you should deny him, he will deny you. Add, then, to your faith, courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, brotherly kindness, and universal benevolence; for if you continue in these things and abound, you shall not be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But should you be deficient in these things, your light will be obscured, and a forgetfulness that you have been purified from your old sins, will come upon you. Do, then, brethren, labor to make your calling and election sure; for thus practising, you shall never fall; but shall have an easy and abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

A word to the unregenerate.—Amongst you are sundry

classes of character. Some of you who believe the gospel, and are changed in heart, quickened by the Spirit, are not generally ranked among the unregenerate. In the popular sense of this term, you are regenerate. But we use it in its scriptural acceptation. Like Nicodemus, and like Joseph of Arimathea, you believe in Jesus, and are willing to take lessons from him in the chambers. You have confidence in his mission, respect and venerate, and even love his person; and would desire to be under his government. Marvel not that I say to you, *You must be born again*, Pious as you are supposed to be, and as you may think yourselves to be, unless you are born again, you cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Cornelius and his family were as devout and as pious as any of you. 'He feared God, gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God continually.' Yet, mark it well, I beseech you, it was necessary, '*to tell him words* by which himself and his house *might be saved.*' These words were told him: he believed them, and received the Holy Spirit; yet still he must be born again. For a person cannot be said to be born again *of any thing which he receives*; and still less of miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. He was immersed, and into the kingdom of God he came. He was then saved. You need not ask how, or why, these things are so. Do as Cornelius did, and then you will think of it in another light—then you would not for a world be unregenerate. To have the pledge, the promise, and seal of God, of the remission of all your sins, to be adopted into his family, and to receive the spirit of a son of God, be assured, my pious friends, are matters of no every day occurrence; and when you feel yourselves constitutionally invested with all these blessings, in God's own way, you will say, that 'his ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts.' It is hard to make a slave feel and act as a freeman. As difficult, we often find it, to make the unregenerate feel and know the value and importance of regeneration. But the regenerate would not be unregenerate for the universe.

God has one way of bestowing every thing. We cannot gather grapes off thorns, nor figs off thistles. The reason is, there they do not grow. We can tell no other reason why they cannot grow there, but that they do not grow there. We cannot have any blessing, but in God's own

way of giving it. We cannot find wool save on the back of the sheep, nor silk save from the worm which spins it from itself. Corn and wheat cannot be obtained, but from those plants which yield them. Without the plant, we cannot have the fruit. This is the economy of the whole material system. And in the world of spirits, and spiritual influences, is it not the same? Moral law is as unchangeable, as the laws of nature. Moral means and ends are as inseparable as natural means and ends. God cannot bestow grace upon the proud, and cannot withhold it from the humble. He does not do it, and that is enough. He could shower down wheat and corn, and give us rivers of milk and wine, were it a question of mere power. But taking all together, his wisdom, power, and goodness, he cannot do it. So neither can he give us faith without testimony, hope without a promise, love without an amiable object, peace without purity, nor heaven without holiness. He cannot give to the unborn infant the light of the sun, the vivacity which the air imparts, nor the agility and activity which liberty bestows. He does not do it, and, therefore, we say, he cannot do it. Neither can he bestow the blessings of the Reign of Heaven upon those, who are children of disobedience

I know how reluctant men are to submit to God's government; and yet they must all bow to it at last. 'To Jesus every knee shall bow, and to him every tongue confess.' But they will object to bowing *now*, and torture invention for excuses. They will tell me, all that I have said is true of natural and moral means and ends; but immersion is not a moral means, because God forgave sins and saved men before immersion was appointed. "It is a *positive*, and not a *moral* institution." And is there no moral influence connected with positive institutions? A *written* law is a positive institution: for moral law existed before written law. But because it has become a positive institution, has its moral power ceased? *The moral influence of all positive institutions, is God's WILL expressed in them.* And it matters not, whether it be the *eating or not eating* of an apple, the building of an altar, or the building it with, or without the aid of iron tools; the offering of a kid, a lamb, a bullock, or a pigeon, it is just as morally binding, and has the same moral influence, as, 'You shall honor your father and mother;' or, 'You shall not kill,' It is THE WILL OF GOD in any institution, which gives it all its moral and

physical power. No man could now be pardoned as Abel was—as Enoch was—as David was—as the thief upon the cross was. These all lived before the *second* will of God was declared. He took away '*the first will*,' says Paul, 'that he might establish the *second will*,' by which we are sanctified. We are not pardoned as were the Jews or the Patriarchs. It was not till Jesus was buried and rose again, that an acceptable offering for sin was presented in the heavens. By one offering up of himself, he has perfected the conscience of the immersed or sanctified. Since his oblation, a new institution for remission has been appointed. You need not flatter yourselves, that God will save or pardon you, except for Christ's sake; and if his name is not assumed by you, if you have not put him on, if you have not come under his advocacy, you have not the name of Christ to plead, nor his intercession on your behalf—and, therefore, for Christ's sake you cannot be forgiven. Could Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Aaron, think you, if living now—could they, I ask, find forgiveness at the altar? And will you imagine, that he, who honored every institution by Moses, by connecting rewards and punishments with the obedience or disobedience of his commands, be less jealous for the honor of the institution of his Son? And will that Son, who, for no other purpose than to honor his Father's institution, was immersed in the Jordan, bestow pardon or salvation upon any, who refuse to honor him, and him that sent him? He has been graciously pleased to adapt means to ends. He has commanded immersion for the remission of sins; and, think you, that he will chance his institution, because of your stubborn or intractable disposition? As well, as reasonably might you pray for loaves from heaven, or manna, because Israel eat it in the desert; as to pray for pardon, while you refuse the remission of your sins by immersion.

Demur not because of the simplicity of the thing. Remember how simple was the eating of the fruit of that tree, "whose mortal taste brought death into the world, and all our woe." How simple was the rod in the hand of Moses, when stretched over Egypt and the Red Sea? How simple was looking at the brazen serpent? And how simple are all God's institutions? How simple the aliments of nature; —the poisons too, and their remedies? Where the will of God is, there is omnipotence. It was simple to speak the universe into existence. But God's will gives efficacy to every

thing. And obedience ever was, and ever will be, the happiness of man. It is the happiness of Heaven. It is God's philanthropy which has given us something to obey. To the angels who sinned he has given no command. It was gracious to give us a command to live—a command to reform—a command to be born again—to live for ever. Remember light and life first came by obedience. If God's voice had not been obeyed, the water would not have brought forth the earth, nor would the sun have blessed it by his rays. The obedience of law was goodness and mercy; but the obedience of faith is favor, and life, and glory everlasting. None to whom this gospel is announced will perish, except those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son. Kiss, then, the Son, lest he be angry, and you perish for ever.

To the unregenerate of all classes, whose education and prejudices compel them to assent to the testimony of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, and Jude.— You own the mission of Jesus from the bosom of the Eternal—and that is *all* you do! Each of you is living without God, and without hope in the world—aliens from the family of God—of various ranks and grades among men; but all involved in one condemnation, because light has come into the world, and you love darkness, and the works of darkness, rather than light. To live without hope, is bad enough; but to live in constant dread of the vengeance of Heaven, is still worse. But do you not tremble at the word of God?

If you can be saved here, or hereafter, then there is no meaning in language, no pain in the universe, no truth in God—Death, the grave, and destruction have no meaning. The frowns of Heaven are all smiles, if you perish not in your ways.

But you purpose to bow to Jesus, and to throw yourselves upon his mercy at last. Impious thought I When you have given the strength of your intellect, the vigor of your constitution, the warmth of your affections, the best energies of your life, to the world, the flesh, and the Devil; you will stretch out your palsied hands and turn your dim eyes to the Lord, and say, 'Lord have mercy upon me!' The first fruits, and fatlings for the Devil, the lame and the blind for God, is the purpose of your heart; and the best resolution you can form! ___ The thief upon the cross, had he done so, could not have

found mercy. It is one thing to have known the way of salvation, assented to it, and to have in deliberate resolution rejected it for the present, with a promise of obeying it at some future period; and to have never known it, nor assented to it, to the end of life. Promise not, then, to yourselves what has never happened to others. The Devil has always said, "You may give *to-morrow* to the Lord—only give to me *to-day*." This has been all that he has asked, and this is what you are disposed to give. Promise not *to-morrow* to the Lord, for you will be still less disposed to give it when it comes; and the Lord has not asked you for *to-morrow*. He says, TO DAY, when you shall hear his voice, harden not your hearts. But you say, you are willing to come to the Lord *to-day* if you knew the way, or if you were *prepared*? Well, what does the Lord require of you as *preparation*? He once said, 'Let the wicked man forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him turn to the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.' He says also, 'Draw nigh to me, and I will draw nigh to you;' 'Cleanse your hands, you sinners; and purify your hearts, you men of two souls;' 'Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings;' 'Reform and be converted;' 'Turn to the Lord;' 'Be immersed for the remission of your sins.' and 'Submit to the government of Jesus.' "What! just as I am!" Pray, how are you? Have you such a persuasion in your heart of the mission of Jesus, as God's own Son, and the only Saviour; and have you so much confidence in his personal character, as to be willing to surrender yourself to him for the present and future—for time and eternity? "I have," you say. As one that has heard his voice, I say then, Come and be regenerated, and seasons of refreshment from the Lord will come to you.

"But I thought I ought to feel like a Christian first, and to have the experience of a Christian, before I came to the Lord." Indeed! Did the Lord tell you so? "His ministers taught me so," It is hard knowing who are his ministers now-a-days. His *commissioned* ministers taught you not so. They were not taught to say so. The Master knew, that to wait for health before we went to the physician—to seek for warmth before we approach the fire—to wait till we cease to be hungry before we approached the table—was not reasonable. And therefore, he never asked, as he never expected, any one to feel like a Christian before he was im-

merged, and began to live like a Christian. None but the citizens of any country can experience the good or evil of the government which presides over it. None but the married can experience the conjugal relation and feelings. None but sons and daughters can have the experience of sons and daughters; and none but those who obey the gospel, can experience the sweets of obedience. I need not add, that none but the disobedient can experience the pains, the fears, and terrors of the Lord—the shame and remorse which are the first fruits of the anguish and misery, which await them in another world. As the disobedient, who stumble at the word, have the first fruits of the awful destruction from the presence of the Lord, which awaits them; so the obedient have the first fruits of the Spirit—the salvation of their souls, as an earnest of the salvation to be revealed at the coming of the Lord.

And now let me ask all the unregenerate, What do you propose to yourselves by either delaying or refusing to come to the Lord? Will delaying have any tendency to fit you or prepare you for his salvation? Will your lusts have less power, or sin have less dominion over you, by continuing under their control? Has the intoxicating cup, by indulgence, diminished a taste for it? Has the avarice of the miser been weakened, or cured, by yielding to it? Has any propensity been destroyed by gratifying it, in any other way than as it destroyed the animal system? Can you, then, promise yourselves that, by continuing in disobedience, you will love obedience, and be more inclined to submit when you have longer resisted the Spirit of God! Presume not on the mercy of God, but in the way that mercy flows. Grace has its channels, as the waters have their courses; and its path, as the lightning of the clouds. Each has its law, as fixed as the throne of God; and think not that God will work a miracle for your salvation.

Think you that the family of Noah could have been saved, if they had refused to enter into the Ark? Could the first born of Israel have escaped the destroying angel, but in houses sprinkled with blood? or could Israel have escaped the wrath of Pharaoh, but by being immersed into Moses in the cloud and in the sea? These things are written for our admonition, upon whom the consummation of past ages has come. Arise, then, and be immersed, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord. The *many who*

refuse grace, will neither prove you wise nor safe in disobedience.

"Multitudes are no mark
That you will right be found;
A few were saved in the Ark,
For many millions drown'd.
Obey the gospel call,
And enter while you may:
Christ's flock have long been email,
Yet none are safe but they!"

DEFECTS OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY.*

Our greatest objection to the systems which we oppose, is their impotency on the heart. Alas! what multitudes of prayerless, saintless, Christless, joyless hearts, have crowded Christianity out of the congregations by their experiences before baptism! They seem to have had all their religion before they professed it. They can relate no experience since baptism, comparable to that professed before the "mutual pledge" was tendered and received.

It was the indubitable proofs of the superabundance of this fruit, which caused me first to suspect the far-famed tree of evangelical orthodoxy. That cold-heartedness—that stiff and mercenary formality—that tithing of mint, anise, and dill—that negligence of mercy, justice, truth, and the love of God, which stalked through the communions of sectarian altars—that apathy and indifference about '*thus saith the Lord*'—that zeal for human prescriptions—and, above all, that willing ignorance of the sayings and doings of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, which so generally appeared, first of all created, fostered, and matured my distrust in the reformed systems of evangelical sectaries. Communion with me was communion of kindred souls, immersed into one spirit—congenial spirits, hearts touched with the love" of God, that celestial magnet, which turns our aspirations and adorations to him, who washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests to God.

To sit in the same pew; to gather round the same pulpit; to put our names to the same covenant, or subscription list; to contribute for a weekly sermon; to lisp the same opinions, extracted from the same creed, always appeared to me un-

* A second Essay, called the "*Extra Defended*," on this same subject, in reply to a pamphlet from Elder Andrew Broaddus, of Virginia, titled the "*Extra Examined*," appeared in October 1831. From our Defence, we here insert only four extracts. The subject as defended, being fully expressed in the preceding essay.

worthy bonds of union or communion, and therefore my soul abhorred them as substitutes for the love of God shed abroad in the heart, for the communion of the Holy Spirit. 'If a man would give all the substance of his house as a substitute for love, it should be utterly contemned.'

The Divine Philosopher preached reformation by addressing himself to the *heart*. We begin with the heart. 'Make the tree good,' and then good fruit may be expected. But this appears to be the error of all sects, in a greater or less degree: they set about *mending* the heart, as preliminary to that which alone can *create a new heart*. Jesus gives us the philosophy of his scheme in an address to a sinner of that time—'Your sins,' says he, 'are forgiven you; go, and sin no more.' He first changes the sinner's state, not external but internal, and then says, 'Go, *and sin no more*.' He frankly forgave the debt. The sinner loved him.

There was much of this philosophy in the question, '*Who loves most*—he that was forgiven five hundred pence, or he that was forgiven fifty? How much does he love, who is not forgiven at all?' Aye, that question brings us onward a little to the reason, why the first act of obedience to Jesus Christ should be baptism into his name, and that for the remission of sins.

But now we speak of the exercises of the heart. While any man believes the words of Jesus, 'Out of the heart proceed the actions which defile the man,' he can never lose sight of the heart, as the object on which all evangelical arguments are to terminate, and as the *fons et principium*, the fountain and origin of all piety and humanity.

Once for all, let it be distinctly noted, that we appreciate nothing in religion which tends not directly and immediately, proximately and remotely, to the purification and perfection of the heart. Paul acts the philosopher fully once, and, if we recollect right, but once in all his writings upon this subject. It has been for many years a favorite topic with me. It is in his first epistle to Timothy—'Now the end of the commandment [or gospel] is love out of a pure heart— out of a good conscience—out of faith unfeigned.' Faith unfeigned brings a person to remission, or to a good conscience; a good conscience precedes, in the order of nature, a pure heart; and that is the only soil in which love, that plant of celestial origin, can grow. This is our philosophy of Christianity—of the gospel. And thus it is the wisdom and power of God to salvation. We proceed upon these as our

axiomata in all our reasonings, preachings, writings—1st. unfeigned faith; 2d. a good conscience; 3d. a pure heart; 4th. love. The testimony of God apprehended produces unfeigned or genuine faith; faith obeyed, produces a good conscience. This Peter defines to be the use of baptism, the answer of a good conscience. This produces a pure heart, and then the consummation is love—love to God and man.

Paul's order or arrangement is adopted by us as infallible: Testimony—faith unfeigned—remission, or a good conscience—a pure heart—love. Preaching, praying, singing, commemorating, meditating, all issue here. 'Happy the pure in heart, for they shall see God!'

IMMERSION NOT A MERE BODILY ACT.

Views of baptism, as a mere external and bodily art, exert a very injurious influence on the understanding arid practice of men. Hence, many ascribe to it so little importance in the Christian economy. 'Bodily exercise,' says Paul, 'profits little.' We have been taught to regard immersion in water, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as an act of the whole man;—body, soul, and spirit. The soul of the intelligent subject is as fully immersed *into the Lord Jesus*, as his body is immersed *in the water*. His soul rises with the Lord Jesus, as his body rises out of the water; and into one spirit with all the family of God is he immersed. It is not like circumcising a Hebrew infant, or proselyting to Moses a Gentile adult. The candidate believing in the person, mission, and character of the Son of God, and willing to submit to him immediately, upon recognizing him, hastens to be buried with the Lord, and to rise with him, not corporally, but spiritually, with his whole soul.

Reader, be admonished how you speak of bodily acts in obedience to divine institutions. Remember Eve, Adam, and all transgressors on the one hand. Remember Abel, Noah, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, down to the harlot Rahab, on the other; and be cautious how you speak of bodily acts! Rather remember the sacrifice of a body on Mount Calvary, and talk not lightly of bodily acts. There is no such thing as outward bodily acts in the Christian institution; and less than in all others, in the act of immersion. Then it is that the spirit, soul, and body of man, become one with the Lord. Then it is that the power of the name

of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, come upon us. Then it is that we are enrolled among the children of God, and enter the ark, which will, if we abide in it, transport us to the Mount of God.

JUSTIFICATION ASCRIBED TO SEVEN CAUSES.

In examining the New Testament, we find that a man is said to be '*justified by faith*,' Rom. v. 1; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 24. '*Justified freely by his grace*,' Rom. iii. 24; Titus iii. 7. '*Justified by his blood*,' Rom. v. 9. '*Justified by works*,' James ii. 21, 24, 25. '*Justified in or by the name of the Lord Jesus*,' 1 Cor. vi. 11. '*Justified by Christ*,' Gal. ii. 16. '*Justified by knowledge*,' Is. liii. 11. 'It is God that justifies,' Rom. iii. 33, viz: by these *seven* means—by Christ, his name, his blood, by knowledge, grace, faith, and by works. Are these all literal? Is there no room for interpretation here? He that selects *faith* out of *seven*, must either act arbitrarily, or shew his reason; but the reason does not appear in the text: He must reason it out: he must infer it. Why, then, assume that *faith alone* is the reason of our justification? Why not assume that the *name* of the Lord alone is the great matter, seeing this name 'is the only name given under heaven, by which any man can be saved;' and men 'who believe, receive *the remission of sins by his name*:'* and especially, because the name of Jesus, or of the Lord, is more frequently mentioned in the New Testament, in reference to all spiritual blessings, than any thing else!! Call all these *causes*, or *means* of justification, and what then? We have the grace of God for the *moving* cause, Jesus Christ for the *efficient* cause, his blood the *procuring* cause, knowledge the *disposing* cause, the name of the Lord the immediate cause, faith the *formal* cause, and works for the *concurring* cause. For example: a gentleman on the sea shore descries the wreck of a vessel at some distance from land, driving out into the ocean, and covered with a miserable and perishing sea drenched crew. Moved by pure philanthropy. he sends his son with a boat to save them. When the boat arrives at the wreck, he invites them in, upon this condition,—that they submit to his guidance. A number of the crew stretch out their arms, and seizing the boat with their hands, spring into it, take hold of the oars, and row to land;

* Acts x. 43.

while some, from cowardice, and others, because of some difficulty in coming at the boat, wait in expectation of a second trip; but before it returned, the wreck went to pieces, and they all perished. The *moving* cause of their salvation who escaped, was the good will of the gentleman on the shore; his son, who took the boat, was the *efficient* cause; the boat itself, the *procuring* cause; the knowledge of their perishing condition and his invitation, the *disposing* cause; the seizing the boat with their hands, and springing into it, the *immediate* cause; their consenting to his condition, the *formal* cause; and their rowing to shore, under the guidance of his son, was the *concurring* cause of their salvation. Thus men are justified or saved by grace, by Christ, by his blood, by faith, by knowledge, by the name of the Lord, and by works. But of the *seven* causes, *three* of which are purely instrumental, why choose *one* of the instrumental, and emphasize upon it as the justifying or saving cause, to the exclusion of, or in preference to the others? Everyone in its own place is essentially necessary. If we examine the word *saved* in the New Testament, we shall find that we are said to be saved by as many causes, though some of them differently denominated, as those by which we are said to be justified. Let us see: we are said to be 'saved by grace,' Eph. ii. 5; 'saved through his life,' Rom. v. 9, 10; 'saved through faith,' Eph. ii. 8, Acts xvi. 31; 'saved by baptism,' 1 Peter iii. 21; or 'by faith and baptism,' Mark xvi. 16; or 'by the washing of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit,' Titus iii. 5; or 'by the gospel,' 1 Cor. xv. 2; or 'by calling upon the Lord,' and by 'enduring to the end,' Acts ii. 21, Rom. jr. 13, Matt. x. 22. Here we have salvation ascribed to grace, to Jesus Christ, to his death and resurrection—*three* times to baptism, either by itself or in conjunction, once with faith, and once with the Holy Spirit; to works, or to calling upon the Lord, and to enduring to the end. To these we might add other phrases nearly similar, but these include all the causes to which we have just now alluded. Saved by grace, the *moving* cause; by Jesus, the *efficient* cause; by his death, and resurrection, and life, the *procuring* cause; by the gospel, the *disposing* cause; by faith, the *formal* cause; by baptism, the *immediate* cause; and by enduring to the end, or persevering in the Lord, the *concurring* cause.

PETER IN JERUSALEM, AND PAUL IN PHILIPPI, RECONCILED.

Thousands ask Peter, *What shall we do?* The Jailor asks Paul, *What shall I do?* TO BE SAVED, if the reader pleases. Peter says, Reform and be baptized, every one of you, &c. Paul answers, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, with thy family.' How is this, Paul and Peter? Why do you not preach the same gospel, and answer the same question in the same or similar terms? Paul, do you preach another gospel to the Gentiles, than that Peter preached to the Jews? What sayest thou, Paul? Paul replies—"Strike, but hear me. Had I been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, I would have spoken as Peter did. Peter spoke to believing and penitent Jews; I spoke to an ignorant Roman jailor. I arrested his attention after the earthquake, by simply announcing that there was salvation to him and all his family, through belief in Jesus." But why did you not mention repentance, baptism, the Holy Spirit? "Who told you I did not?" Luke says nothing about it; and I concluded you said nothing about them. Luke was a faithful historian, was he not? "Yes, very faithful: and why do you not faithfully hearken to his account? Does he not immediately subjoin, that as soon as I got the jailor's ear, I *spoke the word of the Lord to him, and to all that were in his house?* Why, you reason like a Paidobaptist. You think, do you, that the jailor's children were saved by his faith! I spoke the whole gospel, or word of the Lord, to the jailor and *to his family*. In speaking *the word of the Lord*, I mentioned repentance, baptism, remission, the Holy Spirit, the resurrection, judgment, and eternal life: else why should I have baptized him and all his house; and why should he have rejoiced afterwards with all his family!!" Paul, I beg your pardon. I will not now interrogate Peter, for I know how he will answer me: he would say—"Had I been in Philippi, I would have spoken to an ignorant Pagan as Paul did, to shew that salvation flowed through faith in Jesus; and when he believed this and repented, I would *then* have said, Be baptized for the remission of your sins."

Regeneration.

'I create New Heavens and a New Earth.'

ISAIAH lxv. 18.

'Behold I make all things new.'

REVELATION xxi. 5.

We intend an essay full of "the seeds of things." The topic is a common one, a familiar one, and yet it is an interesting one. Much has been said, much has been written upon it; and yet it is no better understood than it ought to be. Few give themselves the trouble of thinking much on the things, which they think they understand; and many would rather follow the thoughts of others, than think for themselves. Suspense is painful, much study is a weariness of the flesh; and, therefore, the majority are content with the views and opinions handed to them from those who have gone before.

We wish to treat this subject as if it were a new one; and to examine it now, as if we had never examined it before. It is worthy of it. Generation is full of wonders, for it is full of God's physical grandeur; yet regeneration is still more admirable, for in it the moral attributes of Jehovah are displayed. But we aim not at a development of its wonders, but at a plain common-sense scriptural exposition of its import.

We have not learned our theology from Athanasius, nor our morality from Seneca; and, therefore, we shall not call upon them for illustration, argument, or proof. To the Sacred Records, in which alone Christianity yet remains in all its freshness, we look for light; and thither would we direct the eyes of our readers. It is not the regeneration of the schools, in which Christianity has been lowered, misapprehended, obscured, and adulterated, of which we are to write; but that regeneration of which Jesus spoke, and the Apostles wrote.

A few things must be premised—a few general views expressed, before we, or our readers, are prepared for the more

minute details: and to approach the subject with all unceremonious despatch, we observe, that—

Man unregenerate is ruined in body, soul, and spirit; a frail and mortal creature. From Adam his father he inherits a shattered constitution. He is the child of a fallen progenitor; a scion from a degenerate stock.

Superior to Adam, the exile from Eden, in physical, intellectual, and moral nature, none of his descendants can rise. It is not in nature to improve itself; for above its fountain the stream cannot rise. Cain, the firstborn of Eve, was in nature the image and likeness of him that begat him. Education failed to improve him, while Abel, his younger brother, obtained the excellency which faith in God's promise alone bestows. The first born, it will be conceded, was at least equal to his younger brother: and who can plead that in nature he excels Eve's eldest son!

Man in his ruins is, however, a proper subject of a remedial system. He is susceptible of renovation. Therefore God has placed him under a regenerating economy. This economy contemplates the regeneration of the whole human constitution, and proposes as its consummation the transformation of spirit, soul, and body. The destiny of the regenerate is described by Paul in one sentence: 'As we now bear the image of the earthly Adam, we shall then bear the image of the heavenly Adam.'

God's own Son is proposed as the model. Conformity to him in glory, honor, and immortality, as the perfection of the regenerate, is the predestination of him, who speaks of things that are not, as though they were.

Regeneration is, therefore, moral and physical: or, in other words, there is now a renovation of the mind—of the understanding, will, and affections;—and there will hereafter be a renovation of the body: 'For this corruptible body shall put on incorruption, and this mortal body shall put on immortality.'

The renovation of the mind and character is, therefore, that moral regeneration which is to be effected in this life; for which the remedial system, or kingdom of heaven, was set up on earth: and this, therefore, first of all, demands our attention.

Before we attempt an answer in detail to the question, *How is this moral regeneration effected?* we shall attend to the principle on which the whole remedial system proceeds. The grand principle, or means which God has adopted for

the accomplishment of this moral regeneration, is the full demonstration and proof of a single proposition addressed to the reason of man. This sublime proposition is, THAT GOD IS LOVE.

The reason and wisdom of this procedure will suggest itself to every one, who can understand the views and feelings of all unregenerated men. Man, in a state of alienation and rebellion, naturally suspects, that if he be a sinner, and if God hate sin, he must hate him. As love begets love, so hatred begets hatred; and if a sinner suspects that God hates him, he cannot love God. He must know that God loves him, before he can begin to love God. 'We,' says an Apostle, 'love God because he first loved us.' While alienated in heart, through the native darkness of his understanding, the sinner misinterprets every restraint which God has placed in his way to prevent his total ruin, as indications of the wrath of Heaven. His transgression of these restraints, and his consciousness of having defied the veracity and power of God, only increase his enmity, and urge him onward in his apostacy and wanderings from his creator. The goodness of God, being misunderstood, furnishes to him no incentive to repentance and reformation. Guilt and fear, and shame, the fruits of his apostacy, becloud his understanding, and veil from his eye all the demonstrations of benevolence and goodness, with which the creation abounds. Adam under a tree, hiding from God, trembling with fear, suspicious of the movements of every leaf, and covered with shame as with a garment, is both an illustration and proof of these views of the state of mind, which obtains in the unregenerate.

Neither the volume of creation, nor that of God's providence, is sufficient to remove from the natural man these misconceptions, and the consequent alienation of heart. The best proof that these two volumes cannot do this, is, that they never have, in any one instance, yet done it. From the nature of things, it is indeed evident that they cannot do it. The elements are too often at war with the happiness of man. The ever-changing attitude of the natural world in reference to health, and life, and comfort, render it at best doubtful, whether the laws of nature, which ultimately bring man down to the grave, are the effect of benevolence, or of malevolence towards mankind. A third volume, explanatory of both, and replete also with supernatural developments, is wanting, to furnish the most diligent

student of nature and providence, with the means of learning the true and full character of him, against whom we have rebelled.

That volume is the Bible. Holy Prophets and Apostles spake as they were moved by the Spirit of Knowledge and Revelation. Its records, its history, its prophecy, its precepts, its laws, its ordinances, and its examples, all develope and reveal God to man, and man to himself.

But it is in the person and mission of the INCARNATE WORD, that we learn that *God is love*. That God gave his Son for us, and yet gives his Spirit to us,—and thus gives us himself—are the mysteries and transcendent proofs of the most August proposition in the universe. The gospel, Heaven's wisdom and power combined, God's own expedient for the renovation of human nature, is neither more nor less, than the illustration and proof of this regenerating proposition.

Thus we hasten to our subject. Having glanced at the great landmarks of the plantations of nature and grace, now that we may, in the light of truth, ascertain the true and heaven-taught doctrine of regeneration, we shall cautiously survey the whole process, as developed by the commissioned teachers of the deep counsels of the only true God.

That certain things, parts of this great process, may be well understood, certain terms which we are wont to use to represent them, must be well defined, and accurately apprehended. These terms are *Fact, Testimony, Faith, Repentance, Reformation, Bath of Regeneration, New Birth, Renewing of the Holy Spirit, Newness of Life*.*

'All things are of God' in the regeneration of man, is our motto; because our Apostle affirmed this as a cardinal truth. He is the author of the *facts* and of the *testimony* which declares them; and being the author of these, he is the author of all the effects produced by these facts. The Christian is a new *creation*, of which God is the *Creator*. The change of heart and of character, which constitute moral regeneration, is the legitimate impression of the facts, or things which God has wrought. The facts constitute the moral seal which stamps the image of God upon man. In the natural order we must place them first, and, therefore, we must first define the term.

* For Fact, Testimony, and Faith, see pp. 100—113.

REPENTANCE.

Repentance is usually defined "*sorrow for any thing that is past;*" and in the religious vocabulary it is simply "*sorrow for sin.*" This is one, but it is only one of the natural effects of the belief of the testimony of God. The gospel facts, testimony and faith, contemplate more than this. But yet it is necessary that this point of faith should be distinctly apprehended, especially in this age, when it occupies so large a space in the systems of theology.

Repentance in our current acceptation, is sorrow for sin; and certainly there is no man who believes the revealed facts found in the testimony of God, who will not be sorry for his sins. But simple sorrow for the past, is but a feeling of the heart which, unless it excite to reformation, or the abandonment of sin, is of no more use than the regrets of Judas after he had sold his Master for fifteen dollars. Repentance must, however, precede reformation; for unless we are sorry for the past, and grieved with ourselves, we will not think of a change of conduct. Repentance is to reformation, what motive is to action, or resolution to any undertaking. It was well for David to resolve to build the temple; and so it is well to form any good design; but much better to execute it. To feel sorry for the poor and the afflicted, and to resolve to assist and comfort them, is well; but to go and do it is better: and, indeed, unless our sorrow for the past terminate in reformation for the future, it is useless in the estimation of heaven and earth; as useless as to say to the hungry, Be filled; or to the naked, Be clothed.

Genuine repentance does not always issue in reformation. Judas was sorrowful even to death, but could not reform. Many have been so genuinely sorry for their sins, as to become suicides. Speak we of "a godly sorrow"? No; this is not to be expected from unconverted and ungodly persons. Christians, Paul teaches, when they err may repent with a godly sorrow; but this is not to be expected from the unregenerate, or from those who have not reformed. It is not, then, the genuineness of repentance that is to be appreciated, unless by genuine repentance is meant more than simple sorrow for the past—unless by genuine repentance is meant reformation. Yet without sincere or unfeigned repentance, there cannot be real or genuine reformation.

This leads us to observe, that the only unequivocal evi-

dence of sincere repentance, is the actual redress of the injury done; not only a cessation from the sin, but a restitution for the sin, as far as restitution can possibly be made. *No restitution, no repentance—provided restitution can be made.* And may I be permitted to add, *that without repentance and restitution, when possible, there can be no remission,*

The preachers of repentance—of the necessity of repentance in order to remission, ought to set this matter fairly and fully before sinners. Do they represent repentance as sorrow for the past, and a determination to reform? How then will the sinner know that he is sorry for his sins against men, or how will the community know that he has repented of such sins, unless full restitution be made? It is impossible that either the sinner himself, or the community who know his sins against man, can have any certain evidence that he is penitent, unless by making all possible restitution.

Peccator wounded the reputation of his neighbor Hermas, and on another occasion defrauded him of ten pounds. Some of the neighborhood were apprized that he had done both. Peccator was converted under the preaching of Paulinus, and on giving in a relation of his sorrow for his sins, spoke of the depth of his convictions, and of his abhorrence of his transgressions. He was received into the congregation, and sat down with the faithful to commemorate the great sin offering, Hermas and his neighbors were witnesses of all this. They saw that Peccator was penitent, and much reformed in his behaviour; but they could not believe him sincere, because he had made no restitution. They regarded him either as a hypocrite, or self-deceived; because, having it in his power, he repaid not the ten pounds, nor once contradicted the slanders he had propagated. Peccator, however, felt little enjoyment in his profession, and soon fell back into his former habits. He became again penitent, and on examining the grounds of his falling off, discovered that he had never cordially turned away from his sins. Overwhelmed in sorrow for the past, he resolved on giving himself up to the Lord; and, reflecting on his past life, set about the work of reformation in earnest. He called on Hermas, paid him his ten pounds, and the interest for every day he had kept it back, went to all the persons to whom he had slandered him, told them what injustice he had done him, and begged them, if they had told it to any other persons, to contradict it. Several

other persons whom he had wronged in his dealings with them, he also visited; and fully redressed all these wrongs against his neighbors. He also confessed them to the Lord, and asked him to forgive him. Peccator was then restored to the church, and, better still, he enjoyed a peace of mind, and a confidence in God, which was a continual feast. His example, moreover, did more to enlarge the congregation at the Cross-roads, than did the preaching of Paulinus in a whole year. This was, unequivocally, *sincere* repentance.

This is the repentance which Moses preached, and which Jesus approbated. Under the law, confession to the priest, and the presenting of a trespass offering, availed nothing to forgiveness without restitution. As the theory of repentance is much lost sight of in this our degenerate age, and as the practice is still more rare, we think it not amiss to be still more explicit on this topic. We shall, therefore, hear the law and the gospel both on this subject.

In Leviticus, we have the word of the Lord upon this subject:—'And the Lord spake to Moses, saying: If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie to his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, (I. e. dealing,) or in a thing taken away by violence, or have deceived his neighbor; or have found that which was lost and lies concerning it, and swears falsely; in any of these that a man does, sinning therein: then it shall be because he has sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took violently away, or the thing which he has deceitfully gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing which he has found, or all that about which he has sworn falsely: he shall even restore it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, and give it to him to whom it appertained, in the day of his trespass offering. And he shall bring his trespass offering to the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock, with thy estimation, for a trespass offering to the priest. And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord; and it shall be forgiven him, for any thing of all that he has done, in trespassing therein.'*

Thus spoke the Lord to Moses, From which we learn that, under the former economy, a trespass offering to the Lord without restitution to man, or restitution to man with-

* Leviticus vi. 1—7.

out a trespass offering to the Lord, availed not to forgiveness. Thus was repentance preached by Moses. But the law went into details still more minute than these; for provision is made for the case in which the sinner could not find the person against whom he had sinned. In such a case, the penitent sinner was to seek out the kindred of the injured party, and if he could find any kinsman, he was to recompense this kinsman; but if he could not find a kinsman, he must recompense it to the Lord, besides offering his trespass offering. It was to go into the Lord's treasury.* The principle uniformly, in all cases of sin against man, was, the sinner 'shall make amends for the harm he has done, and shall add the fifth part thereto.'†

If any one suppose that repentance is to be less sincere or unequivocal under the gospel, let him remember that Zacchaeus proposed more than adding a fifth; he would re-store fourfold, and that Jesus approbated him for so doing. Indeed, John the Immerser demanded fruits worthy of repentance or of reformation, and Paul proclaimed that those who turned to God should do works meet for, or worthy of, repentance,‡

'Works worthy of repentance,' is a phrase which can be understood in no other sense than those works which make amends for the harm done to men, and the dishonor done to God, as far as both are possible. Can any man think that he is sorry for that sin or wrong which he has done, when he makes no effort to make amends to him who was injured in person, character, or property, by it? Works worthy of his professed repentance are wanting, so long as any being whom he has injured in person, property, or reputation, is unredressed to the utmost extent of his ability.

One of our most popular commentators says—and with much truth—"No man should expect mercy at the hand of God, who, having wronged his neighbor, refuses, when he has it in his power, to make *restitution*. Were he to weep tears of blood, both the justice and mercy of God would shut out his prayer, if he make not his neighbor amends for the injury he has done him. He is a dishonest man, who illegally holds the property of another in his hands."||

Every preacher of repentance should insist upon these evidences of sincerity, both for the satisfaction of the peni-

* Num. v. 7,8. † Lev. v. 16. ‡ Acts xxvi. 20. || Adam Clarke on Gen. xl. 2.

tent himself, and for the good of the community. 'Many that believed came and confessed, and shewed their deeds; many of them also who used curious arts, bringing their books together, burnt them before all; and they computed the value of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver.* The was making restitution, in their case, as far as possible; and the principle here evinced is applicable in every other case.

But in pursuing; this subject so far, we have passed over the boundaries of repentance, and sometimes confounded it with reformation. This is owing to the licentious use of language, to which modern theology has *so* richly contributed. We shall, however, redress this wrong, as far as practicable, by a few remarks on

REFORMATION.

The word *metanoia*, used by the sacred writers and heaven-taught preachers of the New Economy, as indicative of the first effect of faith, as has been often showed, is different from that which our word *repentance* fitly represents. It literally *imports a change of mind*; but, as Parkhurst, Campbell, and many others say, "such a change of mind as influences ones' subsequent behaviour for the better." "It has been observed by some, and, I think, with reason, that the former (*metanoeo*) denotes properly a change to the better; the latter (*metamelomai*) barely a change, whether to the better or to the worse; that the former marks a change of mind that is durable, and produces consequences; the latter expresses only a present uneasy feeling of regret, without regard to duration or effects: in fine, that the first may be translated into English, *I reform*; the second, *I repent*, in the familiar acceptation of the words." † Now as every one who reforms *repents*; but as every one who repents docs *not reform*, this distinction is necessary and proper; and there is nothing hazarded, nothing lost by translating the former *I reform*, and the latter *I repent*. There is something gained, especially in all places where we have the word in the imperative mood, because then it is of importance to know precisely what is intended. If we are commanded only to change our mind, or to be sorry for the past, we have obeyed when we feel regret; but. if more than mere change

* Acts xix, 18—20. † Dr. Campbell, Diss. 6, page 3.

of mind or regret is intended, we have not obeyed the commandment until we change for the better. Now it is, we think, very evident from various passages of the sacred writings of the Apostles, and from their speeches, that they commanded more than a simple change of mind as respected past conduct, or mere sorrow for the past. Peter commanded the thousands assembled on the day of Pentecost, who had changed their minds, and who were sorry for the past, to do something which they had not yet done; and that something is in the common version rendered *repent*; and in the new version, *reform*; and in the old English Bible, *amend your lives*. The word here used is the imperative of *metanoeo*. Judas repented, and many like him, who never reformed; and, therefore, it is of importance that this distinction should be kept in view. †

Repentance is not reformation, but is necessary to it; for whoever reforms, must first repent. Reformation is, indeed, the carrying out of the purpose into our conduct. But as reformation belongs rather to another part of our essay than the present, we shall, on the premises already before us, pause and offer a few reflections.

In the preceding definitions of words and ideas, it would appear that we have a literal and unfigurative representation of the whole process of what is figuratively called *regeneration*. For, as we shall soon see, the term *regeneration* is a figure of speech which very appropriately, though analogically, represents the reformation or renovation of life of which we have now spoken.

That the preceding arrangement is not arbitrary, but natural and necessary, the reader will perceive, when he reflects, that the thing done, or the fact, must precede the report or testimony concerning it; that the testimony concerning it must precede the belief of it; that belief of the testimony must precede any feeling in correspondence with the fact testified; and that feeling must precede action in conformity to it. Fact, testimony, faith, feeling, action, are therefore bound together by a natural and gracious necessity, which no ingenuity can separate. And will not every Christian say, that when a person *feels* and *acts* according to the faith, or the testimony of God, he is a new creature—regenerate—truly converted to God? He that believes the facts testified in the record of God, understands them, feels

† See Family Testament, Note 39, page 74.

according to their nature and meaning, and acts in correspondence with them—has undergone a change of heart and of life which makes him a new man.

This is that moral change of heart and life, which is figuratively called *regeneration*. We are not to suppose that regeneration is something which must be added to the faith, the feeling, and the action or behaviour, which are the effects of the testimony of God understood and embraced; or which are the impress of the divine facts attested by Prophets and Apostles. It is only another name for the same process in all its parts.

It may also be observed that numerous figures and analogies are used by the inspired writers to set forth this change, as well as other leading truths and lessons in the Bible. In their collective capacity Christians are called a kingdom, a nation, a generation, a family, a house, a flock, a city, a temple, a priesthood, &c. In their individual capacity they are called kings, priests, soldiers, citizens, children, sheep, branches, stories, &c. They are said to be begotten, born, regenerated, builded, engrafted, converted, created, planted. Now, under whatever figure they are considered or introduced, reason argues that every thing said of them should be expressed in conformity with the figure under which they are presented. Are they called *sheep*?—then he that presides over them is called a *Shepherd*; their enemies are *wolves* and *dogs*; their sustenance is the *green pasture*; their place of safety and repose, the *sheepfold*; their errors are *wanderings* and *strayings*; their conversion, a *return*; and their good behaviour a *hearing of the voice*, or a *following of the Shepherd*. Are they called *children*?—then collectively they are a *family*; they are *begotten* and *born again*; God is their *Father*; their separation is an *adoption*; Jesus is their *elder brother*; they are *heirs* of God; they *live* and *walk* with God. Are they called *priests*?—Jesus is their *High Priest*; the church is their *temple*; the Saviour is their *altar*; their songs, their praises, are *incense* ascending to heaven; and their oblations to the poor, their works of love, are *sacrifices* most acceptable to God. Are they called *citizens*?—the church is then *the kingdom of heaven*; *Jerusalem is the mother of them all*; formerly they were *aliens*, and their naturalization is *regeneration*. Are they called *branches*?—then Jesus is the *true vine*; his Father the *vine-dresser*; their union with Christ, an *engrafting*; the discipline of the gospel, a *pruning*; and their good works *are fruits of righteousness*.

Thus there is no confusion of metaphors in the Scriptures of truth—in the dialect of heaven. It is the language of Ashdod, it belongs to the confusion of Babel, to mingle and confound all figures and analogies. Hence we so often hear of *being born again*, without any allusion to a family or a kingdom! and of *regeneration* as antecedent to faith or repentance! Had a modern assembly of Divines been employed to accommodate the scripture style to their orthodox sentiments, we should not have had to read all the Old Testament and all the historic books of the New, to find the subject of regeneration but once proposed to an alien, as the fact is; but then we should have found it in the history of Abel, of Enoch, of Noah, and of Abraham, if not in every section of the law of Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms. John the Baptist, Jesus, and the Holy Twelve, would have had it in every sermon; and true faith would have been always defined as the fruit of regeneration.

But Jesus had a *kingdom* in his eye and in his discourse before he ever mentioned being 'born again' to Nicodemus: for unless there was a family, a state, or a kingdom to be born into, it is impossible for any one to be born into it. And if the kingdom of heaven only began to be after Jesus entered into heaven; or, if it was only approaching from the ministry of John to the day of Pentecost, then it would have been preposterous indeed—an incongruity of which no inspired man was ever guilty—to call any change of heart or life, a *regeneration*, or a *new birth*. It is true that good men in all ages were made such by facts, testimony, faith, and feeling, by a change of heart, by the Spirit of God; but the *analogy, or figure* of being *LORD*, or of being *regenerated*, only began to be used when the kingdom of heaven began to be preached, and when men began to press into it.

We are now, perhaps, better prepared to consider the proper import and meaning of *regeneration*' in general, and of '*the bath of regeneration*' in particular.

REGENERATION.

This word is found but twice in all the oracles of God—once in Matthew xix. 28. and once in Titus iii. 5. In the former it is almost universally understood to mean a new *state of things*, not of *persons*—a peculiar era, in which all things are to be made new:—such as the formation of a new church on the day of Pentecost, or the commencement of

the Millennium, or the general resurrection. The biblical critics of eminence have assigned it to one or other of these great changes in the state of things. So we use the word *revolution*, and the phrase *the Revolution*, to express a change in the political state of things. The most approved punctuation and version of this passage renders it altogether evident that a new era is alluded to. 'Jesus answered, Indeed, I say to you, that at the renovation [regeneration] when the Son of Man shall be seated on his glorious throne, you, *my* followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel.' This being so evident, and so often alluded to in our former writings, we shall proceed to the remaining occurrence, Titus iii. 5.

All the new light which we propose to throw on this passage, will be gathered from an examination of the acceptance of the word *generation* in the sacred writings. Our reason for this is, that we object to a peremptory decision of the meaning of a word which occurs only in the passage under discussion, from our reasonings upon the insulated passage in which it is found. In such a case, if we cannot find the whole word in any parallel passages, the proper substitute is the root or branches of that word, so far as they are employed by the same writers. Moreover, we think it will be granted, that whatever may be the scriptural acceptance of the word *generation*, regeneration is only the repetition of that act or process.

After a close examination of the passages in which *generation* occurs in the writings of the Hebrew Prophets and Apostles, we find it used only in two acceptations—as descriptive of the whole process of creation and of the thing created. A race of men, or a particular class of men, is called a *generation*; but this is its figurative, rather than its literal meaning. Its literal meaning is the formation or creation of any thing. Thus it is first used in the Holy Scriptures. Moses calls the creation, or whole process of formation of the heavens and the earth, 'The *generations of the heavens and the earth.*'* The account of the formation of Adam and Eve, and also the account of the creations of Adam and Eve, are, by the same writer, called, 'The book or record of the *generations of Adam.*' † This is the literal import of the word; consequently, *regeneration* literally indicates the whole process of renovating or new creating man.

* Genesis ii. 4. † Genesis v. 1.

This process may consist of numerous distinct acts; but it is in accordance with general usage to give to the beginning, or consummating act, the name of the whole process. For the most part, however, the name of the whole process is given to the consummating act, because the process is always supposed incomplete until that act is performed. For example: In the process of tanning, fulling, forging, &c. the subject of these operations is not supposed to be tanned, fullled, forged, until the last act is performed. So in all the processes of nature—in the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, the last act consummates the process. To all acquainted with the process of animalization, germination, crystallization, &c. no farther argument is needed. But, in the style of our American husbandmen, no crop nor animal is *made*, until it come to maturity. We often hear them say of a good shower, or of a few clear days, "This is the *making* of the wheat, or corn." In the same sense it is, that most Christians call *regeneration* THE NEW BIRTH; though *being born* is only the last act in natural generation, and the last act in regeneration.

In this way the *new birth* and *regeneration* are used indiscriminately by commentators and writers on theology; and by a figure of speech, it is justified on well established principles of rhetoric. This leads us to speak particularly of

THE BATH OF REGENERATION.

By '*the bath of regeneration*' is not meant the first, second, or third act; but the last act of regeneration, which completes the whole; and is, therefore, used to denote the new birth. This is the reason why our Lord and his Apostles unite this act with water. Being *born of water*, in the Saviour's style, and *the bath of regeneration*, in the Apostles' style, in the judgment of all writers and critics of eminence, refer to one and the same act—viz. Christian baptism. Hence it came to pass, that *all the ancients* (as fully proved in our first Extra on Remission) used the word *regeneration* as synonymous in signification with *immersion*. In addition to the numerous quotations made in our Essay on Remission, from the creeds and liturgies of Protestant churches, we shall add another from the Common Prayer of the Church of England, showing unequivocally that the learned Doctors of that church used the words *regeneration* and *baptism* as synonymous. In the address and prayer of the minister after the baptism of the child, he is commanded to say,—

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's church; let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayer unto him, that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning."

Then shall be said, all kneeling,—

"We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant that he, being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of thy Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of thy holy church, he may be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom, through Christ our Lord. Amen!"

Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, page 628, shews that St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, and, indeed, all the Greek Fathers, did regard baptism as the consummating act; and therefore they called it *teliosis*, the consummation. These authorities weigh nothing with us; but as they weigh with our opponents, we think it expedient to remind them on which side the Fathers depose in the case before us. By these quotations we would prove no more than that the ancients *understood* the washing of regeneration, and indeed used the term *regeneration* as synonymous with baptism.

But were we asked for the precise import of the phrase, 'washing or bath of regeneration,' either on philological principles, or as explained by the Apostles, we would give it as our judgment, that the phrase is a circumlocution or periphrasis for water. It is *loutron*, a word which more properly signifies the vessel that contains the water, than the water itself; and is, therefore, by the most learned critics and translators rendered *hath*, as indicative either of the vessel containing the fluid, or of the use made of the fluid in the vessel. It is, therefore, by a metonymy, the water of baptism, or the water in which we are regenerated. Paul was a Hebrew, and spoke in the Hebrew style. *We* must learn that style before we fully understand the Apostle's style. In other words, we must studiously read the Old Testament before we can accurately understand the New. What more natural for a Jew accustomed to speak of 'the water of pu-

rification,' of 'the water of separation,'* to speak of 'the bath of regeneration'? If the phrase 'water of purification'* meant water used for the purpose of purifying a person—if 'the water of separation' meant water used for separating a person, what more natural than 'the bath of regeneration' should mean water used for regenerating a person?

But the New Testament itself confirms this exposition of the phrase. We find the word *loutron* once more used by the same Apostle, in the same connexion of thought. In his letter to the Ephesians, he affirms that Jesus has sanctified (separated, purified with the water of purification,) the church by a *loutron* of water—'a bath of water, with the word'—'having cleansed it by a bath of water, with the word.' † This is still more decisive. The common version, so fully aware that the sense of this passage agrees with Titus iii. 5. have, in both places, used the word *washing*, and MacKnight the term *bath*, as the import of *loutron*. What is called the *washing* or *bath of regeneration*, in the one passage, is, in the other, called 'the washing,' or 'bath of water.' What is called '*saved*' in one, is called '*cleansed*' in the other; and what is called '*the renewal of the Holy Spirit*' in the one, is called '*the word*' in the other; because the Holy Spirit consecrates or cleanses through the word. For thus prayed the Messiah, 'Consecrate them through the truth: thy word is the truth.'" And again, 'You are clean through the word that I have spoken to you.'

To the same effect, Paul, to the Hebrew Christians, says, 'Having your hearts sprinkled from a guilty conscience, and your bodies washed with pure water—the water of purification, the water of regeneration: for the phrase 'pure water' must be understood, not of the quality of the water, but metonymically, of the effect, the cleansing, the washing, or the purifying of the person—'having your bodies or persons *washed* with pure water,' or water that purifies or cleanses.

No one, acquainted with Peter's style, will think it strange that Paul represents persons as *saved*, *cleansed*, or *sanctified* by water; seeing Peter unequivocally asserts that '*we are saved*' through water, or through baptism, as was Noah and his family through water and faith in God's promise. 'The antitype immersion, does also now save us.'

Finally, our great Prophet, the Messiah, gives to water the same place and power in this work of regeneration. For

* See Numbers viii. 7.—xix. 9,13, 20, 31.—xxxix 23. † Ephesians chap. v. 26,

when speaking of being *born again*—when explaining to Nicodemus *the new birth*, he says, 'Except a man be *born of water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' May not we, then, supported by such high authorities, call that water of which a person is born again, the water or bath of regeneration?

NEW BIRTH.

We have already seen that the consummation of the process of generation or creation is in the birth of the creature formed. So it is in the moral generation, or in the great process of regeneration. There is a state of existence from which he that is born passes; and there is a state of existence into which he enters after birth. This is true of the whole animal creation, whether oviparous or viviparous. Now the manner of existence, or the mode of life, is wholly changed; and he is, in reference to the former state, dead, and to the new state alive. So in moral regeneration. The subject of this great change before his new birth, existed in one state; but after it, he exists in another. He stands in a new relation to God, angels, and men. He is now born of God, and has the privilege of being a son of God, and is consequently pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, saved. The state which he left was a state of condemnation, what some call "the state of nature." The state into which he enters is a state of favor, in which he enjoys all the heavenly blessings through Christ: therefore, it is called 'the kingdom of heaven.' All this is signified in his death, burial, and resurrection with Christ; or in his being born of water. Hence the necessity of being buried with Christ in water, that he may be born of water, that he may enjoy the renewal of the Holy Spirit, and be placed under the reign of favor.

All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment, not of procurement. Birth itself is not for procuring, but for enjoying the life possessed before birth. So in the analogy—no one is to be baptized, or to be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of *procuring* life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed. If the child is never born, all its sensitive powers and faculties cannot be enjoyed; for it is after birth that these are fully developed, and feasted upon all the aliments and objects of sense in nature. Hence all that is *now* promised in the gospel, can only be *enjoyed* by those

who are born again and placed in the kingdom of heaven under all its influences. Hence the philosophy of that necessity which Jesus preached—'Unless a man be born again he cannot discern the kingdom of heaven—unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into it.

But let no man think that in the act of being born, either naturally or metaphorically, the child purchases, procures, or merits either life or its enjoyments. He is only by his birth placed in circumstances favorable to the enjoyment of life, and all that makes life a blessing. 'To as many as received him, believing in his name, he granted the privilege of being children of God, who derive their birth not from blood, nor from the desire of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God.'

RENEWING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

'He has saved us,' says the Apostle Paul, 'by the bath of regeneration and *the renewing of the Holy Spirit*, which he poured on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by his favor, [in the bath of regeneration,] we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.' Thus, and not by works of righteousness, he has saved us. Consequently, being born of water and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, are not works of merit or of righteousness, but only the means of enjoyment. But this pouring out of the influences, this renewing of the Holy Spirit, is as necessary as the bath of regeneration to the salvation of the soul, and to the enjoyment of the hope of heaven, of which the Apostle speaks. In the kingdom into which we are born of water, the Holy Spirit is as the atmosphere in the kingdom of nature—we mean that the influences of the Holy Spirit are as necessary to *the new life*, as the atmosphere is to our animal life in the kingdom of nature. All that is done in us before regeneration, God our Father effects by *the word*, or the gospel as dictated and confirmed by his Holy Spirit. But after we are thus begotten and born by the Spirit of God—after our new birth, the Holy Spirit is shed on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; of which the peace of mind, the love, the joy, and the hope of the regenerate is full proof; for these are amongst the fruits of that Holy Spirit of promise of which we speak. Thus commences

THE NEW LIFE.

'*Newness of life*' is a Hebraism for a *new life*. The new birth brings us into a new state. 'Old things have passed away; all things have become new,' says an Apostle: 'for if any one be in Christ, he is a new creature.' A new spirit, a new heart, and an outward character, corresponding to this change, are the effects of the regenerating process: 'for the end of the charge,' the grand result of the remedial system, is 'love out of a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned.' 'Love is the fulfilling of the whole law,' and the fruit of the whole gospel. It is the cardinal principle of all Christian behaviour, the soul of the new man, the breath of the new life. Faith works by no other rule. It is a working principle, and love is the rule by which it operates. The Spirit of God is the spirit of love and the health of a sound mind. Every pulsation of the new heart is the impulse of the spirit of love. Hence the brotherhood is beloved, and all mankind embraced in unbounded good will. When the tongue speaks, the hands and feet move and operate under the unrestrained guidance of this principle, we have the Christian character drawn to the life. For meekness, humility, mercy, sympathy, and active benevolence, are only the names of the various workings of this all renovating, invigorating, sanctifying, and happifying principle. 'He that dwells in love, dwells in God and God in him.'

The Christian, or the new man, is then a philanthropist to the utmost extent of the meaning of that word. Truth and love have made him free from all the tyrannies of passion, from guilt, and fear, and shame; have filled him with courage, active and passive. Therefore, his enterprize, his capital enterprize, to which all others minister, is to take part with the Saviour in the salvation of the world. -If by any means I may save some,' are not the words of Paul only, but of every *new man*. Are they merchants, mechanics, husbandmen?—are they magistrates, lawyers, judges, or unofficial citizens?—are they masters, servants, fathers, sons, brothers, neighbors?—whatever, or wherever they may be, they live for God and his city, for the king and his empire. They associate not with the children of wrath—the miser, the selfish, the prodigal, the gay, the proud, the slanderer, the tattler, the rake, the libertine, the drunkard, the thief, the murderer. Every new man has left these precincts;

has broken his league with Satan and his slaves, and has joined himself to the family of God. These he complacently loves—those he pities—and does good to all.

The character of the new man is an elevated character. Feeling himself a son and heir of God, he cultivates the temper, spirit, and behaviour, which correspond with so exalted a relation. He despises every thing mean, groveling, earthly, sensual, devilish. As the only begotten and well beloved Son of God is to be the model of his future personal glory, so the character which Jesus sustained amongst men, is the model of his daily imitation. His every day aspiration is—

"Thy fair example I would trace,
To teach me what I ought to be;
Make me, by thy transforming grace,
Lord Jesus, daily more like thee!"

The law of God is hid in his heart. The living oracles dwell in his mind; and he grows in favor with God as he grows in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ his Lord. As a newborn babe he desires the unadulterated milk of the word of God, that he may grow by it; for as the thirsty hart pants after the brooks of water, so pants his soul after God. Thus he lives to God, and walks with him. This is the character of the regenerate—of him that is born of God—of the new man in Christ Jesus. This is that change of heart, of life, and of character, which is the tendency and the fruit of the process of regeneration, as taught and exemplified by the apostles, and those commended by God, in their writings. We now proceed to offer a few remarks on physical regeneration, the second part of our subject.

PHYSICAL REGENERATION.

Our mortal bodies are yet to feel the regenerating power of the Son of God. This is emphatically called '*the glory of his power*' 'The redemption of the body' from the bondage of corruption, is the consummation of the new-creating energy of him who has immortality. Life and incorruptibility were displayed in and by his resurrection from the dead. It was great to create man in the image of God— greater to redeem his soul from general corruption; but greatest of all, to give to his mortal frame incorruptible and immortal vigor. The power displayed in the giving to the

dead body of the Son of God incorruptible glory and endless life, is set forth by the Apostle Paul, as incomparably surpassing every other divine work within the reach of human knowledge. He prays that the mind of Christians may be enlarged to apprehend this mighty power—that the Father of glory would open their minds, 'that they might know the exceeding greatness of his power in relation to us who believe—according to the working of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.' Faith in this wonderful operation of God—hope for the riches of the glory of the inheritance of the saints in light, are in the most powerful principles of action, which God has ever planted in the human breast. This is the transcendent hope of the Christian calling, which imparted such heroic courage to all the saints of eternal renown. This better resurrection in prospect, has produced heroes which make cowards of all the boasted chiefs of worldly glory. As the magnetic needle ever points to the pole, so the mind, influenced by this hope, ever rises to the skies, and terminates on the fulness of joy, and the pleasures for evermore, in the presence, and at the right hand of God.

To raise a dead body to life again, is not set forth as more glorious, than by a touch to give new vigor to the palsied arm, to impart sight to the blind, or hearing to the deaf; but to give that raised body the deathless vigor of incorruptibility, to renovate and transform it in all its parts, and to make every spirit feel that it reanimates its own body, that it is as insusceptible of decay, as immortal as the Father of eternity, is a thought overwhelming to every mind, a development which will glorify the power of God, *as* the sacrifice of his Son now displays his righteousness, faithfulness, and love to the heavens and to the earth.

This new birth from the dark prison of the grave, is fitly styled 'the redemption of the body' from bondage, '*the glorious liberty of the sons of God.*' As in our watery grave the old man is figuratively buried to rise no more, so in the literal grave, the prison of the body, we leave all that is corrupt; for he that makes all things new, will raise us up in his own likeness, and present us before *his* Father's face in all the glory of immortality. Then will regeneration be complete. Then will be the full revelation of the sons of God, immortality, in the sacred writings, is never applied to

the spirit of man. It is not the doctrine of Plato which the resurrection of Jesus proposes. It is the *immortality of the body* of which his resurrection is a proof and pledge. This was never developed till he became the first born from the dead, and in a human body entered the heavens, Jesus was not a spirit when he returned to God. He is not made the Head of the New Creation as a Spirit, but as the Son of Man. Our nature in his person is glorified; and when he appears to our salvation, we shall be made like him: we shall then see him as he is. This is the Christian hope.

"A hope so great and so divine
 May trials well endure,
 And purify the soul from sense and sin,
 As Christ himself is pure."

Thus matters stand in the economy of redemption. Thus the divine scheme of regeneration is consummated; the moral part, by the operation of moral means; the physical part, by the mighty power of God operating through physical means. By the word of his power he created the heavens and the earth; by the word of his grace he reanimates the soul of man; and by the word of his power he will again form our bodies anew, and reunite the spirit and the body in the bonds of an incorruptible and everlasting union. Then shall death "be swallowed up for ever." "*Where now thy victory, boasting grave?*" But for this we must wait. 'We know not what we shall be.' We only know, that when he appears, we shall be like him; that we shall see him as he is.

THE USE OF THE THEORY OF REGENERATION.

One would imagine, from the voluminous arguments, debates and sermons upon the theory of regeneration, that a sound theory was essential to salvation; that it must be preached in every sermon, in order to regenerate the hearers. Nothing can be more preposterous. Who can think that any theory of the resurrection or regeneration of the body, can effect the body in the grave! As little can any theory affect the unregenerate, or those, dead in trespasses and in sins, A sermon upon generation, or upon natural birth, would be as efficacious upon those unborn, in bringing them into this life, as a sermon upon moral or physical regeneration. This explains the fact, that in all

the accounts of apostolical preaching to Jew and Gentile—in all the extracts of their sermons and speeches found in the New Testament, the subject of regeneration is not once mentioned. It is, in all the historic books of the New Testament, but once propounded, but once named, and that only in a private conference with a Jewish Senator, on the affairs of Christ's kingdom. No theory understood or believed by the unregenerate; no theory proposed to them for their acceptance, can avail any thing to their regeneration. We might as reasonably deliver a theory of digestion to a dyspeptic, to cure his stomach—or a theory upon vegetation to a scion, to hasten its growth, as to preach any view of regeneration to a sinner, to make him a Christian.

Of what use, then, are the previous remarks on this subject? I will first candidly inform the reader, that they were not written for his regeneration, either of mind or body; but for the benefit of those who are employed in the work of regenerating others, and for the conviction of such Christians as may have been induced to regard us as aiming at nothing, but the mere immersion of persons, as alone necessary to the whole process of conversion or regeneration, in their acceptance of these words.*
The use of this

* It may again be necessary in this fastidious age, to remark, that in this essay, in order to disabuse the public mind on our use and acceptation of the term *regeneration*, we have taken the widest range, which a supreme regard for the apostolic style, could, in our judgment, allow. While we argue that the phrase *bath of regeneration*, (Titus iii. 5,) is equivalent to immersion, as already explained, and as contradistinguished from *the renewing of the Holy Spirit*, of which the immersed believer is a proper subject; we have spoken of the whole process of renovation, not in the strict application of the phrase, Titus iii. 5, but rather in the whole latitude of the figure employed by the Apostle. It is not the first act of begetting, nor the last act of being born, but the whole process of conversion alluded to in the figure of *generation*, to which we have directed the attention of our readers. For, as often before stated, our opponents deceive themselves, and their hearers, by representing us as ascribing to the word *immersion*, and the act of immersion, all that they call *regeneration*. While, therefore, we contend that being 'born again,' and being immersed, are, in the Apes-tie's style, two names for the same action, we are far from supposing, or teaching, that in forming the new man, there is nothing necessary, but to be born.

If any ask, why this waiter was not fully developed in our first essays on this subject, our answer is, Because we could not anticipate, that our opponents would have so represented or misrepresented our views. Were a General asked, why he did not arrange all his troops in the beginning of the action, as he had them arranged when he triumphed over his enemy, he would reply, That the maneuvers and assaults of the enemy, directed the disposition of his forces.

Our opponents contend for a regeneration, begun and perfected, before faith or baptism—a spiritual change of mind by the Holy Spirit, antecedent to either knowledge, faith, or repentance, of which infants are as susceptible as adults; and, therefore, as we contend, make the gospel of no effect. By way of reprisals, they would have their converts to think, that we go for nothing but water, and sarcastically call us the advocates of "water regeneration." They think there is something more sublime and divine in "spirit regeneration;" and, therefore, claim the title of orthodox. This calumny has been one occasion of the present essay, and it has occasioned that part of it, which gives the fullest latitude to the term *regeneration*, which analogy gives to the figure used by the Apostle. But when we speak in the exact

theory, if it have any, is, as a guide to those who are laboring publicly or privately for the regeneration of sinners. If we have assigned a proper place to facts, testimony, faith, feeling, action, the bath of regeneration, the renewing of the Holy Spirit, and a new life, the course is fairly marked out. They are to present the great facts, to declare the whole testimony of God to sinners, in order to their conversion or regeneration. Like Paul, in his account of his labors in Corinth, they must go out, not in the strength of human philosophy, '*but declaring the testimony of God,*' and laying before their hearers, '*the wonderful works of God.*'

This is the use, and the only proper use of sound theory on any subject. It is to guide the operator, not the thing operated upon. I would hope, under the Divine blessing, to be the means of regenerating more persons in one year, never once naming regeneration, nor speculating upon the subject, by stating and enforcing the testimony of God, than by preaching daily the most approved theory of regeneration ever sanctioned by any sanhedrin on earth.*

style of the lining oracles on this subject, we must represent *being born again*, (John iii. 5,) and *regeneration*, (Titus iii. 5,) as relating to the act of immersion alone. See *Extra Defender!*, pp. 24—36.

* *August 1st.*—I have just now opened the *Cincinnati Baptist Journal* of 26th July, from which I read an approved definition of regeneration. It is orthodox, spiritual, physical, mystical, and metaphysical Regeneration. It is quoted from the "STANDARD." Regeneration, in the *Evangelical Standard*, is thus defined:—

"Is the sinner active in regeneration? Certainly he is. His mind is a thinking, rational principle, which never ceases to act; and, therefore, when the word *passive* is applied to it, by Old Divines, or by Calvinists, they do not mean that it is *literally* dead, like inert matter, which requires a physical impulse to put it in motion. They only mean to convey the scriptural idea, that the Holy Spirit is the *sole* agent in regeneration, and that the sinner has no more *efficient agency* in accomplishing it, than Lazarus had in becoming alive from the dead. Still they grant that his mind is most active, but unhappily its activity is all *against* the Divine influence; as the Scriptures assure us, unregenerated persons 'Mo always resist' the strivings of the Spirit. '*Every* imagination of the thoughts of man's heart, is *only* evil continually.' 'There is none that doeth good, no *not one.*' The sinner, therefore, instead of voluntarily co-operating with the Holy Spirit, does all he can to *resist* his divine influence, and *prevent* his own regeneration, until he is *made* willing by almighty power."

What a comfortable thing is this theory of regeneration! The sinner is to be regenerated when actively striving against the Divine influence. At the moment of regeneration, "he has," in one sense, "no more efficient agency in accomplishing it, than Lazarus had in becoming alive from the dead;" and in another sense, he is not passive, but "does all he can to *resist* the Divine influence, and *prevent his* own regeneration, until he is *made* willing by almighty power." This is *standard* divinity; and he that preaches this divinity, is a pious, regenerated, Regular Orthodox Baptist Christian Minister' Of how much value, on this theory, is all the preaching in Christendom? The Holy Spirit may be busily at work upon some drunken sot, or some vile debauchee, who is as dead as Lazarus on one side, and on the other resisting the Spirit, with all his moral and physical energy, up to the moment that the Almighty arm pierces him to the heart with a sword, and makes him alive by killing him!!!

The absurdity and licentiousness of such a view of the great work of renovation, we had thought go glaring, that no editor in the West would have had boldness

With these views, we have, then, offered the preceding remarks; and shall now briefly turn our attention to—

THE REGENERATION OF THE CHURCH.

The word *regeneration*, we have found once used in the sense of a new state of things, or of the introduction of a new state of things.* In this application of the word, we would turn the attention of our readers to the necessity of the regeneration of the church.

I speak not of the regeneration of any sectarian establishment. They are built upon another foundation—upon the foundation of decrees of councils, creeds, formularies, or acts of Parliament. But we speak of those societies that professedly build upon the foundation of Apostles and Prophet?, without any human bond of union, or rule of life—our brethren of the reformation, or regeneration, now in process.

Should any one imagine that the state of things to which we have attained, is the sole, or ultimate object of our aspirations, or our efforts, he would do us the greatest injury. Societies, indeed, may be found amongst us, far in advance of others, in their progress towards the ancient order of things; but we know of none that has fully attained to that model. It is, however, most acceptable to see so many societies formed and forming, under the banners of reformation, with the determination to move onwards in conformity to the sacred oracles, till they stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

Our opponents cannot, or will not, understand how any society can be in progress to a better order of things, than that under which they may have commenced their pilgrimage. Their sectarian policies were soon formed, and the limits of their reformation were soon fixed; beyond which it soon became heretical to move. The founders of all new schisms, not only saw through a glass darkly, but their horizon was so circumscribed with human traditions, that they only aimed at moving a few paces from the hive in which they were generated. A new creed was soon adopted, and then their stature was complete. They bounded from in-

to have published it. This is a proof of the necessity of our present essay, and will explain to the intelligent reader why we have given to the whole process of renovation, the name of regeneration, which properly belongs to the last act.

* Matt. xix. 28.

fancy to manhood in a few days, and decided, if any presumed farther to advance, they should be treated as those who had refused to move from the old hive. Hence it became as censurable to grow beyond a certain standard, as not to grow at all. This never was our proposition, and never can be our object. We have no new creed to form, no rules of discipline to adopt. We have taken the Living Oracles as our creed, our rules and measures of faith and practice; and in this department, have no additions, alterations, nor amendments to propose. But in coming up to this standard of knowledge, faith, and behaviour, we have something yet before us, to which we have not attained.

That we may be distinctly understood on this subject, we shall speak particularly on the things wanting in our individual characters, and of the things wanting in our church order, to give to our meetings that interest and influence which they ought to exert on the brotherhood and on society at large.

It will be understood, that our remarks on the things which are wanting in the disciples, are applicable not to every individual, but to the general mass. And first of all, there is wanting a more general and particular knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, than is possessed by the great majority of the reformers. There is, perhaps, wanting a taste or disposition for that private devotional reading of the oracles of God, which is so essential to a growth in that knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ, which constitutes the most striking attribute in Christian character. We thus reason from the proficiency which is discoverable in the bounds of our acquaintance, which is large enough to afford data for very general conclusions.

To read the Scriptures for the sake of carrying out into practice all that we learn, and to read them for the sake of knowing what is written, are very different objects, and will produce very different results. Their influence on the temper and behaviour, in the former case, will very soon become manifest to all with whom we associate; while, in the latter case, there is no visible improvement. David said that he 'hid the word of God in his heart,' or laid it up in his mind, 'that he might not sin against God;' and that he had 'more understanding than all his teachers, because God's testimonies were his meditation.' It will be admitted that the sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, ought to be as precious and as delightful to the chris-

tian, as were the ancient oracles to the most pious Jew. Now as an example of what we mean by a private devotional reading and study of the oracles of Christ, we shall permit a Jew to tell his experience:—

'The law of thy mouth is better to me than thousands of gold and silver. With my whole heart have I sought thee; my soul breaketh for the longing that it has to thy judgments at all times. Thy testimonies are my delight and my counsellors. Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes, and I will keep it to the end. Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law; yes, I will observe it with my whole heart. Make me to go in the path of thy commandments, for in it do I delight. Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage. At midnight I will rise to give thanks to thee, because of thy righteous judgments. O how I love thy law; it is my meditation all the day! How sweet are thy words to my taste; sweeter than honey to my mouth! Thy testimonies have I taken as a heritage forever, for they are the rejoicing of my heart. Great peace have they that love thy law,—nothing shall cause them to stumble.'

These are only a few extracts from one piece, written by a king three thousand years ago. On another occasion he pronounced the following encomium on the testimony of God:—

'The law [doctrine] of the Lord is perfect, converting [restoring] the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple: the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold—yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey, and the honey-comb. By them is thy servant warned, and in keeping of them there is great reward.'

This fully reveals all that we mean by a devotional private study of the Holy Scriptures. Every Christian who can read, may every day thus refresh, strengthen, and comfort his heart, by reading or committing to memory, and afterwards reflecting upon some portion of the book. He may carry in his pocket the blessed volume, and many a time through the day take a peep into it. This will preserve him from temptation, impart courage to his heart, give fluency to his tongue, and the graces of Christianity to his life.

In this age, when ignorance of the Christian Scriptures is

so characteristic, and the rage for human opinions and traditions so rampant, it is a duty doubly imperative on our brethren, to give themselves much more to the study of the book; and then one of them will put a host of the aliens to flight; and, what is still more desirable, he will have communion with God all the day, and ever rejoice in his salvation.

In the second place, there is wanting amongst disciples, who are heads of families, more attention, much more effort, to bring up their children 'in the correction and instruction. of the Lord.' The children of all disciples should be taught the oracles of God from the first dawning of reason. The good seed should be sown in their hearts, before the strong seeds of vice can take root. *From a child* Timothy knew the Holy Scriptures, and they were able to make him wise to salvation, through the Christian faith. How many more Timothies might we have, if we had a few more of the daughters of Lois, and a few more mothers like Eunice! Most saints, in this generation, appear more zealous that their children should shine on earth, than *in* heaven—and that they may be rich here, at the hazard of eternal bankruptcy. They labor to make them rich and genteel, rather than pure and holy; and spend more time in fashioning them to the foolish and wicked taste of *polished* society, than in teaching them by precept and example the word that is better than gold, and more precious than rubies. Well, they sow darnel, and cannot reap wheat. They may have a mournful harvest, and years of bitterness and sorrow may reward them for their negligence and error. If only a tithe of the time, and the labor, and expense that it costs to fit a son or a daughter to shine in the middle or front ranks of *genteel* society, were spent in teaching them to fear God and keep his commandments, how many more virtuous, solid, and useful citizens—how many more valuable members of the Family of God—how many more faithful and able witnesses for the truth of God, would be found in all corners of the land!

Every Christian family ought to be a nursery for God. Their offspring should be trained for the skies. For such are the promises of God, such are the facts on record, and such is the experience of Christians, that every parent who does his duty to his children, may expect to see them inherit the blessing. Their didactic labors, aided by their example and their constant prayers, will seldom or never fail of sue-

cess in influencing their descendants to walk in their ways. The very command to bring up their children in the Lord, implies its practicability. And both Testaments furnish us with all assurance that such labors will not be vain. The men of high renown in sacred history, were generally the sons of such a parentage. The sons of God were found among the sons of Seth, while the daughters of men were of the progeny of Cain. Abraham was the descendant of Shem; Moses and Aaron were the sons of believing parents; Samuel was the son of Hannah, and David was the son of Jesse. John the harbinger was the son of Zachariah and Elizabeth; and it pleased the heavenly Father, that his Son should be the child of a pious virgin.

But it is under Christ that the faithful are furnished with all the necessary means of bringing up their offspring for the Lord. The numerous failures which we witness, are to be traced either to great neglect, or to some fatal notion which paralyzes all effort; for some think that the salvation or damnation of their offspring was a matter settled from all eternity, irrespective of any agency on their part: that some are born 'vessels of wrath,' and others 'vessels of mercy;' and hence the instructions, examples, and prayers of parents are of no avail. Among the descendants of such, it will no doubt often happen that some *become* vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, while others *become* vessels of mercy, predestined to glory.

When God gave a revelation to Jacob, and commanded a law to Israel, he gave it in charge that they should 'teach it to their children, that they might *put their trust in God*, and might not be, like their fathers, a rebellious race.' The Apostles of Christ have also taught the Christians the same lesson. This is our guide, and not our own reasonings. Now let the disciples make this their business, morning, noon, and evening, and then we shall see its effects.

We are sorry to see this great duty, to which nature, reason, revelation alike direct, so much neglected by many of our brethren—to find amongst their children those who are no better acquainted with the Scriptures than the children of their neighbors, who believe in miraculous conversions, or think it a sin to attempt what they imagine to be the work of God alone—never suspecting that God works by human means, and employs human agency in his works of providence and redemption.

I never knew but a very few families that made it their

daily business to train up their children in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, to cause them every day to commit to memory a portion of the living oracles; but these few instances authorize me to think, and to say, that such a course persisted in, and sustained by the good example of parents, will very generally, if not universally, issue in the salvation of their children. And before any one says, I have found an exception to the proverb of Solomon, which says, 'Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it,'—let him show that this child was '*trained up in the way he should go.*'

In the third place, there is wanting among many disciples, a stricter regard to relative duties—we mean, not only the dues which justice, truth, and moderation claim; but *all* relative duties. So long as Christians live after the manner of men in the flesh, according to the fashion of this world, they must, like other men, contract debts which they cannot promptly pay, make covenants and bargains, give promises which they cannot fulfil, and stake pledges which they are unable to redeem. All this is wholly incompatible with our profession, Such were not the primitive disciples. Sceptics of every name, men of the world, who have ever read the New Testament, know that such behaviour is utterly incompatible with the letter and spirit of Christianity. A Christian's word or promise ought to be, and is, if Christ be honored, as solemn and obligatory, as any bond. And as for breach of bargain or covenant, even where it is greatly or wholly to the disadvantage of the Christian, it is not even to be thought of—'he changes not, though to his hurt he covenants.' How much has the gospel lost of its influence, because of the faithlessness of its professors! O! when shall it be again said of Christians in general, that 'they bind themselves as with a solemn oath, not to commit any kind of wickedness—to be guilty neither of theft, robbery, nor adultery—*never to break a promise*, or to keep back a deposite when called upon.' Pliny writes to the Emperor Trajan that such was the character of Christians A. D. 106—7, as far as he could learn it from those who were not Christians. Were all the common (now-a-days rather *uncommon*) virtues of justice, truth, fidelity, honesty, practised by all Christians, how many mouths would be stopped, and how many new arguments in favor of Jesus Christ could all parties find! But even were these common virtues as general as the Christian profession, there are the other finer virtues of benevolence, goodness, mercy,

sympathy, which belong to the profession, expressed in taking care of the sick, the orphan, the widow—in alleviating all the afflictions of our fellow-creatures. Add these virtues, or *graces*, as we sometimes call them, to the others, and then how irresistible the argument for the divine authenticity of the gospel! Let industry, frugality, temperance, honesty, justice, truth, fidelity, humility, mercy, sympathy, appear conspicuous in the lives of the disciples, and the contrast between them and other professors, will plead their cause more successfully than a hundred preachers.

In the last place, there is wanting a more elevated piety to bring up the Christian character to the standard of primitive times. We want not fine speeches nor eloquent orations on the excellencies of Christian piety and devotion. These are generally acknowledged. But we need to be roused from our supineness, from our worldly-mindedness, from our sinful conformities to an apostate generation, to the exhibition of that holiness in speech, in behaviour, without which no one shall see the Lord. What mean the numerous exhortations of the Apostles to watchfulness and prayer, if these are not essential to our devotion to God and consecration to his service?

If our affections are not placed on things above, we are unfit for the kingdom of glory. To see the folly of a profession of Christianity without the power of godliness, we have only to put the question, How is that person fit for the enjoyment of God and Christ, whose heart is filled with the cares, anxieties, and concerns of this life—whose whole life is a life of labor and care for the body—a life of devotion to the objects of time and sense? No man can serve God and Mammon. Where the treasure is, the heart must also be. Thither the affections turn their course. There is no room for the residence of the Spirit of God, in a mind devoted to the affairs of this life. The spirit of the policies of this world, and the Spirit of God, cannot dwell in the same heart. If Jesus or his Apostles taught any one doctrine clearly, fully, and unequivocally, it is this doctrine, that 'the cares of this world, the lusts of other things, and the deceitfulness of riches, stifle the word, and render it unfruitful.'

If any one would enjoy the power of godliness, he must give up his whole soul to it. The business of this life will be performed religiously, as a duty subordinate to the will of God. While his hands are engaged in that business

which his own wants, or those of his household make necessary, his affections are above. He delights in God, and communes with him all the day. A Christian *is* not one who is pious by fits and starts, who is religious or devout on one day of the week, or for one hour of the day. It is the whole bent of his soul—it is the beginning, middle, and end of every day. To make his calling and election sure, is the business of his life. His mind rests only in God. He places the Lord always before him. This is his joy and his delight. He would not for the world have it otherwise. He would not enjoy eternal life, if he had it at his option, in any other way than that which God himself has proposed. He accedes to God's arrangements, not of necessity, but of choice. His religious services are perfect freedom. He is free indeed. The Lord's commandments are not grievous, but joyful. The yoke of Christ is to him easy, and his burthen light. He will sing with David—

The love that to thy laws I bear,
 No language can display;
 They with fresh wonders entertain
 My ravish'd thoughts all day.

The law that from thy mouth proceeds,
 Of more esteem I hold,
 Than untouch'd stores, than thousand mines
 Of silver and of gold.

Whilst in the way of thy commands,
 More solid joy I found,
 Than had I been with vast increase
 Of envy'd riches crown'd.

Thy testimonies I have kept.
 And constantly obey'd;
 Because the love I bore to them
 Thy service easy made.

In the same ratio as Christians devoutly study the oracles of God, teach them to their children, practise all relative duties to society at large, and rise to a more elevated piety, they will increase their influence in the great and heavenly work of regenerating the world.

A few remarks on the things wanting in the order of Christian assemblies, to give to their public, meetings that influence on themselves and on society at large, will finish this section of our essay.

Our heavenly Father wills our happiness in all his institutions. His ordinances are, therefore, the surest, the simplest, and the most direct means of promoting our happi-

might purify and bless it; and, therefore, in the church are all the institutions which can promote the individual and social good of the Christian community. In attending upon these institutions on the Lord's day, much depends upon the preparation of heart in all who unite to commemorate the death and resurrection of the, Son of God.

In adverting to the most scriptural and rational manner of celebrating or observing the day to the Lord, both for our own comfort and the regeneration of the world, we would first of all remark, that much depends upon the frame of mind, or preparation of heart, in which we visit the assemblies of the saints.

Suppose two persons, A and B, if you please, members of the same church, taking their seats together at the Lord's table. A, from the time he opened his eyes in the morning, was filled with the recollections of the Savior's life, death, and resurrection. In his closet, in his family, and along the way, he was meditating or conversing on the wonders of redemption, and renewing his recollections of the sayings and doings of the Messiah. B, on the other hand, arose as on other days, and finding himself free from all obligations arising from the holiness of time, talks about the common affairs of every day, and allows his thoughts to roam over the business of the last week, or, perhaps, to project the business of the next. If he meet with a neighbor, friend, or brother, the news of the day is enquired after, expatiated upon, discussed; the crops, the markets, the public health, or the weather—the affairs of Europe, or the doings of Congress, or the prospects of some candidate for political honor, become the theme of conversation. As he rides or walks to the church, he chats upon all, or any of these topics, till he enter the door of the meeting house. Now as A and B enter the house in very different states of mind, may it not be supposed that they will differ as much in their enjoyments, as in their morning thoughts? Or can B, by a single effort, unburthen his mind, call in the wanderings of his thoughts, and in a moment transport himself from the contemplation of things on earth to things in heaven? If this can be imagined, then meditation and preparation of heart are wholly unnecessary to the acceptable worship of God, and to the comfortable enjoyment of his institutions.

But is it compatible with experience, or is it accordant to reason, that B can delight in God, and rejoice in com-
me-

morating the wonders of his redemption, while his thoughts are dissipated upon the mountains of a thousand vanities? —while, like a fool's eyes, his thoughts are roaming to the ends of the earth! Can he say, with a pious Jew, 'How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longs—yes, even faints, for the courts of the Lord! My heart and my flesh cry out for the living God. Happy they who dwell in thy house; they will be still praising thee! A day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.'—'One thing have I desired of the Lord, and that I will seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in his temple. O send out thy light and thy truth! Let them lead me, let them bring me to thy holy hill and to thy tabernacles. Then will I go to the altar of God, to God my exceeding joy; yes, I will praise thee, O God, my God!'

Or had the Jew a sublimer worship, more exalted views of God's salvation, and more piety than a Christian? Or were the ordinances of the Jewish sanctuary more entertaining and refreshing than the ordinances of the Christian church? This will not be alleged; consequently, B, and all of that school, are utterly at fault when they approach the house of God in such a state of mind, as they approach the market place, the forum, or the common resorts of this present world.

Christians need not say in excuse for themselves, that all flays are alike, that all places and times are alike holy, and that they ought to be in the best frame of mind all the time. For even concede them all their own positions, they will not contend that a man ought to speak to God, or to come into the presence of God, as they approach men. They will not say that they ought to have the same thoughts and feelings in approaching the Lord's table, as in approaching a common table; or on entering a court of political justice, as in coming into the house of God. There is, in the words of Solomon the Wise, a season and time for every object and for every work:—There is the Lord's day, the Lord's table, the Lord's house, and the Lord's people; and there are thoughts, and frames of mind, and behaviour compatible and incompatible with all these.

In the public assembly the whole order of worship ought to do justice to what is passing in the minds of all the war-

shippers. That joy in the Lord, that peace and serenity of mind, that affection for the brethren, that reverence for the institutions of God's house, which all feel, should be manifest in all the business of the day. Nothing that would do injustice to all or any of these, ought ever to appear in the congregation of Jesus Christ our Lord. No levity, irreverence, no gloom, no sadness, no pride, no unkindness, no severity of behavior towards any, no coldness, nothing but love, and peace, and joy, humility, and reverence should appear in the face, in the word, or action of any disciple.

These are not little matters. They all exert a salutary influence on the brethren and the strangers. These are visible and sensible displays of the temper and spirit of Christians; and if Paul thought it expedient to write of *veils* and *long hair* when admonishing a church 'to do all things decently and in order,' we, in this day of degeneracy, may be allowed to notice matters and things as minute as those before us.

We intend not now to go into details of church order or Christian discipline, nor to expatiate on the necessity of devoting a part of the time to singing, praying, reading, teaching, exhorting, commemorating, communicating; nor on how much of this or that is expedient. Times and circumstances must decide how much time shall be taken up in these exercises, and when it shall be most fitting to meet, to adjourn, &c. Nor is it necessary now to say, that there must be simply order, and presidency, and proper discipline, and due subordination to one another in the fear of God. We now speak rather of the *manner* in which all things are to be done, than of the things themselves, their necessity or value.

After noticing what in some instances appears to be wanting in the manner of coming together on the Lord's day, we proceed to notice in order the things wanting in many congregations, for the purposes already specified.

And first of all, be it observed, that in some churches there appears to be wanting *a proper method of handling the Scriptures, to the edification of the brethren*. It is admitted by all the holy brethren, that the Scriptures of truth, called *the living oracles*, are the great instrument of God for all his purposes in the saints on earth. Through them they are converted to God, comforted, consecrated, made meet for an inheritance among the sanctified, and qualified

for every good word and work. Every thing, then, depends upon the proper understanding of these volumes of inspiration. They can only operate as far as they are understood.

The system of sermonizing on a text is now almost universally abandoned, by all who intend that their hearers should understand the testimony of God. Orators and exhorters may select a word, a phrase, or a verse; but all who feed the flock of God with knowledge and understanding, know that this method is wholly absurd. Philological lectures upon a chapter are only a little better. The discussion of any particular topic, such as faith, repentance, election, the Christian calling, may sometimes be expedient: but in a congregation of Christians, the reading and examining the different books in regular succession, every disciple having the volume in his hand, following up the connexion of things, examining parallel passages, interrogating and being interrogated, fixing the meaning of particular words and phrases, by comparison with the style of that writer or speaker, or with that of others; intermingling these exercises with prayer and praises, and keeping the narrative, the epistle, or the speech, so long before the minds of all, as is necessary for the youngest disciple in the congregation to understand it, and to become deeply interested in it, will do more in one year, than is done in many, on the plan of the popular meetings of the day.

Great attention should be paid to all the allusions, in any composition, to the particularities of time, place, and circumstance, to the geographical, historical, and chronological particulars of all questions of fact connected with all persons of note in the narratives: for these are often the best interpreters of style, and expositors of the meaning of what is written.

This searching, examining, comparing, and ruminating upon the Holy Scriptures in private, in the family, in the congregation, cannot fail to make us learned in the knowledge of God, and in the knowledge of men. The Bible contains more real learning than all the volumes of men. It instructs us in all our natural, moral, political, and religious relations. Though it teaches us not astronomy, medicine, chemistry, mathematics, architecture, it gives us all that knowledge which adorns and dignifies our moral nature, and fits us for happiness. Happy the person who meditates upon it day and night! He grows and flourishes in moral health

and vigor, as the trees upon the water courses. His leaf never fades—his fruit never fails.

The congregations of the saints want system in furthering their knowledge of this book. The simple reading of large portions in a desultory manner, is not without some good effect; for there is light, and majesty, and life, in all the oracles of God: no man can listen to them without edification. But the profit accruing from such readings, is not a tithe of that which might be obtained in the proper systematic reading and examination of them. The congregation is the school of Christ, and every pupil there should feel that he has learned something every day he waits upon his Master. He must take the Master's book with him, and, like every other good and orderly pupil, he must open it and study it, with all the helps which the brotherhood, his school-fellows, can furnish for his more comprehensive knowledge of all its salutary communications.

A Christian scribe, well instructed in its contents, or a plurality of such, who can bring out of their intellectual treasury things new and old, will greatly advance the students in this heavenly science; but in the absence of such, the students must be self-taught; and self-taught scholars are generally the best taught: for they cannot progress, unless they study with diligence, and carefully learn the rudiments of every science.

To give some idea of the diligence and attention to the minutest matters, which are necessary to proficiency in the knowledge of all that is written in the New Testament, we shall suppose that the disciples have for their lesson, on some particular day, the Nativity of the Messiah. The second chapter of Matthew is read. After reading this chapter, or the whole of the first section of Matthew's Testimony, the elder or president for the day asks some brother, a good reader, to read what the other evangelists have testified on this subject. Mark and John being silent on the nativity, he reads Luke, 2d section, 2d. chapter, from the 1st to the 41st verse. After the reading of this chapter, the following points are the subjects of enquiry, and most of them are proposed to the brethren for solution:—

1. Who was Cesar Augustus, and over what people did he reign?
2. At what period of his reign was the edict for enrolment issued, or when did the first register take effect?

3. What did Syria include, and what were its boundaries?
4. Who presided over Syria at the time of the first register?
5. Who was king in Judea at this time?
6. How far did Judea extend, or in what part of the Holy Land was it situate?
7. In what country was Jerusalem, where situated, and by what other names was it known?
8. What was the native city of Joseph?
9. Where was Nazareth situated, and in what district?
10. What was the boundary of Galilee, and what were its principal towns?
11. In what canton or district was Bethlehem, and how far from Jerusalem?
12. Who were the magicians?
13. Why was 'Herod alarmed, and all Jerusalem with him,' when the magicians reported the Star in the East?
14. What were the scribes and chief priests assembled by Herod, and why were they called together?
15. By what means did they decide the questions referred to them?
16. On what Prophet do they rely, and where shall the quotation be found?
17. Of what family and lineage was Joseph and Mary?
18. By what means did the magicians find the house in which the Messiah was born?
19. Why did the magicians not return to Herod?
20. Whether did the shepherds of Bethlehem, or the eastern magicians, first pay their respects to the Messiah?
21. In what quarter of the globe does Egypt lie?
22. How far from Bethlehem?
23. How long was the Messiah kept in Egypt?
24. Who predicted his return from Egypt, and where shall it be found?
25. Who foretold the slaughter of the male infants in Bethlehem, and what instigated Herod to this cruel massacre?
26. Who succeeded Herod in the throne of Judea?
27. Why did Joseph retire to Nazareth?
28. What Prophet foretold this circumstance, and where shall it be found?

These matters being all ascertained, to which the maps, geographical and chronological indexes, and the appendix to

the Family Testament, will greatly contribute, some moral reflections will naturally occur; for in all these incidents are manifest the wisdom, care, and economy of our heavenly Father, his faithfulness, condescension, and love; the great variety of his instruments, and agents; the ease with which he frustrates the evil counsels and machinations of his enemies; the infallible certainty of his foreknowledge; the perfect free agency of men, good and evil; the deep humiliation of his only begotten Son in all the circumstances of his nativity. Irresistible arguments in favor of his pretensions may be drawn from these ancient prophecies, from their minuteness of time, place, and circumstance; many eloquent and powerful lessons on human pride, vanity, and arrogance, may be deduced from the birth-place, cradle, and family connexions of the Heir of the Universe; and many other touching appeals to the heart, which the birth, circumcision, and dedication of the Messiah, with all the incidents in Bethlehem, in Jerusalem, and the Temple, connected with his first appearance on earth furnish, will present themselves with unfading freshness and beauty, to the brotherhood of Christ.

A hint to the wise is sufficient. Were this method pursued only two hours every Lord's day, every disciple giving his heart to the work; and were the results then compared with the products of the scrap Doctors, or sermonizers to sleeping and dreaming hearers, no man, having any regard for his reputation for good sense, could give his vote for the popular system.

A reformation in the manner of handling the living oracles is much wanting; and the sooner and more generally it is attempted, the greater will be the regenerating influence of the brotherhood on the world. Intelligent in the Holy Scriptures, clothed with the armor of light, every disciple going forth, will be a David against the Philistines—a host against the armies of the aliens. And better still, the words of heavenly favor dwelling in his heart, he will carry with him into every society a fragrance like the rose of Sharon—a sweetness of perfume like a garden which the Lord has blessed. —

There appears to be wanting in some congregations a proper attention to discipline, and a due regard to decorum, in the management of such cases as occur. In every family, and in every congregation, there is occasional need of discipline. Offences, delinquencies, and apostacies, did

occur in the congregations over which the apostles either were, or had been, presidents; and they will happen again in this state of discipline and trial, in which we are all placed. They must be expected; and every congregation ought to be prepared to act upon the emergency with intelligence and decorum. Much injury has been done to the progress of churches, by a remissness in attention to such cases, and in the manner they have been disposed of when taken up.

Nothing can be more preposterous and revolting to every sentiment of good order and decorum, than that every offender and offence should, at the very offset, be dragged into the public assembly. Persons who have the care of a congregation, the seniors whose age and experience have taught them prudence, ought to be first informed of such cases; and they ought not to lay a case before the congregation, till they have prepared it for the action of the congregation. Every novice is not to feel himself at liberty to disturb the congregation by presenting, on his own responsibility, and at his own discretion, a complaint against a brother, whether it be of a public or private nature.

But we are now speaking of the *manner* of procedure in such cases. The most tender regard for the feelings of all, the utmost sympathy for the offender, the most unyielding firmness in applying the correctives which the Head of the church has commanded, and the necessity of acting promptly in accordance with the law in the case, are matters of much importance.

No passion, no partiality, no bad feeling—nothing but love and piety, but faithfulness and truth; nothing but courtesy and gentleness, should ever appear in the house of God. And when any one is found guilty and excluded from the society, it should be done with all solemnity, and with prayer that the institution of Christ may be a blessing to the transgressor.

But evil-doers, or those that act not honorably according to the law of Christ, ought not to be tolerated in the professed family of God. Such persons are a dead weight on the whole society—spots in every feast of love, and blemishes upon the whole profession. One sinner destroys much good: yet separation or abscission, like amputation, is only to be used in the last stage, when all other remedies, of remonstrance and admonition, exhortation and entreaty, have failed. To prevent gangrene, or an injury to

the whole body, amputation is a necessary, an indispensable remedy. More strictness, more firmness, and more tenderness in such cases, would add greatly to the moral influence of every society. A few persons walking together in the bonds of Christian affection, and under the discipline of Christ, is better than the largest assembly in which there are visibly and manifestly, many who fear not God, and keep not his commandments.

In the house of God, all should be purity, reverence, meekness, brotherly kindness, and love. Confidence in the honesty and sincerity of our brethren, is the life of communion. To feel ourselves united with them who are determined for eternal life, and resolved to seek first of all, chief of all, above all, the kingdom of heaven: and the righteousness required in it, is most animating, comforting, exhilarating. But to be doubtful whether we are uniting with a mass of ignorance, corruption, and apathy, is as rottenness in the bones; love waxes cold, and then we have the form, without the power of godliness.

That the church may have a regenerating influence upon society at large, there is wanting a fuller display of Christian philanthropy in all her public meetings; care for the poor manifested in the liberality of her contributions; the expression of the most unfeigned sympathy for the distresses of mankind, not only among the brotherhood, but among all men; and an ardent zeal for the conversion of sinners proportioned to her professed appreciation of the value of her own salvation, and to her resources and means of enlightening the world, on the things unseen and eternal. The full display of these attributes, are the most efficient means of causing the gospel to sound abroad, and to achieve new conquests amongst our fellow citizens. The Christian health and vigor of every church, is to be estimated more by her exertions and success in bringing sinners home to God, than by all her other attainments. Too long has it been considered the duty, the almost exclusive duty of the preacher, to convert the world. He must spend his time, and wear out his constitution in journeyings and preachings, while the individual members of the church are to mind their own business, seek their own wealth and domestic comfort. He must endure the heat and the cold, forsake his wife and family, and commit the management of his affairs to others, while they have only to look on and pray for his success. Strange infatuation! Has he received a

commission from the skies—has he been drafted out of the ranks to go to war, and they all left at home to take care of their wives and children! Some may believe this—some may imagine that it is his duty alone, to spend his time and his talents in this work, and theirs daily to labor for their own interest and behoof; but surely such are not the views and feelings of our brethren!

The work of the Lord will never progress—or in other words, the regenerating influence of the church will amount to little or nothing, so long as it is thought to be not equally the duty of every member, but the special duty of one or two, denominated preachers, to labor for the Lord.

There is either a special call, a general call, or no call at all, to labor for the conversion of the world. If there be a few specially called, the rest have nothing to do but to mind their own concerns; 'to seek their own things, and not the things of Jesus Christ.' If none be called, then it is the duty of none, and the Lord has nothing for his people to do—no world to convert; or, at least, nothing for them to do in that work. None of us are prepared for the consequences of either of these assumptions. It follows, then, that it is the duty of all to labor according to their respective abilities in this work. All are called to labor for the Lord. I hold that every citizen in Christ's kingdom is bound to take up arms for the King, as much as I am; and if he cannot go to fight the battles of the Lord, he must take care of the wives and children of those who can, and who will fight for their King and country. But the expense of the war must be borne by the subjects of the crown; and as the Lord will not have any tax-gatherers in his kingdom, but accepts only voluntary contributions, he makes a mark over against the names of those who do nothing, and he will settle with them at his return. He calls even the contributions for the gospel, made by those at home, 'a fragrant odor, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.'

But we are afraid of doing any thing of this sort, lest we should be like some other people, who we think have acted imprudently. Strange, indeed, that when any thing has been once abused, it is never again to be used! But I have inadvertently strayed off from my purpose. The manner in which the brethren labor for the salvation of the world, is all that comes within our prescribed limits. On this, enough has been said. Let the brethren solemnly consider

the things, that are wanting to give to their meetings that influence, which they ought to exert upon themselves and upon society at large.

We are as susceptible of receiving moral and religious advantages, from our own good order and decorum in the congregation, as those who attend our meetings as spectators. And in this instance, as well as in all the variety of doing good, he that waters others is again watered in return; for he that blesses others, is always blessed in blessing them. None enjoy the blessings of the gospel more fully, than they who are most active and influential in blessing others. What happy seasons are those in which we see many turning to the Lord! Now if we would have a perpetual feast, we must be perpetually devoted to the promotion of the happiness of others. We must live for God, as well as live to God.

In filling up these outlines, other matters still more minute, but, perhaps, equally important, will present themselves to the attention of the brethren. Now we cannot set about these matters too soon. The time has again come, when judgment must begin at the house of God. The people who have long enjoyed the word of life and the Christian institutions, must soon come to a reckoning. They must give an account of their stewardship, for the Lord has promised to call them to judgment. An era is just at the door, which will be known as *the Regeneration* for a thousand years to come. The Lord will judge that adulterous brood, and give them over to the burning flame, who have broken the covenant, and formed alliances with the governments of the earth. Now the cry is heard in our I land, 'Come out of her, my people, that you partake not of her sins, and that you may not receive of her plagues.' The Lord Jesus will soon rebuild Jerusalem, and raise up the tabernacle of David which has so long been in ruins. Let the church prepare herself for the return of her Lord, and see that she make herself ready for his appearance.

THE REGENERATION OF THE WORLD.

All the kingdoms of this world shall soon become the kingdoms of our Lord the King. He will hurl all the present potentates from their thrones. He will grind to powder the despotisms, civil and ecclesiastic; and with the blast of his mouth, give them to the four winds of heaven. The

anti-Christian power, whether it be called Papistical, Mohammedan, Pagan, or Atheistic, will as certainly be destroyed, as Jesus reigns in heaven. No trace of them shall remain, The best government on earth, call it English or American, has within it the seeds of its own destruction—carries in its constitution a millstone, which will sink it to the bottom of the sea. They acknowledge not that God has set his Christ upon his throne. They will not kiss the Son. Society under their economy is not blessed. The land mourns through the wickedness of those that sit in high places. Ignorance, poverty, and crime abound, because of the injustice and iniquities of those who guide the destinies of nations. Men that fear not God, that love not his Son, and that regard not the maxims of his government, yet wear the sword, and sway the scepter in all lands.

This is wholly adverse to the peace and happiness of the world. Therefore, he will break them to pieces like a potter's vessel, and set up an order of society in which justice, inflexible justice shall have uncontrolled dominion. Jesus will be universally acknowledged by all the race of living men, and all nations shall do him homage. This state of society will be the consummation of the Christian religion, in all its moral influences and tendencies upon mankind.

How far this change is to be effected by moral, and how far by physical means, is not the subject of our present enquiry. But the preparation of a people for the coming of the Lord, must be the result of the restoration of the ancient gospel and order of things. And come when it may, the day of the regeneration of the world, will be a day as wonderful and terrible as was the day of the deluge, of Sodom's judgment, or of Jerusalem's catastrophe. Who shall stand when the Lord does this? But all the regenerations, physical and moral, individual, congregational, or national, are but types and shadows, or means of preparation for the—

REGENERATIONS OF THE HEAVENS AND THE EARTH.

The Bible begins with the generations of the heavens and the earth; but the Christian revelation ends with the regenerations, or new creation of the heavens and the earth. This is the ancient promise of God, confirmed to us by the Christian Apostles. The present elements are to be changed by fire. The old or antediluvian earth, was purified by

water; but the present earth is reserved for fire, with all the works of man that are upon it. It shall be converted into a lake of liquid fire. But the dead in Christ will have been regenerated in body, before the old earth is regenerated by fire. The bodies of the saints will be as homogeneous with the new earth and heavens, as their present bodies are with the present heavens and earth. God recreates, regenerates, but annihilates nothing; and, therefore, the present earth is not to be annihilated. The best description we can give of this regeneration, is in the words of one who had a vision of it on the island of Patmos. He describes it as far as it is connected with the New Jerusalem, which is to stand upon the new earth, under the canopy of the new heaven:—

'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the former heaven and the former earth were passed away; and the sea was no more. And I, John, saw the holy city, the New Jerusalem, descending from God out of heaven, prepared like a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he shall pitch his tent among them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be among them—their God. And he shall wipe away every tear from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor grief, nor crying; nor shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.'

A WORD TO THE MORAL REGENERATORS OF THIS AGE.

God, our heavenly Father, works by means, as we all confess. His means are wisely adapted to the ends he has in view. His agents are the best agents for the work he has to accomplish. He employs not physical means nor agents, for moral ends and purposes. Nor does he produce physical effects, by moral means and agents. He has been pleased to employ not angels, but men in the work of regenerating the world. Men have written, printed, and published the gospel for nearly two thousand years. They have perpetuated it from generation to generation. They have translated it from language to language, and carried it from country to country. They have preached it in word and in deed, and thus it has come down to our days.

During the present administration of the reign of Heaven, no change is to be expected; no new mission is to be originated, no new order of preachers is to be insti-

tuted. The King has gone to a far country; and before his departure, he called together his servants, and committed to them the management of his estate till he return. He has not yet come to reckon with them. They were commanded first to proclaim the doctrine of his reign; then to write it in a book, and to commit it to faithful men, who should be able to teach it correctly to others. By these faithful men the records have been kept; and through their vigilance and industry, they have been guarded from corruption, interpolation, and change. One generation handed them over to the next; and if ignorant and unfaithful copyists neglected their duty, others more faithful, have corrected them; and now we are able to hear the words which Jesus spoke, and to read the very periods penned by the Apostles.

Thus, whatever the Prophets and the Apostles have achieved since their death, has been accomplished by human agents like ourselves. Where men have not carried this intelligence in speech or writing, not one of our race knows God or his anointed Saviour. No angel nor Holy Spirit has been sent to the Pagan nations: and God has exerted no power out of his word to enlighten or reclaim savage nations. These indisputable facts and truths have much moral meaning, and ought to give a strong impulse to our efforts to regenerate the world.

The best means of doing this is the object now before us; and this is one, the importance of which cannot be easily exaggerated. There are three ways of proceeding in this case, which now seem to occupy a considerable share of public attention, These are properly called *theorizing*, *declaiming*, and *preaching*; on each of which we may offer a remark or two in passing.

The *theorizers* are those who are always speculating upon correct notions, or the true theory of conversion. They are great masters of method, and with some of them it is a ruinous error to place faith before regeneration, or repentance after faith. Heresy, with these, is the derangement of the method, which they have proposed for God to work by in converting the sinner. And the true faith which is connected with salvation, is apprehension of this theory and acquiescence in it. These are all theorists, heady, or speculative Christians; and with them the whole *scheme* of redemption is a splendid theory.

Our maxim is, *Theory for the Doctors, and medicine for*

the sick. Doctors fatten on theories, but the patients die who depend on theory for cure. A few grains of practice is worth a pound of theory. The mason and the carpenter *build* the house by *rule*; but he that inhabits it, *lives* by *eating* and *drinking*. No man ever was cured physically, politically, morally, or religiously, by learning a correct theory of his physical, political, moral, or religious malady. As soon might we expect to heal an ulcer on the liver by a discourse upon that organ, its functions, its diseases, and their cure, as to restore a sinner by means of the theory of faith, repentance, regeneration, or effectual calling. But on this enough has already been said, and more than is necessary to convince those who can think, and who dare to reason on such themes.

The *declaimers* are not those only who eulogize virtue and reprobate vice; but that large and respectable class who address themselves to the passions, to the hopes and fears of men. They are those who are so rhetorical upon the joys of heaven, and the terrors of hell: who horrify, terrify, and allure by the strength of their descriptions, the flexions of their voices, the violence of their gestures, and their touching anecdotes. Their hearers are either dissolved in tears, or frantic with terror. These talk much about the heart; and on their theory, if a man's heart was extracted, all his religion would be extracted with it. The religion of their converts flows in their blood, and has its foundation in their passions.

The preachers, properly so called, first address themselves to the understanding, by a declaration or narrative of the wonderful works of God. They state, illustrate, and prove the great facts of the gospel; they lay the whole record before their hearers; and when they have testified what God has done, what he has promised, and threatened, they exhort their hearers on these premises, and persuade them to obey the gospel, to surrender themselves to the guidance and direction of the Son of God. They address themselves to the whole man, his understanding, will and affections, and approach the heart by taking the citadel of the understanding.

The accomplished and wise proclaimer of the word, will find it always expedient to address his audience in their proper character; to approach them through their prejudices, and never to find fault with those prepossessions, which are not directly opposed to the import and design of the ministry of reconciliation. He will set before them the

models found in the sacred history, which show that the same discourse is not to be preached in every place and to every assembly, even when it is necessary to proclaim the same gospel. Paul's addresses to the Athenians, Lycaonians, Antiochians, to Felix, the Jailor, and king Agrippa, are all full of instruction on this topic.

Augustine has written a treatise on preaching, which Luther proposed to himself as a model; but it is said that Augustine fell as far short of his own precepts, as did any of his contemporaries. We all can with more facility give precepts to others, than conform to them ourselves. In Augustine's treatise, which in some respects influenced and formed the style and plan of Luther, and through him all the Protestants, there is much said on the best rhetorical mode "of exhibiting the truth to others;" but it savors more of the art of the schoolmen, than of the wisdom of the Apostles. He labors more on the best style and mode of expressing oneself, than on the things to be said.

Our best precepts in this matter are derived rather from the books of Deuteronomy and Nehemiah, than from any other source out of the New Testament. The book of Deuteronomy may be regarded as a series of sermons or discourses, delivered to the Jews by their great teacher, Moses, rather than as a part of the Jewish history. Two things in this book deserve great attention. The first is the simplicity, fulness, and particularity of his narratives of the incidents on the journey through the wilderness;— Cod's doings and theirs, for the last forty years, are faithfully and intelligibly laid before them. The next is the use made of these facts; the conclusions deduced, the arguments drawn, and the exhortations tendered from these facts. For a fair and beautiful specimen of this, let the curious reader take up and carefully read the first four chapters of the book of Deuteronomy. The fact and the application, the argument and (he exhortation after the manner of Moses, cannot fail to instruct him.

The writings of the scribes during the captivity, teach us how to address a people that have lost the true meaning of the oracles of God. The readings, expositions, exhortations and prayers of Ezra and Nehemiah, are full of instruction to Christians in these days of our Babylonish captivity. To address a people long accustomed to hearing the Scriptures, yet ignorant of them, and consequently disobedient, is a matter that requires all the wisdom and pru-

dence which can be acquired from Jewish and Christian records.

The manner of address, next to the matter of it, is most important. The weightiest arguments, the most solemn appeals, the most pathetic expostulations, if not sustained by the gravity, sincerity, and piety of the speaker, will be like water spilled upon the ground. A little levity, a few witticisms, a sarcastic air, a conceited attitude, or a harsh expression, will often neutralize all the excellencies of the most scriptural and edifying discourse. The great work of regenerating men is too solemn, too awfully grave and divine, to allow any thing of the sort. Humility, sincerity, devotion, and all benevolence in aspect, as well as in language, are essential to a successful proclamation of the great facts of the Living Oracles. He that can smile in his discourse at the follies, need not weep over the misfortunes, of the ignorant and superstitious. He that can, while preaching the gospel, deride and ridicule the errors of his fellow-professors, is, for the time being, disqualified to persuade them to accept of truth, or gladly to receive the message of salvation.

Those preachers have been sadly mistaken, who have sought popularity by their eccentricities, and courted smiles rather than souls;—who, by their anecdotes and foolish jests, told with the Bible before them, have thought to make themselves useful by making themselves ridiculous—and to regenerate men by teaching them how to violate the precepts of the gospel, and to disdain the examples of the Great Teacher and his Apostles.

It will not do. These are the weapons of this world, and no part of the armor of light. Jesus and his Apostles never sanctioned, by precept or example, such a course; and it is condemned by all sensible men, whether Jews or Gentiles, professors or profane.

In attempting to regenerate men, we must place before them the new man, not the old man, in the preacher as well as in the discourse; and while we seek out arguments to convince and allure them, we must show them in our speech and behaviour, that we believe what we preach. So did all the Apostles and Evangelists. They commended themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of Jesus Christ.

Error must be attacked. It must be opposed by the truth. But it may be asked, whether the darkness may not

be more easily dissipated by the introduction of light, than by elaborate discourses upon its nature and attributes. So with moral darkness, or error. To dissipate it most effectually, the easiest and readiest way is to introduce the light of truth. No preacher is obliged to learn all the errors of all ages, that he may be able to oppose them; nor is a congregation enlightened in the knowledge of God by such expositions of error. Present opposing errors may require attention; but, to attack these most successfully, it is only necessary to enforce the opposing truths.

This is a very grave subject, and requires very grave attention. Much depends upon a rational and scriptural decision of the question, *Which is the most effectual way to oppose and destroy error?* To aid us in such an enquiry, it is necessary to examine how the Prophets and Apostles opposed the errors of their times. The world was as full of error in those days as it has ever been since. The idolatries of the Pagan world, and the various doctrines of the sects of philosophers, in and out of the land of Israel, threw as much labor into their hands, as the various heresies of apostate Christendom have thrown into ours. Their general rule was to turn the artillery of light, and to gather into a focus the arrows of day, upon the dark shades of any particular error. Their philosophy was;—The splendors of light most clearly display the blackness of darkness, and scatter it from its presence. Thus they opposed idolatry, superstition, and error of every name. Going forth in the armor of light, as the sun in the morning, the shades of the night retired from their presence, and the cheering beams of day so gladdened the eyes of their converts, that they loved darkness no more. Let us go and do likewise. An intimate acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures is the best apparatus for the work of regenerating men. The best piece I have found in the celebrated treatise of Augustine on preaching, is the following:—

"He, then, who handles and teaches the word of God, should be a defender of the true faith, and a vanquisher of error; should both teach what is good, and unteach what is bad; and in accomplishing this, the object of preaching, he should conciliate the adverse, excite the remiss, and pour out to the ignorant their duty and future prospects. When, however, he finds his audience favorably disposed, attentive, and docile, or succeeds in rendering them so, then other things are to be done, as the case may require. If

they are to be instructed, then, to make them acquainted with the subject in question, narration must be employed; and to establish what is doubtful, resort must be had to reasoning and evidence. If they are to be moved rather than instructed, then, to arouse them from stupor in putting their knowledge into practice, and bring them to yield full assent to those things which they confess to be true, there will be need of the higher powers of eloquence; it will be necessary to entreat, reprove, excite, restrain, and do whatsoever else may prove effectual in moving the heart.

"All this, indeed, is what most men constantly do, with respect to those things which they undertake to accomplish by speaking. Some, however, in their way of doing it, are blunt, frigid, inelegant; others, ingenious, ornate, vehement. Now he who engages in the business of which I am treating, must be able to speak and dispute with wisdom, even if he cannot do so with eloquence, in order that he may profit his audience; although he will profit them less in this case, than if he could combine wisdom and eloquence together. He who abounds in eloquence without wisdom, is certainly so much the more to be avoided, from the very fact that the hearer is delighted with what it is useless to hear, and thinks what is said, to be true, because it is spoken with elegance. Nor did this sentiment escape the notice of those among the ancients, who yet regarded it as important to teach the art of rhetoric; they confessed that wisdom without eloquence profited states but very little, but that eloquence without wisdom profited them not at all, and generally proved highly injurious. If, therefore, those who taught the precepts of eloquence, even though ignorant of the true, that is, the celestial wisdom 'which cometh down from the Father of lights,' were compelled by the instigations of truth to make such a confession, and that too in the very books in which their principles were developed; are we not under far higher obligations to acknowledge the same thing, who are the sons and daughters of this heavenly wisdom? Now a man speaks with greater or less wisdom, according to the proficiency he has made in the sacred Scriptures. I do not mean in reading them and committing them to memory, but in rightly understanding them, and diligently searching into their meaning. There are those who read them and yet neglect them—who read them to remember the words, but neglect to understand them. To these, without any doubt, those persons are to be preferred, who, retaining

less the words of the Scriptures, search after their genuine signification with the inmost feelings of the heart. But better than both is he, who can repeat them when he pleases, and at the same time understands them as they ought to be understood."*

Luther's favorite maxim was, "*Bonus Textuarius, Bonus Theologus;*" or, One well acquainted with the Scriptures makes a good theologian.

There is one thing, above all others, which must never be lost sight of by him, who devotes himself to the work of regeneration. This all-important consideration is, that the end and object of all his labors is *to impress the moral image of God upon the moral nature of man*. To draw this image upon the heart, to transform the mind of man into the likeness of God in all moral feeling, is the end proposed in the remedial system. The mould into which the mind of man is to be cast is the Apostles' doctrine; or the seal by which this impression is to be made is the testimony of God. The gospel facts are like so many types, which, when scientifically arranged by an accomplished compositor, make a complete form, upon which, when the mind of man is placed by the power which God has given to the preacher, every type makes its full impression upon the heart. There is written upon the understanding, and engraved upon the heart, the will, or law, or character of our Father who is in heaven.

The Apostles were these accomplished compositors, who gave us a *perfect form of sound words*? Our instrumentality consists in bringing the minds of men to this form, or impressing it upon their hearts. To do this most effectually, the preacher or evangelist must have the word of Christ dwelling in him richly, in all wisdom; and he must 'study to show himself an approved workman, irreproachable, rightly dividing the word of truth.' He that is most eloquent and wise in the Holy Scriptures, he who has them most at command, will have the most power with men; because being furnished with the words of the Holy Spirit, he has the very arguments, which the Spirit of God chooses to employ in quickening the dead, in converting sinners. For to the efficiency of the living word not only Paul deposes, but James and Peter also bear ample testimony. 'Of his own

* From the Biblical Repository, p. 574. Translated from the Latin by O. A. Taylor, of Andover, Mass.

will he has begotten us, *by the word of truth*, that we might be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.* 'Having been regenerated, not by corruptible seed, but by incorruptible, *through the word* of the living God, which remains.' † To the fruits of his labors, such a preacher with Paul may say, 'To Jesus Christ, through the gospel, I have regenerated, or begotten you.'

Thus, in the midst of numerous interruptions, we have attempted to lay before the minds of our readers the whole doctrine of Regeneration, in all its length and breadth, in the hope, that after a more particular attention to its meaning and value, by the blessing of God, they may devote themselves more successfully to this great work; and not only enjoy more of the Holy Spirit themselves, but be more useful in forwarding the moral regeneration of the world.

To God our Father, through the great Author of the Christian faith, who has preserved us in health in this day of affliction and great distress, be everlasting thanks for the renewing of our minds by the Holy Spirit, and for the hope of the regeneration of our bodies, of the heavens and of the earth, at the appearance of the Almighty Regenerator, who comes to make all things new! Amen.

* James I. 18.

† 1 Peter I. 33.

Blank Page

Breaking the Loaf.

Man was not made for the Christian Institution; but the Christian Institution for man. None but a master of the human constitution—none but one perfectly skilled in all the animal, intellectual, and moral endowments of man, could perfectly adapt an institution to man in reference to all that he is, and to all that he is destined to become. Such is the Christian Institution. Its evidences of a divine origin increase and brighten, in the ratio of our progress in the science of man. He who most attentively and profoundly reads himself, and contemplates the picture which the Lord of this Institution has drawn of him, will be most willing to confess, that man is wholly incapable of originating it. He is ignorant of himself, and of the race from which he sprang, who can persuade himself that man, in any age, or in any country, was so far superior to himself as to have invented such an Institution as the Christian. That development of man, in all his natural, moral, and religious relations, which the Great Teacher has given, is not farther beyond the intellectual powers of man, than is the creation of the Sun, Moon, and Stars, beyond his physical strength.

The eye of man cannot see itself; the ear of man cannot hear itself; nor the understanding of man discern itself: but there is one who sees the human eye, who hears the human ear, and who discerns the human understanding. He it is, who alone is skilled in revealing man to himself, and himself to man. He who made the eye of man, can he not see? He who made the ear of man, can he not hear? He who made the heart of man, can he not know?

It is as supernatural to adapt a system to man, as it is to create him. He has never thought much upon his own powers, who has not seen as much wisdom on the outside, as in the inside of the human head. To suit the outside to the inside, required as much wisdom as to suit the inside to the outside, and yet the exterior arrangement exists for the interior. To fashion a casement for the human soul exhibits as many attributes of a creator, as to fashion a human spirit

for its habitation. Man, therefore, could as easily make himself, as a system of religion to suit himself. It will be admitted, that it calls for as much skill to adapt the appendages to the human eye, as the human eye to its appendages. To us it is equally plain, that it requires as much wisdom to adapt a religion to man, circumstanced as he is, as to create him an intellectual and moral being.

But to understand the Christian Religion, we must study it; and to enjoy it, we must practise it. To come into the kingdom of Jesus Christ is one thing, and to live as a wise, a good, and a happy citizen, is another. As every human kingdom has its constitution, laws, ordinances, manners, and customs; so has the kingdom of the Great King. He, then, who would be a good and happy citizen of it, must understand and submit to its constitution, laws, ordinances, manners, and customs.

The object of the present essay is to develop one of the institutions or ordinances of this kingdom; and this we shall attempt by stating, illustrating, and sustaining the following propositions:—

PROP. I.—*There is a house on earth, called the house of God.*

The most high God dwells not in temples made with human hands; yet he condescended in the age of types to have a temple erected for himself, which he called his house, and glorified it with the symbols of his presence. In allusion to this, the Christian community, organized under the government of his Son, is called his house and temple, 'You are God's building,' says Paul to a Christian community. This building is said to be 'built upon the Apostles and Prophets—Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.' 'Know you not that you are the temple of God? The temple of God is holy, which temple you are.'*

But in allusion to the Jewish temple, the Christian church occupies the middle space between the outer court and the holiest of all. 'The holy places made with hands were figures of the true.' The common priests went *always* into the first tabernacle or holy place, and the high priest *once a year* into the *holiest of all*. Thus our Great High

* 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17,

Priest went *once for all* into the true 'holiest of all,' into the real presence of God, and has permitted us Christians as a royal priesthood, as a chosen race, to enter always into the only holy place now on earth—the Christian church, 'As living stones we are built up into a *spiritual house*, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices most acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.'*

But all we aim at here is to show that the community under Christ is called '*the house of God*.' Paul once calls it a house of God, and once *the* house of God. An individual or single congregation, he calls '*a house of God*.' † I have written to you, 'that you may know how to behave yourself in a house of God, which is the congregation of God.' ‡ And in his letter to the Hebrews, || speaking of the whole Christian community, he calls it the house of God. § 'Having a Great High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near,' &c. It is, then, apparent, that there is under the Lord Messiah, now on earth, an institution called *the house of God*; and this resembles the *holy place* between the outer court and the holiest of all, which is the proposition to be proved.

PROP. II.—*In the house of God there is always the table of the Lord.*

As there is an analogy between the Jewish holy place, and the Christian house of God; so there is an analogy between the furniture of the first tabernacle or holy place, and those who officiated in it; and the furniture of the Christian house of God, and those who officiate in it. 'In the first tabernacle, says Paul, which is called *holy*, there were the candlestick, and the table, and the showbread,' or the loaves of the presence. On the golden table every Sabbath day were placed *twelve* loaves, which were exhibited there for one week, and on the next Sabbath they were substituted by twelve fresh loaves sprinkled over with frankincense. The loaves which were removed from the table, were eaten by the priests. These were called in the Hebrew '*the loaves of the faces*,' or the loaves of the presence. This emblem of the abundance of spiritual food in the presence of God for all who dwell in the holy place, stood always upon the golden table furnished

* 1 Peter ii. 5. † 1 Tim. iii. 35. ‡ Greek, oikos Theou. || Heb. x. 31.

§ Greek, ho oikos Theou.

by the twelve tribes, even in the wilderness. The light in the first tabernacle was not from *without*, but from the seven lamps placed on the golden candlestick; emblematic of the perfect light not derived from this world, which is enjoyed in the house of God.

If, then, in the emblematic house of God, to which corresponds the Christian house of God, there was not only a table overlaid with gold, always spread, and on it displayed *twelve large loaves*, or cakes, sacred memorials and emblems of God's bounty and grace; shall we say that in that house, over which Jesus is a Son, there is not to stand always a table more precious than gold, covered with a richer repast for the holy and royal priesthood which the Lord has instituted, who may always enter into the holy place consecrated by himself.

But we are not dependent on analogies, nor far fetched inferences, for the proof of this position. Paul, who perfectly understood both the Jewish and Christian Institutions, tells us, that there is in the Christian temple a table, appropriately called the Lord's Table, as a part of its furniture. He informs those who were in danger of being polluted by idolatry, 'that they could not be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of demons.' * In all his allusions to this table in this connexion, he represents it as continually approached by those in the Lord's house. 'The cup of the Lord' and 'the loaf,' for which thanks were continually offered, are the furniture of this table, to which the Christian brotherhood have free access.

The Apostle Paul reminds the saints in Corinth of their familiarity with the Lord's table, in speaking of it as being common as the meetings of the brotherhood. 'The cup of blessing for which we bless God, is it not the joint participation of the blood of Christ? The loaf which we break, is it not the joint participation of the body of Christ?' In this style we speak of things, common and usual, never thus of things uncommon or unusual. It is not the cup which we *have* received with thanks; nor is it the loaf which we *have* broken; but which we do break. But all that we aim at here is now accomplished; for it has been shown that, *in the Lord's house there is always the table of the Lord*. It is scarcely necessary to add, that if it be shown, that in the Lord's house there is the Lord's table, as a part of the furni-

* 1 Cor. x. 21.

ture, it must always be there, unless it can be shown that only some occasions require its presence, and others its absence; or that the Lord is poorer or more churlish at one time than at another; that he is not able always to keep a table, or too parsimonious to furnish it for his friends. But this is in anticipation of our subject, and we proceed to the third proposition.

PROP. III.—*On the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf.*

The necessity is not that of a positive law enjoining one loaf and only one, as the ritual of Moses enjoined twelve loaves. But it is a necessity arising from the meaning of the Institution as explained by the Apostles. As there is but one literal body, and but one mystical or figurative body having many members; so there must be but one loaf. The Apostle insists upon this, 'Because there is one loaf, we, the many, are one body; for we are all partakers of that one loaf.' * The Greek word *artos*, especially when joined with words of number, says Dr. MacKnight, always signifies *a loaf*, and is so translated in our Bibles, 'Do you not remember *the five loaves?*' † There are many instances of the same sort. Dr. Campbell says, "that in the plural number it ought always to be rendered loaves;" but when there is a numeral before it, it indispensably must be rendered loaf or loaves. Thus we say one loaf, seven loaves; not one bread, seven breads. 'Because there is one loaf,' says Paul, we must consider the whole congregation as one body. Here the Apostle reasons from what is more plain, to what is less plain; from what was established, to what was not so fully established in the minds of the Corinthians. There was no dispute about the one loaf; therefore, there ought to be none about the one body. This mode of reasoning makes it as certain as a positive law; because that which an Apostle reasons from must be an established fact, or an established principle. To have argued from an assumption or a contingency to establish the unity of the body of Christ, would have been ridiculous in a logician, and how unworthy of an Apostle! It was, then, an established institution, that there is but one loaf, inasmuch as the Apostle establishes his argument by a reference to it as an established fact. Our

* 1 Cor. x. 17.

† Mat. xvi. 9.

third proposition is, then, sustained, that *on the Lord's table there is of necessity but one loaf.*

PROP. IV—*All Christians are members of the house or family of God, are called and constituted a holy and a royal priesthood, and may, therefore, bless God for the Lord's table, its loaf, and cup—approach it without fear and partake of it with joy, as often as they please, in remembrance of the death of their Lord and Saviour.*

The different clauses of this proposition, we shall sustain in order—'*all Christians are members of the family or house of God.*'* 'But Christ is trusted as a Son over *his own family*; whose family we are, provided we maintain our profession and boasted hope unshaken to the end;'—'*are called and constituted a holy and a royal priesthood.*' † You, also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual temple, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices most acceptable to God through Jesus Christ' In the 9th verse of the same chapter, he says, 'But you are an elect race, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood;' and this is addressed to all the brethren dispersed in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.

May not, then, *holy* and *royal* priests thank God for the Lord's table, its loaf, and cup of wine? May they not, without a *human* priest to consecrate the way for them, approach the Lord's table and handle the loaf and cup? If the common priests did not fear to approach a golden table, and to place upon it the loaves of the presence; if they feared not to take and eat that consecrated bread, because priests according to the flesh—shall royal priests fear, without the intervention of human hands, to approach the Lord's table and to partake of the one loaf? If they should, they know not how to appreciate the consecration of Jesus, nor how to value their high calling and exalted designation as kings and priests to God. And may we not say, that he who invested with a little clerical authority, derived only from 'the Man of Sin and Son of Perdition,' if borrowed from the Romanists, says to them, 'stand by, I am holier than thou'— may we not say that such a one is worse than Diotrefes, who affected a pre-eminence, because he desecrates the royal priesthood of Jesus Christ, and calls him common and unclean,

* Heb. iii.6.

† 1 Pet. ii. 5.

who has been consecrated by the blood of the Son of God? Such impiety can only be found amongst them who worship the beast, and who have covenanted and agreed that none shall buy or sell, save those who receive a mark on their foreheads, and letters patent in their hands. But allow common sense to whisper a word into the ears of a priest's "laymen," but Christ's *royal priests*? Do you not thank God for the cup while the priest stands by the table; and do you not handle the loaf and the cup when they come to you? And would not your thanksgiving have been as acceptable, if the human mediator had not been there, and your participating as well pleasing to God, and as consolatory to yourself, if you had been the first that handled the loaf or the cup, as when you are the second, or the fifty-second, in order of location? Let reason answer these two questions, and see what comes of the haughty assumptions of your Protestant clergy!! But this only by the way.

I trust it is apparent that the royal priesthood may approach the Lord's table *without fear*, inasmuch as they are consecrated to officiate by a blood, as far superior to that which consecrated the fleshly priesthood, as the Lord's table, covered with the sacred emblems of the sacrifice of the Lord himself, is superior to the table which held only the twelve loaves of the presence; and as they are, to say the least, called by as holy and divine an election, and areas *chosen a race* of priests as were those sprung from the loins of Levi.

PROP. V.—*The one loaf must be broken before the saints feast upon it, which has obtained for this institution the name of "the breaking of the loaf."*

But some, doubtless, will ask, 'Is it not called *the Lord's supper*?' Some have thought, amongst whom is Dr. Bell, that 1 Cor. xi. 20. applies to the feasts of love or charity, rather than the showing forth of the Lord's death. These may read the passage thus:—'But your coming together into one place is not to eat a Lord's supper; for in eating it every one takes first his own supper; alluding, as they suppose, to a love feast eaten before *the breaking of the loaf*? But this Lord's supper is contradistinguished from their *own* supper. And might it not as reasonably be said, you cannot call *your* showing forth the Lord's death a Lord's supper; for before eating it you have eaten a supper of your own, which prevents you from making a *supper* of it? You do not make it a

Lord's supper, if you first eat your own supper. Nor, indeed, could the Corinthians call any eating a "Lord's supper," conducted as was the eating of their own suppers; for one eat and drank to excess, while another who was poor, or had no supper to bring, was hungry, and put to shame. Could this be called a supper in honor of the Lord!

But as the Lord had eaten a religious supper, had partaken of the paschal lamb with his disciples, before he instituted the breaking of the loaf, and drinking of the cup, as commemorative of his death, it seems improper to call it a supper: for it was instituted and eaten *after a supper*. Not in the sense of one of the meals of the day, can it be called either dinner or supper: for it supplies the place of no meal. *Deipnos*, here rendered *supper*, in the days of Homer, represented breakfast.* It also signified food in general or a feast. In the times of Demosthenes it signified a feast or an evening meal. But it is of more importance to observe, that it is in the New Testament used figuratively as well as literally Hence, we have the gospel blessings compared to a supper. We read of 'the marriage supper of the Lamb,' and 'the supper of the Great God.' Jesus says, 'If any man open to me I will (*deipneso*) take supper with him and he with me.' When thus used it neither regards the time of day, nor the quantity eaten. If applied, then, to this institution it is figuratively, as it is elsewhere called "*the feast*" For not only did the Lord appoint it, but in eating it we have communion with the Lord. The same idiom with the addition of the article occurs Revelation I. 10. '*he kuriake hemera*,' the Lord's day. Upon the whole it appears more probable that the Apostle uses the words *kuriakos deipnos*, or Lord's supper, as applicable to the breaking of the loaf for which they gave thanks in honor of the Lord, than to their own supper or the feasts of love, usual among the brethren. If we say in accordance with the Apostle's style, the Lord's day, the Lord's table, the Lord's cup, we may also say the Lord's supper. for in the Lord's house these are all sacred to him.

As the calling of Bible things by Bible names is an important item in the present reformation, we may here take occasion to remark, that both "the Sacrament" and "the Eucharist" are of human origin. The former was a name adopted by the Latin church; because the observance was supposed to be an oath or vow to the Lord; and as the term

* Illiad 2, line 381—399. and 8 line 53-66.

sacramentum signified an oath taken by a Roman soldier, to be true to his general and his country, they presumed to call this institution a sacrament or oath to the Lord. By the Greek church it is called *the Eucharist*, which word imports *the giving of thanks*, because before participating, thanks were presented for the loaf and the cup. It is also called the communion, or "*the communion of the saints*;" but this might indicate that it is exclusively *the* communion of saints; and, therefore, it is more consistent to denominate it literally 'the breaking of the loaf.' But this is only preliminary to the illustration and proof of our fifth proposition.

We have said the loaf must be broken before the saints partake of it. Jesus took a loaf from the paschal table and broke it before he gave it to his disciples. They received a broken loaf, emblematic of his body once whole, but by his own consent, broken for his disciples. In eating it we then remember that the Lord's body was by his own consent broken or wounded for us. Therefore, he that gives thanks for the loaf should break it, not as the representative of the Lord, but after his example; and after the disciples have partaken of this loaf, handing it to one another, or while they are partaking of it, the disciple who brake it partakes with them of the broken loaf—thus they all have communion with the Lord and with one another in eating the broken loaf. And thus they as priests feast upon his sacrifice. For the priests eat of the sacrifices and were thus partakers of the altar. The proof of all this is found in the institution given in Matthew xxvi. Mark xiv. Luke xxii. and 1 Cor. xi. In each of which his breaking of the loaf, *after* giving thanks, and *before* his disciples partook of it, is distinctly stated.

It is not, therefore, strange, that the literal designation of this institution should be, what Luke has given it in his Acts of Apostles thirty years after its institution. The first time he notices it is Acts ii. 42. when he calls it emphatically *te klasei tou artou*, the breaking of the loaf, a name at the time of his writing, A. D. 64, universally understood. For, says he, in recording the piety and devotion of the first converts, 'they continued steadfast in the teaching of the Apostles, in the fellowship, in *the breaking of the loaf*, in the prayers—praising God.' It is true, there is more than breaking a loaf in this institution. But in accordance with general, if not universal usage, either that which is first or most prominent in laws, institutions, and usages, gives a name to them. Thus we have our *Habeas Corpus*, our *Fieri Facias*, our *Nisi*

Prius, our *Capias*, our *Venditioni Exponas*, names given from the first words of the law.

But to break a loaf, or *to break bread*, was a phrase common amongst the Jews to denote ordinary eating for refreshment. For example, Acts ii. 46. 'Daily, with one accord, they continued in the temple and in breaking bread, from house to house. They eat their *food* with gladness and simplicity of heart.' Also, after Paul had restored Eutyclus at Troas, we are informed he brake a loaf and eat. Here it must refer to himself, not only because it is used *indefinitely*, but because he that eats is in the same number with him that breaks a loaf. But when an established usage is referred to, the article or some definitive term ascertains what is alluded to. Thus, Acts ii. 42. it is '*the breaking of the loaf.*' And Acts xx.7. it is 'They assembled for *the breaking of the loaf.*' This loaf is explained by Paul, 1 Cor. x. 10. '*The loaf which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ.*' This proposition being now, as we judge, sufficiently evident, we shall proceed to state our sixth.

PROP. VI.—*The breaking of the loaf and the drinking of the cup are commemorative of the Lord's death.*

Upon the loaf and upon the cup of the Lord, in letters which speak not to the eye, but to the heart of every disciple, is inscribed, "*When this you see, remember me.*" Indeed, the Lord says to each disciple, when he receives the symbols into his hand, 'This is my body broken for *you*. This is my blood *shed* for you.' The loaf is thus constituted a representation of his body—first whole, then wounded for our sins. The cup is thus instituted a representation of his blood—once his life, but now poured out to cleanse us from our sins. To every disciple he says, For *you* my body was wounded; for *you* my life was taken. In deceiving it the disciple says, "Lord, I believe it. My life springs from thy suffering; my joy from thy sorrows; and my hope of glory everlasting from thy humiliation and abasement even to death." Each disciple, in handing the symbols to his fellow-disciple, says, in effect, "You my brother, once an alien, are now a citizen of heaven; once a stranger, are now brought home to the family of God. You have owned my Lord as your Lord, my people as your people. Under Jesus the Messiah we are one. Mutually embraced in the everlasting arms, I embrace you in mine: thy sorrows shall be my sorrows, and thy joys my

joys. Joint debtors to the favor of God and the love of Jesus, we shall jointly suffer with him, that we may jointly reign with him. Let us, then, renew our strength, remember our King, and hold fast our boasted hope unshaken to the end."

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love;
The fellowship of kindred minds
Is like to that above."

Here he knows no man after the flesh. Ties that spring from eternal love, revealed in blood, and addressed to his senses, draw forth all that is within him of complacent affection and feeling, to those joint heirs with him of the grace of eternal life. While it represents to him *'the bread of life'*—all the salvation of the Lord—it is the strength of his faith, the joy of his hope, and the life of his love.*

This institution commemorates the love which reconciled us to God, and always furnishes us with a new argument to live to him who died for us. Him who feels not the eloquence and power of this argument, all other arguments assail in vain. God's goodness, developed in creation and in his providence, is well designed to lead men to reformation. But the heart, on which these fail, and to which Calvary appeals in vain, is past feeling, obdurate, and irreclaimable, beyond the operation of any moral power known to mortal man.

Every time the disciples assemble around the Lord's table, they are furnished with a new argument also against sin, as well as with a new proof of the love of God. It is as well intended to crucify the world in our hearts, as to quicken us to God, and to diffuse his love within us. Hence it must in reason be a stated part of the Christian worship, in all Christian assemblies; which leads us to state, illustrate, and sustain the following capital proposition, to which the preceding six are all preliminary.

PROP. VII.—*The breaking of the one loaf, and the joint participation of the cup of the Lord, in commemoration of the Lord's death, usually called "the Lord's Supper," is an instituted part of the worship and edification of all Christian congregations in all their stated meetings.*

Argument 1. The first Christian congregation which met

* Christian Baptist, Vol. 3, No. 1. In that volume, in the Fall of 1825, were written four essays on the breaking of bread, which see.

in Jerusalem, and which was constituted by the twelve Apostles, did as statedly attend upon the breaking of the loaf in their public meetings, as they did upon any other part of the Christian worship. So Luke records, Acts ii. 42. 'They continued steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, in *the breaking of the loaf*, and in the prayers.' Ought we not, then, to continue as steadfast in the breaking of the loaf, as in the teaching of the Apostles, as in the fellowship, as in the prayers commanded by the Apostles?

Argument 2. The Apostles taught the churches to do all the Lord commanded. Whatever, then, the churches did by the appointment or concurrence of the Apostles, they did by the commandment of Jesus Christ. Whatever acts of religious worship the Apostles taught or sanctioned in one Christian congregation, they taught and sanctioned in all Christian congregations, because all under the same government of one and the same King. But the church in Troas met upon the first day of the week, consequently all the churches met upon the first day of the week for religious purposes.

Among the acts of worship, or the institutions of the Lord, to which the disciples attended in these meetings, the breaking of the loaf was so conspicuous and so important, that the churches are said to meet on the first day of the week for this purpose. We are expressly told that the disciples at Troas met for this purpose; and what one church did by the authority of the Lord, as a part of his instituted worship, they all did. That the disciples in Troas met for this purpose is not to be inferred, for Luke says positively, (Acts xx. 7.) 'And on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together for the breaking of the loaf, Paul, being about to depart on the morrow, discoursed with them, and lengthened out his discourse till midnight.' From the manner in which this meeting of the disciples at Troas is mentioned by the historian, two things are very obvious—1st. That it was an established custom or rule for the disciples to meet on the first day of the week. 2d. That the primary object of their meeting was to break the loaf. They who object to breaking the loaf on the first day of every week when the disciples are assembled, usually preface their objections by telling us, that Luke does not say they broke the loaf *every* first day; and yet they contend against the Sabbatarians, that they ought to observe *every* first day to the Lord in commemoration, of his resurrection. The Sabbatarians raise the same objec-

tion to this passage, when adduced by all professors of Christianity to authorize the weekly observance of the first day. They say that Luke does not tell us, that they met for any religious purpose on *every* first day. How inconsistent, then, are they who make this sentence an express precedent for observing *every* first day, when arguing against the Sabbatarians, and then turn round and tell us, that it will not prove that they broke the loaf *every* first day! If it does not prove the one, it is most obvious it will not prove the other; for the weekly observance of this day, as a day of the meeting of the disciples, and the weekly breaking of the loaf in those meetings, stand or fall together. Hear it again: 'And on the first day of the week, when the disciples assembled to break the loaf.' Now all must confess, who regard the meaning of words, that the meeting of the disciples and the breaking of the loaf, as far as these words are concerned, are expressed in the same terms as respects the frequency. If the one was *fifty-two* times in a year, or only *once*; so was the other. If they met every first day, they broke the loaf every first day; and if they did not break the loaf every first day, they did not meet every first day. But we argue from the style of Luke, or from his manner of narrating the fact, that they did both. If he had said that on *a* first day the disciples assembled to break the loaf, then I would admit that both the Sabbatarians, and the semi-annual or septennial communicants might find some way of explaining this evidence away.

The definite article is, in the Greek and in the English tongue, prefixed to stated and fixed times, and its appearance here is not merely definitive of one day, but expressive of a stated or fixed day. This is so in all languages which have a definite article. Let us illustrate this by a very parallel and plain case. Suppose some 500 or 1000 years hence the annual observance of the 4th of July should have ceased for several centuries, and that some person or persons devoted to the primitive institutions of this mighty Republic, were desirous of seeing the 4th of every July observed as did the fathers and founders of the Republic during the hale and undegenerate days of primitive republican simplicity. Suppose that none of the records of the first century of this Republic had expressly stated, that it was a regular and fixed custom for a certain class of citizens to pay a particular regard to the 4th day of every July; but that a few incidental expressions in the biography of the leading men in the Republic spake of it as Luke has done of the meeting at Troas.

How would it be managed? For instance, in the life of John, Quincy Adams it is written, A. D. 1823, "And on the 4th of July, when the republicans of the City of Washington met to dine, John Q. Adams delivered an oration to them." Would not an American, a thousand years hence, in circumstances such as have been stated, find in these words *one* evidence that it was an established usage, during the first century of this Republic, to regard the 4th day of July as aforesaid. He would tell his opponents to mark, that it was not said that on *a* fourth of July, as if it were a particular occurrence; but it was in the fixed meaning of the English language expressive of a fixed and stated day of peculiar observance. At all events, he could not fail in convincing the most stupid, that the primary intention of that meeting was *to dine*. Whatever might be the frequency or the intention of that dinner, it must be confessed, from the words above cited, that they *met to dine*.

Another circumstance that must somewhat confound the Sabbatarians, and the lawless observers of the breaking of the loaf, may be easily gathered from Luke's narrative. Paul and his company arrived at Troas either on the evening of the first day, or on Monday morning at an early hour; for he departed on Monday morning, as we term it, at an early hour; and we are positively told that he tarried just seven days at Troas. Now had the disciples been Sabbatarians, or observed the seventh day as a Sabbath, and broke the loaf on it as the Sabbatarians do, they would not have deferred their meeting till the first day, and kept Paul and his company waiting, as he was evidently in a great haste at this time. But his tarrying *seven* days, and his early departure on Monday morning, corroborates the evidence adduced in proof, that the first day of the week was the *fixed* and *stated* day, for the disciples to meet for this purpose.*

From the 2d of the Acts, then, we learn that *the breaking of the loaf*, was a stated part of the worship of the disciples in their meetings; and from the 20th we learn, that the first day of the week was the stated time for those meetings; and above all, we ought to notice that the most prominent object of their meeting was to break the loaf. Other corroborating evidences of the stated meeting of the disciples on the first day for religious purposes, are found in the fact, that Paul says he had given orders to all the congregations in Galatia,

* C. B. pp., 211, 212.

as well as that in Corinth, to attend to the fellowship, or the laying up of contributions for the poor saints on the first day of every week. 'On the first day of *every week* let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come there may be no collections'* for the saints. *Kata mian Sabbaton* MacKnight justly renders, '*the first day of every week*;' for every linguist will admit that *kata polin* means every city; *kata menan*, every month; *kata ecclesian*, every church; and, therefore, in the same usage, *kata mian Sab-baton* means the first day of every week.

Now this prepares the way for asserting not only, that the disciples in Troas assembled on the first day of every week for 'the breaking of the loaf,' but also for adducing a third argument;—

Argument 3. The congregation in Corinth met every first day, or the first day of every week, for showing forth the Lord's death. Let the reader bear in mind that he has just heard that Paul commanded the church in Corinth, or every saint in Corinth, to contribute according to his ability, by putting into the treasury every first day his contributions to avoid collections when Paul came. This is agreed on all hands to prove the weekly meeting of these saints. Now, with this concession in mind, we have only to notice what is said, chap. xi. 20. 'When you come together into one place, that is, every week at least, *this is not to eat the Lord's supper*. To act thus is unworthy of the object of your meeting. To act thus is not to eat the Lord's supper. It is not to show forth the Lord's death. Thereby declaring that this is the chief object of meeting. When a teacher reproves his pupils for wasting time, he cannot remind them more forcibly of the object of their coming to school, nor reprove them with more point, than to say, "When you act thus, this is not to assemble to learn." This is the exact import of the Apostle's address, 'When you assemble thus, it is *not* to eat the Lord's supper.' We have seen, then, that the saints met every first day in Corinth; and when they assembled in one place it was to eat the Lord's supper, a declaration of the practice of the primitive congregations as explicit as could incidentally be given, differing only from a direct command in the form in which it is expressed. But it is agreed on all hands, that whatsoever the congregations did with the approbation of the

* 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

Apostles, they did by their authority. For the Apostles gave them all the Christian institutions. Now as the Apostle Paul approbated their meeting every week, and their coming together into one place to show forth the Lord's death;—and only censured their departure from the meaning of the institution, it is as high authority as we could require for the practice of the weekly meeting of the disciples.

But when Acts ii. 42. Acts xx. and 7. 1 Cor. xi. 2 and chap. xvi. 1 & 2, are compared and added together, it appears that we act under the influence of apostolic teaching and precedent, when we meet every Lord's day for the breaking of the loaf. But this is still farther demonstrated by a fourth argument drawn from the following fact:—

Argument 4. No example can be adduced from the New Testament of any Christian congregation assembling on the first day of the week, unless for the breaking of the loaf. Let an example be adduced by those who teach that Christians ought to meet on the first day of the week not to break the loaf, and then, but not till then, can they impugn the above fact. Till this is done, a denial of it must appear futile in the extreme. The argument, then, is, Christians have no authority, nor are under any obligation to meet on the Lord's day, from any thing which the Apostles said or practised, unless it be to show forth the Lord's death, and to attend to those means of edification and comfort connected with it.

Argument 5. If it be not the duty and privilege of every Christian congregation to assemble on the first day of every week to show forth the Lord's death, it will be difficult, if not impossible, from either scripture or reason, to show that it is their duty or privilege to meet monthly, quarterly, semi annually, annually, or, indeed, at all for this purpose. For from what premises can any person show that it is a duty or a privilege to assemble monthly, which will not prove that it is obligatory to meet weekly? We challenge investigation here, and affirm that no man can produce a single reason, why it should or could be a duty or a privilege for a congregation to meet monthly, quarterly, or annually, which will not prove that it is its duty and privilege to assemble every first day for this purpose.

Argument 6. Spiritual health, as well as corporal health, is dependent on food. It is requisite for corporal health, that the food not only be salutary in its nature, and sufficient in its quantity, but that it be received at proper intervals, and these regular and fixed. Is it otherwise with

moral health? Is there no analogy between the bread which perishes, and the bread of life? Is there no analogy between natural and moral life—between natural and moral health? and if there be, does it not follow, that if the primitive disciples only enjoyed good moral health, when they assembled weekly to show forth the Lord's death, that they cannot enjoy good moral health, who only meet quarterly or semi annually for this purpose?

Argument 7. But in the last place, what *commemorative* institution, in any age, under any religious economy, was ordained by divine authority, which had not a fixed time for its observance? Was it the commemoration of the finishing of Creation signified in the weekly Sabbath? Was it the Passover, the Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles? Was it the Feast of Purim either? What other significant usage was it, the times or occasions of whose observance were not fixed? How often was circumcision to be administered to the same subject? How often Christian immersion? Is there a single institution commemorative of any thing, the meaning, or frequency, of the observance of which, is not distinctly, either by precept or example, laid down in the Holy Scriptures? Not one of a *social* character, and scarcely one of an individual character. The commemoration of the Lord's death must, then, be a weekly institution—an institution in all the meetings of the disciples for Christian worship; or it must be an anomaly—a thing *sui generis*—an institution like no other of divine origin. And can any one tell why Christians should celebrate the Lord's resurrection *fifty-two* times in a year, and his death only *once, twice, or twelve* times? He that can do this will not be lacking in a lively imagination, however defective he may be in judgment, or in an acquaintance with the New Testament.

Having written so much on this subject formerly, I shall now introduce a few persons out of the many men of renown, who, since the Reformation, have plead this cause. We shall not only introduce them to our readers, but we shall let them speak to them:—

John Brown, of Haddington, author of the Dictionary of the Bible, and teacher of theology for that branch of the Presbyterian church called the "*Secession*," has written a treatise on this subject. We shall give him the task of stating and removing the objections to this apostolic institution. The reader will perceive that there are many impurities in

his style; and although his speech betrays that he has been in Ashdod, still his arguments are weighty and powerful.

He offers various arguments for the weekly observance of this institution, and states and refutes nine objections to the practice. A few of the strongest we shall quote:—

"All the arguments I ever knew advanced in support of the unfrequent administration of the Lord's supper, appear to me altogether destitute of force. The following are the principal:—

"Objection 1. The frequent administration of this ordinance, in the apostolic and primitive ages of Christianity, was commendable and necessary, because the continual persecutions that then raged, gave them ground to fear that every Sabbath might be their last; whereas now we are not in such danger, and therefore need not so frequent use of this ordinance.

"Answer. Ought we not still to live as if every Sabbath were to be our last? Have we now a lease of our life more than these had? Did not many Christians in these times live to as great an age as we now do? Indeed, is it not evident, from the best historians, that the church was generally under no persecution above one-third of the time, that weekly communion was practised? But, say they had been constantly exposed to the cruelest persecution, the objection becomes still more absurd. If they attended this ordinance weekly at the peril of their lives, does it follow that now, when God gives us greater and better opportunity for it, we ought to omit it? Does God require the greatest work at his people's hands, when he gives least opportunity? Or does he require least work, when he gives the greatest opportunity for it? What kind of a master must God be, if this were the case? Besides, do not men need this ordinance to preserve them from the influence of the world's smiles as much as of its frowns?"—"Let us invert this objection, and try if it has not more force. It would then run thus: The primitive Christians received the Lord's supper weekly, as their souls were in greater danger from the smiles and allurements of the world, which are usually found more hurtful to men's spiritual concerns than its frowns; and as they had greater opportunity for doing so by their enjoying peace and liberty; yet this frequency of administering and partaking is not requisite now, as we, being under the world's frowns, are in less hazard as to our spiritual concerns; and especially, as we cannot attend

upon it but at the peril of our lives, God having expressly declared that he loves mercy better than sacrifice.

"Objection 2. The primitive and reforming times were seasons of great spiritual liveliness, and of large communications of divine influences to the souls of believers; whereas it is quite otherwise now. Therefore, though frequent administration was then commendable; yet, in our languishing decayed state, it is unnecessary.

"Answer. Ought we to repair seldom to the wells of salvation, because we can bring but little water at once from them? Ought we seldom to endeavor to fill our pitchers at the fountain of living waters, because they are small? Is not this ordinance a cordial for restoring the languishing, strengthening the weak, recovering the sick, and reviving the dying believer? How reasonable, then, is it to argue that languishing, weak, sick, and dying believers, must not have it often administered to them, just because they are not in perfect health?"—"Would not the objection inverted read better? The primitive Christians had this ordinance frequently administered to them, because being decayed and withered, weak and sickly, and receiving only scanty communications of divine influence at once, it was necessary for them to be often taking new meals: whereas, we being now strong and lively Christians, and receiving on these occasions such large supplies of grace, as are sufficient to enable us to walk many days under their powerful influence, have no occasion for so frequently attending on that ordinance, which is especially calculated for strengthening languishing, weak, sickly believers.

"Objection 3. If the Lord's supper were frequently administered, it would become less solemn, and, in time, quite contemptible, as we see is the case with baptism, through the frequency of the administration of that ordinance.

"Answer. Is this mean of keeping up the credit of the Lord's supper, of God's devising or not? If it is, where is that part of his word that warrants it? The contrary I have already proved from Scripture. Since, then, it is only of men's invention, what ground is there to hope it will really maintain the credit and solemnity of the ordinance? Did not the Papists of old, pretend to maintain and advance its solemnity, by reduction of the frequency of administration? Did they not take away the cup from the people, which Calvin says, was the native consequence of the former? Did they not annex the administration of this ordi-

nance to those seasons which superstition had aggrandized; namely, Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas? Did they not annex a world of ceremonies to it? Did they not pretend that it was a real sacrifice, and that the elements were changed by consecration, into the real body and blood of Christ? And, did all this tend to the support of the proper credit of this ordinance? On the contrary, did it not destroy, it? Though the doctrine of transubstantiation procured a kind of reverence for it, yet, was this reverence divine? or, was it not rather devilish, in worshiping the elements? Now, how are we sure that our unfrequent administration of this ordinance will more effectually support its solemnity? Is it not strange that we should have so much encouragement from the practice of the Apostles, the primitive Christians, and the whole of the reformed churches, to profane this solemn ordinance; while the most ignorant and abandoned Papists are our original pattern, for the course that tends to support its proper honor and credit? What a strange case this must be, if, in order to support the credit of God's ordinance, we must forsake the footsteps of the flock, and walk in the paths originally chalked out by the most ignorant and wicked antichristians?

"Besides, if our unfrequent administration of this ordinance render it solemn, would it not become much more so, if administered only once in seven, ten, twenty, thirty, sixty, or a hundred years?"—"Shall we not then find, that those who pray once-a-month, or hear a sermon once-a-year, have their minds far more religiously impressed with solemn views of God, than those who pray seven times a day, and hear a hundred sermons within the year?

"Let us invert this objection, and see how it stands. All human devices to render God's ordinances more solemn, are impeachments of his wisdom, and have always tended to bring the ordinances into contempt. But unfrequent administration of the supper is a human device, first invented by the worst of Papists, and therefore it tends to bring contempt on this ordinance, as we see sadly verified in the practice of those who voluntarily communicate seldom."

The means by which the weekly observance of the Supper was set aside, Mr. Brown states in the following words:—

"The means by which the unfrequent administration of this ordinance appears to me to have been introduced into the church, do not savor of the God of truth. The causes

that occasioned its introduction appear to have been pride, superstition, covetousness, and carnal complaisance. The eastern hermits, retiring from the society of men, had taken up their residence in deserts and mountains, and being far removed from the places of its administration, seldom attended. This, though really the effect of their sloth and distance, they pretended to arise from their regard and reverence for this most solemn ordinance. It being easy to imitate them in this imaginary holiness, which lay in neglecting the ordinance of God, many of the eastern Christians left off to communicate, except at such times as superstition had rendered solemn, as at pasch; and contented themselves with being spectators on other occasions. On account of this practice, we find the great and eloquent Chrysostom, once and again, bitterly exclaiming against them as guilty of the highest contempt of God and Christ; and calls their practice a most wicked custom."

An objection not formally stated by Mr. Brown, which I have frequently heard, is drawn from the words, '*as often as you do this, do it in remembrance of me.*' From these words, it is plead that we are without law in regard to the time how often; and consequently cannot be condemned for a partial or total neglect: for 'where there is no law, there is no transgression.' '*As often*' is used not to licence the frequency, but to denote the manner. '*Always do it in remembrance of me.*' The connexion in which these words occur regarding the manner or design of the observance, and not how often it may, or may not be celebrated, it is a violation of every rule of interpretation to infer another matter from them, which was not in the eye of the Apostle. Besides, if the words '*as oft*' leave it discretionary with any society how often, they are blameless if they never once, or more than once in all their lives, show forth the Saviour's death. This interpretation makes an observance without reason, without law, without privilege, and consequently without obligation.

Next to Mr. Brown, we shall introduce a few extracts from *William King*, Archbishop of Dublin. The Editors of the *Christian Examiner* presented a very valuable extract from Mr. King, in their 7th of May number of the first volume, from which I quote the following, p. 163, 165, 166, 167:—

"The following remarks on this institution of our Saviour, are copied from a '*Discourse concerning the Inven-*

tions of Men in the Worship of God? by William King, of Ireland. He was born at Antrim, 1650; educated at Trinity College, Dublin; and held successively the dignities of Dean of St. Patrick's, Bishop of Derry, and Archbishop of Dublin. He died in 1729. His method, in this 'Discourse,' is to examine and compare the worship of God, as taught in the Scriptures, with the practice of the different religious sects of the day:—

'Christ's positive command to do this in remembrance of him, &c., must oblige us in some times and in some places; and there can be no better way of determining when we are obliged to do it, than by observing when God in his goodness gives us opportunity; for either we are then obliged to do it, or else we may choose whether we will ever do it or no; their being no better means of determining the frequency, than this of God's giving us the opportunity. And the same rule holding in all other general positive commands, such as in those that oblige us to charity, we may be sure it holds likewise in this. Therefore, whoever slights or neglects any opportunity of receiving which God affords him, does sin as certainly as he, who, being enabled by God to perform an act of charity, and invited by a fit object, neglects to relieve him, or shuts up his bowels of compassion against him, concerning *whom* the Scriptures assure us, that the love of God dwells not in him. And the argument is rather stronger against him who neglects this holy ordinance; for how can it be supposed *that man* has a true love for his Saviour, or a due sense of his sufferings, who refuses or neglects to remember the greatest of all benefits, in the easiest manner, though commanded to do it by his Redeemer, and invited by a fair opportunity of God's own offering.

'It is manifest that if it be not our own faults, we may have an opportunity every Lord's day when we meet together; and therefore that church is guilty of laying aside the command, whose order and worship doth not require and provide for this practice. Christ's command seems to lead us directly to it: for, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' implies that Christ was to leave them, that they were to meet together after he was gone, and that he required them *to remember him at their meetings whilst he was absent*. The very design of our public meetings on the Lord's day, and not on the Jewish Sabbath, is, to remember and keep in our minds a sense of what Christ did and suffered for us

till he come again; and this we are obliged to do, not in such a manner as our own inventions suggest, but by such means as Christ himself has prescribed to us, that is, by celebrating this holy ordinance.

'It seems then probable, from the very institution of this ordinance, that our Saviour designed it should be a part of God's service, in all the solemn assemblies of Christiana, as the passover was in the assemblies of the Jews. To know, therefore, how often Christ requires us to celebrate this feast, we have no more to do, but to enquire how often Christ requires us to meet together; that is, at least, every Lord's day.' "

We shall next introduce an American Rabbi of very great celebrity, Dr. John Mason, of New York. The passages which I quote are found in a note attached to the 188th page of the New York Edition of Fuller's *Strictures on Sandemanianism*.

"Mr. Fuller does not deny, that the Lord's Supper was observed by the first Christians every Lord's day, (nor will this be denied by any man who has candidly investigated the subject,) but he seems to think that Acts xx. 7. does not prove that it was so; others, eminent for piety and depth of research, have considered this passage as affording a complete proof of the weekly observance of the Lord's supper. Dr. Scott, in his valuable Commentary, observes on this passage, '*Breaking of bread*, or commemorating the death of Christ in the eucharist, was one chief end of their assembling; this ordinance seems to have been *constantly administered every Lord's day*, and probably no professed Christians absented themselves from it, after they had been admitted into the church; unless they lay under some censure, or had some real hindrance.'

"Dr. Mason, of this city, in his *Letters on Frequent Communion*, speaks on this subject with still greater decision. 'It is notorious, that during the first three centuries of the Christian era, communions were held with the frequency of which, among us, we have neither example nor resemblance. It is also notorious, that the original frequency of communions declined as carnality and corruption gained ground. And it is no less notorious, That it has been urged as a weighty duty by the best of men, and the best churches, in the best of times.'

"Weekly communions did not die with the Apostles and their contemporaries. There is a cloud of witnesses to tes-

tify that they were kept up by succeeding Christians, with great care and tenderness, for above two centuries. It is not necessary to swell these pages with quotations. The fact is indisputable.

"Communion every Lord's day, was universal, and was preserved in the Greek Church till the seventh century; and such as neglected *three weeks* together were excommunicated.

"In this manner did the spirit of ancient piety cherish the memory of the Saviour's love. There was no need of reproof, remonstrance, or entreaty. No trifling excuses for neglect were ever heard from the lips of a Christian; for *such* a neglect had not yet degraded the Christian's name. He carried in his own bosom sufficient inducements to obey, without reluctance, the precepts of his Lord. It was his choice, his consolation, his joy. These were days of life and glory; but days of dishonor and death were shortly to succeed; nor was there a more ominous symptom of their approach, than the decline of frequent communicating! For as the power of religion appears in a solicitude to magnify the Lord Jesus continually, so the decay of it is first detected by the encroachments of indifference. It was in the *fourth* century that the church began very discernibly to forsake her first love.

"The excellent Calvin complains that in this day, professors, conceiting that they had fully discharged their duty by a single communion, resigned themselves for the rest of the year, to supineness and sloth. 'It ought to have been,' says he, 'far otherwise. *Every week*, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for Christian assemblies; and the promises declared, by which in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed.'"*

We shall now hear the celebrated John Wesley. After *fifty-five* year's reflection upon the subject, he decides that Christians should show forth the Lord's death every Lord's day. He prefaces the 106th Sermon, Luke xxii. 19, with this remark:—

"This discourse was written above five and fifty years ago, for the use of my pupils at Oxford. I have added very little, but retrenched much; as I then used more words than I now do. But I thank God, I have not yet seen cause to

* Mason's Letters on Frequent Communion, pp. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 42, Edinburgh Edition, 1799.

alter my sentiments, in any point which is therein delivered."

The Sermon is titled "The Duty of Constant Communion," concerning which the Reformer says—

"It is no wonder that men who have no fear of God, should never think of doing this. But it is strange that it should be neglected by any that do fear God, and desire to save their souls; and yet nothing is more common. One reason why many neglect it is, they are so much afraid of *eating and drinking unworthily*, that they never think how much greater the danger is, when they do not eat or drink it at all."

In speaking of *constantly* receiving the supper, Mr. Wesley says—

"I say *constantly* receiving. For as to the phrase *frequent* communion, it is absurd to the last degree. If it means any thing else than constant, it means more than can be proved to be the duty of any man. For if we are not obliged to communicate *constantly*, by what argument can it be proved that we are obliged to communicate *frequently*? yea, more than once a year? or once in seven years? or once before we die? Every argument brought for this, either proves that we ought to do it *constantly*, or proves nothing at all. Therefore that undeterminate, unmeaning way of speaking, ought to be laid aside by all men of understanding. Our power is the only rule of our duty. Whatever we can do, that we ought. With respect either to this, or any other command, he that, when he may obey if he will, does not, will have no place in the kingdom of heaven."

Though we may have some objections to the style in which John Wesley speaks of the meaning of this institution, as we have indeed to that of all the others from whom we have quoted, yet we would recommend to the whole Methodistic community the close perusal of the above Sermon. It will be found Vol. 3. pp. 171—179.

The Elders among the Methodists, with whom John Wesley is such high authority, we would remind of his *advice*, found in his Letter to America, 1784, lately quoted in the Gospel Herald, Lexington Ky. "I ALSO ADVISE THE ELDERS TO ADMINISTER THE SUPPER OF THE LORD ON EVERY LORD'S DAY."

So much for John Brown, John Mason, and John Wesley, and the authorities which they quoted. When quoting

the sayings of the Johns, I am reminded of something said by the great John Milton, the "immortal bard" of England. In his posthumous works he says; "The Lord's supper (which the doctrine of transubstantiation, or rather anthropophagy, has well nigh converted into a banquet of cannibals,) is essential to be observed, and may be administered by any one with propriety, as well as by an appointed minister. There is no order of men which can claim to itself either the right of distribution, or the power of withholding the sacred elements, seeing that in the church we are all alike priests." "The master of a family, or any one appointed by him, is at liberty to celebrate the Lord's supper from house to house, as was done in the dispensation of the passover"—"all Christians are a royal priesthood, therefore any believer is competent to act as an ordinary minister according as convenience may require, provided only he be endowed with the necessary gifts, these gifts constituting his commission." Thus did the famous Milton make way for the weekly observance of the supper, by divesting it of the priestly appendages and penances of the dark ages.

A cloud of witnesses to the plainness and evidence of the New Testament on the subject of the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper, might be adduced. But this we think unnecessary; and as we would avoid prolixity and tediousness, we shall only add a few extracts from the third volume of the *Christian Baptist*, 2d ed. p. 254, in proof of the assertion—*all antiquity is on the side of the disciples meeting every fast day for the breaking of the loaf:—*

All antiquity concurs in evincing that, for the *three first centuries*, all the churches broke bread once a week. Pliny. in his Epistles, Book x. Justin Martyr, in his Second Apology for the Christians, and Tertullian, De Ora. page 135, testify that it was the universal practice in all the weekly assemblies of the brethren, after they had prayed and sang praises—'Then bread and wine being brought to the *chief brother*, he taketh it and offereth praise and thanksgiving to the Father, in the name of the Son and Holy Spirit. After prayer and thanksgiving, the whole assembly saith, *Amen!* When thanksgiving is ended by the *chief guide*, and the consent of the whole people, the *deacons* (as we call them) give to every one present part of the bread and wine, over which thanks are giver.'

"The weekly communion was preserved in the Greek

church till the *seventh century*; and, by one of their canons, 'such as neglected *three weeks together*, were excommunicated.*

"In the *fourth century*, when all things began to be changed by baptized Pagans, the practice began to decline. Some of the councils in the western part of the Roman Empire, by their canons, strove to keep it up. The council held at Illiberis in Spain, A. D. 324, decreed that 'no offerings should be received from such as did not receive the Lord's Supper.' †

"The council at Antioch, A. D. 341, decreed that 'all who came to church, and heard the Scriptures read, but afterwards joined not in prayer, and receiving the sacrament, should be cast out of the church, till such time as they gave public proof of their repentance.‡

"All these canons were unable to keep a carnal crowd of professors in a practice for which they had no spiritual taste; and, indeed, it was likely to get out of use altogether. To prevent this, the Council of Agatha, in Languedoc, A. D. 506, decreed that 'none should be esteemed good Christians who did not *communicate* at least *three times* a year— at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday,' || This soon became the standard of a good Christian, and it was judged presumptuous to commune oftener.

"Things went on in this way for more than 600 years, until they got tired of even *three* communications in one year; and the infamous Council of Lateran, which decreed auricular confession and transubstantiation, decreed that 'an annual communion at Easter was sufficient.' This association of the "sacrament' with Easter, and the mechanical devotion of the ignorant at this season, greatly contributed to the worship of the Host. § Thus the breaking of bread in simplicity and godly sincerity once-a-week, degenerated into a pompous sacrament once-a-year, at Easter.

'At the Reformation this subject was but slightly investigated by the reformers. Some of them, however, paid some attention to it. Even Calvin, in his Institutes, lib. 4. chap. xvii. sect. 46, says, 'And truly this custom, which enjoins communicating once-a-year, *is a most evident contrivance of the Devil*, by whose instrumentality soever it may have been determined.'

"And again, (Inst. lib. 6. chap. xviii. sect. 56,) he says,

* Erskine's Dissertations, p. 271. † Council Illib. Can. 28. ‡ Council Antioch. Can. 2. || Coun. Agatha, Can. 18. § Bingham's Ori. B. xv. C. 9.

'It ought to have been far otherwise. *Every week*, at least, the table of the Lord should have been spread for Christian assemblies, and the promises declared, by which, in partaking of it, we might be spiritually fed.'

"Martin Chemnitz, Witsius, Calderwood, and others of the reformers and controversialists, concur with Calvin; and, indeed, almost every commentator on the New Testament, concurs with the Presbyterian Henry in these remarks on Acts xx. 7. 'In the primitive times it was the custom of many churches to receive the Lord's Supper every Lord's day.'

'The Belgic reformed church, in 1581., appointed the supper to be received every other month. The reformed churches of France, after saying that they had been too remiss in observing the supper but four times a year, advise a *greater frequency*. The church of Scotland began with *four* sacraments in a year; but some of her ministers got up to *twelve* times. Thus things stood till the close of the last century.

"Since the commencement of the present century, many congregations in England, Scotland, Ireland, and some in the United States and Canada, both Independents and Baptists, have attended upon the supper every Lord's day, and the practice is every day gaining ground.

"These historical notices may be of some use to those who are ever and anon crying out *Innovation! Innovation!* But we advocate the principle and the practice on apostolic grounds alone. Blessed is that servant, who, knowing his Master's will, doeth it with expedition and delight!

"Those who would wish to see an able refutation of the Presbyterian mode of observing the sacrament, and a defence of weekly communion, would do well to read Dr. John Mason's Letters on Frequent Communion, who is himself a high-toned Presbyterian, and consequently his remarks will be more regarded by his brethren than mine."

Thus our seventh proposition is sustained by the explicit declarations of the New Testament, by the reasonableness of the thing itself when suggested by the Apostles, by analogy, by the conclusions of the most eminent reformers, and by the concurrent voice of all Christian antiquity. But on the plain sayings of the Lord and his Apostles, we rely for authority and instruction upon *this* and *every other* Christian institution. It does, indeed, appear somewhat incongruous, that argu-

ments should have to be submitted to urge Christians to convene weekly around the Lord's table. Much more in accordance with the genius of our religion would it be, to see them over-solicitous to be honored with a seat at the King's table, and asking with intense interest, might they be permitted so often to eat in his presence, and in honor of his love. To have to withstand their daily convocations for this purpose, would not be a task so unnatural and so unreasonable, as to have to reason and expostulate with them, to urge them to assemble once-a-week for this purpose.

But as the want of appetite for our animal sustenance is a symptom of ill health, or approaching disease; so a want of relish for spiritual food is indicative of a want of spiritual health, or of the presence of a moral disease, which, if not healed, must issue in apostacy from the Living Head. Hence among the most unequivocal prognosis of a spiritual decline, the most decisive is a want of appetite for the nourishment, which the Good Physician prepared and prescribed for his family. A healthy and vigorous Christian, excluded from the use and enjoyment of all the provisions of the Lord's house cannot be found.

But much depends upon the *manner* of celebrating the supper, as well as upon the *frequency*. The simplicity of the Christian institution runs through every part of it. While there is the form of doing every thing, there is all attention to the thing signified. But there is the form as well as the substance, and every thing that is done, must be done in some manner. The well bred Christian is like the well bred gentleman—his manners are graceful, easy, artless, and simple. All stiffness and forced formality are as graceless in the Christian, as in the gentleman. A courteous and polite family differs exceedingly from a soldier's mess mates, or a ship's crew, in all the ceremonies of the table. There is a Christian decency and a Christian order, as well as political courtesy and complaisance.

Nothing is more disgusting than mimicry. It is hypocrisy in manners, which, like hypocrisy in religion, is more odious than apathy or vulgarity. There is a saintishness in demeanor and appearance, which differs as much from sanctity as foppery from politeness. The appearance of sanctimoniousness is as much to be avoided as actual licentiousness of morals. An austere and rigid pharisaism sits as awkwardly upon a Christian, as a mourning habit

upon a bride. Cheerfulness is not mirth—solemnity is not pharisaism—joy is not noise—nor eating, festivity.

But to act right in any thing, we must feel right. If we would show love, we must first possess it. If a person would walk humbly, he must be humble: and if one would act the Christian on any occasion, he must always live the Christian. Persons who daily converse with God, and who constantly meditate upon his salvation, will not need to be told how they should demean themselves at the Lord's table.

The following extract from my Memorandum Book furnishes the Highest approach to the model, which we have in our eye, of good order and Christian decency in celebrating this institution. Indeed, the whole order of that congregation was comely:—

'The church in———consisted of about fifty members. Not having any person whom they regarded as filling Paul's outlines of a Bishop, they had appointed two senior members, of a very grave deportment, to preside in their meetings. These persons were not competent to labor in the word and teaching; but they were qualified to rule well, and to preside with Christian dignity. One of them presided at each meeting. After they had assembled in the morning, which was at eleven o'clock, (for they had agreed to meet at eleven and to adjourn at two o'clock during the Winter season,) and after they had saluted one another in a very familiar and cordial manner, as brethren are wont to do who meet for social purposes; the president for the day arose and said: 'Brethren, being assembled in the name and by the authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, on this day of his resurrection, let us unite in celebrating his praise.' He then repeated the following stanza:—

"Christ the Lord is *risen* to-day!
Sons of men and angels say;
Raise your joys and triumphs high,
Sing, O heavens! and earth reply!"

"The congregation arose and sang this psalm in animating strains. He then called upon a brother, who was a very distinct and emphatic reader, to read a section of the evangelical history. He arose and read, in a very audible voice, the history of the crucifixion of the Messiah. After a pause of a few moments, the president called upon a brother to pray in the name of the congregation. His prayer abounded with thanksgivings to the Father of Mercies, and with

supplications for such blessings on themselves and for all men as were promised to those who ask, or for which men were commanded to pray. The language was appropriate; no unmeaning repetitions, no labor of words, no effort to say any thing and every thing that came into his mind; but to express slowly, distinctly, and emphatically, the desires of the heart. The prayer was comparatively short; and the whole congregation, brethren and sisters, pronounced aloud the final *Amen*.

"After prayer a passage in one of the Epistles was read by the president himself, and a song was called for. A brother arose, and after naming the page, repeated—

"Twas on that night when doom'd to know
The eager rage of every foe;
That night in which he was betray'd
The Saviour of the world look bread."

"He then sat down, and the congregation sang with much feeling.

"I observed that the table was furnished before the disciples met in the morning, and that the disciples occupied a few benches on each side of it, whilst the strangers sat off on seats more remote. The president arose and said that our Lord had a table for his friends, and that he invited his disciples to sup with him. 'In memory of his death, this monumental table,' said he, 'was instituted; and as the Lord ever lives in heaven, so he ever lives in the hearts of his people. As the first disciples, taught by the Apostles in person, came together into one place to eat the Lord's supper, and as they selected the first day of the week in honor of his resurrection for this purpose; so we, having the same Lord, the same faith, the same hope with them, have vowed to do as they did. We owe as much to the Lord as they; and ought to love, honor, and obey him as much as they. Thus having spoken, he took a small loaf from the table, and in one or two periods gave thanks for it. After thanksgiving, he raised it in his hand, and significantly brake it, and handed it to the disciples on each side of him, who passed the broken loaf from one to another, until they all partook of it. There was no stiffness, no formality, no pageantry; all was easy, familiar, solemn, cheerful. He then took the cup in a similar manner, and returned thanks for it, and handed it to the disciple sitting next him, who passed it round; each one waiting upon his brother, until all were

served. The thanksgiving before the breaking of the loaf, and the distributing of the cup, were as brief and as pertinent to the occasion, as the thanks usually presented at a common table for the ordinary blessings of God's bounty. They then arose, and with one consent, sang—

"To him that lov'd the sons of men,
And wash'd us in his blood;
To royal honors rais'd our heads,
And made us priests to God."

"The president of the meeting called upon a brother to remember the poor, and those ignorant of the way of life, before the Lord. He kneeled down and the brethren all united with him in supplicating the Father of Mercies in behalf of all the sons and daughters of affliction, the poor and the destitute, and in behalf of the conversion of the world. After this prayer the fellowship, or contribution, was attended to; and the whole church proved the sincerity of their desires, by the cheerfulness and liberality which they seemed to evince, in putting into the treasury as the Lord had prospered them.

"A general invitation was tendered to all the brotherhood if they had any thing to propose or inquire, tending to the edification of the body. Several brethren arose in succession, and read several passages in the Old and New Testaments, relative to some matters which had been subjects of former investigation and inquiry. Sundry remarks were made; and after singing several spiritual songs selected by the brethren, the president, on motion of a brother who signified that the hour of adjournment had arrived, concluded the meeting by pronouncing the apostolic benediction.

"I understood that all these items were attended to in all their meetings; yet the order of attendance was not invariably the same. On all the occasions on which I was present with them, no person arose to speak without invitation, or without asking permission of the president, and no person finally left the meeting before the hour of adjournment, without special leave. Nothing appeared to be done in a formal or ceremonious manner. Every thing exhibited the power of godliness as well as the form; and no person could attend to all that passed without being edified and convinced that the spirit of God was there. The joy, the affection, and the reverence which appeared in this little assembly, was the strongest argument in favor of their order, and the best comment on the excellency of the Christian institution."

Dialogue on the Holy Spirit.

AUSTIN AND TIMOTHY.

Austin—Is there no way of settling the public mind on the nature of that influence, which the Holy Spirit exercises upon the human mind in converting and sanctifying men?

Timothy—Certainly, the writings dictated by that Spirit settle these questions.

A.—In the sacred writings these questions may be settled, but the Christian public are unsettled, and greatly confounded through the conflicting theories of spiritual influences and operations. The most sincere hearted are in doubts, and the most candid are yet inquiring what the scriptures teach, concerning both the nature and degrees of influence exerted by that agent in the salvation of men.

T.—This is true of many other subjects which are clearly taught in the Holy Scriptures. Our questions are not discussed there, because many of them are foolish and untaught. Men have long explored both Testaments to find infant baptism and confirmation clearly taught. But who has ever found a hint on these topics in the divine books! Yet the candid and sincere hearted are in doubts and difficulties on these subjects. We have sought out many inventions, and we go to the book in expectation of finding them settled there. But God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor his ways as our ways. He teaches us by his messengers, as he has taught us by his works; nothing in the abstract—every thing in the concrete.

A.—But this does not extricate us from the mazes in which we have strayed. Can nothing be done to relieve us from the influences of these pernicious theories? Can we not reason ourselves out of our false reasonings?

T.—The best reasoning is that which leads us to the Oracles, and turns our attention to the simplicity of the divine teaching. To reason ourselves out of false reasonings is not so easy as many suppose. We have one set of premises in our minds, and another before our eyes; and,

therefore, our conclusions are very often erroneous; and because of the confusion in our premises we cannot detect the errors in our inferences. To illustrate this I will make an experiment on yourself, and shall begin with asking you, What are your conclusions on the *nature* of that influence which the Holy Spirit exercises in converting men?

A.—To this I have no objections; (or my mind vacillates on that subject, and while I incline to my old theory of *divine assistance*, or spiritual operations, independent of what is written, I am not able accurately to define it, nor to maintain it with confidence against some objections, which I have found in your essays on Metaphysical Regeneration; but upon the whole premises, I am rather of the opinion that there is some divine influence either accompanying the word, or apart from it, which makes it an effectual means of salvation, and without which it is not so.

T.—Can you give no name to, nor definition of, that power or influence? or is it an indistinct and indescribable influence of which you can form no idea? for, remember, if you can form no idea of it, it is impossible to think of it, or to speak of it intelligibly.

A.—I confess the difficulty which I feel in giving it a name, because my ideas of power or influence are limited by what I see around me; and I acknowledge that there are but two sorts of power, of which I can form distinct ideas, and on which I can converse with some degree of confidence. These are what are usually called *natural or physical*, and *moral* power.

T.—Perhaps your third sort of power is a combination of these two, as you can have no distinct idea of any influence, which is not in its nature either natural or moral.

A.—I would, upon the whole, call it *spiritual* power, and suppose it to be neither purely moral, nor purely natural, nor even a simple combination of these two; but a species of power which is neither angelic nor human, but divine.

T.—This helps not our conceptions, and I must confess I can form no idea of a power spiritual, which is neither moral nor natural, nor a combination of the two. To speak of a *spiritual* power without some meaning attached to the word, is only to impose upon ourselves.

A.—I will therefore define it. It is a power operating directly on the spirit of man, without any thing between it and the Spirit of God. It is the naked Spirit of God operating upon the naked spirit of man, without any instrument or

means, moral or physical. This is what I call spiritual power. Let me define the three sorts of power of which I have spoken. There is physical power—that is, an agent operating through the laws of nature; there is moral power; —that is, an agent operating through moral law or through moral means; and there is spiritual power;—that is, a spiritual agent operating upon a spirit without any law or means moral or natural. And all this is proved in an ancient and common adage—"God works by means, and he works without them." He employs two sorts of means, physical and moral; and he acts like himself, *spiritually*, when he employs no means at all.

T.—I understand you now, I presume, full as well as you understand yourself. I apprehend your definition of spiritual power, and think you have been more fortunate in expressing yourself, than any person I have met with on your side of the question. Will you allow me to suggest an illustration of your three sorts of power, that you may be satisfied that I do understand you.

A.—I will thank you for it.

T.—Senex had a son whom he wished to bring into his house. He first reasoned with him, and presented motives to induce him to come in. These failed; and he called for a rope, which he threw around him. By this he attempted to draw him into the house, but the rope broke. Then he walked out himself, and seized him with his own naked hands and pulled him in. The first represents your moral power; the second, your physical power; and the third effort represents your spiritual power.

A.—I cannot find an objection to your illustration as respects the *nature* of these powers; though I think your representation of physical power makes it too mechanical, and your illustration of spiritual power makes it too much like compulsion.

T.—Let me have a better one, then, if you can. I only aim at showing you that I apprehend your spiritual power, as contradistinguished from those which are already well defined.

A.—I shall take the same case, and only suppose that when Senex had reasoned with his son, he was willing to come in, but was unable. Then his father handed him his cane, and by it aided him in walking in; but this still being inadequate, he laid aside his cane, and took him by the hand and led him in.

T.—This still exhibits the three powers in the same light, only you have two of them successfully applied; namely, the moral and the spiritual; while I represent the latter only as successfully applied. The difference, then, is not in the *nature* of the power, but in the *success* accompanying its exertion.

A.—Agreed. You understand me, and that is all I wish. You will, therefore, please consider whether such a power is not taught in the scriptures; and is not, in the nature of things, necessary to the conversion of men.

T.—My dear sir, if you were to distribute and classify power into animal, mechanical, physical, moral and spiritual, and could define your own distinctions with all logical and rhetorical accuracy and eloquence, it affects not the nature of the great question on which you proposed an interview, viz:—*the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men*. The present salvation is not a change of body, nor of perception, memory, judgment, imagination, reason; not of the intellectual and animal; but of the *moral* nature of man. Christ came not to make new men and redeem them, but to redeem and save such as we are by nature. Our ruin is not in our senses, nor in our intellectual faculties, but in our moral character and relations. The enlargement of our powers, physical, animal, or intellectual, would neither contribute to our purity nor our happiness. It is a moral revolution, a moral reformation, a moral change, which is essential to the salvation of men. The means must therefore be moral, unless we can think that physical causes can produce moral effects.

A.—I am not opposed to the necessity of such a change, but to your *name* of it. Call it a *spiritual* change and I agree with you in all you have said.

T.—Spiritual change and moral change are both terms of our own adoption. But as you have defined *spiritual* power to be a power without means, natural or moral, we cannot, in *that sense*, use the term in reference to this change; as all must confess, that means numerous and powerful have been employed in effecting the salvation of men. Sacrifices, altars, priests, temples, prophets, apostles, evangelists, words, writings, institutions, ordinances, laws, &c. &c. are found in the vast variety of means employed in effecting this salvation. The power is not spiritual, in your sense of it, which effects this change. And let me add, whatever may be said of God's working spiritually, or without means, in

reference to any other universe prior to, or separate from this one, to which our persons and our Bibles belong, one thing is most obvious and indisputable—he always works by means in this empire.

A.—But it is more to the glory of God to work without means than with them?

T.—Of this, perhaps, we are both bad judges. It is enough for us to know that God has been more glorified by Jesus Christ, than he could have been without his humiliation even to death; and that he has always employed means in the creation, government, and redemption of men. And for my part, I must consider the loaf upon my table as much the gift of God as the manna in the pots of Israel. Both came from God; but the former more circuitously, and to us more ingeniously and curiously than the latter. More of God is seen in giving me a loaf in the usual way, than was seen in a shower of manna. Power was most conspicuous in the manna, but wisdom and power are equally displayed in the loaf. In one sentence, means are employed in bringing man into the world; in sustaining, preserving, and comforting him while in it; and in taking him out of it. All natural good is received by natural means, and all moral good by moral means. So decree all reason and all experience.

A.—It is reason we are now listening to; and it is my wish to know whether reasoning upon any just premises, either in nature or religion, we can be saved from the false reasonings of so many theories, conflicting with each other, and confounding the minds of those who either cannot, or will not, think for themselves.

T.—If you will bear with me, I will put you in possession of my mode of reasoning upon this long and much disputed subject; but I must crave a little indulgence, as to the time I may occupy in giving you my views fully. I will hear your objections with all attention, so soon as I shall have laid my premises and my conclusions before you. And, to secure your attention, I will inform you that I have found a safe haven and a good anchorage, in which I can rest with all security amidst all the storms and tempests, enthusiastic and superstitious, of the times in which we live.

A.—You have my attention secured, and I will promise you either my objections, or my approbation, when I shall have heard you to the close.

T.—We have two sorts of power, physical and moral. By

the former we operate upon matter—by the latter upon mind. To put matter in motion we use physical power, whether we call it animal or scientific power; to put minds in motion we use arguments, or motives addressed to the reason and nature of man. The dominion we have over animals is acquired by our intellectual and physical powers, addressed to their instincts, appetites, propensities, or feelings: thus we control creatures greatly superior to us in animal strength. All the powers, however, which we possess are in our spirits, and these are within us. At their volitions we put forth our physical and moral strength. If D wills to captivate B, he reasons within himself as to the means which he shall employ. If he wills to take him by force, he puts forth his physical strength: but if he wills to take him by argument, he *speaks*. He addresses arguments, allurements, or motives, to move his mind to act in unison with his design.

Motives are arguments; and the strength of an argument is its power to move. Arguments are said to be strong or weak, according to their power to move. And he is said to be a man of strong mind, who is able to produce strong arguments, and can move men to act in accordance with his volitions. A man of weak arguments is a weak man, though his physical strength may be of the highest order. But the strength of an argument is its *meaning*; not the length or number of its words, nor the noise with which it is expressed. It can operate only so far as it is understood.

Because arguments are addressed to the understanding, will, and affections of men, they are called moral, inasmuch as their tendency is to form or change the habits, manners, or actions of men. Every spirit puts forth its moral power in words; that is, all the power it has over the views, habits, manners, or actions of men, is in the meaning and arrangement of its ideas expressed in words; or in significant signs addressed to the eye or ear. All the moral power of Cicero and Demosthenes was in their orations when spoken, and in the circumstances which gave them meaning; and whatever power these men have exercised over Greece and Rome since their death, is in their writings.

The tongue of the orator and the pen of the writer, though small instruments, and of little physical power, are the two most powerful instruments in the world; because they are to the mind as the arms to the body—they are but the instruments of moral power. The strength is in what is spoken

or written. *The argument is the power of the spirit of man, and the only power which one spirit can exert over another is its arguments.* How often do we see a whole congregation roused into certain actions, expressions of joy or sorrow, by the spirit of one man. Yet no person supposes that his spirit has literally deserted his body, and entered into every man and woman in the house, although it is often said he has filled them with his spirit. But how does that spirit, located in the head of yonder little man, fill all the thousands around him with joy or sadness, with fear and trembling, with zeal or indignation, as the case may be? How has it displayed such power over so many minds? *By words uttered by the tongue; by ideas communicated to the minds of the hearers.* In this way only can moral power be displayed.

From such premises we may say, that all the moral power which can be exerted on human beings, is, and must of necessity be, in the arguments addressed to them. No other power than moral power can operate on minds; and this power must always be clothed in words, addressed to the eye or ear. Thus we reason when revelation is altogether out of view. And when we think of the power of the Spirit of God exerted upon minds or human spirits, it is impossible for us to imagine, that that power can consist in any thing else but words or arguments. Thus in the nature of things we are prepared to expect verbal communications from the Spirit of God, if that Spirit operates at all upon our spirits. As the moral power of every man is in his arguments, so is the moral power of the Spirit of God in his arguments. Thus man still retains an image of his Creator: and from such analogy Paul reasons when he says, 'For the things of a man knows no man, save the spirit of a man which is in him; even so the things of God knows no man save the Spirit of God.' And the analogy stops not here; for as he is said to resist another whose arguments he understands, and opposes, so they are said to resist the Holy Spirit, who always resist, or refuse to yield to his arguments.

Whenever a person has expressed all the arguments he has to offer to carry one point, he has spent all his moral strength, whether he carries that point or not. But until all his arguments are stated, heard, and understood, his moral power is not fully developed. We add, "*heard and understood,*" because although an argument may be irresistible to him that hears and understands it, it is perfectly impotent to him who understands it not. Hence the person in the

Saviour's parable, on the success of proclaiming the word, who heard to his salvation, is distinguished as one who *understood* what he heard; and he on whom the same arguments had no effect, is designated as one that *understood not**

A person once observed that he was convinced by a certain argument, which all but himself acknowledged was the weakest of the seven adduced on the occasion. But in conversation with the same gentleman, it was discovered, that it was the only argument of the seven, which he fully understood. It is said by Grecian critics of the highest reputation, that Demosthenes owed more of his fame to the perspicuity and easy intelligibility of his orations, than to any other character of the orator which he possessed. It was the perfect adaptation of his arguments to the capacity and taste of his audience, and accommodating himself to the genius of the age, which gave to him the highest niche in the temple of fame.

But to return. *As the spirit of man puts forth all its moral power, in the words which it fills with its ideas; so the Spirit of God puts forth all its converting and sanctifying power, in the words which it fills with its ideas.* Miracles cannot convert. They can only obtain a favorable hearing of the converting arguments. If they fail to obtain a favorable hearing, the arguments which they prove are impotent as an unknown tongue. If the Spirit of God has spoken all its arguments; or, if the New and Old Testament contain all the arguments which can be offered to reconcile man to God, and to purify them who are reconciled, then all the power of the Holy Spirit which can operate upon the human mind is spent; and he that is not sanctified and saved by these, cannot be saved by angels or spirits, human or divine. *A.*—Here let me interrupt you. Do you allege that the Holy Spirit can exert no greater influence upon the human mind, than is found in the arguments which are written in the New Testament, or which it used to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment, after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus?

T.—I do, provided always, that the arguments are understood. And let me add, that the full apprehension of these arguments requires an accurate knowledge of the precedent revelations. As Jesus said concerning the writings of

* Matthew xiii. 19-23.

Moses and the Prophets, in attestation of his Messiahship; so we say in reference to the arguments of the Holy Spirit, in advocating the cause of the Saviour. If men hear not, feel not, obey not these, they would not be persuaded by any messenger from Heaven, or Hades: nay, more, they could not by any power be converted to God. We plead *that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine Record.*

A.—Now I understand you; you do not mean that more miracles might not be adduced, or that more prophecies could not be uttered; but you argue that these only secure the attention, open, or prepare the heart for the reception of the converting word; but that the captivating, illuminating, purifying, saving power is purely moral; and is therefore, all contained in the arguments first spoken, and then written by the inspired witnesses.

T. — That is just my meaning. 'The word is *able* to make men wise to salvation;' 'Able to build them up, and to give them an inheritance among the sanctified'—'the implanted word is *able* to save men's souls.' These and similar expressions, sustain all that we have said. But we are not arguing this matter from the Scriptures, but the acknowledged principles and reasonings of men, to show that on their own reasonings, the truths which they oppose, can be rationally and fully established. But when we have reasoned this question to rest in our own mind, we only come by another road to the resting place, which we found in the Holy Spirit's teaching, before we began to reason with men on their own principles.

A. —I am almost, but not *altogether* convinced that these things are so; but yet it appears to me a strange assertion, an irreconcilable position, *that no new light can be communicated to the mind, no new arguments offered to convert men to God.*

T.—Men have long talked of new light—I am not an advocate for new light—I believe Jesus is the light of the world. But let me ask, What do you mean by *light*? Do you mean a new sun, moon, stars, lamp, candle, &c.; or do you mean intellectual or moral light?—You need not answer me, for I know you mean *moral*, not *natural* light. Well, then, this light, like moral power, is all contained in *words*. Where there are no words, there is no light. If, then, the Spirit of God can communicate new light to any mind, it must be by new words, or new verbal communica-

tions. Words, too, recollect, must be spoken, uttered, or written. If then new words are written by the Spirit, new ideas must be communicated, and that constitutes a new revelation. Then the sects who contend for special moral influences, are the only "NEW LIGHTS" properly so called. But, mark you, if the Spirit communicates not new ideas, it can communicate no new light. And if it do, then, it only proves that the revelation we have is an imperfect revelation; and that the Spirit of God, like other orators, does not, or cannot, express itself so intelligibly at one time, as at another; and that its second effort is better than its first, and its third better than its second. Are you prepared for this?

A.—I am not. And is this the consequence, the logical and necessary consequence to which the doctrine of special influences tends!! If so, I must re-examine my premises.

T.—Aye, and your conclusions, too, if you please: for I have neither found a scripturean nor a logician, in all the pleaders for new-lightism.

A.—I will re-examine, for I cannot yet give up; I must rally again. But pardon me for interrupting you: I had resolved to hear you to the end before I replied, or objected.

T.—Other engagements call me hence, and I think it better for us to appoint another evening, and to talk the matter over again. Please rally all your forces against this night fortnight, when I will have more leisure. I shall gladly hear all your reasonings and objections: for I am assured that I have found the ark of safety, and the resting place in this long and verbose controversy about spiritual operations. This advantage you will at once perceive results from my conclusions. It secures the undivided attention of all, who thus view the matter, to the oracles of the Spirit, and it exalts the perfection of the sacred records, as the wisdom and power of God to salvation, to all who believe and obey them. And let me add, never did I see a man or woman, a constant and honest reader of the Apostles' testimony, who lacked light; or who complained of the want of power in the written communications, to transform their minds into the image of the truth as it is in Jesus.— They are most clamorous for help, who will not help themselves, by submitting their minds to the impression of the Holy Spirit in his word. But of this more at our next interview.

A.—Of the truth of this last remark, I have much evidence: but I have learned to be cautious, and not to receive any great position, because it has many things to sustain it both from reason and experience. But this much I must add; if in your reasonings, there be not falsehoods or mistakes, this appears a safe and easy way of settling the long controversy. But I am not fully convinced. I will rally again. Good night.

* * * * *

A.—I have longed for this evening ever since we parted. It appears more than a month since our last interview. I have had a hundred thoughts, which I wished to have suggested; and I fear that now, when I see your face, I will not remember even a tithe of them.

T.—I am glad to see you, brother Austin, and to hear that the subject has engrossed so much of your attention; and I doubt not, that you will be able to recall your most important thoughts in the course of our interview, and, perhaps, some new ones may occur which our last conversation did not suggest.

A.—I have marked down on a slip of paper some questions which I wished to propound, and these may recall some of the difficulties which have agitated me so much these two weeks past. Indeed, some of my difficulties are involved in these questions—but first I must tell you, that while I do admit that all the power which is necessary to conversion is *moral* power, and that this is wholly contained in, and exhibited by them, by arguments or motives, and, that consequently, all the moral influence which the Holy Spirit can exert upon our minds, is in the arguments or motives which the New Testament contains—still I cannot reconcile this to some sayings which I find in the book.

T.—Let us have a sample of these irreconcilable sayings.

A.—I will not say that they are irreconcilable, but only that they appear so to me. For example—Paul speaks of the word coming in power, 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.' It would seem, then, that there is a power apart from the word, necessary to produce that moral change, of which you have spoken, and of the necessity of which we are both agreed. Now my difficulty is, that if all the moral power which is necessary to effect that great change in the heart of man be in the word, a greater

power was exhibited on some occasions, than was necessary to the salvation of the individuals who were the subjects of it; which appears to be at variance with your reasonings in our last interview.

T.—To this passage you might add many others, such as Rom. xv. 19, 'I will not speak of any of those things which Christ has not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient by word and deed, through mighty signs and wonders *by the power of the Spirit of God*; so that from Jerusalem and round about to Illyricum, fully I have preached the gospel of Christ,' 'Yea,' says Peter, of his fellow Apostles, 'they have preached the gospel to you with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven.'* 'For,' says Paul, 'our gospel came not to you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance.' † This power of the Holy Spirit is also called '*the hand of the Lord.*' 'And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned to the Lord.' ‡ And thus the Lord had opened the heart of Lydia, that she attended to Paul. || But all these passages, and many others to the same effect, only prove that the arguments of the Holy Spirit are of two sorts, words and actions; and the actions are only to confirm the word, to enable persons to do as the Thessalonians did—receive the word with much assurance. Hence the Lord not only promised to confirm or prove the testimony of the Apostles, but did actually go forth with them, *confirming the word* with all power, and signs, and wonders, and thus opened the hearts of the hearers to receive the gospel. Had the gospel not been confirmed by demonstrations of the power of God inimitable, no one's heart or ears would have been opened to attend to it. But when it came not in word only, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, they could not but attend to it. But all this was implied in my remarks to you the other evening, when it was said that the power of every argument is in its *meaning*. And unless it be made certain, it has no meaning at all. All that is necessary to overcome the world, is to be assured that the gospel is true. Its arguments can have no weight, unless they are regarded as indubitably certain. That Jesus Christ will give eternal life to all who obey him, is an argument to obedience; but it is not only necessary that the words be intelligible, but that

* 1 Peter 1. 12. † 1 These. I 5. ‡ Acts xi. 31. || Acts xvi. 14.

his ability and faithfulness to bestow eternal life be indubitably proved: and this requires the demonstrations of the Spirit and of power.

A.—I anticipated that this would be your method of getting out of the difficulty.

T.—I do not get out of the difficulty, for there is none. Every person must know that any proposition must be proved before there is any argument in it; and the proof must be of the same nature with the proposition. If the proposition be merely human, good human testimony or evidence will sustain it; but if it be divine and supernatural, no less than divine and supernatural proof can sustain it. Paul's argument in the passage quoted is, in brief, "I sought not to persuade you, Corinthians, by human eloquence or the powers of rhetoric, by curious logical or rhetorical orations, but I came declaring only the testimony of God concerning Jesus of Nazareth, and by the demonstrations of the presence of God's Spirit and power I proved it; and so your assurance of faith rests not on my reasonings, but on the power of God which accompanied that testimony.

A.—I am satisfied with this resolution of the difficulty. You understand all the gifts of the Holy Spirit mentioned in the New Testament, necessary to confirm the testimony.

T.—No, sir; this is not all. The gifts of the Holy Spirit had more to do than this. They were necessary to develop the religion, as well as to prove it. Hence all the diversities of gifts mentioned in 1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv. chapters, are classified under two heads; first, those which revealed the religion, and those which proved it. The spiritual gifts necessary to teach the religion, were 'the word of wisdom,' 'the word of knowledge,' 'the gift of prophecy,' 'the interpretation of tongues,' and to these might, in one sense, be added, 'the discerning of spirits.' To confirm the religion, there were 'faith,' or a firm persuasion that they were able to perform miracles; 'the gift of healing diseases;' 'powers,' or an ability to perform such works as Peter did on Ananias and Sapphira, and Paul on Bar-Jesus; 'the gift of foreign tongues:' this was necessary to teach all nations, but as necessary to confirm the word; and the gift of 'inworking,' or imparting spiritual gifts to others by the imposition of hands. But on these gifts I would advise you to read the second volume of the Christian Baptist, as they are insisted on in that volume at considerable length. This

I advise to prevent mistakes concerning our sentiments on this very important subject.

A.—Well, now I am reminded of one of my difficulties, and that I may have it fully examined, I will propose one of my questions:—Why is it that the Apostles exhorted their converts 'to pray in the Holy Spirit,' 'Ho quench not the Spirit,' 'to be filled with the Spirit'?

T.—I am glad that you have made this a question; for much depends upon understanding not merely these and similar expressions, but the state of things in the primitive church, which gave rise to these precepts of the Apostles. I therefore beseech you to hear me patiently.

The churches gathered by the first proclamation of the gospel, were either Jews or ignorant Pagans; and most churches were composed of both. 'Know,' says Paul to the Corinthian?, when he began to write on spiritual gifts, 'Know that you were Gentiles, carried away to these *dumb idols*, even as you were led.' This church 'came behind in no gift,' because it much needed them. Its members had every thing to learn. Destitute of any written revelation—*the Old Testament they had not, and the New was not then written*—they required all the gifts bestowed in that age. This was true of all the churches, save those in Judea: *and these had no letters written to them by the Apostles.*

These churches out of Judea had every thing to learn, and could not have a single spiritual thought, but as they were taught either by inspired men, or by the Holy Spirit. But the inspired Apostles must travel every where, and could not long continue in any one place; and, therefore, it was necessary that these candlesticks, newly lighted up, should be constantly supplied with fresh oil. Hence all those spiritual gifts were bestowed on the first converts for perfecting them. They could neither speak in the church, pray, nor sing, without supernatural aid.

Writings of all sorts were scarce; and many had not the ability to read, had they had the writings of the Apostles all completed in their hands. In these congregations, then, every thing was done by the suggestion of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, it was more compatible with the genius of the religion, and with its prosperity in the world, that it should be set up by such means. The same wisdom which made Apostles out of rude fishermen, and hid the gospel treasure in these humble vessels, chose to fill rude barbarians and ignorant pagans with supernatural gifts, that the excellency

of the power might appear divine and not human. Other reasons may be assigned; but these appear sufficient to commend the divine economy in introducing the Christian institution.

By the Spirit of God they spake, prophesied, sang, prayed and exhorted. Even women, as well as men, prayed and prophesied in the church. Because, according to Joel, in those days, the last of the Jewish age, God promised to pour out of his Spirit on *all flesh*, Jew and Gentile, and on both sexes; 'Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.' One Evangelist had four daughters, all prophetesses; that is, they all spoke by inspiration: for this is the meaning of prophesying, it matters not whether the inspiration respect past, present, or future relations or things, he or she who speaks by inspiration *prophesies*. Corinthian women were exhorted by Paul concerning their praying and prophesying in the church.

The gift of *discerning spirits* was then necessary to prevent imposition. Some possessed this gift; and therefore the prophets were commanded to speak but two or three sentences at a time, that those possessed of this gift might judge whether they spake according to the Spirit of God.

They are novices in the Christian scriptures and religion, who cannot discriminate between the order of edification in the primitive church, while under the guidance of *spiritual* men, from that which was to be the result of that order, when that which is perfect is come. That which was '*in part*,' has now ceased; for 'prophecies have failed.' 'That which is perfect,' the complete revelation, is come.

We must, then, discriminate between the church in her infancy, during her minority, because the Apostles have taught us to discriminate. 'When I was a child I thought as a child,' says Paul to this people, to whom he expounds the nature and design of spiritual gifts; and to the church as a child the same Apostle says, It pleased Jesus when he ascended to bestow gifts—Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors and Teachers, for the *fitting of the saints* for the service of the Lord, that they might not continue children, but grow up by these gifts to the full measure of the Christian stature, to full grown men under Christ the Lord.

The literal body of Christ was literally formed by the Holy Spirit; so his metaphorical body; the church, was formed by the Holy Spirit in these gifts; and when formed it became the temple of that Spirit, and was filled with it.

There is one body, and but one body of Christ composed of Jewish and Gentile disciples, and they have been builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. Hence, *the Spirit is promised only to them who believe*. Every body has its own Spirit, and the body of Christ has the Spirit of Christ.

These are but hints, but they respect matters of the greatest importance to correct and comprehensive views of Christianity. Ignorance of these matters is one principal cause of the present opposition to the ancient gospel, and the ancient order of things. We professed the Christian religion for years without hearing a hint on these subjects; and even now we seldom if ever hear them named by those declaimers about the Holy Spirit. They neither appear to understand what they say themselves, nor the things of which they so strongly affirm.

Let it be noted here, and I pray you keep this proposition in mind, *viz: That every part of the Christian worship, and all the means of edification in the primitive church, during its infancy, or while it was under the guidance of spiritual men, was performed by the immediate suggestion of the Holy Spirit*. Hence such expressions as these: 'Quench not the Spirit;' that is, as explained by what follows, 'despise not prophesyings'—'Pray in the Spirit'—'Be filled with the Spirit,' singing psalms, hymns, and songs suggested by the Spirit—I will sing in the Spirit,' 'I will pray in the Spirit;' but I will sing and pray in a known tongue, that by my singing and praying I may edify others, as well as worship the Lord.

Sometimes a whole congregation expressed all the same words at the same instant of time, the Holy Spirit suggesting to each individual all the same ideas and expressions at one and the same impulse. Thus the whole church kneeled down in Jerusalem, and with one accord, all uttered the same words at the same instant.

Pagans could neither know how, or for what to pray, unless they had been thus taught. Even the disciples of John and of Jesus, during the personal ministry of these two prophets, were taught by them how, and for what to pray. To pray in accordance with the economy under which we are placed, is a matter of some moment to all who have correct conceptions of God.

A.—I cannot express the ideas which throng upon each other in my mind: but I must break silence and tell you,

that really these are matters of which I have scarcely ever had a thought before; I never heard so much to explain to my satisfaction numerous passages in the Epistles, as I have now heard. I can now see why many things are connected together, which I never before understood. For example, 'Quench not the Spirit' is succeeded by 'despise not prophesyings,' and that is succeeded by 'prove all things and hold fast that which is good.' I now see the association of ideas in the Apostle's mind. He exhorted the Thessalonians to stir up the gifts of the Spirit; to exercise the gift of prophesying; and, though some pretended to it who did not possess it, they were neither to contemn the gift, nor to cease from exercising it, *but prove* whether he that spake, spake by the Spirit; and so soon as this was proved, they were to hold fast that which was good. In this way my thoughts are running upon these passages as you proceed. I now understand another expression which I never before understood— 'Be filled with the Spirit.' I could not see, on the Calvinian or Arminian hypothesis, how any person could be *commanded* to be filled with the Spirit, any more than with any divine attribute, inasmuch as that Spirit is not subject to the will of man; but as they cherished in their minds the word of Christ, and spake to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, they were filled with the Holy Spirit— and it was not incompatible with those gifts to *command* the Christians to exercise them.

T.—And if you would read the exhortations delivered to the Ephesians and Colossians, both of which letters were written about the same time, while Paul was a prisoner, and while the same associations of ideas were in his mind, you will see that Paul explains himself. The parallel passages in the two Epistles read thus: 'Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess,* or by which comes dissoluteness, 'but be filled with the Spirit. Speak to one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord.' In the Colossians, it reads— 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; and with all wisdom teach and admonish one another, in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with gratitude in your heart to the Lord.' † In both epistles these words are preceded and succeeded by exhortations precisely similar, only in a few instances verbally different. Compare them accurately, and

*Ep. v. 18, 19. † Ch. iii. 16.

no doubt can exist that the same connexion of things was before the mind of the Apostle in each. Hence it follows, that *to be filled with the Spirit*, and *to have the word of Christ dwelling richly in one*, are of the same import in Paul's mind; and as a means to this end, Christians were to abound in singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs.

But this only by the way. You will find a hundred passages to yield to this great principle of interpretation, or rather to this view of the primitive worship and means of edification.

A.—Methinks another passage opens to my view: 'Stir up the gift which is in you, which was given you according to prophecy by the laying on of the hands of the eldership.' Paul's hands were among these, as appears from another passage—'The gift which was given you by the imposing of my hands.' Timothy was designated by one of those prophets which had the gift of discerning spirits, as a suitable person to act as an evangelist, and as an agent for Paul in Ephesus. As such he is commanded to *stir up* the gift, not *to quench the Spirit*, but to exercise his gift to edification and comfort.

T.—Yes—but this will lead us into another matter; and perhaps it may be a profitable one at some other time; for indeed much of what pertains to the common order which ought to exist in a church, and to the officers which are necessary to its perfection, may be learned incidentally from the gifts of the Holy Spirit of which we are now speaking. But recollect that we are straying off from the subject on which we began.

A.—Pardon me. I have been so much engrossed in this view of the ancient worship, that I have forgotten all my questions, and all my thoughts too on the original topic of inquiry.

T.—Let us then dismiss the subject for the present, and meet again. You will find it advantageous to read the whole New Testament once through from the 1st chapter of the Acts to the last epistle, keeping always in mind this principle of interpretation; and observe, as you proceed, in what new and clear light it presents many passages to your mind. Recollect the proposition is this: *That the whole worship and edification of the primitive church, in its infancy, was directed by inspired men; and that the Spirit suggested the songs, prayers, exhortations, and, indeed, all the discourses which were useful to the congregation; and that every*

thing incompatible with these suggestions was reprobated by the Apostles, and those judges who had the gift of discerning spirits. But let me add, excesses and indiscretions occurred then, even among those who possessed the spiritual gifts; and this is no more than might have been expected in that age, by those who best understood the nature of those gifts; for even now, when a perfect and well proved revelation is possessed by us, how often do we err, even in the most common matters, requiring only prudence and discretion!

A.—True: but I have not yet satisfied myself upon the topics discussed at our former interview, and will therefore examine all our premises again; and I hope to be able to lay my difficulties before you more methodically at another time.

T.—I shall attend to them with all care. Adieu.

* * * * *

A.—Since we last separated, I have overcome a difficulty which at our first interview I thought insurmountable.

T.—And, pray, what is it?

A.—It is, that besides what is written in the book, *there can be no new light communicated to the mind, no new arguments offered to convert men to God.*

T.—And to this you should add, *that all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the Divine word,*

A.—This I might add, were I fully persuaded that light alone constitutes all converting power. But of this I am not yet fully convinced.

T.—I think we agreed, in our first interview, that moral light is contained in words; and, therefore, where there are no words there can be no light,

A.—On reflecting on that saying, I have since suspected its truth, because deaf and dumb persons have some light, I mean moral light, on some subjects; and if all moral light were contained in words, how could they have any light, never having heard a word?

T.—But signs of any sort, which represent ideas, are comprehended in our acceptation of *words*. Words, it is true, are signs of our ideas; but not the only signs. Actions are also signs of ideas. Actions presented to the eye are equivalent to words addressed to the ear. But without actions, or rather without stipulated signs, I. e. signs agreed upon, there can be no idea communicated to the human mind; and, therefore, all moral light, or all truth, is received

by signs. And as the stipulated signs of ideas with us are words, it is in no sense improper to say, that all the moral light which we enjoy is received by words; or, if you please, to be hypercritical, by signs equivalent to words.

A.—Grant it, and then it follows that light is but a figurative name for truth,

T.—It is, in all languages, a metaphor. Light stands for knowledge, and knowledge is an acquaintance with truth. A man of knowledge, and an enlightened man, are equivalent designations. 'Once you were darkness, but now are you light in the Lord,' is a saying which will remind you of a hundred others in the sacred style, to this effect.

A.—Let it be admitted then; for I see nothing to be gained by the exception which I have taken, nor by an over squeamishness about words. I accede to the proposition, *that all moral light or moral truth is contained in words, or represented by them.* But still the question recurs, Is light all that is necessary to convert men?

T.—The question is equivalent to—Is truth all that is necessary to convert men? To answer this with a *yes* or a *no* might subject us to misapprehension, and consequently to misrepresentation; and, therefore, we must qualify our answer to this question. There is something in the New Testament called *the truth, the light*, to give it emphasis, and to distinguish it from all other truth. 'You shall know *the truth*, and *the truth* shall make you free.' This is a eulogy on *the truth*, pronounced by Him who called himself '*the Truth and the Life.*' There are many truths which cannot convert men, for they have no moral power; but there is *the truth* which has all moral power, and that is the truth which makes men free. 'Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is the truth,' said the Saviour. All the moral power of God or man is exhibited in the truth which they propose. Therefore we may say, that if the light or the truth contain all the moral power of God, then the truth alone is all that is necessary to the conversion of men, for we have before agreed and proved, that the converting power is moral power.

A.—But I think you first introduced this proposition to show, that the Spirit could exert no more power in converting men, and could give them no more light, than what is contained in the written word, provided the written word contains all the light or revelation, that is necessary to salvation.

T.—For this purpose this proposition was submitted. To illustrate it I would call to my aid a similitude; but, indeed, neither ancient nor modern history, observation nor experience, furnishes us with a worthy similitude. Suppose, however, that the subjects of some prince had revolted from his government, their own crimes inducing them to suppose that he had become their irreconcilable enemy. They seek to dethrone him, because, in consequence of their ingratitude and acts of rebellion, they infer that he *is* incensed against them. He, by calling on other provinces, might crush them by physical power, but chooses rather to reconcile them to himself, and convert them from enemies to friends. He loads them with innumerable favors, sends dignified messengers to declare his merciful dispositions, sustaining their representations by appeals to his generosity, and the multiplied instances of his bounty which they continually enjoy. After remonstrating in vain, as the highest proof of his benevolence, he sends his only son to win them back to their allegiance. They imbrue their hands in his blood. After this he has nothing to propose except forgiveness for all their acts of cruelty and rebellion, and a restoration to his favor and friendship on condition of their submission and return to their duty. He can do no more. This is the sum total of his moral power. Their destruction or his dethronement is the only alternative; other arguments he has not to offer. These slighted, and mediation is at an end. Now when all this is stated and proved, nothing can be added by any new messenger or mission. This scheme is both the wisdom and the power of the prince, to the reconciliation of every one who receives it. It is his whole wisdom and his whole power to effect a reconciliation. He who rejects it, must dethrone the prince or be destroyed.

We have only alluded to the outlines of the arguments. They may be developed and placed in various lights before the minds of those addressed; but yet, when all is fairly told and fully presented, no new light, truth, argument, or power, can be exhibited.

A.—This I perceive; but yet there is a difficulty in my way. To remember the similitude you have brought, this is a matter of report or of testimony to most of his subjects. Such also is the fact with regard to all the living, as respects the things reported by the Apostles. It comes by faith, or our assurance depends upon testimony, which we

cannot believe of ourselves without some assistance. Now this is still the great question.

T.—Assistance to believe! This is a metaphysical dream. How can a person be assisted to believe? What sort of help? and how much is wanting? Assistance to believe must be either to create a power in man, which he had not before, or to repair a broken power. You do not think of this. Will you explain what you mean by assistance to believe!

*A.—*I do not mean creating a new power of believing, because men can believe the truth when told them by men, but we must be made to feel our need of a Saviour before we will seek an interest in him, and before we believe in him.

*T.—*It is by faith we discover our need of a Saviour; for if we did not first believe the testimony of God, we could not know that we had sinned against God. So that faith in the testimony must precede all conviction, repentance, reformation; all sorrow, all feeling of every sort. That which makes men feel, love, fear, tremble, or rejoice, is in the testimony; and without faith in the testimony, nothing which it contains can move us more than that, which we never saw nor heard. *Without faith in the divine testimony, it is impossible that any thing in that testimony can move us:—*so that faith precedes all feeling. Now if a person can believe one part of the divine testimony without new power, or without new faculties, or without any aid, he can believe another part of it, for it is all alike credible or incredible.

*A.—*Well: something must be first, I admit; and I suppose faith had as well stand first—but whatever comes first, we must be aided in doing that. We all want most help when we are beginning any thing. All that I plead is a little help at first.

*T.—*Is the help to be within us, or without us?

*A.—*Within us. The Holy Spirit makes the word more powerful, or increases our strength to receive it.

*T.—*if it make it more powerful, it must be by revealing some more powerful ideas, not in it; by adding to it some corroborative arguments. Can you conceive what they are?

*A.—*No. I rather would suppose that its help consists not in revealing new arguments, but by enabling us to understand those revealed.

T.—But you must not hide the subject from yourself by words without meaning. To enable a person to understand any subject, we explain it by illustrations, analogies, or more familiar terms. Is this what you mean?

A.—No. The more I strive to explain my meaning, the less meaning I can find in myself upon the subject. I will reason no more in this way, for I see I cannot find premises to favor my conclusions. I will appeal to the scriptures,

T.—To this I have no objection; for indeed this has been my object, to force you from all false reasonings to the scriptures. But now let me ask you, how are you going to make your appeal to the scriptures?

A.—I will make my appeal to the whole book on the subject of conversion.

T.—Conversion to Noah, to Moses, to John the Harbinger, and to Jesus Christ?

A.—No: I mean the instances recorded in the New Testament from the ascension of Jesus Christ.

T.—That is fair ground. The Holy Spirit was not given until the day of Pentecost. Hence if the Holy Spirit aided men to believe in Jesus Christ, it must have been subsequent to that date. Besides, it is conversion to Jesus Christ, and not to Moses, which interests us. Mention, then, any person of whom it is said, that the Holy Spirit enabled him to believe.

A.—I will begin with the preaching of the gospel after the ascension, and appeal to the first discourse. We are told in the 1st chapter of the Acts, that Jesus commanded the Apostles not to preach until they were endued with power from on high. This was to help them to preach. For without this help from the Lord, they could not have spoken successfully.

T.—True. But observe, that the descent of the Holy Spirit was to help them to *prove*, that what they spoke was true. In this way persons can be helped to believe, and this is the only way in which one can help another to believe. For this help we contend. This was the use of the miracles, the tongues, the gifts of healing, the powers, &c., which attended the preaching of the Apostles. But you spoke of an internal operation upon the mind to produce faith. You spoke of a faith *wrought in the heart*. You might as well talk of light, or seeing wrought in the eye: of sound, or hearing wrought in the ear; of taste wrought in the tongue, or of feeling wrought in the hand. It is the

quintessence of mysticism. To help one to see, we increase the light; to help one to hear, we speak loud. The creating of eyes and ears is a different work. But for this you do not plead. But this is only returning to the topics on which we spoke at our last meeting. Mention only one person in all the New Testament who was aided, or who asked for help to believe.

A.—The first three thousand converts.

T.—You cannot allude to the first, or Jerusalem converts, for the miracles convinced them. This is the reason why they believed. Peter taught the first congregation the use of miracles in the following words: 'Men of Israel, hear these words—Jesus the Nazarene was RECOMMENDED to you by God; by *powerful operations, and wonders, and signs, which God wrought by him in the midst of you, as yourselves also know.*' The Holy Spirit also accompanied the speaker by visible and audible signs, which convinced the hearers that these things were as reported: but no Holy Spirit operated upon their hearts otherwise than through these glorious gifts. These pierced them to the heart. The Holy Spirit may figuratively be said to open the heart, to move or quicken the soul by these displays of its power and glory. Thus it opened by signs and wonders, the hearts of three thousand on the first day of its advocacy of the pretensions of Jesus; for, to plead his cause, and not its own, it was sent from heaven. The power of the Spirit as displayed on the cripple in Solomon's portico, opened the ears and hearts of many: for, after Peter had explained the miracle, the number of the men that believed, was about five thousand.

After the power displayed on Ananias and Sapphira, and after 'many signs and wonders were wrought among the people by the hands of the Apostles, believers were the more added to the Lord—multitudes both of men and women.' Again: the Lord opened the hearts of the Samaritans to attend to the things spoken by Philip, 'beholding the miracles and signs which were done.' Thus the Holy Spirit operates upon the hearts of men; but his dwelling in them is another matter. This was promised only to those who believe.

A.—And are all the examples found in the Acts of the Apostles similar to those you have alluded to?

T.—I have made no selections. I have taken them as they come. It is not usual to repeat all the same incidents

in narrating similar events. The sacred historians, like other historians, in first describing any new events, are more particular in giving all the incidents. But were we to examine all the conversions found in the book, we should not find one to suit the popular imaginations on this subject.

A.—What miracles did the Ethiopian eunuch see?

T.—The Ethiopian eunuch, like Lydia, had his heart opened, as we have now, by reading and observing the ancient prophecies, and recorded miracles of the Jewish scriptures. He, and Lydia, and the Bereans, are all cases in point. Of him it was said he was devoutly reading the Prophets; of Lydia it was said, she was a devout woman, whose heart the Lord opened; and of the Bereans it is said, 'they searched the scriptures daily whether these things were as reported; THEREFORE, many of them believed.' But, mark it, there was no need of a miracle to secure the attention of the eunuch to Philip—there was no need either of Philip's expounding the prophecies to him, if, as the theorists say, the Holy Spirit illuminates the mind, either by taking the veil from the scriptures or off the heart. But Philip preached Jesus from Isaiah, and by demonstrating what the Spirit had spoken concerning him, persuaded him to obey the gospel. There is no mention of the Holy Spirit in this case, save that it induced Philip to preach to the eunuch, and took him hence when he had done.

A.—But was not Saul of Tarsus struck down by the Holy Spirit, and convicted by its internal operation?

T.—No. The Holy Spirit is not named in the whole narrative of Paul's conversion, till after Ananias visited him. It was then first mentioned to Paul. It was the Lord himself that appeared to Saul, to show him that he was the Messiah, that he might be an Apostle, and be able to say with the other Apostles, that he both saw the Lord, and heard him speak. *It* you will examine the same section that informs you of Saul's conversion, you will find other cases similar to those which I have already noticed. Peter bade Eneas, a paralytic of eight years standing, to be whole, and he arose immediately. The consequence was, that 'all who dwelt in Lydda and Saron *saw* him and *turned* to the Lord.' Dorcas, too, is raised to life by the same Apostle; and as soon as it was 'known through Joppa, many believed in the Lord.'

An acquaintance with the prophesies and ancient miracles, or a sight of the miracles of the New Mission, opened

and prepared the hearts of the Jews and Gentiles to obey the gospel. This is that *work of the Spirit* which is essential to *recommend* Jesus to men, and to enable them to believe on him. None are intelligent and true believers, who believe not upon such evidence. This is all the Lord of the Spirit can do to produce faith; for he taught us that if men will not be persuaded by miracles and prophecies, by Moses and the Prophets, neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

A.—I don't wish you to cite all the New Testament to prove this point. It is proved incomparably better now than half the thirty-nine articles of my grandfather's creed, and by more reasons than my father ever gave for becoming a Methodist, or my mother for becoming a Baptist. I can now see that the *external* evidences of Christianity are externally operative upon the hearts of men; that they are addressed to unbelievers; that, in brief, these signs were written as well as wrought, that men might be able to believe that Jesus was the Messiah, and that believing this they might be saved, or have life, through his name.

T.—So an Apostle decides. The Spirit of God, the author of these proofs, by them opens men's minds to hear—to obey the gospel. Those who obey the gospel, are in that gospel declared to be the sons of God, and as such receive the Holy Spirit, promised through faith, and are not only adopted, justified, sanctified, but filled with the spirit of sons, with all goodness, gentleness, and love.

A.—It has been more from a wish to explore the whole *rationale* of this much vexed question, than from any returning doubts, that I have led you more in the train of former reflections than into new associations of ideas, or permitted you to prosecute the development of some ideas expressed in our last interview. Unless something new occur to my mind on this subject, I will not call you back to it.

T.—I shall take it for granted, then, that neither on any just principles of reason, nor from any declaration of scripture, can it be made either evident or probable, that the Spirit of God, in producing faith, any other way operates upon the hearts of men, than through the recommendations once given by signs and wonders, and all the variety of supernatural operations formerly addressed to the senses of mankind, and now written down and stamped with the indubitable marks of Divinity, open and plain to every one desirous of knowing the truth. In this way the Spirit now

convinces men of sin, of righteousness, and future judgment, and opens their hearts to receive the gospel.

A.—I discover many decided advantages resulting from a correct knowledge of this subject, among which this deserves attention, that admitting that this is the ancient, and the true way of producing faith, which I think must be conceded by the intelligent, then the efforts of all proclaimers, of all parents, guardians, and instructors of youth, ought to be directed to developing and enforcing the certainty of our religion, by laying before the minds of the unconverted all the demonstrations of the Holy Spirit, and all the divine attestations given to the mission of Jesus, that their faith may rest in the power of God, which was the foundation of the faith of the ancient converts, and which ever must be the only true foundation, on which the faith of man can rest.

T.—This is unquestionably plain. If we have the same faith which the first Christians had, it must rest upon the power of God, the same power of God on which theirs rested. Happy they who, not having seen the actual displays of that power, yet, through the testimony confirmed by the blood of the original witnesses, and by all its internal and external evidences, do believe in Jesus!

This view of the matter is, moreover, equally honorable to the Spirit of God, and gives as much divinity, spirituality, and holiness to our faith, to say the least, as hypercalvinism itself. I would say, incomparably more; but we need not claim more. According to these principles, faith is the product of the Holy Spirit, wherever it is found. If true faith—if faith of the ancient school, it is the result of divine influence; and he that requires greater proof of this matter, is prepared to question whether any thing be the gift of God, which does not come direct from God without the ministry of angel, spirit, or the operations of the laws of nature.

This view of the question is equally opposed to the enthusiasm of preacher and hearer. This is the disgrace of this age. Next to the superstition of the dark ages is the enthusiasm of the present time. No wonder that atheists and sceptics scoff at our religion. Such an army of Lilliputians in reason, and giants in noise, verbosity, declamation and shouting, never stood forth the advocates of Christianity in any age or country, as the preaching corps of these United States. The cause is, the popularity of the prayer for 'baptism in fire.' Fire, fire, holy fire, the baptism of fire

and the Holy Ghost, is the text, the sermon, the song, and the prayer.

* * * * *

A.—I have just been examining *nine* essays on the work of the Holy Spirit, in the 2d volume of the *Christian Baptist*, and have had my attention most arrested to the following sentences:* "This is one distinguishing difference between the disciples of Christ before, and since he was glorified. Those who believed and became his disciples, seeing the miracles he wrought, on the evidence afforded them, *had to wait for the promise of the Spirit through faith* a. good while, and some a long time, till Christ was glorified. But they, who became his disciples after he was glorified, soon received the Holy Spirit. For after Christ was glorified, in one day thousands rom of water and of the Spirit entered into the kingdom, and immediately were filled with love, peace, joy, long-suffering, goodness, fidelity, meekness, and temperance—the blissful cluster of heavenly fruits of which the sons of God are all partakers." The other matters in these essays have become familiar. But on this extract I wish to propose a question. It is this: *Is there any difference between the manner in which Christians enjoy the Holy Spirit since Jesus was glorified, and the manner in which the saints enjoyed the Spirit of God before the appearance of Jesus Christ in the world?*

T.—As well might you inquire, Were the saints *under the law* as enlightened and happy as Christians under the reign of favor? As to the *manner* of enjoyment I speculate not; as to the *degree* of enjoyment, our state, in comparison of the Jewish and Patriarchal, is called 'heavenly places;' and the government, under which we have our citizenship, is called '*the Reign of Heaven.*' But in the same page from which you have made the above quotation, a promise uttered by Jesus is quoted, in justification of the principal idea suggested in the extract: 'He that believes on me, as the Scripture says, shall prove a cistern, whence rivers of living water shall flow.' On this an Apostle comments as follows: 'This he spoke of the Spirit, which they who believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet (given), because Jesus was not yet glorified.'

The glorification or coronation of Jesus in heaven after he had been made perfect through sufferings, is an event of

* Jan. 3, 1825, Vol. 2, No. 2. page 33, 2d edition.

inexpressible importance in the great scheme of our redemption; and the revolution of things in heaven and things on earth consequent thereupon, is a theme on which Prophets and Apostles dwell with admiration. Then it was that all angels, principalities, authorities, and powers were subjected to him; then it was, that having received the promise of the Holy Spirit in all its gifts, he began to confer these gifts on men. Hence in announcing his exaltation to the throne of God, Peter promised the Holy Spirit to all who submitted to his government, but to none else.

A.—But had not Christ, while on earth, power to impart this spirit; or, rather, did he not bestow it upon his Apostles before he was glorified?

T.—When he first sent his Apostles to announce his approaching reign, he gave them *authority* over unclean spirits, to expel them, and to heal all diseases and maladies. He himself had received the Holy Spirit without measure after his immersion, and imparted to his Apostles power to sustain their proclamation by these attestations. But let us now keep our attention fixed upon the principal idea furnished in your extract, or rather in the quotation which authorizes it. Jesus is now glorified, and all who now submit to his government are authorized to expect not new revelations, miracles, or prophetic powers; but that Holy Spirit, whose inhabitation resembles a cistern, from which streams of water ever flow. Hence all the joys and consolations which those who obey the gospel experience.

A.—I think this a subject on which there will not be much controversy between us. Since reading those essays in the volume alluded to, I abandon the idea of the Spirit descending through the air, or falling upon persons as in the times of the setting up of the Christian institution, and also the popular doctrines on this subject; but that disciples are in some way possessed of the Spirit of God is so plain, that I cannot think any person can at all doubt the fact, though none may be able to comprehend how these things can be.

T.—It is sometimes useful to reason from analogy, though *analogy* can *prove* nothing. Analogies may illustrate, but cannot prove any thing in religion. But as the Great Teacher so often reasoned from analogy, illustrated and adorned his heavenly communications by earthly analogies, because we can arrive at the knowledge of things unknown, only by the things already known, we may reason analogic-

ally upon this subject as well as upon some others; but the nice point is to know how far to follow any analogy.

A.—Yes; this is the delicate point—so delicate that few of our annotators in commenting upon the types of the Old Testament, and the parables of the New, have known where to stop.

T.—There are some parables which have but one prominent point of similarity to enforce, while others may have several; and so it happens that few sermonizers seem to know how far to pursue, or trace the analogies in these parables—some falling short, and others greatly transcending the design of him who introduced it. All would seem to agree that in comparing the kingdom of heaven to a grain of mustard seed, it was designed only to illustrate the smallness of its beginning, its progress, and extensive growth in the world; and that he who would say a grain of mustard seed is *round, brown, and pungent*, and seek to find similarities in the kingdom of heaven, would, in the estimation of all, transcend the bounds of sober reason. He also, who in the parable of the sower finds but one point of resemblance, falls as far short of the design of its author, as he who imagines resemblances where there are none.

A.—Of these aberrations from right reason I am convinced. But what analogies have you to offer on this subject.

T.—Many. The church, or congregated disciples of Jesus Christ, are compared to a human body, a temple, or house, a family, a kingdom, a sheepfold, a vine, &c. Some of these figures or comparisons represent this institution more forcibly than others, in reference to some particular object. And were it not for these various objects, we should not have had these various comparisons. It is true, that some or all of these may illustrate one or more prominent features in this institution; but yet each one of them seems to have some peculiar object in view, to illustrate which it is primarily intended. The first of these we have already noticed in our second interview; and it is one to which more frequent allusion is made by the Apostle Paul than any other. But *as* a brother and fellow-laborer, whose praise in the gospel is far spread through the congregations, and whose labors deserve to be highly appreciated, has made much use of this figure in a discourse recently published, and which he is now revising for a second edition, I

shall not now dwell upon it, but refer you to brother Scott's discourse on the Holy Spirit.

A.—That discourse I read immediately after our second interview, and it gave me much relief on one important item; but I shall read it again when revised; for it seems as if the Printer or Proof-reader had made it almost, if not altogether, unintelligible in some places.

T.—The Holy Spirit made the literal body of Jesus by its influences; and afterwards filled it. But it was not until he was born again in the Jordan, that the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove descended upon him; and this Spirit, not in measures, but without measure, ever after abode in him as the spirit of wisdom, power, and goodness. This same Holy Spirit, by its various gifts, creates the figurative body of Jesus, as before illustrated; and when any person is united to the body of Christ, which is ever growing, he receives the Spirit which always dwells in that body. But to refer to other figures.

The tabernacle was built by Moses; but Moses built it by supernatural aid, according to a model which God himself gave him. After this tabernacle was put together, raised, and dedicated to the Lord, a cloud covered, sat upon it, and *the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle**

A.—The temple, too, was built by Solomon; and after it was finished and every thing put in its place, and after the Priests had come out of the holy place from putting the ark of the covenant in its place, 'the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the Priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud; *for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of the Lord.*' The Lord promised to abide there so long as they kept his commandments. He says to Solomon, 'My eyes and my heart shall be in that house perpetually. But if you shall at all turn from following me, you or your children, and will not keep my statutes and my commandments, which I have set before you; then will I cast out of my sight this house which I have hallowed, and Israel shall be a proverb and a by-word among all people. And at this house which is high, every one that passeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss.'

T.—Let me add, that Paul tells us that Christians are the temple of God, and that the Lord dwells in them—his Spirit inhabits them. This is the glory of Jesus which fills the

* Exod. xl. 33—38.

house of prayer which he has reared. The Holy Spirit thus glorifies him by filling his house with glory. His eye and his heart are here continually. If any man destroy the temple of the Lord, by polluting it, him will the Lord destroy. If any man love not our Lord Jesus, let him be *anathema maranatha*. They shall yet hiss at him. The obedient only constitute this house of God, and it is only over them that the Lord's eyes and heart continually preside. The Lord's eyes are over the righteous, and his ear is open to their cry. 'The temple of God is holy, which temple you Christians are.'

These analogies illustrate that promise of the Holy Spirit, given to them who reform and are immersed for the remission of their sins. But as the tabernacle was first reared and dedicated, the temple first builded and furnished, before the glory of the Lord filled it, so the Spirit is promised and given to none, till they are united to the building of God—the church.

A.—Here we have no controversy. I can aid you in these analogies. Let us next contemplate the vine, or the olive tree, as analogous, A branch must be in the vine, or it receives no sap from its root; and a graft must be inserted into the good olive tree, before it partakes of its root and fatness. And are we not first engrafted into Christ, before we can derive any consolation, peace, hope, or joy from him?

T.—True; Jesus says, 'As the branch can bear no fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, no more can you my disciples, unless you abide in me—I am the vine, you are the branches.' He is the root of that goodly vine, which the great Vine-dresser has planted in the earth. It requires no reasoning to show that all the powers of the vine flow in the channels originating in its root, and that adhesion to the vine is essential to the life and fruitfulness of every bough. But alas! this vine has been exposed to the wild boar of the forest, and to the wild beast of the field. 'Return, we beseech thee, O God of Hosts; look down from heaven, and behold and visit this thy vine!—the vineyard which thy right hand has planted, and the branch which thou madest strong for thyself!'

But it is only in reference to the Gentiles, that the figure of grafting into the olive occurs in the New Testament. The Westminster Confession of Faith says, "Baptism signifies and seals our engrafting into Christ:" if so, then we cannot expect to partake of the streams which make glad

the vine, which clothe it with fragrance, beauty, and fruit, until we are immersed into the Lord. But we cannot farther carry the figure of engrafting than to show, that until the scion is engrafted it receives no nourishment from the root; but when engrafted it receives all its health and fatness from it. These analogies illustrate the two great propositions, on which our present conversation turns. We ought sooner to have stated them. Sometimes, however, it is as satisfactory to prove and illustrate a proposition before it is stated. The propositions to which we allude, are, *that the Holy Spirit is promised to no unbeliever, or disobedient person:* and that, since Christ was glorified in heaven, *the Holy Spirit is promised to all who believe and obey the gospel,* or to all who unite Themselves to the family of God.

A.—I wonder if this be not all implied in the promises in the New Constitution, as you call it, 'I will be their God,'* is one promise; 'I will write my laws upon their hearts,' is another; but the reason assigned is the fourth promise, which is the root of the whole matter—'FOR *their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more.*' Remission of these, then, precedes all the promises of the New Covenant.

T.—You mean that although remission of sins is last mentioned in the New Constitution, it is laid both by Paul and Jeremiah, as the root and foundation of all the blessings promised in it.

A.—I do. And let me propose another question—Does it not appear most irrational and inapposite, as well as unscriptural, to represent the Spirit, the *Holy Spirit of God*, as dwelling in the heart of an impenitent, disobedient sinner?

T.—But if we seem to agree so well, we shall have no controversy on this subject, and no new light will be elicited. Can you think of nothing, in which there is not a perfect concordance in our views?

A.—Perhaps I may: but I am called hence at present. I know that on this subject there can be but little difference between us. The difficulty always was about the influences necessary to produce faith; about regeneration anterior to faith, or the infusion of some previous holy principle. But now, seeing how the Holy Spirit has confirmed the testimony, and how faith was produced in the minds of the first converts, I will have little difficulty in agreeing with you in the proposition which affirms, that every one who believes and is baptized, receives the Holy Spirit of God, in

* Hebrews viii. 10—13.

all its moral and sanctifying influences; but, perhaps, on reflection I will have something to propose to you hereafter on this subject. Adieu.

* * * * *

A.—Your premises and your conclusions are now before my mind; but do I understand them? There is an influence which the Holy Spirit exercises *upon* sinners, and an influence which it exerts in the saints.

T.—Very intelligibly expressed. The Holy Spirit is now the Spirit of Christ, as it was once known by the title of the Spirit of God. It accompanied him, dwelt in him and his Apostles, and when he ascended, he sent it to confirm the testimony and to animate the disciples; but it never leaves the Lord Jesus. His gospel it preaches, and his people it inhabits.

A.—Let me explain my apprehensions still farther. The Holy Spirit pleads the cause of Jesus by its words, its signs, and wonders. All who receive Jesus into their hearts, receive not the person, but the word and Spirit of Jesus. The influence which it exercises *upon* sinners is, then, the influence of arguments, of its words and works upon their understandings, predisposing, or opening their hearts to receive the Lord Jesus, as the author of an eternal salvation to all who obey him. When, then, any one gives himself up to the Lord, and receives him as his Prophet, Priest, and King, the Holy Spirit dwells in him, or sheds its influences of love, joy, and peace in his heart.

T.—All you mean is beautifully expressed by the Lord of the Spirit in his epistle to Laodicea: 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice [my words or knockings] and open the door, I will come in, and feast with him, and he with me.' This is the influence *upon* and the influence *within*. The Spirit of Jesus, as you understand, never leaves him. Where he is received, his Spirit is received; where he is resisted, his Spirit is resisted; where he is rejected, his Spirit is rejected. This is now especially the case: for after he was glorified, the Spirit proceeded from him as well as from his Father. Peter says, 'The Holy Spirit is a witness for us, whom God has given to all who obey him.'* The Spirit speaks *to* sinners, knocks, calls, entreats; but it speaks *in* the saints, or in the words

* Acts v. 32.

uttered by the Apostles. It quickens, cheers, animates, gladdens, purifies, sanctifies the saints: 'Because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts:' 'You are the temple of the Spirit:' 'I will dwell in them and walk in them.' No wonder, then, that the promise of the Holy Spirit, as a resident in the heart, is given only to them who submit to the government of Jesus. 'I will sup with him,' I will be familiar with him, and he shall have fellowship, or he 'will sup with me.'

A.—I have one fault to your reasonings upon this subject. You speak of moral and physical influences, and sometimes of spiritual operations. The Bible speaks not in this style. It is owing to these humanisms, that you are so much misrepresented and misunderstood.

T.—It is a fault; but hear my apology. I never introduced these distinctions; I only adopted them. For the sake of argument with those who oppose reformation, I used their own style; I reasoned with them on their own concessions. It is not my style; it is their style. And he that thinks that I used these terms with approbation, forgets what I have written about them.

Were I to sketch a philosophy illustrative of the views which human reason can apprehend, I would have *intellectual*, *moral*, and *physical* power. But to suit our nomenclature, we combine intellectual and moral; and call every thing which is argumentative, which imparts either light, knowledge, disposition, or motive, "*moral*;" and this power may be displayed either in words spoken or written, addressed to the eye or the ear, to the mind, either in signs, suggestions, or tokens, *internal* or *external*. But the Bible neither teaches the one philosophy nor the other; and it would be better, incomparably better, to speak of Bible things in Bible terms, if men would not pervert our words, and abuse the public mind with a phraseology, neither scriptural nor philosophic.

A.—You might as justly, I think, take exceptions to the popular misrepresentation or misconception of *physical* as of moral power. When you allege that spirits cannot operate upon spirits as a hammer operates upon metal, it is to show that *moral disposition* cannot be produced by a spirit operating upon a spirit—moulding it into dispositions good or evil, as a smith fashions a horse shoe; that moral effects cannot be the result of physical causes. But this does not lead to the conclusions which some infer. Suggestions or

temptations, by presenting any sort of motive, may be so far physical as sound or speech is physical; but yet it is the end proposed and achieved which designates the power. All moral means are physical, if we take into view the tongue that speaks, the sound uttered, or the impression made upon the eye, the ear, or the heart. In this confounding of things, there is no power purely moral in the universe. Power is properly denominated either from the agent which acts, or from the object accomplished. Thus we speak on other subjects. We have steam power, water power, horse power, human power, spiritual power, satanic power, and divine power. This is the name derived from the agent. The tendency or result of the power is sometimes chosen to designate it. Thus we have moral power, physical power, political power, pecuniary power. These are sometimes so denominated from the agent, and sometimes from the object or the termination of the power. Human, spiritual, satanic, and divine power, are general terms, and may denote all varieties of power, which these agents can, or do employ.

T.—Grant all this, friend Austin; but what is the use of these distinctions with the great mass of men? If some theologians do not understand what we mean in opposing the popular notions of physical operations—if they suppose we are framing a new theory, because we take their terms and phrases, and show that *their system is discordant with itself*, of what use is it to talk or write upon such distinctions?

If I could make myself understood—if I could speak or write to the apprehension of this speculating age, I would say, that a spirit, and of course the human spirit, cannot be shaped, or disposed, or new created, or new modified by another spirit working upon it, as we operate upon material things; and that it can only be moved, disposed, new created, by truth apprehended and embraced: and whether this truth, real or supposed, be presented by spirits or men, by God or by Satan; physically, by words, signs, tokens, suggestions, temptations, it can operate only *morally* or by *motive* upon the soul. If I could explain myself at all, without the imputation of theorizing, or the terrible sin of denying the Holy Spirit, I would merely suggest this to those who are teaching the people to expect touches, impulses, operations of some naked spirit upon their naked souls, regenerating them in a moment, as lightning rives an oak, or shatters a tower in an instant of time. This is all

I mean— all I would teach, upon this subject—and not even this much, if men would preach the gospel, and talk of the Holy Spirit as did the Apostles.

A.—Well, I am a convert to this view of the matter, and I will no more roam in the airy regions of metaphysics, upon topics which I now see the Rabbis themselves can neither explain, nor understand, in their own phrases and terms.

T.—Let us have done with speculations upon such untaught questions, and let us rather speak the words of the Holy Spirit to perishing sinners, than the speculations of the schools. Let us have the word of Christ dwelling in us. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks. Let us teach sinners that God has promised his Holy Spirit, to all who submit to his government, and that he will write upon the hearts of his disciples the great laws of the new economy.

But that the Spirit of God may operate upon the unbelieving and disobedient, let us approach them with the Spirit in our hearts, with the words of the Spirit upon our tongues, and with the holiness of the Spirit in our lives. Let us not grieve the Spirit of Christ; but let us, 'praying in the Holy Spirit, build ourselves up in the most holy faith; keep ourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ to eternal life.' Let us labor to disabuse the public mind of its errors upon this subject; but let all things be done in the spirit of the truth; in the humility and love which the Spirit of God commends, and the Lord Jesus enjoins upon his disciples.

A.—To all this I will say a cordial *Amen*. And let me only add, that I now feel convinced, that we may be filled with the Spirit of God, if we only walk in the Spirit, and keep the commandments of Jesus.

T.—Peace be with your spirit.

Blank Page

Concluding Addresses.

ADDRESS TO THE CITIZENS OF THE KINGDOM.

Fellow-citizens:—

Your rank and standing under the reign of the Prince of Peace have never been surpassed—indeed, have never been equaled by any portion of the human race. You have visions and revelations of God—his being and perfections—developments of the depths of his wisdom and knowledge, of the counsels of his grace, and the purposes of his love, which give you an intellectual and moral superiority above all your predecessors in the Patriarchal and Jewish ages of the world. Secrets of God, which were hid from ages and generations, have been revealed to you by the Apostles of the Great Apostle and High Priest of your confession. What Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, David, Isaiah, Daniel, and all the Prophets, down to John the Harbinger, rejoiced to anticipate, you have realized and enjoyed. The intellectual pleasures of the highest and most sublime conceptions of God and of Christ vouchsafed to you, so far transcend the attainments of the ancient people of God, that you are comparatively exalted to heaven, and may enjoy the days of heaven upon earth. You have a book which contains not only the charter of your privileges, but which explains a thousand mysteries in the antecedent administrations of God over all the nations of the earth. In it you have such interpretations of God's past providences in the affairs of individuals, families, and nations, as open to you a thousand sources of rational and sentimental enjoyment, from incidents and things which puzzled and perplexed the most intelligent and highly favored of past ages. Mountains are, indeed, leveled; valleys are exalted; rough places are made plain, and crooked ways straight to your apprehension; and from these data, you are able to form more just conceptions of the present, and more lofty anticipations of the future, than fell to the lot of the most highly favored subjects of preceding dispensations. And, indeed,

so inexhaustible are the deep and rich mines of knowledge and understanding in the Christian Revelations, that the most comprehensive mind in the kingdom of heaven might labor in them during the age of a Methuselah, constantly enriching itself with all knowledge and spiritual understanding, and yet leave at last vast regions and tracts of thought wholly unexplored.

But this decided superiority over the most gifted saints of former ages you unquestionably enjoy. Among all the living excellencies with which they were acquainted, they wanted a perfect model of all human excellence. Bright as were the virtues and excellencies of an Abraham, a Joseph, a David, there were dark spots, or, at least, some blemishes in their moral character. They failed to place in living form before their contemporaries, or to leave as a legacy to posterity, every virtue, grace, and excellence, that adorn human nature. But you have Jesus, not only as 'the image of the invisible God,' 'an effulgence of his glory, and an exact representation of his character;' but as a man, holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sin, exhibiting in the fullest perfection, every excellence which gives amiability, dignity, and glory, to human character. You have motives to purity and holiness, a stimulus to all that is manly, good, and excellent, from what he said, and did, and suffered as the Son of Man, which would have added new charms and beauties to the most exemplary of all the saints of the olden times.

Means and opportunities of the highest intellectual and moral enjoyments are richly bestowed on you, for which they sighed in vain; God having provided some better things for Christians, than for Jews and Patriarchs. Shall we not, then, fellow-citizens, appreciate and use, as we ought, to our present purity and happiness, to our eternal honor and glory, the light which the Sun of Righteousness has shed so richly and abundantly on us? Remember that we stand upon Apostles and Prophets, and are sustained by Jesus, the light of the world, and the interpreter and vindicator of all God's ways to man, in creation, providence, and redemption. All suns are stars: and he that is now to us in this life '*the Sun of Righteousness?*' in respect of the future, is '*the Bright and Morning Star.*' Till the day of eternity dawn, and the day star of immortality arise in our hearts, let us always look to Jesus.

But it is not only the felicity of superior heavenly light,

ADDRESSES.

though that is most delectable to our rational nature, which distinguishes you the citizens of this kingdom; but that personal, real, and plenary remission of all sin, which you enjoy through the blood of the Lamb of God, bestowed on you through the ordinances of Christian immersion and confession of sins.

The Jews, indeed, had sacrifices under the law, which could, and did take away ceremonial sins; and which, so far absolved from the guilt of transgressing that law, as to give them a right to the continued enjoyment of the temporal and political promises of the national compact; but farther Jewish sacrifices and ablutions could not reach. This benefit every Jew had from them. But as respected the conscience, Paul, that great commentator on Jewish sacrifice, assures us they had no power. 'With respect to the conscience,' says he, 'they could not make him who did the service perfect.'

The entrance of the law gave the knowledge of sin. It gave names to particular sins, and 'caused the offence to abound.' The sacrifices appended to it had respect to that institution alone, and not to sin in the general, nor to sin in its true and proper nature. The promise made to the patriarchs and the sacrificial institution added to it, through faith in that promise, led the believing to anticipate a real sin-offering; but it appears the Jewish sacrifices had only respect to the Jewish institution, and excepting their typical character, gave no new light to those under that economy, on the subject of a true and *proper* remission of sins, through the real and bloody sacrifice of Christ.

The Patriarch and the believing Jew, as respected a real remission of sins, stood upon the same ground; for, as has been observed, the legal institution, or, as Paul says, 'the supervening of the law,' made no change in the apprehensions of remission, as respected the conscience. But a new age having come, (for 'these ordinances for cleansing the flesh were imposed only till the time for reformation,') and Christ having, by a more perfect sacrifice, opened the way into the true holy places, has laid the foundation for perfecting the conscience by a real and full remission of sins, which, by the virtue of his blood, terminates not upon the flesh, but upon the conscience of the sinner.

John, indeed, who lived at the dawn of the Reformation, preached reformation with an immersion for the remission of sins; saying that 'they should believe in him that was

to come after him.' Those who believed John's gospel, and reformed, and were immersed into John's reformation, had remission of sins through faith in him that was to come: but you, fellow-citizens, even in respect of the enjoyment of remission, are greatly advanced above the disciples of John. You have been immersed, not only by the authority of Jesus, *as Lord of all*, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, but *into the death* or sacrifice of Christ. This, no disciple of Moses or of John knew any thing about. This gives you an insight into sin, and a freedom from it, *as respects the conscience*—a peace and a joy unutterable and full of glory, to which both the disciples of Moses and of the Harbinger were strangers. So that the light of the risen day of heaven's eternal Sun greatly excels, not only the glimmerings of the stars in the Patriarchal age, and the faint light of the moon in the Jewish age, but even the twilight of the morning.

Your new relation to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, into which you have been introduced by faith in the Messiah and immersion into his death, verifies, in respect of the sense and assurance of remission, all that John and Jesus said concerning that superiority of privilege, vouchsafed to the Messiah in the kingdom of heaven. You can see your sins washed away in the blood that was shed on Mount Calvary. That which neither the highly favored John, nor any disciple of the Messiah could understand, till Jesus said *'It is finished?'* you not only clearly perceive, but have cordially embraced. You can feel, and say with all assurance, that 'the blood of Jesus Christ now cleanses you from all sin;' and that by faith you have access to the Mediator of the New Institution, and to the blood of sprinkling which speaks glad things to the heart. You have an Advocate with the Father; and, when conscious of any impurity, coming to him by God, confessing your sins, and supplicating pardon through his blood, you have the promise of remission. You now know how God is *just* as well as merciful, in forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin.

But superior light and knowledge, and enlarged conceptions of God, with such an assurance of real and personal remission as pacifies the conscience, and introduces the peace of God into the heart, are not the only distinguishing favors which you enjoy in the new relation to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, into which you are introduced under the reign of Heaven; but you are formally *adopted*

into the family of God, and constituted the sons and daughters of the Father Almighty.

To be called '*the friend of God*,' was the highest title bestowed on Abraham; to be called the friends of Christ, was the peculiar honor of the disciples of Christ, to whom he confided the secrets of his reign; but to be called 'the children of God through faith in Jesus Christ,' is not only the common honor of all Christians, but the highest honor which could be vouchsafed to the inhabitants of this earth. Such honor have you, my fellow-citizens, in being related to the only begotten Son of God: 'For to as many as received him, he gave the privilege of becoming the sons of God.' These, indeed, were not descended from families of noble blood, nor genealogies of high renown; neither are they the offspring of the instincts of the flesh, nor made the sons of God 'by the will of man,' who sometimes adopts the child of another as his own; but they are 'born of God' through the ordinances of his grace. 'Behold how great love the Father has bestowed on us, that we should be called children of God!' 'The world, indeed, does not know us, because it did not know him. Beloved, now are we the children of God. It does not yet appear what we shall be!'

'Because you are sons, God has sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.' And if sons, it follows 'you are heirs of God through Christ'—the Heir of all things. Is this, fellow-citizens, a romantic vision, or sober and solemn truth, that you are children of God, possessing the spirit of Christ, and constituted heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ of the eternal inheritance! What manner of persons, then, ought you to be! How pure, how holy, and heavenly in your temper; how just and righteous in all your ways; how humble and devoted to the Lord; how joyful and triumphant in your King!

Permit me, then, to ask, Wherein *do* you excel?—nay, rather, you will propose this question to yourselves. You will say, How shall we still more successfully promote the interest, the honor, and the triumphs, of the gospel of the kingdom? Is there any thing we can do by our behaviour, our morality, our piety, by our influence, by all the earthly means with which God has furnished us? *Is* there any thing we can do more to strengthen the army of the faith, to invigorate the champions of the kingdom, to make new conquests for our King? Can we not increase the joy of the Lord in converting souls—can we not furnish occasions

of rejoicing to the angels of God—can we not gladden the hearts of thousands, who have never tasted the joys of the children of God?

In the present administration of the kingdom of God, during the absence of the King, he has said to the citizens, 'Put on the armor of light'—contend earnestly for the faith'—'Convert the world'—'Occupy till I come'—'Let your light shine before men, that they, seeing your good works, may glorify your Father in heaven'—'That the Gentiles may, by your good works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation.' He has thus entrusted to the citizens the great work for which he died—the salvation of men. Let us, then, brethren, be found faithful to the Lord and to men, that he may address us at his coming with the most acceptable plaudit, 'Well done, good and faithful servants; enter into the joy of your Lord!'

Great as the opposition is to truth and salvation, we have no reason to despond. Greater are our friends and allies, and infinitely more powerful than all our enemies, God is on our side—Jesus Christ is our King—the Holy Spirit is at his disposal—angels are his ministering servants—the prayers of all the prophets, apostles, saints, and martyrs are for our success—our brethren are numerous and strong—they have the Sword of the Spirit, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the breastplate of righteousness, the artillery of truth—the arguments of God, the preparation of the gospel of peace—our commander and Captain is the most successful General that ever entered the field of war—he never lost a battle—he is wonderful in counsel, excellent in working, valiant in fight—the Lord of *hosts* is his name. He can stultify all the machinations of our enemies, control all the powers of nature, and subdue all our foes, terrestrial and infernal. Under his conduct we are like Mount Zion, that can never be moved. Indeed, under him we are come to Mount Zion, the strong held and fortress of the kingdom, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem—to myriads of angels—the general assembly and congregation of the first born, enrolled in heaven,—to God the Judge of all—to the spirits of just men made perfect—to Jesus the Mediator of the New Constitution— and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaks such peace and joy, and courage to the heart. Ought we not, then, brethren, Ho be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might?' If in faith, and courage, and prayer, we put on the heavenly armor, and march under the King, sounding the gospel trum-

pet, the walls of Jericho will fall to the ground, and the banners of the Cross will wave over the ruins of Paganism, Atheism, Scepticism, and Sectarianism—*Nil desperandum, te duce, Christe*. If a Roman could say, 'Nothing is to be feared under the auspices of Cesar,' may not the Christian say, 'There is no despair under the guardianship of Messiah the King?'

But, fellow-citizens, though clothed with the whole panoply of heaven, and headed by the Captain of Salvation, there is no success in this war to be expected, without constant and incessant prayer. When the Apostles began to build up this kingdom, notwithstanding all the gifts they enjoyed, they found it necessary to devote themselves to prayer as well as to the ministry of the word. And when Paul describes all the armor of God, piece by piece, in putting it on, he says, 'Take the Sword of the Spirit—with all supplication and deprecation, pray at all seasons in spirit, watch with all perseverance and supplication for all the saints.'

This was most impressively and beautifully pictured out in the wars of ancient Israel against their enemies. While Moses lifted up his holy hands to heaven. Israel prevailed; and when he did not, Amalek prevailed. So is it now. When the disciples of Christ, the heaven-born citizens of the kingdom, continue instant in prayer and watchfulness, the truth triumphs in their hearts and in the world. When they do not, they become cold, timid, and impotent as Samson shorn, and the enemy gains strength over them. Then the good cause of the Lord languishes.

It is not necessary that we should understand how prayer increases our zeal, our wisdom, our strength, our joy, or how it gives success to the cause, any more than that we should understand how our food is converted into flesh, and blood, and bones. It is only necessary that we eat; and it is only necessary that we should pray as we are taught and commanded. Experience proves that the outward man is renewed day by day by our daily bread, and experience proves that the inward man is renewed day by day by prayer and thanksgiving. The Lord has promised his Holy Spirit to them that ask him in truth; and is it not necessary to our success? If it be not necessary to give new revelations, it is necessary to keep in mind those already given, and to bring the word written seasonably to our remembrance. Besides, if the Spirit of the Lord was necessary to the success of Gideon and Barak, and Samson and David, and all

the great warriors of Israel according to the flesh, who fought the battles of the Lord with the sword, the sling, and the bow; who can say that it is not necessary to those who draw the Sword of the Spirit and fight the good fight of faith? In my judgment it is as necessary now as then: necessary, I mean, to equal success—necessary to the success of those who labor in the word and teaching—and necessary to those who would acquit themselves like men, in every department in the ranks of the great army of the Lord of hosts.

Though the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, they are mighty, (only, however, *through God*, to the overturning of strong holds,) to the overturning of all reasonings against the truth, and every high thing raised up against the knowledge of God, and in leading captive every thought to the obedience of Christ. Let us, then, fellow-citizens, whether as leaders or as private soldiers, abound in prayer and supplications to God night and day. If sincere, and ardent, and incessant prayers to God for every thing that he has promised; for all things for which the Apostles prayed—were offered up by all the congregations, and by every disciple in his family and in his closet, for the triumphs of the truth, then would we see the army of the Lord successful in fight against atheism, infidelity, and sectarianism—then would we see disciples growing in knowledge, and in favor with God and man. And is not the conversion of the world, and our own eternal salvation, infinitely worthy of all the effort and enterprise in man, seeing God himself has done so much in the gift of his Son and Holy Spirit, and left for us so little to do—nothing, indeed, but what is in the compass of our power? And shall we withhold that little, especially as he has given us so many and so exceedingly great and precious promises to stimulate us to exertion? Has not Jesus said, 'The conqueror shall inherit all things?'—that he 'will not blot his name out of the book of life'?—that he will confess it before his Father and his holy angels?—that he will place him 'upon his throne, and give him the crown of life that shall never fade away?'

Rise up, then, in the strength of Judah's Lion! Be valiant for the truth! Adorn yourselves with all the graces of the Spirit of God! Put on the armor of light; and, with all the gentleness, and meekness, and mildness there is in Christ—with all the courage, and patience, and zeal, and effort, worthy of a cause so salutary, so pure, so holy, and so divine, determine never to faint nor to falter till you enter the pearly gates—never to lay down your arms, till, with the

triumphant millions, you stand before the throne, and exulting sing, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory, and blessing!"—"To him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb be blessing, and honor, and glory, and strength forever and forever!" Amen.

A WORD TO FRIENDLY ALIENS.

Whether to regard you in the light of *Proselytes of the Gate*, who refused circumcision, but wished to live in the land of Israel, to be in the suburbs of the cities of Judah, and to keep some of the institutions of the ancient kingdom of God, without becoming fellow-citizens of that kingdom; or whether to regard you as the Samaritans of old, who built for themselves a temple of God upon Mount Gerizim, held fast a part of the ancient revelation of God, and rejected only such parts of it as did not suit their prejudices—worshiped the God of Israel in common with the idols of the nations, from which they sprang—I say, whether to regard you in the light of the one or the other of those ancient professors of religion, might require more skill in casuistry than we possess—more leisure than we have at our disposal—and more labor than either of us have patience to endure. One thing, however, is obvious, that if under the Reign of Heaven it behoved so good a man as Cornelius ('a man of piety, and one that feared God with all his house, giving also much alms to the people, and praying to God continually,') to '*hear words by which he might be saved?*' and to put on Christ by immersion into his death, that he might enter the kingdom of heaven, and enjoy the remission of sins, and the hope of an inheritance among all the sanctified—certainly it is both expedient and necessary, that you also go and do likewise.

Every sectarian in the land, how honest and pious soever, ought to bury his sectarianism, and all his other sins of omission and commission, in 'the bath of regeneration.' It is a high crime and misdemeanor in any man, professing to have received the Messiah in his proper person, character, and office, to refuse allegiance to him in any thing; and to substitute human inventions and traditions, in lieu of the ordinances and statutes of Prince Immanuel. Indeed, the keeping up of any dogma, practice, or custom, which directly or indirectly supplants the constitution, laws, and usages of the kingdom over which Jesus presides, is directly opposed

to his government; and would ultimate in dethroning him in favor of a rival, and in placing upon his throne the author of that dogma, practice, or usage, which supplants the institution of the Saviour of the world.

It is to you, then, who, in the name of the King, are changing his ordinances, and substituting your own expedients, for the wisdom and authority of the Judge of all, we now propose the following considerations.

Every kingdom has one uniform law or institution for naturalizing aliens; and that institution, of whatever sort it be, is obligatory by the authority of the government, upon every one who would become a citizen. We say it is obligatory upon him who desires to be a citizen to submit to that institution. But does not your practice and your dogma positively say, that it is not the duty of an alien to be born again, but that it is the duty of his father or guardian to have him naturalized? Now, although many things are in common the duty of brother, father, and child, yet those duties which belong specifically to a father, cannot belong to his child, either in religion, morality, or society. If it be the father's duty to 'offer his child to the Lord,' to speak in your own style, it is not the duty of the child to offer himself. It was not Isaac's duty to be circumcised, but Abraham's duty to circumcise him. If, then, it was your father's duty to have made you citizens of the kingdom of heaven, it is not your duty to become citizens, unless you can produce a law, saying, that in *all cases* where the father fails to do his duty, then it shall be the duty of the child, to do that which his father neglected. Again—if all fathers, like yours, had, upon their own responsibility, without any command from the Lord, baptized their children, there would not be one in a nation to whom it could be said, 'Repent and be baptized'—much less could it be said to every penitent, 'Be baptized, every one of you, by the authority of the Lord, for the remission of sins.' These remarks are only intended to show that your institutions do, in truth, go to the subversion of the government of Christ, and to the entire abolition of the institutions of his kingdom. On this account alone, if for no other reason, you ought to be constitutionally naturalized, and be legally and honorably inducted into the kingdom of heaven. It is a solemn duty you owe the King and his government; and if you have a conscience formed by the Oracles of God, you can have no confidence in God, nor real peace of mind, so

long as you give your support—your countenance, example, and entire influence to break down the institutions of Jesus Christ, to open his kingdom to all that is born of the flesh, and to prevent as far as you can every man from the pleasure of choosing whom he shall obey—of confessing him before men—of taking on his yoke—of dying, being buried, and raised with Christ in his gracious institution. If Jesus himself, for the sake of fulfilling all righteousness, or of honoring every divine institution, though he needed not the reformation nor the remission which John preached, was immersed by John—what have you to say for yourselves—you who would claim the honors and privileges of the kingdom of heaven, refusing to follow the example of Jesus, and who virtually subvert his authority by supporting a system, which would, if carried out, not allow a voluntary agent in all the race of Adam, to do that which all the first converts to Christ did, by authority of the commission which Jesus gave to all his Apostles?

Again—whatever confidence you may now possess, that you are good citizens of the kingdom of the Messiah, that confidence is not founded upon a "THUS SAITH THE LORD," but upon your own reasonings, which all men must acknowledge may be in this, as in many other things, fallacious. Jesus has said, 'He that believes and is immersed shall be saved;' and Peter commanded every penitent to be immersed for the remission of his sins. Now he who hears the word, believes it, and is on his own confession immersed, has an assurance, a confidence, which it is impossible for you to have.

Let me add only another consideration, for we are not now arguing the merits of your theory, or that of any party: it is your duty, as you desire the union of (what you call) the church, and the conversion of the world, forthwith to be immersed and be born constitutionally into the kingdom; because all Protestants, of every name, if sincere believers in Jesus *as the Christ*, irrespective of every opinion found in any human creed, could, if they would, honor and obey his institutions, come into one fold, and sit down together under the reign of the Messiah, If all would follow your example, this would necessarily follow; if they do not, you have done your duty. In being thus immersed, all the world, Catholic and Protestant, admit that you are truly and scripturally baptized; for all admit that an *immersed penitent* is constitutionally baptized into Christ; but only a part of the pro-

fessing world can admit that rite of infant affusion, on which you rely, as introducing you, without previous knowledge, faith, or repentance, into the family of God. Acquit, then, your conscience; follow the example of Jesus; honor and support his authority; promote the union and peace of the family of God; do what in you lies for the conversion of the world; enter into the full enjoyment of the blessings of the kingdom of heaven by confessing the ancient faith, and by being immersed in the name of Jesus, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins. Then you may say as Jesus said to the Samaritan woman. Although the Samaritans have a temple on Mount Gerizim, a priesthood, and the five books of Moses, 'salvation is of the Jews.' Although the sects have the Oracles of God, human creeds, many altars, priests, and religious usages, *the enjoyment of salvation* is among them, who simply believe what the Apostles wrote concerning Jesus, and who, from the heart, obey that mould of doctrine which the Apostles delivered to us.

In so doing you will, moreover, most wisely consult your own safety and security, from the signal calamities that are every day accumulating, and soon to fall with overwhelming violence on a distracted, divided, alienated, and adulterous generation. If you are '*the people of God*,' as you profess, and as we would fain imagine, then you are commanded by a voice from heaven, 'Come out of her, *my people*, that you partake not of the sins of mystic Babylon, and that you receive not a portion of her plagues.*' If affliction, and shame, and poverty, and reproach were to be the inalienable lot of the most approved servants of God, it is better, infinitely better for you to suffer with them, than to enjoy for a season all that a corrupted and apostate society can bestow upon you. Remember who it is that has said, 'Happy are they who keep his commandments, for they shall have a right to the tree of life, and they shall enter in through the gates into the city!'

ADDRESS TO BELLIGERENT ALIENS.

To him who, through the telescope of faith, surveys your camp, there appears not on the whole map of creation such a motley group, such a heterogeneous and wretched amalga-

* Revelation, chapter xviii. verses 4 and 5.

mation of distracted spirits, as are found in actual insurrection and rebellion, in a mad and accursed alliance against the reigning Monarch of creation. In your lines are found every unclean and hateful spirit on this side the fathomless gulf, the dark and rayless receptacle of fallen and ruined intelligences, who, in endless and fruitless wailings, lament their own follies, and through an incessant night of despair anathematize themselves, and their coadjutors in the perpetration of their eternal suicide. Yes, in your ranks are found all who wilfully reject the Son of God, and will not have him to reign over them; whether they are styled the decent moralist, the honest deist, sceptic, atheist, infidel, the speculating Sadducee, the boasting Pharisee, the supercilious Jew, the resentful Samaritan, or the idolatrous Gentile. All ranks and degrees of men in political society—the king and the beggar—the sage philosopher and the uneducated clown—the rich and the poor, who disdain the precepts of the Messiah, unite with you in this unholy alliance against the kingdom of heaven. You may boast of many a decent fellow-soldier in the crusade against Immanuel; many who, when weighed in the balances of the political sanctuary, are not found wanting in all the decencies of this present life; but yet look at the innumerable crowds of every sort of wretches, down to the filthiest, vilest matricide, who in your communion are fighting under your banners—stouthearted rebels!—leagued with you in your attempts to dethrone the Lord's Anointed. If you boast of one Marcus Aurelius, you must fraternize with many a Nero, Domitian, Caligula, and Heliogabalus. If you rejoice in the virtues of one Seneca, you must own the vices of the ten thousand murderers, robbers, adulterers, drunkards, profane swearers, and lecherous debauchees, who have rejected the counsels of heaven, because the precepts of righteousness and life forbade their crimes.

If, then, my friends, (for I now address the most honorable "of your community,) you boast that you belong to a very large and respectable synagogue; remember, I pray you, that to this same synagogue in which you have your brotherhood, belongs every thing mean, and vile, and wretched, in every land where the name of Jesus has been announced. *What a group!* Have you so much of the reflex light of the gospel falling upon your vision, as to flush your cheek with the glow of shame when you look along the lines of your alliance, and survey the horrible faces, the ragged, and tat-

tered, and squalid, and filthy wretches, *your companions in arms—members with you in the synagogue of Satan—and confederates against the Prince of Peace!* If you cannot blush at such a spectacle, you are not among them to whom I would tender the pearls of Jesus Christ.

What do you then say? "I am ashamed of such an alliance—of such a brotherhood; and therefore I have joined the Temperance Society—I belong to the Literary Club—and I carry my family regularly to church every Sunday." And do you think, O simpleton! that these human inventions, which only divide the kingdom of Satan into casts, and form within it various private communions, honorable and dishonorable associations, learned and unlearned fraternities, moral and immoral conventicles, change the state of a single son of Adam as respects the Son of God!! Then may Whig and Tory, Masonic and Anti-masonic clubs and conclaves— then may every political cabal, for the sake of elevating some demagogue, change the political relations in the state, and make and unmake American citizens according to fancy, in despite of constitution, law, and established precedents. No, sir; should there be as many parties in the state, as there are days in a month, membership in any one of these affects not, in the least, the standing of any man as a citizen in relation to the United States, or to any foreign power. And by parity of reason, as well as by all that is written in the New Testament, should you join all the benevolent societies on the chequered map of Christendom, and fraternize with every brotherhood born *after the will of man*, this would neither change nor destroy your citizenship in the kingdom of Satan—still you would be an alien from the kingdom of the Messiah—a foreigner as respects all its covenanted blessings—and, in the unbiased judgment of the universe, you would stand enrolled amongst its enemies.

In *character* there are many degrees, as respects any and every attribute which enters into its formation; but as respects *state* there are no degrees. In the nature of things it is impossible. Every man is either married or single, a brother, a master, a citizen, or he is not. Every man is either Christ's or Belial's; there is no middle power, and therefore no neutral state. Hence the King himself, when on the present theatre of war, told his companions to regard every man as his enemy, who was not on his side. Amongst his professed friends they, who in works deny him, are even counted as enemies.

What a hopeless struggle is that in which you are engaged! Discomfiture, soon or late, awaits you. Have you counsel and strength to oppose the Sovereign of the Universe? Do you think you can frustrate the counsels of Infinite Wisdom and overcome Omnipotence? Your master is already a prisoner—your chief is in chains. The fire of eternal vengeance is already kindled for Satan and all his subjects. Mad in his disappointed ambition, and implacable in his hatred of him against whom he rebelled, he only seeks to gratify his own malice, by involving with himself in irremediable ruin the unhappy victims of his seduction. He only seeks to desolate the dominions of God, and to ruin forever his fellow-creatures. Will you, then, serve your worst enemy, and war against your best friend?

But your rebellion can effect nothing against God. His arm is too strong for the whole creation. You cannot defeat his counsels nor stay his almighty hand. The earth on which you stand trembles at his rebuke; the foundations of the hills and mountains are moved and shaken at his presence. You fight against yourselves. God's detestation of your course arises not from any apprehension that you can injure him; but because you destroy yourselves. Every triumph which your inordinate desires and passions gain over the remonstrances of reason and conscience, only precipitates you into deeper and deeper misery, matures you for perdition, and makes it essential to the good order and happiness of the universe, that you should suffer an 'everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.'

What, then, infatuates you, that you should choose death rather than life, and prefer destruction to salvation? "I am not sure that the gospel is true; I love my companions, and cannot see any criminality in gratifying those passions and appetites, which my creator has planted in my constitution."

You admit there is a God, your Creator; but you doubt whether the gospel is true! What an abuse of reason and evidence! Can you infer from any premises in your possession, that HE, whose creation man is, who has exhibited to the eye and ear of man so much wisdom, power, and goodness, in all his grand designs already accomplished, and daily accomplishing, in the heavens and in the earth, teaching man to sustain the present life, to anticipate the future, and to provide for it, has never intelligibly addressed him on a subject of incomparably more importance—his own

ultimate destiny! That God should have been at so much pains to elevate man in nature—to furnish him with such an organization—to bestow on him reason and speech—admirably qualifying him to acquire and communicate instruction, on all things necessary to his present animal enjoyments; and, at the same time, to have never communicated to him any thing relative to his intellectual nature— never to have addressed him on the themes, which, as a rational creature, he must necessarily most of all desire to know; to have done every thing for his body, and for the present—and nothing for his mind, nor for the future—is, to say the least of it, the most improbable conceit that the most romantic fancy can entertain.

That the Creator *could not* enlighten him on these topics, is wholly inadmissible. That he could, and *would not*, is directly contrary to every analogy in creation—contradictory to every proof we have of his benevolence, an inexplicable exception to the whole order of his government: for he has provided objects for every sense—objects for every intellectual power—objects for every affection, honorable passion, appetite, and propensity, in our constitution; but, on your hypothesis, he has only failed in that which is infinitely more dear to us, more consonant to our whole rational nature, and most essential to our happiness!! It is most contrary to reason.

But the folly of your scepticism is still more glaring, when we open the book of the gospel of salvation. In the history of Jesus, you have the fulfilment of a thousand predictions, expressed by numerous prophets, for 1500 years before he was born. These recorded prophecies were in the possession of his and our most bitter enemies, when he appeared, and are still extant in their hands. How can you dispose of these? All antiquity confirms the existence of Jesus of Nazareth in the times of Augustus and Tiberius Cesar. No contemporary opponent denied his miracles: they explained them away, but questioned not the wonderful works which he wrought. His character was the only perfect and unexceptionable one the world ever saw, either in print, or in real life; and yet you imagine him to have been the greatest liar and most infamous impostor that ever lived. You must admit him to have been the teacher of every thing moral, and pure, and godlike—to have lived the most exemplary life—to have employed his whole life in doing good—while, to countenance your scepticism, you

must imagine him to have been the greatest deceiver, and most blasphemous pretender the world ever saw! Truly, you are fond of paradox!

His Apostles, too, for the sake of being accounted the offscourings of the world, and the filth of all society—for the sake of poverty, contumely, stripes, imprisonment, and martyrdom, you imagine traveled over the earth teaching virtue and holiness—discountenancing every species of vice and immorality, while telling the most impudent lies, and that too about matters of palpable fact, about which no man having eyes and ears could be mistaken! How great your credulity! How weak your faith!

And to consummate the whole, you admit that in the most enlightened age, and amongst the most disputatious and discriminating population, both Jewish, Roman, and Grecian, in Jerusalem itself, the very theatre of the crucifixion of Christ, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and in all the great towns and cities of the whole ancient Roman Empire, Eastern and Western, these rude and uncultivated Galileans did actually succeed in persuading hundreds of thousands of persons, of all ranks, sexes, ages, and intellects, to renounce their former opinions and practices—to encounter proscription, confiscation of goods, banishment, and even death itself in numerous instances, through faith in their testimony, while every thing was fresh, and when the detection of any fiction or fraud was most easy!

Now, if it were possible to place your folly in an attitude still more inexcusable, I would ask you to show what there is in the gospel, that is not infinitely worthy of God to bestow, and of man to receive? And where under the canopy of the skies, in any country, language, or age of time, is there any thing that confers greater honor on man, or proposes to him any thing more worthy of his acceptance, than the gospel?

Can there have been a more acceptable model proposed, after which to fashion man, than that after which he was originally created? When he was beguiled and apostatized from God, could there have been deputed a more honorable personage to effect his reconciliation to God, than his only begotten and well beloved Son? And could there even be imagined a more delectable destiny allotted to man, than an immortality of bliss in the palace of this vast universe, in the presence of his Father and his God forever and forever? Now, with all these premises, will you object to this religion,

that it requires a man to be pure and holy, in order to his enjoyment of this eternal salvation? Then lay your hand upon your face, and blush, and be ashamed forever!

But you say you love your companions! And who are they? Your fellow-rebels, foolish and infatuated like yourselves. The drunkard, the thief, the murderer, love their companions, the partners of their crimes. Conspirators and partizans in any undertaking, kindred spirits in guilty and daring enterprize, confirm each other in their evil machinations, and either from mutual interest, or from some hateful affinity in evil dispositions, coalesce and league together in bands of malicious depredation. A Cataline, a Jugurtha, a Robespierre, had their confederates. The rakes, the libertines, the freebooters of every color, form their own fraternities, and have a liking of some sort for their companions. And wherein does your attachment to your companions differ from theirs? A congeniality of disposition, a similarity of likings and dislikings, all springing from your love of the world, and your dislike of the authority of the Messiah. And will not a change of circumstances convert your affection into hatred? Soon or late, if you do not repent and turn to God, you that are leagued in the friendships of the world, those friendships arising from the lusts of the flesh, the lusts of the eye, and the pride of life, will not only become enemies, but mutual tormentors of one another. Your warmest friends in your opposition to the Son of God will become King's evidence against you, and exasperate the flame that will consume you forever and ever. Break off, then, every friendship, alliance, and covenant, which you have formed with them that disdain the grace of God, and condemn the Saviour of the world, and form an everlasting covenant with the people of God, which shall never be forgotten. Then, indeed, you may love your companions with all the affection of your hearts, and indulge to the utmost " every sympathy and social feeling of your nature. Then may you embrace, in all the ardor of fraternal love, those kindred spirits, that with you have vowed eternal allegiance to the gracious and rightful Sovereign of nil the nations of the redeemed, in heaven and on earth. Such companions are worth possessing, and their friendship worth cultivating and preserving through all the journey of life; for it will be renewed beyond the Jordan, and flourish with increasing delight through the countless ages of eternity.

But you have said that the gratification of all the impulses

and propensities of your nature must be innocent, because they are the creation of God, and were sown in the embryo of your physical constitution. If under the control of that light and reason, under which God commanded your affections and appetites to move, your reasoning would be sound and safe; but if they have usurped a tyranny over your judgment, and captivated your reason, they are not to be gratified. They are like successful rebels that have dethroned their sovereign and, because by violence and fraud in possession of the throne, they plead a divine right to wield the scepter over their dethroned Prince. Such is the meaning of the plea, which you urge in favor of your rebellious affections. When man rebelled against his Creator, the beasts of the field, till then under his dominion, rebelled against him; and all his passions, affections, and propensities partook of the general disorder—of that wild and licentious anarchy which ensued upon man's disobedience. And have you not in your daily observation—nay, have you not in your own experience, irrefragable evidence that the uncontrolled indulgence of even the instinctive appetites, as well as the gratification of inordinate passions and affections, necessarily issue in the destruction of the physical constitution of man? Is not the control of reason, is not the exercise of discretion in the licence of every animal indulgence, essential to the health and life of man? Then why crave an exemption from the universal law of human existence, in favor of that demoralizing course of indulgence, which you would fain call innocent in morals, though in physics evidently destructive to animal organization?

When reconciled to God through the gospel, the peace of God which passes understanding reigning in the heart, all is order and harmony within. Then, under the control of enlightened and sanctified reason, all the passions, appetites, and instincts of our nature, like the planets round the sun, move in their respective orbits in the most perfect good order, preserving a perfect balance in all the principles and powers of human action. Pleasures without alloy are then felt and enjoyed from a thousand sources, from which, in the tumult and disorder of rebellion, every transgressor is debarred. It is then found, that there is not a supernumerary passion, affection, nor appetite in man—not one that adds not something to his enjoyment—not one that may not be made an instrument of righteousness, a means of doing good to others, as well as of enjoying good yourselves. Why not,

then, lay down the weapons of your rebellion, and be at peace with God, with your fellow-creatures, and with yourselves?

"Admitting, then, that the gospel is true—that in my present state and standing I am an alien from the kingdom of heaven, and that I wished to become a citizen, where shall I find this kingdom of heaven, and how shall I be constituted a citizen thereof?" Well, indeed, may you admit the gospel to be true, both on account of what it is in itself, and the evidence which sustains it. Only suppose it to be false—extinguish all the light which it sheds on the human race—make void all its promises—annul all its hopes—eradicate from the human breast all the motives which it imparts; and what remains to explain the universe, to develop the moral character of God, to dissipate the gloom which envelopes in eternal night the destiny of man, to solace and cheer him during the incessant struggle of life, to soothe the bed of affliction and death, and to countervail that inward dread and horror of falling into nothing—of being forever lost in the promiscuous wreck of nature—of sinking down into the grave, the food of worms, the prey of an eternal death?

It is like annihilating the sun in the heavens. An eternal night ensues. There is no beauty, form, nor comeliness in creation. The universe is in ruins. The world without the Bible, universe without a sun. The Atheist is but an atom of matter in motion, belonging to no system, amenable to none, without a destiny, without an object to live or to die. He boasts there is none to punish him: but then there is none to help him—none to reward him. He has no Father, proprietor, or ruler—no filial affection, no sense of obligation, no gratitude, no comfort in reflection, no joy in anticipation. If he cannot be blamed, he cannot be praised—if he cannot be praised, he cannot be honored— and man without honor, is more wretched than the beasts that perish. Unenviable mortal!

What an abortion is the system of nature, if man lives not again! It is a creation for the sake of destruction. It is an infinite series of designs, ending in nothing. It is a universe of blanks, without a single prize. It cannot be. The Bible is necessary to the interpretation of nature. It is the only comment on nature—on providence—on man. Man without it, and without the hope of immortality, has nothing to rouse him into action. He is a savage, a Hotten-

tot, a cannibal, a worm. You are compelled, then, to admit that the gospel is true, unless you put out the eye of Reason, and refuse to hear the voice of Nature.

But is it not a happy necessity which compels your belief in God, and in his Son the renovator of the Universe? It opens to you all the mysteries of creation, the arcana of the temple of nature, and inducts you to the fountain of being and of bliss. It inspires you with motives of high and lofty enterprise, stimulates you to manly action, and points out a prize worthy of the best efforts of body, soul, and spirit. Is it not, then, 'a credible saying, and worthy of universal acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, even the chief?'

But you ask, 'Where shall the kingdom of heaven be found, and how may you be constituted a citizen of it?' The Prophets and Apostles must be your guide in deciding these great questions. Moses in the law, all the Prophets, and all the Apostles point you to the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world—the Apostle of the Father Almighty—the divinely constituted Chief of the kingdom of heaven. He has submitted his claims to your examination—he has invited you to test all his pretensions—and to the humble and docile he has tendered all necessary assistance, in deciding upon his person and mission.

His character is so familiar, so condescending, so full of all grace and goodness, that all may approach him. The halt, the maimed, the deaf, the dumb, the blind, found in him a friend and physician indeed. None importunes his aid in vain. His ears are always open to the tale of woe. His eye streams with sympathy on every object of distress. He invites all the wretched, and repulses none who implore relief. He chides only the proud, and kindly receives and blesses the humble. He invites and beseeches the weary, the heavy laden, the broken hearted, the oppressed, and all the sons of want and misfortune to come to him, and tenders relief to all.

In his official dignity he presides over the universe. He is the High Priest of God and the Prophet and Messenger of Peace. He has the key of David; he opens and shuts the Paradise of God. He is the only Potentate, and has the power of granting remission of all sins to all who obey him.

To receive him in his personal glory and official dignity and supremacy, as the Messiah of God, the only begotten of the Father—to know him in his true and proper character,

thus accredits him is not far from the kingdom of heaven. To assume him as your Prophet, your High Priest, and your King; to submit to him in these relations, being immersed into his death, will translate you into the kingdom of heaven. Why not, then, gladly and immediately yield him the admiration of your understanding, and the homage of your heart? Why not now enter into the possession of all the riches, and fulness, and excellence of the kingdom? He commands *all* men to repent—he beseeches every sinner whom he addresses in his word, to receive pardon and eternal life as a gracious gift.

Can you doubt his power to save, to instruct, and to sanctify you for heaven? Can you doubt his condescending mercy and compassion? Will not he that pitied the blind Bartimeus, that condoled with the widow of Nain, that wept with Mary and Martha at the grave of Lazarus, that heard the plea of the Syrophenician woman, that cleansed the supplicating leper, that compassionated the famishing multitudes, and looked with pity (even in the agonies of (he cross) upon an importuning thief, have pity upon you, and every returning prodigal, who sues for mercy at the gate of his kingdom?

Is there in the universe, one whom you can believe with more assurance, than the Faithful and True Witness, who, in the presence of Pontius Pilate, witnessed a good confession at the hazard of his life? Is there any person in heaven, on earth, or under the earth, more worthy of your confidence, than the sinner's friend—than he who, always, and in all circumstances, bore testimony to the truth? When did he ever violate his word, or suffer his promise to fail? Who ever repented of his confidence in Jesus, or of relying implicitly upon his word? Who ever was put to shame because of confidence in him?

Who can offer such inducements to obedience to his authority, as the Saviour of the world? Who has such power to bless? He has all authority in heaven and on earth. He has power to forgive sins, to raise the dead, to bestow immortality and eternal life, and to judge the living and the dead. And has he not tendered a participation of his official authority to every one who submits to his government, and who, by him, is reconciled to God? If he have wisdom and power divine, has he not pledged these to the relief, guidance, and benefit of his people? Who can injure them under his protection—condemn whom he justifies—criminate whom

he pardons—or snatch out of his hands, those who betake themselves to his mercy?

Was there ever love like his love—compassion like his compassion—or condescension like his condescension! Who ever could—who ever did humble himself like the Son of God? On whose cheek ever flowed tears of purer sympathy for human woe, than those he shed? Whose bowels ever moved with such compassion, as that which dissolved his heart in tender mercies for the afflicted sons and daughters of men? Who ever for his friends, endured such contradiction of sinners against himself; submitted to such indignities; sustained such accumulated sorrows and griefs; suffered such agonies of mind and body; as those which he endured in giving his life an offering for his enemies? Forsaken by his God, abandoned by his friends, deserted of every stay, surrounded by the fiercest enemies, the most implacable foes, whose hearts were harder than adamant, insulting the very pangs which they inflicted, he expired on the accursed tree! The heavens blushed at the sight—the sun covered his face—the earth trembled—the rocks split—the veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom—and graves opened. All nature stood horror-stricken, when Roman soldiers, urged by blood-thirsty priests, nailed him to the cross—when the chief priests, scribes, and elders in derision said, 'He saved others: cannot he save himself?' The person who perceives not, who feels not the eloquence of his love consummated in his death—the tenderness of his entreaties and expostulations, is not to be reasoned with—is not to be moved by human power. Will you not, then, honor your reason by honoring the Son of God—by giving up your understanding, your wills, your affections, to the teachings of the Good Spirit—to the guidance of his love? Then, and only then, *you you, will* you feel yourselves safe, secure, and happy.

Need you to be reminded how much you are indebted to his long suffering patience already—to his benevolence in all the gifts and bounties of his providence vouchsafed to you? How many days and nights has he guarded, sustained, and succored you! Has he not saved you from ten thousand dangers—from the pestilence that walks in darkness secretly, and from destruction that wastes at noon day? Who can tell but he has lengthened out your unprofitable existence to this very hour, that you might now repent of all your sins, turn to God with your whole heart, be baptized

is the only prerequisite to the obedience of faith. He that for the remission of your past transgressions, be adopted into the family of God, and yet receive an inheritance among the sanctified. Arise, then, in the strength of Israel's God—accept salvation at his hands—enter into his kingdom, and be for ever blessed. You will not, you cannot repent of such a step, of such a noble surrender of yourself while life endures, in the hour of death, in the day of judgment, nor during the endless succession of ages in eternity. *To-day*, then, hear his voice: to-morrow may be for ever too late! All things are ready——Come!——Saints on earth, and angels in heaven—apostles, prophets, and martyrs, will rejoice over you—and you will rejoice with them for ever and for ever.——Amen!

Index.

A

Abraham	135
Address to the Belligerent Aliens	392
Citizens of the Kingdom	381
Allegory	35
Analogy of Faith	66
Scripture	64
Ascension of the Messiah	173
Authors of the Bible	17

B

Baptist	234
Barnabas	224
Blessing of Abraham	139
Breaking the Loaf	311
Proposition 1.	312
" II.	313
" III.	315
" IV.	316
" V.	317
" VI.	320
" VII.	321

C

Catachresis	45
Chapters, Verses, and Punctuation	93
Clement and Hermas	225
Concluding Addresses	381
Context	60
Coronation of the Messiah	173
Covenant of Circumcision	136
Cyprian	230

D

Defects of Modern Christianity	251
Dialogue on the Holy Spirit	343

E	
Emphasis	91
End of Sects	121
Ensigns and Devices	75
Episcopalian	231
F	
Fact	106
Faith	110
Figurative meaning of Scripture	27
Figures of Speech	47
Foundation of Christian Union	101
Fundamental Fact	118
H	
Hieroglyphics	69
Hyperbole	44
I	
Immersion not a mere bodily act	253
Inspiration of the Bible	18
Irony	43
J	
Jewish Institution	140
Justification ascribed to Seven Causes	274
Justin Martyr	227
K	
Kingdom of Heaven	129
Coming of	164
Constitution of	153
Elements of	150
Induction into	163
King of	156
Laws of	159
Manners and Customs of	162
Name of	151
Present Administration of	175
Subjects of	157
Territory of	161
L	
Language of the Bible	22
M	
Meaning of Words	23
Literal	25

M

Metaphor	30
Beautiful	32
Bold	32
Both Rude and Bold	33
Methodist	233
Metonymy	38
of the Cause	38
Effect	39
Subject	39
Adjunct	40
Mystical Actions	80
Allegory	76

N

New Birth	273
Life	275

O

Origen	229
--------------	-----

P

Parable	86
Patriarchal Age of the World	129
Peter in Jerusalem and Paul in Philippi, reconciled	256
Preface	3
Presbyterian	233
Principles of Interpretation	15
Proverb	90
Purity of Speech	123

R

Reformation	265
Regeneration	257 268
Bath of	270
of the Church	281
Heavens and the Earth	300
World	299
Physical	276
Use of the Theory of	278
Remission of Sins	183
Proposition I.	185
" II.	186
" III.	187
" IV.	188
" V.	188

R	
Proposition VI.	189
" VII.	194
" VIII.	196
" IX.	198
" X.	203
" XI.	223
" XII.	231
Conclusion of	243
Recapitulation	241
Renewing of the Holy Spirit	274
Repentance	261
Rules of Interpretation	95
S	
Scope	62
Sinaitic Covenant	137
Subject Matter	58
Symbols	72
Synecdoche	42
T	
Tertullian	228
Testimony	108
Confirmation of the	113
Three Dispensations	94
Two Promises	136
Seeds	138
Type	84
U	
Usage of Words	50
W	
Wall Dr. W. (Author of the History of Infant Baptism)	
Testimony of	226
Word to Friendly Aliens	389
Word to the Moral Regenerators of this Age	301
Written Revelation	15