

# Studies in the New Testament

A. Webster



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Philip Schaff

STUDIES  
IN THE  
NEW TESTAMENT:  
OR  
EXPOSITORY DISCUSSIONS  
OF  
NUMEROUS PASSAGES  
OF THE  
SACRED TEXT.

---

BY A. WEBSTER, D. D.,  
PASTOR OF ST. JOHN'S (INDPT.) M. P. CHURCH, BALTIMORE.

---

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR  
BY ISAAC FRIEDENWALD,  
103 West Fayette Street.  
1879.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1879,  
BY A. WEBSTER,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington City.

FB14

W37

156735

## PREFACE.

---

IN presenting these discussions to the public, it may be proper to remark, that while they are the product of some years of thought and study, they were written during a few of the late summer weeks, without any special regard to style, and with so limited literary apparatus, that the collection might be called reminiscences of studies in the New Testament. The author hopes he has made himself intelligible; which is the extent of his wishes in that direction. The chief object was to aid in a satisfactory understanding of the New Testament; which contains the plan of salvation: a subject of the deepest interest to us all.

The book was not designed to be eccentric, heretical, controversial, or *ad captandum* in any evil sense: but to be a serious, plain, unpretending examination of certain passages of Scripture; according to the understanding of the author, who has found no more delightful employment, than drinking from the "wells of salvation;" and leading thither the thirsty, to partake with him of the living water.

His younger brethren in the ministry, may, perhaps, find something helpful to them, in their studies of the

subjects herein treated. He hopes so. It will be a great pleasure to him, should such be the case.

He has the highest and most tender respect, for the right of private judgment; that great Christian principle; and, so, feels it a moral obligation, to treat all Christian denominations, and schools of theology, with affectionate regard: aiming to promote union in spirit and social peace. Good-tempered discussions of doctrine, and order, he thinks decidedly better suited to secure such results; than is the tendency of rude, precipitate, unkind controversy, dissension, and schism.

Truth is changeless, and, therefore, immortal: and as orthodoxy is conformed necessarily to truth, surely it is worth while for us all to be orthodox: to which the road direct is patient thought, kind discussion, in prayerful reliance on Him, who is to "lead us into all truth."

BALTIMORE, Nov. 6, 1878.

# INDEX.

---

	PAGE
JOHN THE BAPTIST. Matt iii. 1. . . . .	1
BAPTISM OF JOHN CONTRASTED WITH THAT OF CHRIST. Matt. iii. 11, 12. . . . .	3
THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST. Matt. iv. 1-11. . . . .	7
THE KINGDOM OF GOD BENEFICENT. Matt. vi. 33. . . . .	8
THE CENTURION. Matt. viii. 9. . . . .	10
LEARNING MEEKNESS OF CHRIST. Matt. xi. 29. . . . .	11
THE RULER'S DAUGHTER. Matt. ix. 18-25. . . . .	12
THE WITHERED HAND. Matt. xii. 10. . . . .	16
THE UNPARDONABLE SIN. Matt. xii. 31. . . . .	18
WHY DID CHRIST USE PARABLES? Matt. xiii. 10. . . . .	20
THE WOMAN OF CANAAN. Matt. xv. 21-28. . . . .	24
THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH. Matt. xvi. 18. . . . .	29
THE LABORERS AND THEIR WAGES. Matt. xx. 1-16. . . . .	34
THE LORD'S SUPPER. Matt. xxvi. 26-28. . . . .	44
THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK. Matt. xxviii. 1. . . . .	52
CHRISTIAN BAPTISM. Matt. xxviii. 19. . . . .	88
SIMEON'S SUPPOSED PRAYER. Luke ii. 29. . . . .	123
CHRIST'S SUPPOSED FIRST VISIT TO JERUSA- LEM. Luke ii. 41-51. . . . .	126
THE TWO BUILDERS. Luke vi. 47-49. . . . .	129
WHY DID SHE LOVE MUCH? Luke vii. 47. . . . .	132
THE ONE THING NEEDFUL. Luke x. 38-42 . . . . .	136
WHICH LORD COMMENDED THE UNJUST STEW- ARD? Luke xvi. 8. . . . .	140



	PAGE
THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS. Luke xvi. 19-31. . . . .	144
THE GLORY OF THE SON. John i. 14. . . . .	151
ANGELS ASCENDING AND DESCENDING UPON THE SON OF MAN. John i. 51. . . . .	154
WHAT HAVE I TO DO WITH THEE? John ii. 4. . . . .	158
THE INTERVIEW WITH NICODEMUS. John iii. 1. . . . .	164
EXCEPT THE FATHER DRAW HIM. John vi. 44. . . . .	169
NO MAN TAKETH IT FROM ME. John x. 18. . . . .	174
WHAT SHALL I SAY? John xii. 27. . . . .	180
WHY THEY COULD NOT BELIEVE. John xii. 39. . . . .	182
WHY WAS PETER GRIEVED? John xxi. 17. . . . .	187
IMPORTANCE OF THE ACTS. . . . .	199
WAS MATTHIAS AN APOSTLE? Acts i. 15-26. . . . .	207
THE CHURCH: THE BISHOP. Acts ii. 47. . . . .	222
THE SUPPOSED DEACONS. Acts vi. 1-6. . . . .	237
LAYING ON HANDS. Acts vi. 6. . . . .	251
ORDINATION. Acts vi. 6. . . . .	257
APOLLOS. Acts xviii. 24-28. . . . .	268
WAS AGRIPPA ALMOST PERSUADED? Acts xxvi. 28, 29. . . . .	275
FROM FAITH TO FAITH. Rom. i. 17. . . . .	287
THE LAW OF FAITH. Rom. iii. 27. . . . .	294
WHY IS FAITH COUNTED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS? Rom. iv. 5. . . . .	311
WE GLORY IN TRIBULATIONS — BECAUSE —. Rom. v. 3-5 . . . . .	315
ADAM AND CHRIST. Rom. v. 12-21. . . . .	319
NO CONDEMNATION TO THOSE IN CHRIST. Rom. viii. 1. . . . .	324
WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT. Rom. viii. 16. . . . .	327
GOD'S PURPOSE ACCORDING TO ELECTION. Rom. ix. 11. . . . .	347
A SACRIFICE, LIVING, HOLY, ACCEPTABLE TO GOD. Rom. xii. 1, 2. . . . .	367

	PAGE
SEEING THROUGH A GLASS. I Cor. xiii. 12. . . . .	384
THE LORD THE SPIRIT. II Cor. iii. 6-18. . . . .	389
THE EARTHLY TABERNACLE: THE HOUSE	
FROM HEAVEN. II Cor. v. 1-9. . . . .	395
IF ONE DIED FOR ALL. II Cor. v. 14. . . . .	402
THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT. Gal. v. 17. . . . .	409
OF WHOM THE WHOLE FAMILY IS NAMED. Eph.	
iii. 14-19. . . . .	415
THE PASSIBILITY OF DEITY. Coloss. ii. 9-15. . . . .	422
THE END OF THE COMMANDMENT. I Tim. i. 5. . . . .	427
THE ROOT OF EVIL. I Tim. vi. 9, 10. . . . .	430
WHY CROWNED WITH GLORY AND HONOR?	
Heb. ii. 6-9. . . . .	431
WHOSE END IS TO BE BURNED. Heb. vi. 4-8. . . . .	434
THAT WITHIN THE VAIL. Heb. vi. 17-20. . . . .	443
NOT A DEFINITION OF FAITH. Heb. xi. 1. . . . .	448
FAITH WITHOUT WORKS; DEAD. Jas. ii. 26. . . . .	453
SUFFERING AND GLORY OF CHRIST. I Peter i.	
10-12. . . . .	457
PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON. I Peter	
iii. 16. . . . .	459
THE ELDERS OF THE CHURCH. I Peter v. 1-4. . . . .	470
THE SUPPOSED CHORUS OF GRACES. II Pet. i. 5-7. . . . .	475
IS IT HE, OR IT, SHALL APPEAR? I John iii. 2, 3. . . . .	479
HE CAN, AND CANNOT, SIN. I John ii. 1. . . . .	485
THE BELOVED LOOKING FOR MERCY. Jude 20, 21. . . . .	492
THE MODEL CHURCH. Rev. xxi. . . . .	498
THE SPIRIT AND THE BRIDE. Rev. xxii. 17. . . . .	514

## SCRIPTURES REFERRED TO OR EXPLAINED.

### MATTHEW.

	PAGE		PAGE
iii. 8-10: . . . . .	222	xxii. 42: . . . . .	128
iii. 9: . . . . .	4	xxiii. 37: . . . . .	172
ix. 37, 38: . . . . .	88	xxv. 14-30: . . . . .	22
x. 1: . . . . .	214	xxvi. 29: . . . . .	196
xx. 26: . . . . .	272	xxvi. 38: . . . . .	180
xxii. 14: . . . . .	36	xxviii. 19, 20: . . . . .	116, 157

### MARK.

i. 4: . . . . .	437	vii. 4: . . . . .	106
iii. 14: . . . . .	211, 214, 259	x. 42, 43: . . . . .	200, 225
iv. 33: . . . . .	21	xvi. 15: . . . . .	40
v. 9: . . . . .	158	xvi. 16: . . . . .	109, 113

### LUKE.

i. 35: . . . . .	128	vi. 49: . . . . .	286
ii. 34: . . . . .	49	xiii. 34, 35: . . . . .	172, 183, 361
vi. 13: . . . . .	214	xix. 42: . . . . .	21

### JOHN.

i. 29-34: . . . . .	2, 216	viii. 56: . . . . .	350
iii. 8: . . . . .	455	x. 30: . . . . .	152
iii. 18: . . . . .	490	x. 11: . . . . .	14
iii. 22-26: . . . . .	3, 98	xiii. 7: . . . . .	388
iii. 35: . . . . .	177	xiv. 9: . . . . .	152
iv. 1, 2: . . . . .	259, 263	xv. 2: . . . . .	202
iv. 38: . . . . .	88	xv. 5: . . . . .	222
v. 40: . . . . .	21, 183	xv. 16: . . . . .	260
v. 46: . . . . .	170	xvi. 12: . . . . .	21
vi. 14: . . . . .	259	xvii. 5: . . . . .	152
vi. 33, 47, 51: . . . . .	335	xix. 34: . . . . .	92
vi. 37, 40, 55: . . . . .	19, 296, 92	xx. 25, 29: . . . . .	290
viii. 28: . . . . .	153	xx. 30, 31: . . . . .	203

## ACTS.

PAGE		PAGE	
i. 4-8: . . . . .	5, 208, 213, 217	x. 2: . . . . .	120
i. 16: . . . . .	159, 238, 240	x. 28: . . . . .	215
i. 22: . . . . .	260	x. 42: . . . . .	261
ii. 2-4: . . . . .	5, 254	xi. 29, 30: . . . . .	226, 249
ii. 14-21: . . . . .	173, 224	xiii. 1-3: . . . . .	255
ii. 29, 37, 38: . . . . .	101, 107	xiii. 48: . . . . .	261
ii. 41-47: . . . . .	101, 226, 238, 239	xiv. 23: . . . . .	263
iv. 12: . . . . .	216	xvi. 4: . . . . .	263
iv. 33: . . . . .	239	xvi. 14, 15: . . . . .	120
iv. 36: . . . . .	256	xvi. 33, 34: . . . . .	121
v. 13. . . . .	240	xvii. 2, 3: . . . . .	218
vi. 3: . . . . .	204	xvii. 31: . . . . .	263
vi. 5-8: . . . . .	215	xix. 1-12: . . . . .	257, 271
vi. 9: . . . . .	243	xix. 40: . . . . .	26
vii. 51, 52: . . . . .	175, 361	xx. 17-35: . . . . .	228, 230, 232, 426
viii. 4: . . . . .	233, 246, 271	xxi. 8: . . . . .	241
ix. 10-12: . . . . .	255	xxii. 16: . . . . .	106
ix. 15, 17, 18: . . . . .	221	xxvi. 23: . . . . .	90

## ROMANS.

i. 1: . . . . .	378	viii. 3: . . . . .	295
i. 11: . . . . .	256	viii. 17: . . . . .	417
iii. 1: . . . . .	38	ix. 23: . . . . .	265
iii. 23: . . . . .	315	x. 4: . . . . .	390, 428
iii. 26: . . . . .	312	x. 10, 17: . . . . .	291, 303, 450, 453
iii. 28: . . . . .	456	xi. 13: . . . . .	249
iv. 2: . . . . .	330	xii. 2: . . . . .	436
iv. 25: . . . . .	305, 326, 433	xiii. 1: . . . . .	262
v. 6-8: . . . . .	406	xiii. 8: . . . . .	196
v. 12-21: . . . . .	403, 433, 501	xiii. 10: . . . . .	376
vi. 1-6: . . . . .	116, 429	xv. 13: . . . . .	337
vii. 10: . . . . .	264	xvi. 25, 26: . . . . .	351

## I CORINTH.

ii. 7: . . . . .	264	x. 1, 2: . . . . .	106
vii. 14, 17: . . . . .	108, 113, 264	xv. 5, 29, 45: . . . . .	212, 100, 335
ix. 21: . . . . .	405	xvi. 12: . . . . .	272

## II CORINTH.

iv. 6, 13, 16: . . . . .	152, 246, 437	vii. 1: . . . . .	101
v. 14-20: . . . . .	325, 378, 302, 406		

## GALAT.

	PAGE		PAGE
i. 1:	209, 219	v. 6:	453
ii. 11-16, 20:	215, 325	v. 16, 17:	308, 300
iii. 13, 19, 24, 26:	326, 405, 323 334, 428	vi. 1:	438

## EPHES.

i. 4:	484	iv. 15, 16:	196
ii. 10:	265	v. 14:	14
iv. 9:	507		

## PHILIP.

i. 1:	228	iii. 12-14:	307, 378
ii. 12:	311		

## COLOSS.

ii. 12:			116
---------	--	--	-----

## I TIM.

i. 5:	390	v. 17:	233
iii. 2:	231		

## II TIM.

ii. 20, 21:			364
-------------	--	--	-----

## TITUS.

i. 5, 7:	265, 231	ii. 14:	327
----------	----------	---------	-----

## HEB.

i. 3:	334	vii. 7:	247
v. 1:	265, 447	x. 15-17; 19-23:	329, 342
v. 9:	481	xi. 8:	448
vi. 4-6:	488		

## I PETER.

i. 25:	336	v. 2:	232, 235
--------	-----	-------	----------

## II PETER.

i. 4:	420	iii. 9, 15:	364, 365
i. 17-21:	329, 337		

## I JOHN.

iii. 1, 8, 9:	306, 347, 367, 308	v. 1:	490
---------------	--------------------	-------	-----

## JUDE.

4:			266
----	--	--	-----

## REV.

v. 8:	496	xix. 10:	331, 391
viii. 3, 4:	496	xxi. 14, 23:	214, 226

## ERRORS.

Among the typographical inaccuracies that escaped correction, are the following :—

Page 49, fifth line from bottom, read *victim*.

Page 91, eleventh line from bottom, *entered in*.

Page 216, seventh line from bottom, insert semi-colon after N. T.

Page 275, eleventh line from bottom, period after expression.

Page 287, fourth line from bottom, read *the whole*.

Page 298, thirteenth line from bottom, *inspires*.

Page 406, eleventh line from top, *dikaiou*.

Page 406, fifteenth line from top, *heemoon*.

# STUDIES

IN THE

# NEW TESTAMENT.

---

---

## JOHN THE BAPTIST.

MATTH. iii. 1.—In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea. 2. And saying, *Repent ye*, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

JOHN was of priestly descent; of miraculous birth; God's Messenger, sent to prepare the way of the Messiah (*Mal.* iii. 1); the voice crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord (*Isai.* xl. 3).

The Mosaic ritual was not *real*, but *figurative*; made after a *pattern* shown to Moses in the mount. That pattern was the *real*, the *great facts* of salvation, God's righteousness—*i. e.*, God's method of constituting a sinner righteous with Him; and so the Mosaic ritual was symbolic, outward, exhibitivè, temporary.

But the Jews who guarded this sacred testimony, for the benefit of mankind, fell into the error of thinking their ritual *real* and *eternal*, and were shocked at the idea of the institutions of Moses being superseded.

Therefore John came, to prepare the way of the Messiah, that the latter might enter among the symbols, as their meaning, their signification, their truth. The remission of sins was no longer to be declared by the priest, as the sequel of the sinner's conformity to

certain rites ; but he must REPENT : he *preached* REPENTANCE *for the remission of sins*.

The Mosaic ritual was fearfully admonitory of sin—universal sin—not even the sanctified High Priest himself being free from its pollution, or the necessity of offering the symbolic atoning blood for himself and the people. *Heb. ix. 7*. And the entire system taught a salvation from sin—the salvation from Rome, and the glory of Israel, with every other benefit, being included in a real atonement for sin, by the real victim, offered by the real High Priest.

John went in among the symbols, an extraordinary messenger, to lead in the substance, the significance, the truth of all those types, and proclaim the Lamb of God, and the one who baptizeth, cleanseth with His OWN BLOOD and the HOLY GHOST. *John i. 29-34*.

Baptism was nothing new to the Jews ; their ritual abounded in it ; they had DIVERS BAPTISMS (*diaphor-  
ois baptismois*) ; *Heb. ix. 10* ; but they were regulated by ritual, and by *his* administration of it, John seemed to claim to be an extraordinary person ; therefore, they said among themselves, It may be the Christ ! Or Elias ! (*Mal. iv. 5*.) Or that prophet ! So they sent to inquire “ WHO art thou ? ” Not what is baptism ? For they knew that baptism was a figure, a sign, a symbol, having relation to cleansing from impurity, for which their ritual provided, prescribing *divers baptisms* for the figurative cleansing of the Jews.

John came before the Christ, not to do the latter’s work, but to prepare the way for Him ; to declare to the Jews that they must look into their system, learn its symbolic character, see that it typed the plan of salvation from sin for all people, and receive Him who was to *fulfill* and complete it all in His own person—the Seed of Abraham ; the High Priest of man ; the True Temple ; the Son of God.



## BAPTISM OF JOHN CONTRASTED WITH THAT OF CHRIST.

MATH. iii. 11, 12.—I indeed baptize you with WATER unto REPENTANCE. \* \* \* He shall baptize you with the HOLY GHOST, and with FIRE: 12. Whose FAN is in His hand, and He will THOROUGHLY PURGE HIS FLOOR, and gather His WHEAT into the GARNER; but He will burn up the CHAFF with unquenchable FIRE.

**B**APTISM with water was a figurative cleansing, purifying, purging. It was much used in the Mosaic ritual, and was well understood by the Jews. So (*John* iii. 22-26), we have Jesus and his disciples baptizing, and John baptizing; which occasioned a dispute between John's disciples and the Jews about PURIFYING; where we see an easy, familiar transition from baptism to purifying.

According with this central thought, we recognize in our passage certain comparisons of John with Jesus; of the work of the former with that of the latter. The Baptist precedes the Messiah, and is the lesser; the Baptist's work is typical, the Messiah's real; the typical instrument is water; the instrumentality of the real is the Holy Ghost and fire. Thus the passage shows us in the work of the Baptist a figure of needed spiritual cleansing; and in the work of the Messiah the instrumentality, the process, and the consummation of the cleansing.

Those who needed cleansing were not the Jews only, but men, and the Jews as men. For John was not the forerunner of a Messiah to the Jews, but to men. Had he come to the Jews only, he would have come in the Jewish fashion, and he would not have been met

by the question, Why dost THOU baptize? But he came to widen the Jewish vision, teaching that their being the children of Abraham did not entitle them to a part in the Messiah of men (*Matt.* iii. 9); only men, as men, had title here.

To show the work of the Messiah of men, the Evangelist exhibits a THRESHING-FLOOR, to which the sheaves of wheat have been brought, threshed, and a mass of wheat and chaff intermixed encumbers the floor. To thoroughly purge this floor, not the wheat, the husbandman uses a simple instrument, a fan, a wooden shovel, with which he throws from the heap into the wind, which separates the chaff from the wheat, each falling into its own mass; then gathering the wheat, he conveys it into the garner, the granary; next setting fire to the chaff, which is all that remains on the floor, the thorough purging of the latter is accomplished. The Messiah has destroyed the work of the Devil. *I John* iii. 8. The refusers of the Gospel, the finally impenitent, the wicked, have gone into everlasting punishment; the righteous into life eternal. *Matth.* xxv. 46. So that the passage before us is a glimpse of the opening and the close of the final, the Messianic Dispensation.

It is interesting to notice the use of the word UNQUENCHABLE (*asbestooi*). There is no need of *unquenchable* fire to consume *chaff*; such a consummation is rapid, and the fire is soon extinguished; it would be quite the reverse, were the chaff an inconsumable substance, that could supply itself as an exhaustless fuel to feed the fire, like the wonderful, immortal, impenitent being who ever supplies himself as the exhaustless fuel for the unquenchable fire. The man that lives in sin, unrepentant to the last, should have no hope of escaping from himself—HIMSELF is HELL!

The theory that the baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, is not sus-

tained by the Scriptural facts. The words of the record are: "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." *Acts* i. 5. Nothing about fire; nothing to lead them to expect fire. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." *Ib.* ii. 2-4. Has it escaped our notice, that there is no FIRE mentioned here? Luke says there came a sound from heaven *as* (*hoosper*) of a rushing, mighty wind; not a rushing, mighty wind, but *as* such. The sound is likened to a rushing, mighty wind; had it been a wind, he would not have likened it to a wind. And so he says there appeared unto them cloven tongues *like as* (*hoosei*) of fire; not tongues of fire, but *like as* of fire. Had they been tongues of fire he would not have likened them to fire. In what respect they resembled fire he does not say; but only that they did resemble fire. Not in heat, we suppose, as heat cannot be seen; and this was an appearance; "there appeared (*oophtheesan*) unto them cloven tongues like as of fire," etc. If not in heat, then perhaps in color or shape, as these are visible, can appear, be seen. The tongue is red, like fire. When the fire flames up it has somewhat the appearance of a number of tongues inter-twisting and leaping up into the air; and the cloven tongues may have been thus like fire. But if we cannot determine the resemblance, it certainly existed; for Luke says *like as* of fire. Not fire, but like fire. And, then, Joel says nothing about fire, except as a portentous sign in a series of "blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke." (Verse 19.)

Peter says their being filled with the Holy Ghost, and speaking with other tongues, was in fulfillment of "the

promise of the Father made through the prophet Joel: and Joel says, And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh (not merely upon prophets), and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy," etc. *Acts ii. 17*. The sound as of wind, the sight of cloven tongues as of fire, were not the baptism of the Holy Ghost; were no baptism of any sort. They preceded that baptism, but for what purpose Luke does not explain. As to the "cloven tongues" (the *diamerizomenai gloossai*, the divided tongues), the division might have been manifold, so that each tongue would have the appearance of a torch in the wind, many intertwisting flames, but yet only an appearance, not fire; and one of these torch-like tongues "sat upon each of them"—a very unusual form of baptism. The resting of a cloven tongue that looked like fire upon each of the one hundred and twenty disciples, was no form of baptism. But if it were, it was not a baptism by fire, for only the likeness of fire was present. Our Lord nowhere mentions any baptism with fire, but only with the Holy Ghost—the promise of the Father, by the mouth of the prophet Joel eight hundred years before—and the mode was by pouring; so the record is that the Spirit was poured upon them until they were saturated; for "they were all filled (*epleestheesan*) with the Holy Ghost." The sound and the tongues were signs, perhaps, that the testimony would be famous in its influence upon men, sweeping over the nations like the rushing, mighty wind, in all the languages of the earth, the living languages; for living tongues are red like fire; dead tongues do not look like fire. Wherever there is a human language it shall convey the tidings, the testimony that Jesus is the Christ. John's baptism was a type; that of the Christ is the reality. It is the FLOOR that he will purge, purify, by storing the wheat purified by the Holy Ghost in the garner; and burning up the chaff, the refusers of grace, with unquenchable fire.

## THE TEMPTATION.

MATTH. iv. 1-11.

A POINT of great interest with us, is the contrast of the temptations of the *first* and *second* Adam. Each represented the human race, MAN; each was MAN.

The *first* was in the highest grade of excellence, soul and body, and in the midst of full supplies for all his needs. "And the Lord God planted a garden, \* \* \* and there he put the man. \* \* \* And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food, \* \* \* And commanded, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." *Gen. ii. 8-17.*

The *second* was in a condition of infirmity. Though it is with difficulty that the mind admits this thought, which the Scripture teaches in describing Him as a partaker of flesh and blood; in all things made like us; tempted; suffering. *Heb. ii. 14-18.* And instead of Eden, a WILDERNESS, deprived of society and food. Forty days and forty nights did He fast; and then, while in this loneliness and destitution, comes the tempter, proposing to Him also an improvement of His condition—that He should use His own resources, be independent of God, supply Himself with provisions, guards, and a kingdom, instead of continuing to be a destitute, lonely occupant of a miserable wilderness.

The first man, in all the superiority of his condition, failed—yielded to the temptation—and the earth became gloomy with sin, death, and woe.

The second man, under all His disadvantages, overcame—resisting the temptation successfully—showing

Himself the master of the tempter, and kindling in the earth the bright hope of a restoration to righteousness, life, and bliss.

The particular passage, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (verse 5), we understand to signify, that, as a creature, man must obey his Creator, wholly, in every respect, if he would be happy. It is highly reasonable, that the Creator's will must be fulfilled, for man to be happy. Having bread is God's will, but not His entire will. Food is given by express revelation, and man must seek it, even though it cost him hard toil. *Gen.* i. 29; ii. 16; ix. 3. But this bread is to sustain the body, while the higher needs of man are sought for, in obedience to God's revealed will, regulating all our relations to Himself and to our fellows; and while bread may be properly obtained by the sweat of our brow, it cannot be properly obtained by a violation of any precept of God; as such violation is injustice to Him, to our fellow, to ourself; is a sin—and sin is death, not life. Man may *die*, but cannot *live*, by bread alone. Man's life is in obedience to all the will of God. So a grand preacher said, "I have not shunned to declare unto you ALL THE COUNSEL (*pasan teen bouleen*), ALL THE WILL of God." He desired that they should LIVE.

---

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD BENEFICENT.

MATTH. vi. 33.—But seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you.

**W**E should not busy ourselves with the affairs of this life, as if they were our highest, ultimate interests; but as our first, chief, essential obligation, we should seek

to understand our relation to God ; our obligations to Him ; our expectations from Him.

1. God, THEOS: the PLACER, DISPOSER, ARRANGER of all things: so *Herodotus*, Book II, chap. 52, "The Pelasgians at first offered all things in sacrifice to the gods, giving them neither names nor surnames, for they knew of none such. But they called them *theous* (placers, disposers), because they looked upon them as being those (*thentes*) disposing in order and beauty all the constituents of the universe." The old Greek *theo* signified to *put*, to *place*. He who was wise, good, and mighty enough to create and arrange the universe, must necessarily will His plan to be carried out, that all His intelligent creatures should understand, enjoy and glorify Him through it. Man, God's representative on earth ; His vicegerent ; put above all earthly beings ; with his face not prone to the earth, like a mere animal, regarding that as the source of his supply ; but, with his face lifted from earth and toward heaven, that he might seek thence the supply needed by his higher nature, that makes him so superior to the creatures around him, and under his dominion.

2. THE KINGDOM OF GOD: king and kingdom are relative terms ; in Greek, *basileus* and *basileia* ; the latter derived from the former ; as is kingdom from king. *Basileus* is derived from *basis*, a support, a base ; and *laos*, the people ; as though the king were to be the *support* of the people ; which is true only of the Kingdom of God. For in the human plan, royalty is on top, pressing down upon the people, who support the king in his power, glory, wars, everything. They pay for all, with their property, persons, lives. The greater the human king, the more glorious and warlike, the more the people are oppressed. Kings and popes are not supports of the people. "The kings of the Gentiles (nations) exercise lordship (*kurieuously*, lord it)

over them. But you not so (you shall not use this principle, there shall be neither king nor pope among you, whom I am leading back to God TO BE SUPPORTED by Him, on His plan), for you are to be like God, benefactors, doing good to each other." *Matth.* xx. 25; *Mark* x. 42; *Luke* xxii. 25. God alone, of all kings, fulfills this promise of support to His people, and, so, is the only true King. Therefore, it is our highest interest to seek admittance into His Kingdom.

3. *His righteousness*; His method of counting one righteous; *i. e.*, of acknowledging him as a subject, invested with the rights, privileges and obligations of His kingdom; *i. e.*, His naturalization law. The condition is *faith*, true faith in the Gospel of His Son, Jesus Christ. A faith that works, works by love, and purifies the heart. Just as he is, the sinner is to approach, believing that Jesus died in his stead, that His blood cleanseth him from all sin, and that he is accepted for Jesus' sake.

---

## THE CENTURION.

MATTH. viii. 9.—For *I* am a man under authority, having soldiers under *me*, and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth, etc.

THE centurion was remarkable for his *humility* and *faith*. In his estimate his house was unworthy of a visit from the Messiah, who was quite able to heal his palsied servant by His will, His order, without His presence. *I* am a man under authority, accustomed to obey orders from my superiors, understanding obedience to be necessary on the part of one *under* authority; other-



wise I should be punished. So, I have soldiers under *me* and they must obey *me*, under pain of my displeasure and punitive authority.

This common-sense view of the matter greatly pleased our Lord, who highly commended it, and granted his prayer. Common-sense presentations of the Gospel are better than metaphysical speculations. The few only are capable of subtle, abstract reasonings; while the Gospel being designed for the many, the masses, is presented in plain figures of speech, easy to be understood. How the will influences the muscles, who can understand? That such is the fact, is known to every one by *experience*.

---

## IMITATION OF CHRIST.

MATTH. xi. 29.—And learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls.

**J**ESUS, the Christ, the second Adam, was MEEK (*praus*), gentle, content, satisfied with his position; LOWLY IN HEART (*tapeinos teei kardiai*), not aspiring, not ambitious, not wishing to be anything other than the second Adam.

The teacher moulds the pupil, makes him to resemble himself. If the teacher be a musician, he moulds the pupil to be like him. I am meek and lowly in heart; therefore I have rest; I am content with my position: learn of me; be meek and lowly in heart, and you, too, shall find rest unto your souls. There is no other path to rest, and no other need be sought after; nothing but

learning of Christ, and so being like Christ, will ever satisfy any of our sinful race.

Adam was not meek and lowly in heart; was not content with his splendid condition and position, his brilliant surrounding and glorious leadership of humanity; but aspired to a higher condition, the divinely appointed one no longer being satisfactory. But, by his ambition, neither he nor we found rest. The infinite, unerring Wisdom appointed him a happy lot, amid all things necessary and delightful; and how could he be happy, at rest, in abandoning his position?

Jesus, amid the gloomy surroundings of sin and death, occupied his position of second Adam, second Leader of humanity, with the dreadful woe of Gethsemane, Calvary, and the Sepulchre before him, content with His position, aspiring to be nothing other than the bearer of human guilt, the sympathizer with human misery, the sharer of human temptations, the deliverer of humanity from guilt, death, and despair. For, beyond all the horror, he saw the joy of success, endured the cross, despised the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the Throne of God. *Heb. xii. 2.*

---

---

## THE RULER'S DAUGHTER.

MATTH. ix. 18-25; MARK iv. 22-43; LUKE viii. 41-56.

IT is a question, Was the ruler's daughter dead? Perhaps this cannot be demonstrated *pro* or *con*. The writer, upon careful examination of the narratives of the three Evangelists, believes she was not really, but apparently, dead.

According to *Matth.*, the ruler Jairus, when he came to and worshipped our Lord, said, "My daughter is even now dead (*arti eteleuteese*);" *Mark*, "My little daughter lieth at the point of death (*eschatoos echei*);" *Luke*, "\* \* \* he had an only daughter, about twelve years of age, and she lay a dying (*kai hautee apethneeske*)." Jairus testifies, first, She is dead; secondly, She is at the point of death; while *Luke* affirms, She lay a dying. *Matthew* and *Mark* relate the words of *Jairus*; *Luke* gives the statement of the fact in his own words. *Apethneeske*, used in the last instance, is in the imperfect tense, and is thought by some to be equivalent to *Matthew's eteleuteese*, both signifying that she was dead. But as the present renderings of the three passages are two to one that she was *not* dead, the proposed change would merely give us two to one that she *was* dead, and would not harmonize the accounts. Moreover, *Wetstein*, as quoted by *Parkhurst*, shows that the Greek writers use this form of the verb in the sense *was a dying*: as *Maximus Tyrius*, xxiv. 9:—*Memphetai teei Xanthippeei oduromeneei oti* (read *ote*) *apethneeske*, "He blames Xantippe for bewailing when he *was a dying*." *Lidd. & Scott* give *to be dying* as one of the meanings of this verb; and refer to *ekthneesko*, a verb that is used by *Plato* to signify *to lie for dead, to lie in a swoon*, opp. to *ontoos tethneekenai*, actually dead.

*Mark* and *Luke* both state that while *Jairus* was with our Lord on the way to the house, word was brought him that his daughter was dead—a fact that cannot be reconciled with the hypothesis that she was dead when her father left her. It is most likely, then, that he had left her, as he supposed, *in extremis*, as *Mark* represents him declaring, *eschatoos echei*, she is in her last moments; that by the time he reached our Lord she had died (as seems to be hinted by *arti* and the indefinite

*aorist*), which was not the case. But soon thereafter, the household supposing her to be dead, as she lay insensible in a swoon, the news of her seeming death was sent to the father, that he need not put our Lord to the trouble of a useless visit. The household thought her dead; they were weeping and bewailing her; but in the very midst of the lamentation and despair, Jesus said, as He entered the chamber, Weep not; she is not dead (*ou apethanen*), but sleepeth (*katheudei*). The three Evangelists are in entire agreement here, each using *apethane* and *katheudei* for dead and *sleepeth*. Jairus said she was dead, and also she was dying; Luke says she was dying; the message from the house to Jairus was that she was dead. But Matthew, Mark, and Luke, with one voice, declare that Jesus said, She is *not dead*, but *sleepeth*. True, the wailers, hearing this, scorned Him, "knowing (*eidotes*) that she was dead (*apethanen*)."<sup>1</sup> But the force of *eidotes*, here, cannot be stronger than *they perceived, in their judgment*, etc.

In the case of Lazarus (*John xi. 11*), where our Lord says, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, the word used is *kekoimeetai*, a very different word from *katheudei*, it being found eighteen times in the New Testament, four of which allude to *sleep* and fourteen to *death*; while *katheudo* is used twenty-one times, and, omitting the three passages under discussion, there is not one clear, indisputable instance in which it signifies *death*. The two passages in which it *may* mean death, are *Ephes. v. 14*; *I Thess. v. 10*. And mark the order in which our Lord uses these words. In the case of *katheudei*, He declares she is *not dead*, *but* sleepeth. In the case of *kekoimeetai*, He declares, first, Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; and when He saw they misunderstood Him, He said unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead (*apethane*). Apart, then, from the difference in the words, the distinction of order, style, circumstances, is very obvious.

Of the maid, He denies first that she is dead, and affirms that she sleepeth ; of Lazarus, He first says, figuratively, He sleepeth ; then plainly, He is dead.

But upon the hypothesis that the maid was really dead, why did our Lord deny it, and rebuke the mourners who believed her dead, turning them "all out"? In the case of Lazarus, who was really dead, but who was to be raised from the dead presently, when He saw Mary "weeping, and the Jews also weeping who came with her, he groaned in the spirit, and was troubled;" and more than that, He wept; He united with the weepers, although He was then on His way to call him back to life. If, then, the maid was dead, why did He rebuke those who thought her dead, and were mourning for her, as the other Jews and Mary were mourning for Lazarus? Was it not as proper to mourn for the maid as for the man? If the maid was dead only for a season, presently to be raised, such, precisely, was the case with Lazarus. Further, there is no negative in what He said of Lazarus: he sleepeth; he is dead; not, he is not dead, but sleepeth; but, he sleepeth, and, more plainly, he is dead. And supposing there was no difference between the words *dead* and *sleepeth*, then our Lord meant that the maid was not dead, but was dead—an utterance that, perhaps, we should not attribute to Him.

But where is the impropriety of accepting our Lord's statement? It is very plain, very intelligible. She was not dead, but sleeping; insensible, seemingly dead, in a swoon, but really not dead; "and he took her by the hand, and called, saying, Maid, arise. And her spirit (*pneuma*, breath) came again, and she arose straight-way," etc. There is nothing to embarrass us; the narrative is intelligible; the maid was not dead; she was ill; had swooned.

But, in this case, there was no miracle; and why was the incident put upon record? We must admit, that

if the maid was not dead, as by our hypothesis, there was not indeed the miracle of raising the dead; but there was the miracle of curing the disease which had caused the fearful swoon, the suspended animation; as shown by "her breath coming again, her rising straight-way, and His command to give her food." The disease fled at His touch; at His call, her health returned; nor is there any need of affirming, against our Lord, that the maid was dead, so as to demonstrate His power to raise the dead; the proof of His possessing such power not needing the attestation of this incident; as it is established by other and abundant testimony. The widow's son; Lazarus; "the dead are raised;" etc.; leave no testimony to be needed on that point. There is no questioning our Lord's *power* to raise the dead; the only question being, is this a case needing the exercise of that power; or was it, as we have interpreted, a case of *suspended animation*, restored by our Lord's healing the violent disease that had caused it?

---

## THE MAN WITH THE WITHERED HAND.

MATTH. xii. 10; MARK iii. 1; LUKE vi. 6.

THE three Evangelists who record this miracle, agree in the statement that the man's *hand* was withered: Luke adding that it was his *right* hand. The word used in the three passages cited, is *cheir*; occurring very frequently (178 times) in the New Testament, and always rendered *hand*. It is true, that it is said to signify also the *arm*, in classic Greek, and *Herod. ii. 121*,

is given as an example. But the phraseology there is, "He cut off the arm near the shoulder" (*apotamonta en tooi oomooi teen cheira*); and the story goes to show, that the robber wishing to use the hand in a certain trick, he could not do it unless by having the entire arm.

But there is no qualifying word in our passages, to indicate that the hand was withered up to the shoulder, *eis ton oomon*; and so the withering involved the entire arm; while in no other passage of the New Testament does *cheir* signify *arm*.

The Greeks had several words wherewith to designate the *arm*:—*oolenee*, *agkalee*, *orguia*, *brachioon*, *peechus*; of which the *first* is not used in the New Testament; the *third* is used as a measure, *fathom*, twice; the *fifth* as a measure, *cubit*, four times; the second in the plural only, *arms*, once; the fourth, *arm*, three times.

If the Evangelist meant that the *arm* was withered, why did he use the word *cheir*, which generally means *hand*? The arm includes the hand; but not the hand the arm. The hand includes the fingers; but not the fingers the hand. The most natural meaning of the passages is, that the hand, and not the arm, was withered.

Then as the power to hold forth the hand is in the arm, the man was quite able to hold forth his hand at our Lord's bidding. The hand, if withered or crushed, can be raised by the healthy arm; but without the arm, the hand cannot rise. The Saviour's power is not in question; to restore vitality to a hand, an arm, or the whole man, was no hard task for Him, the omnipotent; the only question is the facts of the miracle.

The narrative indicates that our Lord guarded against the misrepresentations of His malicious adversaries. When the man whose sight had been restored, was brought to the Pharisees, they doubted the facts in his case. But no one present in the assembly could doubt this miracle. Our Lord called him forth into the midst;

and while the man was standing there, a discussion of the propriety of healing on the Sabbath, allowed them all to see the man's condition; especially when ordered to hold forth his withered hand in full view of them all; and as they gazed upon the withered, useless hand, lo! it was instantly restored whole as the other.

They were angry, but they could not deny the miracle. Themselves saw the withered hand, held forth into public view, swell out into its proper proportions and availability.

This understanding of the text seems to be the most natural, because it is the most conformed to the phraseology of the Evangelists. Blessed are they who, like this man, obey the injunction of the Saviour.

---

## THE UNPARDONABLE SIN.

MATTH. xii. 31; MARK iji. 29; LUKE xii. 10; I JOHN v. 16.

ALL agree that this is a very difficult passage. Some have thought the passage teaches the forgiveness of sins in another world, after death, between death and the judgment—*i. e.*, the forgiveness of other sins than those against the Holy Ghost. But it is very improper to found such a doctrine, so contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, upon an obscure passage: although its obscurity is not on this point: the expressions "this world," "the world to come" (*en toutooi tooi aiooni oute en tooi mellonti*), were commonly understood in that day as referring to DISPENSATIONS, AGES.



The then existing age was the Mosaic; the age to come was the Messianic. In the Mosaic age blasphemy was a capital, unpardonable offense: “\* \* \* he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord (JEHOVAH), he shall surely be put to death,” etc. *Levit. xxiv. 16.* In the age to come, the Messianic, it is to be the same; Jehovah shall not be blasphemed. To speak against Moses, the leader of the dispensation, the divine agent, the mouth-piece of Jehovah, was pardonable; and so “\* \* \* whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man (Jesus, the leader of the dispensation, the divine agent, the mouth-piece of Jehovah, the one raised to be like Moses), it shall be forgiven him.” But to blaspheme Jehovah, the Holy Ghost, was not pardonable in the Mosaic, the then existing dispensation, the “this age” of that day: nor, was it to be pardonable in the Messianic, the then coming age. Jehovah was the same in any age; and alike supreme.

It is remarkable that the Pharisees had declared the work of the Divine One to be the work of Beelzebub; perhaps they really thought so, but our Lord demonstrated their error, and we have no further allusion to the offense.

One most important thought is, that if any one, no matter how sinful and guilty, is penitent, it demonstrates the presence and aid of the Holy Ghost; who has softened the heart, opened the ear, and is calling the guilty one's attention to the Gospel, that he may believe and live. He who is sorry for sin; sincerely desires salvation; comes humbly to Jesus, the compassionate, almighty Saviour; has not committed the unpardonable sin; but is within the compass of the precious, all-encouraging declaration, “\* \* \* HIM THAT COMETH UNTO ME I WILL IN NO WISE CAST OUT” (*ou mee ek-baloo exoo*). *John vi. 37.* The Greek fully requires the strength of the English expression, the *ou mee* being

intensive, and used with reference to what *in no wise* will or should take place. *Winer.*

Were the sinner abandoned by the Holy Ghost, his sins would give him pleasure, not pain. Therefore, distress for sin, is a proof of the presence of the Blessed One, who convicts us of sin that he may persuade us to approach the Saviour. Jesus had a sorrowful way to the cross; and the sinner drops his tears as he goes there to find Him: but his tears always gleam in the light of the merciful, loving eye that gladly watches his approach.

## WHY DID CHRIST USE PARABLES?

MATTH. xiii. 10.—Why speakest Thou unto them in parables?

A PARABLE is “the narrative of a fictitious, but common and natural occurrence, for the purpose of embodying and illustrating some doctrine.” *Meyer.* To teach by parable, seems to have been popular among the Jews. Our Lord adopted this method, and the disciples asked Him WHY?

It is probable, that but for His answer to this question, we of this day would have no special interest in the matter: but, as He might appear to intimate, that His object was to prevent the masses of the people from understanding Him, we are at a loss to conceive why He spoke to them at all.

After reading the connection, and the parallel passages, one might conclude that our Lord did desire to be understood; but as the people were excitable, rash, and disposed to tumult, great caution and prudence were

used by Him, to prevent any tumultuous and revolutionary proceedings. "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause His voice to be heard in the street." *Isai.* xlii. 2. Not with tumult, battle and slaughter was the Messiah to win His throne; but by His own suffering, and the utterance of the truth.

Therefore, in those wonderful parables, there was enough to excite attention and inquiry. Then, if any *inquired* of Him, He explained; though still speaking only as they were able to bear it. Even at the close of His wonderful earthly mission, He said to the very apostles as they sat around Him:—"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*." *John* xvi. 12. Mark informs us that, "With many such parables spake He the word unto them, as they were able to hear it" (*kathoos eedunanto akouein*). *Mark* iv. 33.

We conclude, then, that the use of parables by our Lord, was a measure of prudence, promotive of the real good of His ignorant, excitable auditors; and in the proper spirit of His work, that He might incite them to thought, inquiry, and saving instruction. So far from His seeking to conceal the way of life from any one, He was ever ready to receive the sincere inquirer; while His sorrowing complaint against the masses, was:—"Ye will not come to Me, that ye might have life." *John* v. 40. He wept at the fact that such things were hidden from them, by their own obstinate perversity. *Luke* xix. 42.

The case of Nicodemus is illustrative. His attention had been attracted, although, as a leading Pharisee, his mind was bewildered by the traditions of the elders. He caught a glimpse of the truth, and desiring to know it fully, he came to our Lord, and was very kindly received; while instead of casting obstructions in his way, He sought carefully to remove every hindrance from his perception; and by a long, patient exposition, taught

him the true nature and design of the Messiah's work ; as being not the destruction of men, but their salvation.

Why did He speak to them in parables? Because it was the kindest, most efficient method. They had got into a condition that rendered such a plan necessary, to one who came not to destroy, but to save.

With reference to the remarkable expression (verse 12), "For whosoever hath, to-him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath:" it may be understood upon the principle already suggested. For any one hearing a parable, not understanding it, but incited to sufficient interest in it to think of it, inquire into it—such a person "hath;" the parable has not left him as poor as it found him; for he now has an interest in the subject, that will lead him to inquire, and then more will be given him—*i. e.*, an explanation will be given, so that he will understand the parable, which was his desire, and therefore "he shall have more abundance." But he that heareth the words of the parable, neither understanding it nor feeling any interest in it, so as to think or inquire about it; indeed, has not any benefit from the parable whatever; though he momentarily hath the words, the terms, of the parable, and time and his negligence will soon take away this "that he hath," the words of the parable: a common law, that an unstudied, unthought of, unimproved lecture soon fades out of the memory.

The same expression is seen in at least four other places, and in each has the same significance; that one who has gained something upon opportunity, is he who *hath*; he who has gained nothing upon opportunity, loses the opportunity itself: he had that, gained nothing by it, and had it taken away from him. For example, in *Matth.* xxv. 14-30, we have our principle illustrated by a parable. A man about to go abroad, called his

servants and delivered unto them, according to their several ability, a portion of his capital to be employed in trade. These were servants (*douloi*), but their interest and comfort depended so much upon the prosperity of the master, that his interest was their interest. At his return, he called them to a reckoning, and he who had received five talents brought other five, reporting them to be the profit resulting from his management. His fidelity was commended, he was advanced in his position, and became a sharer of his lord's prosperity. Then came the man who had received two talents, also reporting other two talents profit, likewise a hundred per cent. on his capital; meeting with the same commendation and promotion, a sharer in his lord's prosperity. At last came the servant who had received one talent; bringing no profit; for he had taken no interest in the matter, and had been idle; the talent having been hid in the earth. As to gain, profit, he "hath not:" as to what "he hath," it was the unemployed talent, and that was taken away from him. He had an opportunity; did not improve it; lost it. His lord was the loser by his servant's idleness, and the servant was a sharer in the sorrow. A lesson that employees would do well to study. The joy or sorrow of the employer, is entered into by the employees. His prosperity is their prosperity: his adversity is their adversity. There is no getting rid of that law. Young men in employment should think of this. If they make no gain for their patron, they must soon lose what they have—their place. No man can go on with an unprofitable business.

But it is spiritually that we are to study the case: and it may be illustrated by the hearers of sermons. One hears, is interested, inquires, and has more abundance. Another hears, is not interested, does not inquire, and the sermon, the very text, is gone. He had no profit from the sermon; but he had the sermon, and now that is taken away.

The parable was spoken, to declare the truth prudently, not openly, for the condition of the people would not allow that: and to every one who had an interest excited in him to know more fully, he had but to ask and receive. The parable was to help men into the Kingdom; not to prevent them from entering.

---

## THE WOMAN OF CANAAN.

MATTH. xv. 21-28.

THE key to the proper understanding of this incident is this:—The disciples, in common with their countrymen, were miserably warped by their traditions, in their apprehension of the nature of the Messiah's kingdom. He was, to them, the Messiah of the Jews; a Saviour from the power of the Gentiles, who would have no benefit of His reign, but by becoming Jews. A Saviour of all men, as men; a Saviour from sin; was beyond their comprehension. Throughout this incident, our Lord, who was constantly endeavoring to instill proper views of Himself into their minds, proceeds as illustrating the error of their ideas of His character and functions.

The poor woman, a heathen, coming out from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, approached him with the piteous wail, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil! Poor mother! What a plea! But as the Messiah was for the Jews only, what interest had *He* in this case? The woman was a Gentile: she had no claim upon Him:

her wretchedness was, of course, great; but she was a woman, only; a human being, but not a Jew: He was the Messiah of the Jews only. So, perhaps with a side glance at the disciples, “\* \* \* he answered her not a word.” Not a word? Had their kind, benevolent Master cooled in his regards for the miserable; had his heart become callous to human woe? It was strange, indeed. The wail of the anguished mother penetrated their hearts, although she was a heathen; but it seemed to have no effect upon their Lord. He took no notice of her. He treated her according to their own ideas of the Gentile interest in their Messiah. But, as our Lord foresaw, the human was too strong for the Jew: they actually INTERCEDE for the heathen outcast. They BESOUGHT him, saying, “Send her away; for she CRIETH after us.” That is, grant her request; her cry of wretchedness overcomes us. If they merely desired her dismissal, to get rid of her noise, it would have been a light task for twelve men to drive off one lonely woman. It is by far more likely, that they were touched by her misery, and had been brought by their Master’s wise method to request him to violate their own principles. But they were not yet sufficiently probed: and still taking no notice of the woman, he answers *them*; and such an answer! “I am not sent but unto THE LOST SHEEP OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL!” The woman’s misery and despair were nothing to the Messiah of the *Jews*. Why should they trouble themselves and him, with the anguish of a heathen?

So, the woman finding her advocates of no avail, “came and worshipped him, saying, Lord, help me.” But he answered, perhaps still with a side look at his disciples, and in the spirit of their error; though, at the same time, so as to shape the conversation to his purpose; “It is not meet to take the children’s bread and to cast it to dogs.” The very essence, this, of the

Jewish view of the Messianic kingdom. And these mistaken Jews, his disciples, heard it! and, more, they heard the woman's *contradiction*, she was wiser than they; although they were Jews, and she but a heathen.

The figure used by our Lord, is a man sitting at table, with his children, and a cur or two in waiting. So, when he says, as a Pharisee, the bread has been provided for the children; it is not proper to take of it to cast to dogs; she flatly CONTRADICTS him, saying, "Yes, Lord; for the curs eat of the crumbs (morsels), that fall from their master's table." The actual truth in the case. The man's children; but, also, the man's curs; and many a scrap is thrown to them by both master and children; neither party regretting that the curs, the pets, had a share of the children's bread: indeed, more likely the children would have murmured, had the curs been refused a portion.

If it seem bold, that the woman should contradict our Lord; the language of the Evangelist requires such a rendering: *nai kurie*, Yes, Lord; *kai gar* for also, *ta kunaria*, the dogs, etc. Our version's "Truth, Lord, yet the dogs," etc., does not fairly express the words of the passage. Our Lord says, "It is not meet," etc.; while the woman replies, "Yes, Lord; for also (*kai gar*) the dogs eat," etc. There is no question about *nai*, it means yes: and might be rendered *truth*, in the sense of assent to our Lord's statement, that it was not proper for the dogs to partake of the children's bread: but, in such case, it would not be followed by *kai gar*, a phrase never translated, *yet*, except here, and in the parallel passage in Mark, in the New Testament, or in any Greek literature: its weakest sense equalling the Latin ETENIM, *for, and for*, etc., while it frequently has the greater force of NAM ETIAM, *for even*, etc.: as in *Acts* xix. 40, where the town clerk, in his strictures upon the tumultuous proceedings of the Ephesians, affirms that their dis-



putes should be settled in a lawful assembly: adding, "For (*kai gar*) we are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar," etc. It is quite evident, that *kai gar*, here, might be rendered by our phrase, "for really," "in fact, "for the fact is:" either of which would express the sense of Luke's *kai gar*; while *yet* would be absurd. So in *Rom. xi. 1*, "Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For (*kai gar*) I also am an Israelite," etc. Here the word "also" renders *kai*; and "for," *gar*: and the sense of Paul is well expressed: which would not be the case were *kai gar* rendered *yet*. Again, *Rom. xv. 2, 3*, "Let every one of us please his neighbor for his good to edification. For even (*kai gar*) Christ pleased not himself; but, as it is written, The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me." The word "for" represents *gar*; "even," *kai*. Were the words rendered by *yet*, the sense would not be given; *yet* would be quite unmeaning; while *for even* is very strong and expressive. We may well try to give up self for the benefit of our neighbor; *for even* Christ hath given us the example!

Therefore, we accept the hypothesis, that when our Lord put the statement in pharisaic form, that the dogs were excluded from participation in the family provision; she, wiser than the Pharisees, saw the error, contradicted the statement, and looked for her portion. Her intelligent faith was highly approved: not her *humility*, but her *faith*: not that she was willing to rank with dogs; but she had that clear, bold, all attempting faith, that induced her to venture a contradiction of what appeared to her to be the statement of him, upon whom the restoration of her unhappy daughter depended. When she had exhibited a faith so superior to that of the Jew, this poor Gentile came in for her share, in the benefactions of the Head of the family. The need of the Messiah was not restricted to the Jew: nor a proper

appreciation of him : nor a willingness to receive him. Salvation from sin is the need of every one ; and provision is made for every one.

Our Lord had no intention, from the first, to neglect or deny the Canaanite. Nor was he seeking to try *her* faith. He knew her heart ; sympathized with her grief ; intended to bless her in granting her plea : but, those disciples who were to proclaim him to mankind, had very distorted views of his nature, functions, and character ; and he took occasion to teach them, by this incident, to widen and deepen their Christology. In substance, he said to the heathen, You are right, O woman : the One Father has remembered all ; provided for all : the One Saviour, by the grace of God, is to taste death for every man : the Gospel is to be sent to all : so come in and take, not a scrap, a crumb, a morsel ; but as much as thou wilt : great is thy faith ; be it unto thee even AS THOU WILT.

Upon the hypothesis that she *assented* to his statement, that it was NOT proper for the dogs to partake of the bread ; then, unless *kai gar* be rendered *yet*, or *but*, which is doing violence to the language, and without countenance from any other passage, the woman would be supporting her assent, by showing that she should not have given it : for she points to the well known fact that the dogs *did* get some of the bread. " Truth, Lord ; they should not have any ; for they do get some : " would be regarded as a marvelous argument ; scarcely justifying unusual commendation. But our Lord, exhibiting the Jewish idea, having said " It is *not* proper, " etc. ; the woman contradicts, " Yes, Lord ( it *is* proper ) ; for even the dogs eat of the crumbs, morsels, bits, that fall from their master's ( the children's father's ) table. " The proper exposition, it would seem.

## THE ROCK ON WHICH THE CHURCH WAS BUILT.

MATTH. xvi. 18.

JESUS had asked his disciples, for the opinion of men concerning himself. "And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some, Elias (Elijah); and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say *ye* that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say (omit *also*) unto thee, That thou *art* Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," etc.

The doctrine or confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; is the rock on which the Church is built: *i. e.*, Jesus, the Christ, is that rock.

There is a distinction between *petra* and *petros*. The former signifies a rock, whether peaked or ridged: the latter, a piece of rock, a stone. *Liddell & Scott*. In his *Crit. Sac.* Leigh says, "*petros* doth always signify a stone; never, a rock." To which Dr. Parkhurst replies, "*Longinus*, however, *De Sublim.*, § 35, uses *petrous* for the large stones or rocks (scopulos, as *Virgil* calls them, *Æn.* iii. lin. '575), thrown up by Mount *Ætna*." But, an examination of the passage in *Virgil*, does not sustain Dr. P.

Interdum scopulos avolsaque viscera montis  
Erigit eructans, liquefactaque saxa sub auras  
Cum gemitu glomerat, fundoque excestuat imo.

"Sometimes rocks and the torn bowels of the mountain  
It casts up belching, and the melted stones high in air  
With a groan it heaps up, and boils from its lowest deep."

A sublime picture of the amazing force of Ætna, hurling up those tremendous masses of rock, split, shivered, by the fearful energy of the volcano. To measure with the vast conception, the poet uses *scopuli* for *saxa*; *rocks* for *stones*: as in the fabled battle of the giants against the gods, the former handle mountains, as men of ordinary strength handle huge stones; piling up mountains, to make approach to heaven. Homer, too, exhibits the vast force of his heroes, by their using stones in combat, which men of common strength could not employ. Thus in the skirmish between Hector and Ajax, the former seizes with his robust hand, a black, rough, huge stone, that was lying in the plain, a boulder, and hurls it against the shield of Ajax; but, the latter, a man of amazing force, lifting a stone (*laan*), of much greater size, sent it whirling against, and crashing into his foeman's shield. This stone, which in line 268, Homer calls *laan* (a stone), in line 270, he calls *muloeidei petrooi*: "He breaks through his shield, striking it as with a mill stone." The boulder used by Hector is designated *lithon*, which is equal to *petros*; *lithos*, *laas*, *petros* being interchangeable terms: while *petra* is not interchangeable with either of them. The same author furnishes other instances of maintaining an equilibrium between the deeds and ascribed force of his heroes: as in *Il. xx. 285*, when Æneas has a stone (*chermadion*) in his hand of great weight (*mega ergon*), which exceeded the ability of two men to carry, such as men now are (*hoioi nun brotoi eisi*); but which he, Æneas, alone and easily brandished (*ho de min rhea palle kai oios*). Then, continues the poet, would Æneas have hurled against the on-rushing one (Achilles), the stone, etc. \* \* \* *epessumenon bale PETROOI*, where we see *chermadion*, in common with *lithos* and *laas*, interchangeable with *petros*; all, each, signifying a stone of less size than the vast mass indicated by *petra*; which,

*petra*, is not interchangeable with *chermadion*, *lithos*, *laas*, or *petros*.

Turning now to our passage, we see that the Evangelist uses both *petros* and *petra*: both are figuratively employed: have they the same subject? We decide negatively; believing *petros* to refer to Simon Peter, and *petra* to refer to Jesus as being the Christ, through the confession of Peter, as stated in the 16th verse.

If *petros* and *petra* are the same, except the former is masculine, the latter feminine; then, why make the change? Especially is this remarkable, as *petros* is mentioned first. Had *petra* preceded, and had it been necessary to use a masculine form of it when applied to Simon, the change would have been very significant. But if the words are identical in their meaning, then as *petros* had been used first, why not write *epi touton ton petron* I will build my Church? If indeed the words are identical in meaning, does not the change indicate that the Evangelist apprehended that we might mistake our Lord as representing His Church to be built upon Peter? Certainly there could be no other advantage from the change. If our Lord meant that His Church was to be built upon Peter, *epi touton ton petron* would have exhibited that meaning unmistakably.

To be sure, it is claimed that our Lord did use the same word, in each member of the sentence: KIPHA, a stone or rock; from which may be derived the *keephas* of the New Testament. But, admitting this hypothesis, of which there is no proof; nothing being urged but probability; it remains to be inquired, Why did Matthew make the change, except that he considered himself superior to our Lord, in the choice of words, wherewith to express his meaning? Or, possibly, it was to prevent us from supposing that our Lord referred to Peter, as being THE ROCK. Certainly, the change promised no help to us, in case we were expected to un-

derstand, that Peter was to support the Church of Christ.

We observe, also, that *petros* is used indefinitely ; "thou art *petros*." And turning to *John* i. 42, we have Simon's first interview with our Lord, who, of course, through all the defects of the man standing before Him, saw his true character and worth, which He expressed in giving him the surname *keephas* ; which, John tells us, is by interpretation, A stone (*petros*) : signifying durability, firmness, etc., perhaps. Well, now, after some years of trial, Simon, amid the discordant opinions around him, adheres to the belief, that his Master, "Jesus, is the Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus said with great significance "thou ART *petros* !" He had been surnamed *petros*, and here the propriety of the act was illustrated ; the phrase being a passing reference to the preceding fact ; limiting Simon's personality in the affair ; while our Lord proceeds with His statement of the basis truth of Christianity, JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD. Upon this truth, all Christianity rests. If Jesus be not the Christ, the Christ has not yet come. The Jews are right, in still looking for the coming Messiah.

But, if Peter was the rock on which the Church was to be built, where is the proof of it in the Sacred History ? By what fact can it be demonstrated, that Simon Peter was more important to the Church, than others of the Apostles ? In the Acts of the Apostles, he is seen to be inferior to James and Paul, and there is an entire absence of any appearance of primacy. While in Revelation, the last written of the Sacred Books, any special importance of Peter is looked for in vain : the City had twelve foundations ; and these were not twelve times Peter, but the *twelve Apostles of THE LAMB*.

There is also another distinction in the text: Simon bar Jona (Simon son of Jonas), and the Son of the living God. It would seem that the Omniscient Saviour, foreseeing the errors of men, sought to guard his words, against the perversion of them, urged in after years. This appellative appears nowhere else in the New Testament. Its equivalent is seen in *John* i. 42: xxi. 15, 16, 17: and not elsewhere. Is it not remarkable, that our Lord did not say Simon Peter blessed art thou, but Simon bar Jona? He had not asked of Simon Peter only, as to what men said of him, the Son of man; but, "He asked His disciples," asked them all; and Peter spoke for all; as no one dissented from his statement: it not being added that "others said," etc.: but by their silence, they indicated their agreement with the spokesman. It is quite possible, that they might have taken part in the preceding replies of "some say that Thou art John the Baptist;" "some, Elijah;" "some, Jeremiah;" "some, one of the prophets." For, after these answers, our Lord inquires, as if they all had participated in the conversation, "But whom say YE that I am?" Upon the hypothesis, that Simon Peter alone had made the replies, we should have expected, "But whom sayest THOU that I am?"

So, we are to suppose, that they were all participating, and when the question was put to them all, as they needed not that all should answer in words; as Peter in his promptness uttered the words; so, they by their silence were pledged to the answer. The Lord commended the promptness of Peter, accepted the statement of "his disciples," and informed them that the future of his Church, ecclesia, assembly, congregation, should collect around, or upon the statement, the truth, the fact, that HE, JESUS, IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD.

## THE LABORERS AND THEIR WAGES.

MATTH. xx. 1-16.

AT verse 16, we read, “\* \* \* for many be called, but few chosen.” Is this a deduction from the parable? And are we to understand, that many will be called by the Gospel, but that few will be saved by it? In that case, we must examine the parable, in search of the warrant for such a deduction. Does the parable teach, that but few will be saved, of the many called by the Gospel? Let us see.

A householder went out early in the morning, to hire laborers into his vineyard. He found some, agreed with them for a penny a day, and sent them into his vineyard. About the third hour, 9 A. M., he went out, saw others standing idle in the market-place, and said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right (*i. e.*, in proportion to the time employed), I will give you: and they went. About the sixth hour, noon, and the ninth hour, 3 P. M., he did the same. And about the eleventh hour, 5 P. M., he went out, and found others standing idle, and said unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They replied, No man hath hired us. He said to them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right, ye shall receive.

So, when even was come, 6 P. M., the lord of the vineyard said to his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire; beginning from the last unto (*heoos*) the first. And, so, came first the eleventh hour squad; who, by agreement, were entitled to the one-twelfth part of a penny (a denarius, about fifteen cents in our money: low wages for our day; but then was liberal hire: and the parable represents the laborers agreeing to it; verse 2); and yet, to their astonishment and de-



light, each man received a penny, a full day's wages, twelve times as much as he had earned. According to the plan of payment, next came those who had commenced work at 3 P. M., and, consequently had earned one-fourth of a penny. They, too, receiving a penny, received four times as much as they had earned. So, those who had worked from noon, received twice as much as they were entitled to: and the third hour, 9 A. M. party, had an increase of  $33\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. upon their due. The men who wrought the entire day, having agreed for a penny, labored all day expecting a penny, received a penny, a full day's wages.

What generosity! Who ever settled with hired men, on the principle of giving them what was needed for their support, instead of what time they had made! As some of those men had earned only fractions of the day's hire, and yet all alike needed a full day's hire for their support; this generous man ordered his steward to pay all a full day's hire. So that every one received all he had earned; and the most of them, more. It was only after the toil was over, and the all-day men had seen that the eleventh hour, and the other parties, had received a full penny, that they expected more. All through "the burden and heat of the day," they had expected to receive a penny, as had been agreed upon, between them and their employer; and that wonderfully generous man had certainly not been hard with them, as to the amount of their pay. He had agreed with them for a penny a day. There is no intimation that they had asked for more.

Then, where are the *few* chosen; the many rejected? If any case of equal, delighted success, and happy result be extant, let it be produced. It would be a rare specimen, indeed. So, we see nothing in the parable, from which the deduction can be drawn, that many will be called, but a few only will be chosen. All that were

called in the parable, accepted the call, and were accepted of the householder; who complained of no one about his labor, paid every one at the close of the day all he had earned; and the most of them, more: some, twelve times as much; others, four times as much; others, twice as much; others,  $33\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. more; and none less than the full amount of a liberal day's wages. The first were last, and the last first, only in the fact, that they were all put upon the same footing, by giving to every one from his liberal purse, what the condition of a laboring man needed for his support. He did "what he would with his own," not by denying or withholding it from any, but by generously giving them what they needed, when they neither expected, nor asked for, more than they had earned.

Two chapters on in Matthew, xxii, the utterance reappears; "For many are called, but few are chosen:" and again at the end of a parable; thus. A king made a marriage for his son: sent his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding; and who refused: again he sent for them, stating inducements; but they made light of the matter, acting scandalously: then the king sent out and called from the highways all sorts of people that were to be found there, both bad and good; and the wedding was furnished with guests. Quite a multitude, as it seems, filling up the spacious palace. So, the king having come in to see, salute, honor his guests, "he saw there a man who had not on a wedding garment." He had been found upon the highway, had been honored with an invitation to the royal wedding, and had insulted his king by neglecting the etiquette of his court, in not putting on one of the wedding garments, that had been provided for his guests. This man was ejected and punished: the great multitude of guests were approved.

Where now are the few chosen; the many disappointed, rejected? Of all that crowd, only one man

and he very properly, is put out of doors: the rest, the many, the multitude, are entertained, enjoying all the rich provision for the royal merry-making: "all things were ready;" it was a sumptuous affair; and they all enjoyed it, except ONE audacious man.

It cannot be, then, that our Lord intended to teach, that many would congregate at the sound of the Gospel trumpet; but only a few would be selected, for the enjoyment of the rich blessings, of the sumptuously provided feast: or that only a few laborers in His vineyard should receive their pay.

Yet perhaps we may find a clue to the meaning of "many are called, but few chosen;" in a fact of Jewish condition, that underlay our Lord's teaching: and which fact he sought to undermine. First remarking, that the reading is not "many are called, but few accept, listen, come, obey." There is nothing that implies any responsibility on the part of the called. Some one calls many, and from these chooses a few: or, "the called are many, the chosen, few:" it is all with the caller and chooser.

The most successful, because the most reasonable mode of studying a passage of Scripture, is to attempt it in prayerful dependence upon the promised aid of the Holy Spirit, and in conformity with the general statements and facts of the divine record. From these sources we learn, that the Jews had very perverted and narrow views of the Messianic plan. They overlooked the facts that the promise of the Messiah was made to man, fallen man, to the parents of man, that the gentile was man, the Jew not more than man: that it was with reference to that promise to man, that the principle of ELECTION was introduced (*Rom.* ix. 11), and Noah elected to preserve the race; Abraham, Isaac, Jacob to produce the Messiah, "in whom ALL THE NATIONS of the earth should be blessed."

Therefore, the Jews did not look upon the Mosaic Dispensation as but a part of the divine plan, but as its whole. The patriarchal, the Mosaic, the present dispensation, each is one of three arches supporting a bridge, the Christ, the Way; each important in its place, and all the supports of the One Way, Christ.

Election is a term that should be well understood, at this day. Of necessity, it cannot embrace all: for where all are included there can be no election; no calling out; no selection. And the elect are always the *few*, in comparison with the *many*: and the elect are for the benefit of the many. So, with the president and congress; governors and legislatures; mayors and city councils; judges, etc. The few elected for the benefit of the many. The elect are the officials of the electors. In the great plan of salvation, God elects his own officials, his own instrumentality: not with a primary reference to the salvation of the officials, but of MAN, sinful man.

Therefore Noah was not elected to heaven, to eternal life; but to the ark, and the continuance of temporal life, for the preservation of man. Abraham was elected, not to heaven, to eternal life; but to Canaan, and continued temporal life, to produce a nation to be kept apart from other nations; and thus authenticate the Messiah, who was to bless all the nations of the earth. The same may be said of the prophets. But, especially must it be said of THE Elect: who of all of woman born was God's elect Messiah (*Isai.* xlii. 1): whom no one can suppose to have been elected to heaven and eternal life; or doubt that he was elected to office, the Messiahship; and for the benefit of man. There is no mention of election in Scripture, that does not fairly accord with this principle of interpretation. The elect had great advantages; as taught in *Rom.* iii. 1, "What advantage then hath the Jew? (If after all they are no better by nature, than the despised gentiles living outside the covenant of circumcision.) "Much every way," exclaims the Apostle: it

is a great honor to be the official nation, under the special care of God, and "chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." But their elect position, while occasioning advantage "much every way," did not assure their salvation; which, as the salvation of any other sinner, depended upon repentance and faith. Jesus, THE Elect, knew no sin, needed no salvation; his election conferring no advantage "much every way;" his only benefit consisting in the "joy that was set before him," gleaming across the dark valley of his deadly strife, from the countenance of the distant loving Father, who delighted in the success he was to achieve, in conquering sin, death, and the grave; delivering our sinful race. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." *I John* iv. 9. Not that the Elect, but *man* might live.

Our Lord, then, we may regard as endeavoring to insinuate into the Jewish mind, a more correct and comprehensive view of the election of the Jewish nation: it being unreasonable to suppose that a promise made to MAN, had been narrowed down and limited to ONE NATION of man: that the officials, the elect for carrying out God's purpose, were alone to reap the benefit; notwithstanding that the purpose was "to destroy the works of the devil," to bruise satan's head; and that the elect were but instruments, wherewith to accomplish that purpose: not the *end*, but the *means* of the purpose. How absurd, then, to limit God's love, mercy, aid, to *the few* instruments he employs; to the overlooking of the many, he purposed to aid, through the few elect! Especially, as he has grace enough, and a surplus. The kind lord of the vineyard would have made a different exhibit, if, by his previous bounty to several classes of the laborers, he had not had sufficient for the

payment of the all-day workmen. The king would not have acted kingly, if there had not been sufficient to supply the guests, thronging his royal halls. But the purse and the banquet were both sufficient: and the end of the plan of salvation, will not be a development of the astounding fact, that the proclaimed God and Father of all, will turn out to be merely the God and Father of the elect, the few, the instruments of his purpose. He would be a poor smith who purposing to make a ploughshare, grasps the iron material with his tongs, and thrusting them into the fire of the forge, saves only his tongs, his instruments. Instruments are the means, not the end, of a purpose. ALL THE NATIONS were to be blessed: the called are many; "ho every one that thirsteth," "whosoever will:" the elect are few, and their business is to promote God's purpose, by obeying their official commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (*Mark* xvi. 15). Jesus Christ, by the grace of God tasted death for every man (*Heb.* ii. 9): tell it to every man; and if he believes he shall be saved. (*Rom.* v. 1.)

But good critics omit from the sacred text, the clause we have been discussing; allowing for verse 16, ch. xx, only the words, "So the last shall be first, and the first last." In which case, the fact of but *few* being chosen, or elected, need not be supposed even to be contained, or illustrated in the parable. If it be sought, it cannot be found: it is not in the parable: it is not a deduction, or inference from it. Our own opinion is, that the words are genuine, and should be retained.

There is no dispute, however, as to their genuineness in ch. xxii. 14: and we have looked through the parable there, for the few chosen from the many called, in vain. The servants were sent to call them that were bidden (*kalesai tous kekleemenous*) to the wedding:

they had been called (to call the called); being, perhaps, the nobility, the aristocracy; but even now they would not (*ouk eethelon*) come: so the king sent other servants (as though, the bad conduct of the nobles, might have been occasioned by some fault or blunder on the part of the previous officers, servants; and though the king reminds them of the splendid provision he has made, they behave yet more scandalously; even dishonoring and murdering his servants). "Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden (*kekleemenoi*, called) were not worthy." He had not only called them, but had manifested a great desire, and taken great pains, to have them come; and in despite of it all they had not come. "Go ye therefore into the highways, (places of resort at the meetings of streets, the squares, or confluence of ways: *Alford*), and as *many as ye shall find*, bid (*kalesate*, call) to the marriage. So those servants went out into the public places, and gathered together *all as many as they found*, both BAD and GOOD: and the wedding was furnished (*epleesthee*, filled, satiated) with guests."

It is certainly evident, that the king made most exertion in the case of the first called: they had been already invited (*kekleemenous*, called), and the invitation was twice renewed. But of the last invited, there is no intimation of any previous expectation on the part of the king, or the highwaymen, that any one of these latter should ever be seen at this feast. It must have been a prodigious surprise to such people, to be invited to a royal feast at the palace, and on such an occasion as the marriage of the king's son! And the servants made no exceptions, they "gathered together ALL as many as they found;" just as it happened; BAD and GOOD; every one they found. Nothing could be more unlike an election: there was no choice: quality made

no difference; "both bad and good:" and the bad are mentioned first, as perhaps their number was the greater, or, possibly to indicate that the quality of any one was disregarded; the only essential being the *finding*.

And when the king went in to see his strange guests, they were many, quite many, the wedding, the wedding hall was filled, satiated (*epleesthee*), many had been called, and they all had come: there they were, a crowd indeed: but now from these, where are *the few chosen*; the few elect; those who were accepted to realize the grandest, ultimate blessing, beyond the portion of the MANY? In vain we look for anything of that sort. There is a difference made: a line is drawn; but the *many* are found on the happy, and not on the miserable side. There is a kind of an election made; but it is in the case of but ONE, who was not elected to any special advantage over the others; but to "bonds, the outer darkness, the gnashing of teeth:" all which he might have avoided by a decent compliance with a point of etiquette, of a pleasant nature, and very easy to be complied with.

The words CALLED and CHOSEN should have some consideration. They are *kleetoi* and *eklekttoi*: the former from *kaleoo*, to call; the latter from *eklegomai*, to choose, to elect. Certain persons are called; others elected, chosen out. But the point is, that the high class, and the common class, in the parable, are both called. If the king, by calling the high class first, can be supposed to have made a kind of choice, an election; then the elect were miserably destroyed by the king's own order.

As to the common class, the king commanded them to be CALLED (*kalesate*), but specially forbids any choice, any election, by ordering his servants to call "as many as they should FIND," to the marriage: and the phrase is repeated in the following verse, "all as



many as they found," as if to exclude all idea of choice, utterly. To be found, was the grand point; indicating accident, chance, perhaps, but certainly not choice, election, or fore-ordering that those particular men, should be there, at those particular public places, on that particular day. He who can find such a feature as that in the parable, can find anything in it that may suit his fancy. There is plenty of *calling* (*kaleoo*), in the parable: twice in verse 3; once in verse 4; once in verse 8; once in verse 9; but no *election* (*eklegomai*): it is not seen at all, except once in the 14th verse; showing that that verse is not a *deduction* from the parable, but an axiom in the plan of salvation, which phariseism had overlooked; an error that our Lord was endeavoring in all kind prudence to correct.

You Jews, have been God's elect, that his great purpose might proceed through you as his instruments; and as his elect, you are highly honored, but you should understand that he does not value his instruments, agents, more than his purposed result, the fulfillment of his promise to MAN, the bruising of satan's head, the blessing of ALL THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH. God cares for and calls the MANY; and elects a *few* agents as the human instrumentality, that he chooses to employ, in securing the resultant blessing to the many.

It might be admitted, that there was a choice or election by the king, as to the servants; for he sent some at one time, others at another time; all the elect were elected to carry out the king's purpose toward the many: the crowd of guests at the marriage was the purpose; the election, a mere incident; a principle of no mean value, but yet wholly incidental to the main purpose of the monarch.

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

MATTH. xxvi. 26-28; MARK xiv. 22-24; LUKE xxii. 19, 20; I COR. xi. 23-26.

FROM these four scriptures, it is evident that the sacred Supper is a memorial ceremony; having in the Christian, the place occupied by the Passover in the Mosaic dispensation. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the only ceremonies or ordinances in the Church of Christ; which by its spirituality and simplicity is distinguished from the Mosaic Church, which abounded in types, symbols, rites; necessarily, as it was the figure of that which is to come. With Moses was mystery; the great mystery of the Messiah to come, and his bringing in the gentiles. With Christ is the dispersion of mystery, life and immortality brought to light, and the way to heaven made so plain, that the simplest wayfarer need not err therein. The Gospel calls men: not Jews, but men: not gentiles, but men: and to men, everywhere, tells the same story, and makes the same proposition. It offers Jesus as the Christ, the Saviour of all, to all; because all men need a Saviour, and precisely such a Saviour as he. This universal need, the Gospel attributes to our relation to Adam: "For as in Adam all die;"—"by one man's disobedience the many (all) were made sinners." Therefore presenting to men the two grand truths, in which all are interested, the Gospel exhibits two symbols, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; the one reminding men of their relation to Adam; the other, of their relation to Jesus the Christ. Two great truths; two great symbols or diagrams.

The Lord's Supper, the memorial of Jesus the Christ, reminding us of his interposition for sinners, is much illustrated, as to its ceremonial, by studying its relation

to the Passover; of which we have a full and definite history. When the Jews were held in hard bondage by Pharaoh, in Egypt, and he had refused to release them, when so commanded; an angel slew, in one night, all the first-born in that land, except in the families of Israel; the doors of whose houses had been sprinkled with the blood of a lamb. Then, a cry of anguish being heard all over the nation, the Israelites were hurried out of the land of bondage, and started for Canaan, the land of promise. "And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations: ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever." *Exod. xii. 14*, and in other passages of the Books of Moses. It was a solemn memorial of the divine interposition, in behalf of one nation in bondage to Pharaoh. It was to be kept by divine ordinance, generation after generation, forever—*i. e.*, so long as the Mosaic or typical dispensation should be continued. A lamb was to be slain and eaten, in remembrance of the lamb whose blood was sprinkled on the doors of Israel's habitations, protecting them from the destroyer. They were to use unleavened bread to indicate the haste with which they had been hurried out of Egypt; and bitter herbs to remind them of the bitterness of their bondage there. As the blood-sprinkling was not to be repeated, but remembered, the red wine was a suitable reminder. It should be noticed, also, that the entire solemnity in bringing to remembrance the deliverance from Egypt; that deliverance was because of a PROMISE to the father of that people, Abraham; and that was God's method of fulfilling that promise given centuries before: a method with which was connected miracle, violence, terror, and great destruction of defiant resisters of God.

But there was to arise one like unto Moses; the bringer in of a new and superior dispensation; the

Shiloh, around whom the nations should gather: one who would rescue all the nations of the earth from the grasp of satan; and the Lamb to be slaughtered in the case, would be Himself. This grand event, to which Moses and Israel looked forward; and which was typified in their rites and history; occurred in the person of Jesus the Christ, who came, died, rose from the dead, ascended to heaven. The same night in which he was betrayed, he had been seated, or reclining at the table, celebrating the Passover, the great memorial connected with the *one nation*; and at its conclusion instituted his own feast, to be kept as a memorial by *many nations*—*i. e.*, by ALL. The changes he made were for more simplicity, but for clearer and wider significance. No memorial lamb was to be slain; for there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; so bread was substituted as the memorial of the sacrificed Jesus. That lamb of which we have been partaking, symbolized the lamb slain on that dread night in Egypt; but *this*, this *bread*, you are to use as the memorial of my crucified body. That lamb on the dish, signifies, and in that sense is, the paschal lamb's body: but *ye* shall kill no lamb, THIS (bread) is MY body: this is to remind you, as you break and eat, of my body which was broken for men; for *you* because you are men; and not because you are Jews. The Jewish memorial is about being expended: its forever, in a few days, will be fulfilled and closed. What was that in the dish, there? The paschal lamb. The one slain in Egypt, centuries ago? No; but a memorial of that. And to a child, it might have been said; You know the history of the Lord's passover; how we were in bitter bondage; and were directed to kill a lamb, according to our families, and sprinkle its blood upon our doors; and then were hurried out, without being allowed time for our bread to become leavened. So, we were to observe a memorial

of all this: and, you see, there is the lamb, there the unleavened bread, there the bitter herbs. But no lad would be so stupid as to suppose, the father meant, that all these, the lamb, the unleavened bread, the bitter herbs, had been changed into the identical lamb, bread, and herbs, that were upon the tables, in that dread night of the march from Egypt. Why, then, should any one misunderstand this blessed memorial, with its clear, distinct history in his hand, by the light of which he can read the *IN MEMORIAM MEI*? The disciples were Jews: from their youth, they had been accustomed to keep the Passover; and as a memorial; they had never heard that the constituents of that feast were transubstantiated, by the consecrating prayer. And when they were directed, thenceforth, to substitute the memorial of the breaking, the killing of the Lord's body; and were told, that bread was to be used instead of flesh; they could not have had the slightest difficulty, in understanding their Lord's "THIS is MY body," as meaning nothing other, than that they were to use, in the Christian feast, *bread*, and not lamb's flesh, nor flesh of any kind, in remembrance of their crucified Lord: crucified for them and for the many, all.

The wine was selected as the only other element. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." *Matth.* xxvi. 28. "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." *Luke* xxii. 20. "This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." *I Cor.* xi. 25. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many." *Mark* xiv. 24. In these four statements relative to this element, the wine, there are *verbal* differences, but no discrepancy of teaching. Matthew and Mark write, This is my blood of the new testament; while Luke and Paul write, This cup is the new testament in my blood.

Are we to understand that the wine at that feast was the Lord's blood, and the cup was the new testament? Do the phrases "my blood of the new testament," "the new testament in my blood," differ at all in their meaning? Certainly we cannot but see, that as the Israelites did their part, by confiding in the blood of the paschal lamb, and the Lord did his part of the covenant, by having his destroying angel to pass over those dwellings stained with the blood of that lamb; so now Christ's people, all, are to do their part by confiding in the blood of Jesus, the Christ; and the Lord will do his part of this new covenant, by saving all who confide in that blood shed for the remission of sins. This cup is (signifies, reminds of) the NEW testament (covenant) in MY blood. This is MY blood of the NEW testament (covenant), which was shed. This wine, this cup of wine which has heretofore reminded you of the blood of the paschal lamb, of that *old* covenant in Egypt; is, henceforth, to remind you of a *new* covenant, to ratify which *my* blood will be shed: a fact you and all generations to come should remember; for you are sinners, and my blood is to be shed for the remission of sins. In any other sense than figurative, the bread was not his body; the wine was not his blood.

The memorial character of the Supper, which has no vestige of sacrament about it, is especially evident from Paul's account, who "received of the Lord that account of it which he delivered unto us;" viz: that we are to eat the bread "in REMEMBRANCE of Him," and drink the cup "in REMEMBRANCE of Him." The word *eis* in such a connection fairly means *for*, being expressive of *purpose*: as in reply to the inquiry, Why do you practice that ceremony? we should say, Our object, purpose, is to keep up, perpetuate, the remembrance of him who shed his blood to wash away our sins. The phrase is *eis teen emeen anamneesin*: and is similar to

*Luke* ii. 34, and other passages: *Luke* writes, "And Simeon blessed them, and said unto Mary, his mother, Behold, this (child) is set for (*eis*) the fall and rising of many in Israel; and for (*eis*) a sign which shall be spoken against." Other examples are at hand for the studious, who may wish a further investigation: such as *Rom.* xiv. 1; xvi. 26; *Heb.* iv. 16; etc.

The purpose of the Supper, was to bring Jesus the Christ to our remembrance; the end sought being the spiritual good of the participants. As in the case of the Passover, whose reminder of God's interposition tended to incite gratitude for the great deliverance wrought out for their nation; and obedience by bringing to recollection, that only by an obedient observance of their part of the covenant, did Israel escape the blow of the destroying angel: and grateful obedience to God, is a great spiritual good. There was no mystery in the Passover: nor is there any mystery in the Lord's Supper: that was a monument of the salvation of one nation: this is a monument of the salvation of all nations.

To suppose him present in the elements, is to annihilate the very design of the Supper: for if the elements are he, then he is the memorial of himself: we reach an absurdity. Such a view ends, necessarily, in superstition, adoring the *host*, a day and procession in its honor; withholding it, by way of punishment; etc. The word *host*, signifies a sacrifice, a victim, from the Latin *hostia*: and though the sacred record, distinguishes clearly between the victims offered so frequently, under the typical dispensation, and the "once offered," and "once for all" victims of this latter age (*Heb.* ix); this wildly erroneous theory presents the victim daily; offers it daily; annulling the argument of the Apostle. Besides, no priest offered the Victim who died "once for all," for human guilt. He offered him-

self; obtained eternal redemption for us; "so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." They who use the Supper as a remembrancer, admit his bodily absence; he is invisible; they remember his personal departure, and hopefully look for him: but the theory of his presence in the elements, the transmutation of the elements, the adoration of the elements, does not admit of his personal absence; the participants cannot look for him, he is there, present; they have no *memorial*, who imagine that they have the *person*.

We have a memorial, a monument, not the person; and on the monument is inscribed the fact, that "— he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people." The believer needs not a *host*, but a *memorial*: needs no priest to offer a sacrifice; as no sacrifice for sin is possible, but that of Christ's atoning blood, which he himself offered once for all. An unbloody sacrifice is useless, if not a profanity: for "— without shedding of blood is *no remission*;" "nor yet that he should offer himself often, \* \* \* but now ONCE in the end of the world (*toon aioonoon*, the dispensations) hath he APPEARED to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." *Heb.* ix. 26. So, the theory of his appearings in the elements of the Supper, is remarkably contrary to the statement of the Apostle; and cannot be correct or useful.

And, we observe, that, as the Passover reminded the *Israelites* of the deliverance, in fulfillment of the promise made to their father, Abraham; so, the Lord's Supper reminds *men* of the deliverance, in fulfillment of the promise made to their father, Adam. To Abraham, "\* \* \* thy seed shall be a stranger in a land not theirs, and they shall serve them, and they shall afflict



them four hundred years. And also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance." *Gen. xv. 13, 14.* To Adam, the promise that, "— it (the seed of the woman, Messiah) shall bruise thy (satan) head." *Gen. iii. 15.* The Supper, then, as the Passover was, is a reminder that God fulfils his promises: though he may seem to delay, he is but awaiting the "due time:" therefore, as the Gospel abounds in "exceeding great and precious promises," the Supper should remind us that, "He that spared not his own Son (promised) but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things (promised)." *Rom. viii. 32.*

The facts and scenes of Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage, were gloomy with violence and terror. So, the Súpper reminds us of the darkness of Gethsemane, and the terrors of Calvary. In that dread night in Egypt, when the first-born were smitten, "Pharaoh rose up in the night, he and all his servants, and there was a great cry in Egypt!" *Exod. xii. 30.* And so from Calvary went up a wail, the like of which was never heard until then, and will never be heard again! A dark hour in Egypt, followed by the bright joy of deliverance for *Israel*: a darker hour on Calvary, followed by the far brighter joy of deliverance for *man*.

It may be useful to add, that the first administration of the Supper, was by our Lord in person, to his disciples who were, confessedly, in a very defective condition as to knowledge, faith, spirituality, and grace. Demonstrating the absurdity of supposing something like perfection, to be needed as a qualification for the Lord's Supper. Salvation is provided not for merit, but necessity. When has a believer most need to be reminded of a Saviour, who loved him and gave himself for him? When he is strong, or when he is weak? When he feels worthy, or when he feels unworthy?

Though it be the voice of the prophet, it is in the very spirit of the Gospel, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, \* \* \* without money and without price." *Isai.* lv. 1. So, the prophet. Now the Evangelist: "\* \* \* whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." *Rev.* xxii. 17. Wherein do they differ? Thirst, need, is the requisite, the qualification; and the water is abundant: let the thirsty drink. Hunger, need, is the requisite, the qualification; and the Supper is waiting: all things are ready, let the hungry eat.

---

## THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK.

MATTH. xxviii. 1.—*In the end of the SABBATH, as it began to dawn toward THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK—Opse de SABBATOON \* \* \* eis MIAN SABBATOON.*

AS *sabbatoon* occurs twice in this passage, in one instance rendered *sabbath*, in the other *week*; and as in both instances the word is genitive plural; may not the true rendering be, "In the end of the *sabbaths* (Jewish), as it began to dawn toward *one of the sabbaths* (Christian)?" Which, in conjunction with the co-related passages, would give clear and abundant Scriptural authority for the observance of the present Christian Sabbath.

It is very late to make such a discovery as this: no motive to bias a Greek scholar toward a false rendering being conceivable. If he knew the meaning of *sabbatoon*, there must have been some strong reason for rendering it *sabbath*, sing., in the first, and *week*, sing. also,

in the second instance. And that strong reason must have been known to the successive generations of scholars, who have compared the translation with the original.

Our position is, that the E. V. exactly expresses the sense of Matthew: the sabbath day had passed, and the first day of the ensuing week was about to dawn.

The phrase *mian sabbatoon* is elliptical: yet it is not a simple ellipsis; as we have at Matt. xvi. 14, "And they said, Some say thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others Jeremiah, or *hena toon prophetoon*:" Luke xx. 1, "And it came to pass, that *en miai toon hemeroon ekeinoon*," etc.: Luke v. 3, "And he entered *eis hen toon ploioon, ho een tou Simoonos*," etc.: where we have simple ellipsis, in each case; "one (prophet) of the prophets," "one (day) of those days," "one (ship) of the ships, which was that (the ship) of Simon." In each case, the numeral agreeing in gender and number with the omitted noun: and illustrating the position, that *mian sabbatoon* is not a simple elliptical phrase; as *mian* is fem. belonging to some fem. noun understood; and *sabbatoon* is neut., and in such an expression as "one of the sabbaths," the Greek phrase would be *hen sabbatoon*.

We might use as an illustration, the phrase *to de heteron Pharisaioon*, Acts xxiii. 6; where *heteron* is neuter, and *Pharisaioon* masculine. Could this be rendered "the other of the Pharisees," as meaning "the other (Pharisee) of the Pharisees?" No: it is similar to *mian sabbatoon*; and not a simple ellipsis: *heteron* is not partitive of *Pharisaioon*; but belongs to a neuter noun (*meros*) understood; the whole passage being, "But when Paul perceived that the one part (*hen meros*) were Sadducees, and the other (*heteron*) Pharisees," etc.

Our position holds good, then, except upon the extraordinary hypothesis, that the *sabbatoon* under exam-

ination, is a gen. plur. formed from a *sabbata* fem. sing. of the first declension. But is *sabbata* ever found as fem. or singular?

We assume the negative; and, as we are assured, upon the best authority: indeed, upon all the authority known to us. There is some diversity of opinion as to the declension of *sabbata*; but none as to its gender. On the one hand *to sabbaton* is pronounced to be of the second declension, in the N. T. found only with the gen. sing. and plur. and dat. sing.: while *ta sabbata* is of the third dec., making the dat. plur. *sabbasi*, from a nom. sing. *sabbat*, gen. *sabbatos*. This seems to be Winer's opinion, and based partly on Passow. Yet Winer refers accurately to the fact, that the regular dative plural *sabbatois* is found in LXX. and in Josephus; and acknowledges that it occasionally appears in the N. T., among the various readings, according to good Codd. We cite the Vatican, at Matt. xii. 1, 12. As to *sabbat*, and *sabbatos*, we have nothing cited in support of either; a mere hypothesis, by which to account for *sabbasi*.

Parkhurst, an industrious and patient investigator of the N. T. language, gives "*to sabbaton*, plur. *ta sabbata*, dat. *sabbasi*, from the Heb. *shabbath*, or *shabbathon*." Liddell & Scott's admirable *Lexicon*, based on the German Work of Passow, gives us "*sabbasi*, heterocl. dat. pl. of *sabbaton* (the Heb. word being *shabbath*), Mel. 83, 4. Also, *sabbaton*, *to*, the Hebrew *Sabbath*, i. e. *rest*: hence *the seventh day*, or *day of rest*; also in plur. *ta sabbata*, LXX., and N. T.; dat. pl. *sabbasi*, v. sub. voc.—2, *a week*, N. T."

There is no dispute as to the gender and number; the unanimous decision of the scholars affirming *sabbata*, to be neuter and plural. It occurs but once in the N. T., Acts xvii. 2, where it is undeniably neuter plural: "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days (*kai epi sabbata tria*) reasoned with them

out of the Scriptures." These were the Jewish Sabbaths. The numeral *tria* decides the gender and number of *sabbata*, to be neuter and plural. The illustrations are numerous in the LXX., but we limit ourselves now to one: Lev. xix. 3, "Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father, and keep my sabbaths (*kai ta sabbata mou phulaxesthe*)." Here, the article *ta* determines the gender and number of *sabbata* to be neuter and plural.

The gender of a Greek noun is distinguished by its signification, or by the final letter of the stem; and is generally accompanied by the article in accord with the gender and number; which gen. and num. may also be known by an adjective. Where a noun is found with such relations to articles or adjectives, as to determine its gender and number; that noun when occurring without article or adjective, would be properly regarded as in the same gender, or number.

Well, *sabbata* is found so accompanied by an article, or adjective as to determine it to be neuter and plural: but is never found with article or adjective, so as to determine it, to be sing. or feminine: and when found without article or adjective, as is sometimes the case, it must be regarded as when it has such accompaniment.

The only claim of *sabbata*, to the fem. sing. we have met with, was in the columns of the Presbyterian Weekly, preferred by a correspondent. The plea was based upon Ex. xvi. 23, 25, 26; xx. 10; xxxi. 15; Lev. xvi. 31; xxiii. 3, 32; xxv. 2, 4; Deut. v. 14. But there is neither article nor adjective in any one of these citations, to determine either the gend. or num. of *sabbata*; and unless some undoubted proof of that word being fem. and sing. from some other passage can be produced, it cannot be reasonable to prefer such a claim in its behalf.

Take for instance of the cited passages; Ex. xxxi. 15, *teei de hemerai teei hebdomeei sabbata, anapausis hagia*

*tooi kuriooi* (on the seventh day is the (or *a*) sabbath, a holy rest unto the Lord). It is evident that *sabbata* is without article or adjective; nor is there anything in the passage, to demonstrate it to be fem. or singular. Look then at the 13th verse, and we have TA SABBATA, neut. and plural; at the 14th verse, where we have TA SABBATA, *hoti* HAGION TOUTO *esti*, neut. and plur.; at the 16th verse, finding TA SABBATA \* \* \* AUTA, neut. and plural. Now to select the 15th verse, where there is nothing whatever determinate as to the gender or number of *sabbata*, from two verses preceding, and one verse succeeding, in each case immediately, in which there is undeniable proof of its being neuter and plural; and so claim that this 15th verse exhibits *sabbata* as fem. sing. cannot be correct.

The examination of the other citations, gives the same result. No fair analysis can decide otherwise.

It may be of interest here, to notice the fact, that *sabbata* is used to signify *the sabbath*, the day of weekly rest, which, in English, is singular. Winer says, "Not a few nouns used by us in the singular, were employed exclusively, or at least predominantly (by Greek writers) in the plural; this is owing to the objects denoted by them having—from a general or from a Grecian or Biblical point of view—some sensible or ideal manifoldness of comprehensiveness; as *aiouones*, Heb. i. 2, *world*; *ouranoi celi*, II Cor. xii. 2, *ta hagia*, the *sanctuary*; Heb. viii. 2, \* \* \* *ta himatia* of a single *upper garment*; John xix. 23; the names of festivals *engkainia*, *genesia azuma*; \* \* \* *Ta sabbata* when only the weekly day of rest is meant, Matt. xii. 1; Luke iv. 16, etc., is either a transfer of the Aramæan form of *shabbatha*, or framed after the analogy of names of festivals."—*Gram. N. T.*, 176, 177. It is evident, that *sabbaton*, both in sing. and pl., is used to signify *the sabbath day* and *a week*, in the N. T. As to the sing.

form, nothing need be mentioned ; while of the plural, we refer to Winer's rule of comprehensiveness, and of festivals ; and to Calvin's accurate statement, that the Jews, in honor of the sacred day, called the whole week sabbath (*totam hebdomadam Sabbatum vocaverunt*). As Lightfoot, Michaelis, etc., illustrate from the old Hebrew writers, Sunday was the First day *Beshabbath* ; Monday, the Second day *Beshabbath*, etc.

But, after all this demonstration, which ought to be satisfactory, of the *gend.* and *numb.* of *sabbata*, we turn to the facts, that it is not to be found in connection with a feminine article, or with a feminine adjective : but, wherever found with an article, it is the neuter ; wherever found with an adjective, it is neuter. Further, were *sabbata* first *dec. fem. sing.* it would make *sabbatees*, *sabbateei*, *gen.* and *dat. sing.* ; but no such forms are found ; and as to *toon sabbatoon*, that is altogether too indefinite, to prove any gender or declension from : it proves nothing but number and case : for it would be *gen. plur.* of either the form *to sabbas*, Passow's *to sabbat*, the hypothetical *hee sabbata*, or the actual *to sabbaton* of the N. T.

The hypothesis claims but the two forms *sabbata* and *sabbatoon* : *nom. sing.* and *gen. plural.* As we have just shown, *toon sabbatoon* determines nothing but *numb.* and *case.* There is nothing to be had from the article, as to the gender ; nothing but some one of the adjectives, or participles can determine the gender ; and no such *fem. adjective* or *participle* is to be found, to determine *sabbatoon* in the feminine.

A word more may be inserted as to the plural forms *sabbata*, *sabbatoon*, used to designate the sabbath day. At *Exod. xx. 8*, the *LXX.* renders *zakor eth yom hashabbath* (remember the sabbath day) by "*mneestheeti teen hemeran toon sabbatoon* to sanctify it." And at

v. 10, *yom hashebingi shabbath* (the seventh day a sabbath), by "*teei de hemerai teei heei hebdomeei sabbata* to the Lord thy God." It would be useless to dispute the plural forms of the words in question, or that they express a singular sense: illustrating Winer's rule, respecting festivals. So also, Eusebius uses the plural *sabbatoon* in the singular sense, sabbath; when he affirms that the righteous men antedating Abraham were Christians in fact, though not in name; he says, "*They* did not practice circumcision, nor do *we*; *they* did not observe the sabbath (*oute sabbatoon epiteereeseoos*), nor do *we*." *Ecc. Hist.*, I. iv. 8.

Then, how are we to account for the form *mian sabbatoon*? The ellipsis is to be supplied by *hemeran* governing *sabbatoon* in the gen. plural: and the phrase signifies "the first day of the week."

We refer to the learned work of Bos, on the Greek Ellipses, edited by G. H. Schæfer, (London, 1825,) p. 108, and a foot note on p. 109, from which two pages we make a brief extract.

"HEMERA, *Dies (day)*. The word *hemera* is very generally (*passim*) understood, as in *hee mia*, \* \* \* *hee deuterā*, \* \* \* *hee tritee*, etc., the editor, Schæfer, citing, in addition, Plutarch, t. i. p. 805, *tee pro mias noonoon Oktoobrioon*, *the day before* the nones of October. \* \* \* Refer here *mian toon sabbatoon*, the first of the week (*i. e.* day): Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Acts xx. 7; I Cor. xvi. 2; for John supplies the ellipsis, xx. 19, *en hemerai teei miai toon sabbatoon* (in the day the first of the week). In these passages those interpreters who have not observed their Syro-Chaldaism, fail to exhibit their meaning. For it must be noticed that *Shabbath* and *Shabbathon*, to the Jews of that age, signified 'a week;' and their manner of enumerating days, was this: the first day of the week, was to them, CHAD BESHABBATH, *mia toon sabbatoon*, *i. e.* *hemera*,



'the first of the week' (day). The second, SHENI BESHABBATH, *deutera toon sabbatoon*, and so throughout. It would be necessary that we should produce examples from cotemporary writers had not Lightfoot saved us that trouble, and to him the reader is referred."

Turning to this reference, *Lightfoot*: edited by Rev. John Rogers Pitman; London, 1823, we have at Matt. xxviii. 1, "*Opse de toon sabbatoon*: In the end of the sabbath." In the Jerusalem Talmudists it is *bepooki shoobba*, "In the coming forth of the sabbath;" vulgarly, *bemootsai shabbath*, "in the going out of the sabbath:" *cheda gneroobeth shabbath*, "On a certain eve of the sabbath," namely, when the sabbath began, "there was no wine to be found in all Samaria: *bepooki shoobba* but, at the end of the sabbath there was found abundance, because the Aramites had brought it, and the Cuthites had received it." *Avoodah Zarah*, fol. 44, 4.

"*Eis mian sabbatoon*: 'Toward the first day of the week.' The Jews reckon the days of the week thus: *echad beshabba*, 'one day (or the first day) of the sabbath:' *theri beshabba*, 'two (or the second day) of the sabbath:' 'Two witnesses come and say, *bechad beshabba*, the first day of the sabbath, this man stole, etc.; *vebetheri beshabba* and, on the second day of the sabbath, judgment passed on him.' *Bab. Maccoth*, fol. 5, 1.

"*Shelishi beshabbath*, 'the third day of the sabbath.' 'A virgin is married on the fourth day of the week; for they provide for the feast *echad beshabbath*, the first day of the week: *sheni beshabbath*, the second day of the week: *shelishi beshabbath* and the third day of the week.' *Bab. Chetab*, fol. 21.

"*Berebingi beshabbath*, 'on the fourth day of the week, they set apart him, who was to burn the red heifer.' *Gloss. an Parah*, cap. 2.

"*Bechemishi beshabbath*, 'on the fifth of the sabbath.' 'Ezra ordained, that they should read the law publicly,

on the second and fifth days of the sabbath, etc. He appointed, that judges should sit in the cities on the second and fifth days; (*Hieros. Meg.*, fol. 75, 1); Ezra also appointed, that they should wash their clothes *bechemishi beshabbath* on the fifth day of the sabbath.' *Bab. Bava Kama*, fol. 82.

"The sixth day they commonly called *gnereb beshabbath*, 'the eve of the sabbath:'—'To wash their clothes on the fifth day of the sabbath, and eat onions on the eve of the sabbath.' *Leusden's edition*, Vol. 2, p. 390. *Bab. Bava Kama*, fol. 82. '*Chemishi beshabbath, vegnereb shabbath, veshabbath*, on the fifth day of the sabbath (or week), and the eve of the sabbath, and the sabbath.'

"The first day of the week, which is now changed into the sabbath, or Lord's day, the Talmudists call *yom nootseri*, 'the Christians' day,' or 'the Christian day:' *yom nootseri gnolem esoor*, 'On the Christians' day, it is always forbidden' for a Jew to traffic with a Christian. Where the *Gloss.* saith thus: *nootseri*, 'A Nazarine or Christian is he, who followeth the error of that man, who commanded them *langasoth lehem yom eyed bechad, beshabbath*, to make the first day of the week a festival to him: and according to the words of Ismael, it is always unlawful to traffic with them three days before that day, and three days after, that is, not at all, all the week through.' *English folio edition*, Vol. II., p. 292. We cannot here pass by the words of the Glossers on *Babyl. Rosh hashanah*, fol. 22, 2: 'The Baithuseans desire, that the first day of the Passover might be on the sabbath; so that the presenting of the sheaf might be on the first day of the week; and the feast of Pentecost, on the first day of the week.'"

So far, *Lightfoot*.

MICHAELIS, *Int. N. T.* (*Marsh*), p. 136: "The N. T. was written in a language at that time customary among

the Jews, which may be named Hebraic Greek, the first traces of which we find in the translation of the Seventy, which might be more properly called the Alexandrine version." Vol. 1, p. 3. "The Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark have strong marks of this Hebraic style; the former has harsher Hebraisms than the latter, the fault of which may be ascribed to the Greek translator, who has made too literal a version." [Foot note (h) for instance, ch. xxviii. 1,] etc., Vol. 1, p. 112.

"The Syrian, as well as the Chaldæan Jew, called a week, *shabbatha*, because it contained a sabbath, and reckoned the days of the week in the following manner :

1. Sunday, *Had B'shaba*, the one, or the first of the sabbath or week. It must be remembered that in the Oriental languages the cardinal numbers are likewise used as ordinals, which is often imitated by the Seventy. Exod. xl. 2, *en hemerai miai tou meenos tou prootou*.

2. Monday, *T'reen B'shaba*, two, or the second in the week.

3. Tuesday, *T'latha B'shaba*, the third in the week.

4. Wednesday, *Ar'baa B'shaba*, the fourth of the week.

5. Thursday, *Ham'sha B'shaba*, the fifth of the week.

6. Friday, *Aruba*, the preceding evening, or the evening before the sabbath.

7. Saturday, *Shabta*, the Sabbath.

It is therefore by no means extraordinary that *mia sabbatoon*, Matt. xxviii. 1, Mark xvi. 2, Luke xxiv. 1, John xx. 19, Acts xx. 7, I Cor. xvi. 2, should be used for Sunday, or that Friday should be expressed in Jewish Greek *paraskeuee*, a word which appears to have been adopted by Augustus in the Roman law. [Foot note, 'See Jos. Antiq. xvi. 6, 2, where he has recorded an edict of Augustus relating to the Jews, in which is the following clause: *en sabbasin, ee teei*

*tautees paraskeueei apo horas ennatees*: 'on the sabbath, or on the day of the preparation to it, after the ninth hour.'—W.]”

DR. D. B. VON HANEBERG, *The Religious Antiquities of the Bible*, Munchen: 1869. “Finally we will say a few words concerning the manner of designating the ~~days~~ of the week. In the Old Test. no case of such designation occurs, but we find it in the New. There, the day succeeding the Sabbath, which we call Sunday, is designated as *mia toon sabbatoon* (John xx. 1, 19; Acts xx. 7; I Cor. xvi. 2). This use of the cardinal is conformable to the Aramaic usage, while *prooteei sabbatou* (Mark xvi. 9), corresponds better with the usage of the Mischnah. In Aramaic, Sunday is called *Had B'shabbta*; Monday, *T'reen B'shabbta*, etc. The exact rendering of the phrase *Had B'shabbta* is: one (eins) in the week; so that *shabbat* stands here (as *shabba* (a) in Syriac) for week (b). [Foot Note (a) In the N. T. *sabbaton* undoubtedly has the meaning, *week*, in Luke xviii. 12. (b) In the Targum of Esther, ii 9, the seven week days are collectively designated with cardinals, except *the sabbath*. Also in *Breschith rabbah*, § 11, ¶ 9].”

In the above Note (a), Haneberg, referring to Luke xviii 12, uses the word *undoubtedly*, as to the meaning, *week*, of *sabbaton*; as the idea of a straight Pharisee fasting twice on a sabbath day, would seem to be impossible. Buxtorf, *Syn. Jud.* Basil: 1661, p. 574, says, “There are some who fast every Monday and Thursday, through the entire year, like that Pharisee in the N. T., who proudly and arrogantly boasted, that he fasted twice a week: (*se bis hebdomade jejunare.*)” [We have here the incidental testimony of this great master of Hebrew, that *sabbaton* means week, he translating it by the Græc-latin word *hebdomas*]. Again, p. 577: “No one was to keep a private fast (*i. e.* a fast of his own appointing for himself), on the day of the Sabbath, New-moon,

A Solemn Festival, The Dedication of the Temple, Purim, or Eve of the Expiation. No public fast on the sixth day of the week (septimanæ): because they were ~~then occupied~~ in preparing necessaries for the approaching sabbath, and its three banquets (epulis)." At p. 294, he describes the care of the Jews, to be at home in good time, Friday afternoon, so as to prepare for their Sabbath banquets: "and their lodging must be in a vicinity convenient for procuring the supplies required in honor of the sabbath; lest by a deficiency of those things, by which it should be hilarious, the sabbath should be saddened: (ne ex earum defectu, Sabbato, quo hilaris esse debet, contristetur,) \* \* \*. They honor the Sabbath with three banquets, provided according to each one's means. They think it honors the Sabbath, to spend money freely, and to indulge their natural propensity (genio). Hence, certain of the more holy fast on Friday, that they may be able to eat and drink with the greater appetite, on the Sabbath. \* \* \* (p. 297) The table throughout the whole Sabbath, remains covered and supplied, day and night, etc. \* \* \* (p. 298) The richer Jews had clothes, worn on no other day. For the Rabbins call the Sabbath *malkah*, i. e. *queen*: but, if regal vesture were worn except in audience with the queen, it would be an insult to her. Clothed cheerfully in these garments, one will rejoice at the advent of the Sabbath, as if one should go out to meet a King, or a Bridegroom, or Bride. So R. Chaninah decently clad, on the Sabbath eve, stood, and said, 'Come, let us go out to meet the Queen of the Sabbath.' R. Janai said, 'Come, O Spouse; Come, O Spouse.' \* \* \* (p. 314) All these things are briefly and summarily comprehended in *Sepher Hirah*, *Book of Honor*, where the Jew is taught how to piously prepare himself, written in German rhymes, in this sense:

“It is praiseworthy, if you yourself prepare the things necessary to the Sabbath, although you may have many maids and men servants. \* \* \* Be in good spirits, and think yourself rich: arraying yourself in precious vestments and elegant stuffs, for the Sabbath is called a spouse. \* \* \* Approach the Sabbath, hungry (*famelicus*): provide flesh, fish, and generous wine: fair be the covering of the couch, splendid the furnishing of the table. \* \* \* Whet your knife well; carve the food liberally. \* \* \* Use all things that delight the body. Exhibit yourself as joyful, and alert; as though everything were proceeding as you wish, Repel far all grief and sadness. \* \* \* Rejoice with your wife, and your children, Provide three banquets, Do not say anything, except what is promotive of hilarity, etc. \* \* \* (p. 321) Moreover in the treatise *De Sabbatho*, cap. 16, fol. 118, we read: If any one, on the Sabbath, shall relax his mind, and surrender it to delight, and shall spend the Sabbath in pleasure and joy, to him shall God give a perpetual heritage, as it is written (Isai. lviii. 1, 14), ‘Then’ (truly when you shall delight yourself in the Sabbath, and call it a delight, as it is written in the preceding verse), ‘shalt thou delight in the Lord, and I will lift thee upon the high places of the earth, and I will feed thee with the heritage of thy father Jacob.’ \* \* \* Rabbi Juda said, that Rabh said, ‘*col hamgnunnag eth hashabbath*, etc. He who spends the Sabbath hilariously, shall have from God the petitions of his heart, as it is said (Psalm xxxvii. 4), Delight thyself in the Lord, and he will give to thee the petitions of thy heart.’ \* \* \* (p. 332) It is forbidden to protract the morning prayers (at the syn.) beyond the sixth hour of the day; for to continue prayers and fasting longer is prohibited, as the wise show from that often cited passage, Thou shalt call the Sabbath *gnoneg*, Delight. (See *Levush hachor*, num. 288.)” On the

same page Buxtorf mentions the very rare instance, in which fasting on the Sabbath was allowed, viz: when one should have had an alarming dream: (*somnium inauspicatum*). \* \* \* They write, *Tract. de Sabb.* ch. 16, pp. 117, 118, Orach. chajino. numer. 291, "He who shall have observed carefully and diligently those three banquets, shall not be thrust into hell (inferno), and shall be kept safe from the dreadful war of Gog and Magog, etc. \* \* \* Wherefore R. Jose said: '*Yehi chalki men ukeli g. sangudoth beshabbath*, let my portion be with those who celebrate three sabbath-feasts.'" S. J. 335.

We turn now to the LXX.: Ioudith, viii. 6, "And she fasted all the days of her widowhood, except the Pro-Sabbaths, and Sabbaths, Pro-New Moons, New-Moons, and Feasts, and Rejoicings (charmosunoon) of the house of Israel."

It is established, then, that Haneberg had a right to say, "*Sabbaton* undoubtedly has the meaning, *week*, in Luke xviii. 12." A man who held to the tradition of the Elders, could not omit two of the sabbath meals, and boast that he fasted twice on the Sabbath, without being regarded as stupid for considering *that* to be fasting, and impious for violating the very tradition that he professed to venerate: the *special* preparation for that day, being the providing of rich and well cooked food; and no one to consider himself too noble, rich, or wise, to presume to take no personal part in the preparation; no number of servants excusing him from employing his own hands, in the case. So, in *Tract. de Sabb.* fol. 119, and in *Kidduschim*, cap. 2, "The pious Rabb Chasdam chopped herbs, the very learned Rabbam and Rabb Joseph split wood, Rabbi Siram kindled the fire, Rabb Nachman swept the house, and prepared the entire furniture of the table," etc. There can be no diversity of opinion, here; Luke, UNDOUBTEDLY, meant by *dis sabbatou*, *twice a week*.

In the early age of the Church, the Apostolical Constitutions were imposed upon Christians, as the decrees of the Apostles; and, of course, their author endeavored to make them correspond with the facts of the Apostolic times. The learned Dr. Lardner, in his patiently elaborated *Credibility of the Gospel History*, Vol. IV. of his Works; London: 1835, has, in his discussion of the *Ap. Const.*, collected certain allusions to the Sabbath, some of which we introduce. On p. 214, he says, the Bishops are "directed to hold their courts on the second day of the week, on Monday," etc. (*Ta de dikasteeria humoon ginesthoo deuterai sabbatoon*, k. l. L. ii. c. 47.) "They ordain, that by all Christians in general, the sabbath and the Lord's day should be kept as festivals:" (*To sabbaton kai teen kuriakeen heortazete*. L. vii. c. 23, p. 369), "That every sabbath in the year, except one, and every Lord's day, be kept with joy, without making them days of mourning or fasting:" (*Pan men ton sabbaton, aneu tou henos (not mias) kai pasan kuriakeen epitelountes sunodous euphrainesthe*, k. l. L. v. c. 20, p. 327. Vid. et L. vii. c. 36, in. p. 376.) Dr. L., p. 217, quotes the statement of Sozomen, "that at Constantinople, and almost everywhere, except Rome and Alexandria, Christians assembled on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week. (*Emelei hoi men kai tooi sabbatooi, homoioos teei miai sabbatou ekklesiazousin, hoos en Koonstantinoupolei, kai schedon pantakou. En Romeei de, kai Alexandreiai, ouketi*. Soz. L. vii. c. 19, p. 735, B.)

"In the times next following the N. T.," says Dr. L., p. 217, "Ignatius (ad Magnes. cap. ix. p. 20) says: 'Let us no longer sabbatize, but keep the Lord's day, on which our life arose.'" (*— meeketi sabbatizontes, alla kata kuriakeen zoeen zoontees, en hee kai zoee heemoon aneteilen di' autou.*)

In the great annual fast, of ten days, *Orach Chajim*, num. 602, it was expressly provided, that the sabbath,



occurring within those days, should be excepted: that was called *The Sabbath of Penitence*, and, of course, fasting was forbidden, "by the tradition of the Elders," Matt. xv. 2; of which our Lord complained that it rendered "the commandment of God of no effect." That tradition we have in the *Talmud*, where one may see, how impossible it was, that any pharisee could boast of fasting on the Sabbath; he holding the maxim, *beni hizzaher bedibhre sopherim joser middibhre thorah*; "my son, attend to the words of the Scribes, rather than to the words of the Law."

When they return from the synagogue, Friday evening, to them the beginning of the Sabbath (*Minhag*, p. 9, *Orach Chajim*, n. 269), they forthwith sit down to the table, where with the best wine and food they can obtain, they commence their religious festivity. As they came home, two angels, one good, the other evil, accompanied them (*Tract. De Sabb.*, cap. 16, fol. 119, col. 2). If, at their arrival, they found the sabbath-candle well lighted, the table set and furnished with all necessary things, etc.; then the good angel said, "I wish all these things may be next sab. as now!" While the evil angel was compelled, greatly to his disgust, to say, Amen! But if they found matters, the opposite to these, then the evil angel, said, "May it be the next sab. as now!" And the good angel, with equal unwillingness, had to utter his Amen! That is, we have the record, that Rabbi Jose said, that Rabbi Juda said it was so: authority of too much weight with our pharisee, to allow him to fast "twice on the Sabbath." In *Orach Chajim*, num. 274, the one presiding at the table, is required to be more liberal and polite, in his distributing to those with him, than on other days, in honor of the Sabbath, on which day all sparingness is to be avoided.

Another Talmudic fable, of which there appeared, recently, a condensed translation, as it appears in *Tract.*

*De Sabb.*, cap. 16, fol. 119, col. 1, gives an account of Rabbi Chaja, finding at the house of a butcher, with whom he spent a night, a gold table, so heavy as to require sixteen men to lift it; from which hung sixteen silver chains, the table filled with pure silver appointments, such as dishes, spoons, plates, cups; and these loaded with the richest viands of all sorts. After the host had conducted the meal, according to the traditional formulas, to the close; the Rabbi inquired by what good works, he had attained to such amazing opulence? And he was informed, that in the progress of his trade, the finest cattle had been reserved by him, for his celebrations of the Sabbath! Fat beef for his Sabbath feasting, and not fasting, had confirmed the wisdom of the Elders.

On the same page is a story of one Joseph, who for his careful honoring the Sabbath was called *Sabbathicola*: he, a great lover of fish, spared no expense in providing a luxurious supply of that edible, for his Sabbath festivity; honoring the day, in accordance with the traditions of the Elders. One Friday, a huge fish was for sale in the market; but its great price frightened off every one but Joseph; who eagerly secured it, in honor of the Sabbath, and, upon its being opened, found in its stomach a cap, beneath the lining of which, were jewels enough to be the price of a kingdom! This is a meagre statement of the fable; but we have presented enough of it, to show the utter absurdity of supposing that our pharisee, would have risked his fortune and his soul, by daring to fast on the Sabbath.

It would seem to be unnecessary, to urge any additional illustration, of the use of *shabbath* to signify a *week*. But we present another from MAIMMONIDES, *De Syned.*, etc., cap. xi.: "— therefore they did not judge capital cases, Friday (*gnereb shabbath*), nor the day before a festival (*gnereb yom tob*), as should the accused

be condemned, he could not be executed on the ensuing day : for it was interdicted to defer an execution, beyond the day following the sentence, etc. \* \* \* so they held him in custody until the first day of the ensuing week (*echad beshabbath*), and then brought him to trial. The law allowed civil cases to be tried at any time (Ex. xviii. 22.); but the Scribes, in their decrees, cautioned them not to try even civil cases on Friday (*gnereb shabbath*)."

At this point, we are entitled to affirm, that the old Masters, were not hasty, careless, in defining *sabbaton* as signifying both the *Sabbath day* and *a week* : that is, the *Jewish Sabbath* ; for our Christian Sabbath is expressed in the N. T. only as the First Day of The Week, and The Lord's Day. *Sabbaton* occurs twelve times, after the Gospels : *i. e.*, ten times in Acts ; once in I Cor. ; once, Colossians : and in every case, it expresses the *Jewish Sabbath* ; except Acts xx. 7, and I Cor. xvi. 2, where the reference is to the Christian Sabbath, as the First Day of The Week.

Upon the hypothesis, that the Evangelists meant, in their narrative of the resurrection, that the Jewish Sabbaths had terminated, and one of the new series of Christian Sabbaths had occurred, it is inexplicable, that Luke continued, years thereafter, to mention the *Jewish Sabbaths* only, in using the word *sabbaton*, expressive of *sabbath day* ; and, long after the conversion of Paul, still speaks of the Christian Sabbaths, as "on one of the Sabbaths !" . While, Paul writing to the Corinthians, (I Cor. xvi. 2,) twenty-three years after the commencement of the new series of Sabbaths, still writes "one of the Sabbaths !" The Jewish Sabbath, abrogated, dismissed, according to express Apostolic statement, *opse sabbatoon ; diagenomenou tou sabbatou* ; and "one of the " Christian Sabbaths having occurred twenty-three years before ; yet Luke and Paul still referring, in the

old familiar way to the Jewish Sabbath ; while they continue using their "one of the Sabbaths" as the appellation of the *Christian* day ! The hypothesis is evidently unsustained, impossible.

While to render *mia*, in the case, *first*, which is demonstrated clearly and abundantly, to be the proper rendering ; and yet holding *sabbaton* never to signify *a week* ; is equally inadmissible ; perhaps it makes the matter worse ; for, then we would have *the first* Christian Sabbath, at the resurrection, and *the first* Christian Sabbath twenty-three years thereafter : and, in fact, as to Paul's *first* Christian Sabbath, *I Cor.* xvi. 2, his language is *kata mian sabbatoon*, "EVERY first of the Christian Sabbaths," which is the actual force of *kata*, in this place.

Our predecessors were not infallible : nor are we. We owe more than we generally acknowledge, to those patient, laborious investigators ; certainly, too much to excuse our rejection of their demonstrated, rational, consistent definitions ; and the substitution of our crude, inconsistent, absurd hypotheses ; under the unwarranted and ungrateful pretense, that one of the pioneers carelessly took a false route, and the rest followed blindly in the old beaten track.

*An Introduction, etc.* By Thomas Hartwell Horne, M. A. (of St. John's College, Cambridge). From the Fourth Corrected Edition. Philadelphia : 1825. Vol. III., part II., ch. iv., § 3. *Of the Jewish \* \* \* mode of computing time* : "Seven nights and days constituted a WEEK ; six of these were appropriated to labor and the ordinary purposes of life, and the *seventh* day or *sabbath* was appointed by God to be observed as a day of rest, *because that on it he had rested from all his work which God had created and made.* (*Gen.* ii. 3.) This division of time was universally observed by the descendants of Noah ; and, being lost during the bond-

age of the Israelites in Egypt, was revived and enacted by Moses agreeably to the divine command. This is evident from the word *Sabbat* or *Sabbata*, denoting a week among the Syrians, Arabians, Christian Persians, and Ethiopians, as in the following ancient Syriac Calendar expressed in Hebrew characters:

Chad-shabbatha: One of the Sabbath or Week—Sunday.

Theri-shabbatha: Two of the Sabbath or Week—Monday.

Telath-shabbatha: Three of the Sabbath—Tuesday.

Arbegna-shabbatha: Four of the Sabbath—Wednesday.

Chamesha-shabbatha: Five of the Sabbath—Thursday.

Gner-shabbatha: Eve of the Sabbath—Friday.

Shabbatha: The Sabbath—Saturday.

The high antiquity of this calendar is evinced by the use of the cardinal numbers *one, two, three*, etc., instead of the ordinals *first, second, third*, etc., following the Hebrew idiom; as in the account of the creation, where we read in the original, "*one day—two day—three day*," etc.; where the Septuagint retains it in the first, calling it *hemera mia*. [The Heb. Script. *Gen. i. 5. Yom echad*, rend. by LXX. *hemera mia*: but *Yom sheni, yom shelishi*, etc., using the ordinals *second, third*, etc. So, there must be some error here, as to the Heb. text.—W.] It is remarkable that all the evangelists follow the Syriac calendar, both in the word *sabbata*, used for "*a week*," and also in retaining the cardinal number *mia sabbatoon*, "*one of the week*," to express the day of the resurrection. (Matth. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1.) Afterwards Mark adopts the usual phrase, *prooteei sabbatou*, "*the first day of the week*," (Mark xvi. 9,) where he uses the singular *sabbaton* for a week; and so does Luke, as *neesteuoo distou sabbatou*, "*I fast twice a week*." Luke xviii. 12.

The Syriac name for Friday, or the sixth day of the week, is also adopted by Mark, who renders it *prosabbaton*, "*sabbath eve*" (xv. 42), corresponding to *paraskeue*, "preparation day." (Matth. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 31.) And Josephus also conforms to this usage, except that he uses *sabbata* in the singular sense, for the *sabbath day*, in his account of a decree of Augustus, exempting the Jews of Asia and Cyrene from secular services, *en sabbasi, ee teei protautees paraskeueei, apo tees hooras ennatees*. "On the sabbath day, or on the preparation day before it, from the ninth hour." *Antiq.* 16, 7, 2. The first three evangelists also use the plural *sabbata*, to denote the sabbath day. (Matth. xii. 5-11; Mark i. 21, and ii. 23; Luke iv. 16, etc.) Whereas John, to avoid ambiguity, appropriates the singular *sabbaton* to the *sabbath day*, and the plural *sabbata* to the *week*. (John v. 9-16, vii. 22, etc., xx. 1.)

GLOSSARIUM *Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis*. "SABBATUM, with the Hebrews signified the whole week, and also the sabbath day. Eusebius Pamph. in his remarks on *opse sabbatoon*, 'It was the custom *teen holeen hebdomeda sabbaton kalein, kai pasas tas hemeras sabbaton onomazein*.' [To call the whole week *sabbath*, and to affix *sabbath* to the name of each day.—W]. When it signifies a *week*, it is divided into days, of which the first is (*Prima Sabbati*), the first of the Sabbath; the second (*Secunda Sabbati*), the second of the Sabbath; and so on, unto the seventh, which is called Sabbath, as observed by Jerome, in his *Epistola ad Hedibiam*, quæes. 4, and by Augustin, in Psalm 80; by the same Eusebius in his *Res. Dom.* p. 477, edit. Combefisii; and by Hesychius Presb. Hierosolymit. *Homil. in Dominicam Resur.* p. 748, edit. ejusdem Combefisii. So Cassianus lib. 3 de *Cœnob. Institut.* cap. 9. *Sixth of the Sabbath*, lib. 4, cap. 19, *Second of the Sabbath*, uses for the sixth

and second week days. \* \* \* *UNA SABBATI, Dies Dominicus.* Glossæ. Gr. MSS. in Cod. Regio 2062: *MIAN sabbatoon, teen kuriakeen kalei ho apostolos.* [The apostle calls the Lord's day, the first day of the week.—W.] Augustin, Ep. 86. "One day of the week [una sabbati—W.] was the day then called, which is now called the Lord's day (Dominicus), as is clearly seen in the gospels: for the day of the Lord's resurrection is called the first day of the week (prima sabbati) by Matthew, but by the rest, one of the week (una sabbati), which evidently was identical with the one afterwards called the Lord's day."

THESAURUS GR. LING. HEN. STEPHANO. "*Sabbaton, to.*] This word is taken (1) peculiarly (proprie) for the festal day among the Israelites, which was to be celebrated every seventh day. Then, for all the festal days of the Jews. \* \* \* (2) Unfitly (improprie) for a week. In this sense *mia toon sabbatoon*, with the Evangelists, is the first (prima) day of the week, *i. e.* the Lord's day. Chrysost. Hom. 85 in Johan. ad c. 20, *teei miai toon s., toutesti teei kuriakeei*, etc." [on the first day of the week, that is, the Lord's day.—W.]

FRANZ PASSOW. Neu Bearbeitet und Zeitgemass Umgestaltet: von Dr. Fr. Palm, Dr. O. Kreuzler, Prof. K. Keil, Dir. Ferd. Peter und Dr. G. E. Benseler. Leipzig: 1857. "Ta Sabbata, *the week*, KS; auch To sabbaton, *Euseb. Pamph.*"

LIDDELL & SCOTT. Sixth Edition, Revised and Augmented. Oxford: 1869. "*Sabbaton, to*, The Hebrew Sabbath, *i. e.* Rest, etc. \* \* \* (2) *a week, proteei sabbatou; eis mian s.* on the first day of *the week*, Marc. xvi. 9; Matth. xxviii. 1; cf. I Cor. xvi. 2; *dis tou sabbatou*, Luc. xviii. 12."

PARKHURST, *Gr. Lex. to the N. T.* London: 1825. "*Sabbaton, to*, plur. *sabbata, ta*, dat. *sabbasi*. 2. Both sing. and plur. *A week* \* \* \* so the Heb. *shabbathon*

is used for *weeks*, Lev. xxiii. 15; and shabbath for *a week*, verse 16, according to the interpretation of the Targum, LXX., and Vulgate."

JOHN PETER LANGE, D. D. *Com. on the H. S.* New York: 1866. On Matth. xxviii. 1, where, in a critical note, Dr. Schaff says, "The term *mia sabbatoon* agrees with the Rabbinical signification of the days of the week: *echad beshabbath*, Sunday; *sheni beshabbath*, Monday; *shelishi beshabbath*, Tuesday; etc. See Lightfoot, p. 500. As *sabbata* in the second clause certainly means *week* and not the sabbath *day*, it seems natural to understand it in the same way in the first clause, as Grotius, Wiesler, and Stier."

ALFORD, *Gr. Test.* New York: 1859. Matth. xxviii. 1, "*Mian sabbatoon* is a Hebraism; the Rabbinical writings use *echad, sheni, shelishi, etc.*, affixing *beshabbath* to each, for Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc."

JOANNIS CALVINI, *Op. Omn. Amstelod. Ap. Joan. Jac. Schipper.* 1567. Matth. xxviii. 1; Marc. xvi. 2; Luc. xxiv. 1. "Mark's 'when the Sabbath had passed,' is equivalent to Matthew's 'evening which was brightening into the first day of the week (Sabbathorum);' and Luke's 'on the first day of the week (Sabbathorum).'<sup>2</sup> Two Evangelists mention *primam diem Sabbathorum*, which (day) was the first in order between two Sabbaths. Because some have rendered it Unam (one) many have been led into error, on account of unskilfulness in the Hebrew tongue: for as ECHAD sometimes signifies *one*, sometimes *first*, the Evangelists (as in many other places) following the Hebrew phrase, used *mian*. Lest the ambiguity should lead some one astray, I have given the sense of the writers more clearly.

"Luc. xviii. 12. Sabbathum in this passage, as elsewhere frequently, is taken for *a week*. But never in the Law, does God command his servants to fast twice each week (*singulis septimanis*).



“John xx. 1. *On the first day of the week, etc.* The actual word indeed is *one* (*una*): but it was quite common (*trivium est*) to put *one* for *first*: because in numbers we commence from unity (*in numeris principium incipit ab unitate*). But as each seventh day was dedicated to rest, they called the whole week (*hebdomadam*) Sabbath: on account of the sanctity of the day, honoring it by denominating from it, the other days (*hoc honoris dantes diei sanctitati ut reliquum tempus denominationem ab eo sumeret*). \* \* \* The first day of the week (*Sabbathorum*) had regard to the next Sabbath (*proximi Sabbathi*); because it was the beginning of the week (*septimanæ*) of which the Sabbath was the close (*clausula*).

“Acts xx. 7. *On one day of the Sabbaths* (*uno autem die Sabbathorum*). ON ONE DAY: He (Luke) means either the first day of the week (*hebdomadis*) next after the Sabbath, or some one Sabbath (*unum quodpiam Sabbathum*); the latter appearing to me the more probable, for the reason that that day was more convenient for a public assembly: but as from their use of the Hebrew tongue, it was nothing new for the Evangelists to put *one* for *first*, it seems fittest, that the assembly was held the day after the Sabbath. \* \* \* Quite likely also is it, that the Apostle awaited the Sabbath, that the day before his departure, he might the more easily collect all the disciples into one place.” [As the Greek text is, *en de teei miai toon sabbatoon*, and conforms precisely to Luke’s *teei de miai toon sabbatoon*, it is not easy to understand why Calvin having rendered the latter passage “the first day of the week,” should propose to read the former “some one Sabbath,” meaning the seventh day, or Jewish Sabbath. It is not likely that Luke would use *teei de miai toon sabbatoon* xxiv. 1; and Acts xx. 7; with diverse meanings. If he meant by it “the first day of the week,” in his gospel,

as Calvin has demonstrated, with the common consent of scholars; he used it in the same sense in his Acts.]

"I Cor. xvi. 2. *In una Sabbathum*: The intent was, that they should have their alms prepared in time: therefore he orders them not to await his arrival; because that which is done suddenly and tumultuously, is not done well; but to contribute as seemed proper to, and according to the ability of each, on the Sabbaths; that is, on the usual day of assembling. This phrase *kata mian sabbatoon*, Chrysostom expounds '*on the first Sabbath*' (primo Sabbatho): to which I do not assent: for the Apostle rather signifies, that they should contribute, one on one Sabbath, another on another; or even that each might contribute on every Sabbath if so disposed (unoquoque Sabbatho si voluerint). \* \* \* Nor do I agree with Chrysostom, that Sabbathum here means *the Lord's day*: for it is more likely, that the Apostles at first retained the day they were accustomed to (diem jam usitatum): afterwards compelled by the Jewish superstition, having abrogated that, they substituted another. They chose the Lord's day, in preference to others, because the resurrection of our Lord put an end to the shadows of the Law; that day thus admonishing us of Christian liberty." [It is evident, that Calvin understood the word *sabbatoon* here to refer to sabbath days, Jewish Sabbaths; that, as yet, the Apostles held their religious assemblies on the seventh day of the week, though they afterwards changed to the first day of the week, the Lord's day; and he discovers here no tint of such an opinion as that the series of Christian *Sabbaths*, had begun yet, although this occurrence was at least twenty years after the resurrection. We are again at a loss to conceive how he could affirm so positively that *mian sabbatoon*, Matth. xxviii. 1, meant "the first day of the week," and that the same phrase, here, in I Cor. xvi. 2, alluded to Jewish Sabbaths,

which occurred on the seventh day of the week. His objection to Chrysostom's *primo sabbatho* is equally obscure. That author's works, as by the Oxford translation, 1845, exhibit I Cor. xvi. 2, "On the first day of the week, that is, the Lord's day, let each of you lay up by himself in store whatever he may be prospering in." In the *Patrologiæ Græcæ*. Tom. 61. Paris, 1862, we have Chrysostom's utterance, in his own tongue; *Kata mian sabbatou, toutesti, Kuriakeen, hekastos humoon par heautooi tithetoo thesaurizoon ho ti an euodotai*. There is no *primo sabbatho* here. Chrysostom writes *mian*, feminine, with *sabbatou*, neuter; and cannot mean *the first sabbath* nor *one sabbath*; but meant, most evidently, *the first day of the week*, that is *the Lord's day*. Calvin seems to have supposed, that in writing *mian sabbatou*, instead of *mian sabbatoon*, he meant that the word was to be taken, here, in the singular, and so criticises him as meaning *primo sabbatho*; showing Calvin's adherence to *mian* as meaning *FIRST*; but his overlooking the fact of its being feminine. The truth is, it is most probable, that Chrys. did not make any change, but gave the reading of the Epistle, as he had it; and which is the reading of the Codex Sinait. and the Vulgate. Dr. C. P. Wing, in the *Lange Comm.* says, "The sing. *sabbaton* has been adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, on the authority of A. B. C. D. E. F. G. I., Sinait., the Ital., and Vulg. versions, Chrys. and the Latin writers."

The latitude of the Apostle's *kata mian sabbatoon*, so that one disciple might select one Sabbath; and another, another; while any who preferred might contribute every Sabbath: Calvin seems to think required the plural *Sabbatoon*. Yet the Apostle appears to be remarkably definite: "every first day of the week (*kata mian sabbatoon*), let every one of you (*hekastos humoon*) lay up by himself in store, as God hath prospered him."

How could language be more definite? No one of them had any choice in the matter: every one, every first day of the week, was to lay by as he had prospered, something for the Church's contribution, to be delivered at the arrival of the Apostle.

It may be noted, too, that if the true reading be *sabbatou*, it gives us an additional instance of *sabbaton* signifying a week.

So much for the meaning of *sabbatoon*, WEEK: and we proceed to determine the proper signification of *mian* in our passage. Of course, HEIS, *m.*, MIA, *fem.*, HEN, neut. is the Greek cardinal ONE; but, it is used also for the ordinal PROOTOS, *m.*, PROOTEE, *fem.*, PROOTON, *neut.* FIRST: as will be seen.

Thes. Gr. Ling. H. Steph. Paris: 1835. "HEIS, MIA, HEN: *Primus*; for the Hebrews frequently used a cardinal for an ordinal number. Gen. i. 5. And it was evening and it was morning, *hemera mia*. Joseph. Ant. Jud. i. 2. when he had spoken of the work of the first day, adds, 'and this was the first (prootee) day: but Moses called it *mian*.'" [Josephus affirms, in continuation, 'the cause of which I am able to give even now; but as I have promised to give such reasons in a separate treatise, I shall postpone its exposition until then.' And Prof. Whiston, in a note, says, 'One is put for the *first* not only here in the Hebrew and Numb. xxix. 1. Dan. ix. 1. but elsewhere in Joseph. viii. 5. xviii. 4. and in the Greek, Matth. xxviii. 1. John xx. 1. 19. I Cor. xvi. 2. as Ainsworth observes on this text. It is also in Philo, and among the Egyptians and Chaldeans, and even in Diodorus Siculus.'—W.] Basil. M. Homil. 2 in Hexaem. Vol. I. p. 20. D. labors greatly in investigating the cause of the expression *hemera mia*, instead of *prootee*. But, as he did not understand the Hebrew idiom (consuetudo), he did not succeed. The same *enallage* of number occurs also in the N. Testament.

As what Matth., xxviii. 1., calls *mian sabbatoon*, Mark xvi. 9, calls *prooteei* (*sabbatou*). SUICER. Dionys. de comp. verb. p. 174: *Mia men hautee suzugia* [the first conjugation]. And again: *hautee deutera suzugia* [the second conjugation]. The same, II, *heis* although it be rendered *one*, the Greeks often use it for the ordinal, when united with another ordinal. Herod. 5. 89: *tooi heni kai trieekostooi* (anno.) [the thirty-first year.—W.] Marm. Par ep. 48, ap. Breckh. Vol. 2, p. 296, 48: *etous eikostou kai henos*. [the twenty-first.—W.] Diodor. 16, 71: *Eisi de hai bibloi treis, apo tees mias tettarakostees achri tees tritees kai tettarakostees*. [from the forty-first to the forty-third.—W.] Dionys. A. R. 3, 46: *Paralabanei teen basileian eniautooi deuterooi malista tees mias kai tettarakostees Olumpiados*. [the forty-first Olympiad.—W.] Tzetz. Hist. 6, 602: *Hekaton-tessarakoston kai mian hupeergmeneen \* \* \* historian*. L. D." [six hundred and forty-first.—W.]

Passow: Leipzig, 1847. Heis, mia, hen.) Sch., in den LXX. u. NT. gerade zu für *prootos*. [Schleusner, in the LXX. and the N. T. absolutely for *prootos*.—W.]

JOSEPHUS, A. J. XVIII, 4, p. 140, (16), Fl. Jos. Oper. Omnia ab Immanuele Bekkero. Lipsiæ: 1856. "*Ho archiereus meta mian tees heortees hemeran apeitheto authis eis ton oikon, heeper ekeito proteron*." [The high priest laid them up again in the same chamber where they had been laid up before, and this the very next day after the feast was over. *Whiston's tr.* The *very next day*, i. e. the *first day*, *mian hemeran*, after the feast was over.—W.]

BUXTORF. Lex. Heb. Et Chald. Glasgæ: 1824, "*Echad*) unus, quidam, primus. Ezra, v. 13. bishnath chadah, *in anno primo*." [in the first year, i. e. of Cyrus the King of Babylon: and rendered by LXX. *en etei prootooi*.—W.]

SCHLEUSNER. Nov. Thes. Philog.—Crit. in LXX., etc. Glasgæ: 1822. Heis, mia, hen,) *unus*, it. *alter*,

*alius, idem, quidam, solus, primus.* Gen. i. 5, *hemera mia, dies primus* [first day.—W.] And see Gen. viii. 13." [*tou prootoou meenos, miai, tou, meenos, etc.*, i. e. in the first month, the first (*day*) of the month, etc. It should be observed, that the LXX. had no Heb. word for *month*, in the phrase "the first month;" while in the phrase "the first of the month," the numeral is fem. though *meenos* is masc. genitive and sing. and so the ellipsis must be supplied, necessarily, by a fem. noun; and that fem. noun is *hemerai*. The case is similar to Mark xvi. 9, *prooi prooteei sabbatou*, "early on the first day of the week:" where *prooteei* is fem. and *sabbatou* is neut. gen. sing. and the rendering is necessarily "the first day of the week;" for it could not be "the first hour of the Sabbath," as the Sabbath was passed; nor could it be "the first of the Sabbaths," as *sabbatou* is singular; nor, finally, "the first Sabbath," as the difference in both gend. and case decides that to be impossible: "the first day of the week" is the only possible rendering.—W.]

PARKHURST. Gr. and Eng. Lex. to the N. T. London: 1825. "Heis, mia, hen. III. *The first*. This use of the word is common in the LXX., where it answers to the Heb. *echad*, used in like manner; yet this application is not *merely* Hellenistical; for in *Polybius* we meet with this expression, *en teei miai kai eikosteei biblooi*, i. e. as we say in English, in the *one-and-twentieth* book; and in *Herodotus*, lib. v. we read *tooi heni kai triakostooi (etei* namely) in the *one-and-thirtieth* year, for *tooi prootooi, etc.* See Matth. xxviii. 1. I Cor. xvi. 2. Mark xvi. 2. Comp. ver. 9. and Rev. vi. 1." Mark xvi. 9 we have already considered. At Rev. vi. 1 we have the opening of the seals, by the Lamb. Of these seals there were seven; and the purpose of the Revelator, was to describe their being opened, in order; the first, second, third, etc.: precisely

as Moses purposed to give an account of the six days of creation, in their order, ending with the seventh, the Sabbath, the day of rest. Both writers use the cardinal *mia* for the first of the series, with seal (*sphragis*), and day (*hemera*), for both these nouns are fem.; while the series is continued by the use of the *ordinals*. Now, "when the Lamb opened one of the seals," (*mian ektoon sphragidoon*) that was certainly the *first* seal: it was the description of the opening of the *first*: and any one now referring to that particular seal, would be compelled to use the term *first*; for "one of the seals," would be utterly indefinite, referring to any one of the seven, and to one as much as another: and no one would or could have objected, had our translators given us "the first of the seals," or "the first seal," as they gave us, Gen. i. 5, "the first day." Undeniably, "one day" would not designate the first day of the creation, one whit more definitely than any other of the six; for each of the six was "one day;" while only one of the six, was the *first*, the *second*, the *third*, etc. If the purpose of translation, is to express the meaning, the sense, the idea of the translated language, in another; then, assuredly, our translators were right in giving "first day" as the proper English of *yom echad*; and would have been right, had they given "first seal" for "*mia sphragis*."

WINER, Gram. of the Idiom of the N. T. Seventh Edition: By Luneman. Authorized translation. Andover: 1877. "§ 37. NUMERALS. I. In expressing the day of the week, *heis* is always used for the ordinal number *prootos*, as Matth. xxviii. 1. *eis mian sabbatoon*, Mark xvi. 2. *prooi tees mias Sabbatoon*, Luke xxiv. 1; Jno. xx. 1, 19; Acts xx. 7; I Cor. xvi. 2." It is but proper to state, that in this same § 37. 1. Winer denies the accuracy of rendering the cardinal by an ordinal, in other cases than "in expressing the days of the week,"

except in such citations as we have made of compound numerals, as *heis kai triekostos* (Her. 5. 89) *one-and-thirtieth*.

"The preceding use of the numeral is Hebraistic (Ewald, krit. Gr. 496; on the Talmud, see Wetsten. I. 544; in the Sept. cf. Exod. xl. 2; Num. i. 1, 18; Ezra x. 16 f.; II Macc. xv. 36) and has in classical Greek a parallel in compound numerals, etc.; \* \* \* We, too, use in like manner the cardinal numeral in giving the year, page, etc., mainly for brevity's sake, as *in the year eighteen, page forty*," etc.

Turning to Winer's references, we have at Exod. xl. 2, *en hemerai miai tou meenos tou prootou*: "On the *first* day of the first month." Numb. i. 1. *en miai tou meenos tou deuterou*: "On the *first* day of the second month." 18. *en miai tou meenos tou deuterou*: "On the *first* day of the second month." Ezra x. 16. f. *en hemerai miai tou meenos tou dekatou*: "On the *first* day of the tenth month." II Mac. xv. 36. *echein de episeemon teen triskaidekateen tou doodekatou meenos* \* \* \* *promias hemeras tees Mardochaikees hemeras*: "To celebrate the thirteenth (day) of the twelfth month \* \* \* the *day before* Mordecai's day." Which would be the *first* (certainly not the second, nor any other than the *first*) day before Mordecai's day, which was on the fourteenth. Would it be English to say, Ex. xl. 1, "On the *one* day of the first month?" Or, omitting the article, as, here, in the LXX., "On *one* day of the first month," when the first day of the first month is meant, as is evident from the use, here, of *noumeeniai*?

It will be of some interest, here, to introduce an illustration, of the Talmudic use of *echad* as an *ordinal*. TRACT. TALM. DE FESTO, NOVI ANNI, etc. *Amstel.*: 1695. "There are four beginnings of the year. *Bechad Benisan*, the first day of the month Nisan (March) is the beginning of the year of kings and festivals; *Bechad*



*Belul*, the first day of the month Elul (August) is the new year for the decimating of the cattle; R. Elieser and R. Simeon make it fall *Bechad Betisri*, on the first day of Tisri: *Bechad Betisri*, the first day of the month Tisri (September, new moon) is the beginning of the year for arranging (*figendos*) the years, the releases, the Jubilees, and, at the same time, it is the new year for the planting of all trees and herbs; Finally, the fourth beginning of the year falls on *Bechad Besebat*, the first day of the month Sebat (January, new moon) which is for trees, according to the Schol. of Schammæa, though the Schol. of Hillel makes it the fifteenth day." *Misna* I.

The use of a cardinal for an ordinal, should not surprise us, who are so accustomed to it. We express the cardinals 1, 2, 3, 4, etc.; and the ordinals 1st 2d, 3d, 4th: and yet nothing is more usual, than the use of 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., for both cardinal and ordinal numbers: Chap. 1, page 2, is never misunderstood for chapter *one*, page *two*; but is invariably pronounced chap. *first*, page *second*; which is strictly accurate. Why then should we think it queer that *mia* should be used where the sense is *first*, when it generally means *one*? Especially as the Greek has *protee* to express first, and which *protee* does not mean one? For the same reason possibly, that we use 1 when the sense is *first*, when it generally means *one*; especially as we have 1st, which never means one.

We conclude then, that the old Masters in literature, in deciding that *mia sabbatoon* signifies "the first day of the week," understood the phrase, after careful and patient investigation; and though it may seem odd, that *sabbatoon* should mean both a day, and a week; the word day itself has various meanings, and so has the word week: and when the Masters are asked the ground of their decision; the attentive inquirer soon perceives, that ground to be distinct and satisfactory.

SABBATH, as a title, is never applied, in the N. T., to the first day of the week, the Lord's Day, Sunday; but is used invariably in the Jewish sense. Yet there is no scriptural evidence that the "Lord of the Sabbath," abrogated it. We present a few thoughts. Where is the Sabbath law found? Among the ceremonial laws? No. Among the moral laws? Yes: it is one of the Decalogue. Has the Decalogue been abrogated? Useless question: since each of its enactments is necessarily eternal. To be sure, very distinguished Christians, Papal and Protestant, have excepted this one of the ten, from having perpetual force; understanding it to have been of a ceremonial nature, though the nine others are allowed to be moral. PICTET, on the fourth commandment, teaches that "The Sabbath was abolished with the other ceremonies of the law, and succeeded by the Lord's day, the apostles not so ordering, but practicing, whose example it becomes the Church to imitate, although, in itself, one day cannot be holier than another." (Sabbatum abolitum cum aliis cæremoniis legis, et successisse diem Dominicum, non ita jubentibus, sed observantibus apostolis, quorum exempla imitari decuit Ecclesiam, quamvis ex se una dies altera non sit sanctior.) CARDINAL RICHELIEU, in *Instruc. Du Chrest.* p. 144, on the *third* commandment (properly, *fourth*), says, "There is this difference between this, and the other precepts of the Law, that all the others are natural in all particulars, and consequently perpetual, incapable of change in any respect whatever; while this is ceremonial as to the time we should employ in the special service of God." (Il y a cette difference entre ce precepte et les autres de la Loy, que tous les autres sont naturels en toutes leurs parties, et par consequent perpetuels, sans pouvoir estre changez en quoy que ce puisse estre, au lieu que celuy-ci est ceremonial quant a la determination du temps qu'on doit employer a servir Dieu.) To be sure the Cardinal adds, "The law of

nature teaches us the necessity of giving to God some particular time ; which all nations have done : but it does not instruct us, whether that time shall be Saturday rather than Sunday, or Sunday rather than Saturday ; that depending either upon God, or the Church." Not a very satisfactory idea, this, of Church instruction.

It cannot be shown that the Sabbath is a ceremony : no ceremonies are prescribed : simply rest from ordinary labor. Six days are to be given to the proper labor for our support : then, one day for rest. If the Creator knew, that our nature, in its lapsed condition, *needed* such an arrangement, then, the law is founded in nature, alike with other precepts : and the same is the case, if this nature of ours, requires such a distribution of our time, in view of the proper maintenance of our relations to God, as his creatures, children, servants. We must, our nature considered, labor for our support ; and rest from such labor, for special attention to our spiritual interests. The law does not specify Saturday, nor Sunday, nor any particular day. Nor does it specify Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc., for labor. But, six days shall be given to labor, one, which of course is the seventh, for rest, for a Sabbath. "Remember the SABBATH-DAY, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the SABBATH of the Lord thy God : in it thou shalt not do any work. \* \* \* For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day : wherefore the Lord blessed the SABBATH-DAY, and hallowed it." Ex. xx. 9-11.

The work of the creation occupied six days ; so states the law : the following day God rested. But, is there any process possible, by which we can demonstrate, that the seventh day of our present calendar week, is the identical seventh day following the six days of the creation ? No sane man will answer in the affirmative. By

what authority, then, can we assume, that the present Saturday, is the original Seventh day, and so to be appropriated to the great REST? And, as those days may have been magnificent periods of time; and as there is so varied a scale between the equatorial and polar days; if we fix upon the original Seventh day, as the standard, and as essential to our observance of the Sabbath, we are on the high sea, without chart, compass, or star.

But the law requires of man, as man, everywhere, six parts of his time to be devoted to labor; one part, to rest; this one part to be an *anapausis hagia*, a Holy Rest: because his physical and moral nature, a wonderful compound, requires so much labor, and so much rest: he was made in the image of his Maker; to preserve that image is his high moral duty, and such preservation requires the pure and sweet incentives of the Holy Rest. As the Sabbath violator injures his spiritual interests, is it not demonstrative that the Sabbath law, is in view of the necessities of our nature? Demoralization is the inevitable sequence of Sabbath breaking.

We Christians work six days, according to the terms of the law; though the quality of our obedience is very defective: and we set apart the day following, the seventh, as an *anapausis hagia*, a holy rest; though our setting apart is alike very defective; and neither upon our six days' labor, nor upon our one day's rest, do we base the slightest hope of acceptance: yet that is the case with every other precept of the law, not one, nor all of them, affording us a ground of acceptance, as to our obedience in the case: so that we may confidently believe, that our practice in keeping the Lord's day, will be acceptable to Him, who was working the great work of our redemption on Saturday, and RESTED on the FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK: which became the Christian's Religious day, Rest day, Sabbath day.

“Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, \* \* \* where the disciples were assembled \* \* \* came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. \* \* \* And after eight days (the ensuing first day of the week, according to the Jewish method of computation), again his disciples were within \* \* \* came Jesus \* \* \* and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.” John xx. 19, 26. “And when the day of Pentecost (the first day of the week) was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.” Acts ii. 1. “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them.” Acts xx. 7. “Upon (*kata*) the first day of the week (every first day of the week, as if they assembled habitually on that day) let every one of you,” etc. I Cor. xvi. 2. “I was in the Spirit on the Lord’s day,” etc. Rev. i. 10.

These successive records, we find in the inspired history of the Church, as she moved along in her earliest progress, for some scores of years; and they are certainly of very great interest; inasmuch as they show the assembling of Christians for worship, on the first day of the week, the Lord’s day: while there is an entire absence of any Scriptural record of such an assembling on Saturday. And if, from the date of the resurrection, Christians have had their rest from labor, their sabbath, on the first day of the week, is not this “the day the Lord hath made?” Why, then, should we not “rejoice and be glad in it?” Psalm cxviii. 24. That is, keep it a festival, keep it a Sabbath, a holy festival of Rest, unto the Lord.

## CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

MATTH. xxviii. 19.—Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

**B**APTISM is, indisputably, a New Testament ordinance. "Go ye therefore, disciple all nations, *baptizing* them," etc. Matt. xxviii. 19. And that this was a baptism by water is most evident. When Peter saw the grace of God to the Gentiles, he exclaimed, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Acts x. 47.

In elucidating the subject, it will be proper to state, that, *the New, is the development of the Old Testament*. Our Lord declares, that he came not to destroy, but to fulfil: Matt. v. 17. He describes his dispensation as the *harvest*, Matt. ix. 37, 38: which implies, that the seed-time, the preliminary dispensation was in the Old Testament age, when the men, other than his disciples, had labored, and into whose ancient labors, the disciples had entered: John iv. 38.

So, when this principle of exegesis is put to the test, it proves to be thoroughly sound and sure. JESUS, the great theme, substance and sum of the New Testament, is that Messiah of whom Moses and the Prophets did write: John i. 45. Isaiah spoke of him, when he wrote the sixth chapter of his splendid prophecies: John xii. 41. Indeed, to him give all the prophets witness: Acts x. 43.

Then, if we take the SPIRITUALITY of the New Testament, we find that this was the very promise that had been made in the Old Dispensation. So, when the Holy Ghost had come upon the disciples, Acts ii. 4, 16, Peter

explained it, as being a fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel; "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, (saith God,) I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh:" Joel ii. 28.

If we select FAITH, we find Paul presenting Abraham as the very father of the faithful, Rom. iv. 11, 16: and when he would expound the doctrine of faith, to the Hebrews, he fills up a long chapter with names of the Old Testament worthies, illustrious specimens of faith, going back so far as Abel, and informing us that the time would fail him to tell of all those who obtained a good report through faith, and yet died, like Moses, before they had entered the promised land, the New Testament Dispensation: Heb. xi.

Also, the ATONEMENT, how can it be understood but by looking back into the Old Testament, and learning that the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of our race, was slain from the *foundation of the world*? Rev. xiii. 8: the several dispensations having been but parts of the one great redeeming scheme, devised at the fall, and fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ; and, therefore, when the two disciples, on their way to Emmaus, spoke of the death of Jesus on the cross, as the death of their own confidence in him as the Messiah; our Lord exclaimed, in reproof, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe *all that the prophets have spoken!* Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at *Moses* and *all the prophets*, he expounded unto them in *all the scriptures* the things concerning himself." Luke xxiv. 25, 26, 27.

So, if we take the LORD'S SUPPER, one of the two great symbolic ordinances of the New Testament, we see that it is the development of the ceremony of the Old Testament Passover: which Passover having been observed in commemoration of the fact, that the destroy-

ing angel, when he slew the first-born in Egypt, had passed over the houses where the believing Israelites had sprinkled the blood of the paschal lamb; the Christian passover should now be observed in remembrance of the fact, that faith in the blood of Jesus Christ, will rescue the believer from the final and eternal destruction, which awaits the impenitent wicked. The Lord's Supper is the New Testament or Covenant, in Christ's blood; as the Passover was the Old Testament or Covenant, in the blood of the paschal lamb. Luke xxii. 19, 20.

From these considerations we might infer, *a priori*, that as everything else in the New Testament, beginning with our Lord himself, is developed from the Old Testament, the same would be the case with the ordinance of *Baptism*: and that in this particular also, we should find the gospel, "saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come!" Acts xxvi. 22: and that the light, Acts xxvi. 23, that Christ should shed upon the Gentiles, would be, in part, through the great ordinance of sprinkling them with clean water, that they also might be clean: that is, admitted to be within the pale of the latter-day Church. Ezekiel xxxvi. 25.

Well, this is precisely the case: as we learn from the pen of an inspired apostle: and the divine instituting of Baptism is to be found in the Old Testament as comprehensively and definitely described, as in the case of the Passover: so that we can give chapter and verse, in the one case, as well as in the other. And from these premises, it will also follow, that as the Lord's Supper cannot be fully understood, without tracing it up to its ancient and solemn origin, the Passover, which was the Mosaic Supper; so, also, he who, in studying Baptism, limits himself to the New Testament, and neglects to trace back the ordinance to its solemn and divine origin, the Mosaic Baptism, will, of necessity, come short of a



proper and satisfactory apprehension of the subject. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah viii. 20. It is remarkable, that when the Jews objected to Jesus, or to his teachings, he appealed to Moses and the prophets: the very law and testimony claimed by Isaiah, the evangelical prophet, as the great standard of truth.

But, to the point under consideration.

In Hebrews ix, Paul shows the Christian to be the development of the Mosaic dispensation, and he informs us, that the former, the Mosaic, consisted in *meats* and *drinks*, and **DIVERS BAPTISMS**: for the words, *divers washings*, in the 10th verse, should be *divers baptisms*, (*diaphorois baptismois*.)

"8. The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as **THE FIRST TABERNACLE** was yet standing:

"9. Which was **A FIGURE** for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service **PERFECT, AS PERTAINING TO THE CONSCIENCE**;

"10. Which stood only in **MEATS AND DRINKS, AND DIVERS BAPTISMS, (even)\* JUSTIFICATIONS (or purifications) OF THE FLESH, (dikaïomasi sarkos)**, imposed on them until the time of reformation.

"11. But Christ being come a **HIGH PRIEST** of good things to come, by a **GREATER AND MORE PERFECT TABERNACLE**, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

"12. Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered at once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

"13. For if the **BLOOD** of bulls and of goats and **THE ASHES OF A HEIFER SPRINKLING THE UNCLEAN, sanctifieth TO THE PURIFYING OF THE FLESH** :

"14. How much more shall the **BLOOD** of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself **WITHOUT SPOT** to God, **PURGE YOUR CONSCIENCE** from **DEAD WORKS** to serve the living God ?

\* \* \* \* \*

"18. —Neither the first testament was dedicated without **BLOOD**.

\* *Kai*, here, altogether rejected by Griesbach.

“ 19. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the BLOOD of calves and of goats, with WATER, and SCARLET WOOL, and HYSSOP, and sprinkled both the book, and ALL THE PEOPLE.

“ 22. And almost all things are by the law, PURGED with blood ; and without shedding of blood is no REMISSION.”

It is evident, that the intention of the Apostle is to show, that the *purifications* of Moses were external, and *figurative* of the *purifications* of Christ, which go in unto the soul. But, he says that the Mosaic purifications consisted of *meats* and *drinks* and *divers baptisms—justifications* (or purifications) *of the flesh*; which *purifications* or *baptisms*, were by *blood* and *water*; and hence they were *diaphoroi*, *divers*: and this is the meaning of *divers baptisms*, in this connection, as administered by the Jewish officary.

All these figures are employed in the New Testament phraseology, with familiarity and some of them with frequency. Hence, says our Lord, “ my flesh is MEAT indeed, and my blood is DRINK indeed.” John vi. 55. “ One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout BLOOD and WATER.” John xix. 34. “ This is he that came by WATER and BLOOD, even Jesus Christ ; not by WATER ONLY, but by WATER and BLOOD.” I John v. 6.

The Mosaic, then, with its meats, drinks, and baptisms by water and blood, must be regarded as a system of external purification, and as a “ figure, for the time then present,” Heb. ix. 9, of the Christian dispensation, which is a system of *real, internal* purification unto holiness, that the end may be everlasting life.

That the Apostle refers, so far as water baptism is concerned, to the sixth of Numbers, is most evident, as any one may see by comparing the two passages, Heb. ix. and Numb. xix.: and this inspired reference lights us to the great law of water baptism, with the same

friendly and brilliant precision, with which the star guided the Magi to the mystery of Bethlehem.

Here, then, we have inspired authority, for the divine instituting of Baptism. It is not a human invention. God appointed it, as we shall see, an essential rite in Legal dispensation, and punished the neglecter of it, with excommunication.

Let us now make reference, as just hinted, to the sixth of Numbers; where we shall find the law of Baptism by water, laid down in much detail, as to the preparation of the baptismal water, the officiators, the subjects, the mode, and the penalty of neglect.

Ten verses are occupied with directions, or precepts, concerning the preparation of the baptismal water, by the Jewish officary. Thus—

“ 1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, and unto Aaron, saying,

“ 2. **THIS IS THE ORDINANCE OF THE LAW WHICH THE LORD HATH COMMANDED**, saying, speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring thee a red **HEIFER WITHOUT SPOT**, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke.

“ 3. And ye shall give her unto **ELEAZAR THE PRIEST**, that he may bring her forth without the camp, and one shall slay her before his face.

“ 4. And Eleazar, the priest, shall take of her **BLOOD** with his finger, and **SPRINKLE OF HER BLOOD** directly before the tabernacle of the congregation seven times.

“ 5. And one shall burn the heifer in his sight; her skin, and her flesh, and her blood, with her dung, shall he burn.

“ 6. And the priest shall take **CEDAR WOOD**, and **HYSSOP**, and **SCARLET**, and cast it into the midst of the burning heifer.

“ 7. Then the priest shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp, and the priest shall be unclean until the even.

“ 8. And he that burneth her shall wash his clothes in water, and bathe his flesh in water, and be unclean until the even.

“ 9. And a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp in a clean place, and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel, for a **WATER OF SEPARATION**: it is a **PURIFICATION** for sin.

"10. And he that gathereth the ashes of the heifer shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even: and it shall be unto the children of Israel, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among them, for a STATUTE FOREVER."

This is plain enough. The Jewish officary had divine and specific instructions, as to the preparation of the baptismal agent. The whole, spotless heifer, with the fragrant wood of the lofty cedar, with the humble hyssop, and the scarlet, (hue of sin,) was consumed to ashes, the basis of expurgant soap, and to be kept for the baptismal purpose, by a law binding upon both the Native Jew and the Proselyte.

Next follow nine verses defining the occasion, the subjects, and the mode of the administration of Baptism.

"11. He that toucheth the DEAD BODY of any man shall be unclean seven days.

"12. He shall PURIFY himself with it on the third day, and on the seventh day he shall be clean: but if he purify not himself on the third day, then the seventh day he shall not be clean.

"13. Whosoever toucheth the DEAD BODY of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the WATER OF SEPARATION was NOT SPRINKLED upon him, he shall be unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him.

"14. This is the law when a man dieth in a tent; ALL that come into the tent, and all that is in the tent, shall be unclean seven days.

"15. And every open vessel, which hath no covering bound upon it, is unclean.

"16. And WHOSOEVER toucheth one that is slain with a sword in the open fields, or a DEAD BODY, or a bone of a man, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days."

In so far, we have the *occasion* and the *subjects*. The *occasion* is a *ceremonial defilement*: not any *actual sin* of their own, such as *lying, stealing, etc.*: for there could be no essential guilt in accidentally touching a dead body, a bone, or a grave: and this is a fine figure of the imputed pollution of all men, by contact with the first,

dead, buried man, Adam. And the *subjects* are not limited by either *age* or *sex*. The pronoun *he*, in the 11th and 12th verses, being of *general application*, as is *whosoever* in the 13th verse. Surely this is clear. *Age* and *sex* are not taken into the account, by way of any limitation: and from the very nature and terms of the law, it is evident that persons of *any age*, and of either sex, are implied. Just as all ages and both sexes were baptized into Moses, as laid down by Paul in another portion of the scriptures: I Cor. x. 1, 2.

"17. And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel;

"18. And a clean person shall take HYSSOP, and dip it in the water, and SPRINKLE it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon THE PERSONS that were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave:

"19. And the clean person shall SPRINKLE upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall PURIFY himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even."

Thus we are instructed in the mode of the administering of Baptism: SPRINKLING. All the plunging and bathing herein mentioned, has reference to what the subject does for himself, and that not by the use of the baptismal water: and where the rite is administered by the officary, it is, in every case, by *sprinkling*. It is to be noticed, too, that the PURIFICATION is apart from the washing of the clothes, and the bathing of the flesh; as is clear from the 19th verse: so that, as the Apostle speaks of the *divers baptisms* with reference to the purification of the flesh, and the washing of the clothes, and the bathing of the flesh were apart from the PURIFICATION, they are also apart from the DIVERS BAPTISMS; which have no antecedent left, but the SPRINKLINGS of WATER and BLOOD. Could a law be more definite, or more comprehensive?

And one word more upon the *subjects*. In the 18th verse, where these are referred to, and defined, by the word *persons*, the Hebrew word is *hannephashoth*, limited by neither age nor sex, implying every living person—man, woman, child, in the tent, where one had died, or who had entered while the dead body continued there, untombbed.

"20. But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be CUT OFF from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord: *the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him ; he is unclean.*

"21. And it shall be a PERPETUAL STATUTE unto them, that he that sprinkleth the water of separation shall wash his clothes ; and he that toucheth the water of separation shall be unclean until even.

"22. And whatsoever the unclean person toucheth shall be unclean ; and the soul that toucheth it shall be unclean until even."

So, a neglect of this law was to be punished by excommunication. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; he that believeth not shall be *damned.*" Mark xvi. 16.

Having thus disposed of the several sections of this ancient law, which, as we see, was of divine enactment, it will be well to pause, and consider it in its general aspect.

We have divine authority for the existence of Baptism in the Old Testament, or Mosaic dispensation. There were *divers baptisms*, Heb. ix. 10 ; some of *blood*, some of *water*, Heb. ix. 13, 19, 22 ; and as to the water baptism, by examining the 13th verse of the same chapter, Heb. ix., we see a reference to this very law, Numb. xix., which we have been expounding. These are momentous points. The divine testimony, that there were divers baptisms, by blood and water, of divine appointment, in the Old Covenant ; and that this Numb. xix. contains the law of Baptism by water. Here are

sound and safe premises. We have the law, and it is very precise and comprehensive: comprehending the wherewith, the occasion, the subjects, the mode, the administrator, and the penalty of neglect; and defining all these points with great precision.

The water was to be mixed with ashes; the ashes of the heifer, cedar, hyssop, and scarlet: and it was to be SPRINKLED upon the subject, who might be of EITHER SEX OR ANY AGE. The prophet Ezekiel, alluding to the Christian dispensation, and speaking in the name of the Lord, says, chap. xxxvi. 25, "*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.*" How pertinent and accurate is this beautiful prediction of the modification and increased efficiency of Baptism, in the Christian dispensation! The water was to be *clean, pure, unmixed with ashes*, and yet the subjects *were to be clean*: indicating the greater simplicity and power of the latter-day scheme.

Then too, in Numb. xix. 20, the law was, that the neglecter should be excommunicated; "the water of separation hath not been *sprinkled* upon him; he is unclean." The word-rendered *sprinkled*, here, is *zorak*: the same word is used by Ezekiel, at the place above quoted; although the word rendered *sprinkle*, Numb. xix. 18, is *hizzah*: demonstrating that the prophet had his eye upon this particular passage; which is a final repetition and explanation of verse 13; and in these two verses only, viz. 13 and 20, is this word *zarak* used; *nazah* being used to signify *sprinkle*, in every other instance throughout this entire law of the water of separation.

Also, we see, in the law, that the Jewish officary were the legal administrators, of the Baptismal water mingled with the ashes: but says Ezekiel, in the name of Jehovah, "Then will I sprinkle clean, or *pure* water upon you:" as if the Jewish officary having failed,

Jehovah himself would appear, and introduce a simpler and more effectual system. So we find, at John iii. 22, etc., that Jesus came into Judea and *baptized*; while John was *baptizing* at Enon. *On this account*, (*oun*, v. 25, where *then* should read *therefore*,) there arose a DISPUTE about PURIFICATION, between some of the disciples of John and certain Jews; and they went to John telling him that JESUS was baptizing (or purifying) and that the people were flocking to him, rather than to John. The excellent Baptist rebuked their false zeal; reminding them, that he had always proclaimed Jesus to be the greater, and that this incident was an illustration of the truth, that Christ must *increase* and himself *decrease*. But, when Jesus heard of these facts, he went back into Galilee; John iv. 3; *his hour being not yet come*.

Here, as well as in Heb. ix., PURIFICATION and BAPTISM are interchangeable words; and as we have seen, that the mode of purification was SPRINKLING, as settled by the original law, and the allusions of Paul; we must understand, that Jesus, who was JEHOVAH, *sprinkled clean water upon them*, in literal and beautiful fulfilment of the prophecy. To be sure, *he* did not baptize, but his disciples did it under his supervision, as the Levites did the same under the supervision of the High Priest.

Isaiah predicts of Christ, that "*he shall sprinkle MANY nations:*" Isaiah lii. 15. Moses *sprinkled ONE nation*, the Jews; but Christ shall sprinkle many, the Gentiles. They were "astonished at him;" they thought it wonderful, that the Messiah should appear in such humiliation; but great as was to be his humiliation, he would prove to be the Messiah, and he would "sprinkle clean water" upon the many nations, the Gentiles, and they should be clean, should be within the pale of the Church. "Go ye, therefore, disciple *all nations*, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the



Holy Ghost :” *i. e.* into the Christian Dispensation, or Church : Matt. xxviii. 19. The admission of the Gentiles, as such, into the Church of Christ, had been predicted ; but the Jews considered it impossible. Peter saw them, in a vision, represented under the figure of *all manner of unclean beasts* ; and baptized them, sprinkled clean water upon them, whom God had purposed to cleanse.

True, the text, Isaiah lii. 15, is disputed ; but, as good scholars think, not upon sufficient ground. Some think, that the word rendered *sprinkle*, has been substituted by mistake, for some other word. But, the Vulgate reads, “*Iste asperget gentes multas.*” and in the standard Hebrew Bibles, the word is the same *nazah*, used in Numb. xix.

Again : the law having committed the administration of baptism, to the Jewish officary, the Levitical priesthood, whose proceedings were definitely prescribed, it was astonishing to the Jews, that John was administering this rite irregularly ; and thinking him to claim to be an *extraordinary* administrator, they desired to know his pretensions. “Art thou the Christ ?” they said : “or Elias ? or that prophet ?” And he did make such a claim : he said, “I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness,” etc. This was why *he* baptized, apart from the regular operations of the sons of Levi.

His Baptism was a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins : going further than the Mosaic Baptism ; binding the baptized to a turning away from sin ; while the former was a purification from *outward, ceremonial* pollution. It was more than Mosaic, but less than Christian Baptism. He was the *forerunner* of Christ ; not his *follower* : the least in the kingdom of Christ is greater than John.

His baptizing our Saviour was something very remarkable. That was not *Christian Baptism*, because

John was not a Christian minister. Nor was the rite administered in the Christian manner. In fact, Christian Baptism was not then instituted. It was not John's baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; for our Lord had no sins of his own to repent of; and as to the sins of men, which he bore, they were not to be remitted, but expiated.

It was the installation of Jesus, as the High Priest of men. Water and oil were used in the consecration of the high priest; and "to fulfil all righteousness," to be ceremonially introduced to the functions of his great office, John applied the water, and then the Holy Spirit, whom the oil prefigured, came down upon him, and the Father announced him as the True Anointed: "THIS is my beloved SON."

Let us further test our arrangement of this subject, by I Cor. xv. 29. "Else what shall they do, which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?"

The Apostle's argument is to prove, that the resurrection and a future life are doctrines of Christianity. This, "some among" the Corinthian Christians had denied. He shows first, that Christ is preached as risen from the dead: Adam having brought all men down into death, Christ, who, in one sense, is all men, had gone down into death, and had come up again; that "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Next he introduces Baptism, one of the two great symbols of Christianity, and uses *it* to show, that Christians cannot intelligently use this ordinance, without faith in the doctrine of the resurrection of the just to immortality.

We have seen, that by the law of Baptism, the Jew was baptized *for* the dead, Numb. xix., by which he had been defiled, in some manner of *imputation*. The priest *sprinkled* him with the *mixed water*, Numb. xix. 18;

which was a *public, social, proclamatory* act. After this, the baptized person went away, and by his own *personal, individual* act, according to law, cleansed his *clothes* and his *body*: Numb. xix. 19: commencing with the covering of the body, and going in with the process as far as the *body*; which being as far *inward* as the ceremonial law extended; he thereby perfected his ceremonial holiness. *Now*, he was clear from the dead *for* which he had been baptized; he no longer had a relation to that dead (body), which was fatal to his own covenanted Church life; he being no longer in danger of Church death, or excommunication: for he had been saved from the impending fate, by *Baptism* and his *personal cleansing*: and he was entitled, under that *first tabernacle*, to the covenanted Church life.

So, the Christian is baptized *for* the dead, (Adam,) by which he had been defiled, in some manner of *imputation*: Rom. v. 12; Acts ii. 38. The Christian minister *sprinkles* him with the *clean water*; which is a *public, social, proclamatory* act: Acts ii. 41: (where *immersion* must have been *impossible*.) After this the baptized person goes away, and by his own *personal, individual* act, according to the gospel, cleanses his *body*, (the *clothes* of the soul, including his conduct,) and *spirit*; commencing with the covering of the soul or spirit, and going in with the process as far as the spirit, (HEART, CONSCIENCE,) which being as far *inward* as the gospel plan extends; he thereby *perfects* his gospel holiness: II Cor. vii. 1. *Now*, he is clear from the dead (Adam) *for* which he has been baptized; he no longer has a relation to that dead, (Adam,) which is fatal to his own covenanted eternal life; he being no longer in danger of eternal death; for he has been saved from the impending fate, by *Baptism* and his *personal cleansing*: and he is entitled, under this *more perfect tabernacle*, to the covenanted eternal life.

He has escaped from the empire of death. If he *seem* to die, we must not be deceived by appearances, but we must "judge righteous judgment." Church life was *sure* to the obedient Jew, under the *first tabernacle*; and eternal life will be *sure* to the obedient Christian, under the *more perfect tabernacle*. Christ is greater than Moses. The grave will be emptied, for death has been overcome. "O grave, where is thy victory!" We are clear from that dead Adam, *for* whom we were baptized; and he cannot keep us in the grave: he could not keep Christ there; and Christ was but the "first fruits" of the great harvest to come.

This exposition is in keeping with our arrangement of the subject; and also with the Apostle's argument. It certainly has great verisimilitude: while it consists with the plan of salvation, and with those passages of Scripture, co-relative with the one in hand.

And, as we have seen, that the embracing of infant Jews within the provisions of the original law, was no embarrassment to its operation: so may we say the same with regard to infant Christians.

Thus we see a beautiful consistency of *incidents* and *facts* with this theory of Baptism: and this is one very strong evidence of its truth. It will be impossible to make out such a case in favor of *immersion*, as signifying the *death*, *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ. Paul testifies to the fact, that Baptism was a part of the Mosaic institution; and it becomes those who contend that Baptism means *immersion*, to point out the law in the case; showing us, that *immersion* was ever administered, by divine authority, to the subjects of Baptism, by any of the Jewish officary.

We have gone up to the law, and heard as with our own ears, that Baptism was a *purification* ceremony, administered by *sprinkling*, to persons of *either sex*, or *any age*, who had come in contact with a *dead body* :

just as the Passover was a ceremonial *feast*, for persons of *either sex*, or *any age*, upon the *lamb*, whose prototype's shed *blood*, had been *sprinkled* upon the doors of the Israelites in Egypt: and that our Lord had so modified these two Mosaic and divine institutions, that the *dead body* should now represent ADAM, the great author of our dreadful FALL, POLLUTION and RUIN; while the *paschal lamb* represents HIMSELF, the great author of our glorious REDEMPTION, SANCTIFICATION and SALVATION.

As we read in the law, for those who have been polluted by a *dead body*, it was provided, that a red *heifer*, *without spot*, should be *slain*, the *blood sprinkled* before the tabernacle of the congregation, and the ashes to be mingled with water, and sprinkled upon the polluted, for the *purgation* of the body: so, we hear Paul declaring, "how much more shall the *blood* of Christ, who through the eternal spirit *offered* himself *without spot* to God, *purge your conscience* from *dead works* to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14.

Such are the premises, from which we view the subject, Scripturally and reasonably. And now, let them be borne in mind, while we sketch a general and practical panorama of this divine and instructive ceremony.

BAPTISM IS A CHURCH ORDINANCE, TO BE ADMINISTERED IN PUBLIC WORSHIP, FOR THE GENERAL BENEFIT.

As we have *personal responsibilities*, there are the *individual duties* and *privileges* provided for us, of closet devotion; consisting of reading God's holy word, of meditation; and prayer: while those who are heads of families are bound to have family worship; and, like Abraham, "to command their children and their households after them, that they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment:" Gen. xviii. 19.

But, in our *public, social capacity*, under obligation to aid in the spread of the gospel, we have *the duties and*

*the privileges of the Church* to attend to ; where we aid in the perpetuity of a centre of instructive influences, by a public assembly for prayer, praise, reading and expounding the word of God, and for the administration of the ordinances.

It is obvious, that such an arrangement cannot be carried out faithfully, without great benefit to those who attend : and the very nature of Baptism, connected as it is with our obligation to spread the truth, by bearing the cross of Christ, is convincing as to the duty of *the public baptism* of our children ; for Christians, who are to follow in the steps of the self-sacrificing Jesus, are not warranted in shunning the performance of a useful public duty, upon the plea of its unpleasantness.

The IDEALITY of baptism, is the significance of *natural corruption in Adam*, which has passed upon all men ; *the purifying work of the Holy Spirit, to be poured out upon all flesh*, that the sons and daughters of believers should prophesy ; and *the Church privileges of believers and their children*, as the great instructive, converting, and sanctifying provision of Jesus Christ. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me : " Psalm li. 5. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God : " Rom. viii. 8. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again : " John iii. 6, 7. "Go ye, therefore, and teach (properly *disciple*) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you : " Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

It is supposed by some, that Baptism signifies the *death, burial and resurrection of Christ*, and that therefore it should be by immersion. But, there is no resemblance whatever between immersion and those facts.

Our Lord was not put to *death* by *water*, nor was he *buried* in *water*, nor did his *resurrection* occur from *water*. He was "lifted up" to die upon the cross; to which he was nailed, in agony and shame: and it is impossible, that the immersion of a believer can represent the manner of such a death. He was buried in the hard rock, and there reposed, sealed up in silence and solitude, until he arose in his own omnipotence, without any assistance. For one man to dip another into water, the softest and most yielding of visible substances, bears no resemblance to the depositing of our Lord's body in its sepulchre of rock, one among the hardest materials, the very figure of durability, and there sealing it up with the massy stone. Our Lord's body not having been let down into its grave, as we are accustomed to see now-a-days; but the grave was cut horizontally, into the rock, and a heavy stone was rolled up against it; which stone served as a door. And for one person to lift another out of the water, has no similitude to our Lord's coming forth from the tomb, unaided, in the exercise of the same amazing power, in which he laid down his life, upon the cross. Water is not even the ordinary grave of man: and it seems incredible, that a transaction, such as immersion in water, should have been selected, to signify the burial and resurrection of Christ, when it does not possess one single point of resemblance to those great facts. Was our Saviour buried *alive*? Did he *walk* into his grave and then be laid down in it? Did a man then take him up out of it, as quick as possible, lest he should strangle? Was his resurrection occasioned by some one lifting him out of his tomb? When he arose, was he dripping with water? Were not the grave-clothes of Jesus left lying in the sepulchre? It is evident, to all who read the gospel, that between the immersion of a person in water, and the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, there is

not one single point of resemblance. By tracing Baptism into the Jewish dispensation, whence it came to us ; as is easily done by comparing the above cited, Heb. ix. with Numbers xix. ; it is clear, that its significance has always been a ceremonial purification : by which we see the propriety of using water, the great abluent instrumentality. When the Jews came from the market, considering themselves defiled, they did not eat until they had baptized : Mark vii. 4 : where the phrase, "*except they wash,*" is "*except they baptize.*" So, Paul states it, in the address of Ananias ; "Arise, and be baptized, and \**wash away thy sins,* calling on the name of the Lord : " Acts xxii. 16.

That ITS SUBJECTS are, in part, *the children of believers,* is equally clear. Paul says, "that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea ; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea : " I Cor. x. 1, 2. No one disputes, that this alludes to the whole host of Israel ; and the fact that all their children were then baptized, is beyond the possibility of cavil. In the sixth of Numbers, where the law of baptism is detailed, as we have seen, it is laid down, that when a Jew died in his tent, all the persons within that tent, its vessels, and itself were to be baptized : and as to supposing, that there never were any children in any such tent, in that immense encampment, it is absolutely incredible.

It being clear, then, that Baptism was an old ordinance, familiarly used for centuries before the advent of Christ ; it remains for us, to meet it at the line where it passes over from Moses to Christ, from Judaism to

\* If Baptism did not signify our *natural pollution,* which must be cleansed away, why should we have this phrase, "and wash away thy sins ? " If Baptism signifies *the death, burial and resurrection of our Lord,* why did not Ananias say, "and signify the death, burial and resurrection of your Lord ? " or, "and follow your Lord ? " etc.



Christianity, and inquire for any record of our Saviour having so modified it as *to exclude children*. He did modify it. Until then, it had never been administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; nor by a Christian minister. That he made any further change, is unsusceptible of proof. Children, then, were not excluded. And, therefore, we can understand Peter, when he exhorted the Jews, who were outside of Christianity, to come with their children within its encircling pale. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is to you, *and to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call:" Acts ii. 38, 39.

In this lucid passage, we have the Apostle instructing his countrymen, to *repent of their rejection of Jesus Christ*, and thus entitling themselves, according to his redeeming plan, to come within the hallowing influences of his Church, they were to approach, be baptized as signifying their natural, sinful state, in view of a *prospective* blessing, the *gift of the Holy Ghost*, the spiritual regeneration, the converting and sanctifying needful to their fitness for eternal felicity in heaven: teaching them, that the promise, that is, *the new dispensation*, embraced *their children* as well as themselves. In fact, there is as much reason, for bringing children amid the *prospective blessings* of the Church, as to bring in an adult Jew, or Heathen, who, up to that time, had never received Jesus as the appointed Saviour of men, who has ordained the Church, with its Bible and Ordinances, where the Spirit presides, to perfect in Him, all who believe in him as the Redeemer, and are willing to be led by him, through the regeneration, to his heavenly kingdom.

The Baptism of a child teaches the pastor, the parents, and all the congregation, that here is an immortal soul,

under their official care, for which they are officially responsible, upon which, in view of its life, they are, as a Church, to bring to bear, all the holy and mighty influences of the means under their immediate management. Like *John*, they are to say, "we, indeed, baptize you with water; but there is one mightier than we, who will baptize you with the Holy Ghost. And we, pastor, parents, and congregation, must use the influence that attaches to our office, relation, age, and authority, to keep you carefully within the holy and subduing instrumentality, with which, in the providence of God, we are intrusted."

The Baptism of an infant, or of a repenting Jew or Heathen, under such circumstances as these, must be of manifest and momentous consequence. But, when a Christian-born person, converted, baptized with the Holy Ghost, in the fulness of communion with Christ, is baptized to signify *the death, burial and resurrection of Christ*, what a falling off is here from the harmony, simplicity, and intention of the promise, or dispensation, which is to *us* and to *our children*!

See, next, the instruction of the Apostle through the Corinthians: I Cor. vii. 14. "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else, were your *children unclean: but now are they holy*." If the parents, (or even one of them,) be believers, members of the Church, then the children are not unclean, they are holy. Now, what can this mean? Certainly, not that there is any natural difference, between the children of believers and those of unbelievers. What then? Can it be other than the recognition of their membership in the Church? Members of the Church are the *\*holy persons* of the New Testament, as holy persons were the members of

\* *Church* holiness and *personal* holiness are to be distinguished. The former is official or political; the latter, *actual, internal*.

the Old Testament Church. The young Jew was a member of the Church, being holy by virtue of the membership of his parents; and the same is the case with the children of Christian parents; or what can the Apostle mean, by saying that such children are holy?

The young Jew, by his birth, was entitled to circumcision, and to all the privileges of the Church, as fast as his mind was developed: that he might be instructed, have his heart changed, and be *personally* sanctified to God. And so, Peter tells us, that this Dispensation is for us and our children; who, being members of the Church, as Paul says, are entitled to Baptism, and to all the privileges of the Church, for which their minds are prepared. Can any human intellect see any reason, why *circumcision* should be important to the Jew child of eight days old; and to such a degree, that unless it were performed, he was put outside the covenant, ejected from the Church; and yet, Baptism at the same age be of no utility?

Some urge, that children so young cannot *believe*; and add, that the order is, "he that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be saved:" Mark xvi. 16: so that only they who *personally* believe are the proper subjects of Baptism. But, it is worthy of remark, that from the fuller statement by Matthew, xxviii. 19, 20, we would not feel warranted in such a conclusion. "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." That is, go and bring men to believe that I am the Christ: then baptize such believers and their children; constituting them into a Church, and teach them all the doctrines and practice of religion, that they may make their calling and election sure; that they may avail themselves of their Church opportunities, and be prepared for heaven.

No one understands, it is presumed, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," in heaven, without any other qualification; such as repentance, conversion, and sanctification. The case of Simon, Acts viii. 13, 20-23, is precisely in point. He believed and was baptized; and yet he was in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity. He was *saved*, merely in the sense of having been brought, by a profession of faith in Jesus as the Christ, into the Church, and there supplied with privileges that would aid him, "to work out his salvation with fear and trembling."

And, it must be remembered, that the Apostles were not sent into any *Christian nation*. There was none such. They were sent to the Jews and heathens, who did not believe that Jesus was the Christ. Of course, nobody was baptized until some of the adults believed: and it was only necessary, to believe that Jesus was the Christ, and to profess a willingness to receive his gospel, to be baptized: and then upon such belief and baptism, the dispensation embraced their children also, according to Peter; the believing husband or wife sanctifying them, constituting them holy, by the testimony of Paul; and of course, entitling them to Baptism. In what other way, could the promise, or dispensation, be to a believer's children, any more than to an unbeliever's children? If a pedobaptist were to go into a heathen or Jewish country, where the gospel had not been received, he would first persuade some of the adult population to believe in Jesus as the Christ; and would baptize them; constituting them a church—a holy people. Then, as their children would be holy, and the children of the unbelievers would be unholy, he would baptize the former and not the latter. In other words, the adult heathen, that believed, would be baptized, and be saved, so far as being brought into the Church would imply salvation: and his children would be embraced in the

same privileges, to the same extent ; as the dispensation is to him and to his children. How plain !

The MODE of Baptism is *sprinkling*. When we look at the ordinance in the Old Testament Church, we find no such instance, anywhere, as a subject of Baptism being *immersed* by an *administrator*. There are instances of a man's cleansing his own body, possibly by washing himself in a vessel, or stream ; and of thus washing his clothes. But, where an administrator baptizes a subject, whether person, tent, or vessel, in every instance it is by *sprinkling*. The *law* is laid down with great precision, as we have seen in Numb. xix.

It must be observed, too, that John, in opening the Christian dispensation, declares that Jesus would baptize with the Holy Ghost : and the manner of baptizing with the Holy Ghost, certainly, beyond all question, is not by any one's immersing a believer into that blessed Agent ; but it is described in the Scripture as a *descent* upon the subject, as the rain pours down from heaven, and moistens, refreshes and fertilizes the earth. " Turn you at my reproof ; behold, I will pour out my Spirit unto you : " Prov. i. 23. " Until the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted as a forest : " Isaiah xxxii. 15. " For I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground ; I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring : " Isaiah xlv. 3. While in these passages, there is an evident comparison of the Holy Spirit to *water*, which, on all hands, is admitted as a proper element of Baptism ; it is equally clear, that the similitude is to water falling as the rain from heaven, and refreshing and fertilizing the previously dry, sterile and useless ground ; which in its wilderness and thirsty state, well represents a miserable sinner just looking up to God : and not an accepted sinner, filled with the Holy Ghost,

and offering the grace of love, and the fruits of praise to a smiling and pardoning God.

There is, however, another passage in Joel ii. 28, 29, which is indisputably expounded by Peter, as descriptive and predictive of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, in the Christian dispensation. "But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: and on my servants and on my hand-maidens I will pour out, in those days, of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy:" Acts ii. 16, 17, 18.

Now, recurring to the fact, that, in the original institution, no administrator of Baptism performed that rite upon another, other than by *sprinkling*, as may be seen in Numb. xix. etc.; which sprinkling is like the falling of the rain from heaven upon the earth, making the plants soiled with the dust of the drought to appear fresh and clean and growing: then, bringing in the Baptism of the Holy Ghost referred to by John, and explained by Solomon, Isaiah, Joel and Peter, under the similitude of rain falling from the heavens, in reviving showers: let us turn to that lucid passage in Ezekiel xxxvi. 25. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." What harmony, in the entire collation, in every respect! Surely any one can see, that the form is like the *falling of rain*; the ideality is *cleansing*; and it will hardly be contended, that the rain falls only upon adults, only upon the high mountains, and not upon the low valleys, only upon tall trees, and not upon the young and tender herbage. Our children are *not* excluded.

In the last text cited, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, there is a comparison between the *baptisms* of the Old and New Dis-

pensations, as, in Hebrews ix. 25-28, there is a comparison between their *Sacrifices*: in both instances being favorable, most decidedly, to the present dispensation. The sprinkling, or baptism, under the Old Dispensation was not followed by the decided and thorough effects, that were to signalize, according to Ezekiel, the sprinkling, or Baptism, of Christianity. To what other sprinklings can the prophet allude? "THEN," in the Christian Dispensation, "THEN WILL I SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER upon you, and *ye shall be clean*:" the power of Christianity shall be greater than the power of Judaism: the sprinkling of the *pure water*, under the Christian system, shall be followed by better results, than ensued the sprinkling of the baptismal water, mixed with ashes, under the Mosaic Dispensation.

As a fitting conclusion, look, too, at the enlarged character of Baptism, under the Christian institute. "So shall he sprinkle many nations:" Isaiah lii. 15. Moses sprinkled but *one* nation, the Jews: his administration of the ordinance having been limited to that narrow circumference. But now, Jesus shall pass beyond that limit, and being that seed of Abraham in whom all the nations of the earth are to be blessed, he welcomes into *his* Church all people, and provides for them all its superior privileges. "The promise is to you Jews and your children, but, also, in equal liberality of grace, to all that are afar off: even to as many as the Lord our God shall call;" that is, wherever the gospel advances into a nation, there all are invited to come with their children into the Church of Christ: it being clear, that the faith of the father or mother extends to the child, the privileges of that church: I Cor. vii. 14.

It may not be amiss, to remark, here, that even admitting the evidently erroneous construction put by some upon Mark xvi. 16; "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" and allowing that faith is the *pre-*

*requisite* of Baptism : does not the faith of the parent answer for the faith of the child? St. Paul asserts this positively, and we are not at liberty to contradict him : and to say, that the faith of the parent suffices to bring the child into a state of official, or Church holiness, and is not sufficient to entitle it to a Baptism, to which Simon Magus was admitted, Acts viii. 13, and which is in view of the prospective blessings of that Church membership, that official holiness, into which the faith of the parent brings the child ; is, to say the least, plainly unreasonable.

In view, then, of the Scriptures, reason, and utility, it is our evident privilege and duty, to acknowledge God's grace, and kindness, in this glorious dispensation of his Son, by having our children publicly baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

If, now, any one will take this theory of Baptism, he may bring into it all the facts, allusions and incidents, in the case, of the New Testament writings. Let us select, as an example, the fact, that Baptism is nowhere *described* in any of the narratives or epistles of the Apostles. Here is a remarkable fact, truly ; that so important an ordinance should be enjoined upon us, and yet be nowhere *described* ! It was not so, in the Jewish ordinances : they are all carefully, and minutely described ; as, *e. g.* the consecration of priests, their period of service, their duties, etc. So with the rest. But, Baptism comes to us in the New Testament, without any account of its *institution*, or *manner* !

Upon our theory, this is perfectly intelligible, and precisely what should have been expected. It was an ancient ordinance, instituted hundreds of years before the Advent of our Lord, minutely described in the Old Testament, at Numbers xix., and familiarly known to all the Jews ; so that when they went out to John in the



wilderness, they did not inquire, *What is this Baptism?* for they knew that as well as he did: but why baptizest *thou?* They wished to know by what authority *he* presumed to administer it. Whereas, had it been new and unknown, the inquiry would have been, *WHAT* is this?

For the same reason, while the Passover is alluded to in the New Testament, and that, too, in most interesting connections, in one place Christ being called "our Passover," yet *it is not described*; and we would know as little about it, if we confined our attention to the New Testament, as those do about Baptism, who look no farther than the New Testament; and for the very same reason: neither of these ordinances is described in that section of the Scriptures: because both had been described in the Old Testament; and were too well understood, to need any further description, except in case of *modification*, and that was done. The Passover is familiarly alluded to, by the Evangelists and the Apostles; but no man living could have a clear understanding of its nature and mode, from their writings. This is precisely the case with Baptism. He that looks only into the New Testament, cannot, because it is impossible to any one, understand the nature and mode of that ordinance.

Thus, Baptism and the Passover, coming down from the Mosaic Institute, were well understood, at the Advent, and were alike divine. As they came over into the New Dispensation, the Supreme Legislator modified them both, and the modifications are distinctly defined. BAPTISM was now to be administered by Christian Ministers, as an initiatory rite, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in view of perfecting the subject in the truth as it is in Jesus. "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever

I have commanded you." Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. THE PASSOVER, was modified into THE LORD'S SUPPER, by substituting the Bread and the Wine for the entire elements of *the Passover*, and enjoining its observance in commemoration of Christ.

And now, we will try our theory with an *allusion*, twice made by Paul, and which will be admitted, to be as little likely as any other, to comport with our view. If this will come in without violence, no other can be apprehended. It is the allusion to a *burial*, as made by Paul, at Rom. vi. 3-6, and Coloss. ii. 12. We cite the first.

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Here we have a clear view of the Apostle's premises: Is it becoming for a Christian to live in sin: to be morally filthy and polluted? No, he declares; no, because identified with Christ, as we are, we are dead, being crucified in him as the penalty of sin, and thus making an *end* of the *old man*. No one can read these words, and not understand them to allude to sin, to uncleanness, to pollution: and, now, see how naturally, as would be the case upon our theory, the Apostle's mind recurs to Baptism.

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were *baptized into Jesus Christ*, were baptized into his *death*?" How lucid! First, we have a direct connection between *pollution* and *Baptism*; then, being baptized *into* Jesus Christ, can mean only, that we were brought into his provision of truth and influence, existent in the Church, as the young Jew, or the repenting heathen, was circumcized into the truth and influences of the Mosaic Church: and, by being baptized into his death, we can only understand, that we come thus where his death for sin, is taught as the atonement for our guilt, and the

incitement that we may so love him, and be so instructed as to hate sin and abstain from it, as though we were new creatures. That immersion can signify the *manner* of Christ's death, we have seen to be impossible. Our Lord was crucified. Not by being *put down*; but by being *lifted up*: John iii. 14.

"Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death." When we passed into Jesus Christ, that is, into his dispensation, by Baptism, it was from the sinful and polluted world, where we had been living as the *old man*; and, just as the grave consummates the act of death, and hides a man from his associates and the world; so our having passed, by Baptism, into the Church, was significant of the consummation of our old life of sin, and of our being hidden from our sinful associates and a sinful world.

It is impossible, that Baptism, by immersion, can signify the *manner* of a burial, of our Lord, or of any body else. Because, as we have seen, there is not one point of resemblance. Just as the Supper, which "shows forth his death," does not show forth the *manner* of it; for there is not one point of resemblance. But, it is possible, that Baptism by sprinkling, should signify our pollution and desert of death; the latter of which we escaped by the death of Jesus Christ, and the former of which we are now to have as little to do with, as a man dead and buried out of sight has to do with the sinful visibilities of this world. As, then, the burial of the body is the end of the man in this world: so Baptism signifies the complete end of the sinful life in Adam: and our advance into the instructive, quickening, holy influences of the Christian dispensation, or Church, where we are to live a new, a holy, a pure life: that "like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should *walk in newness of life*." This part of the passage seems to

glow upon all we have said. That it can have no allusion to one's rising from the water, as significant of the resurrection of Christ, we have already shown to be impossible; for there is no resemblance. Nothing could be more unlike, than Christ, leaving his grave-clothes in the sepulchre of rock, where he had reposed so long, and coming forth in his own omnipotence, in his incorruptible body; and a man, *lifted up* hastily from the water, in *the same clothes* in which he went down, they all dripping with water, and he looking *a great deal worse* than before his immersion. It seems amazing, that even any human mind, and of course prone to error, could have imagined, that such a "sorry sight" bore any resemblance to the majestic and glorious, no doubt, but yet *invisible* resurrection of our Lord: as invisible as the regeneration of the penitent soul, which, as in the case of our Lord, appears, after the occurrence, in a Christian walk, or manifestation. The idea of *representing* what was *invisible*, cannot be proper.

"For if we be planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." There can be no resemblance between Baptism by *immersion*, and *being planted*: water not being the usual receptacle of seed: and seed not being put down into the earth, and then hastily abstracted. Planting is a careful and permanent deposition of the seed, which seems to perish in its grave; but, after awhile, though no eye sees the plant actually pierce the surface, it does appear, as a new being, (unlike the brown, hard seed,) a green, tender, upward-growing new creature. The *manner* of this, Baptism by *immersion* cannot signify; there being no similitude between the dripping, soiled, uncomfortable looking man, lifted with a surge out of the troubled water, and the beautiful young plant, rising imperceptibly, and noiselessly, by the power of an inward life and vigor, from the soil. But, Baptism by

sprinkling, according to our theory, does signify these *facts*: that the *old man*, lost sight of in this instructive ordinance, is to be no more seen; and the *new man* springing up from it as from a seed, shall grow, amid the blessed influences of Christianity, to the praise of God's glorious grace. Showers are more important to the farmer, than floods. Egypt, the figure of the world, was the country, where floods served the purpose of agriculture; but Canaan, the figure of the Church, was a land of rain.

"Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." It would seem unnecessary to continue the exposition. The passage in Colossians, ii. 12, is subject to the same principles of explanation; and, therefore, it is unnecessary to bring it into the discussion.

True, if the Scripture did teach, that Baptism signifies the manner of Christ's death, burial and resurrection; there could be no controversy, in the case, among evangelical Christians. But, here is the very point of dispute. To us, it is clear, that the Scripture does not teach so. The only proof alleged to the contrary, is from those passages, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12. But, as those are merely *incidental* in their allusions to Baptism; it is more reasonable, to understand them, to be in conformity with the Law of Baptism, as modified by our Lord in his Gospel; than to make them the *principle* and *rule* of exegesis.

The phrase, "buried with Christ by Baptism," can no more teach the *manner* of our Baptism to be *immersion*; than the phrases, "crucified with Christ," Gal. ii. 20—"the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which I am crucified unto the world," etc., Gal. vi. 14, teach the *manner* of our crucifixion. Nor can such a phrase as, "risen with Christ," teach the *manner* of our spiritual

resurrection, which, like our Lord's, is *invisible*: John iii. 8.

The great doctrines evolved from the Ordinances, do not depend upon these being the symbols of *manner*; but the *commemorations of facts*. We know, that the Lord's Supper "shows forth his death;" I Cor. xi. 26: but, certainly, not the *manner* of it. And why should we suppose, in the absence of divine testimony, that Baptism signifies the *manner* of anything? Especially, the *manner* of three great and awful facts, to not one of which immersion (the mode alleged) has one single point of resemblance!

Sin and death came by Adam, the dead: and, *by imputation*, we are thereby defiled: Gen. ii. 17; iii. 6; Rom. v. 12. At the margin of his Dispensation, stands the triumphant Jesus, the glorious Jehovah, John xii. 41, with his *clean water*, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, to sprinkle us and our children clean from the pollution of sin, death, and Adam: that we may be taught all his commandments, Matt. xxviii. 20; cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and the spirit, II Cor. vii. 1; be new, holy, living creatures, Tit. ii. 14; bearing the image of the *heavenly*, as we bore the image of the *earthly*; no longer serving the flesh, but serving God in newness of spirit; with our affections set upon things above; to experience, that, *keeping Christ's saying*, we shall never see death: John viii. 51.

The cases of Baptism mentioned in the New Testament, all conform to this theory without the least violence. The believing Cornelius, Acts x. 2, feared God *with all his house*; sanctifying these by his faith, and receiving Baptism from Peter. Lydia believed, and was baptized *with her household*, sanctified by her faith; Acts xvi. 14, 15. Nothing is said of the faith of her household: and they were Baptized by Paul, who taught that children were sanctified by the faith of the parent.

This is a very clear case, as to the *subjects* of Baptism. As to the jailor, Acts xvi. 33, 34, his *believing with all his house*, may fairly be understood, upon the same principle. Cornelius *feared God with all his house* : *i. e.* his faith controlled his whole family : like Abraham, he *commanded* them to “keep the way of the Lord ;” Gen. xviii. 19. Lydia did likewise. So did Stephanas ; I Cor. i. 16. If there were any exception, it would be in the very few cases, where the prepositions “into” and “out of” the water are used. To understand these prepositions, requires an accurate knowledge of the Greek language ; which general readers do not possess : and yet, it would be far more reasonable, for the unlearned Christian to conjecture, that if the administrator, did take his subject into the margin of the river, he there sprinkled him, as we have described ; and thus bring these very few cases into the well defined area that we have shown him ; than it would be, to reject all the evidence of the origin, meaning, subjects, and mode, spreading throughout the Scriptures, Old and New, every where clear, every where harmonizing, thoroughly reasonable, instructive, useful ; to reject all this, because of a very few cases, where, as the overwhelming majority of Christian scholars testify, the few prepositions referred to constitute no real embarrassment to our theory.

No one can read the Scriptures, and not perceive, that God has ever manifested a regard for the children of his people. As the Governor and Father of all, this is perfectly consistent. Our Saviour says, that “the little children are of his kingdom : and points us to them as an example of what we all ought to be.” Peter says, “the promise, the dispensation, is to you and to your children.” Paul says, that the children of a believer are “holy.” Now which theory of Baptism comports with these undeniable facts ? The one that *acknowledges* the

right of such children to the "kingdom, the promise, the holiness" referred to; or that which *denies* it?

If a plain man, knowing but little of the matter, and yet wishing to investigate it, should perceive, that the theory of Baptism by immersion, to signify the death, burial and resurrection of our Lord, denies the *holiness* of children asserted by Paul, withholds from them the *promise* declared by Peter, and repels them from the *kingdom* opened to them by our Lord; it would assure him that such a theory must be wrong. And when he should further perceive, that that said theory denied, to *acknowledged Christians*, an access to the Lord's table; it would seem, that he should scarcely hesitate an instant, in deciding upon its prompt rejection.

Our children belong to the kingdom of him in whom we believe. It is our faith, that connects them with it: and we should take care to have them officially entered into their glorious privileges, for their own benefit, and for the good of ourselves, and of our race. It is an important, impressive ordinance; and should be publicly performed.

Any member of a congregation neglecting it, thereby deprives all of a most solemn and instructive lesson; and the deprivation must be greatly to the detriment of the rising generation. Alas! how deplorable is the condition of multitudes of children; because the great facts taught in Baptism, are not pressed with sufficient frequency, upon the minds of parents, guardians and pastors. We need to come often to this awful monument of the FALL; that we may be urged to renewed efforts, to lead our dear children to that glorious REDEMPTION, which is in CHRIST JESUS.



## SIMEON'S SUPPOSED PRAYER.

LUKE ii. 29.—Lord, now lettest thou, etc.

SIMEON appears in the sacred narrative, only in this brief passage. His name occurs nowhere else: nor is there elsewhere any allusion to him. "And, (alluding to the fact, that Joseph and Mary had come up to Jerusalem, to present their son to the Lord:) behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the Holy Ghost was upon him." His age is not stated: "there was a man," is very indefinite. When Anna is introduced, she is said to be "of a great age;" and it is probable, that had Simeon been of a great age it would have been so stated. There is certainly nothing in the record, to intimate that he was old.

Nor, is there any statement, that he was a priest. Zacharias was a priest; *Luke* i. 5, and "well stricken in years." Anna was a prophetess, of a great age: and the genealogy of both Zachariah and Anna is given: he was of the course of Abia; she the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser: but Simeon "was a man in Jerusalem." A very small, inadequate foundation, for any theory of advanced age, or priestly function. His character is given. He was just, devout, waiting for (looking for) the consolation (Messiah) of Israel, and the Holy Ghost was upon him. He was a pious Israelite, expecting the Messiah.

"And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death (not die), before he had seen the Lord's Christ." A more lucid statement could not be presented. God had revealed to him, that the Messiah should come, before the close of Simeon's life;

and that Simeon should see him. A great point with a pious Jew.

“And he came by the Spirit into the temple.” Not that he came to “execute the priest’s office before God in the order of his course;” as with Zachariah, ch. i. 8; for it does not appear, that he had any official act to perform; but merely “came by the Spirit into the temple.” “—and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law; then took he him up in his arms (*kai autos edexato eis tas agkalas*, he also received him into his arms), and blessed God (*eulogeese ton Theon*, lauded, praised, magnified God),” etc. The *kai autos* seems to intimate that others had had the infant in their arms; and now he, Simeon, the just and devout man, who resided in Jerusalem; and who, perhaps, had somewhat bruited the revelation that he was to see the Christ; he also takes him in his arms to acknowledge the fulfilment of the revelation.

In making this acknowledgment, “he said, Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: for mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; (all the nations of the earth; *Gen.* xviii. 18,) a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.” Was this a prayer? Certainly not. It was a declaration of God’s veracity; of his own thankfulness; of the true, divine, view of the relation of the Messiah to all the nations, to Gentile and Jew, to man: all this was incident to his proclamation of the infant Jesus as the Lord’s Christ.

There is no petition in “Lord, now lettest thou depart” (*apolueis*). Not “let thou depart” (*apolue*); but “thou dost let depart.” Meaning that God’s promise had been verified: there was the Christ: the longing of his soul was satisfied: his eyes had seen the Christ, and when death should close them, it would be in peace.

That he died then, soon after, or years after, we are not informed. Had he died then, it is scarcely probable, that his burial would not have been mentioned. The Baptist's burial was mentioned; so Stephen's; even those of Ananias and Sapphira: and it is not probable, that the just and devout Simeon, dying suddenly in the temple, with Christ in his arms, should have been passed by, without notice of either his death or burial. That he did not pray to die then, is certain, if we accept the divine record; which represents him as praising, not as praying: when he did die, is utterly unknown, in the absence of all record whatever.

As Luke represents this good man, as having "the Holy Ghost upon him—as having had a revelation by the Holy Ghost—as influenced by the Spirit;" it is interesting to notice the incidental evidence we have of this, in the expanded, correct views of the Messiah, as to his being the Saviour of *man*; "A light to lighten the Gentiles (*ethnoon*, the nations) and the glory (*doxan*, honor) of thy people Israel." The Messiah was prepared for "all people:" of which "all people," the Gentiles, who had been in darkness, without the "oracles of God," were to have light from "the light of the word;" while Israel, the remaining part of the "all people," were to have the honor, glory, of having produced the Messiah; for which result God had prepared by the election of Abraham, and by the organization of his descendants, for this very production of the Messiah; which event was the purpose and glory of the Mosaic dispensation. When Judaism had produced the Messiah, its function ceased: it came necessarily to a close: in glory; for it had accomplished God's purpose.

## THE VISIT TO JERUSALEM.

LUKE ii. 41-51.

OUR Lord's "parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover." Joseph was compelled to go, *Exod.* xxiii. 14; Mary went voluntarily; boys under twelve were not required to take part in the festival. But, now, Jesus had reached that age, and was at the feast. Was it for the *first* time? It is not very probable.

As both parents went up every year to Jerusalem, to remain a week; is it natural to suppose, that they would leave *such* a child as this, for that length of time, without their personal attention? It is certainly far more likely, that with so many supernatural facts connected with him; his mother would have him in special care. It was not so great a journey as the one into, or from Egypt; and, most likely, when his parents made their annual visit, they took him with them.

This hypothesis might account, too, for the fact of their leaving him in the city, at their starting homeward, at the conclusion of the festival; and relieve Mary of her seeming negligence. He having accompanied his parents annually, one of his bright mind would have become quite familiar with the city; as well as with the movements of the caravans, as to the place and hour of starting; and having never failed to be in place and time, now, when he had reached the age of twelve years, it could not have been thought necessary to keep a strict watch over him. Whereas, had this been his first coming up, it would have been necessary to watch him continuously; as being a stranger to the city, he might have been lost, amid the surging crowds of the occasion.

Then, also, there is no mention of his having accompanied his parents, at this time, as would seem necessary on the part of Luke, had this been his first visit to Jerusalem, at the time of the feast. The record of the tarrying is given; as though this were the *first tarrying*: but there is no record of this as the *first visit*. Yet the natural logic in the case, seems to require a statement of the first visit, if such were the fact: so, that as we are informed that his parents went up every year to Jerusalem, at the feast; supposing Jesus not to have gone with them, because of his minority; the record would be "And when he was twelve years old, then went he up with his parents to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast." But this is not the record: his going up is not mentioned: and the whole air of the narrative intimates, that but for the tarrying, *he* would not be in the incident at all; it being the tarrying that was extraordinary.

On the other hand, the hypothesis that he had been accustomed, not to be left behind, but to have accompanied his loving, careful mother, in the annual journeys to the holy city; the details are natural; when he was twelve years old, having become quite accustomed to the city, and to the coming and going of the caravan; and having never "tarried behind in Jerusalem;" such an occurrence, so unusual, so unapprehended, was extraordinary, and merited record, as accounting for the surprise and anxious search for him by his parents.

It was not until at the end of a day's journey that they missed him, and sought among "their kinsfolk and acquaintance;" as though it were habitual for him to travel with such on the return; for there is no record that they missed him, until they had failed to find him among those, who appear to have become his associates in the traveling. They sought him only there. "And when they found him not, they turned back again to Jerusalem, seeking him." This turning back consumed the second day, and the third day they found him.

He was in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, hearing their expositions of the wise questions he propounded to them; not for his own instruction; but to wake them up from the dreams of phariseeism, to the realities of the Messianic time, and purpose. His questions, very likely, were similar in purpose, to those of *Matth. xxii. 42.* "What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" Such questions were of a nature inciting to inquiry; and with a tendency to aid their extrication from the toils of tradition.

Such a scene is unfavorable, also, to the theory, that our Lord was mere *human*, until, at a period of his life, not yet agreed upon, when there came to him the divine consciousness of his great mission. The Scriptural account has nothing of this kind in it, that the present writer has been able to find. "Therefore that holy thing that shall be born (*to gennoomenon hagion*, neuter like *to pneuma hagion*, but not to be rendered *thing*; as either *paidion*, a child, or *brephos*, an infant, is neuter, and would supply the ellipsis *to hagion*) of thee shall be called the Son of God." *Luke i. 35.* Here, in the scene at the temple, Jesus claims to be the Son of God, at twelve years of age. And Luke testifies, that at about thirty years old, he was the Son of God through human progenitors; "being, as was supposed, the son of Joseph—of God." *Luke iii. 23-38.* But when, a few lines on, he represents the devil as calling him "Son of God," it could not be in the sense of having descended from God through Adam. *Luke iv. 3.* That would have been no peculiarity.

The Holy One born of Mary was the Son of God, as the Only Begotten of God, when the child was

“brought forth, wrapped in swaddling clothes, and laid in a manger;” according to the angelic testimony, “\* \* \* unto you is born THIS DAY in the city of David a Saviour, who is CHRIST the LORD; (*hos estin Christos Kurios.*)” So, when “the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.” So, when at twelve years of age, he sat among the doctors in the temple. So, when he came to be about thirty years of age, and Luke is heard reckoning up his genealogy, as though he were a mere man. So, when at his baptism the “voice from heaven said, This is my beloved Son.” So, all through his wonderful life. So, in the garden, amid the horrors that oppressed him there, when he groaned out “O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.” So, on the cross, when he said of his murderers, “Father, forgive them;” and at the very close, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.” When he was born, while he lived, when he died, when he rose, when he ascended into heaven, now, the same, yesterday, to-day, forever: the Son of God.

As to the HOW can these things be? it may be left safely with the record which was “written that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.”  
*John xx. 31.*

---

## THE TWO BUILDERS.

LUKE vi. 47-49.

“WHOSOEVER cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them.” Our Lord here describes the steps to be taken, if one wishes to be a Christian. Such person must come to him: as an in-

structor, he has something to say to the sinner, and the sinner should approach; it is of great interest. When arrived, he should hear what this great teacher has to say. But, it is of no avail, unless he conforms to the teaching; obeys the direction. Coming, hearing, obeying. Such is the process; and he who conforms to it, is like a man which built a house properly. Proposing to build, he "digged deep:" a phrase that gives a correct, but not a full meaning of our Lord's language. *Deep*, an adverb, is not found in the phrase: "digged deep" is the rendering of two verbs; and not of a verb signifying *digged* and an adverb signifying *deep*. The two verbs are *skaptoō* and *bathunōō*; in the N. T., found only in Luke; the former three times, the latter but once: *eskapsen kai ebathunen*, he digged and deepened: expressive of continuous persistent digging: he purposed to dig until he should reach the hard rock; upon which to build. Not simply he "digged deep;" but he "digged AND deepened;" continued to dig; did not pause in the digging, until he had satisfied himself, that he had a sufficient foundation.

Yet this digging is a laborious process: and in digging a foundation, the men who do that work are not the most esteemed of the employees. No work is of more importance than theirs; and, yet, no workmen about the building are less esteemed. So this digging the foundation for the spiritual edifice, is toilsome, and humiliating. But the humiliation, like that of the digging, is in the seeming; not in the reality. Repentance, the digging, are of first importance: each indispensable; a *sine qua non*: and how can it be really humiliating, to be engaged in a work of the greatest moment? The faithful digger merits not only his pay, but respect and thanks for his indispensable work: and the penitent man, with those around him, should have sense enough to understand, that ceasing to do evil and learning to do well, so far from being humiliating, is ennobling.



The figure in the passage, is that of a man, who begins work, with the intention of finding a good foundation; and continues digging, until he finds it. This is very clear as to the thinking to be done, the attention to be given, and the perseverance necessary, to have a sure support for our religious character, our part in the salvation that is in Jesus the Christ: who is the Rock to be sought for. No other name is given: for no other would suffice: not Wesley, Fox, Luther, Campbell, Canterbury, Knox, Calvin, the Pope: not any Church relation, or ritual: nothing will do but Christ. It is of no use to depend upon frames, feelings excitement, impulses, hopes. Other foundation than Christ is useless; of no avail. Not that God *will* have it so, as a mere arbitrary decision: but, because it must be so of necessity; nothing else being trustworthy; and he is in earnest for our salvation.

When one digs into the gospel, and persists until he sees the Rock; he may immediately begin to build: he can do so safely. The clear belief that Jesus, the Christ, suffered in our stead; washed away our sins with his own blood; satisfied the law, in our behalf, paying all that it claimed from us; and thus reconciled us to God; relieves the conscience of a sense of guilt, and fills the heart with love for him, who loved us and gave himself for us. We build up our hope of heaven, our Christian character, upon this sure rock—Jesus died for me, and is my reconciliation with God. And nothing can shake down our edifice. We believe the Truth; and the Truth is without variation. Frames, feelings, vary; fluctuate; sometimes, rapidly, and to our discouragement and grief: but the gospel of Christ ever remains the same; ever makes the same statement; and happy is he who draws sufficiently nigh to hear its message; attends to it with prayerful meditation, until he understands it; obeys it by returning to the Father with

penitent, loving confidence, and yields his powers and life to his will. He is the successful builder.

The unsuccessful comes, hears, but instead of obeying by digging down to the rock; he builds on the surface; is a Wesleyan, Friend, Baptist, Lutheran, Ritualist, constructing his character and hope "upon the earth;" upon the varying, unstable, unsatisfying; and when the storm comes, "the ruin of that house is great."

Salvation is by Faith. Faith comes by hearing. Hearing is by the word of God; *i. e.* nothing need be heard, nothing should be heard but the word of God, the gospel, for the production of faith: faith being nothing other than an intelligent belief of the gospel; and, working by love, it purifies the heart; bringing us into harmony with our God and Saviour; and into love and charity toward men.

---



---

## WHY DID SHE LOVE MUCH?

LUKE vii. 47.—"Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much."

**W**AS her having loved much, the cause, or occasion, of her many sins being forgiven? Or, her many sins having been forgiven, the cause of her having loved much?

A careful reading of the passage, will, perhaps, lead to the opinion, that the former question should be answered in the negative; the latter, in the affirmative.

A pharisee having invited our Lord to take a meal with him, "they sat down to meat;" and a woman of

the city, a sinner, a poor disgraced creature, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in that house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping. The sitting at meals, was really a *reclining* upon a couch, (*katakeitai*,) so that she would have access to his feet extended on the couch, outward from the table. Her tears falling profusely upon his feet, wet (*brechein*) them; not that it was her intention; but weeping in natural mitigation of the fulness of her heart, painfully expanded and laboring with loving gratitude, the tears fell upon the feet she was kissing, and "began to wet them" (*eerxato brechein*). She wiped away the tears with her abounding hair; continued the kissing; and anointed his feet with the ointment. It is not stated that she said anything. Her heart was too full for utterance. It was as the deep river in its silent flow.

The pharisee, who had been somewhat impressed by the wonderful doings of Jesus; and, possibly, had conceived some respect for the opinion, that he might be the Christ, or a prophet, appears to have been disappointed; as it seemed to him, that our Lord, if even a prophet, would have known the character of the woman; and would have refused to be touched by her polluted hands. He dismissed all idea of such a person being even a prophet; for the idea of his being the Christ, to him, was ridiculous. He had not learned of the woman's conversion; nor had he any thought of the Christ as a Saviour from sin. With him, Christ was to save Israel from the hands of their enemies: to be a horn of salvation for Israel: as to his being a Saviour of men, sinful men, Jew and Gentile; and therefore, should have been expected to "receive sinners;" such a thought had not occurred to him.

Our Lord, who was not only acquainted with the character and conversion of the woman, but also with

the thoughts and error of Simon's mind, addressed him in a manner, that should have indicated his mistake to him; and led him to understand, that the coming of the Christ, had respect to sin, rather than the national elevation of Israel. "Simon," said he, "there was a certain creditor which had two debtors: one owing him five hundred pence; the other fifty. And when they had no means of paying (and he might have cast them into prison, hopelessly); he frankly forgave (*echarisato*, freely forgave) them both." Neither had paid any part of the debt: neither had any means of paying: they had NOTHING wherewith to pay: but the kind, compassionate creditor, unhesitatingly, frankly, forgave them both. "Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him most?" Here was a leading question. The Christ plan might, after all, be a plan of forgiveness of sin: all are sinners: all then would have an interest in Christ: but Simon, as the other Jews, was slow of understanding, looking not at the Scriptures, but at the traditions of the Elders. He answers, "I suppose he, to whom he forgave most." "Thou hast rightly judged," said our Lord, and then reviewed the conduct of the woman, by the light of this principle, to which Simon had assented. *What* was the principle? Evidently, that where much is forgiven, much love will be enkindled: much love will ensue much forgiveness. But, no reader of this passage will fail to perceive, that the woman is represented as loving much. "She hath washed my feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head: she hath not ceased to kiss my feet: she hath anointed my feet with ointment: for she loved much." So, she had had much forgiven; here is the proof of it: first the much forgiveness, then the much love; according to the principle agreed upon: the principle stated by Simon, and declared correct (*orthoos ekrinas*) by our Lord.

The debtors had *nothing* wherewith to pay: and it would not be consistent, to suppose, that our Lord would represent this woman, as having the means to purchase forgiveness: especially, as the creditor "frankly forgave (*amphoterōis echarisato*) them both:" nothing was taken into consideration, but their inability to pay: he frankly, freely, forgave them both. The consistency of the narrative, as well as the principle illustrated, requires the interpretation that she loved much, because her many sins had been forgiven: and *not* that her sins were forgiven because she had loved much: the latter hypothesis showing that she had something to pay; and that she had not been frankly forgiven. "Wherefore, I say unto thee, Simon, her sins, which are many, (*hai hamartiai hai pollai*) are forgiven:" (*apheontai*, 3 pl. per. pass. and meaning *they have been*, they continue to be, forgiven: this great love that this woman has exhibited, is because her many sins have been forgiven; she is now grateful for the forgiveness: and he, cheerfully, reminds the woman of the forgiveness, as if to assure, confirm her faith.) He does not say to Simon, I *will* forgive her sins: nor, I *do* forgive her sins: nor does he say to the woman, I *do* forgive thy sins: but, in the perfect tense of the passive voice, he says to Simon *apheontai autees hai hamartiai hai pollai*, her many sins *are* (have been) forgiven; and to the woman, in kind reminder, thy sins (not mentioning the MANY) *are* (have been, *apheontai*) forgiven.

To the writer, this is the most natural, consistent interpretation. It was not the first time, this, that the overburdened sinner had been in the presence of her Lord and Saviour. Not that it is so stated; but the entire air of the incident suggests the fact. She hears that he is at Simon's; and enters, taking her station at once, without inquiry as to which was he, at his feet; in modest silence; noticing no one else; asking no

favor ; not weeping over her sins, but relieving her grateful heart's swollen emotion, by the tears that fell like gentle rain-drops on the Saviour's feet. Not pleading for forgiveness, and acceptance ; but manifesting her deep, vast love, under a sense that her **MANY SINS WERE FORGIVEN**. Surely she had been in his presence ere this, though we know not where ; and had had a happy experience of the great fact, that "the Son of man hath power to forgive sins." Since the beginning of the world, did any such woman as Simon knew this to have been, behave after this subdued, silent, grateful manner, except in sequence of forgiven sin ?

WINER : The Perfect is used for the Present, (a.) Only so far as the Perfect denotes an action or state whose commencement and occasion were completed in time past : *Moousees, eis hon eelpikate*, Moses, in whom you hope.

---

## THE ONE THING NEEDFUL.

LUKE x. 38-42.—But one thing is needful ; etc.

"**N**OW it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village : and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house." The first visit this, and by invitation, to a family, from that time held in high esteem by the Master. Martha was at the head of the family : it was her house : she received him : and, as his hostess, she intended to manifest her hospitality, by a very handsome entertainment. That there was any vanity in this, we are not informed ; but, in

many cases, there is as much anxiety to make a display of resources and taste, as to testify kindness and respect. But it is not always so; and perhaps this case was one of the exceptions. However this might have been, Martha was cumbered about much serving. This was the part she had chosen. The wondrous Lord, who was attracting so much attention, whose fame was spreading through the land, whom many held to be the Messiah, who was regarded by herself as more than man, Lord, the Lord of Israel, was under her roof, and she wished to make his entertainment worthy of him and of herself. The honor of her house was in question, and demanded the taxing of all her resources and skill. She was cumbered, careful, troubled. She chose to be so. She assumed such part as suitable to the occasion and to herself.

“And she had a sister called Mary—” whose ideas of the incident were very different: and therefore she chose a part, adopted a course, very different indeed from that of her worthy, industrious, generous sister. “She sat at Jesus’ feet, and heard his word.” Here was an opportunity of hearing one who had the word of eternal life. Here was one with a message from heaven; at least, a prophet; perhaps, the Messiah. What had he to say? She must sit at his feet, and hear his word. And when she began to hear, she could not depart from his teaching: it became more and more interesting: she saw instinctively, that he preferred teaching to feasting; and she felt that her everlasting interests were suspended upon what he taught. She had been accustomed to support her sister’s housewifery, as seems intimated by the latter’s surprise and the appeal. But she was sure that the Lord approved her conduct; something in his look, his manner, and “a still small voice” in her heart assured her of this: and she remained at her post. She had chosen this part. She had elected to entertain this unusual guest, in this, to her, unusual manner.

“Dost thou not care,” said the overburdened Martha to the Lord, “that my sister hath left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me.” In her view, the kind-hearted woman saw the honor of the house and the comfort of the Lord, imperilled by the unusual defection of Mary; and seeing the latter’s earnest attention to his word, she requests that he will direct the delinquent’s attention to her duty.

It must have surprised her exceedingly; possibly, she was much benefitted by the discovery; when she learned from his own lips, that it was by far more agreeable to him to instruct, to enlighten, to bless, to save herself and family; than to be sumptuously entertained: that he came “not to be ministered unto, but to minister:” not to possess earthly pomp and luxury, but “to lay down his life” for sinners: not to be a receiver, but a giver: to teach, that “it is more blessed to give than to receive.” All Martha’s care and trouble was kindly meant, but was a mistake; it was not needful; he and his disciples needed rest and refreshment; but did not need all the array that Martha was preparing so busily and anxiously. Something plain, simple, that would not require much toil and time in preparing, and would allow the family time to listen to the Great Teacher, was the demand of the occasion.

The one needful thing, in comparison of all others, was to hear the word of the divine guest, and become wise unto salvation. This is the *sine qua non*: the real need of every one; the great end of life, and it should be life’s object and aim. The life is more than meat. Sustenance is needful for the body; but the “word” is needful for the soul: the soul is more than the body: feasting sumptuously is rather hurtful than needful to the body; and is by no means helpful to the soul. The one thing needful, then, is to hear the word of Jesus, and obey it; conform to it. We do not suppose that



our Lord meant to signify, that there was need of only one dish, or article of food ; but, while he intimated that Martha was unnecessarily careful and troubled ; he signified to her that the one great necessity of the hour, was to take advantage of his presence, by sitting at his feet, and receiving his instruction. Here was the fountain of blessing. To hang garlands upon it, is not the way to honor it ; but to receive the precious outpouring, drinking and praising the living water. A general is not honored by the acclamation of his troops, as by their attention and obedience to his orders. The prophet puts into the mouth of the Messiah these words ; "I delight to do thy will, O God : " and that will was human salvation : and when he, Jesus, the Messiah came to do that will, the "one thing needful" for him, and for sinners, was to let him do it ; to "sit at his feet and hear his word : " for "faith comes by hearing ; and hearing, by the word of God ; " and "by faith are ye saved : " "he that believeth shall be saved."

This was the good part, Mary had chosen ; and our Lord declined to interrupt her in it. She, in her choice, had exhibited a wisdom superior to that of her sister, her senior in years ; by her more accurate opinion of the character, pleasure, wishes of their distinguished guest. To please him, was not to prepare for him an entertainment, to the full extent of their household and personal resources ; but to give him an opportunity to bless and save them all. When a statesman proposes a plan for great good to the public ; the need and wisdom of the day, is not to feast and praise the statesman, but the adoption and trial of his plan. So with the Saviour ; it is not the one thing needful, to erect magnificent churches, under pretense of honoring him ; but to hear and obey his word. If our resources are large, "to visit the widows and fatherless in their afflictions, and keep ourselves unspotted from the world."

## WHICH LORD COMMENDED?

LUKE xvi. 8.—“And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.”

PERHAPS it is the general opinion, that the lord here referred to, is the lord of the unjust steward. Some of the best commentators so affirm, with an “of course,” as if there is no room to doubt; while our translators, by not using a capital letter at the beginning of the word, indicate their harmony with such an interpretation. Yet, we cannot accept it: as it appears to be founded only upon the impropriety, of regarding our Lord as commending a fraud. But where is the propriety of agreeing, that the lord of the steward would commend his servant’s fraud; when he had just reprehended him for that very fault; ordered him to bring in his account; and made known to him, that he intended to dismiss him from his office? The master was a worldly man, and seeking his own interest; and so was the steward: possibly had the latter cheated some other than his lord, and thus made up, or more than made up, the waste he had been guilty of; he might have looked upon *such* procedure as *wise*; and have gladly retained him in his service. But, it was not very consistent, to have called him to account, in process of dismissal, for his *commendable* trickiness: as if his tricks were no longer censurable, but commendable, when carried on to such a degree, as to injure him much more seriously. This lord must have been a very peculiar man, to have enjoyed this artful and perfidious conduct, on the part of a man, who had already injured him so inexcusably. And further, the reason assigned for the commending, is so singular: “for the children

of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." The children of this world ; those persons who act on worldly principle, self-interest, wisely commend the man who takes care of himself at their expense. But this looks like very questionable wisdom : especially in a man, who had sense enough, to reprimand such conduct in his employee, and dismiss him from his position.

But, admitting this view, it does not vindicate our Lord from commending the conduct of the steward. What else is his meaning in the very next verse? "And I say unto YOU, (his disciples, pupils,) Make to YOURSELVES friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," etc. This instruction in such connection, must certainly be understood as commending the example of the steward in *some* respect. When, on another occasion, he had pointed them to the chiefs, the rulers, who were exercising "lordship ;" he did not say, And I direct YOU to secure for YOURSELVES lordship : but he said, It shall not be so among YOU. In this case, on the contrary, he says, in amount, it shall be so also among YOU : and, certainly this is equivalent to a commendation of the steward.

It is more consistent, we think, to accept this eighth verse, as a parenthesis of the narrator, Luke, inserted at the end of the parable, and immediately preceding his resumed account of our Lord's discourse at the ninth verse : a method occasionally used by the sacred writers. It may suffice to cite *Acts* i. 4, "And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, *saith he*, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Here the words "*saith he*," in italics, are interpolated by the translators, to indicate and bridge over the abrupt

transition from the Evangelist's own to the words of the Saviour; a transition of which Luke gives no intimation; leaving the reader to his own inference. Indeed nothing could be more sudden, and unexpected, than the change made by Luke, from a continuous narration of the substance of our Lord's address to his disciples, to his very words; as may easily be seen by omitting the words "*saith he*" from the passage. So *Acts* xvii. 2, 3, "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." Here again Luke passes from his own, to Paul's words without any notice whatever.

Both these examples are from the writings of Luke, from whose gospel alone we have the parable of the unjust steward: at the close of which occurs, as we think, the transition from the words of Luke, to those of our Lord as we find the record, at verses 8, 9, of *Luke* xvi.

Then the point of commendation would be this. The steward, in his generation, *i. e.* not looking beyond the grave; he being a child "of *this* world;" made provision (the force of *phronimoos epoieesen*) for "this world;" the short arc on the circle of infinity which measured his vision, its two termini being the cradle and the grave; for this, his theoretic all-life, he made provision; as his own worldly principle required him to do: he was consistent.

But, the "children of light," those who have come out from the darkness of the world, into "the light," the "marvellous light of the gospel," should imitate this steward in making provision for *their* entire life; which they understand as not being a short arc on the circle of infinity, but infinity itself; so extended, as to dwindle

*this life* into a mere point: and yet many children of light, forgetting the facts of their generation, use the mammon of unrighteousness, worldly means, riches, as though they related to this life only, and had no relation to the endless life; employing them to obtain worldly comfort, position, etc., here; and not so as to enhance their welcome into "the everlasting habitations." This was the lesson: as this steward did not wish to be destitute in the years that were between him and the grave; the boundary of his short, worldly vision; so take care to imitate this one feature, providence, in his bad character; and be interested and busy, making provision for your life, which you believe will be eternal; and so use worldly means, possessions, as to aid you in this respect.

As to the phraseology "the Lord," as applied to the Master by Luke, we see it in x. 1., "— the Lord appointed other seventy also," etc.; as well as in other passages. There can be no dispute about that. But in the parable the word lord is used with reference to the "certain rich man," by the steward invariably with the pronoun *my*: "my lord taketh away," etc.; "— owest thou unto my lord," etc. While our Lord in the only use he makes of the word, qualifies it by the pronoun *his*; "his Lord." All this is definite. The Steward's "my lord," and the Master's "his lord," referred to the same person, the proprietor, the "certain rich man." But Luke's "the Lord" does not refer to the proprietor. If this eighth verse was uttered by our Lord, it is most likely we should have had his reiterated "his lord;" which would have been unambiguous.

## THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

LUKE xvi. 19-31.

TO understand this Scripture, it is well to consider, that our Lord had been discoursing on riches, covetousness, the impossibility of serving God AND mammon. The Pharisees derided him, (*exemukteerizon auton*, a phrase expressive of contempt,) for they had very different ideas of the relation of religion and riches, from those of our Lord. His was new teaching to them. From the days of Job down, the orthodox view of the Jews was, that wealth and health indicated piety, the favor of God; while poverty and sickness marked impiety and the divine displeasure. So, Job's friends thought it their duty, to treat him as a detected sinner, and therefore punished. They admitted that they were not personally cognizant of his wickedness; that he had managed to keep up a fair show of piety; but they urged that the all-penetrating eye had discovered his iniquities, and they insisted on his confession and reformation. Job resisted this charge; and, while acknowledging his nothingness in comparison with God, maintained his integrity; bemoaning the bitterness of his condition; inasmuch as, while he was known of God to be a sincerely pious man, his poverty and disease showed that he was treated as a sinner. That same poverty and disease convinced his friends that he *was* a sinner; and therefore the punishment, which was his due.

The Pharisees who had sneered so contemptuously at our Lord, held the same doctrine; and therefore the parable, to deny this teaching, and to introduce his own.

"There was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day." V. 19.

Such is the description. Are these specifications of his guilt? Is it sinful to be rich? To be apparelled consistently with one's fortune? To have excellent food, when obtained honestly? It is distinctly recorded that Solomon had all these bestowed upon him, as the reward of his wise piety; and it was not because of "all his glory," that he incurred the divine displeasure; but, his decline in his allegiance to God. Job, "the greatest of all the men of the east," whose "sons feasted in their houses, every one his day, and sent and called for their three sisters to eat and to drink with them;" was not brought down to destitution, on account of such vast riches; but, to demonstrate that he did not love and honor God, because of the divine bounty. "Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, Doth Job honor God for nought? Hast thou not made a hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? thou hast blest the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land. But put forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath!" etc. Then, these immense possessions, that made Job the greatest man of the wealthy east, were so evidently of divine bestowment, that he was charged with having received them as hire; and that his reverence for God, was mere pretense, hypocrisy; his real motive being the worldly prosperity conferred upon him, in consequence of his observance of the form of godliness. A false charge; for when his calamities came upon him in swift and fearful succession, one messenger of evil tidings treading upon the heels of another, until the reports came in that he had not a particle of property left, nor son, nor daughter; "then Job arose, and rent his mantle, and shaved his head, and fell down upon the ground, and worshipped, and said, Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away;

blessed be the name of the Lord." The charge was proved false. So it was when his health was taken away. And when he had been sufficiently tried, "the Lord blessed the latter end of Job more than his beginning." That is, he sent him greater worldly prosperity than had been taken from him.

We conclude that what is said of him, in this 19th verse, is not to detail the rich man's crimes. True, there is "no other evil spoken of him:" but *is* this evil? We have given clear example that, of itself, it is not: earthly greatness, earthly splendor is not sin: "the greatest of all the men of the east," was described by the Omniscient thus; "There is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil." *Job* i. 8.

But what is said of him (the rich man) presents him to us, as being precisely the sort of man, who, according to the doctrine of the pharisees, was basking in the smile of God, because of his piety; wealthy and healthy. He is declared to be rich; and the very costly clothing, really royal apparel, was in proof of it: so, also, the fact that he fared sumptuously every day; continuously. The phraseology here employed, is significant of great expense; both the original Greek, and our English rendering. Sumptuous entertainment now and then, is expensive; when frequent, is more costly; but when continuous, the expense must necessarily be prodigious: and there is not the least hint given, that the rich man did not pay all this expense; nor any, that he exhausted, or even diminished his estate. He is represented as dying rich; "the rich man also died, and was buried;" leaving, as we may suppose, and with reason, his wealth unimpaired. The Greek phrase is *euphrainomenos kath' heemeran lamproos*, "LIVING IN JOVIAL SPLENDOR." The Greek beautifully implies, that this worldling not only *indulged himself* in dainty meats, rich wines,



singing, and the other articles of luxury, but that he did all this in an *elegant, sumptuous, and splendid* manner." *Parkhurst*. The man was very rich.

Incidentally, also, his good health is shown: for how could an invalid endure such dressing and feasting? In the very nature of the case, we find it implied that his health must have been as sound and solid as his fortune: there was no giving way in either. So, we have described to us, the pharisees' *beau ideal* of heaven's favorite. Of course, we do not affirm that a rich man cannot be a sinner; as there is nothing in the parable, or elsewhere, to countenance such an idea. All that we suppose in the case, is that our Lord intended to exhibit such a man, as would fairly represent the pharisaic conception of heaven-favored piety. All attempts to find in this 19th verse the specifications of the man's guilt, will be specimens of unsuccessful ingenuity.

"And there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table: moreover (*alla kai*, yea also) the dogs came and licked his sores." Vv. 20, 21.

Here is the description of Lazarus: somewhat more in detail, than that of the rich man. But, are these the items of his piety? No one has had such a thought. Yet why not? If what is said of the one, be the items of his guilt, why not what is said of the other be the items of his piety? Poverty is not piety. A poor man is often found to be pious, exemplary, irreproachable: but, too frequently, the poor are found to be as destitute of grace as of money. Our Lord was not describing the man's piety; but, his poverty and ill health. He had exhibited the favorite of God, according to pharisaic teaching; and now, by the same light, he presents one on whom was resting God's dark frown, as evidenced by *poverty and disease*.

But now the scene changes. Time ends with both ; and to the amazement of the pharisees, he shows them Lazarus in heaven, the rich man in hell ! He did not agree with them in their teaching. They had already derided him, for his underestimate of riches and health ; what would they think of him now, after having sent the man of riches and health to hell ; the man of poverty and disease to heaven !

And now our Lord introduces, with his accustomed prudence and gentleness his own doctrine of repentance ; without which no one will be saved ; and the sufficiency of the Word of God, the Scriptures, to persuade men to repentance. The parable represents the rich man as having five brethren, on their way to " this place of torment ;" and begs that Lazarus, one from the dead, might be sent unto them, that they might repent : which Abraham declines to do ; as the five had the Scriptures, than which nothing could be more efficient.

From this we see, that the five were in the way to torment, from which repentance was their safeguard : not riches ; not health ; not poverty ; not disease : but, repentance. Then repentance had saved Lazarus : and repentance would have saved the rich man. The rich, the poor, every one must repent : unless ye repent, ye perish : repentance toward God, precedes faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Without repentance salvation is impossible to rich or poor. Riches, poverty, etc., do not designate our standing with God. All men, everywhere are called upon to repent ; nor is the penitent ever rejected.

There are some incidental thoughts, suggested by the passage. One, that we shall recognize each other, in the future state. For if the lost one could recognize Lazarus across the " great gulf ;" we can scarcely conjecture that recognition of friends, relatives, and others will not occur, in that world beyond the grave.

Another is, that, in the future state, there will be an eternal separation of the righteous from the wicked; the latter "going into everlasting punishment, and the former into life eternal." No sane man will deny, that our Lord describes Lazarus as being carried, at his death, "by the angels into Abraham's bosom;" and the rich man, at his death, "into hell and torment." And between these places, "a great gulf fixed:" so that there could be no passing from the one place to the other. If this passage be a *history*, the matter is settled beyond dispute. But, if it be not a history, it is certainly a *parable*. Then, what is a parable? A parable is the arranging of certain well known, admitted things, so as to teach something by the arrangement. The constituents of a parable are facts, well understood. "And he spake a parable unto them (by way of instructing them concerning his conduct, of which they had complained, saying this man receiveth SINNERS, and eateth with them!) saying, What man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost." Here, each of the many constituents of the parable is a fact, familiar, well known, and, therefore, the parable is instructive: the sinner is the lost sheep: the owner is grieved at the loss; goes away from the ninety-nine (the real remainder) and seeks persistently until he finds it etc.; through the whole parable. But, suppose not one of these constituents to be a reality, and nothing other than an unsubstantial fancy: what would the parable teach? Nothing: no mortal could tell what was meant by it, for it could not mean anything. Examine, then, any

parable in the entire Scripture, and you will find no exception to this necessary rule, that the constituents of a parable must be well known facts.

Immediately ensuing the one just noticed, is that of the woman who having ten pieces of silver lost one, lighted a candle, swept the house, and sought diligently until she found it; and then invited her friends and neighbors to share her joy. Everything real. And, immediately following, is the parable of the prodigal son. Again everything real. Everything must be fact, reality, in the constituency of a parable, of necessity; nothing can be factitious but the arrangement

Therefore, upon the hypothesis that our passage is a parable, the rich man, poor man, wealth, health, poverty, disease, table, crumbs, gate, dogs, sores, licking, dying, angels, burying, Abraham, hell, torment, water, finger, brethren, repentance, gulf, Moses, prophets, all are realities; and only the arrangement is factitious. So if the passage be a history, the doctrine of the separation of the righteous from the wicked in the future state, the latter to be tormented forever; the former to be comforted forever; is distinctly STATED: and if it be a parable, it is, with equal distinctness TAUGHT.

“But now he (Lazarus) is COMFORTED, and thou (the rich man) art TORMENTED. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed (*chasma mega esteeriktai*): so that they which would pass from hence to you CANNOT (*mee dunoontai*, have not the ability, are unable); neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.” The destiny is FIXED: irrevocable: no purgatory being between the comfort and the torment; but a great, impassable gulf. Happiness, torment: no middle ground. Eternal happiness, eternal torment.

Repent, the voice celestial cries,  
Nor longer dare delay;  
The wretch that scorns the mandate DIES—.

## THE GLORY OF THE SON.

JOHN i. 14.—And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.

THE wonderful words of the New, have such frequent reference to the wonderful words of the Old Testament, that we cannot get their full meaning, except by recurrence to the ancient testimony. Indeed "full meaning" is too bold: we cannot exhaust the sense of Scripture: it has a kind of infinity: but, we can gather more, by regarding the divine book, as a series of revelations, progressive degrees of development; as the light of the dawn advancing toward the perfect day.

This passage relates to Exodus xxxiii., xxxiv. Moses, in his anxiety to know more of God, in one of his awful communings, in which great condescension had been shown him, uttered the daring plea, "I beseech thee, show me thy glory:" which the LXX. renders *emphanison moi seauton*, "make manifest thyself to me." In answer to his servant, God said, "I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and I will proclaim the name (character) of the Lord before thee: and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and I will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy. And he said thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me and live. Behold there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock. And it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock; and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by. And I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back-parts: but my face shall not be seen." *Exod.* xxxiii. 18-23. "And the Lord descended in the cloud (And the word became flesh) and stood with him there (and

dwelt, tented, among us) and proclaimed the name (character) of the Lord (and we beheld his glory). And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and (even) ABUNDANT IN GOODNESS (*chesed*, "grace") AND TRUTH." *Exod.* xxxiv. 5, 6.

The word, the Logos, became (*egeneto*) flesh, was veiled in flesh, as the Father was veiled in the cloud: this Logos, become flesh, was the only begotten of the Father; and had his glory, as the Father had his glory; John xvii. 5, "—the glory which I had with thee before the world was:" and as Moses beheld the veiled glory of the Father, so WE, John etc., beheld the Son's veiled glory: and it was a glory that became the Son, the only begotten of the Father: *grace* and *truth*. If *grace* and *truth* were the glory of the Father; then they were the proper glory of the Son, who was "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person;" *apaugasma tees doxees kai character tees hypostaseos autou*. Heb. i. 3.

It is not correct theology, that teaches a discrepancy of character, between the Father and the Son: as if the Father were WRATH; the Son, MERCY. The Son is the *apaugasma*, the shining out, the manifester, of the Father's glory. The Apostle speaks of "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ;" *II Cor.* iv. 6; and our Lord distinctly declares, "he that hath seen ME hath seen the FATHER;" *John* xiv. 9: and, elsewhere, "I and the Father are one." *John* x. 30. The same Evangelist, iii. 16, represents our Lord as proclaiming, that "God so LOVED the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world;" *I John* iv. 14: "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." *I Tim.* i. 15. The Father and the Son had the same

pity, the same desire to save. "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." *John* viii. 28.

Then when we read of "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," we may recur to the passage in *Exodus*, where in granting Moses' request to see his *glory*, the Father said, "I will make ALL MY GOODNESS (grace) pass before thee!" His goodness, *i. e.* his grace, was his glory; abundant in goodness and truth: and the glory of the Son was "fulness of grace and truth;" and therefore it was a glory that became "the only begotten of the Father."

"God was in Christ;" exhibiting himself; he whose face no man could see and live, manifested himself in Christ, veiled by that bright cloud; that men might see him in Christ; men who in seeing his face, could not endure the piercing splendor, might see in the face of Christ, the Son, all that could be seen, were they able to behold the face of the Father. It is in Christ that we see the character of God, in his relation to man, and learn that he is Love; and that Love is Just.

The Father while abundant in goodness and truth, "will yet by no means clear the guilty;" but will follow sin from generation to generation to rebuke and punish it. So the Son, though full of grace and truth, proclaims himself to be just: "these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." How could the Father of the Son abound in goodness and truth, and not be just? Is not justice, goodness; is not justice, truth? We are not to think of God as a weak father, ruining his children by indulgence, and making them to be a nuisance to society around them. God is not only good to one, or to a few, but also to the many. As a good ruler, he does not confine his kindness to the vicious; but endeavors also to be kind to the orderly and law-abiding; by justly

excluding from them the despisers of law and rights. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" There is no antagonism between goodness and justice. A ruler without goodness, would resemble God quite as nearly as a ruler without justice.

---

## ANGELS ASCENDING AND DESCENDING UPON THE SON OF MAN.

JOHN i. 51.—Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.

WHEN Nathanael had observed the wondrous knowledge of our Lord, he said unto him, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the king of Israel." The "Israelite indeed" was honest, open to conviction, and when told by Philip, "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph," and had been led to him, he was convinced that he was in the presence of the Son of God; but, in common with his countrymen, regarded him as "the king of Israel." The Master commends his faith, but lets him know, that "hereafter, thou shalt see greater things than these:" not greater miracles only, but have more extended views of the Messiahship.

Then turning to the rest, including them, also, in his address, for they were involved in the same error, he refers to the ladder of Jacob's vision; as narrated, *Gen.* xxviii. 12. The ladder set upon the earth reached to



heaven: and behold the angels of God were ascending and descending upon it. The Lord stood above it; proclaimed himself the Lord God of Abraham and of Isaac, and includes him, Jacob, in the number of the three grand patriarchs, by extending to him the assurance, "in thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed." It was thus that Abraham was informed, that the Messiah of man should come into the world through him and his posterity; *Gen.* xii. 3. And Isaac; *Gen.* xxvi. 4. And now Jacob; *Gen.* xxviii. 14. There lay Jacob in vision of the grand revelation: the communication between earth and heaven was resumed: the ladder reached unto heaven: the angels of God ascended and descended upon it: was this ladder Judaism?

This question is settled by our Lord, who interprets the ladder as a type of himself: but of himself as the "Son of man:" not as a Jew, as the son of Abraham, as the representative of Judaism, or as its product; but as the "Son of man." And here were the "greater things," they, in common with Nathanael were to see: that the Messiah, the Christ, is related to MAN; to the Jews only because they were included in man; that himself was the communication between earth and heaven; and to open this WAY, not to be "the king of Israel," in their sense, he had come; the angels, the "ministering spirits" were to ascend and descend upon him; between, not only Judea and heaven, but between EARTH and heaven.

It is remarkable, that both in the vision, and our Lord's appropriation of it to himself, the angels are represented as ascending and descending; and not as descending and ascending: not as coming down to see, hear, and returning to report. "Let us go down," is the language of *Gen.* xi. 7. "I will go down now, and see," etc. *Gen.* xviii. 21. But, here was a ladder

“set upon the earth ;” and reached *from* earth *to* heaven. The rebel earth was at last supplied with the means of ascending to heaven ; not in a daring sacrilegious attack, like that of the fabled giants ; but with humble petition for forgiveness and acceptance.

The *man* Christ Jesus touched the earth, partook of humanity, sat, rested upon the earth ; while he, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, “reached to heaven.” God with God, Man with Man : the ladder was set upon the earth and THE TOP OF IT reached to heaven.

Men, now, became as the angels of God, in respect to access to heaven : and on this ladder they went up for pardon and grace, and descended to tell the good news to others, that they might go and do likewise : for he is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe. In Christ, it is not only provided that the believer shall enter heaven, after death, but he is to have communion with heaven while on this side the grave : for “our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.” *I John* i. 3.

That the angels *ascended* and descended, represents the divine plan of employing *human* agents, in the work of salvation. “Elijah was a man subject to like passions as we are ; (*anthroopos homoiopathees heemin*).” *James* v. 17. Paul and Barnabas, at Lystra, when the people had mistaken them for gods, and “the priests of Jupiter would have done sacrifice,” rent their clothes, ran in among the people, and cried out, “We also are men of like passions with you ; (*kai heemeis homoiopatheis esmen humin anthropoi*).” *Acts* xiv. 15.

In the Old Testament, the word used for angel is *malach*, from the root *laach*, not occurring as a verb in the Hebrew, but in Ethiopic and Arabic signifies *to send*, and in the passive of the former language, *to serve, minister unto*. As a noun, in Hebrew, *malach* is *one sent*, or

*employed, by another; a messenger; a legate; an agent.* So, Parkhurst, and Buxtorf. "And David sent messengers (*malachim*) unto the men of Jabesh-Gilead," etc. *II Sam.* ii. 5. These messengers of course were human. "And the Lord sent an angel (*malach*), which cut off all the mighty men of valor," etc. *II Chron.* xxxii. 21. Here the *malach* was supernatural. So, in the N. Testament, the word for angel is *aggelos*, the first *g* pronounced as *n*, and the second pronounced hard like *g* in *give*: and the word signifies *a messenger*, whether natural or supernatural. "And sent messengers before his face," etc. *Luke* ix. 52. These were disciples, *human* messengers, or angels (*aggelous*), sent on in advance of the Saviour and his following. "And there appeared an angel (*aggelos*) unto him from heaven, strengthening him." *Luke* xxii. 43. Certainly a supernatural being; to encourage the Sufferer for our sins, in his, to us, incomprehensible agony.

Furthermore, the O. Testament *malach* and the N. Testament *aggelos* meet in John, the son of Zacharias, according to *Matth.* xi. 10; *Mark* i. 2; *Luke* vii. 27; a grand human angel, messenger, agent, appearing as the morning star to Messiah's day. Among Christ's earliest acts, also, was the selection of human agents, the apostles (the sent ones, the *malachim*, the *aggeloi*); whom, at the close of his redeeming sufferings and triumph, he sent with a message to every human being; "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." *Matt.* xxviii. 20. Keep nothing back: deliver the whole message, that the communication from earth to heaven is open; I am the Way; let every human foot approach and tread upon this ladder; him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out. Tell them the whole message.

"As St. Austin says of *aggelos* in Greek (by which the LXX. generally render this noun) so we may truly

say of *malach* in Heb. ‘Nomen non Naturæ sed Officii;’ It is a name not of Nature but of Office.” *Parkhurst*. Therefore whether the agent, the messenger, be natural or supernatural, he is alike called an angel; because that word does not designate nature, but office.

A preacher, a minister of the gospel, is an angel, *ex officio*, being the bearer of a message: not a ruler, but an angel. A ruler, to be sure, and a priest, in common with all Christians; as Christ “hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father.” *Rev.* i. 6. Every convert is to be an angel forthwith, for it is not only the joy of his heart, but it is his duty to tell the glad story of his own salvation to those to whom he has access; “go home to thy friends, and tell (*anaggeilon*) them how great things the Lord hath done for thee.” *Mark* v. 19. Christ’s army does not consist entirely of officers as some seem to think: private soldiers are to do their part in the war.

---

## WHAT HAVE I TO DO WITH THEE?

JOHN ii. 4.—Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.

**I**N our day, this language sounds disagreeably; when we know it to have been addressed to a mother. But what would have been the effect, had the terms of our time been used? We can only form a proper idea of the phraseology, by considering it in the light of its own literature. With regard to the word Woman, where we would expect Mother, critics agree that it was

respectful; as much so as madam in English, and is thus frequently used in the best Greek writers—"in voc. (which is its case here) often a *mistress, lady, dame.*" *Lid. and Scott.* With us, it is not respectful to address an assembly by the word *men*: but in Greek, "the vocative plural *andres* was so used, and was equivalent to *sirs* or *gentlemen* in English." *Parkhurst.* Indeed, in the New Testament Greek it appears to be used pleonastically, as indicating politeness, respect, and is, in some places, unnecessarily if not improperly translated. We give a few specimens. At Acts vii. 2, Stephen addressing the Sanhedrin, says, "Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken," etc. The Protomartyr was not speaking to three, but two classes of persons; brethren and fathers: then who were the men? Brethren and fathers would have conveyed to our ears the full meaning of Luke, who intended to signify that Stephen addressed the Council respectfully. Perhaps clearer instances, if possible, might have been the earlier passages, Acts i. 16. "Men *and* brethren," (*andres adelphoi*), where the *and* is interpolated, as if the men and brethren were two parties; whereas Peter was speaking only to one class, the disciples; consisting of the apostles, the women, Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren; in all about one hundred and twenty. The one word "brethren" would have rendered to us the full meaning of Peter's *andres adelphoi*. We have the *and* also inserted in Acts ii. 29, 37. The latter, verse 37, is perhaps the clearest of the passages adduced: for in it we have the incident, of those Jews who had been convinced under Peter's sermon, of whom Luke writes, "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men *and* brethren, what shall we do?" Here it is certainly evident, that no disrespect was intended by the word *men*; that the *and* is improper; and to us the word

*men* is redundant. The Greek *andres*, in such use, has rather the force of an adjective, in some such sense as *worthy, excellent, good, dear*, etc. When alone and in the vocative, it is rendered, and very properly *Sirs*, in Acts vii. 26, "Sirs, ye are brethren," etc. Acts xiv. 15, "Sirs, why do ye these things?" Acts xix. 25, "Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth," etc. Acts xxvii. 10, "Sirs, I perceive that this voyage will be with hurt," etc.: and verse 21, "Sirs, ye should have hearkened unto me," etc.: and verse 25, "Wherefore, Sirs, be of good cheer," etc. In none of these cases is *andres*, though signifying *men*, improperly rendered *Sirs*. In our day under circumstances precisely similar, we would mean no more by *gentlemen*, than our translators meant by *sirs*, and Luke meant by *andres*.

Hoping this seeming digression will prove to be helpful to our exposition, we now return to a more direct consideration of the word, Woman. "O woman (*gunai*) great is thy faith." *Matth.* xv. 28. "Woman, (*gunai*) behold thy son." *John* xix. 26. "And they (the angels) say unto her, Woman, (*gunai*) why weep-est thou?" *John* xx. 13. "For what knowest thou, O wife, (*gunai*) whether thou shalt save thy husband?" *I Cor.* vii. 16. The examples might be multiplied; but it would be useless, the term Woman, in the New Testament, is respectful.

As to the phrase, "What have I to do with thee?" (*ti emoi kai soi*) it is an elliptical form, and, while not disrespectful, may imply rebuke. To supply the ellipsis, we read What thing is there to me and thee in common? The sense is, Thou shouldst not interfere with me; in my peculiar work. A similar phraseology is found at *Matth.* viii. 29, "What have we to do with thee? (*ti heemin kai soi*) art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" It is clear that the complaint

would be better rendered by What hast thou to do with us? He had come too soon, they said, and they denied his right to interfere. In Mark v. 7, who mentions but one possessed person, the expression is precisely the same, as here, in John ii. 4, "What have I to do with thee, (*ti emoi kai soi*) Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not." The remonstrance is against our Lord's interference. It is not a refusal, on the part of the speaker, to take any interest in, or to do anything for, the person addressed; but a denial of the propriety of the interference of the addressed party, with the affairs of the speaker.

Turning to *Judges* xi. 12, we have, "And Jephthah sent messengers unto the king of the children of Ammon, saying, What hast thou to do with me (*mach li valach*, which the LXX. render in the exact words of our phrase *ti emoi kai soi*, and our translators quite differently from their rendering at *John* ii. 4), that thou hast come against me to fight in my land?" The propriety of the rendering is marked. The king of Ammon had invaded Jephthah's territory, and the latter complained of it, and the complaint is in the very form of our passage, both in the Hebrew and Greek. At *II Sam.* xvi. 10, when Abishai one of the sons of Zeruiah, had asked permission of David, to slay Shimei who cursed the king in his retreat from Absalom, David said, "What have I to do with you, (*mach li velachem*, rendered by the LXX. *ti emoi kai humin*,) ye sons of Zeruiah? So let him curse, because the Lord hath said unto him, Curse David." Why do you interfere? You have no part in this matter, which you do not understand: you are jealous for my honor, but your zeal is blind: be silent. Again, *I Kings* xvii. 18, when Elijah had conferred the great blessing upon the widow at Zarephath; it came to pass, that her son fell

sick, and the sickness was so sore that there was no breath left in him: "and she said unto Elijah, What have I to do with thee (*mach li valach*, which the LXX. *ti emoi kai soi*) O thou man of God? Art thou come unto me to call my sin to remembrance, and to slay my son?" The same indications: she complained that Elijah's arrival at her house, that had appeared to be such a blessing to her and her son, had turned out to be an evil.

Once more: II Kings iii. 13, when the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom went down to consult Elisha; the latter "said unto the king of Israel, What have I to do with thee? (*mach li valach*; the LXX., *ti emoi kai soi*) get thee to the prophets of thy father, and to the prophets of thy mother." With them you have to do, and not with me: you cast me off; you preferred the false prophets; so, now, in your extremity, you should appeal to them; not to me. This is the sense of the phrase, and it is remarkable, that while this sense consists with every one of our citations, in only one of them is it so rendered by our translators; the use of the phrase by Jephthah toward the king of Ammon; *Judges xi. 12*.

It must be allowed, we think, that the proper signification of *ti emoi kai soi*, is What hast thou to do with me? and, in declarative form, It is not proper for thee to interfere in this matter. Our Lord, previous to his baptism, and formal entrance upon his great public Messianic work, fulfilled his first, personal, domestic representation of humanity, in subjugation to his parents: for he took upon him our humanity in every stage. In the touching language of Addison, of him, in common with us, it may be said that he "lay in the silent womb," "hung upon the tender breast," ran "in the slippery paths of youth:" and was in subjection to his parents, during his minority. But, now having been



man for us, through all these stages, and grown up without sin, with no blemish, perfect; his time for exhibiting himself, suffering, dying, rising, had arrived; subjection to his parents had ceased; no one must now say to him go, come, or do; "his own arm was to bring salvation." His mother was reminded of this. And the occurrence might seem to have been recorded, in an effort to save the Church from the Mariolatry that many have fallen into, by false views of Mary's maternal influence. The mother was necessary to the incarnation of Him, who was to be "the seed or posterity of the woman:" but has no part in the Christ Office: the mother had influence in training his minority up to manhood; but, then, ceased: the *ti emoi kai soi* was uttered, and the blessed Mary became a follower; not a leader. There is not the least record, of her ever again attempting to interfere with, or influence the will or the power of the Christ: her failure in this instance, seems to have entirely satisfied the "hand-maid of the Lord," that her mother office had ceased; that henceforth she was to be a disciple; and never again is she in any prominence: on the day of the crucifixion, she, in obedience to the Saviour's command is taken by John, as an inmate of his family; soon thereafter to disappear from the sacred history.

The words "mine hour is not yet come," refer to his own judgment in the case. You should not wish to influence me, in my official functions; I am sufficiently aware of the condition of the family; and shall assist them when I see it best so to do.

## THE INTERVIEW WITH NICODEMUS.

JOHN iii. 1-21.

THIS interesting incident, with its apparent independent position in the divine biography, is really connected by a proper particle, with the concluding verses of the preceding chapter. So, at ch. ii. 23 we read, "Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself (*ouk episteuen heauton*, did not trust himself) unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man." And now coming to the third chapter, it should read "But there was a man (*een de anthropos*) of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus," etc. The reader will see that the connective particle *de* is entirely omitted from our translation as though it were redundant: which it cannot be; for it is clearly needed, in its general adversative force, to express the Evangelist's meaning. Men, generally, even when professing to believe in his name, he did not confide himself to. He, of all who have worn the human form, knew men best; loved them most; but, as a rule, he did not trust himself to them. But there was one man who had seen, and been influenced by, his miracles, to whom he did trust himself, a Pharisee, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews; who having come to him by night, that the Teacher might have the more leisure to explain himself, Jesus received him kindly, conversed with him frankly, explained the Messianic office patiently, trusted to his judgment and candor in declaring against the Pharisaic idea of the Messiah, and exhibiting him in his character of sufferer for human salvation.

Restoring this particle *de*, and thus connecting with ch. ii. 23-25, we see why our Lord permitted to Nicodemus this deep, wide vision of his scheme: of himself: while to the masses who were attracted by him, he dealt in parables, prudently keeping himself uncommitted to them. He was frank with Nicodemus, because he could trust him: he knew him, and knew that he would not by any rashness or hostility, embarrass his work.

Notice, further, that this man being a Pharisee and a Ruler, was versed in the traditions of the Elders, and looking for a Messiah according to them, did not see in Jesus the evidence of his Messiahship. Therefore when he says "Rabbi, we know that thou art a TEACHER come from God: for no man can do these miracles (ch. ii. 23) that thou dost, except God be with him;" it was an elliptical manner of introducing the Messiahship, a subject familiar to both parties, and needing no such preliminary detail, as would be required by a subject unfamiliar to either of them. The full sense of the opening address would be "Rabbi, in those miracles thou hast been doing, we see the marks of a TEACHER sent from God; but we do not see the marks given in the traditions that thou art the MESSIAH, our expected KING." To this Jesus answered, "Except a man be born again, he CANNOT see the kingdom of God;" as if he had said, "The difficulty is in yourself; not in me: I exhibit the Scriptural marks of my being the Messiah; but you, influenced by your blinding traditions, have lost the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures, and need, in common with your countrymen a change equivalent to a new birth. Your prophet Ezekiel foretold you of this necessity of spirituality, in the days of the Messiah; 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I

give you, and a new spirit will I put within you : and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes,' etc. So, in spirit, spake all the prophets, pointing out the change in Israel, as to spirituality, in Messiah's day : Israel was to be saved from sin, in common with the Gentiles, who were to come to his rising : this great change, this new birth has not occurred : the king has come ; you *cannot* see him." So, that our Lord does not receive him, with an abrupt annunciation of a doctrine utterly foreign from the object of his visit ; for the very point he had in view, was to inquire of him, how one who had none other than the credentials of a *teacher* come from God, should be accepted as the Messiah, of which fact he, Jesus, had no Pharisaic evidence to produce.

Nicodemus, bewildered, because of his improper training, exclaims, " How can a man be born when he is old ? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born ? " He has, apparently, no power of concentrating his mind upon the actual meaning of the Scriptures, in their teaching of the coming deliverer ; and Jesus aids him by a reference to the passage of Ezekiel ; " Except a man be born of water and the Spirit (the very substance of the prophecy) he cannot enter into the kingdom of God ; " he is not fit for, nor can he enjoy such a state of affairs, as the prophet foretold. " That which is born of the flesh is flesh ; (there would be no such change as Ezekiel and the other prophets described, could your idea be realized ; ) and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit : (in no other way can this change occur, except by the power of the Spirit : had our Lord meant that " the water " would be a regenerating force, he would have added, And that which is born of water, is water. But his mentioning

the water was because of its occurrence in the prophets, as a figure of the cleansing from sin in Messiah's day.) "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye (not *thou* only; but the nation, all) must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth (willeth) and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." As they were then sitting within doors, they heard the sound of the passing wind; but Nicodemus could not have known the precise point from which it had come, nor its precise opposite; nor had he anything to do with the putting of it in motion: but he heard the sound thereof, and had no doubt of the fact of its being then moving. So the divine Spirit comes unbidden into the nation, the family, the soul, and his regenerating acts are known in their effects.

"How can these things be?" is the last recorded question of the mystified Nicodemus. Not mystified by the statements of Jesus; but, by the errors and mysteries of his traditional culture; and now with an oppressive sense of his mistake, struggling toward the truth, which was faintly glimmering as yet, like a torch in the hand of his kind and patient guide. "Art thou a master (*didaskalos*, teacher) of Israel, and knowest not these things?" Is it becoming that a ruler and teacher in Israel, should be ignorant of the precepts by which he was to rule, and of the lessons he was to teach? You have been led out from the true meaning of the Scripture, by your traditions and cabala; while my disciples testify of what they know and have seen. "If I have told you earthly things (quoting your prophets, using as they do earthly figures, with which you should be supposed to be familiar, to explain heavenly, spiritual, things that are beyond your vision) and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things? And (when it is a fact) no man (*oudeis*) hath ascended

up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, the Son of man which is in heaven." No one in human form, now on earth, except myself, the Son of man, has ever been in heaven, so as to be familiar with heavenly things, and able to understand me, should I speak directly of those things without using earthly things as figures.

And now, with further reference to your erroneous views of the Messiah, and his reign, "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness (as a healer, to save the people who had been bitten by the poisonous serpents; so that if a serpent (*nachash*) had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived), even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." The Messiah was to bruise the head of the serpent (*nachash*, *Gen.* iii. 15), who had bitten not the descendants of Abraham only, but the human race: and as the serpent of brass was in the likeness of the poisonous serpent, so the Messiah was to be lifted up, "in the likeness of sinful flesh," that the dying sinner might look to him, and live. "For God so loved the world (not Abraham's family only, but the descendants of Adam, those born of Eve; for the first, wide, all-embracing promise was to the race, in the garden, where the race had been bitten by the serpent (*nachash*); and it was to be fulfilled in Abraham's family, for the benefit of the world, the race; not that the Abrahamic family was to be the Messiah, but was to produce him) that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; (what kind of fulfilment of his promise would this be? This would be bruising the posterity of Eve; not, the serpent's head. The treading down the nations, for the elevation of Abraham's family, was a singular idea of

the predicted intention, to bless, through that family, 'all the nations of the earth;') but that the world through him might be saved." The Messiah was to be a blesser, a benefactor, not a destroyer; a sympathizing Saviour, bearing our sins; not despising men, but despised and rejected of them: not beating them down to place his foot upon their necks, but bearing their griefs to be wounded for their transgressions, to bear the stripes they merited, to die that they might live. *Isai.* liii. He came a light into the world; but men loved darkness and not light: the light distressed them; not that the Messiah would have it so; just the reverse; but because they were sinful, and loved to sin; they delighted in the bite of the serpent; and their only condemnation was, not on Messiah's part but on their own; to stay away from him, was their condemnation, but to come to him, was their life.

---

## EXCEPT THE FATHER DRAW HIM.

JOHN vi. 44.—No man can come into me, except the father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.

IN this and similar passages, we understand our Lord as making allusion to the preceding dispensation; and especially to the "oracles of God," that had been committed to the Jewish people. To them is he speaking, when he employs such words; and the substratum of his thoughts and expressions, was his knowledge,

that they looked upon his teaching as subversive of that of Moses; as being a novelty; never before heard of by their learned men; hurtful to them; opposed to the divine counsel; blasphemous; worthy not only of rejection, but requiring the death of such a heretical teacher.

The compassionate Saviour spared no pains in his efforts to correct this error. He endeavored to show, that so far from his teaching being in opposition to that of Moses, the divine agent in the preceding dispensation, it was the fulfilment of it: that not he, but they had abandoned the teaching of Moses: "had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" *John* v. 46, 47. My words are in exact accord with his writings; and as you do not understand him, how can you understand me, teaching as I do what he taught: for I bring no new thing to you; nothing originating with me; I am merely trying to lead you back to Moses, and through him to God, whose instructions you have forgotten; and therefore my doctrine seems new to you. You "have committed two evils; you have forsaken God the fountain of living waters, and hewed out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." *Jerem.* ii. 13. You have turned away from the writings of Moses, through whom the Father gave you the word, the living water; and provided yourselves with the traditions, inventions of men, that can contain no instruction. This is your error. You, not I, have forsaken God; and sought another source of instruction: although "It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God:" yet you have turned away from the Father's words, to the words of the elders, tradition. The Father speaks to you through his words, delivered by Moses and the prophets; those holy men who spake as they were moved by



the Holy Ghost; nothing else is reliable; "to the law and to the testimony: if any speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isai.* viii. 20. "Every man therefore that hath heard, and learned of the Father, (hath attended to the meaning of the divine word, narrating the election of Abraham, the organization of his family as the *souche* of 'the bruiser of the serpent's head,' the bearer of human iniquities; and hath learned, understood these teachings of the Father,) cometh unto me." Of course, because I am he, of whom "Moses and the prophets" wrote: and every Jew that has reaped the intended benefit of that system, comes to me and accepts me as the promised, predicted Messiah. It is in this manner that the Father gives, transmits to me the result of the Mosaic institute in its action upon candid, spiritual Jews. Those who have learned from it, to look for one like unto Moses, the leader of a dispensation; a Messiah typified by the High Priest, bearing the names of the people, offering atonement for their sins; and typified in the victims and blood shedding, without which there was no remission: these he gives me: he would have given all; but they would not heed, would not learn: but as many as heard and learned were thus secured to me; and I will acknowledge and elevate them, in the last day of Israel, when their fatal mistake shall bring them down into the depth of ruin.

Our Lord discloses his meaning in the use of the words *give* and *draw*. It is not that the Father gives, draws, and then the given, the drawn hear and learn. But those who hear and learn are thus given, drawn. Every such Jew came. How could those come, who did not see in him, the marks of the Messiah as laid down in the traditions, for which they had abandoned the word of God?

Surely, the subject is sufficiently intelligible, without resorting to the hypothesis, that the Father selected

certain Jews, and gave these to his Son to be saved: making their salvation to turn, not upon their own choice, upon their acceptance of Jesus; but, upon his own choice: God's choice of the sinner: selecting him from others in circumstances precisely similar. Where was the objection to all being treated alike? Was not the merit of Christ's blood sufficient to atone for all? Was there not grace sufficient for all? Was the defect in the love of God? the love of him who "so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth, should not perish, but have everlasting life." It is not "whosoever is elected, given, drawn by the Father;" but, "whosoever believeth;" and if it be that no one but a sovereignly elected Jew could believe; why was it not, "whosoever the Father hath elected," etc.? Was it to mock the miserable Jew, by apparently offering him a choice, when such an act was impossible? This cannot, then, be the key to this phraseology; that the Father gave, drew by sovereign choice. No: it was as the proper result of the teachings of the Father through Moses and the prophets.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not." Matth. xxiii. 37. Luke xiii. 34. Here, now, is the clear and distinct statement, that the Jews effectually resisted the will of him to whom "all power in heaven and earth" belonged; power to elect, power to pass by, power to save, power to destroy; and yet he could not save those people he was grieving over: he had chosen them; they were "his own;" but "his own received him not;" he "would;" but they "would not;" and the human "would not" triumphed over the divine "would," and their house was left unto them desolate. If we have varied from the letter or sense of the sacred record, we have not yet perceived it.

Therefore, we present our exposition, that by the phraseology of the passage under consideration, and of those similar to it, our Lord refers to the result of the divine preceding dispensation, as accounting for the fact that the masses of Jews rejected, while some received, him: those who received him were those who had realized the teaching and power of the Mosaic types: they had heard and learned of the Father; and, therefore, came to Jesus as the predicted Christ.

It is interesting to notice here, a remarkable passage of *Acts* ii. 14-21. The apostles having been instructed to await "the promise of the Father," the coming of the Holy Ghost; when that promise came, and they were "all filled with the Holy Ghost," Peter, standing up with the eleven, declared, "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh," etc. The "last days," *i. e.* the time of Christ. "I will pour out of my Spirit," the wonder that had just occurred. Here then "the promise of the Father," was a promise he had made through Joel, in the preceding dispensation (see also what is said at ver. 33): which is confirmatory of our hypothesis, in no small degree. The utterances and symbols of the preceding dispensation, were the utterances made, and symbols held forth, by the Father to draw men to Jesus; and no Jew who had realized their force failed to come to him and receive the eternal life that he brought.

## NO MAN TAKETH IT FROM ME.

JOHN x. 18.—No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.

HERE is a distinct statement that our Saviour's death was voluntary. Not in the sense, that he did not resist his murderers; and, like Cicero, when overtaken by his assassins, who refusing to allow his faithful slaves to defend him, ordered the litter to be set down, and stretching forth his head, submitted it to the sword of the ungrateful Popilius. That was voluntary. But the words of the friend of sinners mean more than that: they include that; for "he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter:" but he says plainly, "no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." He died in a manner, in which no one of the human race, except himself, could die. Men commit suicide; slay themselves, as the word suicide means. But Jesus did not commit suicide; he slew not himself; he died; he lay down his life; at the moment he so willed it, death occurred; he ceased to live, as that phrase applies to man; he died. After voluntarily suffering all that he designed to suffer, for the redemption of humanity; after he had accepted in his own person, the anguish due on the part of humanity, man, the race, to the last particle, he by his own volition, died, lay down his life.

We cannot measure such power. The *modus* of its exercise lies beyond the stretch of our comprehension. Though when we call to mind, that he had "power to take it again;" we seem to think ourselves to understand, that if he could do this, he could do that. But it is mere seeming. We can do nothing more than refuse or accept the statement: he, of himself, without

being murdered, or committing suicide, lay down his life: he, of himself, unaided, unresurrected, took back his life: having power to die, and power to live, to be exercised at his pleasure.

True, it is recorded, that "they crucified him." Peter said to the Jews, "him—ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain," etc. *Acts* ii. 23. Stephen did not hesitate to charge his countrymen with having murdered the Messiah, as their fathers had murdered those who prophesied his coming: "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of that Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers." *Acts* vii. 52. And the charge was just: to all moral intents they betrayed and murdered that "Just One," "killed the Prince of life:" they were as guilty, as if they could have really carried out their malice aforethought, their murderous purpose: they were certainly guilty: they intended murder, went as far as they could go in executing their intentions, and, to all human appearance, as well as to their own satisfaction, they succeeded. They slew him, and hanged him on a tree: or, more accurately, "Whom they slew, having hanged him upon the cross; (*xulon*, an instrument of death made of wood) *hon ancilon kremasantes epi xulon*. *Acts* x. 39. They did their utmost. But, how could human force actually kill one who had life in himself? Not a derived life, such as ours; derived, and suspended upon the action of machinery that another can stop; sources of supply which another can cut off. No hand can control the existence of one, whose life depends upon the action of no machinery; upon no source of supply other than his own will. "In him was life" (*zootee*) *John* i. 4. "For as the Father hath life (*zootee*) in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life (*zootee*) in himself," etc. *Ib.* v. 26.

"I am the resurrection and the life" (*zoote*), etc. *John* xi. 25. "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (*zoote*), etc. *Ib.* xiv. 6. Such a life as that, underived, independent, could not be crushed out by any human force. "No one (*oudeis*) taketh it from me:" they endeavored to do so; seized him; dragged him before Pilate, and when he seeing that he was the very personification of innocence, truth, patience, unselfishness, and every moral excellence, would have released him; a tumult was excited; clamors of "If thou let this man (*touton*) go, thou art not Cæsar's friend," etc., *Ib.* xix. 12, arose from those who would have as gladly murdered Cæsar, as they wished to murder their unresisting victim; the judge, the Roman magistrate, seeing the prisoner apparently helpless, without one advocate to plead his cause, without one soldier to fight in his defense; looking at the tumultuous Jews, and the silent, patient, seemingly defenseless prisoner; "then delivered he him unto them to be crucified. And they took Jesus and led him away." *Ib.* xix. 16. They crucified him "and two other with him;" and those "two other" died at their hands; their lives were taken, and they intended taking the life of Jesus, they thought they had done so, but were mistaken; "no one taketh it from me; but, I lay it down of myself."

The life that he lay down he took again: he had "power to take it again;" a power of which we can have no conception worthy of being mentioned; self-existence being far beyond the ken of those, who know nothing of even derived existence, except the fact, and some of its sequences. Himself says "and the third day he shall be raised again:" *Matth.* xvii. 23. The "exceeding sorry" disciples knew not by whom, and the very last of their thoughts was, that it was to be by himself, by his own power. No human mind but found it difficult to believe, that even God could raise the dead; and

as to one dwelling with them in human form, being supposed to be able to accomplish such a deed, it could not enter into the wildest dream of fancy.

Luke ix. 22, tells us that he made known to his disciples, that "the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised the third day:" all this as if he were to be entirely as passive in the resurrection as in the rejection. Still, the revelation he has given us is the light by which we read all such passages: "the third day he was raised" by his own power, that awful depth and vast of force by which "he had life in himself." Hear Peter; "—whom God hath raised from the dead:" *Acts* iii. 15; "—whom God raised from the dead:" *Ib.* iv. 10; "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus," etc. *Ib.* v. 30. Hear Paul; "But God raised him from the dead:" *Ib.* xiii. 30; "But he whom God raised again, saw no corruption." *Ib.* xiii. 37; "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" *Ib.* xxvi. 8. This seeming discrepancy is dissolved into perfect consistency, by the revealed concert of action, the perfect harmony, between the Father and the Son; which also must be accepted as a revealed fact, whose *modus* is incomprehensible. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." *John* iii. 35; "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. \* \* \* That all should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." *Ib.* v. 19, 23. "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me:" *Ib.* xiv. 11; "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." *Ib.* xvii. 1; "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again." *Matth.* xxvii. 63; "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy

this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. \* \* \* But he spake of the temple of his body." *John* ii. 19, 21. All these testimonies find their harmonious centre here, in the passage we are discussing; "I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." *Ib.* x. 18. "I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me." *Isai.* lxiii. 5. The Redeemer assumed man's guilt and its penalty: died voluntarily in payment of the penalty, and to the full extent of what was due, absorbing its eternity in his own infinity; and then "rose for our righteousness:" in him the human race is righteous before the law. And if any one will now die he destroys himself by rejecting life.

Why then allow the Jews to proceed in their wicked intent, to a seeming murder, and bring upon themselves the awful guilt of blood? If the atonement was really made by the voluntary death of the Christ, why involve the Jews in the guilt of an unnecessary act? Perhaps, no one can fully answer those, or similar questions. To us, it appears that their guilt was not increased, by allowing them to proceed to extremity, upon the revealed principle, that the hater is a murderer; and the man of a lustful eye, an adulterer. Their guilt was not increased, but only manifested by the overt act. It was an awful spectacle of the condition of humanity, as to its need of a Mediator, a Saviour. For the Jews were an elect nation: no nation on earth so favored as it had been: possessing the oracles of God: all pains taken to keep them separate from other people: prophet after prophet sent to them: every advantage given: and now this judgment upon the Christ, was not the work of the ignorant, profane mass; but the deliberate deed of the representative men, the great sanhedrim; those making



the loudest profession of Judaism; the most learned in the traditions of the Elders. In a grand sense, these were not only the leaders of the Jews, but the very *elite* of mankind: the most enlightened of the human race.

Therefore, here, at the wondrous cross, "On which the Prince of glory died," we have the dreadful spectacle of the extreme depth of wickedness and folly to which humanity had descended. What superlative vice to hate, and murder that Just One! What amazing folly to reject such a Saviour! Men who swarmed like bees around any pretender, who proposed insurrection, fight, bloodshed, and the glitter of earthly glory; as from a leper, shrunk away from him who held the truth as essential to the overthrow of error, as the light to the putting an end to darkness. These the choice men of earth, and yet so vicious, and such fools! The gloomy spectacle demonstrated the need of a Saviour. The darkness was deeper than the thick darkness of Egypt: THOHU and BOHU had returned: and the VOICE had also returned "Let there be LIGHT!"

It is but a mere conceit, that considers the proceedings against our Lord, as entirely, exclusively Jewish. This is but repeating the error into which the family of Abraham wandered. There is nothing that separates Jew from Gentile but institutions. There is no distinction that is natural. Humanity enfolds the Jewish nature, as wholly as the Gentile nature. Man is the genus, and the distinction of species is not degrees of wickedness, or folly. In those respects man is a unit. The present generation of Jews did not murder Christ; nor any present nation of Christendom accept him. Men murdered him; men accepted him; and no one but man, either crucifies him afresh, or accepts him to this day. Salvation is not for Jew or Gentile, except as man.

## WHAT SHALL I SAY?

JOHN xii. 27.—Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father glorify thy name.

THE darkness was thickening. The gloom and anguish of his passion, like the clouds bringing the tempest, were overspreading the sky. Now, he stands not upon the deck of the laboring ship, to quell the storm, and quiet the sea; but all the raging billows are about to roll over and overwhelm him. He is not now at the tomb of Lazarus, to exhibit his divine majesty in its power over death; but, within a step of Gethsemane and Calvary, where himself is to "taste death for every man:" every man's sins upon him, and he to suffer what was due to every man. The depth and bitterness of the cup, we can neither see nor taste. "But we see Jesus who was made a little lower (*eelattoomenon*, lessened, decreased) than the angels for the suffering of death," in his human aspect, as the cup is being put to his lips; we hear his human groan of horror, that he must drink the fearful draught. The man, though he be Christ Jesus, and because he is Christ Jesus, THE DIVINE HUMAN, exclaims in his horrōr, "Now is my soul troubled, and how shall I express it? (*kai ti eipoo*)?" Not, What shall I say? except in the sense of despairing to be able to utter any words that could convey a full idea of his trouble, his *tarachee*: that our souls might be filled with "a joy unspeakable," I Pet. i. 8; his soul was flooded with unspeakable woe.

To understand our Lord as inquiring, whether he should say, Father, save me from this hour, cannot be the force of *ti eipoo*, here. There is a similarity of the passage with Matth. xxvi. 38; "My soul is exceeding

sorrowful (*perilupos*, surrounded with sorrow), even unto death :” and, his anguish being unutterable, indescribable, he adds, “Tarry ye here (you can neither understand nor help me) and watch with me. And he went a little farther, (so as to be alone,) and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me : nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.” So we read the mournful words we are examining. The *ti eipoo*, What shall I say! is an exclamation, relating to the mysterious trouble with which he was overwhelmed ; “out of the depths” of which he prayed, as out of the depths of the exceeding sorrow. Therefore we understand the words, “Father, save me from (*ek* out of) this hour :” as a prayer for deliverance from the deadly clutch of death’s dreadful hand, the horror of which none other has ever experienced. So he prayed in Gethsemane, “If it be possible, let this cup pass from me.” Here, he adds not mine, but thy will be done. There, in our passage, his soul gathers confidence, in the thought that the victory is assured to him ; his own arm is almighty, and will bring the salvation that he had invoked : for, “for this cause (*dia touto*, therefore) came I unto this hour.” Not meaning, as we think, that he came unto this hour, to be troubled, to experience the unutterable anguish, that wrung from him the piteous wail *ti eipoo* ! What shall I say ! But, “that he might be saved from (out of the grasp of) this hour :” for it was not the suffering, the agony, the death, that was to save man for whom he was suffering ; but his victory over death ; his ability to die and then to live again ; to lay down his life and to take it again. Had he as man, the race, the second Adam, groaned, died, and sunk into that hour of death, remained there, what would have been accomplished ? Death. Not life. But life was the great aim ; and to reach it, he must needs go through death, and beyond :

into this hour, he must go of necessity ; but with equal necessity must he come out of it (*ek tees hooras tautees*): so that he might be our life. Therefore he adds, "Father glorify thy name:" let the plan proceed, I go down into this dark hour: but beyond the darkness, I see the light; I shall come out of this hour.

---

## WHY THEY COULD NOT BELIEVE.

JOHN xii. 39.—Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias (Isaiah) said again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.

THEY could not believe because Isaiah said something, cannot be the meaning of the Evangelist. Such a cause of unbelief, is not known in Holy Scripture, fairly interpreted. To suppose so, is a hypothesis contradicted by plain revelation. We must find some other key to the Evangelist's meaning. But, are not the words simple and clear? Does not John say "Therefore (*dia touto*, through this, on this account) they could not believe, because that Isaiah said," etc.? Yes: there is no denying it: but words do not always have the meaning that lies upon the surface. Elijah said of Baal to his priests; "Cry aloud: for he is a god (*elohim hoo*); either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." *I Kings* xviii. 27. Certainly Elijah did not mean, to be understood as affirming Baal to be

Elohim ; or that a mere imaginary thing was acting as an intelligent, supernatural being. He was mocking : he meant the very opposite of the literal import of his words. Language is a grand instrument, and we cannot be sufficiently grateful for such a capacity. Yet it is not perfect ; it cannot contain all our thoughts. It is very figurative. Therefore the inattentive fail to understand it, in many instances.

Let us examine this Scripture. They could not believe, "because Isaiah said again:" what did he say again? There is no repetition. True, the Evangelist cannot signify that the inability to believe was caused by Elijah's repetition ; for there is no repetition reported. Then, the inability was caused by the fact, that on another occasion Isaiah said, "He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart," etc. But, the history of the day demonstrates that their eyes were not blinded. They saw the meek and patient Messiah ; watched him ~~him~~ vigilantly ; followed him about, eager to get some cause of accusation against him ; they saw well enough with their eyes : and as to the hardening of "their heart," could it be that *they* had but a *heart* ; one heart to a great multitude ; this, surely was not so : and if the prophet meant the heart of each Jew, this was not hardened, for they were alive, active, maliciously active ; while if each man's *heart* had been hardened death would have occurred instantly. Then, after all, it must be admitted, that the words of the Evangelist and of the prophet are figurative and must not be taken literally. And what do they mean figuratively ? That the prophet having predicted, that the Jews would reject Christ, they could not do otherwise than reject him ? Our Lord never urges such an inability : he puts the cause in their will : "Ye will not (*ou thelete*) come unto me ;" *John* v. 40 : "— how often would I (*eetheleesa*) \* \* \* and ye would not (*ouk eetheleesate*)." *Luke* xiii. 34.

It is not Scriptural teaching, that every prediction must necessarily be fulfilled. There is at least one example to the contrary. "Then they told David, saying, Behold, the Philistines fight against Keilah, and they rob the threshing-floors. Therefore David inquired of the Lord, saying, Shall I go and smite these Philistines? And the Lord said unto David, Go, and smite the Philistines, and save Keilah. And David's men said unto him, Behold, we be afraid here in Judah: how much more then if we come to Keilah against the armies of the Philistines? Then David inquired of the Lord yet again. And the Lord answered him and said, Arise, go down to Keilah; for I will deliver the Philistines into thy hand. So David and his men went to Keilah, and fought with the Philistines, and brought away their cattle, and smote them with a great slaughter. So David saved the inhabitants of Keilah."

"And it came to pass, when Abiathar the son of Ahimelech fled to David to Keilah, that he came down with an ephod in his hand. And it was told Saul that David was come to Keilah. And Saul said, God hath delivered him into mine hand; for he is shut in, by entering into a town that hath gates and bars. And Saul called all the people together to war, to go down to Keilah, to besiege David and his men. And David knew that Saul secretly practiced mischief against him; and he said to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod. Then said David, O Lord God of Israel, thy servant hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to Keilah, to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hands? Will Saul come down as thy servant hath heard? O Lord God of Israel, I beseech thee, tell thy servant. And the Lord said, He will come down. Then said David, Will the men of Keilah deliver me and my men into the hand of Saul? And the Lord said they will deliver thee up."

Now here is a case in which there are two distinct events clearly predicted. Saul will come down. The men of Keilah will deliver thee up. So, of course, according to our hypothesis, David can only remain there with his men, and all be captured, thus fulfilling the divine prediction. The prediction must be fulfilled: David and his men must necessarily remain, and be delivered into the hand of the ungrateful, jealous, bloody minded Saul. Their fate is settled. But the sacred record reads quite to the reverse. "Then David and his men, which were about six hundred, arose and departed out of Keilah, and went whithersoever they could go." The language is descriptive of a very hasty and energetic retreat: *vayithhallechu baasher yithhallachu*; the words sound like galloping; and no doubt David and his "six hundred," fled bravely; they "arose, departed out of Keilah, and went whithersoever they could." They had a correct method of understanding human responsibility, in connection with divine predictions; having not the most remote idea, that the divine foreknowledge controls, forces, or restrains human will and action. Is there any physical force in knowledge? In what sense is knowledge power? Did knowledge ever build a bridge, or a mill? When a man knows how to build a bridge, does his knowledge build it? Knowledge can direct physical force, and if it be obeyed, the bridge will be built: but knowledge has no physical force; nor, *per se*, any force. At all events, the predictions instead of nailing fast the feet of David and his men, put wings to them, and the sacred historian describes the flight as *instanter*; so soon as the predictions are heard, the sacred writer exclaims, *yithhallachu baasher yithhallachu*; they fled lustily to get the start of the jealous Saul, and the cowardly ingrates of Keilah: they succeeded; both predictions failed of fulfilment: "And it was told Saul that David had escaped from Keilah; and he forbore to go forth." *I Sam.* xxiii. 1-13.

One might venture the opinion, that at least part of the aim of this detailed incident, was to instruct us as to the relation of human responsibility, to the divine foreknowledge. The THEREFORE THEY COULD NOT BELIEVE of John, did not signify the impossibility of the Jews to believe, because of Isaiah's predictions: the traditions had made the word of God of none effect: it was not Isaiah, not any of, not all the servants of God, not God, that hindered them from believing: it was their own will: had they tried to get the eyes of their minds open, they would have had plenteous grace given for their success. And had the predictions failed, it would have been no more to the divine dishonor, than the failure of the TWO EXPRESS, UNQUALIFIED PREDICTIONS in the case of "the man after God's own heart." And we are utterly ignorant of any dishonor attributed to God, because of that incident. Certainly there is no record of any complaint on his part, that David defeated the predictions: the "matter of Uriah" being the only stigma on his bright escutcheon.

Taking down our *Benedictus Pictetus*, we turn to his sect. iv. Of the Nature Of the Decrees. p. 102. "That is also proved from the absolute perfection of God, which does not permit, that anything should be done (*fiat*) without his will; yea and by all his knowledge, through which he knew from eternity, not only what is possible, but also what will be; for he could not know certainly what would be, unless he had decreed what should be: (non enim futurum certo nosse posset, nisi decrevisset quid futurum sit.)" David was an inspired man, and from his early youth, had a deep knowledge of the divine character; but, to judge from his conduct at Keilah, he harbored no such theology as this; he could not have held, that the divine foreknowledge depended entirely on the divine decrees. When he implored the divine foreknowledge, he was losing his trouble



and breath, if he believed that the foreknowledge possessed nothing as certain, except as decreed: and when that foreknowledge communicated the decreed facts, that Saul would come down; and the Keilah cowards would deliver him into Saul's hand; where was the propriety, or the hope of his *yithhallachu baasher yithhallachu*: could he hope to escape the divine decree, by attempting an escape from Keilah? No one can think that of David. The foreknowledge was not founded upon the divine decree; nor had the foreknowledge, or the predictions any force to hold David within a city of gates and bars. He arose forthwith and escaped without molestation. It was not Isaiah that hindered the Jews from believing. God "all the day long was stretching out his arms, to a disobedient and gainsaying people." "I would but ye would not."

---

## WHY WAS PETER GRIEVED?

JOHN xxi. 17.—Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee.

IT might be thought, that Peter was grieved at our Lord's repetition of the question "lovest thou me." But there was no repetition. Instead of one question propounded three times; there were three distinct questions. There is a uniformity in Peter's replies; but not in the questions asked him. Dr. Clarke, *in loco*, affirms a uniformity of the latter; "It is remarkable, that in these three questions our Lord used the

verb *agapao*, which signifies *to love affectionately, ardently, supremely, perfectly.*" But while we admit his definition of *agapao*, he is evidently wrong in stating, that it was used in the three questions: he used it in the first, and second, but not in the third question; so that, in fact, this very lack of uniformity in the questions, is a chief element of the proper exposition of the passage.

The verbs *agapao* and *phileo* are used in this colloquy. Alford says, "The distinction (between the words) must not be lost sight of, nor must we superficially say with Grotius, 'John uses *agapan* and *philein*, here, promiscuously, as presently he uses *boskein* and *poimainein* (to feed). Nor must subtleties be here sought.' If so," continues Alford, "why do the Lord's two first questions contain *agapas* while Peter's answers have *phileo*—whereas the third time the question and answer both have *philein*? This does not look like accident.—The distinction seems to be that *agapan* is more used of that reverential love, grounded on high graces of character, which is borne towards God and man by the child of God;—whereas *philein* expresses more the personal love of human affection. Peter therefore uses a less exalted word, and one implying a consciousness of his own weakness, but a persuasion and deep feeling of personal love." \* \* \* "Then in the third question, the Lord adopts the word of Peter's answer, the closer to press the meaning of it home to him." *Alford, in loco.*

This seems to be pretty near our own view. Dr. Clarke's definition of *agapao* has already been given. Of *phileo* he says, "—which signifies *to love, to like, to regard, to feel friendship for* another. As if our Lord had said, 'Peter, dost thou love me ardently and supremely?' To which he answers, 'Lord, I feel an affection for thee—I do esteem thee—but dare, at present,

to say no more.'” *In loco*. Lidd. & Scott distinguish between *agapao*, *eraoo*, *phileo*, which all signify *to love*, but under different modifications: as with reference to being well pleased, contented with one; to love as one's wife; to love as a friend: clear distinction, but chiefly as to classic use. But Greek words have a New Testament meaning, which critics understand, and it is that meaning we are in search of.

Alford and Dr. Clarke give us their opinions, made up from careful observation, no doubt, and, in the main reliable. We add some results of our own observation. *Eraoo* is not in N. T. literature. *Phileo*, in various inflections, is used twenty-four times; in the noun form *philia*, friendship, once, *Jas.* iv. 4; in the adjective form used as a noun *philos*, invariably rendered *friend*, twenty-eight times. *Agapao*, in various inflections, occurs one hundred and seventeen times; in the noun form *agapee*, love, one hundred and nine times; as an adjective *agapeetos*, beloved, *i. e.* in the Christian sense, sixty-two times. To examine these words, as displayed in a full N. T. Greek Concordance, a glance is sufficient to show, that in the N. T. *agapao* is, as the learned Alford affirms, the higher word, as to its sense; *phileo*, the lower. The former, he says, and properly, “is more used of that reverential love, grounded on high grades of character, which is borne towards God and man by the child of God; whereas *philein* expresses more the personal love of human affection.”

In friend, friendship, friendly, philosophy, philanthropy, etc., we have an idea of the force of *phileo* in the N. T.; while in God is love, God so loved the world, thou shalt love the Lord thy God, that disciple whom Jesus loved, having loved his own which were in the world he loved them to the end, the greatest of these is charity (*agapee* love), and multitudinous other such expressions indicate the N. T. use of *agapao*: in

distinction, this latter, is eminently the Christian word. So, we are ready, now, to exhibit the colloquy.

1. JESUS: Lovest thou (*agapas*) me more than these?  
PETER: Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (*philoo*) thee.
2. JESUS: Lovest thou (*agapas*) me?  
PETER: Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love (*philoo*) thee.
3. JESUS: Lovest thou (*phileis*) me?  
PETER: (Grieved that, the third time, this time, he said unto him *phileis me*, instead of *agapas me*) Lord thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love (*philoo*) thee.

We annex the questions in their Greek form.

1. Agapas me pleion toutoon?  
*Ans.* Philoo se.
2. Agapas me?  
*Ans.* Philoo se.
3. Phileis me?  
*Ans.* Kurie, panta su oidas, su ginooskeis hoti philoo se.

Should one know nothing of the Greek, yet he can easily distinguish between these questions: can see that here is not a question asked three times; but three questions, each differing from the others, no two alike. He can see, also, that there is nothing in the form, and may assume that there can be nothing in the sound of *agapas* to suggest to Peter the answering *philoo*: why not answer *agapoo*? Alford's "This does not look like accident," is corroborated by examination. There certainly must have been some design on the part of Peter, in the use of his *philoo*. The natural answer was, Yea (*nai*) Lord; and this he uttered; and if he wished to appeal to his Lord's knowledge, the natural

expression was, Thou knowest that *agapoo se*. There was nothing in the sound of our Lord's *agapas*, certainly, to suggest *phileo*; and upon the hypothesis that the two words were exactly synonymous, as the Master had selected the former, it was not very becoming in the disciple to prefer the latter word, and adhere to it until he had compelled the Master to adopt it. Besides, upon that theory, how could Peter have been grieved, that, the third question contained his own preferred expression? The words are not exact synonyms; there is a distinction in their sense.

In his *Synonyms Of The New Testament*, Trench discusses these two words with great ability. The first discussion, indeed, we had seen, after our own attention had been called to the subject, some twenty years before: by an examination of John xxi. 15, as to the signification of "these," in the phrase "more than these:" in which we had arrived at a conclusion, somewhat differing from that of the learned and able writer of the *Synonyms*.

Dr. T. distinguishes between *agapao* and *phileo*, so as to make the former correspond with the Latin *diligo* and the latter with *amo*; and then adduces the authority of Cicero, for *amo* being the stronger of the two terms. "Thus writing to one friend of the affection in which he holds another (*Ep. Fam. xiii. 47*): *Ut scires illum a me non diligi solum, verum etiam amari*; and again (*Ad Brut. I.*): *L. Clodius valde me diligit, vel, ut emphatikooteeron dicam, valde me amat.*" We have not translated the citations yet, as we desired to exhibit the original text, that the two words might appear in their proper connections and relations: and we now translate as nearly in the Latin order as possible. First: That you may know him by me not *to be loved* (*diligi*) only, but even *to be loved* (*amari*). Second: L. Clodius greatly me *loves* (*diligit*), or, as more emphatically I

may speak, greatly me *loves* (*amat*). The rendering both Latin words by the one English word *love*, does not give us Cicero's meaning: indeed it makes the place a puzzle, to the mere English reader. That L. Clodius *loved* Cicero, or, to be more emphatic, *loved* him, is a singular expression. Did he mean that Brutus should understand the second *loves*, to have been written with more emphasis than the first? Or how? Where is the greater emphasis in *loves*, than in *loves*? This ought to lead to the suspicion, that possibly, the rendering of the two Greek words *agapao* and *phileo*, by the one English word *love*, might make a puzzle out of *John* xxi. 15-17. And such is the case.

But, it is very evident that Cicero uses *amo* as the stronger of the two: he can make Clodius to be understood to love him more, by using *amo*, than by using *diligo*. Dr. T. proceeds, "— we might conclude that 'amare,' which corresponds to *philein*, is stronger than 'diligere' which, as we shall see, corresponds to *agapan*: and this in a certain sense is most true; yet it is not a greater strength and intensity in the first word than in the second which accounts for these and for a multitude of similar employments of them. Ernesti has successfully seized the law of their several uses, when he says: *Diligere* magis ad iudicium, *amare* vero ad intimum animi sensum pertinet. [*Diligere* pertains rather to the judgment, but *amare* to the affections.] So that, in fact, Cicero in the passage first quoted is saying,— 'I do not *esteem* the man merely, but I *love* him; there is something of the passionate warmth of affection in the feeling with which I regard him.'"

We have nothing to object to in all this, except Dr. T.'s decision that *amare* corresponds to *philein*; and *diligere*, to *agapan*. To be sure, he promises that "we shall see" this; but we do not. All that he alleges in proof, that we see, is that the Vulgate, "In almost all

these passages of the New Testament (alluding to some citations involving *agapaoo* and *phileoo*), by the help of 'diligō' and 'amō,' has preserved and marked the distinction, which in each case we have been compelled to let go." The Vulgate is no more an inspired, than our own version. Nor does Dr. T. demonstrate why the Vulgate made *amare*, rather than *diligō* to correspond with *phileoo*. His phrase "in almost all these passages," is proof that in *all* these passages, uniformity is not preserved. *Alford* pronounces *phileoo* the lower term; and, as we have said, the two words exhibited in their connections in the N. T., make it clear that *agapaoo* is the higher term; while its noun form *agapee* is a *peculium* of the N. T., unknown to Greek writers. Dr. T. is authority for "— men are continually bidden *agapan ton Theon* (Matth. xxii. 37; Luke x. 27; I Cor. viii. 3), and good men declared to do so (Rom. vii. 28; I Pet. i. 8; I John iv. 21), the *philein ton Theon* is commanded to them never." *Alford's* view, from the Scriptural standpoint, is the better maintained.

By the hypothesis of *The Synonyms*, "— the risen Lord, addressing Peter says, first, *agapas me*; (the Dr. should have added the *pleion toutoon*, for that is the distinction of the first, from the second question.) At this moment, when all the pulses in the heart of the now penitent Apostle are beating with an earnest affection toward his Lord, this word on that Lord's lips sounds too cold; not sufficiently expressing the warmth of his personal affection toward Him. Besides the question itself, which grieves and hurts Peter (ver. 17), there is an additional pang in the form which the question takes, sounding as though it were intended to put him at a comparative distance from his Lord, and to keep him there; or at least as not permitting him to approach so near to Him as fain he would. He therefore in his answer substitutes for it a word of a more

*personal* love, *philoo se* (ver. 15). When Christ repeats the question in the same words as at first, (the reader will perceive that he does not *repeat the question*; and that he omits precisely one-half of the words, forming a very different question.) Peter in his reply again substitutes his *philoo* for the *agapas* of his Lord (ver. 16). And now at length he has conquered; for when the third time his Master puts the question (how could the learned Dr. misunderstand our Lord as putting *the* question a third time? Nothing could be plainer, than that he used three distinct questions; each, once.) to him, He does it with the word which Peter feels will alone express all that is in his heart, and instead of the twice-repeated *agapas*, his word is *phileis* now (ver. 17). The question grievous in itself to Peter, as seeming to imply a doubt in his love, is not any longer made more grievous still, by the peculiar shape which it assumes. All this subtle (subtile?) and delicate play of feeling disappears perforce, where the variation in the words used is incapable of being reproduced." Thus the author of *The Synonyms*, whom no student of the New Testament can think, speak, or write of with disrespect.

But he has erred here, undoubtedly. Nothing in the narration is clearer, than that it was this very third question, where the hypothesis makes him to "conquer," that was peculiarly distressful to him: the record being, "Peter was grieved that he said unto him the third time *phileis me*:" it was only the third time (*to triton*), not the first, not the second, that "he said unto him *phileis me*." If then *agapas* was too cold an expression, and the icy word was in the first, in the second question; those were the times for him to be grieved: but under the first, he displays no grief; nor, under the second; but when he had conquered, and his Lord uses the warm, grateful, fully expressive *phileis me*;



Peter breaks down with anguish. The hypothesis is inconsistent with the narration. It is curious, that at the foot of the page, here, 70, there is a note, which we transcribe. "Bengel generally has the honor *rem acu tetigisse*: here he has singularly missed it, and is wholly astray: *agapan*, amare, est necessitudinis et affectus; *philein*, diligere, iudicii." That is, Bengel holds that Cicero's strong *amare* corresponds to *agapan*; and the cooler, weaker *diligere*, with *philein*: but how that demonstrates Bengel to have erred we do not see. To us it is a more reasonable supposition, that as Dr. T.'s adjustment of correspondency between the Greek and Latin words, leads him to the most palpable contradiction of the Scripture narrative; the exactly opposite theory would lead to an exactly opposite result; and might prove *rem acu tetigisse*.

In II Peter, i. 5-7, there is a gradation of Christian virtues, rising from faith to love; from *pistis* to *agapee*; and in ascending the series, the two words we are discussing make their appearance: faith, energy, knowledge, continence, patience, godliness, brotherly KINDNESS (*philadelphia*; from *philos*, a friend, loving, and *adelphos*, a brother; and so the compound word signifies brotherly love, love to Christians as brethren), LOVE (*agapee*), the crowning grace; the greatest of the great three, "faith, hope, love (*agapee*), these three; but the greatest of these is love (*agapee*)." *I Cor.* xiii. 13. The apostle, to express this most illustrious grace, uses the N. T. word, *agapee*, and not the classic *philia*; the latter appearing but once (*James* iv. 4) in that sacred collection. Why is this? Is *philia* too warm a word, in which to express the highest Christian grace? Notice, also *Coloss.* iii. 12-14; "Put on, therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering, forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if

any man have a quarrel against any : even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things (put on) love (*teen agapeen*), which is the bond of perfectness (*sundesmos tees teleioteetos*), a construction of "the apposition in the genitive to the noun on which it depends (*Winer*, 531); instead of the two agreeing in case; and the sense here being 'which is the bond, the perfection.' " That is, the proper bond keeping the society in union, thus securing perfection. Or as Dr. Parkhurst renders it, "The bond of perfectness ;" *i. e.* says *Whitby*, "the most perfect bond of union among Christians, *Eph.* iv. 15, 16 ; (comp. ver. 3, and John xvii. 23,) the end and perfection of the commandment, I Tim. i. 5 ; that which fulfils the rest, Rom. xiii:8 ; (comp. ver. 9, 10,) and that which renders us perfect and unblameable in holiness before God, I Thess. iii. 12, 13."

Surely if *philia* were a warmer term than *agapee*, the latter would never have been coined and substituted for it, in such connections as these : and, certainly, it would not have occurred but once in the N. T. and then to signify only friendship of the world, *Jas.* iv. 4.

We hold with Bengel, Alford and others, that *agapao* is the higher term ; and that when they had dined (ver. 15) Jesus said to Simon Peter, Simon (omitting the Peter, the name that signified *steadfast*), son of Jonas (not *my disciple*, *friend*), lovest thou (*agapas*) me more than these (thy brethren, Matt. xxvi. 29) ? This was the first question ; asking *Simon*, as if he had lost his grand surname, if he had been steadfast, as he declared he would be, above all *these*. Peter, not daring to ascend to the high level of our Lord's query, with becoming modesty and shame, replies, Yea, Lord ; or Verily, Lord, thou knowest that I esteem thee (*philoo se*). As if he had said, I can by no means claim any such distinction, as that I remained steadfast in the general defection ; for when they "all forsook thee and fled," the *all*

included me, the shameful *denier*: yet, thou knowest that I have not lost my regard for thee; I esteem thee.

Then came the second question, quite distinct from the first, by the omission of the feature of comparison: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou (*agapas*) me?" Descending a degree, toward the low level where Peter had taken position, he inquires, If you do not any longer claim to have a love for me, superior to that of your brethren, do you really love me at all? Nothing about any grief yet; but much that looks like modesty; in the repeated (Peter, not our Lord repeats) reply, "Verily, Lord, thou knowest that I esteem thee (*philoo se*)." I dare not go higher: I am sure that I have a kind regard for thee: but I dare not use so strong an expression as *agapoo*: with my *philoo* I am safe: I stand in no danger here.

But now for the *third time*, the third question, which is very distinct from the second, and from the first. "Simon (still Simon, only) son of Jonas (no change here yet. But now stepping suddenly down, and, this time, to Peter's own low level, from which he supposed he could not be dislodged, to the consternation of Peter he says), dost thou esteem me (*phileis me*)?" Poor Peter! How unexpected! The question had commenced as usual, but what a sudden, unlooked for, alarming change of term. My Lord intimates that I do not even esteem him. I admit that I have not exhibited a love superior to that of my fellow disciples. I admit that I am not entitled to claim a love becoming a disciple; for I who proudly claimed superiority, merit to be held in the opposite category. But, O the grief of being put entirely beyond the pale of friendship for my Lord! This third question has broken my heart! Here dear Master, here; thou knowest all things; and well I know that; but look, I throw open my breaking heart; search it; O my Lord, "thou knowest that I esteem thee." He did know it. He does

not now rebuke him, as in Matt. xxvi. 34, with the prediction that his claim of *philoo se* would prove to be hollow, unreliable : but proceeds to utter a prediction, that he would not only prove his claim to an esteem for his Lord, but even to his surname Peter, by nobly dying in his cause.

Peter's disgraceful conduct, at the arrest of his Master, and at the hall of judgment, after his having professed a love and fidelity, that would outlast the attachment of the other apostles, must have sunk him very low in their esteem, as well as in his own ; and yet in that small company, chosen for the important office of witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, in crowning proof, of his being the Christ ; mutual confidence and proper esteem, were of very great moment. This remarkable incident, must have had controlling influence in that very direction. Peter having been probed thrice, and in degrees of deep, deeper, deepest ; sustains the probing ; and instead of disgrace at the conclusion ; is honored by the Master's testimony, that he would end his life by martyrdom in the cause of him, whom he had so shamefully denied. This testimony must have deeply impressed his brethren ; restoring him to their confidence. He was not superior to themselves, for they all forsook him and fled ; but then this boaster had been examined by an eye that could not be deceived, and pronounced cured of both his vain glory and cowardice. Peter by his *philoo se*, in the presence of them all, had humbled himself ; and the Lord had exalted him : not above his brethren, but to an equality with them. Having by his first *philoo* abandoned all claim to superior affection ; and by his second, to even an equality ; while clinging, in his third use of the term, with the energy of a last hope, to a claim of at least an inferior love ; the strong hand of his loving and beloved Lord lifts him gently but firmly to his proper place of equality with

the other witnesses of his resurrection. To us, at least, all this seems natural, reasonable, and every way consistent with the incident, and the other facts of the divine record ; leading us to think our exposition of the passage, to be correct.

---

---

## THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

THE four Evangelists testify that Jesus, the reputed son of Joseph, was the Christ, promised in Eden, and along through the ages ; expected to arise from the family of Abraham. Although that family, as time wore on, fell into the mistake, that the Christ was to be an Israelitic Christ ; they were right in looking for a great and happy change in Israel, to occur at the time of his appearing. They, to be sure, were expecting great national prosperity of an earthly character ; while the change that did occur was purely spiritual. Worldly maxims were denied ; the glitter of the pomp and power of the world, denied ; its selfish principles, condemned ; a holy personal and social vitality inculcated ; and the grand doctrines enunciated—life, growth, fruit, as the facts of humanity, including the Abrahamic family ; were to supersede form, tyranny, oppression and ruin. The Christ was to demonstrate that “ God had made man upright, but he had sought out many inventions,” to debase himself, and depress his allotted condition ; and that Himself, the Christ, instead of being a king of Israel, to lead them to glory and power over the prostrate nations ; was the Son of man, the Christ of man, the Way by which men were to return to the plan, protection and blessing of God.

It is clear, that the Christ came not to introduce a form, that would produce life; but a life that would supply itself with form. The life principle, in the number of its inscrutable mysteries holds the amazing power of organization of form; the concretion of the elements of form. The smooth, simple, minute seed enters the genial soil; and what a grand, symmetrical, showy form it organizes, if not interfered with by inimical force! The dew, the rain, the sunshine, the air of heaven come into its earthy basis; and it rises, expands, stretches out its boughs, waves its leaves in graceful recognition of the favors of heaven, while gratefully holding earth in its loving embrace. To heaven and earth it owes its existence and supplies; and acknowledges its obligations to both.

There is one God; the God of nature is the God of grace: and in grace, as in nature, his way is simple and efficient: life; then, life organizing its appropriate form, for fruit bearing, usefulness. Therefore, when the four Evangelists had testified that Jesus was the Christ, the Life; the Historian tells the wonderful story of the organizing of the Life, into its appropriate form for fruit bearing, usefulness, blessing. And the student sees not in The Acts, the Christians, making the same mistake of the Jews, expecting a worldly arrangement of power and pomp, by which themselves were to rule and oppress the nations; for they had been told, "It shall not be so among you." *Mark* x. 43; *Luke* xxii. 26. Therefore, the Apostles, trained and qualified to be "witnesses unto him both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of of the earth;" did bear witness that the very Jesus, whom they had followed several years, believing him to be the Christ spoken of by Moses and the prophets; and whom they knew too intimately to mistake any one else for; had vindicated their faith by actually rising

from the dead, and talking, eating with, and instructing them : and they declared further, that every one who would accept of Jesus as the Christ, relying upon his sacrifice of himself for the remission of sin, should have special aid from the Holy Ghost, to begin and continue an eternal life. The word had a happy effect ; Christ the Life entered with the word into the appropriate receptacle, human hearts ; and the Holy Ghost caused it to germinate and spring up into the form and beauty of life. So they began : preaching Jesus, as the Christ ; faith ; life ; association, loving association.

And a good, clear, instructive specimen of this work, for some thirty years, is given us in The Acts ; the only inspired Church History : a precious standard of divine authority, to which all Church controversies can be safely referred : not safely in behalf of error ; but with perfect safety in behalf of truth. Dr. Lardner quotes one of the fathers as saying " — the times from Christ to Constantine have a three-fold division : the first is from the nativity of Christ to his ascension ; the next is after his ascension, of which The Acts of the Apostles treats ; the third is from that period and the death of the Apostles, to the reign of Constantine ; the affairs of which have been related by several ecclesiastical historians, as Eusebius Pamphili, and Theodoret, whom we are not obliged to receive ; for, beside The Acts of the Apostles, no such writings are appointed to be received by us." *Leontius*. From this book alone, says Chrysostom, is to be known how the Christian religion was planted in the world. Jerome, calls it " nudam historiam," a naked (bare) history of the infancy of the Church, in the estimate of some ; but it was that and more to his thinking. Augustin declares it " — the only history of the apostles which has been received by the Church : all others having been rejected as not to be relied upon."

It is not to be supposed, that The Acts contains a complete record of Church facts, during those first thirty years after the ascension. No doubt there were very many occurrences omitted, as unnecessary, redundant, to the purpose of exhibiting the energy of Christ, as the Life of humanity, organizing a body for itself; a human, not an Abrahamic, body; called the Ecclesia, the Called Out, the Called Out by the Gospel, the dead who should hear "the voice of the Son of God, and come forth" to life; the associators as believers of the gospel; the Church. The unrecorded, were not contrary to the recorded facts; as in the case of a selection of facts to make up a theory; but they were similar, and so redundant, and left out because enough of the like facts had been selected, to make a clear, truthful, unassailable statement of the shooting forth of "the corn of wheat, that fell into the ground and died," (*John* xii. 24,) as the essential preliminary to its reappearance in its new and "own body;" the Church, of which Jesus is the only Head. This was why he died: his own lips tell us the secret, too profound for the learned in "the traditions of the Elders:" "except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it ABIDETH ALONE;" it does not expand, produce its like; does not show the amazing force of vitality within it, by growth and reproduction. He was ALONE in the great work of atonement, redemption, suffering; "I have trodden the wine press ALONE; and of the people there was none with me;" *Isai.* lxiii. 3: but he did not wish to be alone in the joy of victory: he wished his joy to be in others; *John* xv. 2. He purposed to surprise and delight the universe, with the wondrous apostrophe, "Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me, are for signs and wonders:" to fulfil the joyful prediction, "In the midst of the Church (*ecclesias*, of the called out) will I sing praise (*hymneeso*) unto thee." *Heb.* ii. 12, 13.



The gospels, the biographies of Jesus, do not contain all his words and acts. Not that any omitted work or word was contradictory to those recorded; but was of the same nature and character; and therefore would have been redundant, superfluous, unnecessary to exhibit the proof that Jesus was the Christ; so abundantly demonstrated by such of the whole mass of similar facts, selected by the Evangelists, in connection with his birth, life, death and resurrection. John so testifies, chap. xx. 30, 31; "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that JESUS is the CHRIST, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." The Evangelists recorded of the facts, enough to demonstrate the Christ in Jesus: and the one inspired Historian of the Church recorded sufficient of the facts, to show Christ Jesus as in the Church, the Ecclesia, its vitality, its power of association, its only organizing force; and all that "the seed" might not "abide alone," but, having "died," and "risen," bring forth "much fruit."

The Acts should be more thoroughly studied. A careful examination of its inspired narrative, would be more profitable than controversies between the sections of Christendom, concerning order and liturgy. To drink into the spirit of the first disciples, to be imbued with their simplicity of proceeding, to catch an inspiration from their loving assemblings, activity, zeal, self-sacrifice, etc.; would soon bring us to see eye to eye, and to labor hand to hand. There is nothing in that charming spectacle to excite unholy ambition; no sceptre to clutch with the covetous hand; no mitre for the proudly exalted head. Our Lord having taught them, that the way to be great in his blessed system, was not by exercising lordship, but ministry; the Apostles,

during the entire Acts, invent no office or honor, except a ministry of tables for the benefit of some neglected widows. *Acts* vi. 3. No primacy, for no primate is visible anywhere in the history. No Head acknowledged but Christ; no one claims the headship. Peter does not; he is found fault with; defends himself before the assembly; is despatched upon a mission in company with John to Samaria, etc.; but no where figures as a man in chief authority; especially, not as an infallible theologian, outside his specific branch, "the witness of the resurrection of Jesus." There he was indeed infallible.

A thorough acquaintance with this renowned book, would save us from the claims put forth in behalf of office and ceremonies in the church, defended upon the ground of antiquity. An office, a rite, might be very old; might plead centuries in its behalf; and be indignant at anything compared with it, and having the appearance of a novelty in the Church: yet the seemingly old might be really the innovation; and the seemingly new might point out its title, in the facts of the real antiquity of the Church, as recorded in The Acts. Every item of order dating this side of The Acts, is an innovation: like the moss on the tree, it may look soft and pretty; but, it is a parasite, a robber of the vital juices of the tree, tending to corruption and death. The mosses are beautiful; they spread themselves over the bark as offering a friendly protection; but under their velvety semblance, they thrust their roots into the vital juices of the tree, to maintain themselves at the tree's expense; and the prudent husbandman purgeth the tree from them, as a nuisance, that its fruitfulness be not hindered.

The study of this History, is a great promoter of a proper demand for Christian equality and liberty. The great doctrines of the Lord Jesus, as well as his great

promises all come out to the discerning eye of the careful student. His rejection of human lordship; his proposing the fact of Christians having but one Master, himself, the Christ; and the other fact that we ALL are BRETHREN; is quite sufficient, if well understood, to guard us against encroachments upon our Christian liberty. The doctrine of the coming of the Holy Ghost, the calling of the "other sheep" not of the Abrahamic fold, the Gentiles; the one fold, One Shepherd; the one Rabbi, the rest brethren; disciples all: distinguishes the History: the only history of those times given to the Church; because no other was inspired, no other could be relied upon. "Christ in us, the hope of glory," is the doctrine; Christ in every one that believeth; no clergy, no laity; but believers; every one that believeth; Christ only in believers, but in every believer; not to make a lord of him, nor yet a serf; not mere government material; but an heir, an heir of God, a joint heir with Christ; filled with the hope of eternal glory. Not in the whole book is a page, or paragraph given to description of rites, ceremonies, altars, candles, millinery: no processions: no gorgeous ceremonies of installation: no gorgeous anything; but all simple, plain, brotherly, spiritual, Christ-like. Believing, rejoicing, loving, self-sacrificing, suffering and still rejoicing, persecuted and still trying to save their persecutors, stoned to death, but praying that the sin be not laid to the charge of their murderers: it is a wonderful history where Apostles, presbyters, deacons, believers, are all brethren; preaching, spreading the grand truths that Jesus, the loving, gentle Jesus, who had not where to lay his head, is the Christ, the great offering for sin, and that every one believing in him, shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, be a recognized child of God, an heir of heaven. The children of God, are not the serfs of men. Having delivered us from bondage to Satan, it was not to give us into bondage, to popes, clergy, etc.

In organizing Israel, God took special care, to form a republic of which he was the head. The whole system was a grand type of that which was to be: a republic with God for its head. But the Israelites became weary of this, and desired a king. After the evils of the having a king had been explained to them, and they persisted in their demand, the kings came, in succession, reigning over them, distressing them, until the walls of the beautiful city were broken up, and king and kinged were led as slaves to Babylon. So with Christendom. It was organized into a brotherhood, with one Master, Christ: and thus continued through the model thirty years of its first development of the "Christ in you" principle. But, while the Apostles invented nothing but ministers of tables, ministers of charity; those who came in the after years, to judge from the uninspired and uninspiring histories, and present facts, invented the idea of an earthly head of the Church, as a necessity, so as to have two heads, one in heaven, one on earth, and the sequel in this case is similar to the sequel in that case. God is wiser than man, and the result of rebellion against his plan, always exhibits that truth. No Church arrangement should violate the simple, perfect plan, of "One is your Master, Christ; all ye are brethren."

We have been traversing a painful field of observation; but though our feet are torn and bleeding, we hope to aid in spreading the truth, which is the real secret of promoting true liberty. It is not a mistaken form of Church government that is very hurtful, but its real power for mischief is in the ignorance of the masses, who submit to the usurpation of a few of their brethren, in such manner as to invite continued and increased aggression. When the people of the Church or state become well informed, the fetters are soon broken. Darkness dreads nothing so much as light. The two

cannot exist except as twilight; and twilight will not long remain; it must deepen into darkness or brighten into light. The Acts should be studied, and the development of the Christ life be understood. Let no one claim antiquity, precedence, for any Church peculiarity unless he can prove its conformity to "the pattern shown us in the mount." If that cannot be done, nothing can save it from rejection, but a demonstration that it conforms to the spirit of the pattern; that it is the product of the life principle that exhibits itself in the formula, "one is your Master, Christ; all ye are brethren." In that case it has a mark of an omitted fact; "similarity to the facts recorded:" and if it be really similar, it will be safe to believe that it will have a similar result.

---

## MATTHIAS.

ACTS i. 15-26.

THAT Matthias was properly constituted an apostle, is a question, on which we number ourselves in the negative. The transaction was at the instance of Peter; he alone, of the apostles and brethren, suggested the course: his proposition not being founded upon any command of the Lord Jesus; who, to the apostles, had "shewed himself alive after his passion (after he had suffered) \* \* \* being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts i. 3. It seems incredible, that our Lord should have designed the disciples, or apostles, to fill the vacant place of Judas, and yet have said nothing of

it, during those forty days' intercourse. Of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, Christianity, filling that vacancy by men, was an item so insignificant, as to need not a word of instruction; or, else, it was not to occur.

It was commanded, that they should remain at Jerusalem, and "wait for the promise of the Father," the baptism of the Holy Ghost: they were to "receive power after that the Holy Ghost came upon them: and should be witnesses unto Him \* \* \*." Ch. i. 4-8. Instead of "waiting," Peter, founding his opinion upon passages in the Psalms, proposed choosing a successor to Judas. The Psalms cited, while referring to the fall of Judas, and another taking his office, give not even the least intimation, that the apostles, or any other men, should fill the vacancy: and, further, the Holy Ghost alone could have enabled Peter to so interpret that Scripture, as to decide that men were to choose a successor to a vacancy in the apostolate, and the Holy Ghost had not yet come in his miraculous power.

There is something indicating the absence of the divine Spirit, in the very manner of the election. They should have commenced with prayer, one might reasonably suppose; if they thought it necessary to take a very important step; but they began with Peter's argument on the Psalms, and then having chosen two men, as being qualified for the place, and unable to decide between them; then, at their wit's end, they pray for the divine guidance. Did they know, that no other than those two men, could have the divine approbation? Did they know that the divine choice ought to be limited to one of those two? And, when "the lot fell upon Matthias," did they know from that, that the Lord had directed the lot; when, too, he had commanded them to "wait for the promise"? The whole air of the incident, leads us to think that Peter led the brethren into

error. Up to that time they had "waited," according to the commandment; "all continued in prayer and supplication;" and everything was proceeding properly; until "Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples"—suspended the "waiting," and proposed active proceedings. How happened he to be better informed than the rest? There were ten others, his fellow apostles, present, who should have known this necessity, had it really existed. There is no reminding them of any neglected duty, any omission of obedience to a command of their Lord: but everything intimates, that but for those passages in the Psalms, Peter would not have moved in the case. They should have continued waiting in prayer and supplication, until the coming of the Holy Ghost: in which case there would have been no man made apostle; a species of which Paul, at least, had no very high opinion. Such seems to be the force of the opening of his epistle to the Galatians: "Paul, an apostle," (not from *apo*, men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ, etc.) *Gal.* i. 1. What can he refer to, if not the case of Matthias, whose authority was from men (the disciples) by man (the mistaken officiousness of Peter); while his own apostolate was by Jesus Christ, who had not delegated his authority to the apostles, nor the disciples, to choose his "witnesses."

It is certain, that after Pentecost, there are no more elections of apostles: leaving Matthias the only man made apostle, of the thirty years history of the Church: a very significant fact. Some fifteen years later, when James the brother of John was slain by Herod, to please the Jews, there was no election of any one to fill the vacancy. Peter was still living, but appears to have been satisfied with his role of apostle-maker. After the angel had brought him out of the prison, and he had reached the house of "Mary the mother of John Mark," and he had beckoned to them with his hand

to hold their peace, instead of another proposition to fill the place of James, as he had done in the case of Judas, "he declared unto them, how the Lord had brought him out of the prison; and he said, Go shew these things unto James, and to the brethren. And he departed, and went into another place." *Acts* xii. 1-17. Had the vacancy in the apostolate ceased to be of any importance; or was the report of "these things to James and the brethren," to have them attend to the filling of the vacancy; or had they learned under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, that this was not a human prerogative?

But there is a fourth hypothesis. Perhaps as Peter's life was in danger, compelling him to flee, so that he could not be present at the ordination of a successor to James, therefore they did not then go into the election. To this we answer, supposing Matthias to have been an apostle, they could have had eleven present; the same number as that in the election under discussion: and as there was no ordination in the other case, there was none needed in this. But was there no ordination? Does not Peter say, "— must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection?" The Greek words are *dei\*\*\* martura tees anastaseoos autou sun heemin genesthai hena*, which we translate in their own order; "must\*\*\* a witness of the resurrection of him with us be one." To render the verb in question, *ginomai*, ORDAIN, in the modern sense of ordination, would be absurd: perverting the sense of this, and every other passage of the N. T. in which that verb occurs. So, *John* i. 3, "All things were ordained (*egeneto*) by him; and without him was not anything ordained (*egeneto*) that was ordained (*gegonen*)." And, ver. 6, "There was ordained (*egeneto*) a man sent from God whose name was John." Also, *Heb.* ix. 15, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that death being ordained (*thanatou*



*genomenou*), for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament," etc. The reader will easily decide whether any one of these passages would be improved by changing the sense of *ginomai* into "to ordain," as used in Church controversies. A plan that would bring DEATH into *orders* had better not be adopted, even by High Church expositors. Peter, greatly as he erred, said nothing about "one being ordained a witness with us," for nor himself nor any other of the eleven had been ordained, in the Church sense of that word: he said merely "must one be, become, a witness with us:" he was profoundly ignorant of the mysteries of modern ordination: modern, because not found in The Acts, the inspired thirty years history of the outset of Christianity. Any one reminded of Mark iii. 14, "And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him," etc.; by examining will find the word rendered ordained, to be, *epoieese*, and properly rendered "ordained," in the sense of "appointed, or constituted." But, enough on this point: as we propose to notice it in a distinct exposition.

Some four years after "the lot fell upon Matthias," our Lord appeared to Paul, to enable him to be a witness of the resurrection, and appointed him to be an apostle. He knew when to choose, and whom to choose, without the aid of Peter with his lot. We have already given Paul's own testimony that he was an apostle "not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ:" but of Matthias the testimony is that, "he was numbered, calculated, cyphered, (*sugkatepsephisthee*) with the eleven apostles:" not that he was an apostle, was one of the twelve, but he was numbered with the eleven: and after all we see "Peter standing up with the eleven," on the day of Pentecost; though "the twelve" was the technical phrase: so John writes "Thomas one of the twelve," etc., in reference to an

incident that occurred, the evening of the resurrection day; and to which Paul appears to allude in *I Cor.* xv. 5, "— he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve." There is an immense difference between the man made and the Christ made apostle.

Paul constituted an apostle eleven years before the death of James, can with no propriety be supposed the latter's successor. Had it been our Lord's intention to hold Paul in readiness to succeed James, he would have held him in abeyance for that end: but Paul immediately enters upon the duties of the office; and, supposing Matthias to have been an apostle, then, for eleven years, the number was thirteen: in which case it is difficult to see the necessity of the precise number twelve; which necessity is held as the warrant for the election of Matthias. And, further, if the apostles were empowered to fill vacancies; they had done so, and why should our Lord have chosen Paul? The vacancy had been filled: nor was Paul one of those "men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us." Peter's practical good sense enabled him to see, that "a witness of his resurrection" must be able to identify the Lord Jesus, after the resurrection, when he "shewed himself alive," during the "forty days," between the resurrection and ascension: but he appears to have carried matters to extremes, in requiring the witness to "have companied with us all the time" from the baptism of John, until the ascension. It did not require that length of time. Our Lord demonstrates that, by choosing a man who had not companied with them one moment before the ascension; and who was only known as their hater and persecutor, until Jesus "appeared to him in the way," made him an eye witness of his resurrection, and sent him into Damascus to learn what he had for him to do. No one doubts the apostleship of Paul. He was

the equal of any in that office. But, having been put into office eleven years before the death of James ; conceding the apostolate of Matthias, we have thirteen apostles, demonstrating that the supposed necessity of the precise number, twelve, the only cause of the election of Matthias, was an error ; and so the election itself was an error ; being not only beyond the powers of the apostles, but unnecessary. The rational, Scriptural solution is, that the election of Matthias, was unauthorized ; and his having been cyphered into the apostolate was null and void : the number twelve having been completed by the choice of Paul, four years later, " by Jesus Christ : " of which choice we will have a word to say after a while.

The vacancy at the death of James, as we have stated, was not filled. The " promise " had been fulfilled, fifteen years then, and Peter was better informed as to the import of his " power to be a witness." *Acts* i. 8. To create apostles is not one of the qualifications of " a witness." The good James had given his testimony for fifteen years, and, with the honors of martyrdom, had gone to his reward : to this day, his place has not been filled, except after " the order of Matthias," the man-made apostle. Peter's fifteen years experience under the light of the Holy Ghost, had not confirmed him in his skill of Scripture quoting, and his fancied capacity for apostle making, by lot, or otherwise : for he had altogether renounced such pretensions : he never repeated that deed. Nor did any one or more of the apostles, propose or take part in such a transaction. After the death of James, the history runs on fifteen years without a trace of any apostle making : it seems to have died and made no sign ; as if anxious to hide away out of sight : the canon of Scripture was not closed for more than fifty years subsequent to this vacancy ; and when it did close, it was without the least

allusion to its having been filled; or, indeed, to any more apostle making, either human or divine. Something is said of deacon and elder making; and of their qualifications: but of apostle making, nothing. Certainly, this is very significant. What, then, does it signify?

At Mark iii. 14, we learn that he constituted (*epoieese*) TWELVE, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, etc. Luke says, vi. 13, he called unto him his disciples: and of them he chose TWELVE, whom also he named (*oonomase*) apostles; etc. Matth. x. 1, etc., narrates the calling unto him of his TWELVE disciples, to whom he gave power against unclean spirits, etc., and designates them as the TWELVE apostles. Not a word about any ceremony of ordination, or of any ordination at all, as we moderns ordain. For some reason, and doubtless an excellent one, our Lord was no favorer of ceremonies. Nor was the primitive Church. But we have the TWELVE: the specific, limited number: as we see, *Rev. xxi. 14*, "And the wall of the city (the new Jerusalem, *ver. 2*), had TWELVE foundations, and in them the names of the TWELVE apostles of the Lamb:" a limited number, as we see; the twelve apostles; not twelve of the apostles; twelve being the entire number of the foundations of the city, the Church, according to the plan of the Great Builder, Jesus, the Christ: and there is no succession of foundations to his Church, as the gates of hell will not prevail against it. Well, then, as to the twelve, what was their office?

It seems to have escaped the general perception, that, during the earthly sojourn of the Master, the twelve were pupils, ministers, in training for the grand purpose of testifying to the fact of his resurrection, which would attest, beyond all doubt, that "Jesus of Nazareth" was what he claimed to be, the Christ: they were to declare,

after his resurrection, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we (*apostles*) all are witnesses." For this the twelve were in training, and this was to be their peculiar office. As to miracles and other spiritual gifts, they had them in common with other Christians. Mark's and Luke's gospels rank in authority with those of Matthew and John. Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people: *Acts* vi. 5, 8. Paul disavows, in plain terms, dominion over the faith of Christians. Eight years after the Pentecostal scene, and six after the conversion of Paul, we hear Peter, in consequence of a miraculous vision, declaring to Cornelius and his kinsmen and near friends "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me (by the miraculous vision) that I should not call any man common or unclean." *Acts* x. 28. This is very extraordinary language from the mouth of one, whom some have held to be the rock on which Christ built his Church: representing himself as "a man that is a Jew," and bound fast by the Mosaic ritual and pharisaic traditions; requiring a miraculous vision to teach him, that Jew and Gentile could only be defiled by sin; could only be cleansed by the blood of Jesus, "who tasted death for every man." *Heb.* ii. 9. And long after this, seventeen years, we find Peter "withstood to the face, because he was to be blamed," upon this very point; being charged and censured by Paul, for "compelling the Gentiles to live as do the Jews;" *i. e.* to conform to the traditions of the elders: *Gal.* ii. 11-16. This censure was administered, let it be mentioned, seven years after the convention of the apostles and brethren at Jerusalem, upon the subject of circumcision, even to that late day misunderstood by all the apostles except Paul. *Acts* xv.

The apostles, then, appear on the record as no high authority on faith and practice, save on this one point,

for which eleven of them had been trained, and the twelfth miraculously qualified, by the Master; the testifying to the fact that Jesus rose from the dead, and therefore was the promised Christ, so that there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved: *Acts* iv. 12. In this, their real and only peculiar office, they never faltered; they were thoroughly qualified, infallible.

It must not be overlooked, that the one single truth, that Jesus is the Christ, is the sole distinction of the New Testament. It is this that connects it with the Old Testament, as being its fulfilment: both Testaments having but one theology: and the ritual of the old being typical of the Christ to come, at his coming there was nothing left for ritual but to vanish from Christianity; leaving it a sublime simplicity, truth. Ritual came into Christianity as part of the Mosaic types; and when the typified came, the types were useless, they had answered their purpose, they were laid aside. Why should lambs be slaughtered as types of the true victim, when the blood of the true victim had been poured out for the sin of the world? *John* i. 29. Ritual is type; type has been superseded by memorial; Baptism to remind us of the first Adam, and The Supper to remind us of the second Adam, Jesus, the Christ: this is all: ritual with its day and necessity are only in the past.

Thus the twelve were not needed as theologians, where theology was old and settled; gospel preachers select their texts, even now, from the O. T. as readily and suitably as from the N. T. Christ in both; Jesus as the Christ in the latter; nor as governors in a system where "it shall not be so among you," who are all brethren, equals, under the one Master, Christ: but they were needed to be witnesses of the resurrection, upon which fact rested the final proof of the Christship of Jesus. Here then is the Scriptural view of the

apostolate. And for this they were in training by the Master. They were, during that training, as is the case with students of law, or of medicine, intended for the apostolate, but no more apostles, than students of law or medicine are lawyers or doctors. The student must be specially empowered to practice, before he can enter upon his profession: no matter how extensive his acquirements, how complete his qualification in other respects; he must wait for the special power and authority, required. Thus we read, *Acts* i. 8, "But ye (apostles in preparation) shall receive POWER, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth (*tees gees*)."  
This is clear. They had not at the time of this utterance, power to act as apostles; but were to wait for it; wait for their diploma, which would be their warrant for their performance of the great trust to be confided to them. The coming of "the promise of the Father," the Holy Ghost, was to bring their power, commission, authority: and, therefore, up to that time, they had not been inducted into office; but were undergraduates; persons named for office, but not yet commissioned; not yet with power to act. And "not many days thence" the power came, on "the day of Pentecost;" and they immediately entered upon their official duty; proclaiming to the vast multitude, that had collected around them, "this Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we (apostles now) all are witnesses." And let it be observed that this Pentecostal sermon, is a fair specimen of the apostolic preaching; the chief point being to establish the claim of Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ; the final, crowning proof being his resurrection, of which "we (apostles) all are witnesses," duly appointed and commissioned.

Another specimen, among many, is in the substance of Paul's discourse at Thessalonica, *Acts* xvii. 2, 3; "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them (a synagogue of the Jews), and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." Examining this statement with any care, we perceive that "the scriptures" here mentioned are the Old Testament writings of Moses, The Prophets, and The Hagiography, comprising the books of the Old Testament: from these Paul "reasoned with them," concerning Christ; not yet concerning Jesus; but Christ; the Christ predicted in those writings; and whom the Jews and their fathers, had so long been expecting: those scriptures contained much about the Christ; the Christ was their burden, their contents, their chief subject: they predicted, not the Christ of vain pomp and bloody victories in behalf of Israel; such as Paul, in common with his nation, had looked for by the false glare of the traditions of the elders; but a Christ suffering, dying, for the sins of MEN, and rising from the dead, for the justification of humanity: and when he had laid down these broad and deep foundations in "the scriptures;" then he proceeded to the grand point with him, as an apostle, to affirm, "that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." Such is the analysis of his sermon: and such analysis would suit all the sermons of the TWELVE. Jesus did not exhibit the characteristics of the Christ of the traditions of the elders; therefore Paul with the Jewish leaders persecuted him, madly. But Jesus fulfilled the Scriptural characteristics of the Christ; and Paul, having discovered his own error, reasoned with the Jews "out of the scriptures," to demonstrate that JESUS was the Scriptural CHRIST. "And some of them believed;" renouncing the traditions which had made



the word of God of none effect; and returning to the "law and to the testimony:" while others "believed not," clinging to the traditions, and rejecting the Scriptural Christ, Jesus.

The preaching of the present day, has very different characteristics. Rarely is there man, woman, or child, in our congregations, who doubts that Jesus is the Christ; and therefore there is no need of an apostle to testify to us; we have accepted the fact; we have accepted the divine Scriptures of the New Testament writers; the need for apostles is unfelt; we never think of it; it ceased centuries ago, with what we call "the apostolic age." So, the great effort of the modern preacher, is to tell to the present generation of sinners, the way of salvation through the crucified, buried, risen, ascended, reigning Jesus, the Christ of God, the Saviour of sinners; to whose resurrection from the dead, the TWELVE bore witness. For many ages, there has been no need of apostles, and none have been; for God uses not needless, useless instruments. Our Lord chose and empowered the twelve, for an important, essential work; which they accomplished; went to their account; and there being no further need of such officers, no more such commissions have been issued, by the only authority in the universe competent to confer them.  
*Gal. i. 1.*

So, Judas was not an apostle, except as a cadet; one in training; nominated, but never commissioned. He forfeited his commission by treachery and suicide; and did not "company" with the others, to whom the Lord Jesus appeared "alive, after his passion;" nor when the Holy Ghost came upon them, to qualify them officially for the apostolate. As, then, he never was an apostle, except as a nominee, the vacancy occasioned by his defection and death, was not a vacancy in the apostolate. There was no apostolate. A nominee had disappeared; but his fellow nominees had no authority to fill the

vacancy. The forty days continuance of the Lord with them, gave ample time for his own indisputable nomination, or for instructing them to do it, were such his pleasure. But, by the record, he did neither. Had he nominated, even Peter, rash as he was, would not have set it aside in silence : had he instructed them to nominate, Peter would not have alleged as the only motive for their act, a passage in the Psalms, which, as the Holy Ghost had not yet come upon him, he misinterpreted. Up to the day of Pentecost, there were no apostles : only nominees, awaiting power to enter into office.

When the time came for the TWELFTH apostle, the man was there, qualified, commissioned, empowered. Men would not have even dreamed of him to fill such position. They fled from him in terror. So far from his having "compained with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us ;" which was Peter's requisition ; the murderers of the gifted, eloquent, noble Stephen, had him an approving spectator of their inhuman deed. And when "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," he was pursuing them to Damascus ; that merciful, loving Lord, who knew this seemingly fiendish, but really erring, conscientious adversary, appeared to him in the way ; blinded his bodily eye with his intolerable glory ; but opened the eye of his mind to see the mild radiance of the Christ, beaming forgivingly and lovingly from the face of Jesus ; and sent him for the healing of his blindness into Damascus. There even the good Ananias shrank back, when ordered to Paul's relief. "Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints at Jerusalem : and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way : for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name (Jesus, as being the Christ, the testimony of Paul ever after) before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children

of Israel." *Acts* ix. Here was the TWELFTH apostle ; nominated "by Jesus Christ," *Ib.* ix. 15 ; commissioned by the Holy Ghost, *Ib.* ix. 17, 18 ; and accomplishing his duty in a manner, that makes the pages of the sacred history to glow with its lustre, through the continuance of its wondrous thirty years. The Lord was a far better apostle maker than cadet Peter ; a much better judge of what kind of a man was needed for the twelfth apostle ; the brightest star of that constellation ; the one whose grand intellect could grasp the fulfilment of the predicted coming in of the Gentiles, in accordance with the splendid promise to the three Patriarchs, that in "their seed ALL the nations of the earth should be blessed."

This occurred from nine to eleven years before the death of James, and by that time, the necessity for the employment of twelve witnesses had probably ceased. The original intention of having twelve had been consummated by the induction of Paul ; before whose accession, there had never been twelve apostles ; and, now, we have no record of any successor to James, or to any other apostle : the doctrine of "apostolic succession," having not one example in the Scripture : neither example nor precept : being nothing more than an invention of men, to the no little misleading of sincere Christians. Judas, to be sure, has had many successors in defection, in desertion and sale of the loving, patient Lord ; but could have none in the apostolate which he never occupied, and in which he could leave no vacancy. Paul's was an accession ; not a succession : there never was any succession to the apostolate.

We have much more to say on this subject ; yet, we would have ceased long since, but for the hope of contributing somewhat, to a clearer apprehension of the sublime functions of the good and great TWELVE, to whose momentous testimony the human race is so incalculably indebted. Not lords were they ; but faithful, indispensable WITNESSES.

## THE CHURCH: THE BISHOP.

ACTS ii. 47.—“ And the Lord added to the church.”

THE divine agency was at work daily, and the result, addition of saved ones to the church, is ascribed to the proprietor of the agency: *qui facit per alium, facit per se*: especially in this case, where the agent is powerless, except through the presence and energy of the principal. “ Without me ye can do nothing ;” *John* xv. 5. “ As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine (i. e. the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, under any conditions: of itself, it has no power to live, even: but if it abide in the vine, from the vine it will receive power to live and to bear fruit); no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing: *ou dunasthe poiein ouden.*” By reference to *Matth.* iii. 8, 10, it will be seen that *poiein karpon* is a mode of expression for “ bearing fruit,” “ producing fruit:” “ Bring forth therefore fruits (*poiee-sate karpous*) meet for repentance;” “ every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit; *dendron mee poion karpon kalon.*” The branch, then, disparted from the vine can produce nothing; no grapes; no leaves; no buds; nothing: in a little while it will wither; then, a little while, it is dead. Therefore, what fruit the branch produces, is properly attributed to the vine. So the Lord added the saved to the church. Not “ such as should be saved;” but the saved; *soozomenous*. To be sure a branch may abide or not, as our Lord intimates above, *ver.* 5, “ he that abideth in me,” after he had ordered, *ver.* 4, “ abide in me;” and certainly allows

himself the same liberty of will, as he adds, *ver.* 5, "and I in him." The true convert is saved; but that he shall remain saved, depends upon the harmony of his will with the will of Christ, the vine. He is now a branch in the vine; and, saved. If he shall separate himself from the vine, or the vine exclude him from position, he ceases to be saved, and unless he recover his position will be lost. It is a wondrous mercy, that the loving Christ, the deserted, is more than ready for reconciliation.

The apostles affirmed Jesus to have risen from the dead, of which fact they were eye-witnesses, and therefore he was the Christ, and every one believing in him, should have remission of sins. Those that believed were the saved: not the elect: not a word about the elect. When Peter had borne his testimony, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. \* \* \*. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ:" then — "when they had heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost. \* \* \* Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added (unto them) about three thousand souls."

Up to this time, the only enumeration we have is the eleven apostles and one hundred and twenty other disciples, including the women, Mary the mother of Jesus (whose name here appears for the last time in the sacred history), and his brethren. These assembled for prayer and supplication, *Acts* i. 14. In the midst of these stood up Peter, *ver.* 15, to propose the filling

the place of Judas. And these constituted the assembly on the day of Pentecost, when "the promise of the Father" was fulfilled, and Peter speaking for the eleven, *ch.* ii. 14, gave in their testimony, and the three thousand were saved, and added. They continued the testimony, and it continued to produce the same result; the salvation of believers; it was salvation to believe; and daily was it so; and daily were the saved added to the church.

Let us look again at this church; this *ekkleesia*. What an unpretentious object, as to form, externals, it is! At first, the apostles and the one hundred and twenty: without an officer, or rule: a mere congregation, assembly, as the word *ekkleesia* implies: they believed Jesus to be the long-promised Christ, were full of love to him and to each other, and associated, met together, assembled for worship. They had no government but the love which was in their hearts, the love that drew them to a common centre; and, so, to each other. There is no indication of any organization; nothing as yet but an assembly of those of one heart, one mind, one purpose, one hope: and to this simple *ecclesia*, the three thousand were added, the day of Pentecost; and then, daily, such as were saved daily.

But, while everything was so simple, so unostentatious as to form, externals; with neither governor, nor law; a mere voluntary assembly; within, at the centre, what amazing power, what efficient control! Jesus is the Christ, much love to him from those to whom much had been forgiven; this love united this assembly around that precious name, at the peril of the loss of all earthly things, and of life itself. It was not who should govern, but who should serve; as the Lord had taught "—their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister, *diakonos*

(servant).” *Mark* x. 42, 43. They of that assembly sought neither lordship, nor revenue. It was a wonderful power that was present and in force: “And all that believed were together”—more than three thousand believers, all, all together, assembled by a power in each one’s heart: no command; no law; no scourge; no spear:—“and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, as every man had need.” Such persons needed neither governor nor laws, other than the mystic force in their own simple, loving hearts. “After those days, saith Jehovah, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith Jehovah: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” *Jerem.* xxxi. 33, 34.

This happy condition of the assembly was not of long duration. The success of the apostles in the deliverance of their testimony; their prominent position of speakers; occasioned them great popularity and admiration. They had “favor with all the people;” presently even the high priest Annas and his illustrious associates dare not punish them, “because of the people;” then, “as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles’ feet;” then, “And of the rest durst no man join himself to them: but the people magnified them;” the same sort of people who in the ancient time repudiated the government of Jehovah, and to whom Samuel said, “ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when Jehovah your God was your king;” magnified the apostles into functions not intended for them,

and rejecting the inward law of Jehovah by which they had distributed to the need of others, *Acts* ii. 45, they "brought the prices and laid them at the apostles' feet."

Thus ended the simple government by the law in the heart. It was very efficient and grand; and, in the end, when men shall have convinced themselves of the miserable inferiority of their wretched substitutes, it will be restored: for in the New Jerusalem, which came down from heaven, there was "no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light of it." *Rev.* xxi. 23. Happy church, again, when the gentle, loving Lamb shall be its light once more; its suns and its moons being unneeded. But, now come murmurings, *Acts* vi.; something like organization by the appointment of seven men, to relieve the apostles from functions, which, in the previous days, every man who sold his possessions had performed with his own hands, by the guidance of the government in his own heart. Presently we read of elders, *ch.* xi. 30; though this seems rather cheerful, looking, as it does, like some one again "daring to join himself" unto the apostles: for "the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief (*eis diakonian*, something to be ministered) unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Not now to be "laid at the apostles' feet;" but "sent it to the elders." The terrific persecution that had driven the seven, and all the rest, except the apostles, out of Jerusalem, seems to have shaken down the nascent hierarchy, and the apostles are not designated as distributors, or even receivers, of the Antiochian testimony of loving care, for their suffering brethren at Jerusalem. It is pleasant, too, to see the name of Barnabas, who was not an apostle, preceding that of Paul, who was not the inferior of any of the apostles.



The elder is an officer borrowed from the Mosaic forms, to which the first Christians had been accustomed. Why Luke did not give any account of their first employment, it is impossible to say; we can only conjecture with others, that he did not hold church organization to be of any importance; outside the internal, spiritual force in every Christian's heart; which, like every other life force, contains its own powers and laws of organization; organizes its own form; to suit the aim of its own life. The living seed of the vine, organizes a vine: of an oak, an oak: of a church, a church. Jesus, the Lamb-like Son of God, planted the seed of a church, watered it with his blood, warmed it with his smile; it sprang up and began its beautiful development; what a pity the simple, efficient plan was encumbered with insidious parasites, covering and embarrassing its bark, and inviting decay and languor. The elder is introduced here as an officer in the Christian Church, as naturally and quietly, as one would, in writing of a man, mention his hand or foot, or any other organ of the human body. They had always been accustomed to elders, and they were appointed without noise or ceremony, so soon as they felt the need of rulers, overseers, superintendents; and had ceased requiring the apostles to be at their head; in anything other than in bearing their appointed testimony. But what were the functions of an elder?

In discussing this question, we limit ourselves to the Scripture: the question relating to that primitive assembly, very unlike the church of the present day, with very rare, if any, exceptions. The elder, as a Scriptural title, has marked precedence to the bishop. One reading ecclesiastical history, or certain church controversies, might suppose, that the word *episkopos*, rendered bishop, was one of the words most frequently mentioned in the N. Testament. What then must be his astonish-

ment at learning, that the most minute investigation cannot find that word in any one of the four Gospels; but once in The Acts; not at all in the Ep. to the Romans; nor in I Corinthians; nor in II Corinthians; nor in Galatians; nor in Ephesians; but once in Philippians; not at all in Colossians; nor in I Thessalonians; nor in II Thessalonians; but once in I Timothy; not at all in II Timothy; but once in Titus; not at all in Philemon; nor in Hebrews; nor in James; but once in I Peter; not at all in II Peter; nor in I John; nor in II John; nor in III John; nor in Jude; nor in Revelation. Of the twenty-seven books, *episkopos*, rendered bishop, occurs in five, and but once in each of the five; while in twenty-two, and these embracing the larger books, it is not to be found at all. But of these five occurrences, one, that in *I Pet.* ii. 25, "the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls," the reference is to our Lord; leaving only four occurrences of the word in reference to a human officer in the Church; and one of these, *Acts* xx. 28, so evidently identifies the bishop with the elder, that our translators substituted the word *overseers*, for *bishops*, in their rendering of *episkopoi*. This whittles down this small showing of five in gross, in the entire N. Testament, to three. But of these three, one of the instances merits consideration: that at *Philipp.* i. 1, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ;" etc. This is a very solemn and formal address. They of the chief part being "all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi," a city of Macedonia; while they of the inferior part are "the bishops and deacons." These "saints" are not of the sort whose names have been inserted in the calendar, and who, if as good as represented by the inserters, might very well take

precedence of many bishops and deacons: but they were the members of the Christian community or communities; for Philippi was "a chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony;" *Acts* xvi. 12; and saints was the general name, then, of believers in Jesus as the Christ. How came *bishops* to be connected with the saints, in one city? The idea is absurd, if bishops meant there, at Philippi, what the word means here, in Baltimore: and, yet, it is quite likely that episcopalians are as numerous here, as were the saints there: what then if a modern Paul were to address a solemn, formal epistle, to "all the saints (meaning members of the episcopal communities) which are at Baltimore, with the bishops and deacons?" Who could understand it? It would be necessary to rank such an address, with those things in Paul's writings, which Peter said were hard to be understood. Whose bishops and deacons? We suppose, of the saints at Philippi: which certainly, to us, has the appearance that the bishops and deacons belonged to the saints, and not the saints to the bishops and deacons: as "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath;" so bishops and deacons were made for the saints, and not the saints for bishops and deacons: had there not been man, the sabbath had not been; and had there been no saints, there had been no bishops and deacons: before the days of bishops and deacons, there were saints, *Acts* i., as before the sabbath there was man. It would be as natural and philosophical, to think and write of a man being owned by his own hands, his instruments; as to think and write of the saints being owned by their own bishops and deacons, their instruments. So, Paul, the ancient, addressed "all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi," as the real, essential body, church, wishing them grace and peace; in which good wishes he includes their church instrumentalities, their bishops and deacons. Probably

a modern apostle would have addressed, The Bishop and Clergy, with the saints at Philippi: but this would have been as unintelligible there, as the form of Paul's address would be here: for as here the inquiry would be, Where are the bishops? there it would have been, Where is the Bishop, where are the Clergy?

Bishops and deacons: but why did Paul overlook the elders? Did he not wish the elders, which must have been here, as in other churches planted by Paul, (*Acts* xiv. 23,) to share in the "grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ"? There is express record, as hinted above, that Paul took care that the churches should be supplied with elders. So, we read, "And when they (Barnabas and Paul) had ordained them elders in every church," etc.; *Acts* xiv. 23. Every church among the gentile believers, under the advice of Paul, elected elders, after the Jewish fashion; to which Paul, but not the gentile converts, had been accustomed. But how happens it, that these gentile saints at Philippi, had no elders? Or, if they had, why did Paul omit them from his salutation and blessing? There is an easy way out of this dilemma. Before the writing of this Epistle, according to chronologists, Paul had identified bishops (*episkopoi*) with elders (*presbuteroi*), as we see, *Acts* xx. 17-35. "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders (*presbuteros*) of the church. And when they were come to him, he said unto them, Ye know, etc., \* \* \* Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers (*etheto episkopous*)," etc. Here he sent for the *presbuteroi* (elders) and styles them *episkopoi* (bishops); leaving not a particle of distinction between the *presbuteros* and the *episkopos*. The one church at Ephesus had elders who were bishops; and the one church at Philippi had bishops who were elders. This should be

clear enough ; especially when we find no trace of any other sort of bishop appointed through Paul's instrumentality, except the *presbuteros*, the elder.

So, we strike this from our list, before this reduced from five to three ; and now, from three to two. Then, these two are both found in the writings of Paul : " A bishop then must be blameless," etc. ; *I Tim.* iii. 2 : " For a bishop must be blameless," etc. ; *Titus* i. 7. How could it be deemed unreasonable, in the utter absence of any record in The Acts, or any other of the inspired books, that Paul ever advised, or assisted at, the appointment of any bishop other than the *presbuteros* ; and in the open, evident, undeniable presence of a most distinct record, that he styled the *presbuteroi*, *episkopoi* ; how can it be unreasonable, we repeat, to understand his blameless bishop to be nothing more nor less than a blameless elder ? And so the *episkopos* shrinking, of necessity, into the *presbuteros*, our criticism looks again for the Bishop in the New Testament, and finds no higher officer overseeing the church, than the elder. If it be proved that we have blundered, in traversing our subject, we will be surprised, and retract : but until furnished with such proof, we will adhere to our conclusion, that the Episcopalian government warrant, is not from any model to be found in the New Testament : the only bishop known there being the elder.

But, now, the elder, the *presbuteros*. This word appears in the New Testament, sixty-seven times. Of these, twenty-seven instances refer to the elders of the Christian Church, thirteen of them in the writings of Paul, and thirteen times in Revelation where *episkopos* does not occur once. As this book, Revelation, is of the latest date in the canon ; its free use of *presbuteros*, and utter oblivion of *episkopos*, was not the warrant for Dr. Whedon's surmise, " It seems probable that before

the apostle John died the episcopal form was generally prevalent, and probably with his sanction." *Com. on Acts xi. 30.* Such a probability finds little countenance in the foregoing facts, unless, like Paul, our respected and able commentator reads *presbuteros* and *episkopos* as referring to the same officer, and episcopacy as being a mere function of an elder; which would have as authority not only Paul, *Acts xx. 28*, but also Peter, who exhorts the elders to, "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight (*episkopountes*, bishoping, overseeing)." *I Peter v. 2.* The Doctor does not use the word episcopal in this sense; though, as we have seen, this is its true Scriptural signification. "But," he adds, "it is not clear either that the episcopal form was ever divinely enjoined, or prescribed as indispensable to a legitimate Church; or that an absolutely unbroken succession was required for all ages, except so far as such regular succession was, in the given case, most conducive to the Church's well being." In our judgment, as given elsewhere, the "unbroken succession," in the usual church sense of that phrase, was never intended, because never needed, therefore an impossibility, a myth. Not only is it "not clear that the episcopal form" of church government "was ever divinely enjoined;" but it is most clear, that it was not: nothing being enjoined but the life, springing from a grateful, loving faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Lamb of God sacrificed for sin; which loving faith, looking to God, said Abba, father; and to man, brother: and this life, like all those proceeding from him "who has life in himself," contained the force of self-organization: and it organized itself upon these three principles, the Fatherhood of God, the Lordship of Jesus the Christ, and the Brotherhood of Believers. Behold the Church!

To return now to the elders. What was their peculiar function? Not preaching; any believer preached,

as he had opportunity; as we see, *Acts* viii. 4, where thousands of believers, with no other credential than their faith, are on record as preachers of the word; a clear, distinct, undeniable record, which the elders, as elders, do not exhibit. Peter, as quoted above, makes "taking the oversight" of the church, the business of the elders. Paul, in *I Tim.* v. 17, says, "Let the elders that rule well (*kaloos proestootes presbuteroi*), be counted worthy of double honor (*diplees timees*, double salary), especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The laborer is worthy of his hire." If, then, the function of the elder was "preaching," why the "especially" in favor of an elder laboring in "the word and doctrine?" In that case, it ought to have been in the favor of the *proestootes*, who added ruling, presiding, taking charge, to their appropriate function of preaching. As it is, such elders as to their appropriate function of ruling, added, because of the love and zeal in their hearts, labors of preaching as they could snatch a spare moment, were specially commended, by the apostle, and declared worthy of increased salary. In fact, the Jewish elder, to which alone the early Christians were accustomed, was not a preacher, but a ruler: and it is very incongruous to suppose, that in their organizing, they continued the elder but changed his functions: especially when they had thousands of preachers, but no formal ruler. When the history arrives among the gentile believers, it gives account of the appointment of elders; because they were unaccustomed to such officers: but the Jewish believers seemed to assume the use of them naturally, and noiselessly, as the Methodists of the United States, were easily led by Dr. Coke and the revered Asbury, into the adoption of the three orders of ministers, they had been accustomed to

associate with the mother church of England ; Bishops, Elders, and Deacons.

It is not irrelevant to repeat, that in all the inspired history of the Church, for the first thirty years, the bishops are mentioned but once, *ch.* xx. 17, 35, and those bishops were the elders of Ephesus: while, on the other hand, the mention of elders is frequent. In *ch.* xv. 2, we have an account of a deputation from Antioch to "the apostles and elders" at Jerusalem, about some question of doctrine. "And when they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church (*ekklesias*), and of the apostles and elders." Church first, then the witnesses, then the church's instruments: but where is the bishop? "And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." Again, where is the bishop? There was a long debate, but there is nothing recorded as the argument, or opinion of a bishop. "Then pleased it the apostles and elders, with the whole church, to send chosen (*eklexamenous*) men of their own company (*ex autoon*) to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren: And they wrote letters by them after this manner; The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren which are of the gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia:" etc. Once more we inquire, where is the bishop of the church at Jerusalem, that his authority is ignored in this most solemn, formal, ecclesiastical letter? And where the bishop of Antioch, the bishop of Syria, the bishop of Cilicia, that such a document as this should be addressed to "the brethren" at Antioch, Syria, Cilicia? Not even the elders are particularized: nor the deacons: bishop, elders, deacons; all the reverend clergy entirely ignored; "the brethren" alone addressed: the communication is to "the brethren," the congregation, the



church: and the church officers get only the share of brethren. The saints were not yet the property of their rulers.

Among such records, it is useless to look for deacons: deacons appear nowhere, in the history of the Church for the first thirty years. But, as for the bishops, their one single appearance at Miletus, at the request of Paul, is such, that we may, with entire certainty, find them in these elders at Jerusalem. For if the elders of Ephesus were the bishops of Ephesus; no one can say nay, when we affirm the elders of Jerusalem to have been the bishops of Jerusalem. Judas and Silas, having been declared "chief men," wherever they appear they appear as "chief men:" and when Paul, with the fullest possible information in the case, has declared elders to be bishops, wherever they appear they appear as bishops; bishoping being a mere function of an elder; *I Peter* v. 2. The elder was an overseer, ruler in this sense, seeing that the assembly, the congregation, the church, was orderly; and reporting cases of disorder to the congregation for judgment and sentence.

Such we think to have been the simple, efficient organization of the first Christian assemblies. As time wore on, various changes were made, as leading minds impelled by loving hearts, or by ambitious purpose, projected and proposed: and as in the State (Rome) there was a departure from the democratic idea of the earlier times, and a tendency to place supreme power in the hands of one; \* such influence was felt, of course, in Christian assemblies, and the elders, at first all bishops

"\* \* \* et is esset reipublicæ status, ut eam unius consilio atque cura gubernari necesse esset: — and the condition of the republic (Rome) being such, as to make it necessary, that it should be governed by the care and will of one person." *Cicero, De Nat. Deorum, Lib. I. 4.*

alike, glided into the *primus inter pares* condition; and then into the bishop and his elders, etc.; until we have nothing now, perhaps, after the original model. No church can claim to be The Church, without blushing if it has any modesty; or if its modesty be gone, without laughing in its sleeve at its own pretensions. Let any church square with the Church of The Acts, and it may then boldly prefer a claim to true Christian Antiquity: for anything short of that is mere pretense.

But any existing church, possessing and cultivating the true Christian spirit of love to God and man; is not only entitled to think for itself in all relative matters; but also to determine upon the method in which its loving heart will provide itself with instrumentalities and plans, for spreading the glad tidings of salvation for sinners by faith in the blood of the Lamb; and the privilege of believers to grow in grace, and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Any such church is a happy retreat for a sin-sick soul, desirous of learning and pursuing the right ways of the Lord; and though there may be some things, as is very likely, in the order of such assembly that might have been better arranged; it is ruinous to be always tinkering at them, and utterly unreasonable to become schismatic. By a thousand times is it better to be patient, brotherly, loving in our demeanor and intercourse; that while taking sweet counsel together, we may assist each other in our studies of the sacred word, and make common progress in Christian enlightenment and spirituality. We have been slow in learning the depth and extent of that most simple and forceful of all laws, love: in our anxiety and effort for points of doctrine, or of order, we have too often forgotten, The greatest of these is love! And it is a poor gain to smash a magnificent chandelier, under pretense of improving the position of a taper. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light.

The great essential for a church is not form: form does not produce life; but life, form. Life, life from the breath of God, *Gen.* ii. 7, breathed into the form we have; that is the great church need of the day: and life gets into the sum by getting into the units; a million of dead men would make up a huge mass of death; but there would not be a particle of life. To have a living mass of men, it must be made up of living men: and as the best thing a man can do for his country, is to be a true, enlightened, earnest patriot; so, the best thing any member can do for his church, is to become a true, enlightened, earnest Christian. He might be a great churchman (bigot) and a very poor, and even hurtful member: but a great Christian can be neither a poor nor hurtful member of any church: and to be such a Christian, is the privilege and duty of each of us. The effort to achieve such result is the true and only road to personal and church prosperity. Doctrine and order will be all the time getting into proper adjustment, while the heart is kept in proper condition. "My son, give me thy heart:" yes; for that is the avenue of influence to the head, the hands, the feet.

---

---

## THE SUPPOSED DEACONS.

ACTS vi. 1-6.

**W**ERE the deacons secular or spiritual officers? Some affirm the first; others, that their functions were both secular and spiritual. What says the record? Up to this time, no such office as deacon, was known in the Christian Church. What occasioned it? Luke

informs us, that the increase of numbers in the Church, was not accompanied with a correspondent increase of spirituality. Amid the flame of prosperity, was seen the smoke of selfishness and discontent: amid the sound of rejoicing, arose "a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations." Communism had been introduced, under the influence of the warm feelings of the heart, without waiting to consider, to think, to reason, and they were now paying the penalty of their error. The human race is incapable of free love and a community of goods: family and property are indispensables, necessities. The first Christians did not, could not, fall into the error of free love; but they did have "all things in common," *Acts* ii. 44; and they were now experiencing the evil of that plan. It gave sore dissatisfaction, and led to a disturbance of their harmony.

Let us endeavor to discover why this murmuring disturbed the apostles. These had been selected by the Lord and empowered by the Holy Ghost, to testify that Jesus was the Christ, predicted in the Holy Oracles; as demonstrated by his dying for our sins, and rising for our righteousness. They were not lords, but brethren; as the hasty Peter indicates in his address, *ch.* i. 16, "Men and brethren:" men (*andres*) being merely an indication of respect, and having the force of an adjective, as though it had been translated "respected brethren." In that day, they were "all brethren;" until, after Pentecost, when the "eleven" (*ch.* ii. 14) commenced their testimony, and amid their amazing success, the crowds of converts seeing them prominent and the speakers, naturally mistook them for rulers; the awakened doubtless consulting them for needed items of instruction, precisely as in the case of awakened persons now, who invariably seek out the

instruments of their conviction, to aid them in their conversion. The apostles and their hearers were men; as the ministers of the gospel now and their hearers are men: but it really seems necessary that we be reminded of such facts occasionally now, as Peter thought it needful to call attention to well known matters then, stirring up their "pure minds by way of remembrance."

Looking then, in a common sense way, at the apostles as men, successful men, we trace them along the record, to *ch.* ii. 41-47, where surrounded by the one hundred and twenty, and the three thousand just converted, the fruits of their first testimony, "fear came upon every soul: and many signs and wonders were done by the apostles (which signs and wonders were by no means their exclusive function). And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all, as every one had need. And they, (the apostles) \* \* \* having favor with all the people." Soon occurs the miracle of healing the lame man, "at the gate of the temple which is called beautiful;" occasioning a large running together of the astonished people, to whom Peter preached the resurrection with the result, that many believed, "and the number of the men was about five thousand." *Ch.* iv. 4. "And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace (*charis*, favor, and both divine and human: here, human, as in *ch.* ii. 47, where it is rendered "favor") was upon them all (the apostles). *Ch.* iv. 33. Then, "as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet," etc. At first, as we have seen, *ch.* ii. 45, when they sold their property, they distributed the proceeds with their own hands: now, every one is

anxious to exhibit his respect for the apostles ; who presently attained such popularity, that "of the rest durst no man join himself unto them : but the people magnified them." *Ch.* v. 13. No one dared to act as an associate, a peer, an equal, with the apostles ; not even one of the one hundred and twenty ; for the admiration of the people had now lifted the "witnesses," into something like lords ; and given them other powers, than those conferred on them by the Holy Ghost. Therefore it was, that this neglect of the Grecian widows, was murmured into their ears, as being a defect in their administration. They had allowed the money to be laid down at their feet ; and now they were paying for their mistake.

"Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren (not now *andres adelphoi*, "respected brethren," as in *ch.* i. 16), look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude : and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch : whom they set before the apostles : and when they had prayed they laid their hands upon them." *Acts* vi.

Here we have the whole transaction. As one result of their inordinate popularity, the apostles had been honored by having been made treasurers ; had discovered that the duties pertinent to this position interfered with their preaching ; proposed to the "multitude of the disciples" to resign those embarrassing functions, in favor of seven men of proper qualifications, chosen

from among, and by, themselves; to which the assent was unanimous; and the affair was so arranged.

“It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.” Then, to serve tables, the office of the seven, was incompatible with “the ministry of the word.” It was for this very reason, that the apostles refused such service, and proposed that others should be appointed “over this business,” that they might not be hindered in “the ministry of the word.” Indeed they spoke as though there were a necessity for leaving the word of God, if they should have to do what the seven were appointed to do. It is as plain as anything can be, that in this interesting passage, where we have the why and the how of the institution of the seven, there is not an item favoring the idea of the institution of an order of ministers of the word; but both particulars and sum decide distinctly, and unequivocally, that the one business over which the seven were appointed, was to “serve tables,” to attend to “the daily ministration,” in which the Grecian widows were said to have been “neglected.” No one can successfully dispute this. It is as plain a narrative of facts as can be produced. Dr. Clarke among his many excellent criticisms on the place, says, “At present, the office for which the seven deacons were appointed, is, in the church of England, filled by the church-wardens and overseers of the poor; in other churches and religious societies, by elders, stewards, etc., chosen by the people, and appointed by the minister.” The Dr. says “the seven deacons,” as if it were an expression of Luke: but he no where mentions “the seven deacons,” never going beyond “the seven:” and so far as that but once, *ch.* xxi. 8. The word *diakonos*, deacon, is never used by Luke, either in the Gospel or The Acts. It was by no means a favorite word with him, to whom alone we are indebted for our knowledge of the “seven

men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," appointed over "this business," of serving tables, which the apostles declared incompatible with "the ministry of the word."

But it is said that the high qualifications required, are only consistent with an order of "the ministry of the word." It would seem unnecessary to do more, than to reiterate that the duties of the seven were incompatible with "the ministry of the word." But waving this sufficient reply, let us examine these qualifications. First, of "honest report," all this is expressed by the one Greek word *marturoumenous*, well spoken of, being of good reputation. This characteristic is really necessary, for so high an office as "the ministry of the word; but by no means exclusively: as it is an indispensable requisite for any social trust. Secondly, "full of the Holy Ghost," which we also admit to be a *sine qua non*, in a minister of the gospel; but, again, not exclusively: for when Paul exhorts the whole Church at Ephesus, to be "filled with the Spirit," (*Eph.* v. 18,) no one imagines that he is wishing them, men, women, and children, to apply for admission into the diaconate, the first, initial, order (as some suppose) of the Christian ministry. To appease and satisfy those Grecian murmurers, would require all the patient love of God and man, that the Holy Ghost sheds abroad in the believer's heart. *Rom.* v. 5. Thirdly, "wisdom:" required among the qualifications of a candidate for "the ministry of the word; but, yet, not for that exclusively. Surely, the duties to which these men were to be appointed, would require a great degree of wisdom. Thus then, as is clear, the seven with these high qualifications, good reputation, full of the Holy Ghost, full of wisdom, were by no means too well fitted, for the service to be assigned to them. To put an end to the existing dissatisfaction,



and to prevent its recurrence, would require great ability, rich mental and spiritual endowment. It should be noticed, too, that one of the oldest codices, the Codex Sinaiticus, omits the second qualification, reading instead of "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," "full of the spirit of wisdom;" i. e. full of a wise spirit. But we have argued upon the admission of the three qualifications; as we accept the common reading.

Again, it is urged that they did preach. Of two of them, this is said to be certain; and it is reasonable, to infer the same of the rest. Stephen is adduced as an instance of preaching by one of the seven. This holy, devout, gifted man was scarcely appointed, before his active goodness and abundant spiritual endowments, brought him into such prominence, that "there arose certain of the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen." *Ch.* vi. 9. Nothing is said here of preaching. This good man "did great wonders and miracles among the people;" and a considerable number of the Jews, belonging to various synagogues, probably Paul a Cilician Jew among them, "disputed" with him: though this dispute was not, likely, in the form of preaching. Unable to "resist the wisdom and the spirit" of Stephen's disputation; they excited a tumult; seized him, and brought him before the council; where the suborned witnesses delivered their false testimony against him. "Then said the High Priest, Are these things so? And he said, Respected brethren and fathers (not, men, brethren, and fathers; as though he were addressing three classes), hearken;" etc., defending his life in an appropriate speech. But his speech was of no avail. Their irritation increased to rage;" they gnashed on him with their teeth;" cast him out of the city; murdered him.

There is record of Stephen's disputing with the Libertines, Cyrenians, etc.; and of his earnest and proper defense of his life before the council: but no record of his having preached "the word." Yet we freely admit, that it may be inferred that he did so preach; not because he was one of the seven, though, for the only proper inference from that fact is, that he as a good and faithful officer attended to his duties "in the daily ministration," "serving tables."

In Philip's case there is express record, that he "preached Christ unto them," in a city of Samaria; and also, that he "preached Jesus" unto a high officer of Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who was puzzling himself over a passage in *Isaiah* liii. But he did not preach because he was one of the seven; but because he was a Christian; he had believed in Jesus as the Christ, and felt "the power of his resurrection:" therefore he could, as any Christian of his day could, "tell what great things had been done for him." He had not been ordained, in our sense of that word; but, "he believed, and therefore he spoke." After the death of Stephen, the Jews bent on exterminating the Nazarenes as they called the believers in Jesus, raised so great a persecution against them; that "they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles." Jerusalem was clear of them, with this small exception: the apostles alone remained. "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching (*euaggelizomenoi*) the word." Now since the ascension, hands had been laid upon no one except "the seven," who had been especially selected for a work, that was unsuitable to those engaged in "the ministry of the word;" and yet here we have the record that "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching (*euaggelizomenoi*) the word." "They" signifies all the thousands of Christians at Jerusalem,

except the apostles: all these were *evangelizing* everywhere: not remaining at any place, but continuing their flight from place to place; like David and his six hundred fleeing from their Saul and his forces; "they went whithersoever they could go:" thousands of evangelists swarming over the land, not one of whom carried with him any ecclesiastical authority to evangelize. Dr. Whedon, whose Commentary should have a place in every Christian's library, says, on the passage, "These dispersed Christians are, every man, an itinerant preacher! They wait for no 'holy orders' forsooth; ask no bishop's permit to hold prayer-meetings, and do not refuse to exhort or preach because they have received no license. Work is better than formal machinery."

No ordaining of preachers is in the record; but thousands of preachers; among those thousands, Philip is found: driven from Jerusalem and his "tables," he flees before the "great persecution," and, everywhere he goes, "preaches Christ unto them." It would seem very singular, if his having been set apart to "serve tables," gave him authority to preach; and yet the preaching of the thousands of his associates without the least semblance of hesitation, or hint of impropriety, or irregularity, demonstrating the utter uselessness of the laying on hands, as conveying authority to preach. At a later day, it needed a miracle, to get Peter into a gentile's house to preach the gospel there: but these thousands, fleeing for their lives, needed no miracle, laying on hands, Church authority for preaching the word to Jews; and they preached whithersoever they went. Philip did the same: and nearly thirty years afterward, as Luke writes, "we that were of Paul's company \* \* \* came unto Cæsarea: and we entered into the house of Philip the evangelist (*euaggelistou*), which was (one) of the seven, and abode with him." *Ch. xxi. 8.* Philip

was one of "the seven," which fact gave him no authority to preach; but he was also one of "the evangelists" (*euaggelizomenoi*, *ch.* viii. 4), and had the same authority as they, which was universal in the company of believers: believing being the requisite for speaking, preaching; *II Cor.* iv. 13.

Still, there remains the question, If the seven were not intended to be a clerical order, why were they ordained? Here we have the assumption, that the laying on hands, was then, as now, an induction into a clerical order; of which there is no Scriptural proof whatever. According to the hypothesis that Matthias really was made an apostle, then, this being the first induction into an order, in the Christian Church, we look for the indispensable laying on hands, and see nothing of the kind. "Must one be ordained (*genesthai*, be, become):" "and they appointed (*esteesan*, stood them) two;" "and the lot fell upon Matthias:" "and he was numbered with (*sugkatepseephisthee*, reckoned among, numbered with, calculated with) the eleven apostles:" no eye, though keen as "the vulture's," can see or imagine any hand here, but that of Luke recording the incident in its entire clearness and simplicity. And, yet, if laying on hands is the induction to an order, as this was the first induction attempted, and needed every item of force that could be given it; it is not supposable that the apostles and the one hundred and twenty others would have omitted an essential ceremony; and equally is it unsupposable, that had the ceremony been performed, Luke would have omitted it from his detailed account. He mentions the advice of Peter, founded upon the Psalms, relative to the qualifications necessary, the appointing of two candidates, the giving forth of the lots, the falling of the lot on Matthias, his being numbered with the eleven apostles: but, not a word of laying on hands, the grand confirmatory act, as supposed:

indeed the word hand does not occur in the narration, occupying nearly half of the first chapter. No induction into this divinely constituted order by laying on hands: and, so, we may safely conclude, it was not considered a necessary ceremony; for if necessary at any time, it was chiefly so here.

In the case of Saul, "they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And Ananias putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost." And certain prophets and teachers, at Antioch, when they had fasted and prayed, and laid hands on them, sent Saul and Barnabas away, separated unto the work to which "the Holy Ghost had called them:" but not one of these acts was induction into an order; either apostolic or any other. In the laying on hands in the last instance we see the formal authorizing of Saul, to go upon a mission: an old-fashioned Hebrew form of invoking a blessing, and inferring inferiority on the part of the one blessed; *Heb.* vii. 7. And why was not the laying on hands, in the case of the seven, a formal separation of them to the work unto which they had been chosen? It is by far the more likely view of the case. No easy task had been allotted them, and the apostles and brethren prayed, laid hands on them, and sent them to their work of serving tables.

Among Methodists, in this country, the duties of "the seven" are performed by the Stewards: by far more important officers, too, than they are generally esteemed to be. Stewards of good report, filled with the Holy Ghost and with wisdom, are a choice blessing to any congregation, and are worthy of high esteem and grateful love. Few congregations, if any, prosper without competent Stewards. Where the pastor is required "to serve tables," like the apostles, he must "leave the word of

God ;” at the risk, too, of being rated as “a money preacher ;” using the pulpit as a financial agency or convenience. But, whether the Stewards should be called Deacons, is not so clear ; for in all the New Testament, church officers called deacons are mentioned but three times, and by no writer except Paul. These few instances are—1, *Phil.* i. 1, “ Paul \* \* \* to all the saints \* \* \* with the bishops and deacons,” etc. ; 2, *I Tim.* iii. 8, “ Likewise the deacons grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre ; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.” Then the 3, at the 12th verse, “ Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife,” etc. This is the sum total of the mentioning of these church officers in the New Testament. In The Acts, the only inspired Church History, the word deacon does not occur. The Greek word *diakonos* is used twenty-nine times, including the just mentioned three instances ; and except in these, it is never rendered “ deacon,” but always “ servant,” or “ minister,” which latter is an anglicized Latin word meaning “ servant ;” so that, in fact, “ servant ” is the invariable rendering of the word, except in three out of the twenty-nine cases. This fact is of great weight. Our translators, to whom we are all so much indebted, and of whom any one speaking lightly but betrays the scantiness of his own information ; were favorable enough to hierarchy, and were not likely to be biased against it in their rendering. Yet here are the facts : *diakonos* occurs in all the N. T. twenty-nine times ; and in only three of these do they render it “ deacon ;” while in every other instance they render it “ servant ” or “ minister ;” and both these words we get from the Latin, differing not at all, except in the scales of acute criticism. Within this citation from *I Tim.* iii. 8–13, we have the rendering “ And let these also first be proved ; then let them use the office of a deacon,” etc. The whole latter

clause, "let them use the office of a deacon," is the rendering of a single Greek verb, *diakoneitoosan*, signifying "let them serve." And so, at *ver.* 13, "For they that have used the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." Here, also, a large phrase, "that have used the office of a deacon," is the rendering of a participle, *diakoneesantes*, from the same verb as above, the participle signifying "having served." These examples show, that our translators were not averse to bringing in deacons when at all allowable; while their integrity held them to a general accuracy of rendering the word under examination.

The corresponding verb, *diakoneoo*, is used thirty-four times, always rendered by one of the synonymous words "minister," "serve," "administer," except in the two instances above cited from *I Tim.* iii. 10, 13. The related noun, *diakonia*, signifying the *state*, or *function*, of the *diakonos*, is to be found in the N. T. thirty-three times, and rendered also by synonymous words, such as "serving," "ministry," "ministration," "administration," "ministering," "service;" except in two cases, *Acts* xi. 29, where it is rendered "relief;" *Rom.* xi. 13, "office." In the former a ministration, a service of supply "unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea," was determined on by the Antiochian Christians; and the ministration, the service, the *diakonia*, was rendered, *relief*. In the latter, the citation, *Rom.* xi. 13, "— inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify (*doxazoo*) mine office, *teen diakonian mou*." This is all plain enough, if "ministry," "service," or some such word be substituted for "office:" and plain enough as it is, if we give to "office" the sense of one of the synonyms, as above: but what could we do with "diaconate," here, as the meaning of *diakonian*? Was the apostolate, after all, nothing more than a diaconate, the office

of an inferior, the most inferior order of the clergy? Those inclining to High Church principles, as well as all N. T. students, will be in favor of our rendering "ministry," "service," as a substitute for "office," or "diaconate." It is evident, that "deacons" make but little show in N. T. affairs, or history. They do better in the post-apostolic ages and writings; increasing as they come down through the centuries, like a river, which starting from some small spring at the foot of a mountain, enlarges from the influx of numerous tributaries; retaining its name as it flows on in its proud magnitude. Could the mountain get down there where the river has widened out as far as its very wide apart banks will allow, and swollen into a grand channel of commerce; the wondering mass of earth, rock and forest would identify, in all that prodigious volume of water, but the quantum of a thin rivulet that came from the obscure opening at its own base. A handful of snow rolled along, gathers to itself a great bulk; and the original little ball is soon lost out of sight. Could its identity be preserved, and the mass could be unrolled; it would be amusing to look upon the insignificant particle, around which such a showy mass had been collected.

The word "Steward" makes a better exhibit. As the rendering of *epitropos*, it appears twice in our Eng. Ver. of the N. T.; and of *oikonomos*, eight times. But in no instance does it appear as the title of a church officer. So that deacon, after all, is at least more churchly in sound, but not sufficiently so to change the title of our Stewards. Would they but efficiently occupy their very important position, they would be such a blessing to the Church, that they might well be allowed to assume the title of Cardinal, if they desired so to do. They would be of much more value to us than the gentlemen with red hats.



## LAYING ON HANDS.

ACTS vi. 6.

AS there is much diversity in the Scriptural use of this phrase, we will limit our inquiry to "What is its Scriptural signification as a *religious rite*?"

In Gen. xlvi. 14, the venerable Jacob laid his hands on the heads of his grandsons, Ephraim and Manasseh; blessed them; acknowledged them as constituents of the Abrahamic family; from which the Messiah was to come. There is no account of any such laying on hands in his own case; or in the case of Isaac; or in the case of any one of Jacob's sons.

At Lev. viii. 14, 18, 22, Moses brought a bullock for a sin-offering, and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon his head; so with a ram for a burnt-offering; so with a ram of consecration. These statements are parts of a detailed account of the official induction of Aaron and his sons into the priestly office; but only the above-mentioned instance of the laying on of hands is to be found in that transaction. Moses, who was not a priest, inducted those men into the priesthood: but the ceremony of laying on hands was performed by the priests-elect, upon the animals offered in sacrifice.

Next comes the case of Joshua, who was to succeed Moses in the leadership of the people. Num. xxvii. 18-23. On him, Moses, by divine command, laid hands, publicly assigning to him a share of his own honor. This laying on hands was not to confer the Holy Ghost; for of that Joshua was already possessed, the Lord himself having pronounced him to be "a man in whom is the Spirit." It was part of a public ceremony, used by specific revelation, upon the very extra-

ordinary occasion of introducing to Israel the only successor Moses was to have, and who did succeed to his high office some months thereafter.

Then we have the narrative of the revival under Hezekiah, II Chron. xix., where it is stated, v. 23: "And they brought forth the goats for the sin-offering, before the king and the congregation; and they laid their hands upon them. 24. And the priests killed them, and they made reconciliation with their blood upon the altar, to make an atonement for all Israel." Here, again, the imposition of hands was upon the victims, and was part of a religious ceremony: as in Lev. xvi. 21, where Aaron laid both his hands upon the scape-goat, confessed the sins of all Israel, and sent him forth into the wilderness: as in the case of the blasphemer, Lev. xxiv. 14: "Bring him forth without the camp; and let all that heard him lay their hands upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him."

From these citations we must form our opinion of the Old Testament meaning of the imposition of hands, as a religious rite. Passing into the New Testament, Matthew viii. 3, in his account of the leper, who came to Jesus, saying, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," affirms, "And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." The ruler (Matt. ix. 18) came to him, saying, "My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live;" and (v. 25) "He went in and took her by the hand; and the maid arose." So (Matt. xix.) little children were brought unto him, "that he should put his hands on them and pray;" and (v. 15) "He laid *his* hands on them and departed thence." Mark (vi. 5) says of Jesus, "He laid his hands on a few sick folk, and healed them." In vii. 32, he gives the case of the man that was deaf, and had an impediment in his

speech, whom they bring unto him, "and besought him to put his hand upon him." At Bethsaida (viii. 22) they brought a blind man unto him, "and besought him to touch him:" he did put his hands upon him twice, "and he was restored." Omitting similar cases, the four Evangelists mentioning nothing of the imposition of hands, by way of induction to office, we come to The Acts, where, at vi. 6, we have the case of the *seven*, usually styled *deacons*. These men were chosen by the disciples, and "were set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands upon them." *Who* prayed and laid their hands upon them? Suppose it was the disciples, or the apostles, or both these parties: in either case the narrative would be equally intelligible. By common consent, the treasure of the Church, the managing of its finances, had been entrusted to the apostles; and these, perceiving that this interfered with their peculiar mission of testifying to the resurrection of Jesus, the seal of his Messiahship, "called the multitude of the disciples *unto them*, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word." No utterance could be clearer. Between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of tables, the apostles made their choice: for them, ministers, servants of the Word, to turn aside to the ministry; or service, of tables, they declared to be unreasonable; and they advised that seven elect men should be assigned to "this business." What business? Indubitably, the service of tables. They did not ask for help to relieve them from the ministry of the Word; that was not the intolerable, unreasonable burden; but "this business" of serving

tables. To "this business," therefore, the *seven* were assigned: *diakonein trapezais*, to serve tables. Here were seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost (therefore disposed to act justly and kindly), and wisdom (so capable of discernment and good management), with the formal acknowledgment and blessing of the apostles and the whole multitude of the disciples upon them. So, henceforth let *these* have the management of the commissariat, the receiving of the contributions, and the distribution of supplies. No trace of any other office, authority or function is to be found in this short, clear, comprehensive record. If it be asked, Why, then, did the seven preach? It may be replied, if they preached, they had no authority from this transaction. Stephen disputed, wrought miracles, defended himself before a council. Philip, one of the seven, preached, after having been driven out of Jerusalem. So did those who were scattered abroad at the same time, in the same persecution (Acts viii. 4). Apollos preached, and that when he knew only the doctrines of John the Baptist, and assuredly could have had no official appointment to such an office.

We, of this time, are slow to admit that, in the Apostolic days, any Christian preached that experienced an impulse thereto. On the memorable Pentecost, the Holy Ghost descended upon the whole assembly, the entire infant Church; "And they were ALL FILLED with the Holy Ghost, and began to SPEAK with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them UTTERANCE." Acts ii, 4. So, when a multitude had run together, and some, mocking, pronounced them to be full of new wine; Peter, standing up with the eleven, affirmed: "These are not drunken —, but this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." Acts ii. 14-18. And therefore

Paul, I Cor. xiv., "If the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, etc. But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of (by) all, he is judged of (by) all; and thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and REPORT that God is with you of a truth."

In the Primitive Church, preaching and other matters were in much more simplicity than with us.

When Philip had preached the Gospel with great success in Samaria, the apostles, who had managed to remain in Jerusalem, sent thither Peter and John, "who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."

Paul, in a vision (ix. 12), saw "a man named Ananias coming in and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight." And so it occurred. Ananias, putting his hands on him, said, "Brother Saul, the Lord, *even* Jesus, that appeared to thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost." This Ananias was "a certain disciple at Damascus" (ix. 10). Did he *ordain* Paul?

Next, in xiii. 1-3, we have, "Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon (that was called Niger), and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen (which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch), and Saul." Here Paul ranks with the "prophets and teachers;" Barnabas first, Paul last, on the list of the five. Simeon, Lucius and Manaen, are described definitely; Barnabas and Saul are not described. Their history is assumed to be sufficiently known. Who was Barnabas? "Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas (which is,

being interpreted, the son of consolation), a Levite, *and* of the country of Cyprus" (iv. 36). In Christ, Paul's senior, friend, companion; ranking with him in the Church at Antioch, as prophet and teacher. Paul's history up to this time is given us at length.

These five ministered to the Lord, and fasted; and through them it was revealed to the Church, by the Holy Ghost, saying, "Separate me Barnabas — and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Not *ordain*; not *consecrate*; but, *separate*. "And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid *their* hands on them, they sent *them* away." *Who* laid hands on them? If only Simeon, Lucius and Manaen, these were but prophets and teachers. What did they mean by the religious rite of the imposition of hands? What they had been ordered to do, was to separate from their number Barnabas and Saul: to dismiss them for the mission to which they had been called. This they did, laying on hands, as Jacob on his grandsons; as Jesus on the little children; an affectionate and tender commendation to the divine love and care; but not at all in the sense of a modern *ordination*. Omitting two instances of laying on hands for the receiving of the Holy Ghost, xix. 6, and in the healing of the sick, xxviii. 8, as being similar to cases already noted, we leave The Acts, and take up I Tim. iv. 14: "Neglect not the gift (*charisma*) that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." And II Tim. i. 6: "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gift of God (*charisma tou Theou*) which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." This *charisma* that was in him, by the putting on of hands, was scarcely any Church office; but much more likely a spiritual gift, such as Paul desired to impart to the brethren at Rome: "For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift (*charisma*), to the end ye may be established." Rom. i. 11.

Our next instance is Heb. vi. 2. The apostle chiding the disciples for their continuing in an infantile condition exhorts them to "go on to perfection ; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands," etc. Why this collating of baptism and laying on of hands? Is it explained by Acts xix. 5, 6? "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them ; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." This looks much more plausible than to suppose the writer to the Hebrews to have alluded to any imposition of hands in such a ceremony as we call ordination.

The result of our investigation is that the laying on of hands is of frequent mention in the Scriptures, as used in solemn religious ceremonial ; but there is no clear case of doctrine or example, in which it has the significance of investing any one with ecclesiastical office.

---

---

## ORDINATION.

ACTS vi. 6.

THIS word is not in the Accepted English Version. The corresponding verb, *ordain*, occurs with some frequency ; and we propose an inquiry into its Scriptural sense. The ensuing selections will afford opportunity for a correct decision : "It is a continual burnt-offering, which was ordained in Mount Sinai for a sweet

savor, a sacrifice made by fire unto the Lord." Num. xxviii. 6. Here *ordained* renders an inflection of the Hebrew *gnasa*; in LXX. *ginomai*; Vulg. *offero*; Fr. *faire*. "And Jeroboam ordained a feast," etc. I Kings xii. 32. The Hebrew is the same, *gnasa*; LXX. *poieo*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *ordonner*. "And he put down the idolatrous priests, whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense," etc. II Kings xxiii. 5. Heb. *nathan*; LXX. *didomi*; Vulg. *pono*; Fr. *etablir*. "And he ordained him priests for the high places," etc. II Chron. xi. 15. Heb. *gnamad*; LXX. *kathisteemi*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *etablir*. "Also Jehoida appointed the offices of the house of the Lord —, as it was ordained by David." II Chron. xxiii. 18. The word *ordained* being interpolated, in this case, there is no corresponding word in the Hebrew, nor in LXX.; but we have, Vulg. *dispositio*; Fr. *disposition*. "And with the instruments *ordained* by David, King of Israel." II Chron. xxix. 27. A case of interpolation again. Heb. —; LXX. —; Vulg. *præparo*; Fr. *ordonner*. "The Jews ordained, and took upon them, and upon their seed, and upon all such as joined themselves unto them, so as it should not fail, that they would keep these two days according to their writing, and according to their appointed time every year." Esther ix. 27. Heb. *quoom*; LXX. *isteemi*; Vulg. *sustineo*; Fr. *etablir*. "And before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Jer. i. 5. Heb. *nathan*; LXX. *titheemi*; Vulg. *sustineo*; Fr. *etablir*.

So much as to the Old Testament sense of the word ordain; and it is quite certain that neither of the four Hebrew words, *gnasa*, to make; *nathan*, to give; *gnamad*, to stand; *quoom*, to rise, conveys the idea of investing with ministerial function or sacerdotal power. The same may be said of the words from the Greek, Latin and French.



Let us turn now to the New Testament: "And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." Mark iii. 14. Gr. *poieo*; Vulg. *facio*; Fr. *ordonner*. As this is a case of much importance, it may be well to consider this word *POIEO*, rendered here *ordained*. It is used 540 times in the New Testament; and yet this is the only instance in which our Accepted English Version renders it by our English word *ordain*: and though it might seem plausible that our Lord might have used some solemn form of investiture, in the case of the Twelve; and so the Evangelist might have used the word *poieo* in the churchly sense of *ordain*; yet this word is used with reference to him, where it cannot have this meaning. For example, Mark vi. 5: "And he could there *do* (*poiesai*) no mighty work," etc. John iv. 1: "When, therefore, the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made (*poiei*) and baptized more disciples than John." John v. 18: "Making (*poion*) himself equal with God." John vi. 14: "When they had seen the miracle that Jesus *did* (*epoieese*)." Here we have not only *poieo*, but in the very same inflection, *epoieese*, as in Mark ii. 14. So in John vii: "Because I have made (*epoieesa*) a man every whit whole," etc. In John xiii. we have a narrative of the Lord's washing the disciples' feet, the Evangelist using *poieo* some five times: where, selecting the 15th verse, we have: "For I have given you an example, that ye *should do* (*poiete*) as I have done (*epoieesa*) unto you." A multitude of such selections might be given; but it cannot be necessary. The Greek *poieo* corresponds to the Latin *facio*; and its use in Mark iii. 14 is rendered in the Vulg. by *facio*: the general sense of each of these two words being to *do*, shading into *to make*, *to constitute*, etc. It is quite certain, then, that by *epoieese* Mark did not signify that the Lord *ordained* the Twelve in our ecclesiastical sense

of that word ; but that he *appointed* the Twelve, "that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." He appointed them to what? To a position near his person ; his attendants ; his suite. Our Accepted English Version renders *poieo* by appoint, Heb. iii. 2, where, referring to the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, the Scripture declares, "Who was faithful to him that appointed (*poiesanti*) him, as also Moses *was faithful* in all his house."

The next instance of the occurrence of the word *ordain*, is John xv. 16 — "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained (*etheka*) you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit," etc. Gr. *titheemi*, Vulg. *pono*, Fr. *etablir*. *Titheemi* means generally, *to put, to place, to assign, to constitute*, etc. Jesus had selected the twelve—had assigned them a position ; for what purpose? "That they should go (preaching) and bring forth fruit (have success)."

We meet *ordain* next in Acts i. 22 — "Must one be ordained (*genesthai*) to be a witness with us of his resurrection." Gr. *ginomai*, Vulg. *fito*, Fr. *etre*. This is an interesting and lucid instance. We copy Dr. Adam Clarke's note : "This translation misleads every reader who cannot examine the original text. There is no term for *ordained* in the Greek ; *genesthai, to be*, is the only word in the verse to which this interpretation can be applied. The New Testament printed at London, by Robert Barker, the king's printer, in 1615, renders this and the preceding verse more faithfully and more clearly than our common version : 'Wherefore of these men who have companied with us, all the time that the Lord Jesus was conversant among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day he was taken up from us, must one of them BE MADE a witness with us, of his resurrection.' The word *ordained* would nat-

urally lead most readers to suppose that some *ecclesiastical rite* was used on the occasion, such as *imposition of hands*, etc., although nothing of the kind appears to have been employed."—*Clarke's New Testament*. We add merely that the Gr. *ginomai*, the L. *fit*, and the Fr. *etre*, have about the same significance—to be, to become, to exist; and Luke meant that Peter affirmed that "one of these men" must "become a witness, with the remnant of the twelve, of his resurrection."

Coming on to Acts x. 42: "And to testify that it is he which was ordained (*orismenos*) of God to be the judge of quick and dead." Gr. *orizo*, Vulg. *constituo*, Fr. *destiner*. *Orizo* is defined, to determine, decree, appoint, set, its etymon being *oros*, a bound, a limit; as if the judgship of quick and dead had been divinely limited to "Jesus of Nazareth" and therefore he had been divinely appointed to that office. The L., *constituo*, is defined, to set, put, range, establish, constitute, appoint, etc. For the Fr. *destiner*, we have to *destine*, to fate, etc. There is nothing here of any *rite* of investiture.

Acts xiii. 48: "And as many as were ordained (*tetagmenoi*) to eternal life believed." Gr. *tatto*, Vulg. *præordino*, Fr. *destiner*. There is no question of any rite of investiture here, and we might pass the passage without further notice, but for its relation to another subject. *Tatto*, to appoint, order, a verb used eight times in the New Testament, and in no instance in the sense of election, or predestination, to eternal life. Its ideal force is *arrangement, order, disposition*, and not *destiny*. Dr. Parkhurst, who closely, carefully, patiently studied this passage, translates it: "*And as many as were disposed, adapted, or in a right disposition and preparation, for eternal life, believed.*" The Jews were prejudiced against Jesus as a Saviour from sin unto eternal life, desiring and expecting a temporary

Saviour; but the Gentiles, who were the believers referred to in the passage, had no such prejudice and expectation, and as many of them as were disposed to a salvation from sin unto eternal life, accepted the preaching and believed. Such is the substance of Dr. P.'s discussion in his lexicon, and with it Dr. Clarke fully coincides, in his able note, in his commentary.

We may remark, further, that in Rom. xiii. 1 this same participle is used: "The powers that be are ordained (*tetagmenai*) of God." In the following verse, 2d, the apostle says, "Whosoever, therefore, resisteth (*antitassomenos*) the power, resisteth (*anhesteken*) the ordinance (*diatagei*), of God; and they that resist (*oi de anhestekotes*) shall receive to themselves damnation." This *antitassomenos* is a compound of *anti*, *against*, and *tatto*, *to appoint, place, set*, etc., having the same root with *tetagmenai* or—*oi*: the latter rendered *ordained* in verse 1, and the former *resisteth* in verse 2, while *anhesteken* and *anhestekotes* are also rendered *resisteth* and *resist* in verse 2 as synonymous, which is the case with *antitassomenos*. But *anhesteken* and *anhestekotes* are from *anhisteemi*, a compound of *anti*, *against*, and *isteemi*, *to place, set, appoint*, etc. Does the apostle mean that the man *resisting, setting himself against the powers that be* (existing by divine providence) does so by a divine decree? and "receiveth to himself damnation," for obeying the divine decree?

Besides, in verse 1, "Let every soul be subject (*upotassestho*) unto the powers that be," *upotassestho* is a compound of *upo*, *under*, and this same *tatto*, *to appoint, place, set*, etc., the apostle meaning that every Christian should consider himself to be under the authority of divine providence, and should so live, as a matter of conscience: he being held responsible to the government and to God, for so doing or so not doing. It is no divine decree that fixes him in the right; but

his own enlightened conscience and choice: and as many as are disposed to a reasonable, conscientious course, obey the injunction of this Scripture to this day.

Acts xiv. 23: "And when they had ordained them (*cheirotoneesantes de autois*) elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." Gr. *cheirotoneo*, Vulg. *constituo*, Fr. *etablir*. *Cheirotoneo*, from *cheir*, the hand, and *teino*, to extend, stretch out, or lift up, the hand. To choose by vote or suffrage, etc. From the history of the case, and the meaning of the word, the most probable meaning of the passage is, that Paul and Barnabas superintended an election of such brethren as had the confidence of each church referred to, to serve as elders; then they prayed with fasting, and took leave of them. The phraseology of John iv. 1, 2, is in point: "The Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples)." According to common parlance, the Pharisees spoke of the act of the *agent*, as being the act of their *principal*, and properly.

The only other case of the use of *cheirotoneo* is II Cor. viii. 19: "Who was also chosen (*cheirotoneethis*) of the churches to travel with us," etc. A brother was nominated to accompany Paul, and the churches voted in affirmation. A plain statement of a plain case. Acts x. 41, *prokecheirotonemenois*, is rendered in A. E. V. *chosen before*. This word is a participle of *procheirotoneo*. *Cheirotoneo*, in the New Testament, does not mean to invest with office, but to elect.

Acts. xvi. 4: "They delivered them the decrees — that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem." Gr. *krino*, Vulg. *decerno*, Fr. *decreter*. No delay is needed here. We pass to the last instance in Acts.

Acts xvii. 31: "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by

*that* man whom he hath ordained (*orise*).” As this word, *orizo*, has already been examined, at Acts x. 42, it is only proper to hint that this is a strictly parallel case.

We have now arrived at the Epistle to the Romans.

Rom. vii. 10: “And the commandment, which *was ordained* to life,” etc. Was ordained is interpolated. If it were not it could not signify a rite of investing with office.

Rom. xiii. 1: “The powers that be are ordained (*tetagmenai*) of God.” Gr. *tatto*, Vulg. *ordino*, Fr. *ordonner*. No question here of any official investiture.

I Cor. ii. 7: “Which God ordained (*proorise*) before the world,” etc. God pre-ordained the hidden wisdom, the calling of the Gentiles, before the Mosaic dispensation. Nothing of any investiture.

I Cor. vii. 17: “As the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I (*diatasomai*) in all the churches.” The apostle was recommending, that, in the case of a married couple, if one only should believe, the believer should not separate from the unbeliever; but “if the unbelieving depart, let him depart.” He says that in this *he* speaks, “not the Lord.” He only advises, then; and this is what he means by *diatasomai*. If it is not, he certainly means no investiture.

I Cor. ix. 14: “Even so hath the Lord ordained (*diataxe*) that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.” Same Greek word as in the last instance.

Gal. iii. 19: “Wherefore, then, *serveth* the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made, *and it was ordained* (*diatageis*) by angels in the hand of a mediator.” The law was ordained by the instrumentality of angels. Same Greek word.

Eph. ii. 10: "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained (*proetoimase*) that we should walk in them." Gr. *proetoimazo*; Vulg. *præparo*; Fr. *preparer*. This word *proetoimazo* occurs twice in the New Testament; in this Eph. ii. 10, where it is rendered *before ordained*; and Rom. ix. 23, rendered *afore prepared*. The Latin *præparo* gives the true sense of the Greek: as in Cicero's phrase, *ad vitam degendam præparare res necessarias*: to prepare the things necessary to livelihood. The calling of the Gentiles, to live in the purity of, actuated by faith in, the Gospel of Christ, was an item in the original arrangement of the divine plan of salvation.

I Tim. ii. 7: "Whereunto I am ordained (*etethen*) a preacher and an apostle, —, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity." Gr. *titheemi*; Vulg. *pono*; Fr. *etabli*. We have already studied this word *titheemi*, at John xv. 16, and seen that it means *to put, to place, to assign, to constitute*, etc. There is no Scriptural account of the ordination of Paul, or of any other apostle, in the ecclesiastical sense of that word.

Titus i. 5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain (*katasteeses*) elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." Gr. *kathisteemi*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *etabli*. The Greek word is well rendered by the Latin *constituo* and the French *etabli*. Titus was to attend to the election of elders in every city, and to their being constituted in their official position: as Paul and Barnabas had done, Acts xiv. 23. It is not probable that Titus had greater authority than Paul and Barnabas.

Heb. v. 1: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained (*kathistatai*) for men (*huper anthropoon*) in things *pertaining to God*, that he may

offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." Gr. *kathisteemi*; Vulg. *constituo*; Fr. *etablir*. It is remarkable that, in our citations, our Accepted English Version has rendered *kathisteemi* by *ordain*, in three instances—II Chron. xi. 15; Titus i. 5; and in this Heb. v. 1; while in each case the Vulg. renders by *constituo*, and the Fr. by *etablir*. The high priest was put in the stead of men (*hyper anthropoon*), to offer, as their lieutenant, or substitute, the gifts, and sacrifices for sins, due from men to God. As their substitute, when the high priest offered the gifts and sacrifices, it was as though the men themselves had offered them; while the high priest was thus the type of the Great High Priest, Jesus, who offered the great sacrifice of himself for us (instead of us) all. Which is the apostle's argument in the case.

Heb. ix. 6, "Now when these things were thus ordained (*kataskewasmenon*)," etc. Gr. *kataskewazo*; Vulg. *compono*; Fr. *disposer*. *Kataskewazo* signifies *to prepare, make ready, adjust*; and, evidently, it has that signification here; as the reference is to the arrangements in the tabernacle, for the fulfilment of the high priest's office.

Jude 4, "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained (*progegrammenoi*) to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness," etc. Gr. *prographo*; Vulg. *præscribo*; Fr. *ecrire*. There is certainly no allusion to official investiture here.

We have examined fifteen Greek words in the Old and New Testaments, all rendered *ordain* or *foreordain*, in our Accepted English Version: *ginomai, poieo, didoomi, kathisteemi, isteemi, titheemi, orizo, proorizo, tatto, diatatto, keirotoneo, krino, proetoimazo, kataskewazo, prographo*: not one of which signifies such a rite or ceremony, as the existing ceremony of ecclesiastical ordination: their proper scriptural sense being to



*place, put, appoint, assign*: and we conclude that our modern idea of ordination was unknown to the beautiful simplicity of the Church in the apostolic times. Where are we to look, then, for its origin? In the gradual innovation that occurred in the after ages: and, therefore, while we cannot discover it in Scripture, there is no difficulty in finding it in the literature of those after ages. Let us now turn to Worcester's large and excellent Dictionary, at the word *ordain*:

ORDAIN (*L. ordino, ordo, order*; *It. ordinare, Sp. ordenar, Fr. ordonner*).

1. To appoint; to decree; to set apart. Acts xiii. 48; "And as many as were ordained to eternal life," etc.

2. To establish; to settle; to institute; to enact; to order; to prescribe; to enjoin.—*Milton*.

3. To invest or institute with ministerial function or sacerdotal power.—*Stillingfleet, Hook*.

Syn. appoint.

Dr. Johnson, the pioneer in modern English lexicography, and who was of High Church principles, gives four definitions of *ordain*:

1. To appoint; to decree.—*Shakspeare, I Kings, Acts, Waller, Dryden, Prior*.

2. To establish; to settle; to institute.—*Shakspeare, I Chronicles, Milton, Dryden*.

3. To set in office.—*Esther*.

4. To invest with ministerial function or sacerdotal power.—*Stillingfleet*.

His first, second, third definitions are sustained by citations from Holy Scripture, his fourth from ecclesiastical lore. Why did he not also sustain his fourth definition by a citation from Holy Scripture? It was impossible.

## APOLLOS.

ACTS xviii. 24-28.—A certain Jew named Apollos.

THIS person is mentioned but twice in The Acts, seven times in I Corinthians, once in Titus. Why, where so many thousands of names of devoted believers do not, does this one's name appear? Perhaps to mention him, was important to the illustration of certain facts in the history of the primitive churches. He comes into the notice of the reader, here, for the first time; and, as "a certain Jew," as never before heard of. From whence does he come? Nobody knows. It is stated, to be sure, that he was "born at Alexandria:" but it was long before this: for he appears as an educated, eloquent, full-grown man, "mighty in the Scriptures:" and had arrived at Ephesus, instructed in the way of the Lord; but knowing only the baptism of John: i. e. the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Being mighty in the Scriptures, he did not stumble at the teaching of John, that in Messiah's day, a great spiritual change to the condition of the "new heart," would be required. Nicodemus, mighty in the traditions that made the word of God of none effect, was not so apt a scholar as this Scripture-versed Apollos. "Being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord \* \* \* And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue." Now there is something interesting in this unpretending incident. Who had given authority to preach the things (*ta*) of the Lord (*peri tou Ieesou* is the better reading) to this man who knew "only the baptism of John?" Most assuredly not the apostles. Where then did his authority originate? "Being fervent

in the spirit," he spake what he knew, he taught what he knew; and that in the synagogue; where another "certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla," heard him; both heard him; and, pleased with his eloquence, and boldness; but perceiving his very defective knowledge; "they took him unto them." He went home with this good man and his wife; these companions, hosts, fellow laborers at tent-making, of the illustrious and learned Paul. Apollos went with those, at whose house, the great apostle had lodged and labored, during the opening of his ministry at Corinth: who had sailed with him thence into Syria, and were left by him at Ephesus, where they had found Apollos preaching in the synagogue. Aquila and Priscilla being so well acquainted with the learned Paul, from their more than eighteen months' familiar intercourse with him, knew all that was known in their day of the doctrine and order of the Christian congregations, or churches; and we listen attentively to the sacred historian, as he proceeds with his narrative. Well, as he had no authority to preach from the apostles, for such a supposition is absurd, do they rebuke him for such irregular proceeding? Do they express any astonishment at his impertinence and foolhardiness in running before he was sent? Do they send him off in search of an apostle, to be instructed and ordained? Do they represent to him the enormity of parading about the country, as an unordained minister? Not a word of the kind. They took him home with them, "and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly."

Here is the first theological student, Apollos; the first theological professors, Aquila and Priscilla, a layman and his wife; and the building occupied, was their own tent-makers' shop, where, possibly, Paul had reposed his weary head, before he had left these worthy

professors in Ephesus. Professor Aquila and Professor Priscilla, in all probability, taught the same branch, as the theology of that day had not departed so exuberantly as this of our times. The tongues of Pentecost were wonderfully departed, but every part spoke the same simple, sublime story. The grand theology of that day was that Jesus was risen from the dead, and was Lord and Christ, and whosoever believeth in him shall have remission of sins. At all events, this layman and his wife understood "the way of God;" taught it to Apollos; and what then? Did they not send him off, now, when graduated in theology, to an apostle, to be ordained, legitimately inducted into an order of the clergy; made a deacon, elder, bishop, or something? Nothing of the sort. But, "when he was disposed to pass (*boulomenou de autou dielthein*) into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting (*protepsamenoï*, urging) the disciples to receive him." The brethren, the saints, the believers at Ephesus, wrote, exhorting the disciples in Achaia to receive this unordained man; whom they had not sent; but who was disposed to go, chose to go, "being fervent in the spirit," feeling an impulse to itinerate, and therefore, unordained as he was, he went. And when he arrived, he "helped them much which had believed through grace: for he mightily (*eutonoos*, intensely) convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ." The professors had done their work well; and their accomplished theologian, though without apostolic ordination or sanction, built up in their most holy faith, the believers in Achaia, showing by the Scriptures, in which he was so mighty (*dunatos*), even previous to his theological course under the grand proto-professors at Ephesus; that, notwithstanding the Jewish traditional objections, Jesus the loving Saviour, was the Christ. An argument this in favor of teaching theology, by

those who understand it, to those who do not, and who propose to preach "the things of the Lord." The mistake, if any, of Apollos, was not preaching without ordination; for nothing in the whole incident, intimates any necessity for this in the primitive church; but his commencing with his defective knowledge. Who knows, but that those imperfect disciples, found soon after by Paul at Ephesus (*Acts* xix. 1-12), who had not heard of the Holy Ghost, were the fruits of the ministry of Apollos, before his good professors graduated him; there being no proof that he preached in that city, after his instruction, before he was "disposed to pass into Achaia:" and if he did, we cannot know that the disciples referred to heard him. It is better that preachers should understand "the things of the Lord," before they commence preaching. The brief history of Apollos shows this, in connection with his curriculum under the supervision of these two of the laity, the proto-professors of Christian theology; whose graduate, awakened such an attention at Corinth, as even to peril the laurels of the wonderful Paul; I Cor. iii. 4-11.

Our aim, thus far, has been to show, that the divine history does not exhibit the apostles, as the source of authority for preaching the word: this Apollos arriving and preaching at Ephesus, and then at Corinth, under circumstances absolutely forbidding such a hypothesis. Like the thousands "scattered abroad" by the "great persecution," *Acts* viii., who "went everywhere preaching the word" without any ecclesiastical authority; so itinerated Apollos; with one grand item in favor of the thousands, they were better instructed: and this makes the case of Apollos to be very remarkable.

But, if he had no authority from the apostles to preach, had they any control over him after his having been instructed by the layman and his intelligent wife? There is very little more of his history given, but that

little bears important testimony on this very point. At *I Cor.* xvi. 12, Paul informs the Corinthians, to many of whom Apollos was very dear, "As touching *our* brother Apollos (*peri de Apolloo tou adelphou*, but as to Apollos the brother, brother Apollos), I greatly desired him (*polla parekalesa auton*, I besought him, I urged many pleas that he should go, "I greatly desired" not being strong enough to indicate that Paul entreated him) to come unto you with the brethren: but his will was not at all to come at this time; (*kai pantoos ouk een theleema hina nun eltheei*, but wholly not was a will that now he should come. He would not listen to, i. e. heed, the entreaties of Paul: he had not the least idea of going to Corinth at that time;) "but he will come when he shall have convenient time" (*hotan eukaireeseei*). As the time then suited Paul, "the convenient time" of the passage refers to the plans of Apollos; and indicates his independence of the apostle, not only as to his authority to preach, but also as to projecting and accomplishing his plans of ministration. Surely Paul was not the man to decide that it was very important, to have Apollos go then to Corinth; and having authority to send him, waste his time in vain entreaties (*polla parekalesa auton*). He would have said, Go; and Apollos would have hurried his going. It looks very likely that the difference between a centurion and an apostle was marked out by the One Master, when he affirmed, "But it shall not be so among you." *Matth.* xx. 26. So far as the record goes, it is clear, that Paul had no more authority to send Apollos to Corinth, or anywhere else; than Apollos, to send Paul. Read again, "but he will come when he shall have convenient time;" and it must be admitted, that this sounds very like, "but he will come when it shall suit him." Apollos possibly, we might say, probably, very likely, had his plan of operation

adjusted according to his own views of duty ; and was unwilling, wholly and positively (*pantoos*) unwilling to have Paul or any other interrupt him : and, so, he would not be interrupted.

There is but one more incident to be mentioned ; that at Titus iii. 13. The apostle writing to Titus, directs him, near the close of his letter, "Bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them." Probably, Zenas and Apollos intended journeying in company : to what point is left unmentioned : but Paul having knowledge of the intention of Zenas, and of this man who went when he was "disposed to go," *Acts* xviii. 27, and when "his will was not at all to come at this time," staid where he was until it suited him to go elsewhere ; desires Titus, who was to Paul as a son (*Titus* i. 4), to show the lawyer and the preacher great and equal respect. For so we are to understand, "Bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their journey diligently (*spoudaioos propempson*), that nothing be wanting to them." This word *propempoo*, is defined, "In N. T. to send forward on one's journey, to bring one on his way, to accompany for some distance in token of respect and honor." *Robinson*. Of Zenas we know nothing, but what is contained in this brief verse: he was a lawyer ; probably was about to travel with Apollos ; and Paul directs Titus, "his own son after the common faith," to show him marked respect and honor. But our knowledge of Apollos, though limited, exceeds this by so far, that we know that he was a preacher of "the things of the Lord," without having understood them properly, and, of course, without any authority from any apostle ; unordained ; better informed by the judicious interference and instruction of Aquila and Priscilla ; carrying letters from the brethren at Ephesus to those of Corinth, where he labored so efficiently as to rival Paul

in the esteem of the saints ; refusing flatly and persistently to be at the disposal of an apostle, independently judging for himself in coming and going ; and now we see Paul writing to Titus, to pay great respect and honor to this wilful, unordained itinerant. So closes the scene with our interesting, talented Apollos.

But this was the olden time ; in which we have been searching for the true Christian antiquity ; which is not to be found this side The Acts. That men have the right, now, to wander about, at other people's expense, under pretense of preaching the word, though unordained, unauthorized by any Christian body ; by no means follows from the facts we have been discussing. We have been seeking to explore the church facts of the divine history : that we may not be imposed upon by certain matters of ritual claimed to have their warrant in those facts. So, that we may cheerfully accept the plea of our Christian brethren, to suit themselves in such matters, as they have a right to do : but when they claim our adhesion to them, on the plea of antiquity, that we may decline with a smile, affirming that we know better ; we know their pretended antiquities to be novelties, as is proved by the record.

But the order of the church with which one is connected, he is bound in honor to conform to, as an orderly, decent member. He may properly consider and discuss the order ; but while it exists, he should carefully and respectfully conform to it ; as being the product of the common judgment ; and the man who roams about preaching without the authority of his church ; gives very strong evidence, that he is unfit to be entrusted with such functions. No peer of Apollos would, in our day, suddenly appear as " a certain somebody," preaching to Aquilas and Priscillas understanding the gospel so much better than himself ; as to be compelled by mere pity, to take him home with them and teach him his alphabet : i. e. the alphabet of the gospel.



## WAS AGRIPPA ALMOST PERSUADED?

ACTS xxvi. 28, 29.—Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, except these bonds.

VERY able critics have objected to this reading; but we think the defense displays at least equal, if not greater ability. It is thought that the king was not at all impressed by Paul's defense; or if somewhat so at first, he soon dismissed the case with the sneering remark, that it was with a little argument that Paul was persuading him to be a Christian. The force of *en oligooi* in contrast with *en megalooi*, which is held to be a reading preferred to *en pollooi*, is urged as supporting the hypothesis that the words were "spoken ironically and in contempt." *Conyb. and How.* ii. 306. But Chrysostom, who preached in Greek, and certainly understood the force of *en oligooi*, decides against this. Suppose we proceed thus: *oligooi* being an adjective, the phrase *en oligooi me peitheis* (in a little thou persuadest me), is elliptical, and a masculine or neuter noun is to be supplied to complete the expression. Let us then supply *meroi*, dative of *meros*, meaning a *part*. In that case, Agrippa meant to admit that some impression had been made upon him by Paul's discourse: he was persuaded to some extent to be a Christian; in a little part at least. This gives occasion to Paul to affirm his prayer "that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both to some little extent, and to a great extent such as I am, except these bonds." Chrysostom's almost and altogether, as in our Version, agree, certainly, better with Paul's conclusion, than our *meros*,

or the alleged irony: and such a man as Paul merits that construction upon his words, which makes them consist with his conclusion. It is evident that he wished Agrippa and all who heard him, to be altogether such as himself was, "except these bonds." They were the only difference he desired to exist between them and himself: so that, of necessity, we must understand *kai en oligooi kai en pollooi* (or *en megalooi*, if we prefer that reading) to make up the sense "altogether such as I am."

Add, too, the consultation. "And when he had thus spoken, the king rose up, and the governor, and Bernice, and they that sat with them (the chief captains, and principal men of the city): and when they were gone aside, they talked between themselves, saying this man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds. Then said Agrippa, This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar." This does not comport with a sneer, or irony, on the part of Agrippa, or the council. They hear his plea with intense attention; Festus is so carried away with it, that he thought the prisoner's astonishing erudition had deranged his mind, and caused him to imagine the wondrous vision of the way to Damascus, sustaining him in his affirmation, that "one Jesus, who was dead, was again alive;" and then they retired, consulted together, and unanimously acquitted him of anything worthy of death, or even of bonds. No room here for any sneer or irony. Everything has the air of seriousness and respect. The heathen Festus, was serious in his amazement at the recital of wonders beyond his comprehension. Agrippa was serious, hearing only statements, that agreed with the prophets whose writings he believed. The magnates of the army and city were serious, listened attentively, consulted respectfully, and sedately voted him innocent. Then said Agrippa, "This man

might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar:" and he seems to have spoken the mind of the whole council.

Conybeare and Howson, in *The Life and Epistles of Saint Paul*, p. 675, render, "Thou wilt soon persuade me to be a Christian." And add, "The words were doubtless spoken ironically and in contempt: but Paul took them as though they had been spoken in earnest, and made that noble answer, which expresses, as no other words ever expressed them, that union of enthusiastic zeal with genuine courtesy, which is the true characteristic of 'a Christian.' I would to God, that whether soon or late, not only thou, but also all who hear me to-day, were such as I am; excepting these chains." In a foot note, "The phrase here cannot mean '*almost*,' as it is in the Authorized Version. It might mean either '*in few words*' (Eph. iii. 3), or '*in a small measure*,' or '*in a small time*.' The latter (last) meaning agrees best with the following, '*in little or in much*.' We might render the passage thus: 'Thou thinkest to make me a Christian with little persuasion.' We should observe that the verb is in the present tense, and that the title 'Christian' was one of contempt. See I Pet. iv. 16." Thus we have four modes in which the passage might be rendered, of which the respected critics have chosen, as they say, the equivalent of the best, "Thou wilt soon persuade," etc. Yet, why "*almost*" is impossible, or why their four modes are possible, they assign no reason. Nor do they seem to notice their impossible rendering of *euxameen an tooi Theooi kai en oligooi kai en megalooi*, "I would to God, that whether soon or late:" making Paul to pray for one or the other of two preliminaries; whereas the construction *kai . . . kai* requires us to understand him to pray for both. "The formula *kai . . . kai* is used when the writer from the very first conceives both members as co-ordinate, *et . . .*

*et* (both . . . and ; as well . . . as).” *Winer*, 439. “The copulative is often used with both of the connected members : thus *kai . . . kai* ; *kai kata geen kai kata thalassan* both by land and by sea” *Hadley*, 309. “In the N. T. *kai* is never put for *ee* (or).” *Winer*, 440. So we judge “soon or late” to be inadmissible : while “both soon and late” would be manifestly absurd.

But, what real difference is there between “thou wilt soon persuade me to be a Christian,” and “almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian ?” As we are reminded to “observe that the verb (*peitheis*) is in the present tense,” the latter would appear to be the preferable rendering : though we think no stress need be laid upon the tense of the verb.

That the words were spoken ironically and in contempt, we have already shown to be inconsistent with the detailed facts of the occasion : but that Paul mistook the import of Agrippa’s words, is utterly unlikely. He was present, earnestly regarding the king’s countenance, tone of voice, entire manner, and was quite capable of understanding his utterance. Why then should these scholarly critics, venture the opinion, that the king doubtless spoke ironically and in contempt ; but Paul took the words as though they had been spoken in earnest ?

Can it be that C. and H. mean, that Paul knew, to be sure, that the words were ironical and contemptuous, but overlooking that fact, cunningly took them as though they had been spoken in earnest ? What then becomes of the critic’s compliment to the apostle ? Was such a trick as they charge upon him, a “noble answer, which expresses, as no other words ever expressed them, that union of enthusiastic zeal with genuine courtesy, which is the true characteristic of a Christian ?” They could not have meant to charge the apostle with such a paltry trick ; but considered him to have mistaken the import

of the king's words. On what ground, they do not state. Certainly he was not incapable of understanding them; there is nothing to warrant a suspicion that he was not earnestly attending to them; and he had the fullest opportunity for a correct judgment in the case; while we, at least, are quite sure, that it is by far more likely that the mistake in the case, is on the part of C. and H., who were absent; than on the part of the chained prisoner, who was present. If Agrippa's *en oligooi me peitheis Christianon genesthai*, was merely a contemptuous POOH! the solemn council and decision ensuing were absurdities.

But, there is a word to be said upon a point not yet examined. Upon the hypothesis of sneer and irony, it would be necessary to suppose, that Paul's speech was an effort, to persuade Agrippa to be a Christian. "With little effort (with feeble means) thou persuadest me to become (*genesthai*) a Christian." *Lange*. But Paul's argument was nothing of the sort. There is no evidence that he intended or attempted such a thing. It was in his own behalf, by permission of Festus, and at the request of Agrippa. "Then Agrippa said unto Festus, I would also hear the man myself. To-morrow, said he, thou shalt hear him." And on that morrow, the council assembled with great pomp, and Paul was brought before them. "Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Thou art permitted to speak for thyself." Thou art permitted to defend thyself from the accusations of thy people. "Then Paul \* \* \* answered for himself; I think myself happy, King Agrippa, because I shall answer for myself this day before thee touching all the things whereof I am accused by the Jews: especially because I know thee to be expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews: wherefore I beseech thee to hear me patiently." Here we have his plan; his statement of what would be the aim of his discourse: to

answer for himself; to refute the charges brought against him by the Jews, charges of crime that demanded his life as a righteous forfeit, they said: but not a word of any intention to persuade Agrippa, or any one else, to be a Christian. And, moreover, it is clear that he proceeded regularly and logically, to carry out his intention; declaring that he had said "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles." At this point, Festus, to whom the rising from the dead was incomprehensible, interrupted Paul; saying in a loud voice, Paul thou art beside thyself, much learning doth make thee mad. Paul, having respectfully denied the madness, and affirmed the truth and soberness of the argument, he had presented in his defense against the Jews; appealed to Agrippa for a verification of his facts and argument.

Then it was that Agrippa said to Paul, "*en oligoōi me peitheis Christianon genesthai.*" Translate this, now, "With little effort (with feeble means) thou persuadest me to be a Christian," and what relevancy is there, to what had occurred? The point was not whether Paul with little or great or any effort had persuaded the king to be a Christian; but whether the prisoner before him, had uttered madness, or "words of truth and soberness." How any one can see a consistency of such a hypothesis with the facts of the incident, we cannot conceive.

Take then the present rendering, "Almost thou persuadest ME to be a Christian:" i. e. you have not only exonerated yourself from the accusation of the Jews, of hostility to and subversion of the sacred Oracles of your country, but you have so clearly pointed out your doctrine of a suffering Christ and his rising from the dead,

that you have almost persuaded ME to be a Christian like thyself. Upon which Paul exclaimed, "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am (i. e. a Christian), except these bonds." Upon which the council retires, considers the case, acquits the prisoner, and the king is so convinced of the truth of Paul's defense, that he declares it would be useless to detain him further, but for his own appeal.

The remark of Agrippa, and Paul's comment are entirely incidental. This is clear. The speech was not an effort to persuade the king to be a Christian, but to defend the prisoner, accused by the Jews, his countrymen, of high crimes against their laws, and in whose "customs and questions," Agrippa was expert. It is not likely that Luke gives us the entire speech. Such an orator, in such a case, with such profound and vast knowledge, his life in peril, and the splendid auditory assembled especially to hear his defense of himself; doubtless he expatiated on the points, condensed by the historian into a proper and satisfactory summary. This is the case with speeches given by historians: they gathering the records of statements of what was said, as to substance, and framing a speech accordingly. We are to suppose, therefore, that Paul, in such a presence, the king acquainted with and respecting the writings of the prophets, enlarged into details where Luke gives mere points; and upon this fact grounded his appeal to the king, for the truth and soberness of his argument, when the governor in ignorance of the prophets had affirmed such arguments to be the ravings of insanity. This was all that was proposed by Paul to Agrippa. "The king before whom I speak freely knoweth of these things;" he knows that I have presented a fair argument, founded upon the accredited predictions of the prophets and of our great leader Moses; all demonstrating, that, in being

a Christian, I am so far from being a heretic, that I must be acknowledged to be intelligently orthodox, and guilty of no crime against the Jews. If the king chose to respond to this appeal, there was nothing required but to give his testimony pro or con, as to the prisoner's claim to consistency with the prophets and Moses. The fair construction of his reply, taken in connection with Paul's remark upon it, is, that he so fully admits the appeal, that the able, complete argument of the prisoner being in such strict conformity to the prophets and Moses, had not only vindicated the accused, but had almost made a Christian of himself. Would to God, exclaims Paul, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost, and altogether such as I am, a Christian, but not in bonds. All this is natural, reasonable.

Let us now test another rendering: "With little effort thou persuadest me to become a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both with little effort and great such as I am, except these bonds." There had been no effort to make a Christian of the king; the effort of the prisoner was to vindicate himself: and yet the king is made to declare himself *persuaded* to become a Christian! For this is the force of *peithoo*, as may be satisfactorily proved. Its very first occurrence in the N. T. shows this; "But the chief priests and elders persuaded (*epeisan*) the multitude that they should ask Barabbas," etc. *Matth.* xxvii. 20. At *ver.* 43 of the same chapter, we have, "He trusted (*pepoithen*) in God; let him deliver," etc. And again, "And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade (*peisomen*) him, and secure you." *Matth.* xxviii. 14. We pass on to The Acts; "Theudas \* \* \* who was slain; and all, as many as obeyed him (*epeithonto autooi*, were persuaded by him), were scattered," etc. *Acts* v. 36.



“Judas \* \* \* also perished ; and all, even as many as obeyed him (*epeithonto autooi*), were dispersed.” *Acts* v. 37. “And to him (Gamaliel) they agreed (*epeistheesan de autooi*) : and when they had called the apostles,” etc. *Ibid.* 40. Passing several similar instances, we cite, “And when he (Paul) would not be persuaded (*mee peithomenou de autou*), we ceased (beseeching him, *ver.* 12,) saying, The will of the Lord be done.” *Acts* xxi. 14. The reader will notice, that Luke does not write, that his friends persuaded Paul “not to go up to Jerusalem,” but “both we, and they of that place, besought him not to go up to Jerusalem ; and that Paul “would not be persuaded :” which distinguishes very clearly between “besought” (*parekaloumen*), and “persuaded” (*peithomenou*). “Paul’s sister’s son,” having informed the “chief captain” of the plot for murdering his uncle, part of which was that the Jews would request that officer to bring down his prisoner into the council, as if for a further examination, urges, “But do not thou yield (*mee peistheeis*) unto them,” etc. *Acts* xxiii. 21. This, surely, is sufficient to exhibit the force of the king’s “persuadest,” and our hypthotic reading, makes him to rate the apostle’s speech as a “little effort,” and yet quite enough to convince himself of the propriety of becoming a Christian ; leaving us to infer, that, as it required such “little effort” to determine him, he was “almost persuaded” before the “little effort” commenced. Not very likely, to judge from the history. And then, if the king was “persuaded” by the “little effort,” what sense is there in the prisoner’s final remark ? See also *Xen. Op. V. 294*.

Then, another of the proposed readings : “But slightly (that is, not at all) do you persuade me to be a Christian. And Paul said, I wish you were not only slightly, but largely (that is, entirely) a Christian.” But Paul does not put the acme of his wish that the king

should be "largely a Christian;" but "such as I am, except these bonds;" and no one can speak or even think of Paul as "largely (that is, entirely) a Christian." Largely is far from entirely: it cannot mean entirely. And we cannot consent to such a changing of the terms: there must be a consistency in the reading; which would require it to be; "But slightly (that is, not at all) do you persuade me to be a Christian. And Paul said, I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both but slightly (that is, not at all) and largely (that is, entirely) such as I am, except these bonds." A reading certainly indefensible. How could thou and also all that hear me this day, be both not at all and entirely such as I am, except these bonds? Paul never expressed such a wish; or, such a prayer. His speech had made a deep impression upon the king, the governor, and the other members of the council. They were convinced that any further investigation would be unnecessary. In the most serious manner they withdrew to take counsel together; and declared unanimously, that the prisoner had vindicated himself triumphantly: the king adding his decided opinion, that the accused might be set at liberty, without holding him for trial at all, had he not appealed to the high court of Cæsar. So we dismiss this reading also, as unallowable.

Dr. Robinson, Lex. of the N. T., defines *oligos*, as meaning time, a measure of time, little time, in this passage: saying, "Also *en oligooi* sc. *chronooi* Acts xxvi. 28, 29." The objection to this, that it requires *persuade* to be in the future, might be overcome by referring to John xiii. 6, "Lord, dost thou wash (*nipteis*) my feet:" where the Lord was about to wash; the washing was in the future, but the verb, *nipteis*, is in the present. But the idea of time does not come very naturally and easy, into Paul's remark upon the king's expression: "I

would \* \* \* that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both in a little time and much time such as I am," etc. This reading could not well be pronounced Pauline.

Our old friend Dr. Parkhurst, Lex. to the N. T., defines *oligos*; "II. *en oligooi*, within a little, almost, well nigh, *propemodum*. Acts xxvi. 28, 29. So Chrysostom *para mikron*; though I am well aware that in the Greek writers (see Wetstein) *en oligooi* generally signifies *in a little* or *short* time, *chronooi* being understood: but its being opposed, in *ver.* 29, to *en pollooi*, determines its meaning; and see *Raphelius*, *Wolfius*, and *Doddridge* on Acts xxvi. 28, and *Plato* Apol. Socrat. § 7, p. 71, edit. *Forster*, where *en oligooi* may mean *almost, nearly*, as *toiouton ti* following seems to shew. See *Forster's* note. I add, that in *ver.* 29, the modern Greek version explains *en oligooi* by *par' oligon*." This is old time scholarship, but holds good, we think, against some that is more modern and showy. Chrysostom's authority is entitled to much consideration, in seeking the meaning of a Greek, N. T., word; and as *oligos* has various meanings in the sacred writings; such as *few, little, awhile, small, a season, briefly, short*, referring to number, quantity, time; in any one case its meaning must be sought, in its local connection, and accordant with the current sense of the passage. So, as Dr. P. hints, the Greek writers may not generally use *en oligooi* as Luke evidently does here; but that would only prove the latter inaccurate as to that standard, which would not be at all wonderful; and which is mitigated by the passage cited from Plato, in which *en oligooi* may mean *almost, nearly*.

We must remember, too, the N. T. force of *peithoo*, as differing very widely from *parakaleoo*. The king not saying, "*en oligooi* thou beseechest me to be a Christian:" but, *en oligooi* thou persuadest me to be a Christian. In addition, we examine a few passages, that we

may see how the preference of *megalooi* for *pollooi* helps the objection to the reading of our Version, "Almost," etc. Of one hearing the gospel and not doing, it is said that he "is like a man that without a foundation built a house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great (*mega*)." *Luke* vi. 49. The sense is, the house was "altogether" ruined. "To whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest (*apo mikrou heos megalou*), saying," etc. *Acts* viii. 10. The phrase "from the least to the greatest" embraces the whole multitude, its lower and its higher class; as *oligos* and *megas* embrace the two stages of persuasion, the "almost and altogether." Indeed we have a similar expression in this very *ch.* xxvi. 22; "I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great (*mikrooi te kai megalooi*), saying," etc. Here by *small*, the apostle refers to a part of his hearers, and by *great* to the remainder of them; the two words signifying all who heard his extensive preaching. But if it be objected that *mikrós* and not *oligos* is used in these places; we inquire for the difference between these terms.

*Mikros* means little, and in relation to *magnitude, quantity, number, time, dignity, or authority*; and though there is a difference between it and *oligos*, it is not such as to interfere at all with our argument. For if *oligos* be used as signifying little relative to number, quantity, and time; and *mikros* as signifying little relative to number, quantity, time, and dignity; they must be synonymous: and therefore, *en oligooi kai en megalooi*, must mean in *ver.* 28, about what *mikrooi te kai megalooi* means in *ver.* 22. But in the latter *mikrooi* refers to one part of the hearers, and *megalooi* to the remainder; so, therefore, in the former, does *oligooi* refer to one part of the persuasion, and *megalooi* to the remainder. Besides, we have seen in *Luke* vi. 49, that the *reegma mega* signifies an utter ruin.

But if *polloi* be the correct reading, then it is easy to cite uses of that word signifying *all*: as, "for if through the offense of one many (*polloi*) be dead," etc. *Rom.* v. 15. And "For as by one man's disobedience many (*polloi*) were made sinners," etc. *Ib.* ver. 19. So, that this demonstrated use of *polus*, gives the greatest countenance to the reading of our Version. In fact, when we take into the account the opinion of the Greek father Chrysostom; the fact that the king's remark was entirely incidental, there having been no effort to make him a Christian.; the N. T. force of *peithoo*, persuade; and the fact that the rendering of our Version is the only one that consists fairly and squarely with all the items of the passage; we cannot be far, if at all, wrong in our withdrawing from the company of the distinguished objectors referred to, and ranging ourselves with those who read the passage, "Almost thou persuadedest me to be a Christian."

---

## FROM FAITH TO FAITH.

ROMANS i. 17.

THE apostle declares himself a "debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; (i. e.) both to the wise (refined), and to the unwise (unrefined)." So, a debtor to all classes; to the whole human race everywhere, so far as he could have access to them; and by his voice and writing he has paid his great debt in vast instalments; having reached millions, and now continues

the payment to millions of one generation succeeding another. But how different is his language from ours ! We, the ministry of this day, seem to think that the people are indebted to us ; and sometimes we complain that they are very slow in discharging their indebtedness. Perhaps did we feel as Paul, holding the debt to be on our part, we would feel so uneasy about meeting our own obligations, that we should feel less distressed about the tardiness of our congregations in this respect. Paul had been entrusted with precious words for sinners ; held them in trust, always ready to meet their demand upon him ; and at his death, it was found, that he had so invested the principal, that his creditors have been receiving immense dividends ever since ; and will continue so to do to the end of time.

“ So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also.” It was modest in the apostle to write, “ as much as in me is ;” but to us who are familiar with his history and writings, what an amazing force, ability, does this imply ! We are far in the rear of his noble capacity, but if we each can say truly I preach “ as far as in me is ;” we may as he did, say “ I am pure from the blood of all men.” Being debtor to all, he cannot but number those at Rome among his creditors ; and, therefore, to them also he desired to preach the gospel. He did not desire to get a papal crown, a cardinal’s hat, or princely benefice : there were no such things at Rome, in his day ; nor would such things have been known there, ever, had the gospel he preached been adhered to and obeyed. Had the gospel really taught, or permitted, such things, Paul’s next utterance had never been heard.

“ For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ :” he understanding by “ the gospel,” the proclaiming of Jesus to be the Christ ; the anointed of God to fulfil the promise to Adam ; renewed to the three patriarchs ;

typified to Moses in the Law ; declared by the Prophets ; crucified by the Gentiles at the instigation of the Jews ; risen from the dead, as testified by the chosen witnesses, among whom was Paul himself ; ascended into heaven, in proof of which was the presence of the Holy Ghost wherever Jesus was preached, to seal the faith of the believer by the sweet influence of love to God, shed abroad in his heart. There seems to be no propriety in the insertion of the word, Christ, here ; and, in fact, the oldest codices, and some of the most capable editors omit it. The gospel does not proclaim Christ, a title only, of the great *Erchomenos* (the One to come) ; but that Jesus is he ; and to him does the title belong.

He is not ashamed of this gospel ; for though Jesus was rejected by "his own," and died as a malefactor, in the company of malefactors, and overwhelmed with maledictions ; yet the gospel that he was and is the Christ of God, "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth ; to the Jew first and also to the Greek (the gentile)." In this gospel, then, somehow resides "the power of God," omnipotence, though we can have but little conception of what that word signifies ; for the finite has no extent along the awful line of the infinite ; and we must content ourselves with the idea, that whatever power the most desperate case of sinful man needs for salvation, it is not only in the gospel, but abounds in it : at the least, we may say fearlessly, and believe assuredly, that omnipotence, "the power of God," is equal to every emergency. Besides, let God be praised ! this omnipotence saturating the gospel, so that the gospel is said to be omnipotence, is "unto salvation to every one that believeth ; both Jew and Greek ;" every one : "for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world ; (that was what we deserved ; ) but that the world through him might be saved (which was what we needed)." The gospel is the power of God

unto salvation to every one ~~ne~~ that believeth : and every one must have an opportunity to believe ; for Paul, one of those to whom the dispensation of the gospel was committed, declares himself bound to dispense it to every one, both Jew and Greek (gentile).

He proceeds to explain HOW this gospel is God's power unto salvation to every believer : " for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith : as it is written, The just shall live by faith." We have now arrived, at what we understand to be the key to the phrase " from faith to faith," as will appear in this, the apostle's, explanation of the manner, in which the gospel exhibits itself to be " the power of God unto salvation to the believer." The gospel, he says, contains a revelation ; " for therein is revealed : " and, it must be borne in mind that divine revelation is the object of faith. What a man sees, handles, hears, etc., he knows. The senses bring us knowledge. When a man sees snow, he does not believe that it is white ; he knows it : when he touches it, he does not believe that it is cold ; he knows it. When Thomas refused to believe the revelation of his brethren, " We have seen the Lord ; " and said, " Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe ; " *John* xx. 25 ; he was not aware that he was confounding faith with knowledge : for when the kind, condescending Lord appeared, and said to him, Thomas reach hither thy finger, etc. ; the cry of the apostle gazing on the person and wounds, and hearing the voice of his Lord, " My Lord and my God ! " was not the cry of faith, but of knowledge ; and what he believed was not that Jesus had risen, for he knew that ; there was the Lord seen, touched, heard by him ; but he believed now that this recently crucified, and now risen, living Jesus, was " both Lord and Christ." So, when the Lord spoke again, we



are to understand him as signifying, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me (known that I am risen and living) thou hast believed (that I am the Christ, revealed, as to come, to the past ages) : blessed are they that have not seen (known by their own senses that I rose from the dead, and am alive again), and yet have believed" (the resurrection upon the report of my witnesses, the apostles, and therefore that I am the Christ of revelation). *John* xx. 29. We must distinguish between faith and knowledge.

Inspiration informs us, that "the faith (*hee pistis*) comes by hearing (*ex akoees*, report), and hearing by the word of God." *Rom.* x. 17 : and as this is Paul's own language, it gives us a clear idea of what he means by faith ; a cordial belief in divine revelation, the word of God ; as in *Rom.* x. 10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness," etc. So, here, in our passage, the apostle says of the gospel "therein is revealed : " something then is in the gospel which the hearer is to believe. And what is that ? In sum, "The righteousness of God by faith (*ek pisteos*) : " the method of God's declaring a man to be righteous, just, in a state of peace with God ; and treated as such ; i. e. treated as a good subject of his government and entitled to and enjoying his protection : which method is "Believe and thou shalt be righteous ; " shalt be saved ; shalt live. We render *ek pisteos*, "by faith," as it is rendered in the same *ver.* 17, at the close ; "as it is written, The just shall live by faith (*ek pisteos*) ; " for there is no sufficient reason for rendering *ek pisteos* "from faith," in the first instance, and "by faith" in the second ; especially as the second is given in illustration of the first.

This gospel, then, reveals to us, that whatever may have been God's method of declaring a sinner to have become righteous, in the past ; in Eden, or under the Mosaic Law ; he now requires faith, a cordial belief in

the word of God, the gospel sent by his Son; which presents Jesus slain for us, bearing our sins, dying in our stead, rising for our righteousness, ascending to take his place at the right hand of the majesty on high, able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him, sending forth the Holy Ghost, to aid us in comprehending these glorious truths, and in our effort to trust abidingly in them, sending men of like passions with ourselves, who can understand us and sympathizingly teach us; this gospel inspires the very faith on which our salvation is suspended: for the feeling of the sinner hearing this gospel *in his heart*, for it goes down into the poor aching heart so soon as permitted, is Who can resist SUCH a gospel! Therefore, the revelation contained in this precious gospel comes to us, who are aided ever by the Holy Ghost if we ask his assistance, so winningly, so tenderly, like the soft south winds to the frozen earth, melting and mellowing, that we gladly believe such a wonderful plan for the salvation of sinners: so that in the gospel is revealed the righteousness of God by faith, unto (the production of) faith (*eis pistin*).

As to the use of *eis* in this sense, we cite Matth. xv. 24; "I am not sent but unto (*eis*) the lost sheep of the house of Israel." But unto these he was sent, and short of reaching them his mission would not have been fulfilled. *Matth.* xxii. 4; "Come unto (*eis*) the marriage." Certainly, the invited were expected to start for the marriage, and proceed *unto* the place. *John* xi. 31; "She goeth unto (*eis*) the grave to weep there." And, *ver.* 32, "Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw him, she fell down at (*eis*) his feet, saying," etc. In our passage, we have "it is the power of God unto (*eis*) salvation," i. e. producing, resulting in salvation. So, *Rom.* iv. 5, "his faith is counted for (*eis*) righteousness:" his faith values up to righteousness, produces a condition in which the believer is regarded as being

righteous. In these examples we see the force of *eis*, to be progress toward and arrival at a certain point. Thus *eis pistin* in the passage is to be understood. The blessed revelation of salvation by faith comes to, and wins the sinner's astonished ear, and explains to him the wonderful love of God in giving his Son, the wonderful love of Jesus in suffering in his stead, and the wonderful love of the Holy Spirit in coming for his quickening into new life through the blessed word of life; thus winning its way into the springs of his being, unto the creation and sustenance of a faith that saves. The gospel tells the story of love, until the sinner believes, and is saved. It does not tell the story to faith, but, to the sinner, that he may believe and live; that he may experience the springing up of the faith that saves the soul. "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; for therein is revealed the righteousness of God by faith, unto the production of the faith required; as it is written, in the old covenant, the type of the new, The just shall live by faith." Under the Law, it was "Do this and thou shalt live:" but, under the Gospel, it is "Believe and thou shalt be saved." The Law did not work in the sinner the obedience by which he was to live: but, the Gospel does produce in the sinner the faith by which the sinner is saved. So, while the ministration of the Law was glorious; the ministration of the Gospel is still more glorious. Paul had no need to be ashamed of the gospel; he resisted atrociously, until he found it hard to resist it longer, yielded, believed, and "preached the faith which once he destroyed." *Gal. i. 23.*

## THE LAW OF FAITH.

ROM. iii. 27.

**L**AW is the *expressed, uttered, pronounced* Will of the Sovereign. The Laws of Nature are God's Will, for the existences, movements, combinations, changes in the natural world. Moral Law is his Will declared (in S. S.) to his moral creature, man, for his rule of life, inwardly, outwardly. Ignorant of his Will, we could only do it, if at all, accidentally: never intelligently.

II. The divine law, proclaimed to Adam, was simple, precise, intelligible, and could have been easily obeyed: subjecting Adam to no hardship; and requiring of his noble nature, in its excellent condition, but an easy self-denial. In him, was his whole race: it was a grand responsibility; which he was every way competent to fulfil. Gratitude to God, and parental concern for his posterity, demanded it of him imperatively. He fell: brought sin into the world; and death by sin: the sin and death passing upon all men. Rom. v. 12.

III. Then came the law by Moses. A heavy law, impossible to enfeebled humanity. One remarkable nation, Israel, Jews, descendants of Abraham, was placed under it; with every possible advantage of miracle, prophets, angelical visitations, the direst threatenings and the most splendid promises; a carefully prepared priesthood; the most expressive types, symbols, ceremonies, tabernacle, temple, synagogue, the divine Oracles, containing their history, laws, liturgy. No greater advantages could have been asked for: yet they sinned after the similitude of Adam. The human race, except the Jews, have not sinned after the similitude of Adam: men sinned in Adam; as in a somewhat similar sense Levi paid tithes in Abraham.

The Jews, placed under the law, under every possible advantage, and failing; demonstrated that a Law of Works, could not give life, Gal. iii 21: no such law being observable by us, on account of our weakness, incapacity, Rom. viii. 3. It could not give life to them; it cannot give life to any of Adam's race. Yet this revival of the Law of Works, has accomplished an important and beneficent purpose; having shown us, that we cannot be put back, with any hope, under a Law of Works: Adam, in the very glory of our nature, having failed; and the Jews, with every advantage possible to our weakened nature, having failed; it is clear, "that by the deeds of the Law, by any Law of Works, no flesh can be justified." It is a fearful truth, that whoever attempts it, does so in vain.

And, it should be borne in mind, that the Jews, when placed under law, had the benefit of mediation and pardon, in the provision of sacrifice, lustrations, atonement, and pardon: type of the final and perfect plan, promised in Eden, kept in memory through the agency of the Abrahamic covenant, and exhibited to the world, at the appearing of the long-expected Seed of the woman.

IV. The Second Man, or Adam, came to fulfil by his suffering the Adamic covenant, including its temporary re-establishment by Moses. Crowned with glory and honor, he *tasted death* for every man: if he came to lead us to glory, it was of necessity, that he should first descend into the gloomy realm of death, to find us, release us, and lead us upward to life, righteousness and heaven: it was only by the suffering of death, that he could become a perfect, complete, sufficient Saviour to us: to pity us; to know the price of our redemption; to be able to pay that price; was much; but the payment, *that* was the completion, the perfection needed in the case: no pity that stopped short of paying the

penalty, could be of avail for us. The First Adam, arose from the dust, and amid the propitious surroundings of Eden, failed us; lost his position of being a *living soul* to us; was not an *everlasting father*; lost his crown of glory and honor. The Second Adam, came down into the dust of death, to which we had returned, and there, having life in himself, he was a *quickenning spirit*; and having *quickenned* us, we arose with him to a life of righteousness; as he exclaimed, "Behold! *I* and the *children* which God hath given me." HALLELUJAH! We were "crucified with Christ;" we "were buried with Christ;" we "arose with Christ;" we "live with Christ;" we are "one with Christ;" our "EVERLASTING FATHER," who will never fail us, nor be discouraged, able to save us now and forever!

And now, the "priesthood, head, everything having been changed, there is made of necessity a change of the law." The Law of Works has been fulfilled: it is no more: as a part of the old creation; relating to the First Adam, the living soul, the one who began with life, and was to send that living influence upon us all; it found its end, its result, in the Second Adam, *the quickenning spirit*, who descended into our death, imparting life, and bringing us, in this new creation, under the blessed and omnipotent Law of Faith: a law possible to us; every way suited to our condition; intelligible; practicable; our righteousness; an energetic law, working by love, purifying the heart, assimilating us to Christ, making us a blessing to one another, and preparing us for heaven. Our duty now is TO BELIEVE: for it is now the Will of God; that is, his Law; that every one that seeth his Son, and believeth on him, should have everlasting life: "and I will raise him up at the last day." John vi. 40. The object of our faith, belief, is not visible to our eyes; but he is visible to us in the gospel: where the great facts of his redeeming

love and power "are WRITTEN, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name;" by his authority, his offices.

Into man, in the old creation, came the breath of God, and he lived. So, in this new creation the breath divine penetrates humanity: the living air is everywhere: air for the human lungs is not in excess of the air for the human soul: the Holy Ghost gives life, with its capacities and energies; but life being imparted, then the activities of life are required of us. So, vitalized as we are by the Holy Ghost, we must look into the Scriptures, or listen to the Scriptures, and believe their holy, inspiring, glorious testimony. We cannot perform the functions of the Holy Ghost; but we can and must perform our own: he gives the capacity; we are to exercise it, make the proper use of it: and thus believing the record God hath given of his son, our Saviour, our Second Adam, we see that he bore our sins in his own body on the tree; that the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and that by his stripes WE ARE HEALED: so, we are free from the law of sin and death: our faith is counted to us for righteousness; because it *is* righteousness; it is conformity to the Will of God; and it is ensued by peace, hope and love: Jesus is precious, having become our all in all; we shrink back from evil, and begin to do good. Our old sinful ways have lost their charm: how strange that we could have found delight in such impure, frivolous, unsubstantial things! How pleasant now the communion of saints! The company of an intelligent, experienced, sympathizing Christian, what a privilege it is! How delightful to hear of the gospel triumphing! To hope for the day when it shall have proved to be the power of God unto salvation, to the very ends of the earth! We have proved, or experienced, that "faith comes by hearing;" that we "have

peace in believing ;” that it has been to us “ according to our faith.” A dim perception of the gospel, results in a dim faith, and scarcely any, if any, peace. A clear perception of the gospel, brings to the sincere inquirer, clear faith ; and clear faith is ensued by a peace unutterable. The Holy Ghost never neglects his gracious offices ; but our part is faith : he that believeth, by that very act does the Will of God, and is accepted and saved. A human being when born, is born with a relation to Christ : is his : redeemed by his most precious blood : is under the Law of Faith. It cannot be true that any one born into this world, has no relation to the Second Adam : and so is merely related to the First Adam, and under the wrath of God. In that case, what would become of the infants, who are cut off, according to that hypothesis, in their sin and guilt ? There are none such. Jesus, himself, declares of little children, that, “ Of SUCH is the kingdom of heaven.” The Second Adam claims them as his : he stations the loving parents by them as their trusted guardians : he deposits with those guardians, the gospel and its institutions, as appliances and surroundings ; bidding them to “ train up the children in the way they should go :” while the Holy Ghost inspire the little ones with spiritual life and its capacities. Parents neglecting themselves and their children, the wise and kind Second Adam, the “ Everlasting Father,” has provided the Sabbath School ; a blessed institution, where the children learn and sing the sweet old story of the love and care divine. The Almighty Spirit helps them, in their struggle to do right, and many a brave little heart wins the victory. Properly speaking, wicked young people are backsliders, apostates, miserable prodigals, gone away from the abundance of the homestead : wretched swineherds, starving and like to die, as the result of their ingratitude and folly. Every child belongs to Christ, and is a



member of his Church. He is born with face heavenward ; and woe to him "who offends, causes to stumble, one of these little ones." If the wrath of God be on these little ones, where is the reconciliation, wrought "by the death of his Son?" Does the child dying in the wrath of God, ascend to heaven? There is no wrath of God upon such : there can be none, if "of such is the kingdom of heaven." The express command is, "Suffer the little children to come unto me ; and forbid them not." They are of the travail of his soul. He has redeemed them by his blood. He is entitled to them. It would be heartless treachery in us, to hand them back to the lineage and keeping of the First Adam.

Can it be so, that Christ does not die for us sinners, until we repent and are converted? No : it cannot be so : he died once for all : and what did his death accomplish, if not the purging away of our sins? And what did his resurrection accomplish, if not the restoring us to a state of righteousness? And what has the Holy Ghost come for, if not to be our breath, our strength, our life, that we may have capacity to hear the gospel, and believe its joyful report? And when we have cordially, gladly believed the gospel story of his love to us, we love Him : and "he that loveth is born of God." That is the witness of the Holy Ghost ; we are conscious that we love God ; and the Holy Ghost testifies that, in such case, we are the children of God. We cry Abba, Father. It is not our belief, that we are born into this world, with a nature that has no evil in it ; so that the life imparted to us by our Second Adam, the Quickening Spirit, finds nothing in us to resist, oppose and stifle it. Holy Scripture clearly affirms the contrary, even in an advanced state of grace and experience. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, but the Spirit against the flesh : but these oppose one another,

that ye should not do the things that ye would." Gal. v. 17. This seems to be the literal rendering of the passage. The original does not authorize the reading, "So that ye CANNOT do the things that ye would." *Conybeare and Howson* come nearer the meaning, in their rendering, "and this variance tends to hinder you from doing what you wish to do." But, the true sense is, that the flesh struggles to hinder us from doing right, and the Spirit struggles to hinder us from doing wrong; each endeavoring to control our will: and our consolation is that the Spirit is almighty; quite able to help us carry out our will to do right: while our wisdom is to walk, consort, with our almighty helper.

It remains clear, though, that the flesh principle exists in the case of one in an acknowledged state of grace; a subject of the new creation; one who has been born again; a child of God by faith in Christ Jesus; and of whom it is affirmed that, "old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." So, admitting the infant to have received the life-giving influence of the Quickening Spirit; to be in a state of grace; absolved from the law of sin and death; purged from sin, by the precious blood that was shed, when Jesus, who was crowned with glory and honor (constituted the Second Adam) for the suffering of death, tasted that death for every man; a subject of Christ's kingdom; a living member of his Church: it is no more astonishing, that all this is in connection with a carnal principle, that tends to evil; and unless mastered and kept under restraint, will develop in evil; than in the case of an adult, in an undeniable state of grace.

And, that children are able to keep the Law of Faith, is evident. They are remarkable for it. How soon they accept the gospel; the narrative of the life and sufferings of their Saviour. The blessed Spirit warms their yielding hearts, as the gentle mother teaches the

story of the divine love ; and how implicitly they kneel and learn to pray ! Yes, there is life in the infant soul ; life that comes from the death of the pitying Jesus ; who descended to the dreary dust, to which our First Adam dragged us down, and diffused through its blackness of desolation, the life, the glorious, all-penetrating life, that was in himself, and was the light of men ; light of the dawn of the new creation ; light of hope, peace, joy, bliss eternal.

When our Lord, at the tomb of Lazarus, cried "Lazarus, come forth ;" life penetrated the dead, and he did come forth ; but, "bound hand and foot with grave-clothes : and his face was bound with a napkin." It was not faith, that recovered him to life : it was the power of the Quickening Spirit : and when he came forth, he came encumbered with the cerements of death ; but, now, he is to conform to the law and activity of life ; or we shall soon see him languishing in the way leading back to death.

Faith is not life. Jesus, the Christ, is life ; the only, but abundant, all-sufficient source of life to otherwise dead humanity. The infant derives life from Christ, and is placed under faith, the law of life. Made capable of receiving the true record God has given of his Son, the plain, simple, intelligible gospel ; it must be told to him : and how implicitly, reliantly, he accepts it ! How his heart melts at the narrative of his Saviour's love ! How wet is his soft cheek with tears ! The mischief in the case of children is not that they reject the gospel, but that their parents do not teach it to them ; do not train them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord ;" do not illustrate to them, the precepts of the gospel, in their own lives. We lead the little feet astray. We hide Jesus from their eyes. We withhold the gospel from their ears. Instead of their finding in us kind, loving, careful teachers of the Word, by which faith

comes ; we are treacherous to our trust, neglectful of our principal parental obligation ; and lead the poor children to think that they are to "live by bread alone," and not by "every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Poor, dear little ones ! their Saviour bids us to bring them unto him, but we refuse.

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Heb. xi. 3. That is we read in the Bible, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" Gen. i. 1. We believe it, and so we understand that wonderful fact of the old creation. But, we read again, "Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature : old things are passed away ; behold, all things are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." II Cor. v. 17, 18. That blessed Son, the Second Adam, who "by himself purged our sins ;" Heb. i. 3 ; "whose blood cleanseth us from all sin ;" I John i. 7 ; who "loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood ;" Rev. i. 5 ; who "tasted death for every man." Heb. ii. 9. We believe this, and so we understand the wonderful fact of the new creation.

But this belief, this faith is active ; it brings peace to the troubled conscience ; joy to the aching heart. Believing that God is reconciled to us, and is waiting for us to be reconciled to him ; we have hope : we have love ; loving him so soon as our faith perceives that he has first loved us. So, our faith having led us into hope, and love ; here are the Christian triad, faith, hope, love ; and what this love will enable us to do, may be seen in I Cor. xiii. 4. "Love suffereth long and is kind ; envieth not ; vaunteth not itself ; is not puffed up ; doth not behave itself unseemly ; seeketh not her own ; is not easily provoked ; thinketh no evil ; rejoiceth

not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth ; beareth all things ; believeth all things ; hopeth all things : endureth all things ; never faileth."

So we see, clearly, what a power faith is, and what a blessedness it is, that we have been placed under this law. We see, also, how the "ambassadors," the preachers of the gospel, should confine themselves to the gospel, and exert themselves to proclaim it in its simplicity and distinctness, that it may be intelligible ; for "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God ;" Rom. x. 17 ; the gospel : that is by believing the gospel, and understanding, that the Second Adam has washed away our sins, with his own blood, and that we should peacefully, hopefully, lovingly confide in that sufficient, accepted atonement ; assured, that whatever will be needed to our spiritual life shall be freely and fully given to us.

The sinner finds himself in a damp, dark, dreary dungeon. Of what use are his eyes ? He can see nothing. Of what use are his hands and feet ? They are heavily fettered. Of what use are his ears ? Satan assures him that his case is hopeless ; there is no possibility of escape ; there is nothing left him but to despair and die. Poor wretch ! He forgets that Satan is a liar ; and so, trusts him ; lies down to die. But, lo ! the "ambassador for Christ" comes in through the prison doors, whose bars the Saviour has broken, with the blessed torch of truth in his hand : Satan skulks off into his beloved darkness : "Poor brother," says the ambassador, lifting up the torch, "look at those heavy bonds, and see that they are broken, and you may shake them from your weary limbs : see that your prison doors are unbarred ; and you may come forth with me to the pure air, and the beautiful sunlight ; where all necessary things are in abundant provision for your future happy life." "Ah, these are good tidings, indeed," exclaims the astonished

man. "Why what a fool I have been to lie here in this wretched place, believing Satan's lies, that the fetters were indissoluble, the doors fast barred, and escape impossible. O blessed gospel light, that enables me to see that the way of deliverance is open; and blessed news is it, that I may go out this instant, and secure the abundant necessities, so kindly and liberally provided for me, by that loving one who sent you with the torch and the tidings to me, a miserable, deceived prisoner of Satan. I would like to shave, wash, dress, to go out to my loving friend; but, there is no help for it, I must go just as I am: and, in fact, he knows exactly what I am, and how I am, and will neither be disappointed nor displeased at my appearance.

Just as I am, without one plea,  
But that thy blood was shed for me,  
And that thou bidst me come to thee,  
O Lamb of God, I come!"

Now, this is common sense. Let the great and glorious truths of the gospel be plainly stated to the listening sinner; and let the listener believe and live. Show him the great Law of Faith: explain to him, that feeling is not faith; that he is not to feel so and so, and then believe; but that he is to believe the glorious gospel, and he will find peace in believing. His duty is to believe the gospel statement, of what the Saviour *has done, is doing, and will do*, for him: and believing *that*, he will necessarily be happy. He will not fail of divine help: the Holy Ghost is with him, or he would have no interest in such things: but it is not the Holy Ghost who is called upon to believe the gospel: it is the sinner's part to do that; God is working in him to will and to do; let him obey the divine injunction. If God doth not impute his trespasses unto him, is he wiser than God, that he should impute them to himself? Surely, the

Infinite in wisdom understands his own plan ; and if that be his plan not to impute our trespasses unto us, let us consent to it, rejoicing that *he* found a ransom, and bids us come to him, that he may prepare us for, and admit us to, heaven.

Again, " If ye then be risen with Christ " — " For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii. 1, 3, 4. The gospel affirmation is, " Christ was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Rom. iv. 25. Thus, in the Second Adam we die, crucified with him, entering into him by faith, and paying the dreadful penalty: then rising with him, the penalty paid, we rise righteous; the law having exacted its penalty, we are free from its claim; we are just. This great fact is as true of one man as of another: he tasted death for every man; there is no difference in this respect. Christ was humanity, as Adam was: it was precisely in this respect, that " he trode the wine-press alone;" of the people, there was none with him as a helper, but we all were with him as his burden; and he bore it, and sank with us heavily down into the horrible abyss of death. Then it was, that having life in himself, he quickened humanity, himself; quickened us; and arose with us; we with him; " his own arm brought salvation." Isai. lix. 16, lxiii. 5. All these blessed facts are as true of one man, as of another: yes; but to him that is not solicitous concerning them; cares not to understand them; will not believe them; they are as nothing; as though they were not. But their unbelief cannot make the word of God, to be of none effect; and the believer finds his faith to be as a basis sustaining all these precious hoped for things; and as a conviction of the existence of all these glorious facts which are quite invisible to sense.

Under the power of this Law of Faith, as it concerns the First Adam, the old man, he, the believer, admits that he has been put to death, crucified ignominiously as a felon; so, the felon must disappear; he has no right to live; and everything in connection with that felon must be kept in a state of mortification, death. If he appear now, it must be in connection with the Second Adam, the Quickening Spirit. He did once wear "the image of the earthly;" but now he can wear only "the image of the heavenly." When Christ, his life, appears in his conduct, his words, then *he* appears with honor, credit, glory: though not in the eyes of men, the world; for the world cannot see and honor the image of Christ, as it could not see, know, honor Christ himself; who was to them "a root out of dry ground; nor was there any form of comeliness in him, that they could admire him." Still, while such a life is hidden from the world, it is visible enough to God, the angels, and the saints; and it will be crowned with immortality in the final day.

What is the relation of the Law of Faith, to holiness, sanctification? "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not." I John iii. 1. Yes, Christ is the Son of God, and if Christ is we, and we are he, then we are entitled to the same appellation; and we are as unknowable to the world, as he is unknowable to the world: so we must be very separate from the world, if we be beyond the cognizance of its sense: and he whom the world knows as some one like itself; living by its maxims, walking in its ways; must be one without the spirit, mind, image of Christ, and properly belongs to the world. Poor deluded man! perhaps deceiving himself with the mere form, but denying the power of godliness.



But, this sonship, this being in Christ, and so being in filial relation to God, all this seen, embraced, rejoiced in by faith in the word of God; separates from the world, unto God, which is the true idea of sanctification, or holiness; which does not relate to quality, so much as to position, or, possibly, character. A church might be built of the most precious materials, at immense cost: another, of the poorest materials, though the best that the poor people building it could procure, at a very small cost: yet, the latter, would be as holy as the former; and under such circumstances, as those of the widow's mite, would be greatly more acceptable to the Holy One. Faith accepts the word, the gospel, the truth, and it is the truth that sanctifies. John xvii. 17. And the truth is, in part, certainly, that "now we are the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he (IT) shall appear, we shall be like him; for we *shall* see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him, (Christ,) purifieth himself, even as he is pure." I John iii. 2, 3. Faith lays hold on such revelations. We are the sons of God, but it is not revealed to us, what the entire particulars and sum of the inheritance shall be: though it is revealed to us, that we shall see our Christ, our Second Adam, as he is, there, in that heavenly bliss; and, also it is revealed that we shall wear his image. To this very end does the Spirit lead us by the sanctifying word against the flesh, the world, and the devil; armed as we are in the divine panoply, from head to foot; and assured of the victory. "Not as though we had already attained, either were already perfect: but this one thing we do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, we press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Phil. iii. 12, 13, 14.

When faith's keen eye, "in the light" of the word, sees that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin:" I John i. 7, it brings peace to the conscience of the believer; and enables him to look steadily at the Decalogue; perceiving it to be "holy, just, and good;" and that while "the letter killeth, the spirit giveth life;" and while he cannot fulfil the letter, he does fulfil the spirit which is love; "for love worketh no ill to his neighbor," and is the fulfilling of the Law. Faith in the gospel statement, relative to the cleansing blood of Jesus, gives us to see that we are not under the condemnation of the Law: we being now under the Law of Faith, which produces hope, and the love which is the fulfilling of the great object and end of the Law. If the Law of Works were now in force, then no flesh could be justified: but under the Law of Faith, requiring us to believe the gospel, every one who hears has the opportunity to believe, may believe, and should believe; and such believing is righteousness; it is the will of God, which he is commanded to do.

If we mistake the Law of Works to be the standard, by which we are to be judged; and have no knowledge of Christ, then, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." I John i. 8: but when we believe Christ to be our life, and that we are under the Law of Faith, which leads us to love; then, we understand, that, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." I John iii. 9. He keeps the Law of Faith; he is just with God; he feels the power of faith, working by love, and purifying his heart and life; separating him from the world: so that he "walks with the Spirit, and does not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." Gal. v. 16. Like Enoch, he walks with God, and has the testimony that he pleases God. "The life that he lives, is by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him, and gave himself for him; by his blood, cleanseth him from all sin."

Nothing in favor of antinomianism is intended ; not faith without works ; not living in sin, and pretending to have peace by believing the gospel. No such man believes the gospel. There can be no faith without works. Faith without works is dead, is nothing. Faith cannot exist without working, any more than the body can exist without breathing. He that believes the gospel does not wish to commit sin ; and if temptation weakens his faith, and he be overtaken by sin ; he would fall into despair, but that the gospel reminds him, that " If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, who is the propitiation for our sins." So, that faith revives, and recovers him under its law and power. Blessed Law of Faith ! May we understand it better, and prize it more highly !

Here is a fitting illustration of faith as being a cordial belief of the gospel, taken from the *British Evangelist* :

There was an old man of Dartmoor, who for many years obtained his livelihood by looking after the cattle distributed over those wild moorland hills. At last, through infirmity and old age, and the constant and continual exposure to all kinds of weather, his sight entirely failed him, so that he had to seek an asylum in one of our west of England infirmaries, to end his brief remaining days. While there he was frequently visited by one of his grand-daughters, who would occasionally read to him portions of the Word of God.

One day while this little girl was reading to him the first chapter of the first epistle of John, when she reached the 7th verse, " And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," the old man raised himself and stopped the little girl, saying with great earnestness, " Is that there, my dear ? "

" Yes, grandpa."

" Then read it to me again ; I have never heard the like before."

The little girl read again, "And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

"You are quite sure that is there?"

"Yes, quite sure."

"Then take my hand and lay my finger on the passage, for I should like to feel it."

So she took the old blind man's hand, and placed his bony finger on the 7th verse, when he said, "Now read it to me again."

The little girl read with her soft, sweet, gentle voice, "And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

"You are sure that is there?"

"Yes, quite sure."

"Then if any one should ask how I died, tell them I died in the faith of these words, 'And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'"

And with that the old man withdrew his hand, his head fell softly back upon the pillow, and he silently passed into the presence of Him whose blood cleanseth us from all sin.

Now, dear reader, may I ask, if you were called to die, would your testimony be that of the old blind man of Dartmoor? Are you resting on the precious blood of Christ? Have you your sins forgiven? It is blessed to know this at the last hour of man's dissolution; but more blessed to be *living* in the conscious enjoyment of sins forgiven through faith in the atoning blood of Christ, so that, whether living or dying, we are enabled to say to any one who may ask, I *live* as well as die in the faith of these words: "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

## WHY IS FAITH COUNTED FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS?

ROMANS iv. 5.—But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.

IT may well surprise the uninitiated, that a premium for inactivity seems to be here offered: and the gospel expounder is advocating a do-nothing system; the man's "working" hindering his success. When we turn to the first creation, it is spoken of thus; "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all the work (of creation) which he had created and made (to make, to do)." All his works, including man, were to do, to be active; no idleness, inactivity, allowed to any of his works. And we need only look around and above us, to see that it is so: nothing is still. The Master says, in contrasting the second (his own) with the first creation (his Father's), "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." *John v. 17*. And is it possible that in his creation, there is no working? It is not possible. We are required to "work out our own salvation," *Phil. ii. 12*, by express command. But, did man work his way into the first creation? It was only after God had "formed him of clay and made him man," that he became a worker. And the apostle, here, is alluding to one's entrance into the second, the new creation; not of his duty within it. He means that the requisite is not work on the sinner's part; no penance, tears, groans, prayers: nothing to suffer, nothing to do. The one requisite being faith: "He that believeth with the heart."

He "believeth on him that justifieth (*epi ton dikaiounta*) the ungodly:" believeth, trusteth to the one justifying (declaring righteous) the ungodly; the ungodlike; the one created in the image, the likeness of God, but who has lost it; and is ungodlike, which is the full orthography for the abbreviated ungodly. God is wise, good, pure, loving, and beneficent; and the ungodlike is not wise, good, etc., but is foolish, bad, impure, hateful, and hating: so that he resembles his father, the devil; *John* viii. 44; is earthly, sensual, devilish; *Jas.* iii. 15. Yet such is the one, that it is proposed to justify! i. e. to reckon righteous! Then, where is the sinner whose condition is so wretched, as to justify despair? He can hardly put himself outside such a qualification as this—ungodlikeness: surely any poor wretch has that qualification. And that is the requisition; that he shall believe, trust in, the one justifying the ungodly.

O for a trumpet voice  
 On all the world to call,  
 To bid their hearts rejoice  
 In him who died for all!  
 For all my Lord was crucified;  
 For all, for all my Saviour died.

To this miserable ungodly one believing, trusting in the one justifying the ungodly, "his faith is counted (*logizetai*) for (*eis*) righteousness." His faith is counted, computed, to be righteousness. Not, that faith really not being righteousness, is counted as such, because of the abounding grace and mercy of God; as he does not merit of us any such idea, as that his goodness would induce him to be false, or unjust. The gospel is truth; not pretense. God can be, and is, "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." *Rom.* iii. 26. Then, his faith is reckoned to him for righteousness, because it is righteousness; his faith is his righteousness.

Is not he righteous, who obeys the government under which he lives? Then what does the Lord of this new creation require of the sinner, that he may come in? Faith: nothing but faith: no victim, no suffering, no tears or groans, no improvement of his condition, but "Believe in the justifier of the ungodly;" in which case his faith is his righteousness; he has fulfilled the only requisition made of him. He needs nothing but this faith to be counted in: and when in, there will be appliances supplied to him, to secure the result that his faith shall work; work mightily; work by love and purify the heart.

In this condition of righteousness by faith, we are in a position, in some important respects, equivalent to our never having sinned at all. For summon one of the blessed, who has not lost his first estate, and let him stand before us bright as the morning star, and pure as the clearest crystal; and let this sin-scarred believer, slashed at every part by the blade of Satan, stand also before us. "Blessed angel, have you peace with God?" What a rapturous smile on his radiant features, as he replies, "O yes: I have never, since my existence began, offended him: I have peace with God, certainly." "And now, my poor sin-scarred brother, have you peace with God?" A holy calm is upon his features, and the light of thankful gladness in his eyes, as he replies, "Being justified by faith, I have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. My sins which were many and grievous were borne and expiated by my loving Redeemer. I am accepted in the Beloved." Is not that glorious; our scarred brother, as we see upon examination, has had all his scars healed by the balm of Gilead, administered by the physician of sinners: and as to peace with God, he ranks with that bright angel on whom a spot of sin has never come!

“Celestial one, does God love, and guard you now?” The same smile is there, as he answers in the same prompt and confident voice, “Yes: God is love: he is everywhere; and as I have never been conscious of an act, a word, a thought, contrary to his will; wherever I am I bask in the smile of his love. All this heavenly brightness that you see upon me, is but the reflected light of that smile.” “Then, my poor brother, you who have sinned so deeply and persistently, have you any such idea as that God, so pure, so apart from sin, has any love for you?” And astonishing as it is, he abides this test also: for as calm is his countenance, and as lustrous is his eye, as when under the first question, as he says, “God so loved me as to give his only begotten Son, to die in my stead: God is without change, therefore faith whispers all through my heart, that he loves me now; and this faith keeps me in the love of God: the love of God is assured to me by the Holy Ghost, who has shed a respondent love abroad in my heart.” Is not this splendid! Our brother is not only delivered from the guilt of his countless sins, but God loves him so, that in this respect also he ranks with this heavenly one, so sinless, and so much beloved! O this faith, how wonderful it is!

But once more, “Happy spirit, what is your prospect for the future?” How he glows as he responds, “God inhabiteth eternity, and my blissful existence shall proceed forever.” “And you, believer?” “My Saviour is alive for evermore: because he lives, I shall live also: forever am I to be with him, that I may behold his glory; sharing the joy of my Lord: I shall not see death.” Is not the test well sustained? The believer in these grand respects ranks with one who has never sinned: his faith is counted for (*eis*) righteousness.



## WE GLORY IN TRIBULATIONS—BE- CAUSE—?

ROMANS v. 3-5.—“And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost given unto us.”

“AND not only so” (*ou monon de*, but not only): the apostle had just mentioned that among the results of justification by faith were “peace with God,” and an abidance in a state of grace, in which we, believers, “rejoice in hope of the glory of God.” This “glory of God” does not signify, that we are to have a glory such as that of God; as Satan promised to Eve in Eden, “your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods,” etc. Nor, that we shall see God in his own glory, in the future state; though this is true. But, that we believers are sure, steadfast in the hope, that this grand plan of salvation by faith, will not come short, be interrupted, be laid aside as defective, typical, but will really glorify God in its complete success. At *ch.* iii. 23, we are told that “all (Jew and Gentile) have sinned and come short (*husterountai*) of the glory of God:” i. e. as we read it, have failed to glorify God as their Creator and Governor; as a piece of bad workmanship does no credit to its maker: the tongue of deceit, the poisonous lips, the mouth full of cursing and bitterness, the feet swift to shed blood, causing destruction and misery, and having no reverence for God; these dishonor their maker: but this whole, crowning scheme of God, justification by faith in his Son, with its blessed accompaniments, and sequences, will glorify God, in producing

such regenerating and sanctifying effects upon men, that "God is not ashamed to be called their God:" *Heb.* xi. 16. The system of Jesus made a poor show in the eyes of Saul, the Pharisee, and he did what he could to stamp it out of existence, as a disgrace to Him who had framed the Mosaic institute, supported by the tradition of the elders. But Paul, the Christian, saw it in a different light, "a light from heaven above the brightness of the sun;" and had no doubt that this grand scheme of a suffering, risen, reigning Christ receiving sinners by faith, regenerating them, sanctifying, sustaining, saving them by his word, grace, and providence would not fail to glorify God. So with all Christians: so far from thinking this simple, but comprehensive plan, so suitable to sinners, to be inferior to any other, they regard it as being superior to all: and while they mourn that the Edenic, the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, the Philosophic plan all failed to exhibit their votaries as worthy of God; they rejoice in the hope, that this Christian plan, this final effort, will glorify God.

And not only do they thus, "but we rejoice (*kauchoometha*, the identical verb, in the same mood, tense, and person, as rendered *rejoice* in the second verse) in tribulations also:" for we are not afraid that the suffering Christian will dishonor God. It might appear so, to the world. They might say, if God can do nothing to protect his people from the prison, the sword, the cross, the stake, he is of small resources: our Jupiter and his family overthrew giants mighty enough to pile mountain upon mountain to scale heaven: but this Jesus, whom his followers say, contrary to all reason, had life in himself to conquer death and break the bars of the grave; cannot protect his people from a common mob!

But Christians *know* more of the matter, than the heathen; they know that "tribulation worketh patience."

Now, this, as an abstract proposition cannot be maintained: for tribulation worketh impatience; as we see from Scripture, where men are represented as being visited with such an anguish of tribulation, that "they gnawed their tongues for pain, and blasphemed the God of heaven because of their pains and their sores, and repented not of their deeds." *Rev.* xvi. 10, 11. This is surely no picture of tribulation working patience: there is tribulation enough; but an utter absence of patience. And such is the natural tendency of trouble; it tends to impatience, fretfulness; ruins the temper; as is seen in so many cases of sickly children, and men of broken fortunes. "Patience (worketh) experience," as a proposition, is admissible; for that is obvious: a patient trial of any plan or thing will give one experience of its value. Patience with a physician; a lawyer; a merchant; a mechanic; a course of exercise, diet, anything, will work experience as to his or its worth. Experience can be had in no other way. "Patience, experience:" we admit it. But now, again, "Experience (worketh) hope," is, as a proposition, inadmissible, for sometimes it does, and, perhaps, more frequently does not. Men hope when they commence an experience of a man or of a mode of business; but very many when they have gained experience of a man or of a mode, abandon him or it in despair: experience instead of working hope, wrought the destruction of hope.

And again, "Hope maketh not ashamed; because," etc. This proposition needs no because. Like "Patience worketh experience," it is self-evident. It is the very nature, and peculiarity of hope to buoy up, sustain, elevate, make bold, invigorate, make one smile at objections, at obstacles, at contempt for one's plans. While hope lives the hoper proceeds with his despised plan, *hoping* to overwhelm with surprise and mortification all gain-sayers, by achieving success. It is suspicious, that the

usual mode of understanding this passage, gives to this grand writer, Paul, the air of supporting a proposition that needs no support, and leaving others unsustained having absolute need of it. So, we propose as another exegesis, that we make the sustaining "because," etc., the support of the whole series of propositions, or statements, or allegations. "Knowing that (because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us) tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed;" but still holds on to and rejoices in the expectation, that this simple, final plan of saving sinners, ourselves among them, will vindicate the wisdom of God, and redound to his glory.

We should not forget, that the thought of this magnificent writer courses, often, through large periods; and we do not get his meaning unless we accompany him with held breath to the close. The Christian becomes patient, suffering without murmuring, under tribulation, because the love of God in his heart impels him to confidence in God, and to say "the cup which my FATHER giveth me, shall I not drink of it?" And his "experience" of God's gracious support and consolation in affliction, leads him to hope, that the divine plan will exhibit itself at the close as glorious. The reason why a Christian acts like a Christian, is because the love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, given to him; and instead of blasphemy from his mouth, in tribulation, he continues to rejoice in hope of the glory of God, crying out, "just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." *Rev.* xv. 3. Then let "because," etc., not support the self-evident proposition, "Hope maketh not ashamed:" but the entire series.

## ADAM AND CHRIST.

ROMANS v. 12-21.

IT must be owing to the depth of this passage, that learned and able expositors differ so much, in their understanding its meaning: and we have hesitated as to giving our own opinion of it. To us it appears, that the apostle having treated of justification by faith, as in advance of justification by works; proceeds to show the reasonableness of this view, by contrasting Adam the introducer of sin and death, with Jesus Christ the introducer of the atonement and recovered life: that we may consider the former as bringing upon the human race a great evil; the latter, himself being so much greater than the former, bringing upon the human race a greater good. The great evil from the former having come without the consent of the race; and the great good also, without their consent. As to HOW the evil and the good thus came to us from these sources, nothing is said: perhaps it is above human intelligence. Only the two facts are stated, and as facts we are to receive them: the HOW being, probably, one of the many lessons of the future eternity.

“Wherefore, as by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that (*eph' hooi*) all have sinned:” There can be no question as to the statement, in its first particular. Adam introduced sin: was the first sinner: the apostle merely restates the fact, recorded in Genesis. And sin produced death: whether man and other orders of creatures are all included, we do not discuss; content with observing that Paul says nothing of other orders here; while the decree was, “for in the day

thou eatest thereof thou (Adam) shalt die." *Gen. ii. 17.* The remainder of the verse particularizes the general statements foregoing; by specifying the passing of death upon all men, because all sinned (*heemarton*). Upon this point, the inquirer will find as much controversy as he will be willing to read: the HOW, here is inscrutable: we concern ourselves with the fact alone: Adam brought sin upon us, and, so, death; in an inscrutable sense we were infected by sin, all, and, so, became subject to death: all sinned, and therefore death passed upon all (*eis pantas anthropous ho thanatos dieelthen*).

From *ver. 13*, to *ver. 17*, inclusive, we have a parenthesis, illustrating the statement of sin and death descending from Adam, by showing the fact that sin was "in the world," i. e. universal among men; and death reigned from Adam to Moses; until which latter time, of all who died, not one had sinned "after the similitude of Adam's transgression:" i. e. not one was put under a law, to which obedience was life; disobedience death: and yet, all having died, and death being by sin, their death must have been by Adam's disobedience, sin; in which, in some inscrutable way, all were implicated: when Adam sinned, all sinned.

"But not as the offense, so also the free gift. For if through the offense of one many be dead—" here the statement is transparent: the many (*hoi polloi*, THE many, all) are dead by the offense (an offense, singular, one, not offenses, plural) of THE one (*tou henos*)—"much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto (*eis*) THE many (*tous pollous*)." The poison issuing from the one unto the many (all) was universal, virulent and deadly: but the gracious energy of Jesus Christ, the "unspeakable gift," the one, bringing the expiation and life unto the many (all) hath much more abounded: for it is mightier to quicken the dead, than to kill the living.

The energy for good issuing from Jesus Christ, greatly exceeds the energy for evil issuing from Adam.

“And not as by one that sinned, the gift: for the judgment by one (*ex henos*, from one offense, because of one offense) unto (*eis*) condemnation (*katakrima*); but the free gift (*to charisma*) of many (*ek polloon*) offenses unto (*eis*) justification (*dikaioomai*, the opposite to *katakrima*).” Adam’s offense, the Jews’ offense, and all the offenses proceeding from these, are the many offenses referred to; all offenses having been provided for in the scheme of redemption, according to which “Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man.” *Heb.* ii. 9.

“For if by one man’s (Adam’s) offense death reigned by one (Adam); much more they which receive (*lam-banontes*) abundance (*perisseian*) of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.” Death by one (Adam); life by one (Jesus Christ). No doubt about the energy of the poison; no doubt of the greater energy of the remedy. Jesus, the Christ, is greater than Adam.

“Therefore (*ara oun*, so then) as by the offense of one upon (*eis*) all men to (*eis*) condemnation (*katakrima*); even so (*kai*) by the righteousness (*dikaioomatos*) of one upon (*eis*) all men unto (*eis*) justification (*dikaioosin*) of life.” We have omitted, as the reader will perceive, the interpolated words of the translators, amounting as they do to their comment on the passage; and have confined ourselves to the words of the apostle: these showing, as we believe, that the “offense” of one involved all men, unto condemnation; and the “righteousness” of one involved all men unto justification of life. The offense of Adam affected all for evil; the righteousness of Jesus Christ affected all for good. No one excluded from participation in the great offense; no one excluded from participation in the greater righteousness.

“For as by THE one (*tou henos*) man’s (Adam’s) disobedience (*parakoees*) THE many (*hoi polloi*, all) were made (*katestatheesan*, became; as *Jas. iii. 6*, *hee glossa kathistatai*, “the tongue is”) sinners; so by the obedience (*hupakoees*) of THE one (*tou henos*) shall THE many (*hoi polloi*, all) be made (*katastatheesontai*, become) righteous.” Here the parallel is expressed with increased clearness. By the one man’s disobedience, sin, the many, all, became sinners; by the one’s (Jesus Christ’s) obedience, righteousness, all became righteous: for though in the latter line of the parallel, the verb is in the future; it can only be referred to the logical inference; as, if you admit the former, you will be compelled to admit the latter; or something of that sort. And if it be objected, that the force of *kathisteemi* is *constituted, assigned the position of*, etc.; that seems to reproach the justice of God, as it represents him as rating with sinners those who are not sinners. If God treats any one as a sinner, it is because he is a sinner. “That the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? And the Lord said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then will I spare all the place for their sakes. \* \* \* And he said, I will not destroy it for ten’s sake.” *Gen. xviii. 25, 32*. We have given the true force of the verb, as equivalent to one of the senses of *ginomai*, to become: all became sinners by Adam; all became righteous by Jesus Christ: the latter’s influence extending from Calvary back to Eden; and forward to the hour when shall be heard the voice, “There shall be time no longer:” in accordance with the revelation that Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever. He was slain from the foundation of the world. “But Isaiah is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.”



*Rom. x. 20.* The Saviour was promised to man: the whole race: to bruise the serpent's head: to destroy the works of the devil: and, wherever the blight from the first Man's sin extended, beyond it went the blessedness of the second Man's righteousness. Sin and death by Adam; righteousness and life by Jesus Christ.

Lest from this supra-Jewish survey of the subject, he should appear to have forgotten the Law, the grand dispensation through Moses; he brings it in, to the horror of Phariseeism, as a mere adjunct, segment, item, of the immense scheme of salvation. "Moreover the law entered, that sin might abound." Not that God was anxious to have more sin in the world: but, that a chosen nation might be put under a law of works, and be supplied with the greatest possible natural and supernatural advantages; and by a miserable failure, demonstrate the incapacity of the human race, to be saved by any law of works, even under the most propitious conditions: the law thus becoming a pedagogue to lead the race to Christ. Such an expedient, to be sure, involved the Jew; in addition to his share in the one offense of the one first human transgressor; in his own many offenses against the law of sin and death given by Moses. But he was held in the hand of the Mediator; *Gal. iii. 19*; and "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:" the Mediator's hand was between him and death; the sinner offered his typical victim confessing his sin, and was forgiven; he was saved by faith through grace. "That as sin hath reigned unto (*en*) death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto (*eis*) eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

This view, which may not be preferable to any of those preceding it, may be useful to those minds which resemble our own. The important thing is not to conform the Scripture to one's theology; but one's theology to the Scripture. The HOWS will be more manageable in eternity.

## NO CONDEMNATION TO THEM WHICH ARE IN CHRIST JESUS.

ROM. viii. 1.

**T**HIS is the corollary of the problem the apostle has just solved, and illustrated: viz.; The complete work of Jesus, the Christ, who assumed the headship of the human race, to lift it from the degradation of sin and death, into which Adam plunged us all; into the glorious righteousness and life procured for us all by his death and resurrection, and the air (Holy Spirit) and food (the gospel) provided for us.

“In Christ Jesus,” is a splendid phrase; and happy is he who understands and experiences what it means. It resembles the parables somewhat; as, not being at once intelligible, but exciting the curiosity of those who catch a glimpse of the truth in them, to seek for more, until they comprehend.

With regard to the figurative expressions of the Scripture, the student should first acquire a clear view of the figure employed. In this case, an abode, or shelter within Christ Jesus. Think of his heart, or any other organ within him. It must be perfect, faultless; not to be thought light of, as unworthy; not to be condemned as unfit; for it is of his nature, and his nature is perfect. Now if one were in Christ Jesus, as a part of him, he could not be condemned, because as Christ is, so he is. Such is the figure. But what does it teach? Certainly, that clear, steady, tenacious faith understands something equivalent to that, in the condition of him “who believeth with the heart unto righteousness.” The sinner believes himself into Christ Jesus. That is,

his faith urges him nearer and nearer to Christ: he cannot at first draw nigh, being, like Paul, blinded by the light, but hearing his voice; groping his way, until, perhaps, Ananias speaks to him in the name of the Lord, the scales fall from his eyes, he sees the wounds in his hands, his feet, then the wound in his side, into which he enters and lays his throbbing head, upon the loving heart of his SAVIOUR.

Better taught, or rather with better perception of the gospel, than at the outset; he learns the true relation he sustains to the Christ of God, the loving Jesus, the wonderful "Second Man who is the Lord from heaven:" who took his position low down into the depths to which Adam had reduced us, with the fearful mass of sin and death overwhelming us; dissolving the mass by his own blood; dying for us, in our stead; living for us, in our stead; having burst the bars of the grave for us, in our stead; and come forth for us, in our stead: everything for us, in our stead. That is, when he died, we died; the penalty was paid: when he rose, we rose: the law having secured its penalty, and having no further claim upon him, who was made sin for us, in our stead; he was righteous for us, in our stead. So the apostle, "I am crucified with Christ," *Gal. ii. 20*; I hang with my substitute on the cross; I suffer with him; there I pay my debt to the violated law: for "we thus judge, that if one died for all (*ei heis huper pantoon apethanen*), then (*ara*, then indeed) the all died (*hoi pantes apethanon*). *II Cor. v. 14*.

He, then, thus believing, identifies himself with Christ; so that his faith perceives, that if Christ was the human race, suffering, dying, rising in righteousness outside the penal claim of the law; then he, as an item of the human race was in Christ, dying and rising, and is now in him risen and righteous.

In this state, his faith sees there can be no *condemnation*: for the penalty having been paid; the old Adamic

life of sin and death cut off; and he, risen with Christ, living the new life of righteousness; it would surely be unjust to condemn him: and as God is now "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus;" *Rom.* iii. 26; he would most assuredly be unjust, in condemning such believer. So he may be ashamed of his not being more exemplary, and useful: bitterly regret that he did not turn to his Redeemer earlier; and grieve that he has not served him more efficiently: but let him never impugn or dishonor the precious blood of the Lamb of God, which washeth away the sin of the world. Let him rejoice, that Christ Jesus was "delivered for our sins, and raised again for our righteousness." *Rom.* iv. 25. That "we are not under the law." *Gal.* v. 18. That, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." *Gal.* iii. 13. How very absurd, then, with all these blessed assurances sounding out so cheerily from the never changing, everlasting gospel; to suppose ourselves under condemnation, and be looking for, expecting, dreading the curse, from which we have been redeemed by our Lord, who suffered in our stead.

But is not this antinomianism? Do not such views encourage us to carelessness, and excuse us in our sinning? This encourages us: for a clear statement of the redemption in Christ Jesus, ever has to the superficial thinker the appearance of encouraging to sin. Hear the apostle who had just presented this point: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" *Rom.* vi. 1, 2. He saw that a clear, sharp, parallel between the ruin through Adam; and the salvation in Christ Jesus; would look to some like antinomianism; and he guards against it. So must we do. In fact those who are deeply interested in this point, through a keen sense of unworthiness, are they who struggle against wrong-doing, and

labor to do right: and, this, too, under the discouragement of great temptation to despondency, and even to despair; it often seeming to them useless for such as they, so unworthy and so feeble, to make any further effort toward heaven.

Such must learn to distinguish between unworthiness, and condemnation. What merit has the believer? None. What condemnation? None. What merit has the starving beggar, who receives in his wasted hand, the bread given to him to save his life? None. What condemnation does he expect, while eating the bread bestowed by pitying charity? None. Cheer up, then, you that have been "walking in darkness and having no light" Here is plenty of light in this glorious gospel of our compassionate Redeemer, "who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity (*that* he has accomplished, shedding for the purpose his own blood), and purify to himself a peculiar people (his own property to guard and take care of, which he is doing in his own wise way, by the word, the ordinances, his providence, and perhaps by some of those things we are disposed to be discouraged by)." *Titus* ii. 14. The future will vindicate both his wisdom and his love.

---



---

## THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

ROMANS viii. 16.

"FOR ye have not received the spirit of servitude (*douleia*, slavery) again unto (*eis*) fear (i. e. that ye should be afraid of your master); but the spirit of adoption, because (*en hooi*) we exclaim (*krazomen*)

Abba, Father." The spirit of the enlightened Christian, is not slavish; he not regarding his duty as the thankless task of a slave, but as the pleasant employment of an adopted son. He has been taken from a position of slavish drudgery, under a hard master; and has been adopted into a pure and happy family, where his adopting Father has treated him so kindly and generously, as to inspire a spirit becoming his position: as he is treated like a son, he has the spirit of a son; his feelings being filial, he does not address his patron as Master, but Father: and this easy, natural, spontaneous cry, Father, demonstrates that he has the spirit of adoption. It is very clear that he has not received the spirit of slavery, for he does not fear as does the slave. It is equally clear, that he has received the spirit of adoption, for in the very language of that spirit, he says, Father. The spirit is known by the language. The filial spirit, by the filial language.

All this refers to Christian experience; and not to a sinner turning, with an aching heart and a confused mind, from the error of his ways. Not to the beginning, but to the progress of a believer's life. He has entered the family; his adoption is made manifest, not by the witness of the Spirit, but by the cry Abba, Father. When one has a filial spirit toward God, he may be sure that he is a Christian believer; for that fact demonstrates this fact: if it be a fact that he has a filial spirit, it is a fact undeniable that he is a child of God.

What is the witness, the testimony of the Spirit himself, the very Spirit who alone "knoweth the things of God?" *I Cor.* ii. 11. It is not difficult to discover this testimony; "every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God." *I John* iv. 7. But is the word of God the testimony of the Spirit? "For the prophecy came not by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" and this

prophecy the apostle declares "more sure" than a "voice from heaven." *II Peter* i. 17-21. So, there can be no doubt that the Holy Scripture, written by holy men of God moved by the Holy Ghost, is the witness, the testimony of the Spirit. "The Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." *Heb.* x. 15-17. Here is direct proof that the Scripture is the Spirit's testimony; proof that he witnesses by the Word. The Holy Ghost, says the apostle, is a witness to us (*marturei heemin*, beareth witness to us): and then quotes from the writing of Jeremiah (*ch.* xxxi.) the testimony. The proof is clear. What the Spirit "beareth witness" to, is on record; and can be consulted, and reconsulted *ad libitum*, and is by far more sure, steadfast, abiding, *bebaioteron*, than a voice heard from heaven, passing away into silence, as is Peter's testimony, quoted above.

"The Spirit himself (not *itself*, an unfortunate rendering because of mere grammatical gender in the Greek. *It* will not apply in English to a *person*, and the Spirit is a *person*) beareth witness with (*summarturei*) our spirit (each one, the spirit of each of us), that we are the children of God." Each one of us has a spirit in him crying Abba, Father; crying, Abba, which means, Father. Then if it be the prompting of our inner nature to look to, and address God as Father; it is because we have been adopted into his family, after a change of our nature, which formerly felt the impelling of the spirit of slavery, to say, hard Master! Now, this word of our spirit, Father, testifying to our adoption, is corroborated by the accordant testimony of the All Knowing Spirit, by his word which he moved the holy John to write, "every one that loveth is born of God." *I John* iv. 7.

He that loveth God and loveth his brother is a child of God: so the Spirit beareth witness. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." *Gal.* iv. 6.

If we deny the Scripture to be the testimony of the Spirit, then our argument may be laid aside. But, as it is, admitting as we do the inspiration of the Scripture, we hold it forth, maintaining that the Spirit nowhere and in no manner bears any witness, superior to that in the written word. In fact, himself declares that of the written word "more sure," preferable even to his own awful voice "from the excellent glory," which was not abiding, but became silent. The written word is what we are to believe. Our salvation does not depend on the witness of the Spirit, except as to believing the witness, the written word. The witness has been given: the holy men moved by the Holy Ghost have spoken: it remains for us to believe His testimony as we have it on the record.

There is but one condition of justification; faith. "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before (*pros*) God" *Rom.* iv. 2. That is, "but not according to God—" the account God gives of the matter. In *Gal.* ii. 14, *pros* has this meaning: "But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according (*pros*) to the truth of the gospel," etc. So, *II Cor.* v. 10; "—that every one may receive the things done in the body, according (*pros*) to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." These instances of this use of *pros* are Pauline. Then one from *Luke* xii. 47; "And that servant, which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not, neither did according (*pros*) to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes." Therefore we read the passage; "—if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory (exult); but that hypothesis (that he was justified by works) is not according to the account God



gives of Abraham's justification. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Nothing but faith, then, is the divine account of the condition of Abraham's justification. So with Christians; "Therefore being justified by faith (nothing else) *we* (we Christians, also) have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ:" in this system brought in by the Son of God, the long-expected Christ, faith is the one condition of justification; as it was in the case of our father Abraham, and of all the ancient worthies who "died in faith." *Heb.* xi. 13.

Faith is not sense, not feeling: it produces feeling; for we have "peace in believing:" but itself is not feeling. Nor does it come by feeling: faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God: and that word of God is the testimony (the witness) of the Holy Ghost. Faith reposes upon testimony, and so comes by hearing the witness: this is true, as a general proposition. But our Christian faith comes by hearing the witness, the testimony of God the Holy Ghost, who moved holy men; men separated and accredited to that purpose; to speak to us his word. And what testimony is so reliable as the testimony of God? "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son." *I John* v. 9. And what hath God testified of his Son? The Scripture. That is the testimony; that is what he hath testified of his Son. "Search the Scriptures \* \* \* they are they which testify of me." *John* v. 39. "I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus \* \* \* for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." *Rev.* xix. 10. The testimony concerning Jesus, as to his being the Christ, and all the logical sequences, is the very spirit, pith, life, substance of the prophecies: leave that out, and there is no mean-

ing left in them. A cordial belief of the word of God, the testimony he gives in the Scripture concerning his Son Jesus, the Christ, is faith ; is believing God ; and is counted to such believer for righteousness. Such believer has peace with God. If he is conscious of a filial spirit, the spirit of adoption, that demonstrates the clearness of his faith in Jesus, the Christ, the Lamb of God who taketh away his sin, and brings him to God to sustain the relation of child, son ; and the now natural cry, Abba, Father, witnesseth the fact of his possessing that spirit of adoption (for that is the meaning of the phrase "whereby we cry ;" *en hooi*, because, inasmuch as, *krazomen*, we cry) : our spirit witnesses by the cry, the word, Father ; and the Holy Spirit, by his word, the Scripture (such as *I John* iv. 7, etc.), says the same thing ; i. e., that we are born of God, he is our Father : every one is such, who loves God, and loves men, especially the brethren. Our spirit and the Holy Spirit witness the same fact ; testifying, each by his word, crying, saying, that we are children of God : and that is the assurance of our inheritance ; for " — if children, then heirs ; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ," etc. *Rom.* viii. 17.

The testimony of the Spirit concerning Jesus, is the most momentous that can reach the ear of sinner or of saint. First, he is the Christ ; in him are explained all the types of victims bleeding and dying for sin ; the wondrous type of the two goats, on the same day of atonement ; one bleeding and dying, the other bearing away the sins of the whole people ; all this typical display, though this is but an item or so, to point forward to him, upon whom our sins were laid ; upon whom was the chastisement of our peace ; and by whose stripes we are healed : so to the most severe accusation of Satan, the vilest sinner may reply, True : but JESUS DIED ; and although " it is not possible that the blood

of bulls and of goats should take away sins :” *Heb.* x. 4 ; yet, “—if we walk in the light as he is in the light (if we suffer the light of God’s word to shine into our minds, so that we can see the great facts of redemption) we have fellowship one with another (we shall understand things alike, and be drawn by a communion of mind into a communion of spirit and action: and we will see in this light, for the best eye cannot see without light, of God’s word, that) the blood of Jesus Christ (the great Victim typified by all preceding, in every age) his Son cleanseth us from all sin.” *I John* i. 7. He — “loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood.” *Rev.* i. 5.

O the blood ! the precious blood !  
That Jesus shed for me !

Such is the witness of the Spirit that brings “peace in believing ;” for when the sinner understands that his sins were laid upon Jesus, that he might suffer in his stead ; and that he did suffer ; that he is reconciled to God by the death of his Son ; that God so loved him as to give his only begotten Son to die for his offenses ; that Jesus gave himself for him ; that the holy gospel is sent to tell him all this ; and the Holy Ghost has come to help him understand all this ; and that he does understand it ; is it any wonder that he has peace in believing and joy in the Holy Ghost ? It would be the wonder of wonders if he had not.

The importance of the passage urges to a further consideration. We notice the order of the testimonies. The testimony of our own spirit, the filial spirit is mentioned first. Our spirit cries, Abba, Father : we have been adopted into the family : our faith has saved us : we have accepted cordially the testimony God gives us of his Son : we have trusted in the blood that cleanseth from sin, and in the mercy that endureth forever : we

have heard the voice of Jesus instructing us to say, in our prayer, "Our Father:" we do thus look up to God: we are not of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh; but we are such according to faith; and the filial spirit in our hearts moves our lips to the utterance, Abba, Father.

Next comes the testimony of the Spirit, according with, agreeing with that of our own spirit: demonstrating that our cry, and the spirit inducing it, are right, they agreeing with "the law and the testimony." It is not the order, that the Spirit himself bears witness, and then our spirit becomes filial and we cry, Abba, Father. Not that is the apostle's statement. "For ye are all the children (*huioi*) of God by faith in Christ Jesus." *Gal.* iii. 26. There is no other mode of becoming a child of God, but "by faith in Christ Jesus." The inquirer after God must be pointed to Jesus, as "the way, the truth, and the life. No man cometh unto the Father but by me." *John* xiv. 6. Jesus is "the brightness of his (God's) glory, and the express image (*charakteer*) of his person (*hupostaseos*, the invisible, inscrutable nature), etc. *Heb.* i. 3. Jesus, then, is the way to see God, to arrive at God; inscrutable to us, he appears in Jesus, "God was in Christ," showing himself to the world, to men, that we might be "reconciled to him," as we should see nothing in him to be dissatisfied with, and everything to challenge our admiration, confidence and love. Jesus is the truth, concerning God's disposition toward us; his compassion for our miserable, lost condition; dead as we are in trespasses and sins; mere bones lying dispersed in the valley; but he found a ransom for the captives, a word and spirit for the bones; he gave his only begotten Son; sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world; sent him not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved; a great groan was heard through the whole

world, "O Ephraim, how can I give thee up?" And he did not give us up; for Jesus is the life, our life; he had life in himself and imparted it to dead humanity: it was not only at the bedside of the ruler's daughter, the bier of the widow's only son, the tomb of Lazarus that he was "a quickening (*zoopoion*) spirit;" *I Cor.* xv. 45; but as "the last Adam," the "second Man," he sent the quickening, life-causing energy, through the whole human race. "The bread of God is he which (who) cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." *John* vi. 33. "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." *Ib.* 51. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." *Ib.* 47. Yes, he is the life whether we believe in his atoning act and ceaseless intercession, or not; but if we believe he becomes to us the bread, the nutriment of everlasting life: he quickens every man into life, but if he will not receive the bread provided for the sustenance of his life, there is nothing left him but starvation and the second death.

"If we receive the witness (*marturian*) of men, the witness of God (*hee marturia tou Theou*, the testimony of God) is greater: [and the fair inference is, that God's testimony is more worthy of being received by us, than is the testimony of men] for this (statement that the apostle John had just made concerning Jesus, the Christ) is the witness (*marturia*, testimony) of God which he hath testified (*memartureeken*) of his Son (*peri tou huiou autou*, concerning his Son). He that believeth on the Son, hath the witness in himself; (*echei teen marturian en heautooi*, hath the testimony within him, hath received the testimony of God, the truth concerning Jesus is in his mind and heart): he that believeth not God (does not receive his testimony) hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record (*marturian*, testimony) that God gave (*memartureeken*) of (*peri*, concerning) his Son. And this is the

record (*marturia*), that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." I John v. 9-12. Such is the blessed, cheering, lucid, glōrious witness, testimony of the Spirit, addressed through our minds to our hearts.

Not a sensation, a blaze of light, an impression on the sense of feeling: sensation is the avenue of knowledge: knowledge is not "the *hupostasis*, the *substans*, the *support*, of things hoped for;" that being the function of faith, the faith that comes by hearing the word, the testimony, of God. Faith rests upon testimony; the testimony that God hath testified of his Son. Therefore says the same apostle John, "— it is the Spirit that beareth witness (*marturoun*, that testifieth) because the Spirit is truth (*to pneuma estin hee aleetheia*, the Spirit is the truth, the truth is the Spirit ." I John v. 6. Nothing is the object of faith but truth. Unless we believe in the truth concerning God, as communicated to us by the word of God, the Scriptures, we cannot believe in God: we might by believing fables, lies, believe in gods many; but only by believing the Scriptures can we believe in God. The same is exactly true as to believing in Christ; we can only believe by the testimony of the Spirit, as we have it recorded in the Scripture, "the word of the Lord (which) endureth forever. And THIS is the word which by THE GOSPEL is preached unto you." I Peter i. 25. Not that we "limit the Holy One of Israel;" omnipotence is something too great to be weighed in our insignificant balance. But, unless we be "holy men," men separated unto the divine use, for that purpose of being the recipients of the direct, immediate communications of the Spirit; we are shut up to the testimony that he has communicated through the agency of those "holy men of old," which testimony, Peter declares "more sure" (*bebaioteron*, better founded, more steadfast, better adjusted for permanence, abiding) than a

special voice from heaven, sounding on the air and sinking into a silence, never again to be similarly broken. *II Peter* i. 19. To this precious word (*propheetikou logon*, prophetic word) he advises us to take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark (*auchmeerooi*, desert, dreary, gloomy) place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in our hearts. The written word does not sound in our dreary hearts, and then sink into silence. But there it is; abiding; a written testimony; made under oath, God who could find no greater, having sworn by himself, *Heb.* vi. 17; that we may take heed to it; read it; read it again; hear it preached, expounded; until at last the bright morning star, Jesus, is seen by the understanding, and the pure and peaceful light is shed through our heart: the testimony of God has been received, and the same mighty voice which stilled the wind and waves, that were sinking the ship in the roaring depths of Galilee; has stilled into sweetest composure, the commotion of the believer's heart: he has peace in believing. *Rom.* xv. 13.

We can conceive of no form or manner of testimony superior to the written word of God. If a voice from heaven were heard, it would supply nothing more, nothing less, than this blessed written word of God. Woe to the man who adds to, or takes away from the words of this Book! *Rev.* xxii. 18, 19. Woe to the man who believes anything but what is written in this Book, as something to teach him the way of life! *Gal.* i. 6-9. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." *Luke* xv. 31.

It is the farthest from our thoughts to intimate, that the Spirit, the gracious paraclete, has no direct presence and influence in the conversion of the sinner: that he cannot enter our being except by the word, coming into our minds and hearts. How, we know not. But, it is

not more certain, that the warm spirit of the spring-time, sweeps over and through the frozen surface of the earth, melting the ice, drying and warming the softened soil, preparing it for the plough and the seed; than that the Spirit enters, thaws, warming and drying our death frosted nature; preparing it for the seed of life, the testimony that God gives us concerning his Son. The Spirit is the atmosphere of life; we must breathe that heavenly air or die. The spiritual life is as really a matter of consciousness, as is the natural life. The "joy in the Holy Ghost" is very distinct and distinguishable from natural joys. We are exhorted to "walk with the Spirit;" to be "filled with the Spirit;" to "grieve not the Holy Spirit of God;" etc.

But we are seeking the exposition of *Rom.* viii. 16; and it is, that what the Spirit witnesses is recorded in the WRITTEN WORD. It is not by might, not by any other might, we mean, than by the Holy Ghost, that the process of conversion begins, and is conducted to completion. The Divine Agent opens the ears, softens the heart, supplies the truth, and brings every aid to the sinner, that is needful to enlighten and invite him: and if he will only yield his will in hearty, real acceptance of the truth; casting himself for time and eternity upon the clear, blessed, changeless truth of the gospel; that the atoning blood was shed, shed for him, washing away his sins—that God is reconciled to him by the death of his Son—that the ambassadors are sent to entreat him, the sinner, to be reconciled to God—of course, he has "peace in believing;" the scales have fallen from his eyes; he sees now his relation to Christ his Saviour, to be that of a redeemed sinner; and he has "joy in the Holy Ghost." He is happy enough in this blessed faith, to which he has been led every step by the gracious impulses of the Holy Ghost, among the secret machinery of his wonderful nature, while the plain words of the



Holy Ghost were entering his ear from the preached gospel, or entering the springs of his will from the chambers of his memory. To him, it has seemed to be the working of his own powers of perception, understanding, decision, will; involving great confusion of thought, distress of sensibility, penitence, inquiry, prayer; little dreaming of the mercy that has been shown him, in the piercing convictions that have filled him with shame and anguish, and the kind urgency toward the belief of the truth, vouchsafed to him by the Holy Ghost.

What is the result? He has entered the rest and joy of faith. He has believed the gospel, and has peace in believing. He rejoices in hope of the glory of God. But why should this happy experience be called "the witness (the testimony) of the spirit?" The experience witnesses, testifies that he has believed the Spirit; has believed the testimony given by the Spirit in the gospel; the blessed testimony concerning Jesus, the merciful and mighty Saviour of sinners, that he suffered in the sinner's stead; was delivered for his offenses, and raised again for his justification. But the experience so peaceful, so happy, so joyous, is a condition, an unspeakably happy condition, into which the subject has been brought, by the pervading power of the Holy Ghost, aiding and urging him to believe the glorious truths of the gospel, that testimony of the Holy Ghost, concerning the shedding and power of the blood of Jesus, for the cleansing the sinner from his sins. He has believed the testimony of God, the Holy Ghost, as recorded in the gospel. Nothing has been said to him but the words of the gospel. He has believed and is saved. The impenitent sinner has believed so much of the gospel, the witnessing of the Spirit, as relates to sin, and has been convicted, and has taken one step, in becoming penitent: and now he has received the

gospel, the witnessing of the Spirit, as to the cleansing blood of Jesus, the Christ, and has taken the other step into assured justification and conscious peace.

But it is not to such persons, at such times, that the Scripture under consideration refers. The context demonstrates that the Apostle alludes to the normal experience of believers, all believers, at any point of their progress: persons who are in the Spirit, and the Spirit of God in them; who are led by the Spirit of God, and are the sons of God; who have received the spirit of adoption, inducing the language of children, Father. To be sure our translators decide, that the "spirit of adoption" refers to the Holy Spirit: but it is more likely that the phrase is antithetical to "the spirit of bondage," just preceding; and is to be understood as in *Luke* ix. 55, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of." Christians, the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, in a filial spirit, say Father; and are so taught by their divine teacher, and elder brother, to say, "Our Father."

We turn our attention, now, to a special examination of the phraseology, "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit:" *auto to Pneuma summarturei tooi pneumati hemoon*. Which we render, The Spirit himself witnesses with our spirit: confirms the testimony of our spirit: our spirit says something, and the Holy Spirit says something in confirmation thereof: the two testimonies AGREE: by the mouth of the two witnesses the thing is established; Christians are the children of God, and then, heirs. The phrase is not The Spirit himself witnesses TO, but WITH, our spirit: in accord, agreement: our spirit utters the word Father; because our spirit is filial, and Father is the proper word to be used, when we address God: we do not address that word to ourselves but to God; and it witnesses that we have a filial spirit. And in strict accordance therewith,

“the Spirit himself” has recorded his testimony, “But as many as received him, to them gave he power (authority) to become (be) the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.” *John* i. 12; “— every one that loveth is born of God.” *I John* iv. 7.

It is not correct to take *summarturei* as referring to agreement in time, as though the two testimonies are uttered at the same time. Dr. Parkhurst defines it, “*To bear witness also, together, or at the same time:*” but, certainly, there is nothing in the word to signify time: the agreement is not as to time, but to testimony: *sugchronos*, where the *g* corresponds to the first *m* in our *summarturei* (the *g* and *m* being put for *n*, for the sake of euphony) means agreement as to *time*; but *summarturei* signifies only agreement as to testimony. Liddell & Scott define it, “*To bear witness with or in accordance with another;*” and give among other cited proofs, *Xen. Hell.* 7, 1, 35: which passage is in an account of a Grecian embassy to the Persian court, where Pelopidas of Thebes having recited certain exploits of his countrymen; Xenophon says that Timagoras, the Athenian, testified, *sunemarturei*, that all the statements of Pelopidas were true. The two agreed in their statements: but did not testify at the same time: the king would scarcely have allowed them, to testify at the same time. Pelopidas had given in his testimony, before Timagoras had opened his mouth. And so, the testimony of the Spirit, as in our passage, was given and recorded before we were born; but it agrees precisely with the testimony of our spirit, when it prompts us to address God as our Father. Greater weight is given to this quotation from Xenophon, by the fact, that, while many Greek words in the N. T. are modified from their strictly classical meaning; this is not the case with *summartureoo*: and on that account, Professor Cremer omits it entirely from his *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*.

We have already cited *Heb. x. 15*. "Whereof the Holy Ghost is a witness to us: for after that he hath said before, This is the covenant," etc. The words of Paul are, *marturei de heemin kai to Pneuma to hagion*, The Holy Spirit witnesseth to us: and what the Holy Spirit witnesses, or testifies, is a passage of Scripture, *Jerem. xxxi. 33, 34*: demonstrating that the Scripture is the witness, the testimony, of the Spirit: and as the canon of the Scripture is concluded, the testimony of the Spirit is concluded; remaining on record in the sacred volume; and every word being there, that is necessary to salvation; we need to look for none other; nor is any other given. To believe the record God hath given of his Son, is sufficient: he that believeth shall be saved.

"Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, which new and living way through the veil, that is, his flesh, he hath consecrated for us; and (having) a high priest over the house (the dispensation, plan) of God; let us draw near with a true (sincere) heart, in full assurance of faith, etc. \* \* \* let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised." *Heb. x. 19-23*. Here, in this very clear and instructive passage, the Apostle, at v. 15, having referred to the witnessing of the Holy Ghost, as recorded in the Scripture, exhorts us to make the nearest possible approach to God (into the HOLIEST) by the blood of Jesus, the new way, consecrated by our High Priest, who directs us to enter "in full assurance of faith;" our highest qualification, for the highest privileges of the saints. Faith in the atoning blood of Jesus, the Lamb of God, the proof of the love of the Father; faith in the record, the testimony, the witness which the Holy Ghost hath borne of these great facts; this faith fills the soul with assurance, comfort, joy.

When the Spirit bears witness by the mouth of John, *I John* iii., that "we are the sons (children) of God," he but repeats the witness by the prophets, the holy men of old, that in the day of Christ, we gentiles should have equal privileges with the Jews, and be the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. The gospel, the witness of the Spirit comes to us, and he that believes it, to his delighted astonishment, looks up to God as his Father; to Jesus as dying for his sins and rising for his righteousness; to the Spirit as his inspirer and leader; and the spirit of bondage flees, vanishes from his heart, filled now with the spirit of adoption, as is demonstrated by the language of his lips crying, Father.

In The Acts, that inspired history of the simplest, purest days of Christianity in motion, the uniform statement of conversion is by faith, cordial belief of the gospel. After the first proclamation of the gospel, the record is, *Acts* ii. 41, "Then they that gladly received his WORD were baptized: and the same day there were added about three thousand souls." And this is a fair specimen of the facts of conversion. The gospel was preached, and they that believed were saved. This was the unvarying process. The gospel was the power of God unto salvation to every one that believed. The preachers delivered the testimony of the Spirit, who brought all things to their remembrance, and thus were they enabled to preach the gospel with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, inspiring them, and inspiring their hearers: they preached and heard the gospel, the words, the witness of the Holy Ghost.

"But perhaps one might say (desiring any who are taught of God, to correct, to soften, or strengthen the expression), the testimony of the Spirit is an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit, that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given

himself for me ; and that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God.

“8. That this testimony of the Spirit of God must needs, in the very nature of things, be antecedent to the testimony of our own spirit, may appear from this single consideration : we must be holy of heart, and holy in life, before we can be conscious that we are so ; before we can have the testimony of our spirits that we are inwardly and outwardly holy. But we must love God, before we can be holy at all ; this being the root of all holiness. Now we cannot love God, till we know he loves us. ‘We love him, because he first loved us.’ And we cannot know his pardoning love to us, till his Spirit witnesses it to our spirit. Since, therefore, this testimony of his Spirit must precede the love of God and all holiness, of consequence it must precede our inward consciousness thereof, or the testimony of our spirit concerning them.” *Wesley's Works*, Vol. I. 87.

It would be very unjust, to suppose the writer wanting in respect or veneration, for this great leader in the Church, whose influence is likely to go down upon all generations. Yet it is evident, that his mind was not clear upon this subject : “but perhaps one might say,” is not his manner of expression, upon theological points in definite accordance with Scripture : “desiring any who are taught of God, to correct,” etc., is equally significant of confused definition. The indistinctness of the teaching, is occasioned by a commingling the two ideas of the direct influences of the Holy Spirit, and his teaching by the gospel : his mysterious influence upon us, enabling us to understand and accept the truth as it is in Jesus ; and his influence upon the holy men, his scribes, who wrote that truth as it is in Jesus, that we might read it, have it preached to us, believe it, rejoice in it, obey it, and be saved. The truth as it is in Jesus is what the inquirer is to understand, believe, and stay

himself upon; conforming to it as the rule of his life, the authority for his hope. But, our sainted leader puts it, that the Spirit must make an "inward impression on the soul, whereby the spirit of God directly witnesses to my spirit (*summarturei* does not signify witnesses *to*, but witnesses *with* : of the *two* witnesses the Spirit is *one*. A. W.) that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me; and that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God:" and this must occur before our spirit can give its utterance, Abba, Father. Now if our venerated father meant that we are to feel the impression, and therefore believe; that would not be faith, but knowledge: what we feel, see, smell etc., we do not believe; we know: we believe what is reported to us by a creditable witness, although we neither see, nor by any sense attain to what he reports. And as to this unintelligible impression testifying, that we are the children of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved us, and given himself for us; and that all our sins are blotted out, and we, even we, are reconciled to God; there is not one word or sentiment here stated, that is not sparkling on the written record of the Spirit's testimony, the Scripture, the recorded gospel. Sense is not faith; nor is joy; nor is anything other than a cordial belief of the truth as it is in Jesus. But such a belief brings feeling; the feeling of peace, trust, joy; of which the soul is quite conscious; and this belief, this faith, with its blessed results, is because of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, without whose gracious aid, we cannot hear understandingly and gladly the gospel of Jesus, the Christ; and, therefore, this great Agent comes to us, we write it most reverently and thankfully, as a divine Factor, indispensable in the glorious plan of salvation. But the

testimony, the witness, the word, it is written, recorded, unvarying, clear, so that "he that runs may read."

The gospel assures us, that God is reconciled to us by the death of his Son, who bare our sins in his own body on the tree; washed us from our sins in his own blood; rejects no one that comes to him; shows us the Father in his own amazing love and care for us; prepares us a place in the heavenly rest; instructs us to trust in his blood as the expiation of our sins, in his upholding hand in our weakness; and in the blessed leading of the Spirit by his recorded word; and to honor Father, Son, and Holy Ghost by a hearty, loving faith in all this glorious truth, the gospel. He that believes this, is certainly conscious of the fact; conscious of the peace it brings; conscious that his faith in Jesus is a fountain within him from which flows rivers of living water. The gospel that he has believed, unfolded to him the fact that God first loved him, with such overwhelming facts attesting it, that he now loves God; and, of course, he is conscious of that love. And he will try to live in conformity with his obligations to the Father who loved him; to the Son who loved him; to the Holy Spirit who loved him; and the Father, Son, and Spirit will take up their abode with him, and make him useful and happy. When the filial spirit inspired by the story of so much love speaks out from his heart the blessed word, Father; the cry testifies his sonship: and there is the recorded testimony of the Spirit, corroborating his right to, and the propriety of, such an utterance. Nothing can be more warranted by Scripture, than the right of him who believes the truth as it is in Jesus, to look up with an eye sparkling through tears of gratitude, and cry, Abba, Father.



## GOD'S PURPOSE ACCORDING TO ELECTION.

ROM. ix. 11. —For being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; (12) It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.

WHAT was God's purpose? We can safely refer to *Gen.* iii. 15, which has been properly designated as being the very core of revelation, of the Scripture; "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." All the Scripture preceding this promise explains why it was given; and all succeeding it, shows how it was fulfilled. It was God's purpose, then, to bring into the world one of woman born, who should destroy the works of the devil. *I John* iii. 8. To carry out this purpose, God chose his own instruments, according to his own wise and sovereign will; having no respect to what any one had done, whether good or evil; for in the case of Esau and Jacob, they were not born when the election of Jacob was announced; demonstrating that the election was not of works that Jacob had done; for he had done nothing.

The first grand election, that of Noah, was, in some sense, by works; for it is the divine testimony that, "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God. \* \* \* And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." *Gen.* vi. 9; vii. 1. This election was to preserve the race, and bring in the seed of the woman.

The next election was somewhat similar, as to the person elected, Abraham; the great Abraham; the friend of God. "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house (a complete election, choosing out), unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, \* \* \* and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." *Gen.* xii. 1-3. This election was of a good and great man, as the *souche*, the origin, of a nation from which would be brought in the seed of the woman, to be a blessing to all nations, the whole human race: and, like the former, it was for the accomplishment of God's great purpose of the redemption of man.

But now, this Abraham, whom God knew, "that he will command his children and his household after him (i. e. he while living will order his family aright; and so completely, that they will feel the influence of his administration 'after him,' after his decease), and they shall keep the way of the Lord," etc. *Gen.* xviii. 19; this Abraham had a son, Ishmael, whose mother was an Egyptian slave; and though Abraham's prayer was, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" *Ib.* xvii. 18; he was informed that his aged wife, Sarah, should have a son; and of the two, the younger who was altogether of his own blood (Abraham and Sarah being of the same lineage), should be the *elect* link in the formation of the Abrahamic nation, from which should spring the seed of the woman.

The elect Isaac, the son of Abraham and his sister-wife in their old age, also lived to be advanced in life, before the birth of his twin sons, Esau and Jacob. Before their birth, their mother, Rebecca, was informed, that it was God's pleasure to *elect* the latter, Jacob; as the next link in the official series, in the formation of the great Abrahamic nation, from which should come

the seed of the woman, to accomplish God's great purpose, the redemption of man.

Now the principle of election ceases. Jacob having twelve sons, the twelve tribes spring from these; though two of these, Ephraim and Manasseh, are from Joseph, one being in the room of Levi, whose descendants were separated for the priesthood and its service. These tribes organized into a nation, under such institutions as kept them apart from all others; constituted the elect nation: and such was the efficiency of the organization, that it was clearly and sharply apart from all others, at the time of the bringing in of Jesus, the seed of the woman, the Christ of God, who came to be the Saviour of the world. He was promised to the world; not to the Jews, except so far as that he was to "spring from Judah," *Heb.* vii. 14, one of the twelve tribes.

But in all these elections, no one can perceive anything like an election of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve tribes, to eternal life. There is nothing here but an election of instruments, agents, for the accomplishment of the great and glorious purpose of God, the redemption of man. These elect had great incidental, spiritual, religious advantages, while acting for the benefit of the race. As in the case of all needed functionaries, these were compensated for their public position and responsibility. "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? (have we Jews been compelled to hear and endure the shrieks of our sons, in the painful rite of circumcision, that we might be kept a separate nation, merely to bring in the Christ for the common benefit of men; so that the Gentiles have as much interest in him as the Jews? Then what profit is there to the Jew in all this?) Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God. (They had the Holy Scripture which the Gentiles had not: and by comparing the

nations that now possess the Bible, with those that do not, as to their civil as well as to their religious condition ; we see clear proof of what a prodigious advantage, this fact gave the Jews over other nations. Yet, while the nation held this splendid advantage, all did not use it to profit.) For what if some did not believe ? shall their unbelief make the word of God without effect ?” *Rom.* iii. 1-3. Those that believed were saved.

There is no election unto eternal life, taught in the Scripture. The only election there mentioned is this election to official position, with its great incidental spiritual advantages ; and that for the carrying out of “God’s purpose.” When that purpose was fulfilled, and Jesus, the Christ, brought in ; then the dividing wall was broken down, and there was one fold, with One Shepherd. This blessed expansion of light and truth in Messiah’s time, was no novelty. It was fore-known, fore-ordained, predestinated, ages before its occurrence : “Moses and the prophets,” those holy writings were full of such predictions. The intention to bring in the nations, the Gentiles, was older than the giving of the Law : “Abraham rejoiced to see my day : and he saw it, and was glad.” *John* viii. 56. This is the key to all this class of words in the Scripture : all the nations were to be blessed through the agency of the elect Abrahamic nation, by their bringing forth the Christ, and having the keeping of the Scripture ; and such words as we just now quoted, *fore-known*, *fore-ordained*, etc., relate to the predictions of the prophets, concerning Christ, and the expansion of the Church so as to include all who should believe, Gentile as well as Jew : therefore we find these words amid allusions to the bringing in of the Gentiles ; which, to the Jew, was the great mystery kept secret from the foundation of the world, but now revealed at the coming of Christ. Thus the apostle, “—the preaching of Jesus Christ, according

to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but is now made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." *Rom. xvi. 25, 26.*

Here we have the statement, that Jesus Christ was to be preached in a certain mode; i. e. according to the revelation of "the mystery," the coming of the Gentiles to God directly through Christ; and not indirectly through Moses: a mystery this, which had been kept secret since the (Jewish) world began; but now was made manifest, and by the writings of the prophets, by the commandment of God, for they wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, made known to "all nations" for "the obedience of faith." No circumcision, no performance of the various rites and ceremonies peculiar to the one elect nation: only faith: faith is the obedience required, now that the Christ has come; to authenticate whose coming, and typify his work, was the cause of this nation's election to the duty of being the torch-bearer for the nations.

This very word "purpose" (*prothesis*) used here by Paul, in this phrase "the purpose of God," is significant. It is found in the N. T. twelve times. Of these, four times it refers to the shew bread; three times to human purpose; five times to the divine purpose respecting the salvation of all men, Gentiles as well as Jews. And as to the four references to the shew bread, "—since part of the frankincense put upon the bread was to be burnt on the altar for a memorial, i. e. of the bread (*Levit. xxiv. 7*), even *an offering made by fire* unto the Lord; and since Aaron and his sons were to *eat* it in the holy place (*Levit. xxiv. 5-9*), it is evident that this bread typified Christ, first presented as *a sacrifice to*, or rather *to the presence of, Jehovah*, and then becoming *spiritual food* to such as *in and through* him

are *spiritual priests* to God, even his Father. See *Rev.* i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6. Comp. *I Pet.* ii. 5." *Parkhurst.* So, that nearly the whole use of this word "purpose" (*prothesis*) in the N. T. is with reference to this very point, the redemption in Christ Jesus for men; and not for Jews, except as men: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." *Gal.* v. 6. The obedience of faith is all: believe and thou shalt be saved.

So, we see God's "purpose," *prothesis*, to bring in the Redeemer of men, revealed, made known clearly, *Gen.* iii. 15; and the *to menein*, the continuance, the persistence of the purpose "according to election," according to, in the use of the principle of election, the sovereign choice of his agents; we see plainly noted in the divine history, if we choose to read it: for there is neither secret nor mystery in that; it being recorded in all the perspicuity we could desire. First, the election of Seth, Enos, etc., down to the great election of Noah to tide the human race over the flood, and multiply it on the earth. Second, the election of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve lesser patriarchs, to produce and organize the elect nation, for the production and authentication of the seed of the woman, whose wounded heel should bruise the serpent's head in behalf of man. And "the purpose of God" was accomplished by means of these elections; these sovereign elections; elections not because of the works of the elected, for the record is that Isaac, Jacob, and the whole Jewish nation, were elected before they were born, and of course before they had done either good or evil. But to what were they elected? Certainly, to act as the instruments, the agents of God's purpose of bringing in the Christ, to be the Redeemer of men. If the elect nation was elected to eternal life, the election in multitudes of instances, alas! was in vain, failed, came to nought. If the elect nation was elected

to hold in deposit the Scriptures, and produce the Christ, the election manifested the wisdom of God, in completely accomplishing his purpose; for that nation handed over to us those Scriptures, and the Christ; demonstrated facts these, by history and possession.

That this was done from "the foundation of the world," is clear enough, and entirely intelligible. But that it was so arranged, in every particular, "from all eternity," we do not vouch. If it were so revealed, we should accept it as a revealed, inscrutable fact, above our thoughts; but as to understanding what such a phrase means, we are very sure that no finite intelligence can do it. It faints, after its utmost power of flight, without having crossed the threshold. When one says, "From all eternity," he means nothing; he can mean nothing; he can only darken counsel with words.

We have the history of election, plainly, very plainly written; and we can easily see that it dates back as far as to the outset of our race; Seth the younger, was preferred to Cain the elder, the assassin, the fratricide. Why, then, instead of accepting and rejoicing in the blessed and instructive narrative, demonstrating to us the loving interposition of an offended, insulted God; and of his persistent purpose, and continued choice of agents for its accomplishment, until the oracles of God and the Christ of God, were placed by those agents in the possession of mankind; why should we waste our time, weary our powers, and worry each other in vain attempts to penetrate to the "from all eternity"? Such controversies are not only useless, but hurtful. God, our Father, has not seen proper to open to us an access to the depths of the past eternity; and, we suppose, it would be very useless to do so: for with the aid of all the powers we possess, we could never explore them. We are not capable of any benefit from such revelation, were it made to us: and wisdom dictates the better plan,

of accepting the inspired history of election ; and learning from it the loving, persistent care of God, to secure to all our race the redemption that is by Jesus, the Christ.

In the same manner we read the apostle's allusion to the case of Pharaoh, the unbelieving king of Egypt. We have a quite detailed statement of the case in the book, Exodus ; and need not be puzzled and confused by conjectures. God was about to bring Israel out of Egypt, to the land the nation was to occupy, until the coming of Christ. He proceeded, in his providence, to prepare the great leader Moses, whom he sent to Pharaoh, supernaturally empowered, commanding him to release his people. He did not excite them to rebellion, or to civil war ; thus attempting to bring his people away without shedding the blood of their unjust and cruel task-masters. Upon the king's refusal, a series of plagues was commenced ; but, though the king occasionally gave way, acknowledging his fault, and promising obedience if the plague should be removed ; yet his heart was hardened by the divine forbearance, until the cry of horror at the death of the first born was heard throughout the land. Then he and his court, in their wild dismay, hurried off the Israelites who had prepared themselves for the predicted departure. This was hardly done, before Pharaoh and his court, equally hardened by the very providence that should have subdued them to repentance, mustered an army and pursued after the Israelites, to enforce their return.

Up to this point, history furnishes no clearer example, of the divine patience with a cruel, deceitful, promise-breaking, obstinate sinner. Having spared him and his country, the horrors of a sanguinary insurrection, which they so richly merited at the hand of this evil-entreated people, he commanded him to release Israel, his people, and sent the order by a most extraordinary ambassador.



Refusing to obey, he was made to feel and fear the consequences of his disobedience, with increasing pressure, and repeated releases from the scourge. Was there ever a clearer case of careful interposition in behalf of an oppressed people ; or wiser and kinder measures used with their oppressors ? But, as in the cases of other individuals and other nations, the goodness of God, which should have led them to repentance, only hardened the hearts of this king and his people. Then came the end. Undismayed by the miraculous separation of the sea, so as to afford a passage to the Israelites ; Pharaoh and his host, in hot pursuit, rushed into the awful opening, as though they would make the very plan of God for the escape of his people, the means of their capture. This was the time of the end. The waters rolled back into their natural level. All was over.

As many an instance of base ingratitude has demonstrated, kindness, forbearance, mercy will not always soften and improve the human heart ; but it frequently hardens under such influence. Goodness and severity were both tried perseveringly in Pharaoh's case ; and he was not overwhelmed, until he put himself where destruction was without alternative.

We must understand the apostle's expressions, consistently with the history to which he refers. Had he told us, that there was a king whom God ordered to do a certain act, and hardened his heart to prevent the wretch from doing it ; and continued chastising ; threatening, hardening him, until he brought him with a numerous, well-appointed army into an opening made in the sea, where he drowned him and his host for not doing what God himself had prevented him from doing : all this stated, and no historical light upon it : we would have pronounced it so opposite to the clear and abundant revelation that God hath made of himself ; that it must have been brought into the sacred text surreptitiously. Let any one read the great revelation of God

as made to Moses, *Ex.* xxxiv. 6, 7 ; and he could not reconcile the hypothetical statement just presented, with such a character as is there portrayed. Could Jesus, the express image of the Father, the brightness of his glory, have done such an act as that? The idea cannot merit a thought ; it is an utter absurdity. And if any one should transcend this, by affirming, that God not only did this, but coolly decreed it " from all eternity ;" did we not remember the splendid passage in Exodus, just cited, we would stand in silent horror, expecting his lips to blacken with the guilt of such an utterance.

We cleave to the history, and remembering the scope of the apostle's argument, he being " in great heaviness of heart " because of his people's entanglement in this same error as to election, they not seeing the temporary character of their national mission ; he informs them that God's great purpose of redemption must proceed, according to his own wise, kind, persistent sovereign will ; notwithstanding his patience, mercy and wisdom should melt some and harden others : as the same bright, glorious sunbeams soften one substance, and harden another, according to the nature or condition of each. The expression " have I raised thee up " (*exeegeira se*) is to be understood not as done *originally*, or *from thy birth*, but as the Hebrew word means " I have caused thee to stand, or subsist," *Ex.* ix. 16. " I have preserved thee from perishing by the preceding plagues." So the LXX. translate the word by *dieteereethes*, " thou hast been preserved." *Parkhurst.* I have raised thee up from thy prostration by plague after plague, " that I might shew my power in thee ;" as he did. But no sane man will suppose that God's power can only be seen in the destruction of sinners. When he stayed a plague, and lifted Pharaoh and his nation from prostration, he shewed his power in or

by Pharaoh; and had the repentance of the king been sincere, and had the once haughty monarch now submissively and kindly permitted Israel to go in peace; what a glorious exhibition it would have been of the divine power to save! The salvation of both parties would have glorified the divine power, certainly as much as the salvation of one, at the expense of the destruction of the other. And certainly it would have been more pleasing to Him, who has declared so emphatically, "As I live, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked."

Furthermore: with reference to God's showing his power, we might refer to Moses himself, the great agent in the demand made of Pharaoh, for *his* idea of the exhibition of the divine power. Consulting *Numbers* xiv. 11-21, we read, "And the Lord said unto Moses, How long will this people provoke me? And how long will it be ere they believe me, for all the signs which I have shewed among them? I will smite them with the pestilence, and disinherit them, and will make of thee a greater nation and mightier than they. And Moses said unto the Lord, The Egyptians shall hear it (for thou broughtest up this people in thy might from among them); and they will tell it to the inhabitants of this land: for they have heard that thou, Lord, art among this people, that thou, Lord, art seen face to face, and that thy cloud standeth over them, and that thou goest before them, by day-time in a pillar of cloud, and in a pillar of fire by night. Now if thou shalt kill all this people as one man, then the nations which have heard the fame of thee will speak, saying, Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the land which he sware unto them, therefore he hath slain them in the wilderness. And now, I beseech thee, let the power of my Lord be great, according as thou hast spoken, saying, The Lord is long-suffering, and of

great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations. Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people, from Egypt even until now. And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word: but as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord."

In this luminous Scripture, we see Moses estimating the long-suffering power of God, as greater than his power of destroying. As a passionate man may have an arm strong enough to kill, but not a will strong enough to quell his rage and spare the offender. Alexander would have "shewn his power," by sparing the wine-heated, insolent Clitus: while by slaying him he showed the power of his arm; but sad kingly weakness. God exhibited his power, in sparing Pharaoh, granting him repeated respite, treating him with amazing forbearance, as in the case of every sinner, and not crushing him, until the king forced him to choose between the destruction of Israel, and of the Egyptians. Sparing Egypt longer, allowing him to pass the sea and overtake Israel, was to destroy the latter: so the waters were loosened from their miraculous restraint, and the army and the king were no more.

The power of patience, forbearance, long-suffering is wonderful. Passion, rage, fury is never significant of moral strength. "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath," means, that as a frail man one has experienced his passion to have been too strong for him: but as a Christian, he knows where to procure strength, and he must recover his self-possession. The power of creation cannot be greater than the power of preservation; while either by far exceeds the power of destruction. This Moses urges in the plea, that the destruction of offending

Israel, would be to the nations a sign of Jehovah's weakness. He was unable, they would say, to bring them into, and maintain them in, Canaan; and so he destroyed them: he was only able to destroy.

All this argument of Moses goes to show, that Pharaoh's submission and releasing Israel, and the blessings that would have ensued to him and his people, would have glorified God's power and name, in a way much more satisfactory to him whose "tender mercies are over all his works," than did the obstinacy and destruction of the wretched monarch. This is also confirmed by Jehovah's own blessed words, "I have pardoned according to thy word (argument, plea, the principle you have stated as to the display of power): but as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." The pardon, the long-suffering, would do as well, then, as destruction, that "my name might be declared throughout all the earth." And so, the "raising up" was not to the throne, that he might be hurled from it into destruction; but, from his prostration by the plagues, to show God's amazing power of forbearance; "not willing that any should perish."

In the same category, we place the apostle's illustration of the power of the potter. We have a short history here in the divine record: but we have also some acquaintance with the facts connected with the trade of the potter. The history we have is at *Jerem.* xviii. 2-11, where a potter having a piece of work marred in his hands; he tried again and succeeded: the moral being in the eleventh verse: "—speak to the men of Judah \* \* \* saying, Thus saith the Lord, Behold I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you: return ye now every one from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good." There is nothing in the passage but the potter at work with a lump of clay, making a vessel; and being disappointed, he

having the marred vessel in his power, it seems good to him, instead of tossing it away in his displeasure, to make another effort at completing his vessel. "O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold as the clay in the hand of the potter, so ye in my hand, O house of Israel. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them." No clay can justly complain against such a potter as this.

But the apostle's potter, who represents the same just, kind, patient, placable Being, "has power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor." It cannot be thought that the meaning is, that he makes one vessel to be honored in any other way, than to be put to honorable use; such as a cup for the master of a family, a vase to ornament a chief room, etc. Or that the vessel unto dishonor, is any other than one for culinary, or such, purpose, it never making any show, never being ornamental in the house. But each, the honorable, the dishonorable, is made for a purpose; either for utility or ornament; and in fact a proper ornament is useful, as it cheers the heart by pleasing our taste: and never, in all time, in any generation, was there a potter who made vessels for the purpose of destroying them. No such potter was ever heard of. When Jeremiah went down to the Scriptural "potter's house," he saw the potter at work, "and the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter:" but the potter

did not mar it intentionally ; he was disappointed in the result ; for “ he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it.” He tried once more, and this time he was successful : it seemed good to him to persevere, until he should succeed.

The lesson was, that God purposing to make a great nation of Israel, it had marred in his hand, but he did not wish to destroy it. Unlike the clay, in one great respect, Israel had marred himself, in spite of the skill and care of the divine Potter ; and now he is told to turn from his evil ; with the promise that God would resume his work and loving care. He refused, and never was Israel the nation God would have made it to be. This is as evident as any fact in the sacred volume ; which represents God as lamenting the folly, perversity, and wickedness of Israel, hindering his kind designs and efforts for their good. The potter did not propose repentance to his clay, as the one condition of his making a second effort to form it into a vessel. He had more sense. Potters do not hold their clay responsible for the marring. Never did the clay on a potter's wheel, know or care what he proposed to do with it. But Israel was another sort of clay, into which God had put life, reason, a sense of moral right, and the consequent responsibility ; and therefore to his clay, the divine Potter did propose a condition to be complied with on their part, for the resumption of his work. They refused : so the main purpose of God, the bringing in of the Christ through Abraham's posterity, was accomplished in despite of them ; but the incidental blessing of their “ much every way advantage, chiefly in their possessing the oracles of God,” was frustrated by their unbelief and disobedience. “ He would, but they would not.” *Luke* xiii. 34, 35. “ Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost : as your fathers, so ye.” *Acts* vii. 51. The

human will resists the Holy Ghost. We need not pretend a traversing of the "from all eternity" to find proof of this: the Spirit who does search all things, "yea, the deep things (*ta bathee*), of God," testifies to this awful fact; "—it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." *Gen.* vi. 6. The clay was marred in the process, by its volition, and the Potter was so disappointed, that "he repented his preparation of the clay, and the marring grieved him at his heart." He made man upright: tempered wisely the clay, before placing it on the wheel; neglecting nothing on his part: but as the wheel turned obedient to the treadle, and the fingers of the Potter were employed in the formation of the vessel, the race; the wilful clay refused to be modeled after the mode chosen by the Potter; resisted, and his work was marred. It is a melancholy, but a plain, intelligible statement of facts.

Yet, the apostle speaks of "the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." True: but what does he say of them? "What if God willing (*theloon*, having his will formed, decided) to shew (*endeixasthai*, to exhibit) his wrath, and to make known (*gnoorisai*) his power, endured (*eenegken*, bore, carried) with (*en*) much long-suffering (*polleei makrothumiai*, forbearance, long-suffering, patience under trials and afflictions) the vessels of wrath (*skeuee orgees*, vessels of wrath, wrathful vessels. *Winer*, 185, § 30: as *Theos tees hupomonees*, God who is patient.) fitted to destruction." Then there is nothing said here of destroying such vessels? Not one word. Not a syllable. Not a letter. Not a punctuation point. Absolutely nothing. But what is said of them? That although God "wills," is decided, determined to show his wrath at sin, and his power to punish; as becomes the "Judge of all the earth," who "will by no means clear the guilty;" yet he "endured with



much long-suffering the wrathful vessels," the wicked agents, the Jewish nation, warring against him, and "fitted to (*eis*) destruction." They were fitted to destruction: were in a condition in which if the hot thunderbolt had fallen upon them, no murmur against the ruin would have been just: yet God "endured them with much long-suffering;" a grievous burden was it to bear; yet he bore it (*eenegken*). A wonderful picture, not of the wrath kindled and provided "from all eternity;" but of the patience and mercy of him, who, while perfectly just, and fixed in his "will" to maintain his sovereign authority and dignity; yet has some wondrous way of reconciling with that authority and dignity, his "much long-suffering endurance" toward the "vessels fitted to destruction."

And who fitted those vessels to destruction? Not the Potter. Else the history of the potter's work, as we have it in the divine record, is vain, teaches us nothing to the purpose. The potter's work was marred; but certainly, not by his intention: no potter is fool enough for that. The potter makes out of the same lump, one vessel unto honor; for the chief room, or for the master's use: and another for the kitchen, or for the servant's use; but never any potter made a vessel for the purpose of destroying it: no potter is mad enough for that. How then are we to answer the question, as to who fitted these vessels to destruction? It would be a fearful outrage against the character of God as revealed in the Scripture, and illustrated there by the history of his Son, to say that the hand of the divine Potter "made them thus." Had he done so, he could not have endured with much long-suffering, what he had done wholly to please himself. We can conceive, that, in such case, he might have been greatly pleased, at seeing the complete success of his work; they being wholly fitted to destruction; and the bolt ready, waiting, provided "from all eternity," to shoot hissing down its

path of destruction, at his *fiat*. But, we cannot conceive, how any good man, with the Scriptures in his hand, the only source of faith, could turn away from it, and search amid the thick, impenetrable darkness of "from all eternity" for such a contradiction to the revealed character of him, who "— is long-suffering to usward, not willing (*boulomenos*, counseling, devising) that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." *II Pet.* iii. 9. "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation;" etc. *Ib.* iii. 15.

The answer to our question can be found, only in the free agency, the will, and consequent responsibility of the vessels. In this differed the house of Israel in the hand of God, from the senseless, inanimate clay in the hand of the potter. This same author of the Epistle to the Romans, was the author of the Second Epistle to Timothy; in which also he wrote something concerning "vessels to honor and to dishonor;" which we must cite, in the case. "But in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth (*ostrakina*, a pot made of clay, earthen ware); and some to honor, and some to dishonor. If a man therefore purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified (*estai skeuos eis timeen heegiasmenon*, he shall be a vessel set apart unto honor), and meet for the master's use (*euchreeston tooi despoteei*, very useful to the master), and prepared unto every good work." *II Tim.* ii, 20, 21. Surely this is sufficiently plain. The vessel to dishonor is spoken of as having it in his own choice to remain with such, or purge himself from such, and "be a vessel separated (from his dishonorable associates) unto honor, and very useful to the master." And, surely is it implied, that if the vessel to honor chooses to degrade himself, he can do so: as he also is endowed with free agency, will, and the consequent responsibility; and every man finds

it easier to do wrong than right. If the weak vessel to dishonor can achieve the hard task of attaining to honor ; the vessel to honor can certainly contrive to attain unto dishonor : and if the vessel to dishonor is fitted to destruction, the vessel to honor can, by becoming a vessel to dishonor, fit himself to destruction.

This is not replying against God. We accept the divine statements, as given us in the Scripture ; and adore him whose long-suffering with those who have descended from honor to dishonor, fitting themselves to destruction, is designed to bring them to repentance, and thus back to honor and salvation : whose tender mercies are over all his works : who is long-suffering to usward, not purposing (*boulomenos*) that any should perish, but (purposing) that all should come to repentance. *II Pet.* iii. 9 ; and so if any perish, it will not be because of the divine purpose (*boulee*, design, purpose, decree, counsel) ; but because with a stiff neck and uncircumcised heart and ears, he resists the teaching of the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, and his mysterious, melting, merciful influences in his own frozen, wicked heart.

We append to this discussion, a few generic thoughts, which will now be the more easily understood.

The purpose of God according to election, *Rom.* ix. 11, was to fulfil his promise to man, *Gen.* iii. 15 ; which promise is the point of departure for all the inspired history, prophecies, providence, until this day. Of the sons of Adam, the number of whom is unknown, Seth was elected. Cain's birth is mentioned ; also Abel's, to show how Seth was "appointed (*schoth*)" in the room of Abel, who lost his position by the murderous hand of Cain, who was expelled from the official line because of the fratricide. Adam had sons and daughters, *Gen.* v. 4, but Seth stands alone in the line to Christ. So Seth had sons and daughters, but only Enos, the elect, is mentioned. For the same reason, of the sons and

daughters of Enos, we have no record of any but Cainan. And so on, with Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methusaleh, Lamech, Noah, each of whom had sons, but in each case, only the name of the elect son is recorded, until we get down to Noah, whose three sons are all mentioned, because Ham and Japhet, the two outside the official line to Christ, to which Shem was elected over Japhet and Ham his elders, were appointed two of the sources of the peoples renewing the earth. Of the five sons of the elect Shem, Arphaxad, the third in order of birth, was elected: then the son of Arphaxad, Salah; and his son, Eber (Heber); of whose two sons, Peleg and Joktan, Peleg, the younger, was elected. So, we have in the elect line, after Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber (Heber), Peleg, Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah; each of whom is stated to have had sons, but in the official line recorded, *Gen. xi. 10-26*, we have, in each case, only the name of the elect son, until we reach the last, Terah, where, as in the case of Noah, we have the names of his three sons, Abram (Abraham), Nahor, and Haran; of whom Abraham was elected to the official line, and the names of the others were recorded, because of the connection of their posterity with the history of Abraham. And as in the case of Noah's three sons, Shem the youngest, was the elect; so of Terah's three sons, Abraham, the elect, was the youngest. He and Shem both mentioned first of their several three, in the sacred narrative, because of their several eminence over their brothers, by their appointment to position in the official line. "Abraham was the youngest, but, by merit of excellence, named first." *Augustine, Gen. Quest. 25.* "Only named first because of his dignity, and his having been appointed the head and founder of the subsequent generation; and because to him was first made the express promise concerning Christ." *N. Lyranus.* That is, the revelation that the

nation springing from Abraham, should present the long-expected Christ, properly authenticated by sacred records, to mankind. This appears to be the real meaning of "God's purpose according to election," as illustrated by the holy records to which the Apostle appeals. This principle of election, resulted in the constituting the Abrahamic people, the agency for preparing the divine writings, and presenting the seed of the woman, fully accredited by those Scriptures, who was to bruise the serpent's head; or as John puts it, "To destroy the works of the devil." *I John* iii. 8. The election was for the benefit of men, the race; involving great incidental advantages to the elect, and great responsibility; but their personal grace and salvation, were to be secured only by personal faith and obedience.

---

---

## A SACRIFICE, LIVING, HOLY, ACCEPT- ABLE TO GOD.

ROMANS xii. 1, 2.—I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a sacrifice, living, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good and acceptable, and perfect will of God.

BY the word, "brethren," we are reminded of the beautiful simplicity of the gospel scheme: not lords and serfs; but brethren: all brethren. And as brethren, taking sweet counsel together: endeavoring to promote each other's welfare, and to secure the general harmony. "I beseech you," I have no authority over you: my

mission, as an apostle, gives me no dominion over your faith; *ouch hoti kurieuomen humoon tees pisteos, II Cor. i. 24*; in that respect we both occupy the same level; the Scripture being the only source of faith, and that is open alike to all: I am, as an apostle, a witness of the resurrection of Jesus; the great proof of his Messiahship; and, as a Christian, I beseech, I exhort you. Instead of basing my exhortation upon any apostolic dominion, a mere figment of the imagination, I beseech you by the mercies, the tender, countless mercies of God; the remembrance of which should induce you to strive eagerly to please him; to be rejoiced that you can do anything to manifest your gratitude for his redeeming mercy, and loving care of you in sending you the glad tidings of salvation, by faith in the gospel of his Son, given to be the Saviour of all, both Gentile and Jew.

I beseech you to "present your bodies;" nothing said of souls. The cause of this omission will appear from the general scope of the passage, the central thought in the second verse "the renewing of your mind," and the fact that he was addressing Christians. It is not, that the body is the principal part; not that he concerns himself with externals only, or chiefly: but, nevertheless, he does commence with telling us what to do with our bodies. And what are we to do with them? "That ye present your bodies a sacrifice \* \* \* to God." We have changed the order of the words, because the three adjectives *living, holy, acceptable* belong alike to the sacrifice, which they qualify; and it rather obscures the place to have one of them to precede, one to follow, and the third to seem to be connected with the word, God. The body is to be presented to God a sacrifice, *thusian*, from *thuoo* to slay; as when Stephen referring to the folly of Israel in making the golden calf, says they "offered sacrifice (*thusian*) to the idol." The

members, passions, powers of the body must be attended to, and so regulated as to have them accord with righteousness, benevolence, and humility: for God requires of us, each, "to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with his God." It is a humiliating thought, that to do this, will make such a wide distinction in a Christian's seeing, hearing, talking, feeling, walking, using his hands, etc., that his body will appear to be dead, in the estimate of a natural man. His body is presented a sacrifice.

But it is not to be dead: not slain, not starved, not emaciated by excessive fasting, or scarred by lashing, or other penance. Not that: but its members, passions, powers so employed, that "whether we eat or drink, whatsoever we do, we do all to the glory of God." *I Cor. x. 31.* Our feet must not be allowed to transport us anywhere, that our presence there will dishonor God: and so with our other members and capacities. But they are not to be idle. They must be actively employed: eating, drinking, doing what our hand finds to do, and going where we should go; but all in such a manner as to show in our conduct, that we belong to God; and are following his Son, our true and only Lord.

The sacrifice, the body, is to be holy. This necessarily follows a conformity to the apostolic rule, just cited, "do all to the glory of God." In which case, as we have remarked, it will be seen that we attempt not to follow lords many, or lords two; but only the one Lord Jesus Christ. In the Scripture, the word holy expresses the idea of "set apart;" something not in common or general use, but set apart, restricted to one special use. The corresponding Hebrew term, *kadash*, signifies to set apart. "Thou shalt separate three cities for thee in the midst of thy land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it." *Deut. xix. 2.* "Wherefore I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt separate

three cities for thee." *Deut.* xix. 7. "And they appointed (*vaiyakdishu*, they made holy, sanctified) Kedesh in Galilee in mount Naphtali, and Shechem in mount Ephraim, and Kirjath-arba, which is Hebron, in the mountain of Judah." *Joshua* xx. 7. There was no protection, in the Mosaic Institute, for a wilful murderer. *Exod.* xxi. 13, 14. But an accidental slayer had a place of refuge appointed to which he might flee, be judged, and protected. These facts explain the command in *Deut.* xix. 2, 7; as cited above; that the Israelites should *separate*, *TABVDIL*, three cities in the midst of the land, for this purpose; i. e. they should set apart those cities, as places of refuge for the accidental slayer: no other city than one of these would protect such party. But, when this separation was effected, it is stated that, "they appointed (sanctified, made holy, *vaiyakdishu*) Kedesh," etc. Which shows that in the mind of Moses, to separate, *badal*, and to sanctify, *kadash*, were interchangeable terms.

The Hebrew *kadash* does not, then, signify quality, but condition; or state; that of being set apart from common use, and so in special service, or condition. A very clear instance of this, and demonstrating that the word holy did not, *per se*, mean anything pure and good; we have in *Gen.* xxxviii. Judah had married his oldest son to Tamar, who surviving her husband, became the wife of the second son: again a widow, Judah under pretense that his third son was too young to marry her yet, sent her back to her father's house to await the maturity of his son. But as this was a mere scheme to get rid of her, Tamar seeing through it, contrived an interview with her father-in-law. "When Judah saw her, he thought her to be a harlot (*zonah*, rendered by the LXX. *porneen*); because she had covered her face." *Ver.* 15. Having given her in pledge that he would send her a kid from his flock, his "signet,



his bracelet, and his staff;” Judah “sent the kid by the hand of his friend the Adullamite, to receive his pledge from the woman’s hand: but he found her not. Then he asked the men of that place, saying, Where is the harlot (*hakdeshah*, the holy woman) that was openly by the wayside? And they said, There was no harlot (*kedeshah*, holy woman) in this place.” *Verses 20, 21.* We may add, that in both these verses, 20, 21, the LXX. render *kedeshah*, by *pornee*, as they rendered *zonah*, by *pornee*, in *ver. 15.* The “men of that place” by denying the presence of any harlot there, affirmed the excellence of the character of the female population: a harlot would have been a very exceptionable woman, there; quite set apart indeed.

At *Deut. xxiii. 17*, we read, “There shall be no whore (*kedeshah*, a holy woman) of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite (*kadesh*, a holy man) of the sons of Israel.” “And there were also sodomites (*kadesh*) in the land.” *I Kings xiv. 24.* “And he took away the sodomites (*hakkedeshim*) out of the land.” *Ib. xv. 12.* “And he brake down the houses of the sodomites (*hakkedeshim*, the holy men, the set apart men),” etc. *II Kings xxiii. 7.* It must astonish those who have not investigated the subject, that the study of the Scriptural sense of the word *kadash*, to sanctify, to make holy, should thus occasion so much humiliation and horror, at these remindings of the utter degradation to which our common human nature can descend: so much below the brutes. But this painful study is necessary, to our proper understanding of this important subject. We have seen in these citations that the word, holy, does not necessarily mean something pure and good; for we have had instances of its signifying precisely the opposite. By examining *Exod. xv. 17*, “— the sanctuary (*mikkedash*, the holy place, the place set apart for divine service), O Lord, which thy hands have established;”

and *Isai.* xvi. 12, "And it shall come to pass, when it is seen that Moab is weary on the high place, that he shall come to his sanctuary (*mikkedash*) to pray; but he shall not prevail;" we shall see that the word holy, *per se*, has no reference to quality, good or bad: for in the two passages just cited, it has a good meaning in the former, and a bad meaning in the latter; determined by the connections to indicate in the former, a divine sanctuary, and in the latter, an idolatrous one: yet, though the word refers to opposites, in a moral sense, there is no difficulty in distinguishing its indications; for a place may be set apart for an evil, or for a good purpose. So a human being may give up himself to the service of God or mammon. As one may devote himself to pleasure, or to toil; to amusement, or to business. Also as one may employ himself in deeds of malice, or of benevolence.

As another illustration that the word holy does not, *per se*, refer to quality, a house for divine worship, and a house for the most iniquitous use, may both be constructed of precisely the same material, say stone from the same quarry; and by the same workmen; and therefore they could not differ as to quality, in any respect: but in their condition, their status, they would differ *in toto*: for one would be set apart (holy) to good, the other (holy) to evil; one for the service of God, the other for the service of Satan. Both would be set apart (holy); one to God, the other to Satan. This explains the phrases "holiness to the Lord," "holy garments," etc. It is well, also, to notice how differing qualities of things, may not hinder their being holy in equal degree. A spacious house of worship may be constructed of the most costly and enduring material, rich and splendid in all its appointments, and sincerely set apart, sanctified, to the service of God. So, a small temple for the same purpose, in some district where

meagre poverty prevails, may be erected of the poorest material, with the most scanty appointments, yet the best the people's circumstances can afford, and with equal sincerity be set apart, sanctified, to the service of God. Now which of these is the holier? The former exceeds the latter in length, breadth, height, material, cost of construction, architecture, general appearance, seating capacity, durability: but in holiness they are equals; as also, in their acceptability to God. So, that the two houses differing so very much in quality, are equally holy; because alike set apart.

The subject is illustrated in *Num.* xv. 37-41; where Moses was instructed to direct the children of Israel, to make fringes in the borders of their garments, and to put upon the fringe a ribbon of blue; that they might look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord; and not suffer their eyes or their hearts to lead them off to other gods; and thus, "be holy (*kedoshim*) unto your God. I am the Lord (Jehovah) YOUR God (or, 'I, Jehovah, am YOUR God,' governor, ruler), which brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: I, Jehovah, YOUR God." This sheds light upon *Exod.* xx. 3; "Thou (the nation, as *one* nation; or, an individual, as each one of the nation) shalt have no other gods before me (in my presence; in association with me; as partakers with me of your homage, worship. But, you must be separated from all other gods unto me, worshipping and acknowledging me, alone; and thus being holy unto me)." So that the First Commandment is equivalent to, "Be ye holy unto Jehovah, as your God, as your Governor, Sovereign, whose laws only you must observe."

So in *Deut.* xiv. 2, we see this idea of separated, set apart, clearly expressed. "For thou art a holy people (*gnam kadosh*) unto the Lord thy God, and the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people (*segullah*,

equivalent to the Latin *peculium*, and not meaning eccentricity, oddity, or anything of that sort; but, a *private possession*; no other god having any property in this nation: and all this having no reference to the quality, physical or moral, of the nation; but only to the quality of the Lord's title to its faith and obedience: the title may be unquestionable, where the property is worthless.) unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth." This gave Israel an incalculable advantage: and had that people kept itself holy, apart, and obeyed the divine statutes, it would have surpassed all others, in every respect, physical and moral. Its holiness was position; but one that favored an advance to the most excellent quality. In the remarkable prophecy of the destruction of Babylon, by the Medes and Persians, *Isai. xiii.*, those heathen destroyers are called God's SANCTIFIED ONES: "I have commanded my sanctified (*mekudashai*) ones;" *v. 3.* Bishop Lowth translates, *my enrolled warriors*: which Dr. Clarke declares to be *the sense* of the word here. Rev. Alfred Jenour, "mine appointed ones;" explaining in a critical note, "Anything is said to be sanctified in scripture that is set apart and appropriated to a particular use. Hence the vessels of the temple are said to have been sanctified, because devoted exclusively to the service of God. We know they could not be *intrinsically* more holy than other vessels. So the Medes and Persians are called God's sanctified ones, because destined to perform a special service for him. Let us not however suppose that it is only in this sense that believers are called God's holy ones, or saints."

Believers differ, certainly, from those sanctified Medes and Persians; but not as to the nature of sanctification. Setting apart, is exactly equal to setting apart. Every one of those warriors was set apart, to serve God in the special service of punishing Babylon; and every believer in Jesus is set apart, to serve God in the special

service of "working out his own salvation with fear and trembling," and doing good to all men as he shall have opportunity; growing in grace and in the knowledge of Christ; keeping himself unspotted from the world; running with patience the race set before him; enduring to the end. The believer, set apart, sanctified, delighting in the law of the Lord, meditating in it day and night, acknowledging its authority in all things and at all times; is "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not wither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." *Psalms I*. He is sanctified, set apart, grows, is green, fruitful: his sanctification is position; his position all that can be desirable for growth and fruitage. The believer differs from the Mede and Persian, not in the nature, but the character, purpose of his sanctification.

A very lucid illustration of the word SANCTIFY, is at *Isai. lxi. 17*. "They that sanctify themselves (*ham-mithkaddeshim*) and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating swine's flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, shall be consumed together, saith the LORD." *Comp. Isai. i. 29; lxv. 3-5*. In these passages the sanctification was evil, vile, abominable, ruinous; a setting apart to evil: and demonstrating that the Scriptural sense of the word does not refer to quality; but to condition, character.

It would be very unjust to us, to suppose that we object to "holiness to the Lord," and plead for a low grade of religious experience. This is very far indeed, from our intention and desire. We believe the most excellent way is LOVE; and love "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth." *I Cor. xiii. 6-8*. "Love worketh no ill to his (the) neighbor: therefore love

is the fulfilling (*pleerooma*, fulness, contents, purport, requirement, etc.) of the law." *Rom.* xiii. 10. So, when one is converted, regenerated, born of God, he loves; he bears the image, the likeness of his divine Father; he has the spirit of a son; he commences a new life, a spiritual life, and is necessarily separated, sanctified from Satan, the world, and the flesh; sanctified unto God: for as no one can serve God AND mammon, neither can he serve God AND any one, or any thing, else: he may serve EITHER, but cannot serve BOTH. Holiness to God is the only road to heaven: Jesus is the way: so to walk in the way of holiness to God, is to believe one's self into Jesus, and remain in him, living in him, having his Spirit, his mind, crucified with him, buried with him, risen with him, growing in grace, having the affections set on things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. Every believer is in the way of holiness to God: there his feet are found at his regeneration; there his feet are found when not in apostasy; and there his feet are found until they enter the heavenly rest.

The children of God are not led by the gospel and the Spirit, into some dangerous, or less safe path, for a season; and then, in anguish and suddenness plucked into a better, purer, safer path. There is no better, purer, safer path, than that into which the guiding gospel and the guiding Spirit lead him who believes in Jesus. Then begins the eternal life in its everlasting progression. Then the believer enters the way of holiness to God, in which he pursues to completion his pilgrimage to heaven. This is the way the holy prophets went; the road that leads from banishment; the King's highway of holiness. This is the way the holy apostles went; and the saints of the primitive Church. In all the sacred history, where cases of conversion are recorded by the thousands, not one instance of the work of sudden, second, experience of sanctification is to be found.

The Scripture sanctification to God, begins when Paul, fallen to the earth; asks eagerly, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord says, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished says, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? He renounces his own will; he renounces every other than the will of God: and thus becomes separated, sanctified to God. And now, search along the line of his luminous history, for the greater second work; something to correspond with the teaching of some good men on the subject of sanctification; and the search is fruitless. There is no way of being holy to God, but the knowledge of his will and conformity thereto, which is the very experience implied in Paul's conversion, as involved in his two submissive inquiries, Who art thou, Lord? \* Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?

Aware of the excellence of brethren, of several denominations, who hold that sanctification is a second, greater, inward work, ensuing regeneration, justification; and like it preceded by conviction, with its pangs, and faith, with its power and peace; we hold such views in great respect, for those brethren's sake. But, for the foregoing, and other similar reasons, we differ from them, in love, and, with modesty but firmness, present our own understanding of the Scripture teaching in the case: and we hope it will not be thought tedious and useless, that we yet further extend the discussion.

In *Jerem.* i. 5, the Lord says to the prophet, that before he was born, "— before thou camest forth from the womb I sanctified thee (*hikdashtica*), and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations (*nabi laggoyim nethattica*)." The word *and* is an interpolation. Without it, the passage reads, Before thou camest forth from the womb I sanctified thee; I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations. The sanctifying was the ordaining, the

appointing, the setting apart Jeremiah to be a prophet. What other meaning is possible? We are shut up to this sense of the passage. Can Jeremiah mean that the Lord told him, that while he was in the womb, he believed unto justification, and then by faith proceeded to a second deeper work of sanctification? It cannot be. The Scriptural sense of sanctification is, a being set apart, appointed to, ordained to, etc.

The believer in Jesus, according to the Scripture is a saint: he thought on his way; perceived to his sorrow that he was going in the wrong direction, his steps taking hold on hell; turned his feet toward the testimonies of the Lord; made his (the Lord's) will the rule of his life; having believed the testimony that God gave of his Son; and was thus set apart, ordained, sanctified to be a child of God by faith in Christ Jesus: who "—died for (*hyper*, instead of) him, that he, living, should not henceforth live unto himself, but unto him who died for (*hyper*, instead of) him, and rose again." *II Cor.* v. 15. He has entered the way of holiness, he has consecrated himself to God, has become a saint, and as he exhibits himself to others through the body, the manifestations through the body must be holy, apart from those made by unbelievers, by the world: like Paul, who was separated unto (*aphoristate \* \* \* eis*) the work whereunto he had been called, *Acts* xiii. 2; separated unto (*aphoorismenos eis*) the gospel of God, *Rom.* i. 1; separated (*aphorisas*) from his mother's womb, *Gal.* i. 15; that is, set apart, ordained, sanctified; "forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, he presses toward the mark (*kata skopon*, toward the mark at the end of the race, called in Latin *calx*, and afterward *creta*, because the Romans used to mark it with *chalk*. *Parkhurst*. A goal, aim, end, *Phil.* iii. 14. *Cremer*.) for the prize (*epi to brabeion*, after the prize, in pursuit



of it, and that to win or obtain it: as in *Luke xv. 4*, "— if he lose one of them, doth **not** leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after (*kai poreuetai epi*) that which is lost, until he find it?" *Kypke* shows that in the Greek writers *epi* after verbs of going or sending, denotes the design of such going or sending, and is prefixed to the words denoting the thing sought or wanted. *Parkhurst.*) of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus: (*tees anoo kleeseos tou Theou*, Dr. Clarke, who held firmly to the doctrine of sanctification as a second, greater blessing than justification, and whose opinion is justly entitled to great respect, well gives the sense of this phrase. "The reward which God from above calls me, by Jesus Christ, to receive. The apostle still keeps in view, his crown of martyrdom, and his glorious resurrection.") The prize is at the end of the race; and the believer "so runs that he may obtain."

In the N. T. we recollect no instance, in which *hagios*, the equivalent of *kadosh*, is used, like the latter, in an evil sense: the meaning having become restricted, at the time of the writing of the books of the N. T., to the setting apart a person, or thing, from common uses to the special use of God. In our day the idea that the word must be used, only in indicating goodness, purity, in some person or thing, is still more strengthened and prevalent: for now, we are hesitant to apply the word, saint (holy one), to Christians; while in the time of the N. T. writers, it was the common appellation of believers in the Messiahship of Jesus; found frequently in those sacred writings, applied to the entire membership of churches; the good, bad, and indifferent being alike styled saints (holy persons). Ananias, Sapphira, Simon Magus, Hymenæus, Alexander, Diotrefes, etc., were saints of that time; but were not very exemplary in their deportment. But as we have modified the word, *damnation* (the rendering of the Greek *krima*, a solemn

judgment ; a judicial trial ; a private judgment, or pronouncing a private sentence or opinion ; etc.) so as to indicate only the last, fearful sentence to perdition : so, in the time of the N. T. writers the varied significations of the word, holy, came to be restricted to one, the setting apart from a common, to a special and higher use. With respect to the membership of the primitive churches, they were called saints, set apart ones, holy persons, inasmuch as their belief and confession separated them from both Jew and Gentile ; as circumcision and other Mosaic rites had separated the Jews from all the nations of the earth ; constituting them a holy nation, although there were many corrupt persons among them ; as in the holy church, were those of very evil character. The word Christian is used but three times in the N. T. ; the word saint, frequently : but now Christian is the general appellation, while saint is only applied to the victorious believers, who have gained their crowns. This exhibits a very great difference between the ancient, and modern use of the word. Then to those who bore the cross, was it applied ; now, to those who wear the crown.

So, the body must be presented to God, a holy sacrifice, set apart, to his service, exhibiting its members, passions, capacity, separated from a participation in the employments and the enjoyments of an exclusively worldly spirit and character.

“Acceptable to God,” *euariston*, well pleasing, agreeable to God. Those please him, who endeavor to know and to do his will. If we be earnestly engaged in an effort, to keep ourselves apart from the world to him, he does not wait until we shall have succeeded, in achieving some grand position on the scale of moral excellence, before he, well pleased, smiles upon us ; and owns us as his own peculiar people. As the sun smiles upon the spot of earth, under which the young plant is

stretching out its roots, and struggling to push up toward the light and air; greets its first peep above the surface, and beams upon it till its entire maturity; cheers it along through gloomy autumn and gloomier winter: so the smile of God cheers the first symptoms of spiritual life, the first struggle upward, and all the stages toward entire maturity. "Grow in grace," is the *modus* of spiritual life; and the humblest one presenting his body a living, holy, well-pleasing sacrifice; no matter in what vale of obscurity the sacrifice shall be offered; the fire of the divine love will descend upon it, in evidence of God's gracious acceptance of our humble offering.

The "reasonableness of this service" is so very evident, that the very statement of the proposition is enough. It need not be demonstrated, that the most reasonable thing possible, is to be guided by the highest reason in the universe; especially as that universe, so far as we can see, attests the perfection and consequent infallibility of that reason. We are to notice, in passing, that the conduct we have specified will please God. That is, if we sinful, frail, worthless ones desire and try to please God, he will accept our effort.

"And be not conformed to this world." The force of "and," here, we take as equivalent to "even," or "that is;" as the phrase is in very close sympathy with the preceding verse, and explains and expands its meaning. Such use of the body as urged in the former verse, amounts to denying self and the world; and is called a sacrifice, a slaying of selfishness and worldliness; in which case, we will not be conformed to this world, certainly. So if we be in that condition of sacrifice, we will necessarily be in this condition of non-conformity to this world. The soul, the mind, the real man, is invisible and cannot appear in form: the body and form; the body and manifestation: the world around

us can observe the manner of our seeing, hearing, talking, doing, walking; i. e. can observe the manner of the deeds of the body; but the soul and its thinking cannot be observed by those around us. Our bodies will not manifest a similarity to the bodies of worldly minded people, as to localities, practices, and general conduct. They will not be found in localities, practices, conduct merely worldly. Our bodies will not look as if they were inhabited and used by worldly minded people. Much may be learned of the man, by observing the house he inhabits.

“But be ye transformed (*metamorphousthe*, be ye metamorphosed, completely changed in the manner of the body) by the renewing of your mind.” Here is the pivot of the passage. Your mind has been renewed, because ye are brethren, Christians, and no man enters into this brotherhood with an unrenewed mind; and now it becomes you to manifest that great fact, in your conduct, your deportment.

As the very first element of Christian character is the renewing of the mind; when that has occurred, a change of the mind's manifestations will follow, and its manifestations are made through the body. Its love or its hate is exhibited through the body; as also its commands or prohibitions. If in its former state, the mind did not wish to please God, its repugnance was manifest in the body not being employed in his service: and now in its renewed state, it is altogether reasonable, to expect the body to manifest, that the new mind does desire to please God. The outward manifestation, will correspond to the inward thought, conviction, condition. “If the Lord be God follow him: but if Baal, then follow him.” *I Kings* xviii. 21. There should be no halting between two opinions: no effort at serving two masters: living, holiness, the active exclusive service of God, alone befits the renewed, regenerated

mind: and if this be persisted in, one will make proof of, experience, the nature and character of the will of God, which has, by renewing his mind, metamorphosed its manifestations through the body.

He will experience that to do the will of God, doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly, is good: is every way becoming a reasonable man: good for himself, for his family, for his business associations, for his political responsibilities and interests, for the whole human race so far as his influence extends; good for all the vicissitudes, trials, perils, joys, sorrows of time, and for all eternity. Then as he attempted this sacrifice, took up this cross, to please God; he will find, to his delighted astonishment, that it is acceptable, agreeable, delightful to himself. The love of God being shed abroad in his heart, the labor he has undertaken is a labor of love, and the smile of his Father, makes the task delightful. He has peace in believing, joy in the Holy Ghost, and he rejoices that through the gentle and sweet persuasions of the gospel, he turned his feet to the testimonies of God.

“Perfect:” the will of God, as expressed in the gospel of his Son, Jesus, the Christ, the Lamb of God slain for his sin; the coming of the Holy Ghost to help his infirmities, to make intercession for him with unutterable groanings, to quicken his perception of the divine truth, to aid his understanding in grasping it, to help his feeble heart to stay itself upon the sure promises of God; the wonderful providence that as he is told watches him, guards him, urges him, checks him, makes everything co-operate for his good; the certainty of the support of the divine presence and power in the encounter with death, and an abundant entrance into the everlasting joy of his Lord: all this, and the unutterable more than this, satisfies him. He needs nothing more. He desires nothing more. The new inventions

do not attract him. He says to the inventors, I am satisfied; all my capacity is filled; I can contain nothing more. If your invention be less than this, all this, it would injure me to accept it: if it be more than this, more than joy unutterable and full of glory, it would be useless for me to welcome it, for I could not contain it, being full now to overflowing. Yes, he that humbly tries to do the will of God, even though it appear to his partly-instructed mind to be a cross, will find grace to aid him, and discover that this is the path leading to an enlightened mind, a peaceful conscience, a happy heart, a useful life, and a safe passage from time to a glorious eternity. As for God, his way is perfect. If the Christian begins with the cross, he finishes with the crown. Thou, O Christ, art all I need.

---

## SEEING THROUGH A GLASS.

I COR. xiii. 12.—For now we see through (by means of) a glass, darkly (enigmatically); but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as I am known.

**I**N this state of existence we are not capable of thorough perception and knowledge: but in the future state, the improvement in our capacity and opportunities of knowledge will be greatly increased.

Now, we do not see things, but the reflection of things. We see "through a glass," (*blepomen gar arti di' esop-trou*, we see by means of a mirror.) A mirror is called a looking-glass, and, briefly, a glass; as modern mirrors are made chiefly of glass: though, as the ancient mirrors were metallic, of polished brass, the rendering of the

Hebrew *maroth*, looking-glasses, at *Exod.* xxxviii. 8; and the Greek *esoptrou*, glass, here, in our passage, is rather unfortunate. How are we to understand, "And he made the laver of brass, and the foot of it of brass, of the looking-glasses of the women assembling, which assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation"? How could he make a brass laver out of looking-glasses? Of brazen mirrors he could have accomplished it.

So, here, looking through a glass, might induce one to think the apostle meant looking through a window pane, or something of that kind. But the glass in a window does not obstruct the sight; or, certainly, not sufficiently to warrant that, as the figure used, to signify the present great obstruction to our perceptive power. Nor does the word darkly, imply that the glass is discolored: that would necessarily be expressed by an adjective, and not by an adverb. We may say dark glass; but not darkly glass. The word darkly modifies the verb, we see.

*Esoptron*, the word rendered, glass, is used but twice in the New Testament; here, and *James* i. 23; and in both places signifies *mirror*; but in both, is rendered, glass. James speaks of one beholding his natural face in a glass, and then forgetting that its appearance needed some adjustment. Of course, he is referring to a mirror, and the same is the case here; the apostle means a mirror. Nor need we be embarrassed by the preposition "through," in the Greek *dia*, which has various senses, and is frequently rendered, through, in the sense of, by, or by means of. "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the Apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given," etc. *Acts* viii. 18. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." *Ib.* x. 43. "That through this man is preached unto

you the forgiveness of sins." *Acts* xiii. 38. "But we believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." *Ib.* xv. 11. Comp. these citations with, "And it came to pass \* \* \* that he went through the corn fields; and his disciples plucked the ears," etc. *Luke* vi. 1. In each, the Greek *dia* is rendered by "through;" yet in those from *Acts*, "through" signifies *cause*, or *instrumentality*; while that from *Luke* refers to place. So we read the passage, "For now we see by means of a mirror (as in a mirror)."

"Darkly:" obscurely, enigmatically (*en ainigmati*, in an enigma, a riddle). In a riddle, we have the reflections of things presented, to us; and not the things themselves. "And Samson said unto them, I will now put forth a riddle unto you: if ye can certainly declare it me within the seven days of the feast, and find it out, then I will give you thirty sheets and thirty change of garments: but if ye cannot declare it me, then shall ye give me thirty sheets and thirty change of garments. And they said unto him, Put forth thy riddle, that we may hear it. And he said unto them, Out of the eater came forth meat, and out of the strong came forth sweetness." *Judges* xiv. 12-14. In this riddle, enigma, "the eater" hints at the lion, that Samson had previously slain; as does also "the strong:" while "meat" and "sweetness" hint at the honey, which he had found deposited in the carcass of the lion. The riddle puzzled the Philistines so, that, in despair of solving it, on the seventh day they threatened Samson's wife with the burning of herself and her father's family, if she did not obtain from her husband the solution of the enigma: which, no doubt, appeared very simple, when they had procured its clue. So, the divine providence is often an enigma to us, which we cannot solve; and which in the glow of eternity will dissolve as the mists of the morning.



While what we see in a mirror is but a reflection of our person, and of things near us ; we do not see even a perfect reflection : no one seeing himself in a mirror, as he appears to others. If he have a blemish on his right cheek, the mirror will show it to be on his left cheek : it will show his right, to be his left arm ; his right, to be his left eye, etc. And, moreover, what he shall see in the mirror, depends upon the angle at which he takes his position. Standing in front, perpendicular to the vertical centre, he will have a full view of himself ; but as he steps to the right, or to the left, presently, though in survey of its entire surface, he no longer sees his reflection. He might, if ignorant in the case, deny that there was any such reflection. At that very time one standing at an equal angle from the mirror, would affirm the fact of that reflection, as seen by his own eyes. Each would see the other's, but neither his own reflection. Many of earth's discordances of opinion, are occasioned by the fact, that we look at the same mirror from different positions : the difference of positions, being occasioned by the different circumstances of birth, education, association, etc. Many a man is a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant ; of this political party, or of the other ; not that he understands the matter, but because he does not understand it. " He knows in part," and therefore, he can but " prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." *I Cor. xiii. 9, 10.* Were men all from the same central position looking into the mirror, they would admit that all were reflected ; and would be Christians and Patriots.

" But then face to face : " then, in eternity, we shall see the very things themselves, and not mere reflections. We shall see Christ " as he is ; " saints as they are ; and the obscure enigmas of this checkered life, will all be so clearly solved, that some of our loudest, most exultant

shouts, will be at the unfolding of some providence so dark, that our eye could not penetrate the thick gloom ; faith having been told, that it would work out eternal good, persuaded us to trust, and we stayed ourselves upon our God. The hereafter has come, and we know. *John* xiii. 7.

“ Now I know in part ; but then shall I know even as also I am known.” The verb *to know* is used three times in this sentence, and might be supposed to have the same force in each case. It is not so. In the first instance the Greek verb is *ginooskoo*, to know, to perceive, etc. ; while in the second and third instances, it is *epiginooskoo*, to know, or perceive, clearly ; the prefixed *epi* giving intensity to the other simpler form. So, the idea of our knowledge in this world, which corresponds to the child and childish ways of the preceding *ver.* 11, being but “ in part,” is expressed by the feebler form of the verb. While the idea of our knowledge in the world to come, which corresponds to the manly, mature state of the preceding verse, is expressed by the intense form of the verb. Thus indicating to us that our knowledge here, will bear no stronger comparison with our knowledge there ; than do the toys and ways of childhood, with the apparatus and employments of manly maturity. Crippled and obstructed as is the mind of a Christian here, its achievements seem to be marvellous. How amazing its discoveries in every direction ! Its capacity for science, evidenced so frequently by the most splendid success ; almost causes us to cease wondering at its triumphs ! And yet all this dwindles away, into a resemblance of children’s admiration at a smart boy’s exploits, so far surpassing their own conception and daring, in comparison with our future, heavenly state.

What a blessing the faith that can grasp and retain such instruction ! the hope that can stay itself upon

such a faith, and look smilingly forward to such fruition ! the love that can hear faith's story, see hope's smile, and say confidently, my Father will certainly bring all this to pass ; for it is his own unchanging promise, and he will not disappoint his child.

---

## THE LORD THE SPIRIT.

II COR. iii. 6-18.

“WHO hath also made us able ministers (*hos kai hikanoosen heemas diakonous*, who effectuated, qualified, made sufficient, us ministers) of a new covenant.” There is no such adjective as “able” to qualify “ministers.” In verse 5, we have, “Not that we are sufficient (*hikanoi*) of ourselves to think anything of ourselves ; but our sufficiency (*hikanotees*) is of God.” We see, here, the adjective *hikanoi*, sufficient, and the noun *hikanotees*, sufficiency : while to render the corresponding verb *hikanoosen*, we have no verb corresponding with our adjective sufficient and noun sufficiency. Now, as these are from the Latin *sufficio*, had we borrowed from the same root such a verb as *to suffer*, signifying to make sufficient ; then, we could have rendered the Greek verb, *hikanoosen*, hath suffected, in correspondence with our adjective sufficient, and our noun sufficiency, of verse fifth : reading, “Who hath suffected us ministers of the new covenant.” An able, might yet not be a sufficient, minister : and Paul meant *sufficient* ministers.

7. We are to understand by "the new testament," or covenant, in this passage, the outcome, the flower, the fruit of the old testament, or covenant: as we see in the distinction, "not of the letter, but of the spirit" of that letter. There is death in the letter, but life in the spirit. Yet the ministration of that letter, type, symbol, engraved in stone letters, and having no life in the mere letter, type, symbol, was glorious: so much so, indeed, that the people could not look steadily at the face of Moses, the minister of the letter, for the glory of his face; which glory was to be done away, to cease: prefiguring the temporary ministration of the letter, the type, the old covenant.

8. "How shall not the ministration of the spirit (of that glorious letter, type, symbol, old covenant: its actual meaning, significance) be rather (more) glorious?"

10. "For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory which excelleth;" *eineken tees huperballousees doxeees*, on account of the exceeding glory, i. e. of the blooming out of the magnificent flower, righteousness by faith in the blood of Jesus, the Christ; from this plant, the Mosaic Institute, the Old Covenant.

13. "And not as Moses, put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end (*telos*, the purpose, the scope, as *Rom. x. 4.* "Christ is the end (*telos*) of the law;" as compared with *Gal. iii. 24.* "The law was our pedagogue (leader of children) unto Christ. And see, also, *I Tim. i. 5.* "Now the end (*telos*) of the commandment is love," etc.) of that which is abolished."

14. "But their minds were blinded: for until this day the same vail upon the reading (i. e. the letter, type, symbol) of the old testament (covenant) remaineth untaken away: for in Christ it is taken away." Israel still looks upon the letter, the type, and does not understand it. The type is covered by the thick vail of

unbelief in Jesus, the Christ: and only by abandoning their unbelief and accepting Christ, can the veil be "done away," removed. The Jews never saw that the Mosaic Institute was temporary, an adjunct of the great plan of bringing in the Christ, promised in the garden, to man, and not to the Jews, except as men: their system to pass away when it should have accomplished its end, aim, purpose.

15. "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart." As if the nation saw with its heart; saw what it wished to see: and as to seeing a thing, it is the same impossibility, whether the veil be on the thing or on the eye. The intimation is, that the failure to see the meaning of the type, the letter, is owing to the heart, prejudice, passion.

16. "Nevertheless when it (the heart, the Jewish heart) shall turn to (*epistrepse*, convert to) the Lord, the veil shall be taken away:" the whole system of type shall become plain; the covering veil will be gone; the Jew will see Christ to be the Spirit of the whole system; that it all meant Christ, the great sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, offered by himself, himself by himself, the great High Priest for man. Christ was the significance, the more glorious spirit, of the letter, the type, the glorious old testament.

17. "Now the Lord (Jesus) is that (the) spirit;" the Christ, the spirit of the letter, of the entire typical system ministered by Moses. As we see, *Rev.* xix. 10, "For the testimony (what is testified) of Jesus, is the spirit of prophecy:" the prophecies all mean Christ: that is the very spirit, breath, life of them. "And where the spirit of the Lord, there liberty;" i. e. liberty from the obstructing veil: to him who believes in Jesus, who sees him to be the significance of the letter, the type, the old testament; all is clear: the veil is taken away in Christ.

18. "But we all (we Christians, believers in Jesus), at an open face (no vail upon the reading of Moses to us) beholding as in a glass (a mirror) the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image (likeness) from glory to glory, as by the spirit, the Lord." Here is the difference between the Jew and the Christian; there is no vail of unbelief, prejudice to obstruct the vision of the latter: they look upon the letter, the type, the symbol, the old testament, and see Jesus, the Christ, its spirit, its meaning. "With open face" being dative may be taken objectively, as "toward," "at," etc.; signifying the unvailed letter, the vail "done away," removed from Moses' face: or, as the dative of manner, signifying the unvailed, open, face of the Christian, looking without obstruction at the old testament, the letter. Either way, the meaning is the same.

"Beholding as in a glass (a mirror):" all this is the rendering of one Greek word, *katoptrizomenoi*, persons looking in a mirror. Such persons see themselves therein: but, in this case, we, Christians, looking into the letter, type, as into a mirror, see, not ourselves, but "the glory of the Lord," the Christ, Jesus, in his glorious character of our dying, rising, reigning Lord. And, as those using the mirror adjust by its aid their personal appearance, so do we, Christians, who look upon the letter, seeing in it that lovely image, likeness, of the pure, loving, forbearing, patient, compassionate, long-suffering Lord; we feel the excellence of these graces, these glories of his character, and have our own character gradually (from glory to glory) moulded by them; ever progressing toward the same image, likeness.

Paul is not peculiar in this idea of the looker into a mirror not seeing his own image. Isaac Abarbanel, the learned Spanish Jew, who flourished in the latter half of the fifteenth century, in his excellent dissertation

*De Statu et Jure Regio*, from his Commentaries, *Deut.* xvii. 14-20, as translated from Hebrew into Latin by J. Buxtorf, Jun., says, "From what I have expressed thus far, it is evident, that a king is under obligation to keep the (divine) precepts, beyond other men; and for three reasons. *First*: because a king is like a POLISHED MIRROR to his whole people, on him they all cast their eyes, and imitate his deeds. For the populace (*vulgus*) is naturally impelled to assimilate itself to the magnates in all things, so far as it can be done. Thus we see, when the Jewish kings were good and upright in heart, the whole people followed them, and submitted to their admonition: but when they were bad and sinful, all were bad and sinful, imitating them. Hence a certain philosopher said: By so much as a kingdom is more eminent, is it looked at and watched by all: and so the actions of a king are a general teaching to all his people (the whole realm is arranged according to the example of the king)." So far Abarbanel.

The people looking at this polished mirror, their king, see not themselves, except as contrasted with him, and endeavor to imitate him: and so we looking into the Scripture (where the Jews saw but the letter, the type) see Jesus, the Spirit, the Lord, and endeavor to imitate his perfect character. Standing before that mirror, in which we see not ourselves, according to nature (i. e. it is natural to see ourselves when looking into a mirror); but, Jesus, our Lord, according to grace; those who observe us will see our appearance changing, progressively, and for the better; as though a moulding influence were perpetually emanating from that mirror, because of the likeness of our Lord, the spirit of the letter, which we see therein. A great mystery this, to the uninitiated. One of our hymns expresses the fact and mode of this spiritual change for the better in Christian character.

In duties and in sufferings too,  
Thy path, my Lord, I'd trace;  
As thou hast done, so would I do,  
Depending on thy grace.

Inflamed with zeal, 'twas thy delight  
To do thy Father's will;  
O may that zeal my soul excite  
Thy precepts to fulfil.

Meekness, humility, and love,  
Through all thy conduct shine;  
O may my whole deportment prove  
A copy, Lord, of thine.

The sincere, humble one, who reads the blessed Scripture regularly, devoutly, prayerfully, and sings such hymns as the foregoing, will soon see into the beauties and lessons of the passage we have been endeavoring to expound. It is the diligent hand that maketh rich, in spiritual, as well as in natural pursuits; and, in either department, idleness tends to poverty. Surely, a man, endowed as he is with reason, should think his salvation worthy of some earnest attention. Christians act but a reasonable part, when they look steadfastly into this mirror, at the mild glories of Christ Jesus, and yield themselves to the sweet, gentle, transforming influences of its spirit, the Lord.



## THE EARTHLY TABERNACLE: THE HOUSE FROM HEAVEN.

II COR. v. 1-9.

**T**HERE are four particulars to be noticed. 1. The tabernacle ; 2. The earth ; 3. The building not made with hands ; 4. Heaven. The earthly house for earth ; the heavenly house for heaven. The general conception is, we think, that the teaching is that when the body is shattered by death, the believer, as a spirit, has heaven for his house, his home. But we should notice, that while in a very intelligible sense, by the word home, we may indicate a district, city, country, or the entire earth ; this is only speaking generally ; and in that district, city, country, or entire earth, one has a special home.

The most especial house of the human being, according to the Scripture we are studying, is the body ; which here appears as a tent, tabernacle, temporary residence. So understood by those referred to in the word *we*, i. e. Christians. For the Christian regards the body, as a temporary residence, in the earth, where he is a sojourner ; and when, after having accomplished the purpose of his sojourn, his education for heaven ; he shall depart, he will not take his tent with him, but leave it behind ; and find a house in heaven, where he shall dwell permanently.

But is he to have all heaven for his house ? We are instructed, that we shall have "a building of God," *ek Theou*, from God ; "a house not made with hands," *oikian acheiropoieton*, an unhandmade house ; not as the present house, the body, which is made by agents ; but direct from God, and not subject to decay, enduring, *aioonion* (a word whose significance must always

be found from its context), "in the heavens, *ouranois*, heaven." The house not made with hands is not heaven; for it is described as being "in heaven:" as the tabernacle, *skeenos*, the body, is not the earth, but the earthly house; the house in which the Christian dwells, while a sojourner in the earth; the *epigeios* house, the house *epi* upon, *gea*, *gee* the earth.

"For in this (house, the body) we groan:" we find it, and its surroundings, uncomfortable (and especially was it so in Paul's day. "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by my own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." *II Cor.* xi. 24-27); and sigh for relief from misery. Therefore,

"Earnestly desiring to be clothed upon, with our house which is from heaven; *ex ouranou*:" our house then will come from heaven; something distinct from heaven; not heaven, but our dwelling place, residence, to be dwelt in by us in the heavenly state. Dr. Parkhurst thought *ex*, as used here, equivalent to *en* in *ver.* 1. But that was occasioned by his not seeing the parallel between the body for earth; and the unmade-withhands house for heaven.

"If so be (*ei ge*, since indeed) that being clothed, we shall not be found naked, *gumnoi*." The existence of the Christian as a spirit, unclothed, naked; the present body dissolved, *katalutheei*, demolished, and no substitute, or equivalent for it; is not the doctrine of the text. We are not to be found out of the body, mere spirit; but in this unmadewithhands tent, house.

“ For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened : on which account (*eph' hooi*) we would not be unclothed (merely rid of the body, and the surrounding misery) but clothed upon (within our house from God, and in the bliss of heaven) that mortality (*to thneeton*, the mortal tent, the corruptible body, with its lashings, beatings, and innumerable pangs and griefs) might be swallowed up (*katapotheei*; i. e. as when anything is swallowed, it disappears; so, the body might disappear, with all its connected evils; and nothing appear as the clothing, the residence of the soul, the Christian, but the incorruptible body, given directly from God) of life.” That we might exchange the earthly body and its beatings, for the heavenly body and its bliss : this rickety habitation that shakes, creaks, and groans in the blast of the storm; for that divine structure upon which no storm shall ever beat, but within which we shall find perpetual composure.

“ Now he that hath wrought us for this self-same thing (*katergasomenos heemas*, hath taken all this pains to prepare us for, and to provide us with, this wonderful exchange) is God :” and therefore it is ascribed to an amply adequate source; he being able to accomplish all that his loving wisdom and care for us may devise.

The work is, indeed, a matter of faith; but our faith rests upon the sure word of God, who hath confirmed his promise by an oath. And lest in our frailty and worthlessness we should yet hesitate at his promise, “ he hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit.” The melting, vitalizing, subduing influence, through which our stupid minds and hard hearts yielded to the persuasions of the gospel; sustaining us in our struggle to understand its gentle and saving instructions; and in all our application of them to practical life; our very spiritual breath sustaining our Christian life; is the Spirit, the blessed, helping Holy Ghost : and this is the

earnest of the covenant God has made with us; that covenant being, that if we will believe the gospel, and be guided by its pure, loving teaching, God will take care, at the dissolution of this body, to supply us with one suitable to the bliss of heaven.

The earnest, *arraboon*, stands for part of the price, and is paid beforehand to confirm the bargain, or covenant: the party receiving it, being considered the more solemnly and strongly bound, to perform his part of the covenant. But, in this great transaction, we being the vastly more interested party, it would be the reasonable thing, for us, who have so much at stake, to offer the earnest, *ho arraboon*, to Him, upon whose fidelity to the covenant, our everlasting salvation is suspended. But, wonder of wonders, we are the careless party; and he, who will gain the least, binds us to the performance of our part, by this divine earnest; lest we fly the bargain, and reap ruin where he would have us reap life eternal. This figure of the earnest-money teaches us that God is much more anxious to save us, than are we to be saved.

“Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: for we walk by faith, not by sight: we are confident and consider it better (*eudokoumen mallon*) to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.” So, there is no intermediate state, between being absent from the Lord by being present in the body; and being present with the Lord by being absent from the body. We are here; or we are there. Nothing between. Two states; earth and heaven: and when not in one, in the other. Is the Christian not in heaven? Do those who preceded him, look in vain for him, among the shining host? Then he is on earth; yet pelted by its tempests; still urging his weary way toward the REST. Do those with whom he went to the

house of God, and took sweet counsel in plans for honoring the Lord and benefiting the needy, miss him from the holy path and the benevolent council? He is there where Jesus is, at the fountain of living waters, with a bright and tearless eye.

Yes, they are present with the Lord. But where is the Lord? "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." *Acts* i. 11. In the outset of our exposition, we had, with reference to the Christian, the two residences, the present body, and the one to be given direct from God; with the two states, earth and heaven: then, something about the exchange of the former for the latter; with the statement, that "we should not be found naked," inasmuch as when we should be unclothed, by the dissolution of the body, we should "be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." But, while we saw an earthly house for the earthly state, to be immediately succeeded by a heavenly house for a heavenly state; we saw nothing whatever about an intermediate house for an intermediate state. Because there is no intermediate state for the Christian. Only earth with its burden and groans; and heaven with its bliss in the smile of the Lord.

"Wherefore we labor (*philotimoumetha*, we are extremely desirous, ambitious) that, whether present (in the body) or absent (from the body) we may be accepted of him." His pleasure is our one aim. To live is Christ, to die gain. His smile breaking through the rifts of the clouds that hang over us, while here in the body, is the brightest joy we have on earth; and his smile that brightens the cloudless, eternal day, will be our unvarying joy in heaven.

One doctrine of the passage is, that after death breaks down the body, the Christian shall be supplied with a

body, direct from God, to prevent his being a naked, bodiless spirit, until the grand resurrection shall restore to him his body redeemed from the power of the grave; whence it shall be "raised a spiritual body," suited to be occupied by him in heaven. Not one of the sacred writers has written more distinctly and fully of the resurrection, than the author of this epistle: and, of course, there is nothing in this section of it, inconsistent with that grand doctrine, which he had already taught these Corinthians to regard as fundamental in the Christian system: "— if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." *I Cor.* xv. 13, 14.

It may seem to embarrass this view, that the "house not made with hands," *oikian acheiropoieton*, is said to be "eternal," *aioonion*. The sense of this word can be determined only from its context. In its general meaning it signifies the entire duration of any period of time, to which it refers. Its corresponding Hebrew term *gnolem* expresses the finite, and the infinite; and so *aioonios*. "That the people may hear when I speak with thee, and believe thee forever." *Exod.* xix. 9. "And his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him forever." *Ib.* xxi. 6. In both cases "forever" means the time of a man's life on earth. "But Jehovah shall endure forever." *Psalms* ix. 7; this relates to eternity. So with *aioonios*, "— everlasting consolation," *II Thess.* ii. 16, stops short at the grave; for beyond that, the days of our mourning will be ended, and no consolation will be needed. "For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldst receive him forever." *Philem.* 15; where Paul is referring to earthly relations. Then, the infinite, which is by far more frequent in the N. T., than the finite, "— in the world to come, eternal life." *Mark* x. 30. So

that, the apostle referring here, to the entire period from the death of the body to its resurrection, aptly uses *aioonion*, eternal, as expressive of the fact, that the Christian, who is not to be found during that period, naked, disembodied, shall use the substitutory "not made with hands" body, without any further change, until the sound of the last trump shall open the grave, and arouse his body from its long slumber, which the philosopher had declared to be forever.

The body is the tenement of the human being, the Christian as well as the unbeliever. Such is the order of our existence. As the death of the body must occur; we might expect to sleep with it until the resurrection, or drift through the vasts of space a disembodied spirit without eyes to see, ears to hear, hands to do, etc. But neither is to be our lot. When this body tumbles down into its grave, our body from heaven will be given to us, and we shall use it until the one in the grave "shall be raised a spiritual body," and be restored to us. So, when Moses and Elijah were on the mount with the Lord and the favored disciples, they appeared, they had their form, they conversed with the Lord; the apostles saw them, heard them, recognized them. Elijah who went off visibly to heaven, had his body changed; but Moses died in the mount and left his earthly house, for the heavenly. Neither was naked: both were clothed upon.

## IF ONE DIED FOR ALL —.

II COR. v. 14.—Because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.

“IF one died (*apethanen*) for all (*huper pantoon*).”  
 The “one,” of course, is Jesus, the Christ, who “died” on the cross, the piercing of his side by the soldier’s spear, demonstrating the fact, as the condition of the issuing blood indicated death. But a main point is the signification of the phrase “for all,” *huper pantoon*. The preposition *huper* has various meanings; it being rendered, for, above, more than, on (our) part, than, concerning, of, on behalf of, in the stead of, toward, beyond, more than, to, over, than: yet each of these accords with its local meaning, over, above a place; and, properly, without immediate contact; (*Xen. M.* 3, 8, 9, *ho helios tou therous huper heemoon kai toon stegoon poreuomenos* (the summer sun passing over us and our roofs), *Herod.* 2, 6, 9.) *Winer*, 382. In the N. T., *huper* is only used in a figurative sense, and in this place, according to very judicious critics, means *in the stead of*: and so we accept it.

Thus, *Philem.* 13, Paul writes of Onesimus, “Whom I would have retained, that in thy stead (*huper sou*) he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel: but without thy mind would I do nothing,” etc.: The sense is so clear here, that our translators adopted the rendering, as cited, without placing any sign of doubt in the margin. Again we have this rendering in *II Cor.* v. 20; “— we pray you in Christ’s stead (*huper Christou*), be ye reconciled to God.”

We admit, that where the local sense of a preposition is established, and its figurative sense will allow of fifteen



various renderings into our language ; great care must be exercised in the choice of renderings, in any particular passage. Our rule is, that the rendering selected shall agree with the scope of the place, and the plain statements of the divine revelation. It is not sufficient that the proposed rendering is to be found elsewhere. The question is, will it suit here, and allow the passage to accord with the plain statements of the Scripture ?

We are taught, especially, *Rom. v. 12-21*, that Adam, in some sense, acted instead of us all ; represented us all ; so as to involve us disastrously in his deed : and that Jesus, the Christ, the Lord, in some sense, acted instead of us all ; represented us all ; so as to involve us blessedly in his deed. How Adam poisoned us unto death, or how Christ supplied the antidote unto life : how one dragged us down, without any consent on our part, into death ; or how the other quickened us, without any consent on our part, into life ; we are not informed : no one knows : but those two facts are so clearly revealed, that they are accepted by the great mass of Christian people ; although their opinions on some other points diverge.

So, by the rendering, " if one died in the stead of all," we agree with the plain statement of the revealed fact, that Christ, in the great work of redemption, acted in our stead ; and one chief, essential part of this work was his dying, for which a human body had to be assumed by him ; in which to die in the form of man, in man's stead. And it certainly agrees with the scope of the passage, which concludes with the marvellous statement, " For he (God) made the one not knowing sin ( not having sinned and deserved punishment ) to know sin instead of us (or as one having sinned and been punished for it ; and all this, his bearing the likeness of a sinner, and bearing the punishment as a sinner, in our stead), that we might appear as righteous in

him:" in our substitute who died expiating our sins, and rose in a state of righteousness, the law having no further claim against him. So then, the rendering responds satisfactorily, to each demand of our prescribed rule.

"Then were all dead:" Our favorite commentator, Dr. Clarke, says that this is justly inferred from the foregoing affirmation that Christ died for all mankind; the Doctor appearing to regard the chief idea to be the extent of the death, and not its character; making *pantoon*, all, the emphatic word, and not *huper*, for, in the stead of. Therefore he adds, "for if all had not been guilty, and consigned to eternal death, because of their sins, there could have been no need of his death. Therefore, as he most certainly died for all; then, all were dead, and needed his sacrifice, and the quickening power of his Spirit." All this is very true, and is sound doctrine; but it does not develop what we regard to be the force of "for all" in the first, nor of "were all dead" in the second member of the sentence: or, as Dr. C. puts it, the apostle's first, and second, position.

We, also, hold that he infers the second from the first position; but, we regard the matter thus: "if one died in the stead of all, then all died:" the act of the one was the act of the all: the act of the representative is the act of the represented; *qui facit per alium, facit per se*, what one does by an agent, himself does. There needs little argument here, we think; it being only necessary to notice the verb employed in the case. "If one died (*apethanen*) for (in the stead of) all, then all died: *hoi pantes apethanon*." Nothing can be clearer than that *apethanen* and *apethanon* are the same verb, in the same *voice*, the same *mood*, the same *tense*, the same *person*; and that they only differ in *number*; the one being in the third person *singular*, the other in the third person *plural*: and this only because their nominatives differ in number; the one, singular; the other,

plural. So, the correct rendering must be, "if one died in the stead of all, then all died:" died by their representative, their surety. If A becomes a surety to B, for a debt contracted by C; and at the failure of C to pay, pays it; B has no claim upon C, as he has been paid by A: the last being the only one to whom C is indebted. Thus Paul, who describes redemption from the curse of the law, by Christ, *Gal.* iii. 13; so that we are not under the law, *Ibid.* v. 18; yet speaks of himself as a redeemed sinner, being "under the law to Christ." *I Cor.* ix. 21.

There can be no propriety in the rendering, in the very same connection, *apethanen* "he died," *apethanon* "they were all dead." It is only accountable upon the hypothesis, that the translators, as Dr. Clarke, failed to see the emphatic character, or force, of *huper*; and had their attention fixed upon *pantoon*, as expressive of the extent of Christ's mediation. Certainly if all died, all were dead, subsequent to the dying. But the present rendering puts the state of death, as previous to Christ's dying, and as the cause of his dying: which destroys the figure. For, if one be condemned to die, and another is accepted as a substitute to die in his stead: the latter does not die because his friend is dead; but because he is living, and his plan is to die for him, that his friend may continue to live. So the death of Christ in our stead, is to be accepted as our death; and the claim of the law against us ceases; we having paid the penalty by our substitute.

Dr. Parkhurst, to whose learning and patient investigation we have been so frequently indebted, quotes a very interesting passage from *Doddridge*, upon the sense of *huper*, in this and similar places, being *in the stead of*. "Raphelius (Not. ex Xen. in ver. 8) has abundantly demonstrated, that *huper heemoon apethane* signifies he died in our *room and stead*: nor can I find

that *apothanein huper tinou* has ever any other signification than that of *rescuing the life of another at the expense of our own*, and the very next verse (i. e. verse 7) shews independent of any other authority, how evidently it bears that sense here, as one can hardly imagine any one would die for a good man, unless it were to redeem his life by giving up his own." This criticism by Dr. P. refers to *Rom. v. 6-8*. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for (in the stead of) the ungodly (*huper aseboon apethanen*). For scarcely for a righteous man (*huper dikaion*) will one die: yet peradventure for a good man (*huper agathou*) some (one) would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us (*huper heemon apethanen*)."

In this connection, we will examine the use of *huper* in the twentieth verse of this fifth chapter of II Corinthians. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ (*huper Christou our presbeuomen*, in the stead of Christ we act as ambassadors) as though God did beseech you by us: we pray (you) in Christ's stead (*huper Christou*), be ye reconciled to God." Even an unlearned reader will perceive, that the place is somewhat obscured, by rendering the first *huper*, for; and the second, in stead, (the possessive form "Christ's" causing "in Christ's stead," in place of "in the stead of Christ:") the "for" signifying here, and frequently, "in the stead of," is an accurate, but not a happy rendering. In its present reading, the passage has the appearance of an alternation between the words "God" and "Christ." Now then we are ambassadors for *Christ* (as though Christ had sent us), as though God did beseech you by us (as though God had sent us): we pray you in *Christ's* stead (as though Christ had sent us), be ye reconciled to *God* (as though God had sent us). A uniform rendering of *huper* gives another air to the expression.

“ Now then (therefore) WE are acting the part of ambassadors in the stead of Christ (who, when in the flesh acted this part), as though God did beseech you by US (as he once did by his Son, Christ, our Lord): WE pray (you) in the stead of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.” As the grand ambassador of God, Christ, our Master, with us, apostles, in his suit, prayed you, sinners, to be reconciled to God: coming in the “ express image of his person,” he demonstrated that there was nothing in God, but what fairly challenged your admiring love; so that you “ hated him without a cause:” and he besought you to cease your hostility, and be reconciled to him, who sent not his ambassador to order you to lay down your weapons, and be punished, but to cease to resist his efforts to bless you with all the wealth of his loving care. You slew his ambassador; rejecting his gracious overtures: and now WE are negotiating in the stead of Christ, as though God did beseech (you) by US: WE (now) pray (you) in the stead of Christ (whom ye slew), be ye reconciled to God. We are acting ambassadors, in his place, and reiterate the same proposition of peace; *the injured party paying all the expense of the unprovoked war!* As the heavens are high above the earth, so are God’s ways above the ways of man!

Buxtorf says, in his account of the Ten Days Penitence, at which occurred, in happier times, the ceremony of the two goats, the one slaughtered, the other sent off as the Scape Goat; that on the ninth day, the Jew slew a cock, striking it three times on the head, following each blow with these words, “ May this cock be in exchange for me; may he come into my place; may he be an expiation for me; may death be visited upon this cock, but to me and to all Israel, a happy life. Amen.” This he does three times successively, i. e. for himself, for his sons, and for the strangers that may be with him; as the High Priest also made expiation, as recorded in Leviticus. Placing his hands upon the cock,

as formerly in the sacrifices, he proceeds to slay him ; and drawing the skin at the neck, he thinks within himself that *he* is the one who deserves *to be strangled*, but the cock is substituted and offered in his place : next he cuts the throat with a knife, acknowledging to himself that *he* is the one worthy of being *smitten with the sword* ; and immediately throws him violently to the ground, that he may denote himself to be worthy of being *covered with stones* : lastly he roasts him, that he may thus signify, that himself merits *to be burned to death* : and so, these four modes of death the cock should sustain for the Jew. Care must be exercised, that the cock be white ; as red is the color of sins, *Isai.* i. 18, and a red cock abounding already with sins, would be unfit to bear the sins of the Jew. Antonius Margarita writes in his book on the Jewish faith, that certain persons affirmed, as having come down from their ancestors, that for this expiatory oblation an ape should be taken ; as more resembling a man, etc. But the cause of preferring the cock to any other animal is this ; one of the Hebrew appellations for a man, is *Gebher* : so if *Gebher* has sinned, *Gebher* ought to bear the punishment of sin : but as the punishment is more than a Jew can bear, a cock, which in the Talmudic or Babylonish dialect is called *Gebher*, is substituted in his place, and so he satisfies the justice of God : for since *Gebher* hath sinned, *Gebher* (the cock) hath also been smitten. *Syn. Jud.* 508-512.

It is added that Leo de Modena affirms, this rite to have been abrogated in Italy, and in the East, as being unfounded and superstitious. Nothing of the kind, we think, is practiced in this country, or in this age. But, the Jews have a ceremony of prayer, and offering the will and intention for the deed : in which they continue to recognize their idea of expiation ; believing that if they could offer a victim in sacrifice, that the victim

would be their substitute, and bear their sin; the shedding of his blood, would be the same as the shedding of their blood: not understanding that the victims offered in sacrifice under the Mosaic system, were but types of the true sacrifice, the Messiah; but believing that "the blood of bulls and goats COULD take away sins." *Heb. x. 4.* Let us take care that we, Christians, do not put less value upon the true Victim, slain once for sins; than the Jew puts upon the types, the animal figurative victims. Let us not forget the record, the witness of the Spirit, that the great High Priest, "— now once in the end of the world hath appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." *Heb. ix. 26.*

It is this very idea of substitution of the victim, that is taught in the Apostle's "Because we thus judge, if one died for all, then indeed the all died:" the all suffered by their substitute; having been "crucified with Christ;" so that the debt has been paid, the punishment has been exacted, "BY HIS STRIPES WE ARE HEALED." Such is the witness of the Spirit.

---



---

## THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT.

**GALATIANS v. 17.**—"For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

**T**HIS is a chilling announcement to the Christian, sincerely desirous of doing right. When he reads of Zacharias and Elizabeth, "— they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless;" *Luke i. 6*; and then

reads here, that he "cannot do the things that he would," he inquires, whether the duties of a Christian are so much more difficult of performance, than those of a Jew? And when Peter answers that Judaism was "a yoke \* \* \* which neither our fathers nor we (Jews of his day) were able to bear;" he knows not what to think concerning the advantage of Christianity over Judaism, if they are alike impossible of being obeyed by their subjects. Yet Zacharias and his wife really did conform to the intolerable Judaism; while Paul is represented as declaring Christian duty impossible. There must be some mistake here.

Our first objection to the idea of the impossibility of living properly, on the part of Christians, is; that such an understanding of this ver. 17, is flatly inconsistent with the verse preceding it; "I say then, walk in (with) the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." This exhortation is to a course we can pursue: for it would be unjust to this magnificent intelligence, to suppose he would exhort to an impossible course; especially when he connects with it the assurance, that by so doing, we will be able to resist the enticements of the flesh: ye shall not fulfil (complete, consummate) the lusts of the flesh: they will tempt you, but will not overcome you. And could such a man as Paul exhort us to a course, assuring us that in case of compliance, we should not consummate the lusts of the flesh; and then, in the very next breath, mockingly declare that the consummation is inevitable, as we cannot refrain from fulfilling the lusts of the flesh! we can never believe this of Paul, until our struggle to disbelieve it shall have been crushed, by the weight of resistless testimony.

Then another objection. The expression "so that ye cannot do the things that ye would" is very general in its terms; and lacks an important adjective, to restrict it to the sense usually ascribed to it: we allude



to the adjective *good*, as qualifying *things*: for as the sentence now stands, we cannot do anything, good or evil, that we would. If we *would* do something *bad*, we cannot: our determining to do it, makes defeat inevitable; for we cannot do the things that we would. On the other hand, if we *would* do something *good*, we cannot: our determining to do it, makes defeat inevitable; for we cannot do the things that we would. The only chance for us Christians, is to never determine to do right, and be always persistent in our determination to do wrong. Very queer ethics.

Our third objection is, that such a statement extinguishes every hope of inheriting the kingdom of God. For this same Paul, the apostle, and not behind the "chiefest," affirms, only a few verses on, in speaking of the works of the flesh, which we are supposed, by the idea we are opposing, to be unable to keep clear of; "Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." *Ver.* 21. We cannot pursue our course through life, without doing such things; and as the doers of such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God, our hopes are vain; we are lost. Our war with the flesh must result in our ruin. Very queer gospel.

A fourth objection. In absolute antagonism to our supposed helplessness in the hands of this all victorious flesh, Paul, *ver.* 24, says, "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." No affirmation could be more direct and positive. The flesh, with its passions and lusts, has been crucified by the Christian; the deed is done, it is in the past. One crucified, nailed to the cross, may not yet be dead; but is of necessity in a conquered, suffering, unformidable condition. Certainly he is proved to be inferior to his crucifier. And thus the Christian, he that is Christ's

is represented to be the conqueror of the flesh: which suffers, writhes, complains, but is under the control of the Christian. The expression, too, is very comprehensive. It is not the uncommon, the extraordinary, the most favored servant, soldier, of Christ, who is represented as achieving this victory: but "they that are Christ's;" which certainly includes all real Christians. This is a very different picture, from that supposed to be delineated in our passage: this, painting the Christian in possession of actual victory; that, representing him to be amid the mortification and sorrow of a hopeless struggle and inevitable defeat. Let us see if a fair criticism will rescue the apostle's words from such a predicament; surely a very awkward one for him, who "could do all things through Christ who strengthened him." *Phil.* iv. 13.

Paul had been discussing points of Christian propriety, and remarked, "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." Then, lest the Galatian brethren should be ignorant of their real condition of weakness, as to the flesh; and strength, as to the Spirit: and be discouraged at the conscious strife of opposing powers within them: and especially that they should not be surprised, at the fact, that they, regenerate believers, should be subject to the enticements of the flesh, the corrupt nature; he adds: "For the flesh (*sarx*, the corrupt nature of man) lusteth (*epithumei*, strongly desires, so as to urge the active powers to obtain the object of desire, and that in a good or evil sense) against the Spirit (*kata*, against, contrary to the

pleasure, will, word, prompting of the Spirit) and (*de*, a particle of frequent use, very often adversative, as *Acts* xii. 9, "And he went out, and followed him; and wist not that it was true which was done by the angel; but (*de*) thought he saw a vision,") the Spirit against the flesh: and (*de* is found here in an explanatory sentence and evincing somewhat of its adversative force (*Winer*, 443), may be rendered "but," especially as we remove the colon after "other," by substituting a comma; as the sense requires, and as maintained by high authority) these are contrary the one to the other (*tauta de alleelois antikeitai*, and these, the flesh and the Spirit, oppose each other) so that not (*hina mee*, lest: *hina*, a word used with great frequency, more than six hundred and fifty times, in the N. T., is rendered "so that" twice; here, and *Rev.* xiii. 13. Connected with the negative *mee*, as in this case, the usual rendering is "lest," equivalent to "that not:" as "— then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest (*hina mee*) they should believe and be saved." *Luke* viii. 12; "For I would not, brethren, that ye be ignorant of this mystery, lest (*hina mee*) ye should be wise in your own conceits." *Rom.* xi. 25. Of this *hina*, *Robinson* says, in defining its N. T. use: "I. Properly *telikoos*, as marking the final end or purpose, *to the end that, in order that*; and with a negative, *hina mee, in order that not, lest*." Therefore we remove the colon after "other," substituting a comma, and render *hina mee*, lest, and make the closing sentence to be the object sought by the parties to the strife before mentioned. That is, the flesh and the Spirit oppose each other, in an effort to influence and control the Christian's will; can you do the things that ye would (*hina mee ha an theleete tauta poieete*, lest the things ye may wish, those ye may do. If the flesh incite you to wish to do wrong, the Spirit opposes and strives

to hinder the flesh from overcoming you; and if the Spirit incite you to wish to do right, the flesh opposes and strives to hinder the Spirit's success. The word "cannot" is not warranted in the sentence. To express the idea of impossibility, the N. T. writers do not employ a mere subjunctive form of the word, as this *poieete*, here. As, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see (*ou dunatai idein*, not is it possible to see; and not simply *ideete*, may see) the kingdom of God." *John* iii. 3.)

Therefore, the proper rendering is, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, but the Spirit against the flesh: but these are opposed the one to the other, lest those things you may wish, you may do." The flesh will oppose the Spirit in all his influencing you toward the good; but the Spirit will oppose the flesh in all its influencing you toward the evil. Now comes the grand question, Which of these two mighty powers is the mightier? Is the flesh stronger than the Almighty Spirit? We need not hesitate as to the correct reply. Then again, Which of these powers is FOR us? Certainly the Almighty One: and surely we may say with David, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" *Psalms* xxvii. 1. Were the Spirit against us, we could have no hope: but with him asking the control of our will, let us have the common sense to yield it to his direction. For "— if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law:" the flesh will not bring you into disgrace and condemnation. We will avoid the horrid works of the flesh, enumerated, in part, verses 19–21: in part, for in verse 21 the apostle seems to sicken in the disgusting recital, and winds up with "and such like." And, indeed, it is a loathsome catalogue; and it is fearful to think, that any one should interpret Paul as teaching that we do such things of

necessity, notwithstanding the almighty aid of the Spirit, and the sure promise, "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." *I Cor. x. 13.*

And not only, in the gracious leading of the Spirit, will we avoid the works of the flesh; but we will exhibit the fruits of the Spirit, as detailed in verses 22, 23; "against which there is no law." This is a happy prospect, a blessed hope, a glorious heritage.

After all, then, this apparently discouraging Scripture, when properly interpreted, discloses to us, that we have an almighty ally, in our efforts to resist temptation. So, "If we live in the Spirit (*pneumati*, by the Spirit, by the agency or power of the Spirit) let us also walk in the Spirit (*pneumati kai stoichoomen*, let our orderly life be regulated by the same pure and mighty Spirit)."

---

## OF WHOM THE WHOLE FAMILY IS NAMED.

EPHESIANS iii. 14-19.

"FOR this cause (my desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you) I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:" there being no praying to glorified saints, in Paul's days: nothing of that sort being mentioned in all Scripture.

"Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named:" all the children of God, Jew and Gentile, departed from earth or lingering upon it, constitute the

family: in separate apartments, but the same family. Another proof, too, of there being no intermediate state; the "whole family" is in "heaven and earth:" nowhere else: so, even admitting an intermediate state, there is no one of God's children in it; as "heaven and earth" contains them all. But the name: of whom are they named? Not "our Lord Jesus Christ." For, the whole family does not bear his name: the name Christian was not heard of, before the gathering of disciples there, which was subsequent to the conversion of Paul; and the appellative must have been adopted slowly, as the word occurs but three times in the Scripture: so that the whole family is not named *Christian*. But if it were, Christ is not the name of our Lord Jesus; but, his title: as is Lord: his name being Jesus, so named by the angel, *Luke* i. 31. Nor is it the custom to name a family from a son, but from a father. The Scriptural name of the whole family is, *saint*; God being *holy*, his children are *holy*; and this is the meaning of the word, *saint*. Furthermore, the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine codices all omit "of our Lord Jesus Christ:" the verse stopping with "Father."

It is most likely, that the apostle refers to character, and privilege, rather than to mere appellative, or family name; as in *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16; "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." These lads were Ephraim and Manasseh, who never bore the name Jacob, Isaac, or Abraham; and though they were called Israel, as it regards their descendants, yet Israel was not the name of Abraham, or of Isaac, but of Jacob alone. The patriarch had

reference to character and privilege, with regard to being members of the great nation, to spring from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from which was to come the Messiah. In this sense, the word "holy" applies to the Abrahamic nation, as it was SEPARATED from all others, for this specific purpose; and to believers in Jesus, whose faith, like circumcision, separates them from all others, and constitutes them children and heirs of God. *Rom.* viii. 17.

"That he would grant you (Gentiles who have believed in Jesus, and have thus entered into this family of saints), according to the riches of his glory (his glorious riches manifested in this ample scheme, for the salvation of all, Jew and Gentile, by faith in the blood of the Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world) to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man (*eis ton esoo anthroopon*, unto the inner man; which, in fact, is THE man; Paul caring nothing about mere ritualism, church millinery, genuflexions, a strength of display; but praying that these children of Abraham, by faith in Christ Jesus (*Gal.* iii. 19), who had nothing to show by way of Jewish ritual, might through the Spirit, be strong in faith, love, and hope).

"That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith:" another of the petitions of his prayer. He desires that they may have such a clear apprehension of, and faith in, the system of salvation by Jesus Christ, the Lord of all; that it will be with them, as though Christ actually, personally, was dwelling in their hearts, directing and controlling their emotions, and being the very spring and impulse of their words and actions.

"That ye, being rooted and grounded in love:" Dr. Clarke admirably explains, "Here is a double metaphor, one taken from *agriculture*, the other from *architecture*. As *trees*, they are to be *rooted in love*; this is the *soil* on which their souls are to *grow*: into the infinite love

of God, their souls, by faith, are to strike their *roots*; and, from this love, derive all that nourishment which is essential for their full growth. \* \* \* As a building, their foundation is to be laid in this love, etc. \* \* \* In this, as its proper *soil*, it *grows*. On this, as its only *foundation*, it *rests*." *In loco*. These observations are just, beautiful, lucid, every way well expressed. The Christian is to grow as a tree grows: the tree's roots striking into and stretching through the soil, so as to procure the nutriment to sustain and enlarge its growth; to which ends the roots are essential; a living tree with a dead root, was never seen: so faith enters into a perception of the love of God, in giving his Son to be the Saviour of the world, stretching out in every direction through the *divine* word, searching for Christ, the great evidence of the divine love, and finding him in every page, and sending the blessed food of the soul, to every part, so as to maintain and enlarge its growth in grace. A tree bearing fruit, to profit man and please God. The Christian is to rise and enlarge, as a building rises and enlarges: its foundation securely laid, and the superstructure rising by the care, and according to the plan of the skilled architect: the material well selected, the plan convenient, commodious, beautiful. A temple in which God will dwell and be worshipped.

In each of these expressive figures, do we see the true doctrine of sanctification. The tree grows up, steadily, and brings forth its fruit: and this separateness to its development, begins with its beginning, and accompanies it continually: it does not, at any time, by any sudden, mighty, extraordinary impulse and shooting up, attain this separateness of being a tree only: it is this or nothing. The house is built up from the foundation, and its separateness, or holiness, is not attained in any one moment more than another; for it is this house, or it is not. So with the Christian: he "cannot



serve God AND mammon ;” if a friend of the world, he is the enemy of God ; he must be a Christian or not ; he must be regenerate or unregenerate ; a sinner can have the form without the power of Godliness, but a Christian cannot. Sanctification is not a grace that a Christian attains ; it is what a sinner attains when he becomes a Christian, and what he retains while he remains a Christian. It is an essential ; for, “ Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.”

“ May be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height ;” These terms of mensuration apply to the building just referred to, as a figure of the Christian ; and, therefore, they relate to Christian edification, experience, as we style it. These Gentiles converted to Christ, were to be able to comprehend equally with all saints, especially the saints of the family of Abraham, and with Abraham himself, and with Isaac and Jacob, the grand privileges and expectations, as well as duties and usefulness of a Christian life. “ But what can the apostle mean by the breadth, length, depth, and height of the love of God ? ” *Dr. Clarke.* With all due respect, we answer, Nothing. He is not alluding to the measure of God’s love, which none can comprehend ; but to the measure of Christian experience based upon faith in the divine love, which is comprehended, he says, by all saints.

“ And to know the love of Christ that passeth knowledge : ” A splendid utterance of this grand writer, who needed these paradoxical phrases, in the rushing forth of his full ideas, too great for usual modes of expression. The love of Christ, like the overhanging sky, is too vast for our thoroughly investigating it : and yet, as we can know something of the vasts of the unsearchable sky, and may reasonably conclude, that what lies beyond our ken, is like that which lies within it ; so with the love of Christ, we may know that he loved us,

and gave himself for us, that his love induced him not only to die for us, rise for us, reign for us, but to provide ample means for our learning all this, and to pledge his changeless word to receive every one that will come unto him, and give him grace to live a happy, useful life, leave time in full hope of a blissful eternity, and dwell with him in heaven forever. This is a great amount of knowledge of the love of Christ; which yet stretches like infinity, beyond, so far beyond, so indescribably beyond the finite! Yet, the Christian really knows the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

“That ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.” Of course no sane person can entertain the idea, that a Christian can contain all the fulness of God, in any absolute sense. But, there must be some sense, in which we can understand the apostle, as praying for what is intelligible and possible. By regeneration, we become partakers of the divine nature: “—that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature (*theias koinoonoi phuseos*), having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.” *II Peter* i. 4. God being our Father, we have in a certain sense, his nature, his characteristics. Having lost his image in which we were created, by the defection of Adam, it is restored to us by the mediation of Jesus, the Christ. And especially was this joyful intelligence to the Gentiles, who had been regarded as being so far away in sin and hopelessness. Throughout this passage, we must keep in mind, that Paul, a Jew, trained to look upon Gentiles as being outside the covenant; and whose touch was polluting to a Jew (*Acts* x. 28); is here gazing upon the development of the great mystery, of the Gentiles having equal privileges with the Jews, in the boundless blessings brought to mankind by Christ. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God.” *I John* iii. 2. “Every one that loveth is born of God.” *Ib.* iv. 7. “Every

one" includes Gentile and Jew. Then as the Christian is a child of God, he partakes of God's nature, wears his image, resembles him, partakes of his fulness, *i. e.* the fulness of his nature, his moral nature: thought, emotion, will, love, forbearance, compassion, etc., are the same in kind, but indescribably different in degree, in the Christian as in God: he is a Godly (Godlike) man: as a small bowl of water dipped from the vast ocean, contains the same elements; and is the same water, in kind; but as to quantity, too infinitesimal even for comparison. All the glory of having a character like that of God, is attainable by the once despised Gentile. The amazing blessings of Christianity, comprised in our restoration to the divine likeness, are freely offered to all. "Ho every one that thirsteth, come!"

The student may obtain some assistance, toward a correct understanding of the place, from observing the use made by the apostle of *hina*, in its proper telic sense (*to the end that*). It occurs thrice: 1. "That he would grant" (*hina dooe*); 2. "May be able" (*hina existhuseete*); 3. "That ye might be filled" (*hina pleerootheete*). In the first instance the aim, purpose, end, of his prayer was, that certain great blessings might be granted to the Ephesian believers: and in the second instance, a certain one of these (their being rooted and grounded in love) "that ye \* \* \* may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height:" *i. e.* that they, a tree rooted; or a house founded; might then comprehend, as all saints do, by experience, the propriety and beauty of such a tree growing on such a soil; of such a house, resting upon such an ample and sure foundation: the tree having nothing in its structure, but the elements drawn from that soil, love; the house being in exact keeping with its foundation, love. In the third instance, his petition is, that they might know the love of Christ,

surpassing knowledge, that (*hina*, to the end that) they might be filled with all the fulness of God. For the Gentile Christian meditating upon the love of Christ, who gave himself for us, in accordance with the love of God, who gave his Son to be the Saviour of the world, all who will come unto him; will be changed into the same image; for having borne the image of the earthy, he shall also bear the image of the heavenly: and when he bears the image of Christ, he also bears the image of God; for Christ is "the express image of his person." Christ is the Son of God; and Christians are the sons of God: having the divine nature.

This line of thought again makes it clear, that the mensuration terms refer to the Christian tree, or edifice; personal or social; and not to the love of Christ, or of God.

---

---

## THE PASSIBILITY OF DEITY.

COLLOSS. ii. 9-15.

DEITY is a mystery unfathomable by any creature. Only the divine consciousness is able to measure the divine capacity. It becomes us frail, finite beings, to acknowledge our dependence upon revelation for all our information concerning the divine nature. What God has been pleased to reveal to us, in his works and in his word, we are to accept with reverent gratitude and unfaltering faith, even where the *modus* of any revealed fact or statement is, to us, incomprehensible. In our metaphysical wanderings among the vasts of the divine attributes, we see little, know less, and are not

warranted in many of the conclusions we announce: often, too, with a confidence that should be exhibited only by those who estimate their logic as being infallible, we affirm the attributes of Deity to be infinite. But what do we mean by such a word? Does it amount to anything more than our casting our finite selves down upon the immensity we are assuming to measure, and declaring that it goes, in every direction, beyond our insignificant stretch? And yet we mouth such words as infinity, omnipresence, omniscience, with entire familiarity, as if we comprehended their meaning, and arrange them in the premises of our arguments, as being easily managed by our logical force and skill.

“Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as Heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea.” *Job xi. 7, 8, 9.* And, while proclaiming the incomprehensibility of this awful Deity, a presumptuous theology dogmatizes as to what he is, and what he is not; imagines him to be circumscribed by its diminutive system, and declares him to be a cold, motionless, passionless entity; so that to affirm the passibility of God, is heresy, and we are required to teach that the expiatory sufferings of our Lord, did not, could not extend to his divinity.

If the doctrine of the divine passibility be heresy, it is a very safe one, for the Holy Scripture abounds with it; and it savors much more of heresy to deny it; *i. e.* to deny the divine passibility; for it is by far safer to trust in what God reveals concerning himself, than in the delirious assertions of the metaphysicians. The Scripture reveals God as repentant, grieved to the heart, compassionate, patient, disappointed, etc.; all which are states of suffering. If the Deity reveal himself passible, shall we, who say he is incomprehensible, deny

it? Do we mean by the doctrine of the divine incomprehensibility, that God does not understand his own nature? That he is conscious of nothing in the vastness of his nature, but what our logic has discovered? Orthodoxy makes but a poor show of it, in a flat contradiction of God.

But it is *not* a flat contradiction; orthodoxy *explains* the revelation; in the cases referred to, the expressions are anthropic; they are after the manner of men; Deity cannot suffer; and, therefore, such Scriptures as represent him to be patient, grieved, etc., must be understood in a sense accommodated to the divine nature; which divine nature we understand; so we are to take the patience, pity, grief of God, as meaning something other than patience, pity, grief, and, therefore, orthodoxy does not *flatly*, but only *metaphysically*, contradict revelation; as the wise old philosophers held, that while the gods existed in human form, they had not *blood* and *body*, as we, but *quasi* blood, *quasi* body.

The Scriptures reveal Deity as patient, pitying, grieved; and so, suffering; but, then, they do not mean *real* patience, pity, grief, suffering; but *quasi* patience, pity, grief, suffering; for, the Deity is impassible. Impassible, because, otherwise, he could not be perfectly happy. But, can we explore and fix the constituents of perfect, infinite happiness? Do we know that suffering is incompatible with perfect, infinite happiness? Do we know that suffering is incompatible with the perfect, infinite happiness of the Deity? In what does the divine happiness consist? Is it anywhere revealed, that suffering is incompatible with the divine happiness? It is not incompatible with human happiness, as Paul and Silas demonstrated by their midnight songs, in the Philippian dungeon.

What can be the meaning of *Gen. iii. 22*, "and the Lord God said, behold the man has become as one of

us, to know good and evil"? As we stand aghast before this deep mystery, do we see no glimpse of the divine passibility?

But, the Deity has come among us, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. God hath spoken to us by his Son, who is the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person: *Heb. i. 1-3* We agree, as to the divinity of Christ. But, admitting that, how can we hold the divine impassibility, without separating the divinity from the Christ, and leaving him as only a human sufferer, to expiate our guilt? It is absolutely certain, that the sacred narrative has not a word of such an occurrence, as the withdrawment of the divine element of the Christ. It was the Christ begotten of the Holy Ghost, the Son of God, who bore our sins in his own body on the tree, and by whose stripes we are healed. He suffered for us: and in those sufferings which exceed human understanding, demonstrated, that more than human energy was required to endure that woe. As to impinging the divine happiness, it is recorded of this divine sufferer, that it was his delight to do the will of him, who sent him to endure that woe. Dr. Watts is not wrong, when he affirms:

Down from the shining seats above,  
With joyful haste he fled:  
Entered the tomb in mortal flesh,  
And dwelt among the dead.

As to the mystery of God's suffering and yet being happy, it is absurd to urge it in presence of the incarnation; the prayers of the divine Christ, who was omnipotent; and many other features of the wonderful plan of salvation.

We, frail, miserable mortals, how can we be wise, in turning away from the sweet assurance, "that as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that reverence him," to the icy demonstration of the metaphysician, that there is no *real* pity in the heart

of God; but merely a *quasi* pity: and so all this revealed *affection* of the tender heavenly Father, is a mere seeming and sham; for metaphysics excludes the divine nature from all capacity for emotion.

It has not been our intention to attempt any demonstration of the divine passibility, as a matter of metaphysics and logic: but merely to show that the holy Scripture so represents it; holding that to be the impassable limit of the question. There we must stop. We know nothing, on this topic, beyond what is revealed: and the suffering image of God, leaves no room for the idea of a merely human, or merely figurative sorrow. We must deny the divinity of Christ, or admit divine passibility.

Paul, *Acts* xx. 28, exhorts the bishops of Ephesus, "to feed (or guide) the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood:" and this reading is sustained by the oldest MSS. in existence: Lange does not attempt to criticise it: and the passage definitely connects divinity with the anguish of the cross. Death is not annihilation. If a mere man die, he is not annihilated, extinguished. The Scripture affirms that Christ had life in himself; and also, that he suffered and died: that his death was *voluntary*: the Jews intended to slay him, and are charged with such guilt, properly; because they intended it, and did what they could to accomplish their intention. But, their wicked hands were not necessary to the death of Christ. He had power to die, and power to live. He would have died, had his "own" received him, and consoled him with their sympathy, as he proceeded to the agony and the tomb; for the agony and the tomb were the necessary penalty of human guilt, which he had taken upon himself to expiate. If the Jews were allowed to participate in the dreadful scene of the crucifixion, perhaps it was to have the surpassing wickedness of man, to meet the



surpassing love of the Redeemer at the cross, as a spectacle of the power of sin, and the power of redeeming love; to excite the horror and the gratitude of mankind. But it was no merely *human force*, that was capable of enduring that expiatory anguish; to lay down that wonderful life; and take it again; and Paul meant that, when he affirmed that "God had purchased the church with his own blood."

The passibility of Deity is clearly revealed. The HOW is beyond our comprehension, and equally so is the HOW NOT.

---

## THE END OF THE COMMANDMENT.

I TIM. i. 5.—Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.

PAUL had "besought" Timothy to "abide still," to remain, at Ephesus; himself about to go into Macedonia. He did not order him so to do; which must be odd to those who hold a high estimate of apostolic authority: nor did he request it: but he besought, and so prevailed. The aim of Paul in this, expressed in *hina*, was, that Timothy should remind the Ephesians of the true doctrines of the gospel of Jesus, the Christ, as preached by him, and warn them against "other doctrine" and fables and genealogies ministering strife.

"Now the end (*telos*) of the commandment:" The commandment, *paraggelia*, refers to the true doctrine of the gospel, it being a message from God to man, by his Son. In this gospel we have the will of God, as to our inward condition, and outward conduct; and his

will, thus expressed, is not inward hatred and outward strife. If any, then, be found in this condition, it must not be attributed to the gospel: for the one object, aim, purpose (*telos*), of the gospel message is love. Thus we read, "For Christ is the end (*telos*) of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." *Rom.* x. 4. What the law aimed at, the end it sought, was that men should keep its precepts, and be righteous. This end, it could not accomplish because of the weakness of the flesh; which weakness and consequent impossibility to be righteous by law, having been demonstrated, the law handed us over to Christ, that we might, by faith, obtain the righteousness, which was the end, the scope, the object sought, of the law. "Wherefore the law was our pedagogue (child leader) unto Christ, that (*hina*, to the end that) we might be justified by faith." *Gal.* iii. 24. The end of the law was to make us righteous; and had it accomplished its purpose, it would have made us loving; for nothing is more righteous than love. The perfectly righteous One is Love. *I John* iv. 16. Love is the fulfilling of the law. *Rom.* xiii. 10. Therefore the doctrine of the gospel by teaching us how to be righteous, teaches us to love.

But the love comes out of a pure heart; and the pure heart, out of a good conscience; and the good conscience, out of faith unfeigned; and the faith unfeigned, out of the true doctrine of the gospel: and not out of "other doctrine, fables, or genealogies."

The gospel then is the basis of the whole Christian scheme: this is the message from God to men: this is the only message: anything else, is "other doctrine, fable, genealogy," etc.: to which we should give no heed. We hear the gospel and unfeignedly believe it; believe it with the heart; glad to believe it; it is precisely what we need; and when we thus believe, it is faith, the faith that delightedly grasps the delightful

truth, that Jesus, the Christ, bore our sins, expiated our guilt, paid our debt.

From this comes a good conscience, a peaceful conscience, an absence of condemnation. For our debt is paid; our sin is punished; we being crucified with Christ, also arose from the grave with him cleared of the law by the payment of the penalty. We are sorry that sin entered the world, marring God's beautiful work; sorry that it entered into us, and that we cherished it as a good, while it was defacing in us the divine image and making us to be hateful: but, we are in Christ Jesus, and have no condemnation.

So from this good conscience, this righteousness by faith in Jesus, the Christ, our Christ, our substitute, our surety; comes a pure heart. "How shall we that are dead to sin (having been crucified with Christ) live any longer therein." *Rom. vi. 2.* Faith in Christ, producing a good conscience, we find our hearts anxious to empty themselves of self, the world, and Satan; and to be occupied by Him who bought us with his groans and blood. We open our hearts to make him room: and whenever Christ is in the heart, it is both pure and loving.

Thus then the end of the commandment is obtained, by its securing our faith, which produces a good conscience; which produces a pure heart, which produces a steady stream of love, blessing all within its influence.

## THE ROOT OF EVIL.

I TIMOTHY vi. 9, 10.—But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

“**B**UT they that will be rich” (*boulomenoi*, devising, plotting; *ploutein*, to grow rich): They who aim at becoming rich; make their plans to that end; riches being their object. This does not refer to those who seek to make a livelihood, in an honest employment; and are prospered in the routine of regular business; living in acknowledgment of their obligations to God, and man; and yet prospering and becoming rich, while acting with Christian propriety. Those referred to make wealth their one grand object: plotting not to make an honest competency, but to be rich: gathering money for the sake of having money.

“Fall into temptation and a snare, and many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.” They are so set upon being rich, that they easily fall in the hour of temptation, and are taken by the devil in his snares secretly set for their souls. In this way, many are caught and ruined, on what they suppose to be the route to wealth, and find themselves in the penitentiary or on the scaffold, instead of in a sumptuous villa. Many use their riches in such manner as to contract ruinous habits, that not only prevent further accumulation, but destroy them. Many are so fond of their money, that they hear not the calls of God whose stewards they are, and their souls are eaten away as by canker.

“For the love of money (not the possession of money) is a root of all evils:” It is not THE root of all evils, as though there is no evil that did not grow from this root: but a root from which all sorts of evils spring: all kinds of scandalous trickery, mean frauds, base lying, robbery, murder, etc. Not that every one who loves money, does all these things; but every one does some such, and the money lovers, as a body, do them all.

---

## WHY CROWNED WITH GLORY AND HONOR?

HEBREWS ii. 6-9.—“But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor, and didst set him over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him.”

THUS far the reference is to the first Adam, created a ruler, after the image of God the Great Ruler; and dominion given to him; the earth and all the inferior orders of animated beings, placed in subjection to him; and he crowned, not with a jewelled crown, but with glory and honor, by God's own appointment, the vicegerent of earth. *Gen.* i. 26, 28. The phrase “crowned with glory and honor,” is figurative, of course, and signifies that Adam was placed at the head of his own royal line, and was to rule over all the terrestrial domain.

But "NOW," we look around and see all this splendid arrangement defeated. The sovereign has lost his crown and sceptre. Confusion and violence fill the earth; instead of the peace and prosperity that should have resulted, from all things having been subjected to Adam's authority. The order has been broken. Men have usurped dominion over each other. Empire, as God appointed it, has been lost. Slavery, human slavery, in various forms, especially satanic, has been introduced. The royal family is enslaved.

"But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death;" It would seem then, that angels cannot suffer death, and that Jesus who had assumed to die, had to be made somewhat lower than the angels. Adam and Jesus both were "made a little lower than the angels:" a complete parallel so far. But of Jesus only is it said, that his being made a little lower than the angels, was "for the suffering of death." Adam "was made a little lower than the angels," to live; Jesus, was put in that same position to die. In the case of Adam, it was decreed, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." *Gen.* ii. 16, 17. In the case of Jesus, it was decreed, "— it (the seed of the woman) shalt bruise thy head, and thou (the serpent, the devil, Satan, *Rev.* xx. 2) shalt bruise his heel." *Gen.* iii. 15. Adam did eat, violated the decree: the decree being not that he should eat; but, that he should not eat (and, thus, the doctrine that, "from all eternity" it was decreed that he should eat, is flatly contradicted by the recorded decree that he should not: besides the phrase "from all eternity" means nothing, it is mere verbal fog): and so he brought human "sin into the world, and death by sin;" and so (*houtoos*) death passed upon all men, for that

(*eph' hooi*, because; the *houtoos* being thus defined as describing the *manner* of death's passing upon all men; and *eph' hooi* declaring that all men were implicated in Adam's act, which act was sin) all did sin (*heemarton*, were sinning in Adam's act). *Rom.* v. 12. Adam lost his glory and honor, which had been conferred upon him, the headship of humanity, its representative, plunging them into sin and death.

But Jesus, the seed of the woman, who graciously assumed the position lost by Adam, came to put himself at our head; and finding us in the realm of death, he "was made flesh and dwelt among us;" *John* i. 14; he was in "the likeness of sinful flesh;" *Rom.* viii. 3; "for the suffering of death;" that he might associate himself with us in our death; and be "crowned with glory and honor," i. e. occupy the headship of humanity, as Adam had done; suffering for us; representing us in the suffering he endured. So he was made "a little lower than the angels," to be capable of suffering death; and then "crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man."

He did not win the crown by what he suffered; but by his love inducing him to become the second Adam. Hence there is no need of being embarrassed, by wondering why the apostle represents him wearing the crown at the beginning, instead of at the end of the struggle. He could not have been prepared for his bruising Satan's head, except by the lowering, the lessening; nor could the bruising his own heel have been suffered, unless he had assumed the headship of our race, the crown of glory and honor. What he won was life and righteousness for the human race: "Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." *Rom.* iv. 25. And still he wears that crown, that headship, for "— he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." *I Cor.* xv. 25: "Who is gone

into heaven, and is on the right hand of God." *I Peter* iii. 22: "Whither the forerunner is FOR US (*huper heemoon*) entered, even Jesus." *Heb.* vi. 20.

The phrase "tasted death" means nothing more than dying. It is used five times, in the N. T., and in every instance is equivalent to dying, and that with respect to man, except in our passage, where it refers to Jesus; and we know of no rule of criticism, which would allow any special meaning to the phrase here. It is simply equivalent to "that he \* \* \* might die for every man." What is remarkable is, that HE should die; and, that HE should die FOR EVERY MAN (*huper pantas*, in the stead of every man, no man left out, so that there is no man but for whom Jesus died in his stead).

---

## WHOSE END IS TO BE BURNED.

HEBREWS vi. 4-8.

IT is wonderful, that any one should reject the gracious overtures of the gospel. Still more wonderful is it, when any one who has sold all that he possessed, and bought the pearl of great price, throws it away! So foolish does it seem, that some deny the fact; holding the final perseverance of all who have been truly converted; really regenerated. Indeed, so sure are they of this, that the persons here described, are held to be only apparently, not really, regenerated. They err.

"It is impossible for those who were once enlightened:" this relates to past time (*phootisthentas*) in which they were enlightened; having been turned from darkness unto light (*Acts* xxvi. 18).



“And have tasted of the heavenly gift:” an item of clear Christian experience, also expressed by a passive participle (*geusamenous*).

“And were made partakers of the Holy Ghost:” the *arraboon*, “the earnest of our inheritance;” *Eph.* i. 14. Again the past (*metochous geneethentas*).

“And have tasted the good word of God:” the good word has not only been heard, but tasted, experienced, as “the power of God unto salvation.” *Rom.* i. 16. Again past (*geusamenous*).

“And the powers of the world to come:” the powers, energies, influences, impulses of Christian faith, energized by “the love shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost given unto” believers. *Rom.* v. 5.

It cannot be that we have here anything other, than a real Christian experience. Where is the true Christian who will fail to recognize this fact? But, now we have arrived at an important point. Can such fall away? They can backslide, all admit that. But can they utterly fall?

“If they shall fall away:” the Greek text is, *kai parapesontas*, and must be rendered “AND having fallen away.” So that the whole reading would be; “For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and have fallen away,” etc. Their falling away, is in the past, as in the other particulars; each being expressed by a similar participle; and the last one very improperly rendered contingently and future.

And, moreover, the participle *parapesontas*, used here, is found nowhere else in the N. T. Its root *parapiptoo* is not found in those sacred writings, in any other inflection, than this, one of its participles, the aorist, and only here. This compound verb is from

*para* and *piptoo*; the latter signifying to fall, and found eighty-seven times in the N. T. Why, then, should the apostle select this word unused by any N. T. writer, but himself, and that only in this one instance? If he meant a mere ordinary fall, why not write *pesontas*, a form in frequent use? Perhaps *para* has, here, its *intenseness*, from its signification of *beyond*, as in *para-kaluftoo*, to hide entirely. *Parkhurst*. Thus the word would mean, to fall away entirely: according to *Dr. Robinson*, "to apostatize, absol. *Heb. vi. 6:*" by which he means that it must be taken here absolutely; as any scholar would know without our aid: but many for whom we are writing are not scholars.

We have then a fall so great, that an *apax legomenos*, a word used but once, must be brought in to express it; and a fall from a Christian experience of such a grade, that a continuance therein would have secured the maintenance of "peace with God," and final salvation. Then the clear teaching is, that as some of the really regenerate had fallen away utterly, in Paul's day, such an occurrence is not impossible now; and, in fact, such cases are of actual observation, so far as we can judge by "fruits," a test that has divine authority, as to its sufficiency.

But now is such a case hopeless? The apostle declares it "impossible (for such) to renew them again unto repentance, *palin anakainizein eis metanoian.*" There are two words here that we propose to analyze. *Anakainizein*, from *ana*, again, and *kainos*, new; used only here: a similar verb, *anakainoos*, from *ana*, again, and *kainos*, new, is used twice: a similar noun *anakainoosis* from *ana*, again, and *kainos*, new, is used twice. Whatever the root idea may be, it is expressed thus but five times in the New Testament. "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind." *Rom. xii. 2*; where the restoration of the soul to the condition it

had lost, is referred to. "He saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." *Tit.* iii. 5; the meaning being that the renewing, restoration, aforesaid, is by the agency of the Holy Ghost. "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new (man), which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." *Coloss.* iii. 9, 10. So far as we can judge this also refers to the restoration (regeneration, as we understand in these cases) and its manner. "But though our outward man perish, yet the inward (man) is renewed day by day." *II Cor.* iv. 16: where the sense of the renewing certainly differs from the three preceding instances; as there it referred to restoration, regeneration, at its incipency; but, here refers to the continuation of regeneration, spiritual life; or perhaps to its reinvigoration when weary or flagging. In this sense we take it here.

*Eis* is defined by *Robinson*, "— with the primary idea of motion into any place or thing, and then also of motion or direction *to, toward, upon*, any place or object. The antithesis is expressed by *ek, out of*:" "The devil taketh him into an exceeding high mountain (*eis oros hupseelon lian*, upon a mountain very high), and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world." *Matth.* iv. 8. "And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain (*anebeei eis to oros*, he went upon a mountain, he ascended a mountain): and when he was set, his disciples came unto him:" *Ib.* v. i. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (*eis aphesin ham-artioon*, for the remission of sins, one must repent to have his sins remitted, upon repentance his sins would be forgiven). *Mark* i. 4. "But Jesus stooped down, and with (his) finger wrote on the ground" (*egraphen eis teen geen*). *John* viii. 6. "And put a ring on (*eis*) his hand, and shoes on (*eis*) his feet." *Luke* xv. 22. We accept this sense of *on*, or *upon*, for *eis* in our passage.

Then the impossibility of such apostates to renew themselves upon or on repentance may be understood, from the facts of ordinary Christian experience. One may be a sincere believer, and yet "be overtaken in a fault (*prolephtheei*, be taken before he is aware, be overtaken, surprised into a fault)." *Gal.* vi. 1. But such a case is far from hopeless, the apostle, in the very same verse, giving direction for his restoration. In such a case, one is grieved, distressed, out of heart for awhile; but is penitent, and here is his safety; upon this penitence, repentance, he renews himself, restores himself; for he like the publican, smiting upon his breast, says, God be merciful to me a sinner! and is comforted by the assurance, Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out; *John* vi. 37. Such an occurrence is of sad frequency with us. Sad, as to the sin; but, joyful as to our kind Father's forgiving love. Alas! for such shameful lapses: the Lord be praised to our utmost and forever, for such compassion!

But, the apostate, who crucifies to himself (so far as his conduct signifies) the Son of God afresh, and puts him to an open shame; utterly renouncing all hope in him, all allegiance to him, all expectation from him; has lost everything, not even shame and penitence remaining: as if an earthquake had swallowed the very ground on which he stood. Nothing left. No penitence upon which to stand, and look up for mercy and grace to him, who restoreth the soul for his own holy name's sake.

But even for this apostate is there mercy and salvation, should he be brought to see his sin, and turn once more to the fountain opened for sin and uncleanness. And to bring him to his senses, and to repentance, the tireless Spirit essays his subduing, melting, moving providence; for his amazing long-suffering finds it hard to give Ephraim up. *Hosea* xi. 8. Therefore the

illustrative figure of verses 7, 8. "For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet (fit, suitable) for them by whom it is dressed (*georgeitai*, tilled, cultivated, farmed), receiveth blessing from God (*eulogias*, eulogy, praise, intimating that such result of production responsive to the judicious toils of the farmer, is pleasing to God; he having endowed the soil with capacity for useful production, and the farmer with capacity, for learning and practicing the art of farming): but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing (*kataras eggus*, near cursing; *kataras* in the eighth, is the opposite of *eulogias* in the seventh verse; and indicates the perversion of the field, farm, earth's capacity for useful to useless production, and the indolence and negligence on the part of the farmer); whose end is to be burned (*hees to telos eis kausin*):" the consequence of which state of things is a burning.

*Kausis* is defined by the judicious *Dr. Parkhurst* to signify, "A burning, or being burnt up, with drought, namely, the husbandman no longer troubling himself, according to the eastern agriculture, to supply it with water, *exustio*, occurring *Heb.* vi. 8, where see *Mac-knight*." But the good and studious Doctor, to whose labors we are so much obliged, forgot that the figure here is not of irrigated land, but of that favored by frequent rains (*huetos*, rain), a shower of rain, as *Dr. P.* properly defines it: and as used elsewhere, and always in this sense; as "— in that he did good, and gave us rain (*huetous*, showers) from heaven." *Acts* xiv. 17.

*Dr. Robinson* understands it, as being burned by fire. And so, *Dr. Clarke*; who, however, limits it to the burning off the thorns and briars, to appropriate the field to the pasturage of cattle: the nature of the case, he says, prevents us from supposing that the apostle alludes to the custom of *pushing and burning*, in order

to further *fertilization*. But, we cannot see how the nature of the case prevents us from such a natural supposition; for this is precisely what the nature of the case demands. The farmer has neglected his field until the thorns and briars have usurped it, and it is now fit for neither tillage nor pasture. What is to be done by a sympathizing neighbor in the way of advice? The Doctor thinks, advise him to burn off the thorns and briars, so as to improve the field into a condition fit for pasturage. But as it had been arable land, and was in its then condition through the scandalous negligence of the farmer; would it not be more neighborly to advise a change of mind and conduct on the part of the farmer? Thus inducing him to resume his farming; and as the fault was that he suffered these nuisances to grow, while he was neglecting to sow and till his land; he is very unlike a farmer, who in the proper time, manures his land after exhaustion from cropping, ploughs, seeds, cultivates in the usual routine: for this man, if he be awakened to a sense of his shameful waste of time, visiting taverns, etc., instead of attending to his abandoned farm; and now determines to resume his business; he has first by fire and mattock, to get rid of the thorns and briars; so as to recover his field for husbandry; and in so doing really benefits the land by the burning and the ashes. As the man who turns his feet toward the cross, not only finds it to be a blessing to be there; but a blessing to be away from his old sinful ways and habits.

Dr. C. quotes from Virgil's beautiful *Georgics* i. 84.

Sæpe etiam steriles incendere profuit agros;  
Atque levem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis.

Long practice has a sure improvement found,  
With kindled fires to burn the barren ground:  
When the light stubble to the flames resigned,  
Is driven along, and crackles in the wind.

So Dryden translates verbosely, for the sake of his rhyme; and, as all other poets, mars the poetry of his original more by attempting to render it in English verse; than he would have done by attempting to translate into prose. The translation into poetry is impossible. One can come nearer his original with prose than poetry.

But, to return to our figure. The land that bringeth forth thorns and briers is nigh unto cursing: but, thank God, the compassionate and long-suffering God, it is not yet cursed; the bolt has not yet fallen; his mercy is not yet "clean gone forever." And, moreover, a sweet, clear, moving voice is heard, "Father forgive them;" for one has sinned, and yet he has "an advocate with the Father!" Think of this, O desponding soul: the Father, with a father's loving heart; and an advocate with the Father! Either would seem to be enough for the very worst case; and yet we have both! O let God be praised throughout the universe, and forever and ever: for his plan with us is, not what we deserve, but what we need!

Not cursed; but nigh unto cursing, a sad condition, indeed, but not a hopeless one. There is one process left, the kindling of the fires for the burning of these thorns and briers. For though the phraseology is that the earth, the land, the field, is to be burned; it must be taken as an agricultural idiom; and no one ever meant the consuming of the field itself, by such a phrase; and only the consuming by fire of what the farmer calls "the filth" upon its surface. So, the providential fires are kindled, and the thorns, briers, and such like burn in the crackling flames; leaving the field blackened and ashy; and ready to be broken up by the plough of repentance, that the precious promises and assurances of the gospel may again be sown, in the hope of renewed harvesting of product fit for the farmer's use.

These persons, to be sure, had "crucified to themselves the Son of God afresh." Like the Jews, they had cast him out of their heart, hurried him to Calvary, and put him to an open shame as a malefactor. But, when we stood amid the scene of the first crucifixion, at the very moment when he was hanging, bleeding, dying upon the cross, and they were shouting their insults into his ear; we heard a voice whose pleading rose above their cruel shouts, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do!" And "Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday, to-day, forever;" and "if any man sin (the extent is not mentioned) we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

In addition to this reasoning, we have the history of a very distinguished and shameful apostate in the case of Manasseh, the son of the pious and excellent Hezekiah. In despite of his training and position, this inexcusably wicked and ungrateful king apostatized from Jehovah, "— reared up altars to Baalim, and made groves, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served them. \* \* \* And he built altars for all the hosts of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord. \* \* \* So Manasseh made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to err, and to do worse than the heathen, whom the Lord had destroyed before the children of Israel. \* \* \* Wherefore the Lord brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria, which took Manasseh among the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon. And when he was in affliction (the fire had now been kindled in this field, which had covered itself with the thorns and briars, that were now crackling in the flames), he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers (ploughed deeply and thoroughly, in repentance), and prayed unto him: and he was entreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought



him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom." The field was restored; the farmer having turned from his evil ways, and thereafter attending to his husbandry: or, as Jude expresses it, "— building up himself on his most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keeping himself in the love of God," etc. Verses 20, 21.

So then, we have the fact of the possibility of the utter apostasy of a truly regenerate man; which should urge us to constant diligence and care; hearkening to the needed warning, "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." *Heb.* iii. 12. But if we be so wicked and ungrateful as to allow ourselves to be possessed of such an evil heart, and depart from the living God; let us not drown ourselves in continued sin and despair, but from our wretched condition of guilt and worthlessness cry to him, who heard the prayer of Manasseh ascending from the fires of his affliction, forgave him, and restored him to the kingdom he had so wickedly and foolishly forfeited. "His mercy endureth forever."

---

## THAT WITHIN THE VEIL.

HEBREWS vi. 17-20.

"WHEREIN God willing (*boulomenos*, devising) more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise" (*tees epaggelias*, the promise; *i. e.* the promise made to Abraham of Christ the Saviour of man. "For ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. \* \* \* — ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs

according to the promise." *Gal. iii. 26-29*) the immutability of his counsel (*to ametatheton tees boulees autou*, the unchangeableness of his design, purpose, device), confirmed (it) by an oath (*emesiteusen horkooi*, interposed with an oath; so as to stay up, as it were, his purpose, his design. *Emesiteusen* is from *mesiteuoo*, to mediate, interpose; and this from *mesitees*, a mediator, interposer): that by two immutable things (the promise, and the oath) in which (*en hois*, by which, on account of which; *i. e.* either the promise, or the oath: and not that the two combined were necessary to secure us from falsehood on the part of God: for, so far as he was concerned neither was necessary; his purpose, design, having been formed; but as we needed both for our encouragement; for the exciting, invigorating, maintaining our faith; he gave them both; showing that it is not requisite that we wring salvation from his reluctant hand, but that we obtain our own consent to accept what he so earnestly presses upon our acceptance) it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation (*ischuran parakleesin*, very well rendered by "strong, mighty, consolation;" and demonstrating that it is not our Father's plan to stint us in the supplies of grace, of which his store is so abundant; for he "—giveth to all (men) liberally, and upbraideth not." *James i. 5.* But it is well to analyze this consolation, this *parakleesin*. The word is from *parakaleoo*, a word compounded of *para*, to, or intensive, and *kaleoo*, to call; and signifying to send for, or to call to one's self, to entreat, to exhort, to console, etc. So, we being in sorrow, trouble, doubt, about our salvation, our loving Father calls us, that we may repose our heads upon his kind, compassionate breast, and have him talk to us, explaining to us the groundlessness of our apprehensions, in view of his own exhaustless resources, and equally exhaustless love. The weak and doubting

should always go to God. There they are always welcome. There they have a standing invitation; "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden;" and a standing promise, "I will give you rest." *Matth.* xi. 28. The invitation and the promise are both recorded; both upon the same book; always to be found in company; never separated; they are inseparable; God hath joined them together, and no man dare put them asunder; to the very last moment of time it will be "Come, and I will give." We must look in the Scripture for these, and many other words of strong consolation: they are ever there; and our feeble faith may well lean and rest upon them, for they will never fail us: the heaven and earth may pass away and be no more; but the word of the Lord endureth forever; and forever has consolation for the sad and weary), who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us (the figure is that of fleeing to take hold on the horns of the altar, as *I Kings* i. 50; "And Adonijah feared because of Solomon, and arose, and went, and caught hold on the horns of the altar." It is pleasant, also, to notice, that it is not a threat that is set before us, but a hope: no hearer of the gospel is warranted to despair; for a hope is held out to him, which he should grasp and rejoice in; for it is a blessed hope): which (hope) we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast (the anchor is a simple, but very ingenious instrument, so constructed that when it is thrown overboard, it is certain to plunge its fluke into the bottom, and hold the ship: the adjectives sure, *asphalee*, and steadfast, *bebaian*, seem to refer to this fact, as the anchor is sure, certain, safe, because it goes (*bebaian* being from *baoo* or *bainoo*, to go) into the bottom of the river or sea, thus enabling the ship to resist the wind or tide), and which entereth into that within the veil (*to esooteron*, the inward part), *i. e.* of the Most Holy Place, and, therefore, within the veil, *katapetasmatos*, which was spread,

expanded before the Mercy Seat; and through which the High Priest, once a year, with great special ceremony, entered into the Most Holy Place, to cover the Mercy Seat with a cloud of incense, and sprinkle the blood of atonement upon it. These two words are used by the LXX. in describing the ceremonies of the day of atonement alluded to: *Levit. xvi. 2*; "And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy (place) within the vail (*to hagion esooteron tou katapetasmatos*) before the Mercy Seat, which is upon the Ark:" and verses 12, 13; "And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring (it) within the vail (*esooteron tou katapetasmatos*): and he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of incense may cover the Mercy Seat that is upon the testimony," etc.: and ver. 15; "Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail (*esooteron tou katapetasmatos*), and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the Mercy Seat, and before the Mercy Seat." The Hebrew words thus rendered in these citations from the LXX. are, *mibbeith lapparoketh*.

And what are we to understand by THAT within the vail? We would prefer a modified rendering; as, "an anchor sure and steadfast, and entering within the vail:" the vail of the figure being the surface of the sea, vailing from the seaman's sight whatever may be within it; *i. e.* the bottom, which is beneath the surface, and veiled from the eye of the seaman, who drops the anchor from the bow, it plunging out of sight, and fastening its fluke into the clay below. And as that anchor passed within the vail, the sea, and laid hold so as to secure the ship; so the High Priest, who acted for (*huper*, in the

stead of, *Heb. v. 1*), the whole nation, and was their hope, their representative, their anchor, entered once a year within the veil, that shut off from the sight of the Jews, the Mercy Seat, where the sprinkled blood atoned (in a figure) for the sins of the people, and laid hold upon that Mercy Seat, and secured the people: and so Jesus the forerunner (*prodromos*) is for (*huper*, in the stead of us; he being our High Priest, acting for us, men, Jew and Gentile) us entered within the veil, heaven, that conceals him from our sight; but he has taken hold upon the true Mercy Seat, which he has sprinkled with his own most precious blood; while our faith fastened to him, as the cable to the anchor, holds us secure. Jesus is our hope, our anchor, there within the veil; but we are here, outside the veil, and the connection between our anchor, and our ship (the Church), is our faith. There is no danger of the anchor failing us; it is sure, steadfast; the only peril is in the breaking of our faith: and to prevent this we may ever recur to the promise **and the oath; the two immutable things**; ever the same; the promise of God, the oath of God; the promise of God that as our day so shall our strength be, the oath by himself that blessing he will bless us.

Jesus is our forerunner, we are where he is, he represents us there: and as an army may be said to have entered the city, when its commander is quartered there; so the Church may be said to have entered heaven, in the person of its forerunner, its Head. Quite a number of the troops are also there; and after a while, we shall all enter that peaceful, eternal residence of the soul.

One army of the living God,  
To his commands we bow;  
Part of the host have crossed the flood,  
And part are crossing now.

## NOT A DEFINITION OF FAITH.

HEBREWS xi. 1.

IT cannot be, that this is presented as a definition of faith. Would "A good king is the hope and stay of his kingdom," be a definition of a king? It would be the statement of a proposition; but could not be a definition. This section of Scripture could not answer the question, What is faith? It would though very well answer the question, Of what importance is faith? Answer: It is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen.

But how is this made to appear? By considering what faith is, and by explaining the terms used in this passage. Then what is faith? We have an item of history to assist us, in our inquiry. Abraham is given as affording an illustrious example of faith, by some interesting incidents in his life. "Now the Lord had said to Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. So Abraham departed," etc. *Gen.* xii. 1-4. God said to him, that he would make of him a great nation, from which should come the Christ: he believed what was told to him, and departed. Of this incident Paul says, *Heb.* xi. 8; "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went." All this means, that Abraham having heard the word of God believed it: which was faith: and his faith impelled his departure.

And so throughout his entire history : " He believed in the Lord, and it was counted to him for righteousness." *Gen.* xv. 6. Faith, then, is believing the divine word, in a filial, loving manner, that impels to obedience.

What is meant by the substance? The Greek word is *hupostasis*, from *hupo*, under, and *stasis*, a standing, the latter from *histeemi*, to place : so *hupostasis*, something that stands under, a *substans*, or *subsistens*, a foundation. So a filial, cordial belief of the word of God, faith, is the foundation, the *substans*, the *hupostasis* of things hoped for. All the spiritual help we need to enable us to overcome our spiritual foes ; all the grace we need to persevere in our duty and be useful ; to give us victory over death and the grave ; our happy entrance into heaven ; our share in the blessed smile of the Lord ; our reunion with our loved and lost ones ; our harp, and crown ; our blissful eternity ; all these, and the other multitudinous things we hope for, rest on this one foundation, faith. In the very same moment in which that foundation is destroyed, there is an end of all these things hoped for : they cannot remain an instant, after faith is gone. It is the word of God that declares to us all these things, and if we do not, like Abraham, believe that word, we will never set out to seek them, for they will be as nothing to us.

The apostle does not mean, of course, that the things, grace, providence, heaven, etc., will fall into ruin : they will abide, though our faith may fail : but they will be as nothing to us, as the sun or moon is nothing to a blind man, as music is nothing to the deaf. He means that in the absence of faith, we cannot hope for things of which we know nothing, but that they are revealed or stated in the word of God, which we do not believe. Therefore he affirms so solemnly, at the close of the preceding chapter, " Now the just shall live by faith : but (*kai*, and) if (any man) draw back, my soul shall

have no pleasure in him :” i. e. it cannot be a pleasing sight to one who has such a deep interest in you as I have ; that any one of you should cease to have faith, which is the only basis of Christian character, and a fitness for heaven, and of all hope for a sinner. Upon this same principle he affirms a few verses on, “— without faith it is impossible to please God ;” for God who so loved us, as to devise this plan, that the great tidings of the gospel should be proclaimed to us, that we might believe and live ; cannot be pleased when we disbelieve and die. Thus, too, we interpret ; “— they that are in the flesh cannot please God :” i. e. while they remain in that condition ; because their loving Father in heaven, who has devised a plan for their elevation to purity, usefulness, and happiness, cannot be pleased to see them remain in wickedness, mischief, and misery. Faith is as indispensable to the hopes inspired by the word of God, as a foundation is to the edifice that rests upon it.

“The evidence of things not seen.” The evidence is not a good rendering of the Greek word *elegchos*, here : for *elegchos* is produced by credited evidence. Dr. Robinson defines it, here, *conviction, persuasion, firm belief* : Dr. Parkhurst, *conviction, evident demonstration or manifestation* : Dr. Clarke, “such a *conviction* as is produced in the mind by the *demonstration* of a *problem* : after which demonstration no doubt can remain, because we see from it that the thing *is* ; that it *cannot but be* ; and that it cannot be *otherwise* than as it is, and is proved to be.” But this is knowledge. One does not believe what is demonstrated ; he knows it. Faith does not come by demonstration, but by hearing (*akoe*, fame, hearing, rumor, ear, audience, report, preached ; such are its N. T. renderings ; and something reported, is its general sense), and hearing by the word of God. *Rom. x. 17.*

Conviction produced by mathematical demonstration, is knowledge. No mathematician *believes*, that “the



square of the base of a right-angled triangle is equal to the difference of the squares of the other two sides :” he knows it to be so ; and that it cannot but be so. But the conviction here spoken of is such as occurs to a juror, who has heard evidence, judged by him to be reliable. If he believes the testimony given by the witness, he is convinced that the occurrences stated by him were facts, although unseen by the juror. His belief of the witness’ report, produces the conviction of the unseen facts : and his conviction is impossible if he do not believe his report.

Did Paul believe that Jesus rose from the dead? No : he knew it. Did he believe in the resurrection of the dead? Yes : that has been reported by the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of the Prophets, and has not been demonstrated ; is not a matter of knowledge. So far from believing the report of Peter and the other appointed witnesses of the resurrection, Paul looked upon them as deluded fanatics at best, probably scandalous liars ; and breathed out threatenings and death against them, until the Master, who elected him to be the twelfth apostle, appeared to him, and made him, in common with the other apostles, KNOW that he had risen from the sepulchre, and given the final highest proof of his Messiahship. All the apostles *knew* that Jesus arose from the dead ; they saw him ; conversed with him ; ate with him ; that they might be witnesses qualified to testify to that glorious fact.

*Elegchos*, conviction, occurs when a credited witness makes his report, gives his testimony. Of the things concerning which he testifies, you have seen not one : to you they are absolutely “ things unseen : ” your faith in his report, is essential to your conviction : did you disbelieve his report, conviction would be impossible. “ Through faith we understand (*nooumen*, to see mentally, to perceive, comprehend) that the worlds (*tous*

*aioonas*, the world, the visible universe) were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Ver. 3. That is, we read, *Gen. i.*, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," etc., and believing the testimony of the sacred writers, who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, we are convinced that the universe came into existence at the fiat of the Almighty; "who spake and it (the universe) was: he commanded and it stood fast (in the order appointed). Our belief of the testimony, *Gen. i.*, is the cause of our conviction, that the world was *created*; not that it was organized out of eternal matter; and that probably in the Epicurean, accidental, chance manner, the eternal atoms dropping and whirling into position; just as we (do not) see now the snow flakes, falling perpendicularly, aslant, whirling about, for hour after hour, day after day, and aggregating into all sorts of form, birds, beasts, men: or we might give in to the conjectures and fancies of Darwinianism. But we are saved from all such vanities, because we have God's word, sent us through his appointed agents, that he created and ordered the world: "framed" might imply that he arranged the world out of then existing matter; but the qualifying phrase, "so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," puts it beyond dispute, that the framing was of the things God had created.

How evident, then, is it that faith, a filial belief of God's word, is essential to our having a conviction of the things unseen, but reported in that word! Those very things hoped for, mentioned in the first section of this verse first! Faith is indispensable to the Christian; when that is gone, all that distinguishes him is gone; the locks of Samson having been sheared off, Samson "became weak, and like any (other) man." *Judges xvi. 17-20.*

One may *know* that certain statements are made in the Scripture. The creation; the fall; the promise of the Christ; the election of the agents in fulfilling that promise; the Abrahamic nation, and its agency; the coming of the Christ, his rejection by the Jews, his death, burial, resurrection, ascension; the witnessing of the apostles; the outsetting of the Church: one may *know* that these statements are in the word: but he will not accept them as true, on the ground of knowledge; he cannot *know* that they are true: but he can accept them only by believing the word reporting them to him; *i. e.* by faith: by faith he perceives that all those unseen facts occurred; and by them, as by a chart and compass, he steers his rocking bark across the sea of time. The port is unseen by him; he has never been there; it lies due east, says the chart; he steers due east, and arrives.

---

## FAITH ACTIVE.

JAMES ii. 26.—Faith without works is dead.

WE have defined faith to be a filial belief of the word of God, impelling to obedience. There can be no other evangelical faith than this. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness." *Rom. x. 10.* The heart, the affections, must be involved in true faith, saving faith, and it is the heart that is its energy: "—faith which worketh by love (*pistis di' agapees energoumenee*, faith energized by love, faith made operative by love)." *Gal. v. 6.* Wherever saving faith, the faith that is counted for righteousness, is, it is operative. "What (doth it) profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works?" That is, how

absurd for any one to profess faith, and yet not obey the word of God! Such a one is defective in mind, or in morals. The thing is impossible. The man is not a Christian. "Can faith (such a pretense as he makes to having faith) save him?" *James ii. 14.* The salvation by faith, is so heartily to believe that Jesus is the Christ, as to place one's self at his command: glad to trust and to obey.

Look at Abraham, the man whose faith was counted to him for righteousness. Do you not see that his was a working faith? He was commanded to offer up Isaac, the wonderful Isaac, the elect Isaac, "upon the altar." How *could* this consist with the promise, that Isaac was to be a stone, an indispensable stone, in founding the "great nation" from which the Messiah was to spring? Abraham could not answer that question; but he believed that God could; and, thus believing, he obeyed, in spirit, in intention; and, as his uplifted hand was staid, he understood, that the difficult question had needed no solution; for it had not been God's intention, to have the father to redden his hand with the blood of his son, and he the son of the promise; but to exhibit to all coming generations that brilliant spectacle of childlike, unquestioning, unhesitating faith in God; to instruct mankind, that he who obeys God is never the loser, always the gainer.

See also, the case of Rahab, the harlot, who believed the report of the spies, and, therefore, shared their peril, identifying her, with their fate; and securing eventually the lives of herself and relatives. She had heard of the wonders done in Egypt by Jehovah, in behalf of Israel: and how he had been keeping them in the desert, to weed out the generation of rebels, and establish their children in Canaan; and now here were the spies sent to spy out the land, in view of the advance of the grand host; and her faith in the confirmatory report of these two men, who brought her the direct

word of God, impelled her, to ask to be identified with God's people, and to appropriate action. Neither the faith of Abraham, nor of Rahab, was in complete condition, except by working, by being energetic, operative.

We must now comprehend the figure used. A body without the spirit, *to sooma chooris pneumatos*, the body without breath. *Pneuma*, from *pneoo* to breathe, has three general significations. I. A breathing, breath, breath of air, a breeze, a blast, the wind. II. The spirit of man, i. e. the vital spirit, life, soul; the rational spirit, mind, soul. III. A spirit, i. e. a simple, incorporeal, immaterial being, possessing higher capacities than man in his present state: in this last signification it includes the Deity and the angelic hosts. It is used in all these senses in the New Testament: its special meaning, to be determined by the context. It can be found with widely variant meanings, in the same verse: "The wind (*to pneuma*) bloweth (*pnei*) where it listeth (*thelei*, willeth) and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit (*tou pneumatos*)." *John* iii. 8. The senses of *pneuma* are measurelessly apart here; but there can be no embarrassment, in determining each sense. In the case before us, we have given the proper sense of *pneuma*, to be *breath*; thinking that to be consistent with the figure used.

In riding along, we meet with a human form bruised and bloody; and alight to make some investigation; taking it to be a case of murder, suicide, or fatal casualty. Upon examining, we find life not extinct, for the lungs are in motion; the body is not without breath; it is not dead. But, if upon examining, we find the body without breath, we know that death has occurred, our help is not needed, the body without breath is dead. Because breathing is a vital function; like the circulation of the blood: and when these functions cease, either of them, life ends. On this account, our Maker

has made them involuntary ; their use not being voluntary on our part : we not being capable of such a trust. Seeing and the other senses, he has committed to us : for their exercise, though important, is not vital. By neglect, in those respects, we might subject ourselves to inconvenience and suffering, to remind us of our carelessness, and impel us to seek to remedy it ; but neglect of vital functions would be fatal.

There is motion in the body, if the lungs be moving ; and if motion, life. As the motionless body is dead ; so with the motionless professor of faith. Motion is essential to the life of the body ; and quite as much so to the life of faith. The body without the acting lungs cannot be in life, is inert, insensible ; and faith that is not energized by love, cannot be, exist, as the faith that saves.

When Paul concludes " that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law ;" *Rom.* iii. 28 ; he is not contradicting James. It is quite unnecessary to say, that Paul is treating of the justifying faith of the penitent ; and James, of the continuous faith of the believer. They both allude to the one only faith, believing the word of God in that filial manner, that impels us to obey him. The man with this kind of faith comes to God, walks with God. It is useless to attempt to approach God, with half of the heart : all, or none ; ye cannot serve God AND mammon : the AND plan is impossible : it must be OR ; for that is possible and sure. There is absolutely no evangelical, saving faith, where there are no works, Christian works, such as praying, trusting, praising, watching, doing good as we have opportunity. We do not mean the works of the law, circumcision, offering animal sacrifice, etc. ; but, Christian works ; doing things, but doing everything to the glory of God : living in the propriety of Christian life.

## THE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST: THE GLORY THAT SHOULD FOLLOW.

I PETER i. 10-12.

THE words of the heading are the centre of the passage. The prophets are represented as predicting it; the preachers of the gospel, as reporting its fulfilment. The prophets inquired and searched diligently what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it (he) testified beforehand, the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. The Spirit moved them to predict the sufferings appointed unto Christ (*ta eis Christou patheemata*), "It is quite erroneous to take (these words) *I Pet. i. 2* for *ta Christou patheemata* (the sufferings of Christ) as in ch. v. 1. It means (similar to *peri tees eis humas charitos*, verse 10) *the sufferings* (destined) *for Christ.*" WINER, 193. And so the prophets had testified; not comprehending it clearly, and earnestly searching into the signification of the words dictated to them. What time would it be; and what sort of time, or condition of the world it would be, when these marvels should occur: when the Christ, the Mediator, should bear the sin of the world in his own body, that by his stripes men might be healed.

And now the preachers inspired by the same Spirit, report these wonders as accomplished; and they with similar energy of search, inquire, in vain, into the fullness of the event. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" *Rom. xi. 33.*

U

Christ, the Lord from heaven, is the Second Man. This fact is the foundation of the whole gospel scheme. The First Man betrayed his trust, and brought humanity into sin, death, and ruin. The Second Man interposed in our behalf; to accomplish our recovery from ruin. The First Man had merely to retain his high, pure, brilliant position, by abstaining from an act, the abstinence by no means limiting his supply of everything needful for his happiness. The Second Man had to empty himself, and assume the likeness of sinful flesh; assuming all the consequences of the First Man's dreadful failure, as they affected him and his race; requiring him to go down into the very depths of death, and there to bring life into himself and into all those dead bones lying in that silent, cheerless valley. This he did, as Adam did that, FOR ALL, *huper pantoon*, in the stead of all.

The order of the recovery, was, of necessity, the reverse, precisely the reverse, of the order of the fall. With Adam, the record was *tas eis Adam doxas kai ta meta tauta patheemata*, the glory appointed to Adam, and the sufferings that followed. But with Christ, the sufferings appointed to Christ, and the glory that followed. And as the glory of Adam terminated in suffering; so, the suffering of Christ terminated in glory. His own arm brought salvation to him and to us. It was a strong arm, and it won a great salvation.

What a glorious thing to break the bar of the grave, death's prison house, which appeared to be inviolable! What a glory, to win for every human being the certainty of such a resurrection! To acquire for every such person the mysterious enabling of the Holy Ghost; the teachings of the gospel, through the agency of the Church; and the influences of Christian association and example, together with the care of Providence; so that



when the certain resurrection shall occur, it will be unto everlasting life in heaven: where the greater, brighter, everlasting glory shall beam upon the saints, in the endless kingdom of the Father.

Suffering and glory. Such is the order of Christ. The suffering first; then the glory to follow, and that surely. Paul and Barnabas "— returned again to Lystra, and Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." *Acts* xiv. 21, 22. There it is: no avoiding of tribulation: we must encounter it: but it ends surely in the kingdom of God: in GLORY.

---

---

## PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

I PETER iii. 16.

"**H**AVING a good conscience:" Here is a great point. Suffering is unpleasant, and suffering for righteousness' sake is what the inflictors of it should be ashamed of; but the Christian having a conscience void of offense toward God and man, may console himself, with the assurance, that if suffering be allotted to him, it is better "to suffer for well doing than for evil doing."

In such case he has the high example of Christ, the great Benefactor, and Example of men; who suffered the just for the unjust; the just instead of, in the place of, the unjust; that he might lead the unjust to God, to

be reconciled to Him, to be blessed and saved. And this suffering, Christ assumed, took upon himself voluntarily: it not being what he could not avoid, but what he had come down from heaven to undertake: and to demonstrate the malignity of those for whom he suffered, men, the elect nation of men, the nation honored of God above all others (*Deut. x. 15*), were eager to be the agents of his suffering and death.

What a noble sufferer was this! Meriting the sympathy, and eternal gratitude of those blasphemers, scourgers, and murderers, who suitably represented not only the Jews, but all our race; he submitted to be led as a lamb to the slaughter. "He closed his eyes, to show us God." His object was to bless us: to do this he had to endure suffering: he did endure the suffering, in all the needed amount and intensity: and the suffering was for well doing. Had he borne that punishment for his own evil doing, it would not have availed for us. It was nobler in him, and unspeakably better for us, that Christ suffered the just for the unjust. There was no smooth road by which he could have brought sinners to God.

It is necessary that Christians have a good conscience: it is better that they suffer for well doing, than for evil doing: and in both these particulars they have the high example of Christ. These are the great points with the apostle in his instruction, and exhortation. In a word, they are to live as Christians should: letting their light shine; exhibiting among themselves and toward unbelievers, the mind and spirit of Christ; embracing every opportunity of doing good; striving by the purity and gentleness of their loving lives, at all cost of personal contumely and persecution, to win sinners from the error of their ways, as did the divine Master.

In setting this perfect example before them, Peter describes the suffering of Christ as utterly unmerited

(the just); as the highest possible grade of benefaction (for the unjust, and to bring them back to God); as the most extreme suffering (being put to death as to the flesh). Yet the result was victory, life. The great well doer was not kept a prisoner in the realm of death: the heavy fetters were broken: the Christ had life in himself; and when he had drained the cup of death in behalf of the unjust, he arose. "His own arm brought salvation to him." "I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down; and I have power to take it again."

"By which (*en hooi*) also (*kai*):" It seems to be generally admitted, that *en hooi* relates to "the Spirit," *pneumati*, in the preceding verse. This merits some attention. In the 16th verse, *en hooi* is rendered *whereas*. In ch. iv. 4, it is rendered *wherein*. "That, whereas (*en hooi*) they speak evil of you," etc. "Wherein (*en hooi*) they think it strange that ye run not with," etc. In our passage, *pneumati* being neuter, and the relative *hooi* in the neuter form, it might be taken as relating to *pneumati*, and so to signify "By which (Spirit) also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison," etc. But this involves the statement in impenetrable obscurity. Did he go by that Spirit, leaving the body in captivity to death, and preach to the spirits in prison; the preaching terminating very early in the morning of the first day of the week? In which case, some thirty hours, or so, were devoted to evangelizing those spirits. Or, did he wait for the quickening of the body, and then go upon his mission to those spirits? Then, as Luke declares that he lingered on earth, some forty days, shewing himself alive, and that by many infallible proofs, to his disciples, speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, assembling with them, etc., until he was taken up from them, in their sight, into heaven (Acts i. 1-9); we are amazed that Luke should have

omitted all mention of such a fact, as this most important mission to *hades*. Is it possible that such an item could have escaped the ear of the Evangelist, who had so great desire to imitate the many, in declaring "those things which are most surely believed among us;" and who had "a perfect understanding of all things from the very first." Or, that if he had ever heard of it, he would have omitted all, even the least, mention of it from his Gospel, or his Acts? And is it not passing belief, that such a fact could have been made known to the Apostles, and no lucid statement of it should have been recorded? As to Paul's "lower parts of the earth," *Eph.* iv. 9, supposed by some to refer to *hades*, read "lower parts, the earth." *Winer*, § 59. 8. a.

Then, too, how are we to account for the fact, that he should have preached only to those "who were disobedient in the days of Noah?" Of all the generations, were these the only infidels who required or needed a second call to accept the divine mercy? It is impossible for us to conjecture, why the mission of Christ was limited to those of the days of Noah; who had been favored with the ministry of that "preacher of righteousness," and yet had not been persuaded. One might have expected, that as on earth the gospel was provided for all; then, were a mission to the lost projected, those of the days of Noah might have shared in the benefit: but that such a mission should be limited to them, to us is incredible in the absence of some clear Scriptural statement.

If it be supposed, that a more general provision is stated in ch. iv. 6; "For for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead (*nekrois eweggelisthee*) that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit:" it is impossible to regard this as a clearer, or less ambiguous statement than that of ch. iii. 19, 20. If we consider

“them that are dead,” to mean all the dead, we are puzzled by the certainty that they were not all judged according to men in the flesh; and by the clear revelation of the impassable gulf, forever yawning between those who die impenitent, and those who are carried by the angels to Abraham’s bosom. *Luke* xvi. 19–31; *Matth.* x. 28; xviii. 8, 9; xxv. 41, 46; *Mark* ix. 43–48; are much clearer passages, than these from Peter; and true criticism reads the ambiguous by the light of the clear; and wisely refuses to shroud the clear in the gloom of the ambiguous.

The success of the gospel preached to the living, glows on the page of the sacred history; but, while our hypothesis mentions the preaching the gospel to the dead, not one word as to success is uttered, nor a single trophy exhibited: so, while we may have some basis for a discussion of the fact of the preaching to the dead; there is certainly not an inch of ground for the affirmation that one of those spirits in prison ever escaped from it. We have no trace of any such fact, in all the divine history; and our knowledge in the case is absolutely limited to that sacred book. Supposing then the mission to have occurred, it was utterly fruitless of good; and as a doctrine it is certainly without promise of good, and may tend to harm, by inclining some to await the process of evangelization in the future state.

Our Lord’s parable, *Luke* xvi. 19–31, most certainly excludes all idea of any evangelizing beyond the grave. The rich man died, and in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torment; and Abraham’s colloquy cuts off all prospect of any favorable change in his condition. It is demonstrated by that parable, that the Sacred Scriptures are a sufficient instrumentality of salvation; superior to the ministry of one from the dead; and the infidels of Noah’s day, having rejected the gospel from the lips of that “just man, who was perfect in his generations,

walking with God, and a preacher of righteousness ;” it is a contradiction of the teaching of our Lord in the parable, to suppose that Peter meant, that himself, Jesus, after his death, went to preach to those, whom he knew to have rejected the word, faithfully preached to them for more than a century.

But there were other generations, after the days of Noah, who had not the word declared to them ; and why they all should have been overlooked, and the mission restricted to infidels of the Noachic age, who had been favored with, and had rejected, such superior advantages, is incredible, in view of our Lord’s lucid teaching, as to the several responsibility of the informed and uninformed. “And that servant, which knew his lord’s will, and prepared not, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required : and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.” *Luke* xii. 47, 48. Yet contrary to this avowed principle, the generation that had the most abused its privileges, was dealt with leniently, kindly, mercifully ; and those who had offended less, and in ignorance, were left unvisited by mercy.

Again ; “ Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works, which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom,

it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee." *Matth.* xi. 20-24. But our hypothesis makes it infinitely preferable to be such as Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, in the day of judgment, than to be as Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom. Therefore it is unreliable. It leads, logically, to an absurdity.

We prefer taking *en hooi*, ver. 19, not as "by which," but as a conjunctive phrase, "because," "inasmuch as," etc., connecting "he went and preached," etc., with "For Christ also" in ver. 18; thus presenting us with a second instance of Christ's submitting to indignity, while engaged in well doing; laboring through the instrumentality of Noah, to convert the infidels of a generation, from which only eight souls were saved. When Peter wrote, those spirits were in prison: but in the days of Noah, when they would not be persuaded, they were on earth; and had the advantage of the preaching, prophesying, and example of that just man; who received from the Lord (Jesus, the Word, who was in the beginning, who was with God, who was God, and by whom all things were made: *John* i. 1-3) the direct revelation of his extreme disgust, at the exceeding wickedness of men; so that "it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth," etc. *Gen.* vi. 5-7. All this revelation the preacher made known to those of his day, but they would not be persuaded; they were *apeittheesantes*, unpersuaded, "disobedient." The time of their disobedience is distinctly stated by Peter: "which (spirits) sometime were disobedient (*apeittheesasin pote*, disobedient once, at a certain time) when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing,"

etc. This is very specific as to the time of their refusing to be persuaded; and when they refused to be persuaded, was the time when they were preached to.

If the "spirits in prison" are supposed to be, necessarily, the departed from this life, we refer to Dr. Clarke's enumeration of passages, where the word "spirits" must refer to living men: "—the spirits of just men made perfect, *Heb.* xii. 23, certainly means righteous men, and men still in the Church militant; and the Father of spirits, *Heb.* xii. 9, means men still in the body; and the God of the spirits of all flesh, *Numb.* xvi. 22, and xxvii. 16, means men not in a disembodied state." *In loco.* Dr. Parkhurst gives as a definition of *pneuma*, the word rendered "spirits" in our passage, "x. A religious teacher who pretends to divine inspiration or authority, whether truly or falsely," and cites "—in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits (*pneumasi*), and doctrines of devils." *I Tim.* iv. 1. "Beloved believe not every spirit (*pneumati*), but try the spirits (*pneumata*) whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit (*pneuma*) that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit (*pneuma*) that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God:" *I John* iv. 1-3. The "spirits" here referred to, were false teachers, disturbing the Church. The "spirits in prison" referred to by Peter, were disembodied sinners at the time of his writing, but were embodied at the time of their refusing to be persuaded, by the preaching of Noah.

The history of Christ, the Lord striving with them, the bearing with them one hundred and twenty years, their resisting, and destruction, all this, we have in the sixth and seventh chapters of Genesis. And by this



light we should understand Peter, not to be referring to any divine visitation to these men, above all other lost ones, in the world of spirits: but to the history of their evil doing and infidelity, in the days of their flesh; their wickedness and provocation borne with by the Lord so long; and resulting in the rescuing of but eight souls, from the destruction of the whole race of man. Only eight saved from an entire generation of the human race; because only those eight were *peittheesantes*, persuaded by the divine voice. No generation, since "the days of Noah," has existed with but that small number of believers. So, that the picture of the Lord's suffering grief over human stubbornness of opposition, as drawn by Peter; and his success, so seemingly small, yet so astonishingly great, in saving the seed of humanity, for the re-peopling of the globe, with men who have never exhibited a generation so unpersuaded, as to contain but eight believers; accounts for their being mentioned, above all others, in this connection.

So we read; "Having a good conscience; that, inasmuch as they speak evil of you, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conduct in Christ. For better, if the will of God be that you suffer, that it be for well doing, than for evil doing. For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; having been put to death as to the flesh, but quickened as to the Spirit: (and he hath suffered) also, inasmuch as he visited, in the days of Noah, those spirits now in prison, who then resisted all persuasion, when the long-suffering of God waited while the ark was being prepared, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."

This theory conforms to the divine history, and to the general Biblical doctrine: in which latter we have no clear statement of any probation or offer of mercy beyond the grave: but very distinct teaching, that,

at death the impenitent go directly to a place of torment, from which there is no escape. *Luke* .xvi. "To be cast into everlasting fire (*to pur to aioonion*)," as the result of a sinful life, *Matth.* xviii. 8, is too clear and positive to be set aside by ambiguous expressions. Our Lord teaches plainly in the passage from *Matthew*, that we should get rid of incitements to sin, at any sacrifice, rather than "to be cast into everlasting fire:" and in the citation from *Luke*, he describes the course of a sinner with entire distinctness, as sinning, dying, and lifting up his eyes in hell being in torment, from which flame he is told that extrication is impossible: the tormenting flame is the everlasting fire. The two lessons are altogether consistent, teaching the same doctrine. And after all the objections alleged, as to the insufficiency of present probationary opportunities; the inequality of those privileges, growing out of social position, educational advantages, and corrupting influences; the awful excess of the punishment, over the peccadilloes of this brief life, etc.: it is only necessary to take the whole subject into fair and full consideration, to be convinced, that, "As for God his way is perfect."

The sinner is gifted, every sinner is richly gifted by the Creator, with mind, heart, will, impulse; and no man is fixed by providence, where he cannot do right, if he will. The history of our race absolutely sparkles, glows, with instances of men beginning their career in obscurity, poverty, unkindly and adverse influences of all sorts; and making their way to the most eminent position of power, and fame. Our Lord puts the matter fairly: "Light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light." *John* iii. 19. He that laments the absence of opportunity to improve his condition is the man who is sinfully neglecting the opportunity in his possession; like the man with the one talent. And why should God or man give a man ten talents,

when he shows himself incapable, unwilling to undertake the managing of one? Every man has one talent.

And shall a man who will not deny his propensities to evil, and take up his cross though none so heavy, for a moment, a mere handbreadth of time, to secure to himself an eternity of perfect bliss; dare to mutter from amid the hopeless gloom and horror of the pit, that his punishment is disproportioned to his offense! What was the offense? He was offered eternal bliss, on condition of momentary cross bearing; and he refused the offer! He would not flee the wrath to come, on that infinitesimal condition! To have accepted the cross would have made him a better, more useful, more noble, happier man: he refused. The refusal was a dishonor to his own mind, a plague to his own heart; it minified him; degraded him; all around him whose opinion was worthy of respect, were grieved at it; only the vile were pleased at it; and yet he refused. Should he then complain of the eternal horror from which he refused to escape upon such a simple, possible condition; it will not in the least tarnish the perfection of the divine administration.

To sum up: Peter is seeking to encourage Christians, suffering as they were in that day, by persecution for their faith and good conduct. He reminds them of the support and comfort of a good conscience; and points to two instances of suffering on the part of their Lord — one after, the other before, he assumed flesh — both instances being recorded in the sacred history; the former in the gospels, by Matthew, Mark, Luke, John; the latter in Genesis vi. and vii. by Moses. In Gethsemane, according to Matt. xxvi. 38, he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death:" while with reference to the infidels of the days of Noah, Moses declares, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of

the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." Yet, in each instance, the result was grand. The anguish of Gethsemane and Calvary resulted in life, "quickened as to the Spirit;" while the "long-suffering" during the one hundred and twenty years, of the divine grief, resulted in life to the post-diluvian world, by the saving of the eight souls in the ark. And so the Christians of Peter's day, were in Christ the true ark, and amid the roaring deluge of persecution, would be tided safely on, to spread the faith for which they were suffering, for the blessing and salvation of the coming generations. Of which we are part, and well may we be grateful, and rejoice that the sufferers maintained their integrity, and sent on to us the precious faith, to cheer us in our struggle for life and salvation.

---

---

## THE ELDERS.

I PETER v. 1-4.

“THE elders (*presbuteros*, sometimes this word signifies advanced age; more usually, in the N. T., office; as is the case here) I exhort, who am also an elder (*sumpresbuteros*, a fellow-elder, not so well rendered by ‘also an elder:’ fellow-elder is more expressive than ‘also an elder:’ the apostle meant to signify his sympathy, kind regard, equality; as making it reasonable and proper, for him to exhort them to the course of official duty, suitable to their office. There is no trace of a gradation of orders, from deacon, to elder,

to bishop, to apostle, or any thing similar, in the N. T. ; so as to lead us to suppose, that Peter had come up to the apostolate, through the lower orders ; and, therefore, comprehending all the functions of those orders in the highest, the apostolate, he might very properly style himself a fellow-bishop, fellow-elder, fellow-deacon. The history is, that he was placed by the Head of the Church, at once, in his position of apostle : and as he tells us here that he was a fellow-elder, a *sumpresbuteros*, we can but infer, that, at the time of the writing, he had been elected an elder of some congregation and was engaged in the exercise of his functions ; having but rare occasion, now, for the peculiar functions of his apostolate, the witnessing to the Christ's death and resurrection. Even in our day, we have known a bishop to be called to the rectorate of a special congregation ; exercising his episcopal functions as occasion required : and we suppose Peter, to have been quite as capable of similar obligations. According to his own statement, he was a fellow-elder ; and as there was no mode of becoming an elder, in those days, except by an election on the part of a congregation ; we take it for a probability that such was the case : *i. e.* he had been so elected, and was a *bona fide* fellow-elder to the "Elders which are among you").

"Feed the flock of God which is among you." *Poimante*, from *poimeen*, a herdsman, a shepherd, one who tends herds or flocks : and, so, not a mere feeder, or a mere guardian, but one who attends to all that the flock needs, food, protection, general care of pasturing and folding. "But which of you, having a servant, plowing or feeding cattle, will say unto him by and by, when he is come from the field," etc. *Luke* xvii. 7. In this citation, it is evident from the entire drift of thought, that the servant was at some all-day employment, and would be weary in the evening when returned

from the field. "Feeding," *poimainonta*, then should be substituted by "tending;" or, if we had such a word "shepherding:" for "feeding" does not so well express the sense of *poimainonta*, officiating as a shepherd, as tending, herding, shepherding. There is no "cattle" in the original; "feeding cattle" being used as the translation of the one word, *poimainonta*, a participle of the verb *poimainoo*, which expresses the action of the *poimeen*, a herdsman, shepherd, one who tends flocks.

Thus the *presbuteros*, the presbyter, the elder, is exhorted by his fellow-elder, experienced in the matter, to shepherd the flock; and that as having no superior, but the owner of the sheep. To a flock, the shepherd is the highest in office. And so "taking the oversight" is really unnecessary, and the word *episkopountes* (the word rendered "taking the oversight") is omitted by some of the best copies of the N. T. If the word be retained, however, its rendering is well enough, except that it being a participle of the verb *episkopeoo*, to oversee, superintend; which with *episkopos*, an overseer, superintendent; and *episkopee*, the office of an overseer, superintendent, all derive from *episkeptomai*, to visit, to go or come to see with the purpose to assist or benefit, etc.; and should have a consistent, uniform rendering, so as to be unembarrassing to the mere English reader. Then if we make *episkopos*, bishop; we must have *episkopee*, the office of a bishop (as *Acts* i. 20); and *episkopeoo*, to bishop, to exercise the functions of a bishop. But bishop in one place (*I Tim.* iii. 2), and overseer in another (*Acts* xx. 28); visitation here (*I Peter* ii. 12; *Luke* xix. 44), and the office of a bishop there (*I Tim.* iii. 1; *Acts* i. 20); looking diligently now (*Heb.* xii. 15), and taking the oversight then (*I Pet.* v. 2); really this looks as if there is something out of joint in this matter of the episcopacy. Christians

have been too much concerned about something, of which there is very little mentioned in the N. T. The officer, occurs four times ; the office, four ; the act of the officer, twice : a small sum.

It is easy to see, that the bishoping, *episkopountes*, is included in the *poimanante*, shepherd ye, act as the shepherds of the flock. No bishop has any higher office than that. So if *episcopountes* be omitted from the text, our argument that the elders were the shepherds of the flock, remains uninjured : but if retained, so much the better for our point.

“Not by constraint, but willingly :” by constraint (*anagkastoos*) being opposed to willingly here, must signify unwillingly ; and intimates that the eldership, the true episcopacy of Peter’s day, was not a very inviting position : was not sought after : the congregation had some difficulty in persuading an elder or bishop elect, to accept the office. It is likely the feeble powers, slender emoluments, and meagre pomp of that officer, did not overbalance the risk in persecution, and the onerous duties, involved in its acceptance. Yet there were emoluments, either of salary or fees ; for the fellow-elder further exhorts :

“Not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind :” Not in a manner to show that you are actuated *only* by the salary, or fees, which would vilify such emolument, and change it into “base gain,” here expressed as “filthy lucre ;” for though a decent support might have been given by the congregation, and received by the pious and faithful elder or bishop, in all honor and propriety ; to one who had sought the position for the pay, and not with “a ready mind,” i. e. a mind disposed, and desirous, to do good ; it would be all one as with, here and there, a blatant patriot, who, under various pretenses, pushes himself into an office, to be used in the filling of his pockets.

“Neither as being lords (*hoos katakurieuontes*, as lording it, acting as lords) over (God’s) heritage (*toon kleeroon*, lots, portions falling to persons by lot).” This word *kleeros*, a lot, die, anything used in determining chances; a part or portion assigned by lot, occurs in the N. T., twelve times: of which, six times in the first sense of casting lots; and the rest, in the second sense of a portion assigned as by lot. Among the latter we rank the *toon kleeroon*, the lots, portions falling to persons by lot. The respective congregations, or churches presided over by their respective elders or bishops; and the proportion of a church or congregation to a bishop, then, was one to many; those churches are referred to by *toon kleeroon*: and the elders are exhorted not to lord it over them, as though they owned them as property fallen to their possession; as if an elder were something more than a brother; or other than a mere salaried officer, for the common weal.

“But being ensamples to the flock:” As the elder would be frequently seen in their assemblings, and in their families; instead of appearing in the false form of a lord, a proprietor, a master, he should come in his true form a brother, called to office as a servant, but yet a kind, loving, careful, sympathizing brother, sharing in their happiness or affliction. He should be a model to the brethren. For Christian sheep are very superior to the simple animals, to which they are likened in the figure. They are very susceptible to moral impressions, for good or for evil, as good or evil examples come before them. So, let them see in you a pious brother.

“And when the chief Shepherd (*tou archipoimenos*, the archpoimeen) shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” Demonstrating that the elders who were exhorted, to “Feed the flock,” (*poimanate to poimnion*) were the *poimenes*, the shepherds of the flocks, the churches; and were responsible not to some human officer; but only to the chief



Shepherd, who would reward their faithful discharge of duty. The churches, since that day have chosen to have above the elder, the bishop, the archbishop, and others. Whether it is better, is questioned by many thoughtful and pious thinkers. The simplicity of the churches, in the day of the apostle, who was a fellow-elder, was very beautiful.

---

## THE SUPPOSED CHORUS OF GRACES.

II PETER i. 5-7.

THERE is a peculiarity in the structure of this section of Scripture, that is not exhibited in the present rendering, which, otherwise is correct enough. At present, the graces of Christian character seem to stand side by side, as the chorus in a Grecian dance, who danced with joined hands: *Clarke*. We cannot think this gives the true figure used here, by the apostle. There is no dancing in it; and there should be none countenanced by Christians, who should set the example of rational men and women; and not of spinning-tops. They who have minds and souls, can afford to leave dancing, to the inferior orders of creatures.

“And beside this:” *Kai auto touto de*, “*auto touto*, governed by *kata* or *dia* understood, *II Pet.* i. 5, which I take to be the *apodosis*, or correspondent member of the sentence, to ver. 3. *Hoos*, *As* or *since his divine power hath given us all things that (pertain) to life and godliness*, etc. *Kai (kat’)* *auto touto de*—*So also agreeably, or according to, this very thing, or to all that I have just said, giving all diligence, add,*” etc. *Parkhurst*.

“Add to your faith virtue:” Add (*epichoreegeesate*, from *epichoreegeoo*, “to furnish besides, in addition, to supply further, to minister;” *Robinson*. “To supply, furnish; or rather, to supply or furnish abundantly, \* \* \* occurring *II Pet. i. 5*. I am aware that *Sir Norton Knatchbull* and *Doddridge* have supposed that the word, in this place, alludes to the ancient custom of dancing *in chorus*, Faith being represented as the *leading* grace in the chorus of Christian virtues, and they accordingly explain *epichoreegeesate* by *join*, or *associate to the chorus*, of Christian virtues, namely. This exposition, it must be confessed, is ingenious, and well suited to the apostle’s discourse; but I can find no authority for *epichoreegeoo* being ever thus used, which is the less probable in this place, because at the eleventh verse it is evidently applied in its usual sense of *supplying, furnishing, or ministering.*” *Parkhurst*. The word being compounded of *epi*, besides, or to, and *choreegeoo*, from *choreegos*, the leader of the ancient chorus, also he who supplied the chorus, at his own expense, with ornaments and all other necessaries, (*Ibid.*;) is used in the N. T. five times, of which this is one instance, and in the other four there is no vestige of leading in a chorus. “Now he that ministereth (*epichoreegoon*) seed to the sower both minister (*choreegeesei*) bread for (your) food,” etc. *II Cor. ix. 10*. “He therefore that ministereth (*epichoreegoon*) to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you,” etc. *Gal. iii. 5*. “And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands *having nourishment ministered* (*epichoreegoumenon*, this one participle being rendered by the three English words italicized) and knit together, increaseth,” etc. *Coloss. ii. 19*. Then, after the place in hand, “For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you (*epichoreegeetheesetai humin*) abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord

and Saviour Jesus Christ." *II Peter* i. 11. It would be contrary to safe criticism, to adhere to the dancing chorus fancy, in the presence of such facts. The judicious Dr. Robinson does not even hint at such a sense; Dr. Parkhurst, a thorough student, denies it; and it is discountenanced, by all the other uses of the word in the N. T. Liddell & Scott, whose lexicon is justly ranked among the best, give us the following definitions: "*epichoreegeoo*, to furnish, supply besides; in general, to furnish, supply: *epichoreegeema*, an additional supply; hence, 2,=*epiphoreema*, dèssert, sweetmeat: *epichoreegia*=the foregoing; in general, a supply, N. T." So, we accept *supply* as the sense here).

"Supply (in) to your faith virtue;" insert virtue to your faith: *en teei pistei humoon teen areteen*; into the faith of you, force, energy. "When, however, N. T. expositors took *en* simply for a nota dativi (mark of the dative) even where a Dative proper (not an Ablative) is required, they went too far, and their opinion could not find even a remote support in the Hebrew idiom." *Winer*, 217. This able grammarian refers to *I John* iv. 9, in illustration: "In this was manifested the love of God toward us (*hee agapee tou Theou en heemin*);" which he takes to signify, "the love of God was manifested *in* (respect to, *on*) *us* which differs unquestionably from *to us*." And *Gal.* i. 16; "To reveal his Son in me (*ton whion autou en emoi*)." We are not to take *en teei pistei* as a simple dative, and the sentence in which it stands as signifying that energy is to be supplied to faith, as a mere associate: but the energy is to be inserted, introduced, put in; according to the proper use of *en*: for if the apostle had meant simple association, the simple dative would have been sufficient without the *en*. And it is remarkable, that throughout this series of seven precisely similar sentences, the *en* invariably precedes the dative followed

by the accusative. Thus the energy is to be supplied into the faith; the knowledge, into the energy; the temperance (self restraint), into the knowledge; the patience, into the self restraint; the godliness, into the patience; the brotherly kindness, into the godliness; the love (*agapee*), into the brotherly kindness. The similarity of construction, and of the use of *en* in the construction is complete, unvarying. Supply *en teei pistei* (*hymoon*) *teen areteen*; *en de teei areteei teen gnoosin*; *en de teei gnoosei teen egkrateian*; *en de teei egkrateiai teen hupomoneen*; *en de teei hupomoneei teen eusebeian*; *en de teei eusebeiai teen philadelphian*; *en de teei philadelphiai teen agapeen*. There we have the series; than which nothing could be in more complete similarity; even in gender alike; the *en*, the *de*, the *dative*, the *accusative*: the *de* is connective; the *en* local, signifying place, position.

Like a bulb, faith is the outward tunica or peel, enwrapping energy, enwrapping knowledge, enwrapping temperance, enwrapping patience, enwrapping godliness, enwrapping brotherly kindness, enwrapping love; the heart of the bulb, in which is the life germ, the principle of growth, of propagation: for without that, the *tunicæ*, the peels, all the rest, the peels, are nothing. Love is the precious, crowning, principal, Christian grace; and this brotherly, godly, patient, continent, intelligent, energetic faith is to produce and protect this all important love. The life of the beautiful plant, the germ of all propagation, is love. Without this, a Christian profession is the sound of hollow brass, the tinkling of a cymbal.

## IS IT HE, OR IT, SHALL APPEAR?

I JOHN iii. 2, 3.—Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.

“**B**ELOVED:” Believers that Jesus is the Christ: brethren according to the faith expressed in the succeeding sentence.

“Now are we the sons of God:” *Tekna Theou*; he that loveth is born of God: the children of the same Father, Christians, love one another: love is the distinguishing characteristic of a Christian: but it must be observed, that while love covers faults, hides defects, and is very patient; love is quick to detect and careful to signify anything wrong, sinful, and therefore pernicious in the character or conduct of the beloved one, for his own sake, and not because of the annoyance to the perceiver. The children of God; a very great distinction, indeed! To be a child of a very distinguished man is considered honorable. It is said, that when Rev. Joseph Wollff, the eminent convert from Judaism, asked the hand of a noble lady in marriage, her father was disposed to decline, what he considered an alliance with one of inferior rank; until his good sense yielded to the plea, that the blood of Abraham was inferior to none other. But while the Israelite may glory in being a child of Abraham, the Christian holds himself to be a child of God.

“And it doth not yet appear what we shall be:” *Kai oupoo ephaneroothee ti esometha*: the *ti esometha*, what we shall be, is not yet manifested, made to appear, being in the future. Now, in the present, we are exhibited

to the world, as being the children of God. We have been regenerated by the Holy Ghost through the instrumentality of the gospel. We are new creatures in Christ Jesus: born of God; the children of God. All this is manifest, now. We are the children of God.

But what we shall be, our future, of course the future can be predicted, but it can be manifested only when that future shall have become the present. Grand things are predicted of us: victory over the flesh, the world, and Satan; victory over death and the grave; an abundant entrance into the glorious city; the crown, the harp, the following the Lamb to the fountain of living water, the wiping away of tears forever; etc. But these pure and never fading glories are not yet manifested. They belong to the future. They are to come. "But we know:" Equivalent to the full assurance of faith. We know that the blessed future is predicted, promised, but it is not an object of sense, and therefore we perceive it by faith. We walk by faith, and not by sense.

"That when he shall appear:" *Hoti ean phanerootheei*, we know, we are sure, we firmly believe, that when IT (our future condition) shall appear, be made manifest. "He shall appear" is not the natural construction. John says NOW WE ARE the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear WHAT WE SHALL BE; but we know that, when it shall appear (WHAT WE SHALL BE). This is the proper, natural construction. *What* does not appear? Certainly, "what we shall be:" well, when *that* shall appear, what then? This is what he proceeds to tell us.

"We shall be like him:" whom shall we be like? Surely, God. In verse first, we are pointed to the wonderful love of the Father, who hath arranged a plan, in the execution of which, sinners shall be called, become, the sons of God: the world not recognizing us, because it did not recognize him; and, we being like him, it

does not recognize us. Then being now the sons of God, and it not appearing what we shall be; we are very sure that, when our future condition shall appear, whatever glory shall have come to us, we shall still be like our Father: although our advancement shall be beyond what we can now imagine; it never can be beyond that, the likeness to God, our moral character being like his. We were created "in his image, after his likeness;" and through Jesus Christ, sent to be our Saviour from the loss of that likeness, we have recovered it, and shall retain it forever: for our Second Adam hath procured for us an "eternal salvation;" not failing us as did the first Adam. *Heb. v. 9.*

We are now like Jesus. We have his Spirit; we have his mind; he is the Son of God, we are the sons of God; the spirit of adoption impels us to say, Abba, Father. And if Jesus be the express image of God, and we be like Jesus, it follows that, we are like God. The possession of a body, does not prevent our being like God; for such a fact did not hinder his being like him; nor will our having on the resurrection body, made like unto his glorious body, prevent our bearing that likeness to God; for it is a moral, and not a physical likeness.

No changes of season, or state,  
Can make any change in (the) mind:

And whatever shall occur as we pass through the impenetrable gloom of the valley of the shadow of death, or when the radiance of the heavenly city shall glow upon us, the moral likeness shall not diminish, but shine in brighter degree.

"For, we shall see him as he is:" *Hoti opsometha auton kathoos estin*: not, that our seeing him as he is will make us to be like him; for that has occurred; it was at the time of our new birth, our regeneration.

Then we became the sons of God, and were made like him. But *hoti* is to be taken in the sense of *seeing that*, as "What shall I do? for (*hoti*) my lord taketh away from me the *stewardship*." *Luke* xvi. 3. "Dost not thou fear God, seeing that (*hoti*) thou art in the same condemnation?" *Ib.* xxiii. 40. The gospel declares that, the pure in heart shall see (*opsontai*) God (*Matth.* v. 8); not in a physical sense, but with the mind, shall perceive the development of his invisible, inscrutable nature, as to his moral characteristics; in his works, and in his methods, administration, reign: shall perceive and sufficiently understand, to delight our minds and hearts, filling us to the full with joy. This is the case here: the believer sees God in his grace and providence, until he is filled with joy unutterable and full of glory. But his vision is imperfect, now: and, so, he knows but in part. Then however, then, "when it shall appear" what we shall be; in that blessed day, our eyes will be stronger than those of Moses, who had to be sheltered, while God allowed him to see what was least brilliant of himself; though that was the most glorious sight ever witnessed outside Eden; until he who walked in that garden in the cool of the day, impressed with his sacred feet the appointed soil, where he shed for us that precious blood, that made atonement for our sins. There, in the bright world of reality, we shall see him as he is.

What we see here, we have hinted at in our reference to Moses. We refer to that wonderful revelation promised to him, when he prayed so earnestly, "I beseech thee shew me thy glory. \* \* \* And the Lord said, Behold there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a clift of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back



parts: but my face shall not be seen." *Exod.* xxxiii. 18-23. And yet Moses saw "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation." *Exod.* xxxiv. 6, 7. Unvarying, unfaltering justice and truth, with mercy, grace, long-suffering, abundant goodness. An intelligent mind could not desire a ruler with superior characteristics to these. Yet this glorious view of God, is not his face. We are to see a brighter glory than that, whose reflection merely made Moses' face to shine so, that the eyes of the people could not endure it: we shall see him as he is.

"And every man that hath this hope in him," *teen elpida tauteen ep' autooi*, this hope in, concerning God, this hope founded in or upon God: not the man has this hope in, within himself; though that is true of course, but the hope that is in this hoper is "this hope in God;" that he will see God as he is. If there be any instances of *epi* being thus used to signify what is within one's self, we can recollect none. Its general import is *upon, above*, etc. Here it means *concerning*, as in *Acts* xi. 19, "Now they that were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen (*epi Stephanooi*, concerning Stephen)." And "— that now at the last your care of me hath flourished again; wherein (*ep'h' hooi*, concerning which) ye were also careful, but ye lacked opportunity." *Philip.* iv. 10. Then we read "every man that hath this hope concerning him (God)."

"Purifieth himself (*hagnizei heauton*):" The reflexive pronoun is properly rendered "himself:" the man having the blessed hope, nourished by his faith in God's

word, that he shall resemble God more strikingly, and that he shall see God more clearly; will love God more fervently, and his love energizing his faith, his heart will be purified, and, so, his life.

"As he (*ekeinos*) is pure:" Here of the two subjects of the apostle's remark, *himself*, the one that *purifieth himself*; and the one that is pure, that one upon whose word the hoper rested; *ekeinos* refers to that one, God, upon whom the hope of the believer is resting. That is, the *ekeinos* (demonstrative) refers to God, as represented by *Theou, autooi, auton*, in ver. 2, and by *autooi* in ver. 3; and not to the child of God, as represented by *heauton*, himself, in ver. 3.

"As," *kathoos*, does not signify an equality of purity, as to the believer and God: but has the sense of that *adverb* in *John xvii. 2*, "As (*kathoos*, as, inasmuch as, since) thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give," etc. And, "And even as (*kai*, and, *kathoos*, as, inasmuch as, since) they did not like to retain God in their knowledge," etc. *Rom. i. 28*. Also, "Even as (*kathoos*, as, inasmuch as, since) the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you." *I Cor. i. 6*. Again, "Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as (*kathoos*, as, inasmuch as, since) ye are unleavened." *Ib. v. 7*. So, "According as (*kathoos*, as, inasmuch as, since) he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world —" i. e. he chose to have the Gentiles to share the blessings coming through the Christ of man, before he arranged the Jewish dispensation, which, in fact, was but an *adjunct* to his plan. *Ephes. i. 4*. And, "Even as (*kathoos*, as, inasmuch as, since) it is meet for me to think this of you all," etc. *Phil. i. 7*. These citations are sufficient.

Therefore, we read, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we are sure that *when* it shall appear, we shall be

like him, for *we shall see* him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him (God), purifieth himself, since he (God) is pure."

It may seem to be a weak point, that we have given this adverb *kathoos* a sense in the conclusion of the third, differing from that given to it at the conclusion of the second verse. But, the word has different senses; and it would not be amiss, perhaps, to give it the sense of *since* in verse second: so that we should read "— for *we shall see* him, since HE IS;" he, unlike the deities of the heathen fables, exists: his existence is a certainty; his word is a certainty; that we shall all appear before him is a certainty; and an equal certainty is it that we shall see him, having awakened in his likeness.

---

## HE CAN, AND CANNOT, SIN.

I JOHN ii. 1.—My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.

SIN being hateful to God, and hurtful to man, the benevolent and pious old John would have Christians to avoid it; and to that end writes to us; as a father to little children, warning us against this insidious evil; which may spread and destroy like one of those fearful epidemics, that are generated from neglect and carelessness of sanitary rules.

In his teaching he says, — if we walk in the light, as he (God) is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth

us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned (*heemartteekamen*, the perfect tense and used to signify an action or state whose commencement and occasion were completed in time past; as *John* xx. 29, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me (and art still seeing me), thou hast believed (*pepisteukas*, thou hast believed and dost now believe):" and, *Ib.* iii. 18, "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed (*mee pepisteuken*, hath not believed, and so does not now believe: i. e. he that believeth not is condemned because he believeth not) in the name of the only begotten Son of God:" again, "She saith unto him, Yea, Lord: I believe (*egoo pepisteuka*), I (emphatically; if no one else, I have believed, and do now believe; sustaining our Eng. Version) that thou art the Christ." *Ib.* xi. 27.) So, the apostle means here by, "If we say that we have not sinned," precisely what he meant in verse 8, by "If we say that we have no sin." These are but two modes of expressing the same idea. As if he had said, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and contradict God."

But, then, on the other hand, in ch. iii. 9, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." We may not say, that the apostle here speaks of "committing sin," and there is a difference between it and sinning: for there is no difference: to commit sin, and to sin, meaning exactly the same act; as to commit theft, and to thief or steal, are the same; and as to tell a lie, and to lie, are the same. Commit, here, means to do: the expression being, *hamartian*, sin, *ou*, not, *poiei*, he doeth: and that there is no difference of sense between those two modes of expression is seen in

the fact, that in the succeeding part of the same verse, and in view of the same subject, we have "and he cannot sin (*kai ou dunatai hamartanein*, and not is he able to sin, it is impossible for him to sin) because he is born of God."

Does this mean, that if it be possible for any one to sin, it demonstrates that he is not born of God? That he never was at any time born of God; because, if so, the seed would have remained in him, and made it impossible for him to sin? Then why John's "if," ch. ii. 1; If any man (*tis*, any one, any Christian) sin: how could he sin, if he could not sin? And what would be the use of an advocate with the Father, if no Christian could, by any possibility, have any need of him? For the expression could not have been made stronger; *ou*, not, *dunatai*, is he able, *hamartanein*, to sin: and this inability to sin, is because he his born of God. How then can a believer, one born of God, sin? How can he omit any duty, hesitate at any cross, utter an idle word; or lie down after the transactions of the day, without being consciously sure that to the utmost degree of his capacity, he has devoted every moment, and every faculty to the glory of God? As to lying, stealing, smiting, swearing, railing, and other gross sins, of course his conscience is quite clear: and in addition to this every fibre of every faculty, and every moment of every hour, have been, without the slightest negligence or shrinking, honestly and fully devoted to God. He is even with God for that day; as he was even with him yesterday; and as he will be to-morrow; for since he was born of God, he has not been, and is not now able to sin.

Such men must be very rare. We have never been in the company of one such, knowingly. We make no such profession, in our own behalf; for we have no such testimony to offer: our cry being:

O to grace how great a debtor,  
Daily, I'm constrained to be!

But if one could not sin, he would be in no need of grace: for having fulfilled his whole obligation, how could he be offered grace? "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory:" *Rom.* iv. 2. And so would it be of any one else. Besides, it was not the works required by the Mosaic law, that were referred to; for Abraham was centuries before Moses. It meant works of any kind. So, "to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt:" the reward is due: it is not grace to give it: it would be unjust to withhold it.

Whatever the apostle meant, it could not have been that he who is regenerate, cannot sin: and yet, apparently, that is precisely what his words signify. In that case, Paul is very wide of the mark, in uttering such solemn warnings against apostasy: for how can a man apostatize, if he cannot sin? Yet in *Heb.* vi. 4-6, he speaks of apostatizing from an advanced stage of Christian experience. True, to shelter the doctrine of final perseverance, an IF is introduced at verse 6; "IF they shall fall away;" but there is no IF used by Paul, the expression being, "— *kai*, and, *parapesontas*, having entirely fallen away:" an impossibility, if a regenerate man cannot sin.

There must be some mode of reconciling John's "if any one sin," with his "he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Adam was born of God, yet he could, and did sin. Was not the inspired David a regenerate man? Yet *he* sinned, and bore testimony that, "If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" *Psalms* cxxx. 3: that is, as the LXX. render it, "*tis huposteesetai*, who shall endure it?" No one will be able to endure it. "Therefore by the deeds (works) of the law (law) there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." *Rom.* iii. 20. What can be the mode of correctly understanding John's apparently variant modes of expression?

If we turn to the Epistle to the Galatians, we will see Paul remonstrating with them, concerning their turning away from grace and faith, to the law. "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, (saying) In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident: for, the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." *Gal.* iii. 7-14.

Then, if we propose to keep the law, and live without sin as respects the law, we undertake an impossibility: humanity is too weak for this: and Paul called the Galatians "foolish" for attempting it even in part: for there is no possibility that a human life can square up to that perfect rule; can lie smoothly by that straight edge. Nor is there any necessity for it. Jesus, the Christ, hath stood for us before the law, and met all demands upon us: so that the law makes no exaction of us: although were we judged by that perfect law; were the Lord to mark iniquities by that straight edge; we should not be able to endure it for a moment.

But, the law, the rule, now, is faith. "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed

in the name of the only begotten Son of God." *John* iii. 18. Such are the words of the Master. The sin of the present dispensation is unbelief; the holiness, is faith. As the requirement of the Mosaic dispensation, was to keep the law, to do the commandments; and the not doing so was sin: so the requirement of the present dispensation, is to believe in Jesus as the Christ; and the not doing so is sin. So that with respect to THE LAW, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us:" and with respect to FAITH, the believer, the regenerate, "doth not commit sin," i. e. does not sin; "cannot sin;" for it is impossible to believe and not believe at the same time. "He is born of God," is the proof that he is a believer: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," *I John* v. 1. He then that is born of God is a believer on Jesus and is not condemned, is not a sinner under the requirement of this dispensation; wherein sin is not to believe in the name (Messiahship, Messianic authority) of the only begotten Son of God (Jesus): and the impossibility of the believer to sin, is because it is impossible to believe and to disbelieve at the same time. It is only in this sense that the believer cannot sin.

But, now something concerning the life of the believer, the one born of God, the regenerate. Being justified by faith, he has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; and the love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, given unto him to help his infirmities. He is a child of God, and is to be educated, trained, fitted for his inheritance; in which he must improve his opportunities, resist enticements to negligence and disobedience; not to become a child of God, but to please his Father, by being useful and happy. He is a soldier, and his foe is strong, artful, persistent, insidious; but he is well armed, has an almighty ally, and must



fight not to be a soldier, but to please his king, by winning the victory. He finds a struggle within himself: the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, but the Spirit against the flesh: but these oppose one another, that he should not do the things that he would: when he would do good, under the impulse of the Spirit, the flesh opposes; when he would do evil, under the impulse of the flesh, the Spirit opposes; and as he, the child of God, who is shielded by the divine promise from intolerable temptation, may choose to walk with the Spirit, his almighty friend; if he do so, he shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. He may be enticed, but he will not be compelled to consent. The state of his inclinations and will would not measure up creditably, if tried by the law which does not allow a stray, or careless look or feeling; for by the works of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; but he is in Christ, and to him there is no condemnation; regret, to be sure, and sorrow, that he is encompassed and impeded by infirmities; but rejoicing in the blood that makes the foulest clean, and in the grace that upholds such a feeble worm; and the love that counts his faith as righteousness, and grants him such gracious aid and comfort.

The love that is in him fulfils the law. This is his joy. In this wonderful respect alone, is he without sin. He believes and loves. His faith is energized by love: the love is the vitality of the faith, and love worketh no intentional ill to one's neighbor; but ever seeks to do him good. Love is not omniscient, and may err in judgment, plan, device, and do ill; but, never errs in intention. Love, because of human frailty, may weary, flag, droop, cool, in some degree; and would not be able to rejoice in a trial by the law of ALL the heart, ALL the time; except for the shouting of faith, "Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death, for every man, and there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus."

He that loveth is born of God, and he that is born of God is he who believeth that Jesus is the Christ, and has the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him: and such a man is not a sinner; his faith is counted for righteousness; and is righteousness, for that is his obedience under this gracious dispensation of salvation by faith. But put this man under the law, and in that instant he is dead. Our life is Christ, who hath redeemed us from the law.

---

## THE BELOVED LOOKING FOR MERCY.

JUDE 20, 21.—But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.

“**B**UILDING up yourselves on your most holy faith:” Between the commencement and termination of our earthly Christian race, there is more or less space to be run over; in which we are to apply ourselves, and, “stretching every nerve, press with vigor on.” Between our infancy and maturity of Christian state, our education, training, development, must occupy our time and energy. Between the foundation of our Christian character, and its completion, there is the building up to be achieved, taxing our powers and involving responsibility. This last is the figure used by Jude, and, like the two others, and every other used in the holy writings, it teaches progress, growing, increase, in experience and character.

Our faith is "most holy," because it rests only on the word of God, concerning his Son Jesus the Christ. It listens to, hears no other report concerning Jesus, but the testimony of the Holy Ghost, given through the holy men, the inspired writers of the Scriptures. What the Spirit thus witnesseth, testifies, faith accepts; no other: for however great may be the witnessing of men; the witnessing of God is greater. "Thus saith the Lord," is sufficient for faith, should science, interest, policy, the world, as with the voice of a whirlwind storm out a contrary report: but, a "Thus saith the Lord" is essential, a *sine qua non*. Therefore, it is a most holy faith, because it will hear nothing of Jesus but what the word of God reports; and will rest solely upon him as therein represented.

Jesus; the Christ; the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world, and taking away the sin of the world; the Victim whose most precious blood atones for the sin, which the blood of the typical victims could not atone for, their function being not to atone, but to prefigure the atonement. Jesus; the Truth concerning God and sinners, embodying all the expression of the divine love toward us miserable sinners, who neither merit nor desire the least of his mercies; manifesting his amazing wisdom, in the devising a plan, by which we will desire and obtain, not the least, but his most abundant mercy, enduring forever; a plan by which God can be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in his Son.

Jesus; the Power of God; the mediatorial King; *our* Mediator; *our* King; ruling in righteousness, but in mercy; able to defend us from all our adversaries and keep us secure in the shadow of his throne.

'Tis Jesus, the first and the last,  
Whose Spirit shall guide us safe home;  
We'll praise him for all that is past,  
And trust him for all that's to come.

Faith is holy, then, because it separates its trust from all other offered supports, and trusts only in Jesus, as presented by the word of God, as dying for our offenses, rising for our justification, and reigning as our Lord to bring us to his eternal glory. And on this most holy faith in Jesus, our Christ, we are to build up ourselves. Building is progressive, the increments of material added, hour by hour, day by day, year by year; steady, continuous, constant work. No cessation; no holidays; no striking for higher wages; no anything else than unremitting work. No neglect for a season, and our work stopping while we attend to something else, and then a sudden setting to our work, with an exultant shout that we are now wholly devoted to it. No, it must be build, build, build, without any stopping and starting again: such a case is lamentable: and if there has been a coming short, a turning aside, and then a return to entire attention to our work; it is a very plain case: we have done wrong, and have returned to our duty. A regenerate one is a child of God: and a child of God is a child of God. As such he is a worker. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," *John v. 17*; and every Christian being like Christ, and like the Father, he too is a worker; and his work tasks his full capacity at any time.

So he builds, not by fits and starts; or, at least he ought not to do so; but should build layer on layer, round upon round, stone upon stone, toward completion. Building by the Model, the Christ, whom he is to resemble in his character; and that Model is seen only in the word of God; not in his or any one else's imagination. Thus, the Spirit will bear constant witness if the building, the character, the experience is going on properly.

If some men are sharp and watchful after others, busily building, or assuming to build others: they are

not obeying Jude's instruction that each should build himself; a work large enough for the capacity of any one. A fact worthy of our attention. And as builders need their daily food, to enable them for their daily work, we are to "pray in the Holy Ghost." We shall get on poorly without prayer; and true prayer is always in the Holy Ghost, in his influences, in his aid, in dependence upon him. "Prayer is the Christian's vital breath:" he knows not what to pray for as he ought; but "the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to (the will of) God." *Rom. viii. 26, 27.* The presence and power of the Spirit are essential to the Christian's existence, activity, success. The natural man cannot live without the air (*pneuma*); to live he must be in the air; and it must be pure and plentiful. And the spiritual man, the Christian, cannot live without the holy air (*pneuma*); to live he must be in the Holy Ghost; and it must be pure and plentiful, as this blessed air ever is, entirely vitalizing.

But how are we to pray in the Holy Ghost? Just as a man speaks, or walks, or works in the air: which means simply that the air is present with him, nothing excluding it from him, for the air is ever present with us unless we prevent it. And so the divine Spirit, unless we shut him off by some foolish, wicked, ingenious contrivance, is ever with us, so pure, so plentiful, that we will find breath enough to pray with: and the Spirit will instruct us how to present and perfume our prayers. His witness, testimony, is "And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials (*phialas*, bowls, goblets, broad and shallow, like the Latin *patera*, a broad

shallow cup or bowl used for drinking out of and making libations) full of odors, which *hai*, i. e. *phialas*, the bowls, and not the odors, *thumiamatoon*, for the latter word is neuter, and the feminine (*hai*, must relate to the feminine *phialas*), are the prayers of the saints." *Rev.* v. 8. *Parkhurst*. So, our poor, unworthy, lame, ill-shaped prayers, are estimated by the Holy Ghost, as GOLDEN BOWLS! This the Spirit himself witnesseth, to our great surprise and comfort; and we may read it over and over and over again to our great joy.

But, how about the odors? Our golden bowls held out to Him whose city is paved with gold, would not be held in high estimation. So, they must be "full of odors:" then we must again seek instruction from the "witness of the Spirit." "And another angel (the angel of the covenant, Jesus, our great High Priest) came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer (our golden bowl, prayer); and there was given unto him much incense (*thumiamata*, the odors of ch. v. 8, his own precious name), that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which is before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand." *Rev.* viii. 3, 4. The smoke of the incense ascended, because of the air in which it was burned; for without air there can be neither burning of the incense, nor ascending of the smoke.

Prayer, the golden bowl, must have in it the name of Jesus, "—that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." *John* xv. 16; and the fragrance of that name ascends on and through the Holy Ghost (air) up before God. Praying in the Holy Ghost.

"Keep yourselves in the love of God," by thus conducting yourselves. For with our faith holy, holy

because trusting in Christ alone, as set forth in the word of God, building up our character after that perfect model, praying in the Holy Ghost, we shall be encompassed by the love of God, caring for us, providing for us, smiling upon us, and filling us with his peace. The building will arise in the smile of his approbation; and, like Enoch, we shall have the testimony that we please God. The pleasure of God is the rule of our work, our building; whatever we do should be to his glory.

And yet as to the end, the result, we "look for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life:" the mercy obtained for us by him in his gracious mediation, by his bitter suffering of death in our behalf, and his victory over the grave for our justification, or righteousness. He was a great leader in Israel, who declared upon his death-bed,

I the chief of sinners am,  
But Jesus died FOR me!—*J. Wesley.*

And he was a distinguished scholar and divine, who, commenting on this passage, wrote, "For, although they were to build *themselves* up, and to *pray* in the Holy Ghost, and keep *themselves* in the love of God; yet this *building, praying and keeping*, cannot *merit* heaven; for, after all their diligence, earnestness, self-denial, watching, obedience, etc., they must look for the *MERCY of the Lord Jesus Christ to bring them to ETERNAL LIFE;*" *Dr. A. Clarke.* And yet this excellent and great man in his comment on *I John* iii. 3, affirms: "*As he is pure.*] Till he is as completely saved from his sins, as Christ was free from sin." In which case in what his need of mercy would consist is to us incomprehensible. For as to his sins in connection with Adam, and his own frailty, they being atoned for, and he now being as pure as Christ, as free from sin as Christ,

mercy is out of the question. To him, the reward is not reckoned of grace but of debt. It is not gospel, that one as pure as Christ from sin, needs mercy. The man who dares to challenge the marking of his iniquities, will be unable to endure the investigation. Enter not into judgment with thy servant.

---

## THE MODEL CHURCH.

REV. xxi.

(☞ First read carefully, Isai. lx.)

**V**ERSE 1. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth." Here we have the New Creation brought into view; the Old, in which Adam stood at the head of the race, having passed away.

2. John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride for her husband. This is the Church as it ought to be, and as it yet will be. As the pattern of the Mosaic Church was shown to Moses; so here was the pattern of the Christian Church shown to John. It was a distant view; John was far off. But he could see that it came from God, out of heaven, was very beautiful, and intended for earth.

3. And he heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with MEN (not with the Jews only, but with men, without regard to their descent: while the first tabernacle was with the descendants of Abraham), and he will dwell with them, *eskeenoosen*, he will tent, tabernacle with them, always be found of



them in this tabernacle, this holy city, this new Jerusalem. And they shall be his people, to know him, to worship him, to serve him, only him, to be holy to him, separated to him. And God himself shall be with them, with men; and not send them a Moses; nor allow a pope or any other pretended vicegerent, to assume to be his representative, agent, plenipotentiary; for he himself, the Holy Ghost, the ever present, the almighty, will be with them; "their God." Their God to protect, guide, sustain, and every way bless them. So that his people, as his plants do, will grow up, develop, in his ever-smiling light, and ever-present air, and ever-refreshing dews and rains. Who kindles up God's sun, and sheds its bright, warm beams upon the herbage? Who breathes God's air around for every green thing to partake of? Who compounds God's dews and showers, to cherish the roots and foliage? And can he not dispense with popes and such things, and himself meet with and bless his people? And that is precisely this model plan, as exhibited to John: popes are not of his providing, nor are they, in any of their forms, to be found in this divine pattern. Men are men, and they are God's care. God is with men, and men are with God.

4. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, said the great voice; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. Because the voice said all this to John, some suppose that it refers to the heavenly state; and not to any condition of the Church on the earth. But, these are the blessed effects of faith, as it ought to be in the Church, i. e. in those believers who constitute the Church. For what is the propriety of tears with those, who really believe the gospel cordially? If everything is to work our good and salvation, is it reasonable to weep and

grieve over anything? If we really believe that we shall not see death, why should we sorrow and mourn and dread a mere imagination. Our dear one has gone with the smiling angels to the feet of the Saviour, in the bright and beautiful land of the blessed; and we are broken-hearted: is it proper? The angels are trooping down from heaven, with a crown for us, and a hearty welcome to the eternal re-union and bliss; and we shrink back and exclaim Death! O we of little faith!

But, in the model Church, there exists the model faith, that accepts God's word, and rejoices in the hope of the glory of God, in the hottest tribulations, so that they are changed into blessings. Real, true, insistent faith would soon cause old things to pass away and all things to become new.

5. "And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I make all things new." The old Church and its appointments were typical, symbolical; typifying, symbolizing the greater things to come. The new Church is entirely without types; these being all fulfilled in the appearing of the Christ, and his people; whose coming Moses, and his people, signified. The types are all gone: we are in the midst of the realities; and our faith ought to rise with our happy surroundings.

"And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful." This is the true model; and before the close of time, it shall be the condition of the Church.

6. "And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end." I am straitened in no respect. I have time and power. It is done, because I have determined it. "I will give unto him that is athirst, of the fountain of the water of life freely." It is no qualification to be a Jew, but a thirsty Jew: no qualification to be a Gentile, but a thirsty Gentile. He that is "athirst," Jew or Gentile, let him come; the fountain is inexhaustible; he need bring no price; I will give to him freely.

7. "He that overcometh (his unwillingness, the opposition of the flesh offering its cup, of the world offering its cup, and of Satan offering his cup; and forces his way, thirsty and panting, to me) shall inherit all things." Not only to him will I give free access to the fountain of life, that he may live; but he shall have everything from me to sustain his life, into his full development.

8. "But the fearful" (*deilois*, timid, cowards), those who will not face, fight and overcome their foes; but give way, allow themselves to be overcome; conquered instead of being conquerors: "and unbelieving," those who reject the gospel, informing them of their condition, offering them all-sufficient aid; they preferring to remain as they are: "and the abominable," the disgustingly corrupt and corrupting: "and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars" (*pasin tois pseudesin*, as if those mentioned in the foregoing list were liars, their principles a lie, their lives a lie, every one deceived and deceiving; and the phrase 'and all liars' signifies 'and all others of that sort;') all who adopt and adhere to such false, base, destructive maxims and practices), shall have their part (*meros*, share, portion, fellowship) in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." The first death, which came into the world by one man's sin, has been conquered by the death, resurrection, righteousness of one man, Jesus the Christ, the Lord from heaven; *Rom. v. 12-21*: but the second death is the contrivance of those who refuse salvation through the Christ, and in despite of his love, his suffering for them, and his entreating gospel, prefer to die the second death.

The exclusion of the wicked is here clearly taught. Their separation from the righteous is absolutely certain. They separate themselves. They destroy themselves. The bliss of the righteous, is no bliss to them.

It is not that God, by some unreasonable, arbitrary d ecree assigns them to eternal misery, as a punishment for the peccadilloes of a moment. God's decree is, that they, in this time moment, where they are supplied abundantly with opportunity and means, should turn from their evil ways to him, and be fitted for the possession and enjoyment of complete, unending happiness. But their will, their decree, is to remain in a condition, in which the brilliance of heaven would be intolerable to their diseased eyes; and they would be compelled to flee from it into darkness.

Nothing is more unreasonable and unscriptural than universalism. It is false; utterly false and unreliable. For, the lake burning with fire and brimstone, here, in this passage, according to our conception of it, being on this side the grave, makes nothing whatever in favor of a happy eternity for liars. If the liars *must* have *their part* separately from those who overcome the lie and reach the truth, in the new earth; is it reasonable to suppose that the truth and the lie can have fellowship in eternity? And if "the second death" occurs in time, what will break its dreadful fetters in eternity? If sin is death in this world, upon what principle will it become life in the world to come? The body is not the man: it is the tent in which he dwells. When a man's house is destroyed, does that change the man? And if his neighbors build him a new house does that change him? All liars, all the wicked, all who reject salvation from sin, make to themselves a lake burning with fire and brimstone, in this world: and many are so miserable in it, that they lose all common sense, and take the short road of hanging, poisoning, shooting, to the more dreadful lake in eternity, over which hangs the thick gloom of unending despair.

This picture of the model Church, in the new dispensation, where there is no more sea; the sea, in ancient

times, being the great, formidable separator of men; exhibits a separation between the saved and the wicked. The saved have their part in Christ's new Jerusalem; the liars of all sorts, their part in their lake burning with fire and brimstone. No distinction between men, as men; but a marked, inexorable distinction of character.

All this John heard, when from afar he saw the wondrous descent of the holy city, coming from God, out of heaven. The great voice made these statements to him, as he stood there gazing upon the splendid vision.

9. "And there came unto me one of the seven angels \* \* \* and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife." You have from afar seen the luminous city, I will now cause it to be seen by you closely, so that you will be able to examine it particularly, in detail.

10. "And he carried me away in the spirit to (*epi*, upon) a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great, city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God,

11. "Having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal; —"

The "holy Jerusalem," separated not to the Jews, but to those who "overcome;" and "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" *I John* v. 5: such as think on their ways and turn their feet to the testimonies of God; making haste, and delaying not to keep his commandments. *Psalms* cxix. 59, 60. The holy Jerusalem is the separated Jerusalem: holiness is the state of being separated, set apart. Separated to good, or separated to evil: and the context shows that this new Jerusalem was set apart to God and the good: the lake burning with fire and brimstone, being set apart, as the *meros*, the share, the portion of the bad; and holy to them.

The glory of the city, John saw to be "God." The Sinaitic codex has "the glory from God." This phrase "the glory of God," here, signifies that God is the glory of the city (*teen doxan tou Theou*, glory, God); the words being in apposition, meaning the same thing; *tou Theou* being the genitive of apposition; not at all unusual in the New Testament. God was this Church's glory; and not hierarchy, ritual, vestments, etc. The presence of God; his smile of approbation; his communion with his people: these were its glory: and, therefore, her light, her glory was "clear as crystal;" pure; transparent. But, the glory from popery, in all its phases, and ritual, in all its phases, is obscured by selfishness, ambition, corruption, pride, etc., and is very far from being "clear as crystal," pure.

12. "And had a wall great and high:" demonstrating that it was not accessible to all sorts of people. For this wall was to protect the city from intrusion. It was not a prison wall; not a convent wall; to keep people IN; but a city wall, to keep improper people OUT.

There were "twelve gates" in this wall, each inscribed by the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel: significant of the fact, that the organization of the Abrahamic nation, was but an adjunct to God's one, grand purpose of providing salvation for men, all men; the Mosaic dispensation, the law, being but a servant to lead the child to Christ. *Gal. iii. 24.* The twelve tribes, comprising the entire nation, being but twelve gates into the great Christian Church. At each gate was an angel, God's messenger, a minister of the everlasting gospel, declaring to all applicants the terms of admission: and not like the angel at the gate of Eden, with his flaming sword guarding from access to the tree of life. These angels, on the contrary, each at his gate was persuading those without to comply with the terms and enter in through his gate into the glorious city.

13. There were "on the east three gates (opening toward the old eastern world); on the north three gates (for those who had gone as far as the eternal frosts would allow); on the south three gates (for those who, according to the science of the day, had gone as far as the perpetual fire would permit); and on the west three gates (for the dwellers in the new section of the world)." Here is equal, impartial access to the holy city: accessible thus equally to those on this side or that. Three gates opening toward each of the four points, N., S., E. or W. Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, having tasted death for every man: having been the propitiation for the sins of the whole world: every man, in the whole world, is to have the gospel preached to him, and if he will accept the gracious provision, complying with the terms, the angel, not Peter, not a pope, or any other than the angel at the gate, invites him to enter the city.

14. "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb." Where, now, in this model of the perfect Christian Church, is the rock Peter, on which the Church is thought, by some, to be built? Peter, undeniably, makes a grand show, here; but yet utterly undistinguished from the other apostles of the Lamb: he is confessedly honored with his name on one of the twelve foundations; but John does not consider it of even the least importance, to inform us which bore that honored name. They, the twelve, are highly honored; their great part in the new dispensation, witnesses that Jesus arose from the dead, and therefore was the Christ, is noted by the statement that their names were inscribed upon the twelve foundations of the wall of the holy city; but the honor is shared equally.

15-19. The city was measured, and found to be most complete: the length, and the breadth, and the

height of it are equal: a perfect cube. The wall was jasper: the city, pure gold.

“And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones: jasper, sapphire, chalcedony, emerald, sardonyx, sardius, chrysolite, beryl, topaz, chrysoprasus, jacinth, amethyst;” twelve; each peculiar; each garnishing, adorning, a foundation: yet, not in the least signifying any superiority, of any foundation, in any respect. Each of the twelve apostles had his peculiar characteristics; but all stood upon the same level, as apostles: one being no more authorized to testify to the resurrection of Jesus, than the rest of them.

21. “And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl:” The gates of pearl were all alike. The terms and the privileges of entrance the same to all. When standing at the gates of this city, the terms are alike to king or beggar: none need approach in the hope of an easier, more honorable, admittance than another. They all accept the same terms; and go in upon an entire equality. God is no respecter of persons. The high and low, in this respect, are alike. “In the most solemn manner, I say unto you, Except he be born again NO ONE (*tis*) can see the kingdom of God.” *John* iii. 3. “Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” *Luke* xiii. 3. There is no difference made at these gates.

22. “And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.” In the old Jerusalem, the temple was the chief point of interest. There the divine worship was performed. “Two men went up into the temple to pray.” *Luke* xviii. 10. The temple was one of the types; it signified the dwelling of the Shekinah, the divine glory; i. e. Jesus the Christ; in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. *Coloss.* ii. 9. “Jesus answered and said unto them,



Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body." *John* ii. 19-21. This last phrase "the temple of his body," *tou naou tou soomatos autou*, signifies "the temple, his body;" it being "a very common grammatical usage to annex the apposition in the genitive to the noun on which it depends (Bengel on *John* ii. 21)," etc. *Winer*, 531. (It would be well to mention here, that *Winer* in illustrating this way of expressing apposition, quotes *Eph.* iv. 9, "Now that he has ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth (*katebee eis ta katootera (meree) tees gees*, to the lower parts, i. e. the earth, or which constitute the earth (similar is *Isa.* xxxviii. 14, *eis to hupsos tou ouranou*, which the Eng. Version expresses by "upward;" and by which the LXX. mean "unto the height of heaven," or, according to *Winer*, "unto the height, heaven," cf. he says, *Acts* ii. 19, "*en tooi ouranooi anoo \* \* \* epi tees gees katoo*, in the heaven above \* \* \* upon the earth beneath). The apostle infers from *anabee*, he ascended, a *katebee*, he descended: now Christ strictly and properly came down on earth (and from it ascended again); this, contrasted with heaven, which is here called *hupsos* (verse 8), is spoken of as a deep or lower region. Christ's descent into Hades (to which the expression is referred in *Evang. Apocr.* p. 445) as an isolated fact cannot here be taken into consideration; it would be too restricted to refer the expression *aichmaloteuein*, to lead captive, *aichmalosian*, captivity, to that." Our readers will not censure us for this digression.)

The absence of the temple from the Church, and the presence of the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb in substitution, is explained by our Lord, in his instruction to the woman of Samaria; "Woman believe me, the

hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit: and they that worship him, must worship (him) in spirit and in truth." *John* iv. 21-24. The Christian dispensation is characterized by spirituality. It is the dispensation of the Spirit. Locality was important to Judaism. The land was holy, chosen, separated, and precisely at the point or section, the best suited from which to irradiate Asia, Africa and Europe with the truth, the holy oracles of God. And in this holy land, was the holier locality Jerusalem, to which the tribes came up three times a year; to appear before God in the holiest locality, the temple; the figure of Christ. But with Judaism type, ritualism passed away; having answered their end; and, therefore, in this model city, this Christian Church, John saw no temple, no type, no ritual: that had gone; there was no need of type or ritual: that was to typify Christ, the temple of the Deity, and he had come. So in the holy Jerusalem, there is no type, no ritual the accessory of type; for here is Christ in whom is the Shekinah, and these are the typified temple.

And yet, with this model of a templeless Church before us, one might judge that we, pay very little respect to it: for large bodies of Christians proceed, as if they considered the hand-made temple the principal feature of Christianity; especially, is it so with those bodies who claim to be "THE Church." But spiritual, truthful worship, while it may be offered in a gorgeous edifice, by no means requires such a building; and is really embarrassed by ritual. Hannah was so unobservant of ritual, when her soul was worshipping God, pleading for a son, that the good priest, Eli,

supposed she was intoxicated. Her worship lacked the usual formality: it was spiritual and true. The character of our worship is immensely more important than its locality; and though we may not "forsake the assembling of ourselves together," and so must have assembling places, meeting-houses; yet is it ardently to be desired, that we will forsake the bad habit of imitating temples, exceeding our means, defrauding the builders, and having our houses of worship covered with mortgages, disgracefully sold, and those who contributed their money that they might have a house for them and their children to worship in, turned away, and their money wasted. Spirituality in worship is the great desideratum.

23. "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb (is) the light thereof." Here we have a still more direct protest against type and ritualism, as NEEDLESS; "the city had NO NEED of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it:" its only light came from God, through the mediation of the Lamb. In the old creation, *Gen. i.*, we read, "And God made two great lights (*hammoroth*, light instruments, for this was the fourth day; light was created on the first day; and the *mem* signifies the instrument of the light's action; the greater light (instrument) to rule the day, and the lesser light (instrument) to rule the night: \* \* \*. And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day, and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that (it) was good." But in this new heaven the two great light instruments were not placed: there being no necessity for them: they were good, useful, and very beautiful, in the old heaven; those splendid lamps, shedding the light upon the needy earth, which rejoiced in the invigorating, cheering brilliance: yet no sun, no moon,

shines upon this city, for it has no need of them. Sun, moon, stars lightened the old Jerusalem of PAL-ESTINE, the holy, set apart land: it had great need of them: its light was by their instrumentality, and, so, its ritual was abundant, varied, embracing every idea of the Messianic age to come. Everything was a type, signifying something concerning Christ. It was a glorious ministration! But, "How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather (more) glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excellet. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." *II Cor. iii. 8-11.*

Here, in this holy city of the new EARTH, the divine glory, shining through, by means of the Lamb, renders sun, moon, types, lamps of all kinds, **needless**. They are done away. Passed. They served the divine purpose, and vanished. Their presence would be as the presence of the stars at the noon of a sunny day.

As the light of the first day, precedes the light instruments of the fourth day, which instruments made the light available to earth; so, here, the divine glory, "the glory of God," precedes, and exists independently of any instrumentality: and then comes the light instrument (*ho luchnos*), the Lamb.

"LUCHNOS] a lamp, an instrument of giving light: hence English, A LINK." *Parkhurst*. "LUCHNOS] a light, i. e., portable, as a candle, lamp, lantern." *Robinson*. "Neither do men light a candle (*luchnou*), and put it under a bushel," etc. *Matth. v. 15*. "Is a candle (*luchnos*) brought to be put under," etc. *Mark iv. 21*. "No man, when he hath lighted a candle (*luchnon*), covereth it with a vessel," etc. *I. uke viii. 16*.

“Let your loins be girded about, and your lights (*luchnoi*, lamps) burning.” *Ibid.* xii. 35. “As unto a light (*luchnooi*) that shineth in a dark place,” etc. *II Peter* i. 19.

God's truth is light, his glory; and the Lamb, that was slain for us, is the *Luchnos*, the instrumentality that makes the light, the truth, apparent, and useful to us. Christ in us, the hope of glory, our light, our life, our salvation, is worth far more than all those lifeless, meaningless, cast-off types and rites of an effete system, which some good men wish to establish in this spiritual dispensation. “What is the chaff to the wheat?” Much, certainly much, while the wheat is forming and maturing; else the wise Creator would not have provided it. But, when its important function has been performed; it dies, dries, and is winnowed away: the substance, the life, the end of the plant, the system, is the wheat; the chaff, useless, a hindrance, an embarrassment now, is blown off; and when we look into the garner, the wheat is alone.

24. “And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honor into it.” Here we have real politics, the true method of civil prosperity and happiness. To walk in the light that flows from the truth divine upon this holy city, is “to do justly (not require justice of others, but of ourselves; dealing very rigorously with ourselves; insisting upon it that in our minds, our hearts, our thoughts, our emotions, with all our powers, and at all times; we are strictly just to others, all others), and love mercy (putting the best possible construction upon the words, deeds, intentions, of others; very lenient with them; never suffering the sun to go down upon our wrath; ever ready to forgive, and anxious for reconciliation), and walk humbly with our God (never supposing that, with all our

care and effort, our justice, and our mercy, have been perfect, meritorious, and that we may now expect some special favor from him, in view of our excellent conduct: but quite assured that the smile of his approbation will be only from the prompting of his own deep, warm, abiding love). Such are the divine principles of politics, exhibited to us, here; and the restless, unhappy, nations, will never find repose from the strife and ruin of the selfishness now prevailing; until they walk in the light that illuminates the holy city: the truth of God that shines through the Lamb.

25. "And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there." The access is ample; twelve gates; three on each side; the gates never shut; at each an angel to make known the terms of admission, which is without money or price: and always is it light enough to see the gates, and quiet enough to hear the angels; for there being no sun to set, and the glorious light of the city flowing from the Lamb being inexhaustible, the day is perpetual.

26. "And they shall bring the honor and glory of the nations into it." All the honor and glory of nations will be ascribed to Christianity. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." *II Cor. v. 19.* The hope of the nations is enveloped there. That one brief sentence contains incomparably more, than all the volumes of political economy. The nations must be reconciled to God. They are now never quiet, save when the dangerous elements beneath them are still: else, irruption, with its fiery lava, stifling cinera, and ruin. God's truth is the only moral truth; and morality, piety, is the *sine qua non* of a nation, as well as of an individual. Nations are made up of individuals; and the condition of the nation is never other than that of its constituents.

27. And there shall in no wise (*ou mee*, the intensive negative, in reference to what *in no wise* will or should

take place) enter into it anything that defileth, neither (whatsoever) worketh abomination, or (maketh) a lie: but they which are "written in the Lamb's book of life." John exerts himself, to discountenance what is called Universalism; i. e. the doctrine that all men will be saved. Having given us an account of his distant view of the city, he closed it, ver. 8, with the statement, that unbelievers would have their part in the lake burning with fire, and brimstone. And now, having described the city, from the overlooking mountain top, where he had a near and full view of it; he sees, what he had heard, that the separation of the unbelieving from the believing, the wicked from the righteous, did take place. "There shall IN NO WISE (a very strong expression) enter into it anything (a very sweeping phrase) that defileth, etc. \* \* \* but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life: (the register at the gate, any one of the twelve gates, where any one may have his name registered, who penitently approaches with a heart believing unto righteousness. John calls it the Lamb's book of life; because faith in the Lamb slain for us, secures to the trusting sinner, life.) Only the saved (*soozomenous*, the saved; and not "such as should be saved;" for the participle cannot signify "such as should be saved;" the persons alluded to were saved) are added to the Church. *Acts* ii. 47. The unsaved remain in their lake; they preferring fire and brimstone to salvation. God does not so decree: he pities them; entreats them to escape: holds forth his helping hand; says, Why will ye die? But in vain. They harden their hearts; stiffen their necks; stop their ears; pass on; perish.

## THE SPIRIT AND THE BRIDE.

REV. xxii. 17.—The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

“THE Spirit,” the divine helper of the Church ; whose great office is to assist all who wish and try to get to heaven. The presence and office of the Holy Spirit are described, *John* xvi. 7–15.

“The bride,” the Church, those who having been called, come out ; and are separated from the world, from unbelievers : and are associated in the name of Jesus. “And there came unto me one of the seven angels \* \* \* and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb’s wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem.” *Rev.* xxi. 9, 10.

“The Spirit and the bride say, Come.” The office of the Spirit being to prepare the bride, as illustrated in the case of Hegai, the king’s chamberlain, and Esther, the niece of Mordecai (*Esther* ii. 1–17) : he has accomplished his task. He, the gracious one, is ever ready, ever willing, ever toiling in the great work assigned him. He softens the heart ; opens the ear ; and gives energy to the gospel ; so that we may believe and live. Without him we can do nothing. He never withholds his aid. He is our breath, the holy *pneuma* that we breathe, and we cannot live, spiritually, without him. When David prayed, Take not thy Holy Spirit from me, he prayed against spiritual death ; as Hezekiah prayed against natural death, when he turned his face toward the wall. The presence and functions of the



Spirit, are the life, hope, success, happiness of the Church; and we may well be exhorted to be filled with the Spirit (*Eph* v. 18); to walk with the Spirit (*Gal* v. 16); and warned to quench not the Spirit (*I Thess* v. 19). Here, the Spirit is represented as having accomplished the preparation, and the bride is ready, awaiting the coming of the Bridegroom, and the marriage.

And, now, the voice of the Bridegroom is heard, Behold I come quickly; verses 7, 12; and proclaiming himself (16) the root and the offspring of David, the bright and morning star. And the Spirit and the bride, as with one voice, respond, Come. For he has completed his part; she is ready; and both are waiting that announcement.

Some think that the "Come" is an invitation to sinners, to come to the privileges of the gospel. But this is not probable; for though our Come may be either singular or plural, the Come of the text, *erchou*, come thou, can only be singular; and had it been so rendered by our translators; while it would have been inelegant, perhaps no one would have mistaken it for an address to sinners. Besides, the Church would not be presented in her character of "a bride adorned for her husband," as a laborer in the work of spreading the gospel. What has a "bride" to do with calling sinners? Not to her wedding, for they are unprepared. The figure and the language require us to accept the *erchou*, come thou, or do thou come, as a response on the part of the ready and waiting Spirit and bride, to the "Behold I come" of the approaching Bridegroom.

"And let him that heareth say, Come." The instruction is, that any one who will hear the gospel, will be admitted into this happy state of brideship, and unite in this joyful response, Come, thou divine Lord. *Ver.* 20. The gospel is the means used by the Spirit in the

preparation of men, for the blessed and eternal union with Christ in heaven. "Faith comes by hearing;" "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Such is the plan. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." *Mark* xvi. 15, 16.

"And let him that is athirst come." Here is a very decided change in the phraseology. It is no longer a saying, Come thou; or a saying anything. It is doing, motion; let the thirsty not say, Come, to any one; but let himself come: not *eipatoo*, let him say; but *erches-thoo*, let him come. He is not prepared to join in the joyful response to the Bridegroom; but let him come to the fountain of life, and make the preparation.

Penitence, because of our stupidity occasioned by sin, is a gloomy, painful, anxious condition. Yet, the angels rejoice over one sinner, every sinner that repenteth. So do the pious on earth. So would the penitent himself, were he aware of the great change for the better, that has occurred in his condition and prospects. He has thought on his ways; he has discovered that they are wrong; that death is in them; that they take hold on hell. What a blessed change is this! How different from the thoughtlessness, with which he was hurrying on to certain ruin! Yet, then, he was gay, and was unaware of any peril. But, now, that the good, loving Spirit has succeeded in arresting him, and there is hope that he will believe the gospel and be saved, he is miserable. He was in a burning house, fast asleep on his downy bed; yet awhile, and escape will be impossible: his dreams are pleasant; but one knowing his danger, rushes in, awakes him, he springs up, and, instead of moaning and grieving, rushes out of the building, with his heart aglow with gratitude for the timely warning.

Thirst is painful ; but it is a kind, gracious, necessary provision. Water is not only pleasant to our palate, but it is needed for our health and life. The blood which bears the nutriment needed all through the body, cannot perform its functions, unless, when it has lost much of its serous element, by insensible perspiration, etc., it shall be furnished with new supplies of water. Therefore, our Creator has placed this thirst as an alarm bell, to warn us of our need, that we may drink and live.

So with the thirst of the soul : it is for its benefit ; its life. "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God." The hart, feeling the need of water, the bell of warning (thirst) having been rung, speeds away in panting haste toward the brook. "My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God : when shall I come and appear before God?" *Psalm* xlii. Now : even this very moment : there need be no delay ; the fountain is full and flowing. Let him that is athirst come : let every one that is athirst, all that are athirst, come.

"And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." There is no word corresponding to whosoever here : nor is there any reason why that word should be used exclusively in this sentence : for it is equally implied elsewhere in the passage. "And whosoever heareth, let him say, come. And whosoever is athirst, let him come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." The whosoever is as proper in one place as another ; and proper throughout.

*Kai ho akouoon eipatoo.*

And the one hearing let him say.

*Kai ho dipsoon elthetoo (or erchesthoo).*

And the one thirsting let him come.

*Kai ho theloon labetoo.*

And the one willing let him take.

The construction of the three sentences, is entirely similar ; there is no difference at all : nor can there be any reason for rendering *ho*, whosoever, in the third instance, that does not hold equally good in the first or second sentence. It is equally proper in them all. "The one hearing," is the same as "any one hearing," or "whosoever heareth." And so with the others. Whosoever is proper in each.

The fountain is ready, filled with the water of life, the living water ; not stagnant, unwholesome, deadly ; but living, fresh, fitted for health and life. Then let the thirsty come. Let them gather around. Access is free. No fee is demanded. The water is not sold. Water and air are free and waiting to be used.

The living water is the truth, contained in the word of God, that exhaustless well of salvation. We drink it when we believe it ; for in believing it we receive it ; we are revived, satisfied, by believing it ; and to believe it, receive it, be saved by it, we have only to be willing. The thirsty stand around ; there is the living water ; to which each is not only welcome, but invited, urged to drink and live. Water cannot quench the thirst, and cherish life for him who will not drink : a river of water is useless to him who will not partake of it. So with the water of life : it is plenteous, but it must be received : it is provided in exhaustless abundance ; so that the more we drink, the more plenteous it seems to be : but the gospel must be received, believed : we must drink, or die ; naturally or spiritually.

The penitent, the thirsty in spirit, is confused by looking within himself for some great occurrence there, that he may have for the basis of his hope of acceptance with God ; the witness of the Spirit that he is truly converted, regenerate, a child of God ; this he would receive, believe, drink. But this would be sense, not faith : and it is by faith that he is to live. The thirsty man

does not thus. He does not look within, awaiting the happy change from the restless, burning pain, to a quiet satiety: there is the water; he seeks that, and not an inward satiety that will occur without drinking the water. The bewildered penitent should do the same. He should not watch within for the work of the Holy Spirit; the Blessed One will never be slack with his presence and power: he it is who has produced this thirst; that has provided this gospel, this living water, the truth; that has led his wayward feet to the fountain; that has urged him to come, to see, to drink, to believe the truth as it is in Jesus, who bore our sins, received the stripes which were our due, making complete satisfaction for our sins, opening to us our Father's arms; leaving for us nothing but to believe the blessed tidings, say Thanks, unutterable, eternal thanks to our Father "for his unspeakable gift!" and rush into the waiting arms, shouting

My God is reconciled!  
His pardoning voice I HEAR!  
He owns me for his child!  
I can no longer fear.  
With confidence I now draw nigh;  
And Father! Abba, Father! cry.

To believe what the gospel says of the loving, dying, living, reigning Jesus, the Christ; that is, to drink, to take the water of life freely. "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly, his FAITH is counted for RIGHTEOUSNESS." Amen! Let the sinner rejoice, and be glad; for here is a salvation that is suited to US! Amen!

FINIS.













THE BURKE LIBRARY



5 0245 985

