IN PREPARATION,

AND WILL BE PUBLISHED AS SOON AS COMPLETED,

WITH A

SPLENDIDLY ENGRAVED LIKENESS,

THE LIFE

OF THE LATE

Rev. NICHOLAS SNETHEN,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL

IN THE

METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH,

BY

WORTHINGTON GARRETTSON SNETHEN,

COUNSELLOR AT LAW.

NOTICES.

From the Rev. E. Y. Reese. (Methodist Protestant,) Aug. 8, 1846.

A VOLUME OF SERMONS BY THE LATE REV. NICHOLAS SNETHEN.

Through the polite attention of the publisher of these Discourses—Rev. U. Ward, Washington city—we have been permitted to examine them *in the sheets*. They are not yet out of press; but will be ready for delivery about the first of September ensuing.

The name of Snethen, in connection with this volume, will excite large expectations. The memory of his stirring eloquence is yet fresh in the hearts of those who in former days were permitted to listen to his silvery voice, and sympathise in his pious and sublime emotions. Others who may have never enjoyed this privilege, have yet heard of his astonishing power and unparalleled success as a minister of Jesus Christ, and will, of course, expect to find in this volume, some intimations of the author's intellectual strength and splendor.

Mr. Snethen was emphatically an extemporary preacher. As such, perhaps no man was ever more philosophical and systematic. His pathos was also at times irresistible and overwhelming. His efforts admirably combined the doctrinal with the practical; and possessing a mind richly stored with the treasures of Natural Science, he was able continually to illustrate and enforce the more abstruse points in theology by striking and simple analogies found in the physical world. The most cultivated minds were charmed with his quickness of discrimination, and his aptitude to elucidate; and the most illiterate were spell-bound, and enchained by the charm of his oratory and the wisdom of his instructions. More than one of his former friends and auditors in this city and elsewhere, if interrogated in reference to the power of Snethen's preaching, would say with the emphasis of true feeling:—

> "He was a man—take him for all in all
> We ne'er shall look upon his like again."

The Sermons now published, are Recollections, written at the age of nearly SIXTY-NINE, (almost three score and ten,) of the author's thoughts and sentiments in earlier life. He regrets, in the prefatory remarks, that he had not written them out at the time when their impressions were most distinct, and commends it as highly important to an extemporary speaker, "who relies mostly upon his feelings, if he wishes to preserve his best thoughts in the best forms of expression, that he should commit them to writing, and not trust to future excitements." He moreover adds, "Many parts, which were considered best at the time of their delivery, are now irrecoverably lost, by the neglect of writing them down, thro' a series of years, and this neglect being occasioned, in part, from too great a confidence in the memory, as though it partook not of our mortal nature."

We confess that we were apprehensive, from the natural decay of intellect in advanced years, that we should not find, in the volume before us, much of Snethen as he was in his palmy days. But in this we have been agreeably disappointed. The very first discourse

in the book brings out the author as himself;—and those who are at all familiar with recollections of his noble appearance and fine delivery, will be able almost to live over the past. The Sermon is NICHOLAS SNETHEN from beginning to end! The close thinker—the student of philosophical analogies—the fervent Christian—the *repose* of calm discrimination, relieved by occasional outbursts of *oratorical climax*—are all before you. At the close, you feel that quiet and peaceful sensation so often realized after the hearing of a *good sermon;* and an almost irresistible inclination to read it over again.

We intended at present to write only a very brief acknowledgment of the receipt of these pages, but have been drawn out beyond our design. We shall hereafter give a more extended notice, with extracts from the discourses. Are we expressing ourselves too strongly, when we hope that every minister in the Methodist Protestant Church will forthwith secure a copy of the work?

From the Rev. A. Webster, Baltimore, August, 1846.

REV. N SNETHENS'S SERMONS.

It is well known to many, that the Rev. Nicholas Snethen was one of the most intelligent, eloquent and forcible preachers of his day. An ardent Methodist, though ever a liberal and devoted Christian, he preached over a large portion of the United States, with great acceptability and usefulness. Gifted with a high order of intellect and with the brilliance of true genius, the agreeable companion and unwavering friend of the talented and judicious Bishop Asbury, he effected much toward the popularity and usefulness of American Methodism.

By him, Bishop Asbury was regarded and venerated as the Father of the Methodist Community in this country ; and to the latest hour of his own long and beneficent life, he spoke and wrote of him with the warmest affection and eulogistic respect: and though some have questioned and even censured the Bishop's administration, Mr. Snethen's publications and copious private correspondence will show, that he never impeached the motives of that great man, nor ceased to think his movements wise, and his life a great blessing to the country and mankind. To those who desire to know Mr. Snethen's theory in the case, it will be enough to state, here, that, at the decease of Bishop Asbury, he looked upon the surviving Methodist preachers as being the Bishop's sons in the gospel ; and wished the Economy of American Methodism to have been so modified, as that no one of the Brethren should assume the vacant relation of the Parent. Whether his theory were scriptural or reasonable ; in this free land, each must determine for himself. He saw evidence enough to satisfy his own mind, and to determine his own decisions and Church relation : but neither this, nor any other favorite hypothesis ever deadened his sense of the important annunciation of the inspired Apostle,—" The greatest of these is Charity :" for it may as truly be said of him, as of any other, that he lived and died in charity with all, Thus much upon this delicate point, may be said, we hope, without offence.

As a preacher, it must be admitted, that neither his high estimate of human liberty nor the fervors of his wonderful genius, could turn Mr. Snethen aside from an earnest and orthodox ministry of the gospel, which he indeed believed, felt and saw to be the power of God unto

salvation. Such a preacher could not but be *unique*, *original*; but never was he so at the expense of orthodoxy. His great intellect was employed, not in attacking and degrading the doctrines that had been instrumental in his own salvation, but in elucidating them by the blaze of his gifted mind, and in heralding them by the silvery tones of his matchless oratory. The intelligent reader of the following sermons will have proof enough of this, as he proceeds along that glittering path of the preacher's magnificent mind. At almost every step, he will think himself arrived at some delightful novelty, which will turn out to be but a venerable and permanent truth, whose very dimness and rust sparkle and flash in the beams of refulgent thought.

The true minister of the gospel is as a candle in its being consumed by the burning, illuminating light. Such was Mr. Snethen. The brilliance with which many passages of scripture shine in these Sermons, is wonderful. One cannot conceive how they could be more luminously exhibited. They are as thoroughly lustrous, as though not only the wick, but the whole oleaginous substance itself were in a transparent flame. Indeed, for originality and power of illustration, beautiful and instructive philosophy, the sweetest spirit of charity, and most impressive intellectuality, these sermons, though the imperfect Recollections of what they were, when first presented by the extemporaneous oratory of their admirable author, are not likely to be presently surpassed. For many years to come, and long after the echoes of his musical voice shall have become silent in the death cold ear of the last of his surviving auditors, will these stores of thought be the treasure of the pious, intelligent, studious reader; who, at every successive perusal, will find the more to study, the more to admire.

And, really, no one, especially if he be a minister of the gospel, should be satisfied with a single reading of such a book as this; which should be kept at hand, and read repeatedly, until that familiarity and edification, which distinguished an acquaintanceship with its sainted Author, shall be, in some part at least, secured from his printed Recollections. In his society every one was safe. His purity of conversation, his utter avoidance of all fanciful heresies, his respect for the absent and the dead, his forbearance toward the few who ranked themselves his enemies, his earnest spirituality, his exhaustless fund of literary and practical information, kept the too usual social evils in awe of the wise and holy man: and those favored with his courteous fellowship felt that they had no peril to dread from his eye or his tongue. So with this delightful production of his pen. One may hand it to his dearest on earth with a smile of confidence. The immortal soul has nothing to fear at its entrance within these peaceful and spiritual precincts. Here will he never read lessons of envy or malice; and he must be strangely indurated against the charming influences of gospel charity, who can depart from this volume's final page, without a consciousness of having acquired, in communion with a pure and gifted friend, an increased love for God, and a heartier good will towards all mankind.

For no deadly drug of bigotry has been steeped in this peaceful cup. No deafening thunder of useless controversy, no blinding lightning of polemic ire, mars the radiant serenity of this cloudless sky. The Sun of Righteousness is its benignant glory. His beams corruscate in the pure words of the Christian preacher, and light the inquiring

reader into some of the noblest researches of Christian Philosophy. May a book so valuable occupy that prominence in the Sacred Literature of our Country which it so justly deserves.

BALTIMORE, 1846. A. WEBSTER.

WASHINGTON, *August* 28th, 1846.

I have read with much carefulness and pleasure, several Sermons of the late Rev. N. SNETHEN, a part of the volume now in course of publication by REV. U. WARD, of this city. Having been honored by an intimate acquaintance with the author while living, I had anticipated, from his eminent learning and elevated piety, a rich treat in the perusal of his Discourses, which has been even more than realized. The unique and original style, profound and philosophic thought, catholic spirit and scriptural purity which characterize them, together with their perfect practicalness—present a sufficient commendation to ensure their general reading and popularity The fruits of a deeply pious and highly cultivated mind, they alike enlighten the understanding and impress the heart, and their publication cannot fail to prove greatly promotive of the cause of truth and holiness.

SAMUEL K. COX,
Pastor of the 9th St. M. P. Church, Washington City.

From the Rev. A. H. Bassett, (Zanesville, Western Recorder,) August 20, 1846.

SNETHEN'S SERMONS.

The Protestant of the 8th inst., announces that the "Volume of Sermons by the late Rev. Nicholas Snethen," which has been so long in contemplation, will be ready for delivery about the first of September. We truly say with the Protestant, that "we hope that every minister in the Methodist Protestant Church will forthwith secure a copy of the work;" and we might add laymen too; so that they might have something to remember the "old man eloquent."

It was said of him by BISHOP MCKENDREE, that he was like the Ohio River—clear—rapid—deep.

SERMONS

OF

THE LATE

NICHOLAS SNETHEN,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL,

IN THE METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH.

WRITTEN BY HIMSELF,

IN THE SIXTY-NINTH YEAR OF HIS AGE.

EDITED BY

WORTHINGTON GARRETTSON SNETHEN,

COUNSELLOR AT LAW.

"Gather up the fragments that remain, so that nothing be lost."

SECOND EDITION.

WASHINGTON, D.C.
PUBLISHED BY ULYSSES WARD.
1846.

CONTENTS.

Unto all the Methodist Churches throughout the United States and Great Britain, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.

ADVERTISEMENT.

The manuscript of the present volume of Sermons is from the pen of the Author himself, who committed them to writing at Cincinnati, in the winter of 1838. In giving them to the public for the first time in print, the editor has been careful not to vary a single expression or word in the original, but to send them forth as they came from the hands of the writer—unchanged, untouched. The subjoined letter will not fail to arrest the attention of the readers of these discourses, and particularly of those who were once his hearers.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., September, 1846.

PRINCETON, INDIANA, October 31st, 1843.

Dear Son: I send you my manuscript Sermons. I have taken some pains to make them legible. The leading thoughts in them were connected with my most successful efforts. A combination of circumstances led to the neglect of writing those discourses down at the time I delivered them, but the main one I have mentioned in the preface;—namely, I was not fully aware how memory would be affected by age. So, when I made this attempt to commit them to paper, I remembered that I had forgotten, and found that the primary feelings were past never to return. An attempt to revive rhetoric under these conditions, is worse than useless. It may be doubted if poets could even do it. Among the practical errors of our old uneducated extemporizing itinerants, who depended upon religious feelings for their inspirations, all they had to depend upon, was their almost entire inattention to the natural decay of the feeling power, and of the memory in old age. Though many of us came to know or fore-know these facts, our convictions were not strong enough to counteract old habits. Sometimes, for some days, before I delivered those discourses which made the greatest impression upon the hearers, my feelings burned within me with an almost unrestrainable ardor. In the midst of such emotions is the time to write, for then one can write as well as speak, which it is impossible to do when they are wanting. Your affectionate father,

NICHOLAS SNETHEN

To Worthington G. Snethen, Esq.,
Washington City, D. C.

THE

RECOLLECTIONS

OF AN

ITINERANT

AND

EXTEMPORARY PREACHER,

WRITTEN BY HIMSELF

IN THE

Sixty ninth year of his age.

"Gather up the fragments,—let nothing be lost."

PREFACE.

A high degree of self-knowledge implies fore-knowledge. We know not, how we shall feel and think and act or speak, in unknown conditions and circumstances. And all the future is unknown to us. It is common, to hear people say, in unusual cases, that they never shall or never can forget, and yet, the things that seem to be so indelibly impressed upon the memory, may be forgotten, while those of less regard may be remembered. Experience proves, that the most pleasurable feelings and their most immediate effects, are not always remembered the longest, or with the greatest distinctness. Persons, whose youth has passed away, without the acquisition of the elements of literary knowledge, who, after becoming religious, under the excitement of religious feelings, have begun to speak in public, and in time, to be regarded as popular and successful extemporary preachers, are apt to rely upon their memory of those discourses, or parts of discourses, which were delivered under the most powerful emotions of their pious feelings, and appeared to produce the greatest degree of good effect upon their hearers. Or, if they distrust their memory, trust, that with the return of their good feelings, the same thoughts

and words, will also return, and there have not been wanting old preachers, who have favored this opinion. But, its natural tendency, is to induce a neglect of reading and writing, and especially the latter.

Now, there seems to be no reason to doubt, that our stronger and more habitual feelings, have much influence in producing or governing our thoughts and words, and in some instances, not only voluntarily, but also against our wills; but what evidence, have we from experience and observation, to lead us to believe, that our religious feelings will continue, or can, by any means, be continued, in equal degrees, in fatigue and disease, and particularly in old age, though our religion may remain the same in degree? Religious feelings, like all other feelings, appertain to our living bodies, and must, of course, be more or less under the influence of their varying states and conditions. A degree of feeling, in the pulpit, which might be in a high degree pleasing and successful in a younger preacher, might overpower an older one.

When, therefore, an extemporary preacher, whose memory, for the first eighteen or twenty years of his life, was but little exercised in letters, or the rules of literary composition, finds it difficult to incorporate these rules into his mind or memory, (as he will be apt to do,) so that they shall seem rational to him; he will also find,

as he grows old, that his recollection of them will begin to become unsteady. Here then, are two causes of the failure of memory, in uneducated extemporary preachers; first, the want of the early exercise of the faculty in the rules of thought and of language, and secondly, the natural decay of the faculty. The first impressions upon the memory are generally remembered the longest. Thus, we can account for the frequent examples of old preachers feeling in their pathos, and becoming common-place in their argument or matter, though they give evidence of continued piety and zeal. How important, then, is it to an extemporary speaker, who relies mostly upon his feelings, if he wishes to preserve his best thoughts in the best forms of expression, that he should commit them to writing, and not trust to future excitements!

We call these discourses, recollections, as we remember many parts of them to have been considered the best, at the time of their delivery, which are now irrecoverably lost, by the neglect of writing them down through a series of years, and this neglect being occasioned, in part, from too great a confidence in the memory, as though it partook not of our mortal nature.

Much of the knowledge we gain by experience comes too late for us to profit by it; but do we not owe it to those who have time and strength to reduce their knowledge to practice, to endeavor to

prevent or correct their errors and mistakes, by showing them our own? We have cause to regret the silence of our seniors, upon these important subjects of feeling and memory, and their relative associations. How can every generation grow wiser than the previous one, unless the knowledge of the old is communicated to the young, in the same professions or callings? But let no one undervalue religious feelings as means of stimulating the mind. Many persons who had grown to manhood, with little or no education, have, through them, become truly pious and also useful preachers. We mean only, to caution good men against overvaluing them, by showing what they cannot do. They cannot compensate the want of twenty years of education, they cannot retain their energy in sickness and old age, and sustain the memory of what was acquired after the faculties have grown to maturity, by their influence alone. The great advantage of early elementary instructions in religious doctrines or principles, in this relative view, is very evident; and also the advantage of committing to writing, our best thoughts and words as conceived and delivered under the excitement of our holiest and most ardent emotions.

Now these remarks are of scarcely less importance to hearers, than to extemporary preachers themselves, to guard them against a prejudice too common, that writing deadens the feelings of preachers, and that uneducated men make the most lively

and powerful speakers. This prejudice is apt to be reciprocated between preachers and hearers. The error respecting the inspiration of preachers, also, is fostered by this mutual opinion of the all-sufficiency of good feelings to produce thoughts and to preserve the memory of them. Under the first impressions, the effects of these good feelings do indeed seem like inspiration and to savor of infallibility. But let it be admitted, that preachers of different denominations have these feelings, and that their effects upon them are nearly similar, however they may differ in doctrines and practice; each believes these feelings peculiar to his own order, and regards them as proofs, that the doctrines they preach are true. The doctrines, they say, come from the feelings and the feelings come from God,—must not they therefore, be true? But the fact is not taken into the argument, that the doctrinal theory or principle may be adventitious and not suggested by the feelings.

One, who had grown to mature years, without religious instruction, living among Deists, Socinians, Mystics, and Antinomians, on the land and on the water, in the vicinity of a commercial city, during the American Revolution and the overflowings of the infidelity of the French Revolution, when he began to preach under the excitement of his religious feelings, could hardly fail to find much difficulty in framing a simple form of doctrinal or theoretical propositions. All the controversies against

the positive announcements of Scripture, tend to negatives or to no definite practical opinions; hence, the injurious effects of habitually hearing them in opposition to asserted or declared truths, (and nothing being proved to be true in place of them,) will be long felt. In the selection of texts, no desire may be experienced to make a system, but to discover the plainest method of explaining a scriptural system. But should not the scriptural system be explained in the words of scripture? So it is often affirmed. Let the trial be made by questions and answers, beginning with words or terms. What is faith? What is justification? What is justification by faith? Will it suffice to answer, faith is faith? An uneducated man, who professes religion, may have every thing to learn, though his feelings prompt him to learn every thing. He may preach extemporally until he is near sixty-nine years old, and may then propose to himself, to test his memory, to ascertain what he has left, or how much he remembers of what he once knew.

Behold, a specimen of his recollections!

NICHOLAS SNETHEN.

Cincinnati, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE FIRST.

THE ONE MEDIATOR.

For there is one God, and one mediator, between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. *I. Timothy* ii, 5. 6.

The context is, that God will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. It might be asked, then, who hath resisted his will? Must not all men, therefore, be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth? The text itself seems to meet the question. There is one Mediator, through whom God wills them to be saved. God wills some acts to be done immediately, and other acts to be done mediately. In the latter cases his will may be disobeyed. When he wills that there should be light, we hear of no medium, no mediator. He said "Let there be light," and light was. But, when the Lord said to the Prophet; "Oh! son of man, I have set thee a watchman to the house of Israel," and he adds, "therefore, thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me," he wills, that the house of Israel should hear his word mediately. The voice of the prophet was the medium. It follows, when, "I (the Lord) say unto the wicked, 'Oh! wicked man, thou shalt surely die!' if thou dost not speak, to warn the wicked of his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity,

but his blood will I require at thine hands." It is, then, supposed, that the wicked may not hear, through the fault of the medium. If God had spoken immediately or directly to the wicked man, he must have heard, whether he obeyed or not. The principles or causes of immediate and mediate operations are to be found everywhere in nature and art, as well as in religion. Primary moving powers or causes in physical and mechanical movements, may operate with or without media. Wheels, springs, levers, screws, and pullies are media, through which primary powers may operate, and also voluntary and rational agents. But, it is well known, that the actions of all prime movers and agents may be modified by media, and so affected, that the media only may be apparent. So the word of God to the Prophet was not audible to the wicked, although it was primary.

Natural or experimental philosophy is mostly restricted to media or secondary causes. Electricity, though one among the most subtle and powerful principles or agents in nature, cannot pass freely and immediately through the air and several other bodies, called non-conductors. The presence or absence of media, and the variety of their modifications upon natural agents, give rise to the great diversity of natural phenomena. If every natural cause operated immediately, the present appearances would be very different. The media of light and sound, it is well known, produce colors and

music. Strength in man is very limited; and yet by the aid of media, how vast and various are its effects, and, in some instances, how apparently superhuman.

To the immediate power of God no limits may be conceived. It is Almighty power and controlled only by his own wisdom, goodness and truth. He does what he wills to do, and how he wills to do it. It is the will of God, that there should be one, and but one Mediator between him and men. All intercourse between God and men must be through one Mediator. If he wills to speak to men, or to hear them, it is through one mediator; and so, likewise, if he wills to give or accept anything. There is but one Mediator for all religious purposes. The medium is human nature—God manifested in the flesh—who gave himself a ramson for all, to be testified in due time.

The Mediator must be known. "This is eternal life, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." "I am the way, the truth, and the life." One true God is revealed, and one sent Mediator is revealed. To know the Mediator, whom God hath sent, the prophecies concerning him must be identified in him. One Mediator is sent at one time. That time is predicted. It is a proper time and a due time. Many mediators might be sent at as many different times. At sundry times past, God spake by the prophets, but finally by his Son. The incarnation of the Son of

God was not due sooner; if it had been delayed longer, it might have proved to be too late. It was due in the time of the second temple, but this temple was totally destroyed not many years after this time.

A mediatorial system requires at least one mediator, and God has judged, that one is enough. Having given himself a ransom for all, he is able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God through him. Now, it has been a long and much controverted question, whether there can be any pardon granted by God to the offenders against his moral laws, consistently with their truth and justice, without satisfaction being made to meet their demands or penalties. But does it not admit of a query, whether the parties to the controversy have steadily kept in view the relation between this question and the principle of mediation? That the relation has often been noticed and discussed is certain, but we do not remember, to have met with an author, who has professedly followed the analogy of the satisfaction, which is manifestly required, in regard to offences against the laws of nature. When the laws of nature are violated, they seem, in no case, to pardon or to remit the penalty due to offenders, without satisfaction; and the offenders seem not to be able to make the satisfaction immediately or directly. But, between transgressions against natural and moral laws, the analogy holds generally.

In each of these classes of laws, transgressions may be committed immediately. Moral errors and wrongs or evils, seldom, if ever, require mediators to their commission. Human inclination and power to commit sin, answer as nearly to the idea of immediate as any thing we can well conceive. Ability to do harm and to undo it, when done, is so strikingly disproportionate, as to have forced public attention to notice it, in all ages and countries. It is, only, when men have some favorite opinion to support or defend, that they attempt to argue, that, it is just as easy to do good as to do evil; or to do right as wrong, or to undo evil as to do it.

All matter is said to be governed by the laws of gravity, or to have a tendency to a common centre. Falling bodies obey this law. It is the cause of friction and of the stability of bodies. But this law cannot be violated with impunity; it must be satisfied. When violated, it cannot be immediately remedied. Let a man disengage himself from any point of elevation, and he will immediately fall to the nearest point of resistance; but he shall attempt, in vain, to ascend in the same immediate manner. The law of gravity will oppose his reascension; he must have some medium, by which to rise again. A flight of steps or a ladder might satisfy the law, but it will not be satisfied, without some medium. Do we see bodies rising from the earth, or suspended or floating in the air? Why

do not these bodies fall? The reason is, the law of gravity is satisfied. If a stone and a piece of wood were put into a vessel, filled with water, the stone will remain at the bottom, and the wood may float on the surface of the water; but remove the water and the wood also will repose on the bottom of the vessel. They both obey the law of gravity; the balloon and the clouds do the same. Matter is governed not by partial, but by general laws. The laws operate without chance or accident. In regard to sickness or diseases of the body, it is well known, that, it is enough to relieve the body, or to suspend the action of the disease, to effect a cure; that this effect cannot be produced immediately, but through the medium of medicine and medical art. The immediate cause of wounds and fractured bones makes no part of the surgeon's skill, which is all mediate. In regard to property, how easily and directly may it be spent or wasted, though hardly gained and still more hard to regain. The immediate and the mediate in these examples are in striking contrast; and it is evident that their relations are not interchangeable. Wisdom and goodness always require means of attainment. What is education from first to last, but a mediate process? How little is known, that is not learned! What great and useful work of art was ever produced immediately? Houses, ships, and machines of all descriptions, the culture of the fields,—look where we may,—all are mediate which improve or advance.

Laws must be fulfilled by direct obedience, or be satisfied by indirect means; or their penalty will be incurred and suffered. Is it to be presumed that moral or religious laws are designed by the Universal Lawgiver, to be an exception to the general system? The Christian Religion, not being founded or predicated upon the innocence, or purity, or goodness of human nature, but upon its fallen or sinful condition, follows the analogy of mediatorial theory. We have seen that the law of gravity, by which, every particle of matter tends to a common centre, is the cause of the stability of bodies. Let but this law be suspended, or repealed, and we cannot help inferring, that all matter would become chaotic. Hence the necessity of mediatorial system, to leave general laws undisturbed, and to prevent remedies from becoming worse than the diseases. If all the material, necessary to compose a building, could be relieved from the effects of gravity, they would be like so many feathers, and this would be a great saving of labor in building, but the building would have no more gravity than feathers. A stone of the largest size might be taken with the thumb and fingers to any given height, but the first puff of wind might blow it away. Now, on the supposition, that the moral law might have no more control over moral actions, than gravity would have over matter, if that law were suspended; would it not as effectually unsettle the stability of morals, as in the other case it would that of matter? To restore a man to

a moral condition or standing, whose moral character has been deranged or forfeited, the moral law must be interrupted or changed, or medium must be resorted to. Law must remain and operate in all its force against the medium which satisfies it; otherwise, nothing that is gained, can be secured. The one Mediator magnifies the law and makes it honorable. Having satisfied it, he justifies its transgressor, who believes on him, without making it void through faith, for the transgressor thus becomes responsible to him. A steamboat, ascending the falls of the Ohio, furnishes, perhaps, as good an illustration of the nature of the satisfaction of natural laws as can be found among the medium effects of the arts. The principle of gravity, which acts upon every particle of water in the rushing river, operates upon every part of the boat, her machine, and all her fixtures, and even upon the fire and the steam itself; but, by the medium of the steam, she moves steadily up the foaming and roaring rapids. But any general cause, sufficiently powerful to suspend the current, would prove destructive to the boat. There is, then, medium (namely steam,) by which a steamboat can ascend the falls. The mediate force overcomes the immediate resistance. Not a particle of matter is freed from gravity; the law is perfectly satisfied in all its demands. The mighty river still flows on, chafing the rocks and whitening them with its foam. The moral law has denounced its awful and immediate penalty of death, upon the

soul that sinneth. Behold! the Mediator. He is testified in due time; he appears in fashion as a man, in the form of a servant. What does he do? Does he suspend the law and thus render its penalty null and void? Not so. He gives himself a ransom for all. Is not the law satisfied with the ransom? He becomes obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. How does the sinner obtain pardon through the medium of the death of Christ? Not by any immediate process. This one ransom of this one mediator leaves the law in all its integrity, and secures or merits the sinner's pardon. The tide of justice (so to speak,) is not suspended, is not turned up stream; it keeps on its course, it presses with all its force against the Mediator, and yet he bears the sinner above it. What security could a sinner have in an immediate pardon of a violated law? Would not every principle, in the whole system, become unsettled, by this making void the law? Through one Mediator and his mediation, God may be just, and the justifier of him, that believeth in the Mediator. That is, justice is not violated; and is not this idea implied in the word, satisfied? It has been said, that it is unjust, to accept the sufferings of the innocent in place of the guilty; but those, who say this, also unsay the doctrine of mediation, a doctrine, which, we cannot look upon nature without perceiving, nor act, without realizing. The very lightning of heaven passes not without a medium. Man cannot raise himself

to his own height from the ground without a medium. Ships cannot sail without a medium, and birds cannot fly without a medium. Surrounded as man is, with demonstrations of this principle, and having scarcely one example, in all the laws of nature, of an immediate process; why should he hesitate to believe, that, there is one mediator between God and man? In fact, there is a tendency in many minds to believe that there are more than one Mediator. And the text seems to aim to correct this proneness of mind, which, there seems to be nothing apparent in nature to correct, by adding, "who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." When the penalty of a law is incurred, by a violation of it, one of two things must happen, to save the violator from suffering the penalty; the law must be set aside, or some medium must be provided, through which he can be pardoned, without invalidating the law. Immediate justice and immediate pardon cannot go together. They do not go together in human and civil laws. Immediate pardons, when frequent, render the laws, if not void, at least mediate. The maxim dictated by experience is, better to have no laws, than to have unexecuted laws. But, in theology, the truth of God is involved in the threatened penalty of the law; if it fails, his word fails. If mercy, as some speak, may disarm justice, it may not invalidate truth. Only a mediator can meet a truth of threatening a penalty, and only by giving himself a

ransom for all to whom the penalty is due. If a man owes a sum of money, the law cannot object, if another gives it. And, if one should pay for a thousand, the law, that is, justice, could not object.

Sin is a transgression of the law. The evil, the mischief is done; but the law, which is transgressed, cannot remedy it. The law itself, being presupposed to be right, it cannot immediately repair the injury done, and take the offender into favor and protection. The law and the sinner cannot be reconciled without some acknowledgment on the part of the law, or of the sinner. But, if the former confesses the wrong, it is law no longer. The law, under the first covenant, is called the law of innocence, as the beings, who were to be governed by it, were innocent. This law was holy, just and good. It had no Mediator; every thing pertaining to it was immediate. While it was obeyed, there was no evil to be remedied. But transgressed, and its penalty incurred, it was not thrown away or set aside, and another substituted in its place to operate in the same immediate manner, but without penalties. The covenant, made with guilty man, the covenant of grace, had one Mediator. It was mediate, otherwise the penalty of the law of innocence must have gone into immediate effect. But sin entering into the world by one man, all men are placed by the Supreme Lawgiver under a mediatorial system, having one Mediator as its head. Between God and innocent man, there

was no mediator. The Lord spake unto Adam and Adam spake unto the Lord immediately. The effect of the first sin was immediate. "I heard thy voice and I was afraid." It is a property of fire to burn living flesh. The effect is so uniform, that it is considered as a law. And so it is with substances called poisons; they operate with all the uniformity of laws. To transgress these laws, is to be burned or poisoned. The effect is immediate. Not so the cure; if indeed, there can be a cure. Not to dwell longer upon the principle of mediation, so obvious to every reflecting mind, proceed we, now, to consider, why there needs be but one Mediator between God and men.

The man Christ Jesus unites in himself all the attributes necessary to the office. He is,—as some speak,—God with God and man with man,—God manifest in the flesh, the only begotten of the Father full of grace and truth, not a servant, as Moses was, but a Son, the heir of all things. In dignity he is supreme,—to which of the angels, said he, at any time, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." But unto the Son, he saith, "Thy throne, O God! is forever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." His existence is coextensive with the duration of the office. He is the first and the last, the beginning and the ending, the author and finisher of faith. There can be neither predecessor nor successor in a priesthood of the order of Melchizedec. His power is all-sufficient. He has all power in heaven and

in earth. He is head over all things to the church. And his name or authority is above every name.

> That every knee should bow to him,
> And every tongue confess.

He is all-wise; he knows what is in man; he knows the hearts of all men; he searcheth the reins. His merit is perfect. He gave himself a ransom for all; not that he should suffer often, or that he had suffered often, from the foundation of the world; but now, once at the end of the world, hath appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. One perfect mediator is enough. Two are only better than one, in any work, when one is insufficient to do it. Men make up in numbers for their individual defects. If the Mediator were subject to human imperfections, one would not be enough. And in fact, it is found, that those who hold to human or angelical mediators, are apt to have the number unlimited, if they do not fill heaven and earth with them. Gods many, and mediators many, are sure indications of individual imperfection. So, in the number of ancient ransoms or sacrifices. They were offered by every sinner and for every sin. But he, who gave himself for all sinners and for all sins, needed no partner to mediate with him. The complete union of mediatorial attributes in the one Mediator is, in scripture, referred to divinity,—"They shall call his name Emanuel, that is, God with us." "He shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty

God." "In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." "Who thought it not robbery to be equal with God." What mere man could alone mediate between God and men!

Mediation is a great work. It is the saving of men, by bringing them to the knowledge of the truth. How lost, how ruined is man! How bewildered and led astray in ignorance and error! Every sinful propensity and sinful action tends to inveterate sinful habit. The night of ignorance and error requires a light, above the brightness of the sun, to enlighten it. Men have hated the one Mediator and hate him still. As soon as it was announced that he was born, measures were taken to destroy him; the designs to take away his life finally succeeded. Being betrayed into the hands of his enemies and sentenced to death, without any evidence of guilt, to quiet the clamor of the multitude, whose cries for his crucifixion increased, as the legal forms failed them, he laid down his life on a Roman cross. The one, the only true Mediator dies as a malefactor. His own people, to whom he came, received him not; they denied the Holy One and the Just One, and preferred as a customary reprieve, a murderer. Men know not the Father nor the Son. Ignorance hates instruction and instructors. It is naturally cruel; wherever, it can be traced nearest to its extreme point, it is found to be least humane. The most ignorant savages are most cruel, and in fact man-eaters. The unpardonable offence of Jesus in the judgment of

the Sanhedrim was, that he made himself to be the Son of God. For this, they judged that he ought to die, and multitudes of others in different ages and countries are of the same judgment; and though they cannot persecute and kill him, are no less hostile to his followers. "This," said he, "they will do, because they know neither Me, nor my Father." To bring such ignorant creatures to the knowledge of the truth is one part of the great work of mediation. Ignorance cannot be immediately enlightened. Instruction is a slow process, because it is a mediate one. It takes from time, what it lacks in direct force.

The Mediator must reign, until he shall have put all things under his feet. His power, like his light or instruction, is mediate, and of course progressive. The opposers of divine revelation, and particularly, those good men, who oppose the spirit to the letter, seem to lose sight of the mediatorial analogy. What is historical knowledge? Not surely immediate knowledge. How many generations of men may have passed away, since the facts existed! Would it not sound strange to hear, that, though the men who saw and recorded events and facts, two thousand years ago, were wise and good men, yet, there are now and always have been, wise and good men, who could write as good a history of them? Are not such declarations shocking to common sense? When the witnesses of any facts are dead, the only safe and correct medium of infor-

mation respecting them, is the recorded testimony or written history, not the opinion of writers who lived in after ages. The Bible is a medium of religious knowledge; slow, indeed, it may be in transmitting it, but sure. It has been urged against the doctrine of depravity, that it is an argument in favor of the divinity of the Mediator, being, as it were, a parent error. But, supposing the doctrine of human depravity should be yielded, still the difficulties of the mediatorial work are real, and the necesssity for it as great as ever. In what age or country, when the gospel was first made known, did it meet with no resistance, no opposition? Is not the history of religion a history of its deaths and its resurrections, of its sufferings and its triumphs? "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life that I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." "It is a faithful saying, that if we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him."

It is earnestly contended by many, that miracles and immediate inspiration have been, and are to be, perpetuated in the Church through all ages. May not the question be settled by a reference to the mediatorial principle? Would not a system, that cannot be carried on without perpetual miracles and inspiration, seem to be better entitled to the title of immediate than mediate? And can good reasons be assigned, why there should be a mediator

over perpetual miracles and inspirations? The first man was a miraculous or immediate creation; so also might have been the first language. But, the race of men is not continued by miracles, nor language by inspiration. The immediate inspiration of the Almighty does not continually give knowledge to the spirit which is in man, as it did to the first man; nor to all Christians and teachers, as it did, at first, to the Apostles. By what miracle or inspiration have any people heard the gospel without a preacher? The name of Christianity, wherever found, can be traced back to Christ; it is not adventitious. In contemplating the work of the One Mediator, the mind naturally pursues one of two courses. If it lessens the work, it also lessens the worker. If it augments the work, it also augments the worker. A great work requires a great workman, and a little work may be done by a little workman. The mind takes one or the other of these courses, for it cannot change the number of workmen to meet the demand. Now, the greatness of this work seems to be implied, in the idea, of One for All. The number of men, the number of sinners, the number of sins,—can we, by any rule of proportion, infer that a little agent, by himself alone, or one man, no greater nor better than one of the individuals, would be adequate to the work? Can one man be a mediator for all men, and give himself a ransom for them all? To answer this question in the affirmative, the character and condition

of the whole race must be lightly estimated. Very little instruction would be needed to bring them to the knowledge of the truth, if one man could give it all. And their offences must be mere peccadilloes, little sins indeed, if one sinful man could give a ransom for them all. We need only know the common effect of self-praise or self-condemnation upon the mind, or of pride or humility, to know the different conclusions, men will be apt to arrive at under the influence of these different feelings. A little mediator and a little mediation, will do for the proud and self-sufficient. But the humbled and self-condemned will feel the necessity of a great mediator and a great ransom. Bating for the accidents of education, it seems to be a general rule, that the ideas and feelings of little sins and a little saviour reciprocate, and that the ideas and feelings of great sins and a great saviour have the same relative action. And whoever has much experience how the consciousness of the exceeding sinfulness of sin may be augmented, by an insight into the imperfections of human nature, will not be disposed to criticise, very strictly, the strongest words, when applied to this subject, not perhaps even infinite itself, for when men have no data to calculate a precise result, they set it down as infinite. Let this rule obtain in theology. If a finite calculation could be made, what security could any one have, that, on a death-bed, if not before, his feelings might, and consequently his fears might not exceed it? It

is plain, that the Scripture sets no bounds or limits to a Saviour's merits.

With the subjects of mediation and redemption, the wrath of God (so called) is involved. God governs those, whom he has constituted moral agents, by written laws or by conscience, but conscience itself conforms to written laws. The primary idea of wrath or anger in God seems to be derived from conscience, in a manner, not dissimilar to the supposed derivation of the idea of causation from our own volition. A consciousness of having done wrong, that is, of having offended some rule or law admitted to be right (and every man admits some rule of right) must be attended with a feeling of self-displeasure. No person can feel pleased with himself, when he violates a rule. Hence, self-justification involves censure of the law. This capacity, to feel the difference between right and wrong, is natural; art can only modify it. Like the eye, or any natural faculty, though it may be destroyed, it is nevertheless inborn; its excesses or morbid states are not to be compared to excrescences, but to disordered sensibilities. A consciousness of a violation of an admitted rule, may prompt the mind to inquire, how things are or may be right or wrong; the mind may thus pass from facts to causes. When effects exhibit great appearances of uniformity, the idea of chances or accidents will not account for them. Let the mind come to the conclusion, or admit the conclusion that the law is of God, and the idea of displeasure

against sin will be transferred to him. Must not a person, who is displeased with himself, for having transgressed the law of God, infer that God must be displeased with him? If he can be angry with himself for sin, may not God be angry with him?—"Brethren if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts and knoweth all things."

Should the assumption be still insisted upon, that the notions of law and of sin had their origin in priest-craft, still the universal aptness of the human mind, to receive these impressions or ideas, remains to be accounted for. Let persons, some of whom were born blind, be shut up in the dark together, and be all brought into the light, and what will the effect of the light prove? Not surely the craft of him, who brought the persons into it, out of the dark, but the power of vision in some, and the want of it in others. A taper, or any artificial light, will test the existence of the natural power of vision, as effectually as the sun itself. And, if men, who had never seen the sun, could be made to believe, that any other light was the sun, it would not disprove the existence of the sun, nor of eyes. Men, and conscience, and certain ideas of moral laws, exist throughout the world in societies, but a society or tribe of men has never yet been found without consciences, or some kind or degree of feeling of the difference between right and wrong. By what rule of reason, or by what modification of belief, can a man, who has suffered a guilty conscience, come to

deny the displeasure of God against sin, and consequently, against a sinner? And Adam said,—"I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself." And the Lord said,—"Who told thee that thou wast naked?" Conscience is here revealed. "I was afraid." Their eyes were opened; they had eyes. Men's consciences may be brought to act. Consciences no longer lie concealed, when they begin to feel guilt. The Mediator does not destroy or suspend conscience, when he mediates between God and men. But, would he not do so, in effect, by destroying or suspending moral law? What is conscience without law?

Who stands between the Father's wrath and me? Who can so stand, save the One Mediator? But, how was the Father's wrath indicated, save by conscience? The sinner is displeased with himself. "God, be merciful to me, a sinner!" Now, God is love; he is loving to every man; he so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, as a Mediator and a ransom. "God, be merciful to me, a sinner!" for Christ's sake. The mercy, the pardon of sin prayed for, is mediate. God did not so love the world, as to save it from punishment and give everlasting life to it, without a mediator. Could he have done so, without abrogating his own laws, effacing conscience, and setting aside the necessity of repentance and faith? He, who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, so as not to perish, but to have everlasting life, cannot believe, at the same time,

that his soul will be saved without a Mediator, or that any mediator can save his soul, who did not give himself a ransom for it.

The conceptions and views of certain writers, on these points, seem not to be uniformly steady. Let us not assume effects without causes, nor suppose causes without objects, but keep the questions distinct;—with or without a mediator and a ransom? "Without me," said the Mediator, "ye can do nothing." How, indeed, can we, if a mediator be necessary, and if there be but one? May not many of the disagreements between Christians be traced to this cause? If the idea of a Mediator or of mediation be omitted, or the nature, extent, or difficulty of the work be misapprehended, a wide door is opened for discussion. Many, among the Jewish believers, who recognized the Messiah in Jesus, could not be prevailed upon to give up the legal ransoms. The Mediator might mediate between God and men, but they must repair to the altar with the price of sacrificial blood. Each of these believers gave his own ransom. If their views had prevailed, thousands of victims would still be bleeding at the altar. And there are, even, in these days, Gentile converts, who do not hesitate to say, that the blood of Christ, as a ransom, has no more merit than the blood of a bullock. They do not believe that Christ died for us, or put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. It makes no part of their creed, that Jesus was delivered for our offences, and

rose again for our justification. But, whether, they come under the description of those, who deny the Lord that bought them, or not, we may leave to the righteous Judge of all to determine.

We conclude, by urging upon the attention, the conformity between the quotation from St. Peter and the text. "Let no one deny; let no one be ashamed, or afraid to confess the Lord, that bought him, before men. Our bodies and souls are not our own. They are bought with a price.—He hath ransomed our race?"

Oh! how shall we praise,
Or worthily sing,
His unspeakable grace!

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE SECOND.

THE POOR IN SPIRIT.

And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying: Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven: Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.

Matthew v. 2, 3, 4.

Enunciations, like these, partake of the nature of predictions, as all promises do. The consequences will follow from the premises. Jesus must have foreknown, that the effects would follow from the causes, and under these conditions. Did he not mean to be understood, as though he had said;—I am about to establish a new kingdom, under the name of the kingdom of heaven? But, what mortal man knew or foreknew the conditions of admission into it or its nature? Must all, to enter into this kingdom, be poor in spirit, must they all be mourners? Upon these conditions alone, can they all be blessed? To have said so, without knowing the fact,—would it not have been presumptuous? Or, if the speaker had determined it should be so, without knowing his ability to bless,—would it have been less hazardous?

If a person should exhibit a new seed or plant, the like of which, no body had seen, and should proceed to tell how it should be cultivated, how it would grow, the time it would take to come to maturity, the size shape and quality of the fruit, and

all other particulars, would he be credited without an admission of his knowledge or of a spirit of prophecy? To say, that the poor in spirit shall be blessed, because theirs is the kingdom of heaven, to say, that the mourners shall be blessed, because they shall be comforted, would be unwarrantable, without knowledge, or faith in those who do know these things. A knowledge of a given number of results of this kind, without a promise or a prediction, would only amount to probability that they would continue to come to pass. We are struck with the vast variety in the seeds or germs of vegetables and animals, and the differences between the embryos and the forms in their full developments. Who could anticipate all their changes? Or, who could predict that a pine seed would produce a pine tree, or by seeing trees, could conceive the size and shape of their seeds? These disproportions baffle all conjecture. The elm and the sycamore are striking examples of the want of agreement between the blossoms and the seeds, and the seeds and the trees. Nor, is the apparent difference between poverty of spirit and mourning, and the kingdom of heaven and its comforts less striking. In the latter case, it even amounts to a contrast. In all the metabolia tribes of insects, the changes, in their several transitions and transformations, defy human prescience. The beautiful butterfly was a shapeless mass, wrapped in its webb covering, then a green oval figure, marked with golden spots, but still

wingless. Thus, moral and spiritual existence (if one may so speak) unfolds itself or is transformed, concealing its future characters from all but the divine mind,—the predictions of them being confirmed by experience and observation. In this respect, the natural man understandeth not these things of God, cannot comprehend how the poor in spirit can have the kingdom of heaven, nor how the mourners can be comforted. He cannot see the kingdom of heaven and cannot naturally discern those heavenly things. The divine wisdom of Jesus, then, is manifest in the first part of this discourse on the mount. This was teaching as man could not teach. It was teaching prophetically. To bless the poor in spirit, was to bless those whom mortals curse; to bless the mourners, was to reverse the judgment of the world. This testimony of Jesus was the spirit of prophecy. The king of this kingdom reigns over the poor in spirit. They submit to him, and he protects and blesses them. Happy is that people whose God is the Lord, yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord! In the midst of the conscious feelings of poverty, they are rich in promises and privileges. This kind of evidence, of the truth of the Gospel, is apt to be overlooked, even by its friends. When the text was pronounced, the Church was not formed. No man knew the nature or the plan of its religion. Those people, who had a general expectation, that the Messiah would save his people from their sins,

did not fully comprehend the mode of operation. This teacher, then, taught the first principles of his own religion, from the very outset of his ministry, and also pointed out its consequences. He disclosed the fact, that, what the ignorance and error of the human mind had led man to shun, as the sources of misery, if not as misery itself, were the first steps to the highest happiness. The progress of religious experience, is an evidence of the truth of revelation. The things that are foretold, coming thus to pass, the promises are thus verified. These changes and transitions require time, and give occasion and opportunity for the exercise of faith and patience. The first germs and buds do not show the future product, even in a miniature form. The natural analogy and illustration are to be taken, rather from the metabolia, than from the ametabolia, or from those cases, in which one apparent form is changed for another different, if not opposite. So, many aerial insects are natives of water and others of the earth. Several of the illustrations of the resurrection will also apply to Christian experience. So, in regard to the corn; first, the blade, then the ear, and after that, the full corn in the ear, and yet all dissimilar in appearances. The first and most constant propensity of the mind is, to judge according to appearances, and from first and strongest impressions. The history of the errors and vices of different ages and countries, discloses to the eye of the observer, the effects of these pro-

pensities. The sense of injuries or of wrongs is, generally among the first of our feelings, that is most easily developed; and from its natural acuteness, revenge, which, all have agreed to call sweet, soon follows. Sweet revenge, that is, the pleasure of revenge requires no oracular aid and no example; it springs forth spontaneously. It prevails in its highest degree, among the most savage tribes, and is the last of the passions to be subdued by education and religion. To talk of a kingdom, and to base the happiness of its subjects upon their poverty in spirit, is to bring strange things to the ears of savages, and of men, in whom the savage disposition of revenge is not only not subdued by education, but rendered more subtle by it. The Jews, who were the auditors of this discourse, were looking for a Messiah, to revenge their nation upon its Roman conquerors and masters. Many of them, probably then came to the conclusion, that this teacher came not from God, as the dispositions, he taught, fostered none of their notions of patriotism or heroism. Not only, was the cross a stumbling block, but almost all the sayings of Jesus; they were contrary to all experience among political men. The resurrection was more credible to their minds, than that the poor in spirit should be the blessed subjects of the Messiah's kingdom. "Without controversy, the mystery of godliness is great." Much of what it teaches now, can only be known hereafter. The learner lives and walks by faith, and not by sight.

The confidence of the first disciples must have often been put to the severest tests, while they listened to the discourses of their master. There was great reason that they should be assured, that the spirit of truth should come and lead them into all truth.

But, what are the meaning and import of these terms,—poor in spirit and mourn? When two or more terms or phrases, applicable to the same persons or things, occur in the scriptures, may we not, as a general rule, regard them as nearly synonymous? Now, as we seldom hear these terms repeated, but find the word repentance, where they seem to be called for, may we not infer, that they were used interchangeably with repentance,—that to be poor in spirit and to mourn is to repent, and that to repent is to be poor in spirit and to mourn? Actions may appear very different to the mind, before they are committed, while they are being committed, and after they have been committed. In the two former cases, they may inspire courage and pleasure or joy, and in the latter, fear and grief, or produce poverty in spirit and mourning. There are cases in men's lives, which they cannot think upon, without self-abasement. The hero, the mighty warrior may discover, upon reflection, that he has been fighting against God, and, if he does, will not his courage fail him, will he not be apt to become poor in spirit, in fortitude, and in resolution? May not conscience, in this way, make cowards of us all? But, who can make such a discovery and not mourn over it? Do

we provoke the Lord to jealousy—are we stronger than he? What folly, what madness, to continue fighting against God! "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, for our God is a consuming fire." How strong in spirit, how courageous were those Jews, who, in their misjudged zeal for God, were going about to establish their own righteousness! Prompted by this zeal, they crucified the Lord of Glory! But, mark their poverty in spirit, their mourning, when they were touched to the heart, when Peter charged them with the fact Their courage, their zeal are gone; they cry out, —"Men and brethren, what shall we do?" All men, who seek happiness in sin, in effect, fight against God.

Those painters, who have painted tears flowing, while none of the corresponding muscles of the face, were made to take on the attitudes of weeping, have been justly ridiculed. Mighty and proud and daring spirits never mourn. In the process of true repentance, it must be evident, to any one, familiar with subjects of religious experience and the human system, that there is some physical change, in some way, connected with it. Repentance is, as the scripture expresses it, a heart-breaking operation. The spirit gives way, is impoverished; the strength is gone, the sources of it have failed. Behold! a poor and needy sinner indeed! This poorness in spirit, and mourning, could not long continue, without relief or mitigation; the heart would sink rapidly into despair. Hence, these subjects

are not held up alone, for a length of time, in the Gospel. They that mourn are promised comfort. The happiness of religion is pronounced upon those who seek it, by anticipation; without hope, they would be most wretched. These beatitudes, or modes of extracting real blessedness out of apparent misery, were mysterious to their first hearers, though it is now customary to applaud them as models of plainness and simplicity. They are indeed, plain to him, that hath (this kind of) understanding; but to others, they are as an unknown tongue. Blessedness to the poor in spirit, and from being poor in spirit,—what an enigma! How incomprehensible to the great master spirits of our world! How discordant to the views and habits of wine-bibbers, and alcohol bibbers, who cannot make themselves rich enough in spirit, by the greatest luxury in drinking! The ingenuity of the human mind is exhausted, in endeavors to fortify the mind against fear and sorrow. Oh! this dread of lowness of spirits, this *ennui*, this black melancholy! Heroes are not afraid of death; they laugh at death; but, the bare idea of becoming poor in spirit, strikes terror to their hearts.

The religion of Jesus is true to nature. Health and life are destroyed by misery. In the feeling of enjoyment, in every kind and degree, there must be corresponding modes of animal action, opposite to those which take place in suffering. In all vicious enjoyment, there is naturally a fulness or flow

of spirits. The pleasant, the cheerful, and the gay in all degrees, and the unpleasant, the uncheerful, and the gloomy, do not result from the same mental, moral and physical conditions and emotions. Changes, in the proximate causes, are indicated by the changing feelings. But, happiness in error and sin is not a stock, on which, happiness in truth and virtue can be engrafted. The pleasures of sin must be destroyed, before the pleasures of holiness can be enjoyed. Not only are they opposite, in their objects and their tendencies, but human nature itself cannot endure double and opposite excitements. Too much pleasure becomes pain and ends in disease. The pleasures of vice and of virtue, if they could exist together in the highest degree, would overpower the most robust constitution. But their primary causes are so opposite, that a conflict of desire and volition, would almost immediately ensue. "Be not drunk with wine," which drunkenness is produced by an excess of stimulus, "but be filled with the spirit of grace." But, what resemblance is there between the desire for wine, and the desire for the spirit of grace; or between the means of procuring the one and the other? Both excite agreeable feelings, and both kinds of feelings may terminate in ecstacy, but while the former brutalizes, the latter sanctifies. The experiments have been made, times without number, and under every variety of circumstances, and the results have proved uniform: sinful and religious enjoyments cannot long exsit

together; it is as vain to attempt to unite them, as it is to serve two masters. It is not, as has been argued, physically possible. The sinner, then, who is rich in spirit, must become poor in spirit, before he can be rich in grace; must lose his appetite for sin, before he can have a desire for righteousness, and must die to the former before he can live to the latter.

Poverty in spirit and mourning, do not elevate the feelings but depress them, are not joyous for the present but grievous. Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, not to be repented of. Medicines may be nauseous, yet curative. It would be as disingenuous as vain, to attempt to prove, that it is a pleasure to be poor in spirit and to mourn; for if it were so, how could it be pleasurable to be converted? If the sinner be happy, if the mourner be happy, and if the Christian be happy, conversion or a change of heart, would not imply a change from misery to happiness. And such, indeed, is the view, some do take of conversion. It is the idea of passing from death unto life, which they dislike. The bitter pill of repentance is loathing to their souls. The happiness of the kingdom of heaven, while repentance lies between it and them, they get their own consent to forego. The cases of self-moved volition, to become religious, are rare; the heart feels itself repelled in its first movements. Sinners are to be called to repentance; the subject is to be preached to them; the spirit of truth and

grace must mightily convince them and move their hopes and fears. When, the natural and lawful enjoyments become as sorrowful meat, when tears water the pillow and mingle with food, and the heart grows sick and faint; then religion begins to appear lovely, and is anticipated as sweeter than honey, and more to be desired than fine gold, and the promises of the gospel present the certainty of salvation. Faith comes by hearing the word of God. The words of the text are not expedients: they enter into the plan of salvation; they are principles in the system. The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. He filleth the hungry with good things. Now, the change of feeling and desire are so great as to sustain a change of purpose, and the prospect of success is evident enough, to sustain hope. The love of sin and the habit of sin never generate their contraries. Practice in sin, like all other practices, may be carried to fatigue or exhaustion, and consequently to aversion; but after rest, the same desires will return. The aversion for food, after eating, bears no affinity to a change of heart; nor, does any physical debility, which follows excess or accident. The fatal indigestion, consequent upon gluttony, could it be suspended, would reveal the continued excess of desire for the pleasures of the table. The hearts of old men are not proved to be changed by the imbecility consequent upon age. The old soldier, who shoulders his crutch and shows how fields were won, is not impoverished in

courage, in proportion to his bodily decay. Though nature must be changed, as has been intimated, to a certain degree in its physical affections, yet, the causes, which change the vicious propensities, are mental and moral. Men, who have been intemperate, have become sober and regular in their habits, from rational and moral influences; the appetite did not change itself. The distinction, sometimes made between these causes and religious causes, in order to show the inefficacy of the former, has, in some instances, been injudicious. In fact, religious influence does not succeed unless it conforms to the rational and moral modes.

Whatever tends to destroy any irregular, vicious, or excessive pleasures, does not, at first, produce pleasurable sensations. Vices, which yield pleasure, will, when suspended, leave pain. Every body has heard of the celebrated M. N., the minister of finance in France. This gentleman, a native of Geneva, became an eminent banker in Paris, and, in the eventful movements, which were connected with the French Revolution, was called into the cabinet,—banished,—recalled,—and again, compelled to retire, after having shared royal and popular favor. In his last retirement, he was visited by Mr. Gibbon, the historian. Mr. G.'s description of the fallen minister, taken from his own confessions, represents him as humbled and wretched in the extreme. The historian adds, that if he wanted to cure the ambition of a young aspirant

for fame, he would have presented him M. N. at this crisis. As the popular minister, he wanted only the name of royalty. Behold! the transition through which he had passed! Behold! the misery, consequent upon the abstraction of the highest degree of this kind of pleasurable excitement, which a private citizen could have experienced! One day, at the summit of wealth, power, grandeur and flattery; and the next, a degraded, a banished and an obscure individual! Now, is it possible to conceive, how so much pleasurable emotion could cease, without leaving the heart in a most painful state? If religion, and reason, and volition, had all conspired to effect, what necessity had done, still the transition could not have been passed through, without painful sensations. Religion might have made M. N. happy, after his fall from power; and it is said that it did afford him solace in his retirement: but it could not have gotten him down from such an elevation, without some experience in himself of the state described in the text. Observation has compelled reflecting persons, to be distrustful of what are called sudden conversions, or as they might more properly be called, short repentances. They do not, in general, allow of much time, to realize and identify states and conditions, so as to contradistinguish them. The confessions of opium-eaters, who have disused that powerful narcotic, (not a common case) furnish another proof of the law of feeling, in passing from high excitements to a state,

in which they are abstracted. Over-dosed nature will sink, and sink to a contrast with its former elevation. Immediate transitions, from vicious to virtuous pleasures, have no foundation in nature, and they have none in Scripture. The happiness of religion among sinners, must be preceded by the wormwood and the gall. The spirit must be brought low, and become poor, before it can be raised and enriched by grace.

It is the general opinion, in this country, and is practically operated upon, that church and state ought to be kept separate. Anti-christian politicians earnestly insist upon this separation, as they believe, of course, that there is no truth in the Church. Do Christians conceive that men can be good republicans, without being poor in spirit; or that the poverty of spirit, which prepares them for the kingdom of heaven, unfits them for the duties of the republic? The fact seems to be, that ambition may exist in republics, and in the hearts of their professing Christian members, in a manner, that neither creeds nor constitutions can detect or eradicate. But, the primitive Christians, when persecution was in action, could hold neither Jewish nor Roman offices. They were religiously and civilly proscribed. It seems plain that poverty in spirit has no affinity to ambition, any more than to pride, and that republican ambition may become an impediment of religion. Republicans, who seek the glory that comes from men through the ballot-

box, are wont to glory over the aspirants for royal favor; but can the honor that comes from men, sought through either of these means, be easily kept within bounds which may not rival the honor that comes from God? In a republic, with universal suffrage, the majority of the voters being anti-Christian, would not the Christian, who should canvass for office, find his poverty in spirit put to a severe test? It is, indeed, a favorite maxim, that "the people are honest,"—that they want nothing but light. The religiously disposed candidate, however, should know, how unfairly, truth is matched with falsehood, when party feeling runs high. Who, that understands human nature, and republican parties, and the religion of Jesus, would not be cautious, how, he pronounced the subjects of republican ambition,—Blessed?

Americans, it seems, whether intentionally or not, have decided, that Christianity and our Republicanism are not identical; that, the Lord Jesus, when he pronounced the poor in spirit, blessed, did not mean to confer a divine right to the kingdom of heaven, upon Democratic Republicans. Worldly ambition, however it may be modified, cannot elevate the soul above itself. There are few points, perhaps, on which men of public spirit are more apt to run into error, than this;—when the mind is under the strong influence of this feeling, it is difficult to discriminate self-love, love of country, and love of religion. In truth, in our zeal to keep church

and state separate, we are daily giving our great patriots, passports to heaven, upon the merit of their patriotism alone.

The avaricious, also must not be confounded with the poor in spirit. Avarice generates pleasures, at variance with religious happiness. The desire of riches, like all other desires, increases by gratification, and the pain of privation, as the intenseness of the pleasure of acquirement, The anticipation of happiness originates in want, and want may be real or imaginary. A starving man wants money to buy food; but if he has money, and there is no food to be purchased with it, his hunger would continue without reference to money. To love money, for its own sake, is an imaginary want. But, if a man wants money, for the sake of the means it may procure to sustain life, the money satisfies that immediate want, so soon as the means are procured. But money, when procured for its own sake, relieves not the the desire for more. And if it be confided in as a source of happiness, it becomes an object of idolatry; and hence covetousness is so called, and hence, too, the prohibition,—trust not in uncertain riches. The love of money may become the root of all evil, an all absorbing passion, exercising an entire control over the will, equal to religion. But riches, though loved as a God, may make to themselves wings, and fly from their possessors. But how great and painful must be the vacuum thus left in the heart, or as one speakes, the sinking of the heart!

A change of heart or conversion, is one of the strong points of objection to religion, among unbelievers. And those believers, who refer it to the power of God, gain nothing of them, as they have no more faith in the power of God, than in a change of heart. On what ground, can these unbelievers be met in argument? Can it not be shown, what poor in spirit, is not? Let a man be deprived of all the well-known sources of spirit, and will he not be poor in spirit? Deprive him of all the sources of happiness, and will he not be poor in happiness? Deprive him of all the sources of his courage, and will he not be poor in courage? And, so of confidence, and of hope, and every thing else. Irreligious men may be rich in spirit. Every vice is a substitute for virtue. Every error, a substitute for truth. It has long been a matter of desire, among Missionaries, to find an unsophisticated or uncorrupted people, to whom, they might preach the Gospel. Is not this, like wishing to find some darkest midnight, into which, to carry the light? If physicians ever had a corresponding desire, perhaps, those of them, who have had much experience in epidemic diseases, are pretty well content, for the time to come, to practice among sophisticated patients. Must not the infidel be met upon the position, that moral causes may produce physical changes? Let this be demonstrated. And is it not a demonstrable position? Indeed, it is one of the favorite arguments of unbelievers, that physical causes do produce moral changes. Why not, then,

reverse the rule, and admit, that moral causes may produce physical changes? Mourning, which is usually coupled with weeping,—the tears being the indicative,—cannot be easily understood, without some reference to physical principles. The causes of mourning and weeping may differ, but whether the cause be moral or natural, the tears will not be found to vary materially, in their component parts. The same organs or functions are operated upon, and operate among the mourners in Zion, as upon mourners in other places. Truth may make sorrow come; and the greater the truth, the greater the sorrow. In its highest tones of joy, the heart may be suddenly struck with veritable tidings, of the most painful kind; and the heart may be changed, so as never to recover its tone of joy again. A popular and well-authenticated story, of this kind, is of modern date. It bears, that a certain Frenchman rendered important services, to one of the ministers of the Bourbons, in the late restoration of that dynasty, at the hazard of his life, being encouraged by many and great promises. After the restoration, he waited on the Minister, but instead of receiving the promised rewards, the Minister affected not to know him! It is said, that he was never afterwards seen to smile. The world is full of examples of the powerful and fatal changes of nature, from moral causes. The heart has been thus literally broken. One of the predicted offices of the Messiah was, to heal the broken hearted. There

are cases of conscience, which, nothing but religion can remedy. And, it is remarkable, that the remedy is brought to act through faith. "We have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus, being justified by faith." We have peace and joy, through believing.

Come on now, let us reason together. We have common data. As an unbeliever, you assumed, that natural causes might produce moral changes. We granted your position. Now, in our turn, we assume, moral causes may produce physical changes. How can you deny it? We give you the choice of examples, and only ask the principle. But, if there be no preference, take the following: "Thou fool, this night, shall thy soul be required of thee; and then, whose shall all these things be?" The case is a plain one. There can be no mistake or doubt about it. Well, does the heart remain unmoved? Rather, does not Belshazzar's trembling seize it? What so potent, as promises and threatenings, to move the hopes and fears? "Behold! I bring you good tidings of great joy!" "How beautiful, upon the mountains, are the feet of those, who bring good tidings of good things; who say unto Zion,—behold! thy God reigneth.!" The Providence, and truth, and grace of God, have many ways of reaching the conscience, for sorrow or for joy. The heart may be made to know its own bitterness. The terrors of God may make it afraid. But, there is a voice of sovereign grace:—

"Blessed are they that are poor in spirit, blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted!"

DOCTRINAL PROPOSITIONS.

1. The heart cannot sustain the pleasurable emotions of two opposite excitements, at the same time, in equal degrees.

2. The heart cannot pass from a vicious to a virtuous excitement, immediately, or without a suspension of the pleasurable emotions of vice.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE THIRD.

FREE GRACE.

He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not, with him, also freely give us all things.
Romans, VIII. 32.

The language of the text differs from that of the prophet, who says,—"Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given." The Apostle would not say,—"Unto us a Son has died,"—but,—"delivered up (to death) for us all." God did not spare his own Son from death. Christ died for us. Does the Christian religion differ from all others? And if so, in what does the difference consist? Is it not in this; in all other religions, the sinner gives the sacrifice for sin to God, but in the Christian religion, God gave the sacrifice for sin, for the sinner, and accepted it? This difference was real. In the religion of all nations, there were sin offerings, or sacrifices for sin; and they were all given by the sinners themselves. All nations had their priests, and priests are offerers of sacrifices. This is the nature and design of the priestly office, for every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices. "Wherefore, it was of necessity, that this man (Christ Jesus) should have somewhat, also, to offer." A priest, then, who offers nothing, or has nothing,

to offer, is a contradiction in terms. Every religion had its altars, its victims or sin-offerings, and its high priest, with the subordinate priesthood. And the people, as sinners, gave the sacrifices to the priest, to be offered by them, in behalf of the sinners to God. The Gods of the nations gave no sin-offerings to themselves for sinners. The people were not so taught by the teachers or the poets. But, was not the religion of the law of Moses, so called, that is, the religion of the Old Testament, an exception to the general rule? Did not its teachers teach the people, to believe, that God gives the sacrifice for the sinner? Be it so. But, though the sacrifices under the law, are considered as types and shadows, and although enough is quoted, to prove, that, the sacrifice of God was the substance pointed to; still, the sacrifices were to be furnished by the sinners to the priests, to be offered to God, in their behalf. And, this is the ground of the difference between Judaism and Christianity, or the law of works and the law of faith. The apostolic preaching of Christ crucified, that is sacrificed, was to "the Jews, a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness." Nothing could have been farther from the thoughts of those concerned in procuring and effecting the crucifixion of Christ, than the idea or belief, that they were the instruments of God, who was thus making a sacrifice to himself. The most subtle or inveterate enemy of Christianity, has never made such an insinuation. "The God of our

Fathers," says St. Peter, "hath glorified his Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go; and ye denied the holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof, we are witnesses." The opinions respecting the merits of the legal sacrifices, had become so general and so fixed, among the Jewish Priests and People, that nothing, short of the proof of the merits of the death of Christ, could have satisfied them.—Is it also true, that it is the doctrine of Christianity, that God gave the sacrifice to himself, for sinners? If not, how could the text be true? "He that spared not his Own Son, but delivered him up for us all; how shall he not, with him, freely give us all things?" This is Free Grace. The procuring cause of salvation (so called,) is not in the sinner. Here is the line of separation and the point of departure, between grace and works, or the merit of works. Who gives the sacrifice for sin? If the answer be, God, then it is Grace, Free Grace. If it be the sinner, then it is works, the merit of works. It is true to the letter of Scripture, that God gave the sin-offering for sinners; and not that sinners gave a meritorious sin-offering to God. But is it true to reason; is it possible? How can God be the giver, and the receiver of his own gifts? General laws or principles, it has been assumed, must

be fulfilled or satisfied, and consequently justice. If it were possible to conceive of one of the divine attributes, as more immutable than another, should we not conceive that attribute, to be justice? This surely must be without variableness.

The justice of God, and the laws of God, are commonly, if not always, illustrated, by the friends of the atonement, by references to human justice, or human laws. But are there not important points in which analogy fails? The justice and the moral law of God,—must they not be conceived of, as inseparable from God himself, and not, as in human law-makers, separate and distincts acts? The human law-maker is dead, but his laws live and are in force, in the law-book. But the laws of God are in his immortal mind; if they are written in a book, this is only an edition or transcript of them. They are therefore unrepealable. "If we deny him, he abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself;"—is applicable to the law of God. If we violate it, he abideth faithful; he cannot violate it. Moral laws, in contradistinction to political or circumstantial laws, are not affected, by what is called, the changes of divine dispensations. They are not like the divers washings, of which the Apostle speaks, imposed until the time of reformation. Notwithstanding the prejudice, often met with, against the principle of satisfaction to divine justice, yet, in men, who have no public character, the principle sometimes discloses itself, with striking effect. "And Zaccheus

said, the half of my goods I give unto the poor, and if I have wronged any man, I restore unto him fourfold." This man was a publican, or a farmer of the taxes, that is, he had paid into the Imperial, or Roman Treasury, cash to a certain amount, and was to repay himself, principal and interest, and the expense of collection, out of the difference between the sum assessed and the sum paid, taking all the risk and delays, and odium too, he being a Jew. The temptations and the opportunities of those publicans, to commit extortion, were great. If justice is not near to conscience and character, conscience and character are near being lost. Society never reposes long on injustice. Justice and judgment inhabit the divine throne. Behold! the principle. God redeems sinners from his own justice! But, why not suspend or repeal his law? "He abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself." Justice is one of his divine attributes, and divine law is inherent in it; and when it emanates from justice, the principle never is separate from God, as the human law-book is from dead men. Love may satisfy justice or law; but if it were to destroy it, would it not be an unjust or an unlawful love? Justice must be satisfied with the mode, in which, love supplies its place.

The more carefully we look into the subject of redemption, the more clearly it appears to us, that God must provide the price. Immortal souls!—can they be redeemed with mortal or perishable

treasures? Put these in contrast with the precious blood of Christ,—"as of a lamb, without blemish and without spot, who verily was fore-ordained, before the foundation of the world; but was manifested, in these last times, for you, who, by him, do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope may be in God,"—and, before the justice of God, or the just God, will they not wholly disappear, and leave the undivided merit with this precious blood of Christ? He spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to his justice, the Just for Unjust. "How shall he not, with him, also, freely give us all things?" The idea runs through the Scripture, that the benefits of redemption exceed the pardon of sin, and the restoration of the soul to the divine favor; that treasures of grace are opened by it, which never could have been realized, as mere rewards of personal obedience. "But, God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from wrath through him: for, if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God, by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life; nay, in all these things, we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. Now, unto him, that is able to do exceedingly abundantly, above all that we can ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto

him, be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, through all ages, world without end, Amen!"

When we receive Christ, we shall with him, receive all things, and without money or price, all things, with him, as free grace.

> Oh! to grace, how great a debtor,
> Daily, I'm constrained to be!

Now, the sacrifices, which sinners give to God,—if they could merit pardon for sin, what more could they merit? Would not the question,—how shall he not, for these sacrifices, which we give him, freely give us all things,—be impertinent? Should it not rather be asked,—how can he return any thing for a price so insignificant? Christianity differs from all other religion, not only in the gift of God's own Son, but in the infinity of the free gifts, that are given with him. The proposition and the interrogatory challenge our entire faith, our fullest confidence. How shall he not,—what data have we to infer, what argument to prove, that he will not with him,—also, freely give us all things? Is any other gift, so great, so good, so dear to the Father, so desirable to man, as his own Son? If he spared not his own Son, but delivered him up to a painful and a shameful death, on the cross, to be numbered with the transgressors, how shall he not give any gifts, which cannot suffer? Will he require money or price for any of them, after having spared his own Son?

Faith and many other terms are common to different religious systems, but not always with the same precise meaning. Do those, for instance, who offer sin-offerings to God, have the same objects of faith, as those, who believe, that God gives the sacrifice for the sinner? This, it is evident, cannot be. Among Christians, modes of faith are often found to vary, but, is he to be regarded, as a Scriptural believer, who believes, that the sinner, not God, gives the offering for sin? Does it not behoove those who so believe, to prove to their own conviction, at least, wherein their faith, or the object of it, differs from certain other modes of belief, which claim no affinity to Christianity? Is it not equally important, to settle the question of,—who is the giver, as it is, to determine the quality of the gift? If the sinner believes, that he gives the sacrificial price, must he not believe, that, he himself is the procurer? It is evident, that the difference between the writers of the New Testament, and their opposers, was not,—redemption and no redemption, merely, or,—sacrifice and no sacrifice, merely. St. Paul told the men of Athens, that he perceived, they were too superstitious, for, among their altars, he beheld an altar, inscribed,—TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. So, they had altars, and of course, sacrifices, and on these altars, they offered sacrifices to the Gods.

Is it not strange, that, among the controversies upon the subjects of faith, we should so seldom

meet with formal enunciations of the difference, that must result, from the giver of the sacrifice? For the want of attention to this point, may it not have happened, that there have been disputes, between parties, without any just ground? One creed teaches us to say,—I believe in Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, dead and buried, rose again the third day, ascended into heaven, and so on. But, why not add,—I believe, that God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all; I believe, that, with him, also, he will freely give us all things; I believe that sinners cannot offer to God sin-offerings to merit the pardon of their own sins; I believe that Jesus Christ hath obtained eternal redemption for us? The weakness of faith, so often to be found among believers, may, perhaps, in most instances, be traced to some defect in the creed itself, or its not embracing the counteracting principle of the doubts. One may read books, hear preaching and conversation, and scarcely hear this case of,—who is the giver of the sin-offering,—illustrated. In the division, between Mr. Wesley and Mr. Whitfield, which originated from a sermon of the former on this very text, both seem to have left the question of,—the givers,—out of view; the leading point of dispute being, whether Christ died for all, or only for a part, Those ardent-minded men were so pre-engaged by this question, that they found neither time nor lei-

sure to harmonize other opinions.

It is also probable, that, the rhetorical manner, in which the sufferings and death of the Redeemer have been exhibited, has proved unfavorable to discrimination and precision. Justice, in this mode of preaching, is painted to the imagination, as a vindictive passion, rather than, as a principle or law, analogies to which may be found in the general laws of nature. The celebrity of Mr. Whitfield's discourse, on the offering up of Isaac, is well known. All, no doubt, that tender and sympathetic emotions could effect, was effected by the most pathetic of speakers. But, pathos seems not to have been the Scriptural object. The leading idea, in St. Paul's mind, is the faith of the father in the resurrection. "By faith, he offered him up, being persuaded, that God was able to raise him from the dead, from which, also, he received him, in a figure." It is difficult, to conceive of a case of stronger faith in the resurrection, when taken in connection with the patriarch's faith in the promise,—"In Isaac shall thy seed be called."—for, if he had slain Isaac, the promise could not possibly have been fulfilled, without his resurrection.

We are disposed to consider justice, as we do gravity;—relatively, to the objects of its action. Justice is the general governing principle of society, as gravity is of nature. Now let it be supposed that an edifice, a temple for instance, should by any

means have been demolished, and we shall at once admit, that it cannot be re-edified, without some means to overcome gravity, which acts upon every part of the ruins. We should not, then, hesitate to say, that a fallen building can never be rebuilt, unless the law of gravity is satisfied. No love, on the part of him, who is disposed to rebuild it, could do it, without scaffolding, inclined planes, or mechanical powers. Any person, looking over these ruins, without the aid of science, would say, these materials are too heavy to be raised immediately by human hands. The same ideas prevail in the minds of those, who contemplate the vast structures of antiquity; they cannot forbear the inquiry, by what means those massy blocks and columns could have been raised, not supposing a miracle or the suspension of gravity. But, it is not necessary, to spend a moment in attempting to prove, that justice is the basis of all governments, divine and human. St. John's law of love and law of liberty satisfied justice. One of the main points, on which, all the law and the prophets hang, is,—thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself;—and is not this very like justice itself? What law would require more to satisfy it? Man, in his relations to his Maker and his fellow men, is bound by the principles of justice, which it is the aim of the law-giver to express in laws. If he offends or falls under justice, it punishes him or threatens punishment; for justice cannot immediately change its own nature or mode of

action, without a universal change. One exception to its action destroys equity and becomes partiality. Almighty power works no miracles to suspend justice, though it may suspend gravity, it being a law of matter, and not like justice, an attribute of the divine mind. The just God governs his creatures justly. His love is not partial, not unjust. The Scripture is as express, as words can be, that there is One Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all. To mediate, where justice is concerned, the redemption principle cannot be excluded; without it, there could be no Mediator, no mediation; the transactions become immediate and direct, and no case is involved in which justice is retrospective. Justice never says and unsays, does and undoes, never slumbers or sleeps, in heaven or on earth. One of the great purposes of redemption is, to establish a Church, in which the Mediator is to be head, a Church, which shall be commensurate with the habitable world, a holy Church, in which there shall be none to hurt or destroy. How is this great community, which is to learn war no more, to be governed? How, if not by justice and equity, unless justice is satisfied that it should be governed by some other means? Can it be governed by love, unless justice is satisfied? But, to satisfy justice must not the principle be retained? But the principle of justice is retained in a redeemed Church. This is the name, whereby the Lord of this Church

shall be called.—"The Lord our righteousness,"—"Thy Maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel,"—"The God of the whole earth shall he be called." How could a Church stand, against which violated and unsatisfied justice were continually urged? Could it stand against these accusations, by faith? Faith, in what? In the mercy of God. Is this mercy revealed in the Bible? In this book, mercy and love, and grace and kindness, are all associated with the principles of justice and the fact of redemption. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." The title (as some speak,) to grace, without redemption, would not be clear. After that, the kindness and love of God, our Saviour, appeared. "It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came unto the world, to save sinners." There is mercy, for there is plenteous redemption. If it were permitted to inquire, what is the basis of the holiness of God, should we not come to the conclusion, that it is justice? Is not the idea of the suspension or repeal of a holy law of God, equivalent to the idea of a suspension or a repeal of the holy character or nature of God?

To make the objects of our faith, is human invention in religion. Over the mere act of faith, the will exercises but a limited influence. It is not easy for men to have one object of faith, and believe in another. The object directs and determines

the faith, rather than the faith the object. Now, of the mercy and justice of God, we can know nothing objectively, for the purposes of faith, save by revelation. Even, if we could form clear and distinct perceptions of them, as principles, we have no means but revelation to ascertain, how the divine wisdom has modified them by combination in system. Let the character of the people of these United States, be ever so well appreciated by foreigners, ignorant of our constitution, and what conception, could they have of that instrument? The taking it for granted, that it is based upon freedom, would most probably mislead them. The freedom of all the parties concerned, is among the causes of the complex character of the charter of our liberties, and proved to be among the greatest difficulties, in its formation and adoption.

It is the common desire of all Christians that Christianity should become the universal religion. The fact, that it will become so, is an object of prophecy. But, causes of doubt are daily presented to our minds, in history and in passing events. The gifts, necessary to the accomplishment of the predictions, seem to fail. What church is there, yet, which can convert the inquiry in the text,—"how shall he not, with him, also freely give us all things,"—into an affirmation; or say,—he has given us all things? Probably many zealous Christians do now believe more, and believe more ardently, than some of the primitive

ones did. But, it is not those who have the most light and the greatest number of objects, who always see the best; but, those who have a well-defined object, placed in a proper point of light. A hundred matters of faith and of controversy now exist among Christians, which, perhaps, were not thought of in early times. Our own mind, for years, was occupied with the doctrine of Free Grace. We believed it, defended it, and urged it, with our whole soul, not doubting but that our faith was like St. Paul's, and that of our opponents like St. Paul's opponents: but, we thought not of the distinction, expressed in this discourse; heard no one announce it, so as to fix it in our understanding; or if we read it or heard it preached, or conversed about it, either did not comprehend it, or forgot it. And we are now inclined to suppose, that it is no uncommon thing, among Ministers and Christians, to remain perplexed with modern opinions, without carrying their minds back to the time of the Apostles, and ascertaining what was the general state of sacrifice in the world, up to that period. Can we be mistaken in concluding, that the prevailing opinion among the Jews and the Nations was, that sinners were to give to God, or the Gods, sin-offerings, and that they recognised the principle of redemption?

Now, the question,—what did the Apostles teach these people?—presents itself. Did they teach Jews and Gentiles, that God himself gave the sin-

offering or sacrifice, in the death of his Son, Jesus Christ, upon the cross? Between the Apostles and their hearers, there was no cause of dispute, respecting the fact of sacrifices for sin, but, who gave the sacrifice, God or the sinner. To admit or affirm, that God gave the sacrifice, was to believe or to express the belief. For to those, who were taught, that the sinner gives the sacrifice, this was the great point of unbelief to be overcome. The believing Minister exclaimed,—"God forbid, that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ!" "I am determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." The blood, that flowed from the body of him, who was crucified on this cross, cleanseth from all sin, If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin. God's sacrifice and ours can be united, only upon the belief, that the former does not cleanse from all sin; but, it is enough for all, enough for each, enough for evermore!

Had this difference between Christianity and all other systems of religion, which existed or had existed in the world, been fully understood by philosophical writers, how could they have classed the religion of the New Testament with priest-craft? In thus classing it, they have given evidence that they did not know the nature or the tendency of Christianity. It is well known, that the priests

who ministered at all altars, whether Jewish or or Heathen, took the lead, in all persecutions, against Jesus and his religion. They did not mistake: they anticipated effects and they saw that Christianity would be fatal to their office and to their work; that it would put an end to the altars and the offerings or sacrifices for sin by the sinners themselves. They could not help foreseeing the consequences of,—"Behold! the lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world." One of the complaints against the new religion, was, that the altars were forsaken through its progress, and that the victims for sacrifice were not purchased in the markets. This must needs have been, if the people turned Christians. The Ministers of the Gospel, according to St. Paul's definition, cannot be priests, for they have nothing to offer on the altar, sinners having no sin-offering to bring to them. They cry to sinners not to bring sacrifices, but,—"Ho! every one that thirsteth ,come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money, come, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price." "Seek ye the Lord, while he may be found; call ye upon him, while he is near." "Let the wicked man forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." They cry;—

Jesus, our great High Priest,
Hath full atonement made;
Ye weary spirits rest,
Ye mournful souls be glad:
The year of Jubilee is come,
Return, ye ransomed sinners. home!

It is the circumstance of the offender's being the offerer of the sacrifice, through the Priest, which confers power and influence upon Priests. The offering being committed to them, the pardon is also expected to be returned through them. It is for them to say, whether the sacrifice is accepted, and if not, to show the reason why. The priest, being thus placed between the sinner and the God, obtains a control over conscience, which enables him to exercise an authority, in many instances, absolute. But this system is reversed, under the Gospel; the consequential priest-craft becomes impossible. If ministers of the Gospel exercise power, they must assume it, as politicians; unless indeed, they succeed in so corrupting Christianity, as to claim and maintain a divine right, to offer sin-offerings for the sinners and the right to forgive their sins,—a right and a power which the Apostles, personally and by doctrines, wholly disclaimed, and which is indeed impossible, while God gives the sacrifice. In the present poverty of the church in gifts and graces, should not all examine the ground and foundation of faith? Is it not to be feared, that much of what passes under the name

of faith, is nearly allied to presumption, or a forcing of the mind, to make its acts conform to our wants and wishes? In the progress of the mind from faith to faith, its acts of believing, in several cases, conform to reason. There is a sequence in the operations, which bears an analogy to inference. "How shall he not with him, also freely give us all things?"—is followed by other questions and answers, placed argumentatively, as,—"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?" "It is God that justifieth." This is like a mode of reasoning. He, who believes that he is justified by faith, or that God hath justified him, must infer in his own mind, that he has nothing to fear from any accuser. Again,—"Who is he that condemneth?" "It is Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." The believer comes to this conclusion, that he has nothing to fear from any other tribunal or judge; and he must so reason, after the scripture manner, or force his faith, by the mere efforts of volition, or suffer from a fear of condemnation. So again,—"Who shall separate us from the love of God?" "I am persuaded that, ———— nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." The first questions relate to judgments or legal prosecutions; the second to force or power. "I am persuaded," that no power can forcibly "separate us from the love of

God." St. John comes to the same conclusion. "Ye have overcome them, little children, because greater is he, that is in you, than he, that is the world." This may be called rational faith. The foundation will bear the superstructure. The premises will warrant the inferences, and the causes are adequate to the effects. The Gospel abounds with this kind of ratiocination. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more, shall your heavenly Father give the holy spirit, to them that ask him?" So again, in the argument for trust in providence. "If God so clothe the grass, how much more, will he clothe you, oh ye of little faith!" When truths and facts are given as a basis of our faith, our reason, in its highest exercise, can aid our final confidence. A true logical deduction is identical with an object of faith. We never doubt the truth of an inference, but only the mode of operation, lest some error might have crept into the mind. "How shall he not, with him, also freely give us all things?" Do we admit the premises to be true,—"that God spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all?" Then, the greatness and the freeness of the gift, his Own Son, and the end, for which he gave him, make the conclusion entirely credible or reasonable. The effort or trying to believe, or putting the mind under voluntary compulsion, by refusing to look at the principles, which, in a manner, challenge our faith and shame our doubts, not only

often fails, from revulsion of mind, but may injure the mind itself, and render it more susceptible of error.

It was not, until the Saviour had exhausted argument upon his antagonists, that he upbraided them with their unbelief. "If ye believe not me," says he, "believe the works;—if I had not come and done greater works, than any other man among them, they had not had sin." Their condemnation was, that they loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil; not that they did not try to force themselves to see without light. The great foundation,—truth, is revealed, is made manifest: it claims our confidence, but difficulties, wants, and weaknesses accumulate upon the believer; his faith wavers and grows feeble,—shall he force or compel himself to believe? Will he not thus rather conceal his unbelief, than increase his faith? "Oh, thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?" Did not St. Peter's reason or argument fail him? His request to his Lord, to bid him come unto him, was evidently predicated upon the evidence of the power of Jesus, in his own walking upon the water. The evidence of the fact was good and sufficient; and if the mind of St. Peter had remained steady, his faith would have sustained him, for his conclusion was logical. When Jesus stilled the tempest, they all marvelled, saying,—"What manner of person is this? For even the wind and the sea obey him!" Hav-

ing this evidence of his power over the winds and the waves, would not a future doubt of his power, then, have been unreasonable? But it is true, in many instances, in the course of Christian experience, that the modes of the divine operations are wholly concealed from reason, as well as from sense; but even in such cases, reason may become more abstract. Abraham, in the last resort, rested wholly upon the veracity and power of God, being fully persuaded, that what God had promised, he was able, also, to perform.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE FOURTH.

FAITH IN THE SON OF GOD.

For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.

John iii, 16.

Would the declaration,—God so loved the world, that whoever is born, and lives, and dies, shall not perish, but have everlasting life—be equivalent, or identical in meaning with the text? The difference in the meaning of the word, *so*, in the real and the supposed case, is plain. In the supposed case, the results would be immediate; in the real case, they are mediate. The inference from the text is, that God did not so love the world, as to save it, without the gift of his only begotten son, or without faith in him. Should it be said of a man, that he so loved the beggars that he let not one pass without giving some money, would not this kind of benevolence be questionable? Daily experience in society proves, that immediate benevolence tends in many cases to defeat its own ends, by increasing rather than lessening misery. The eyes of benevolence must not be blindfolded, as those of justice are represented to be. Good men must love the poor, *so* that their gifts may do more good than harm. Can we read a page in the New Testament, about the

love of God, without perceiving that it is not blind to consequences, and that it restrains itself from doing good, when greater evil may come of it? Now, if God so loved the world as to save it immediately, it might be saved without faith; and consequently, without the works, that spring from faith, or the love, by which faith works. Immediate salvation is, unconditional salvation. Faith in a mediator is the condition of salvation, the mediator being an object of faith. The gift of God's only begotten Son, as a mediator, makes salvation conditional; faith, in this case, including alliance or allegiance as well as reliance. We owe our salvation to the mediate gift; and this gift is an intelligent agent, able to command, to direct, to protect, and to punish, as well as to save. Faith is not a mere reliance upon an efficacious or saving cause or principle. And when we are saved, our gratitude is not like the praise of the bridge which carries the passenger safe over. To believe in the only begotten Son of God, is to believe all that he is; the same as, to believe in gold, is to believe that it is gold, and not that it is silver or copper or lead much less that it is stone or earth. The volition and the attributes or the great object of gospel or saving faith, are apt to become indistinct and faith in him to become more like faith in things, than in a person. If the only begotten Son of God be not a saviour only, but a law giver and a judge, and faith in him is restricted to his saving power, it is not complete and so may expose us to error and

danger. We may be in a condition to need the commanding authority of a head, to direct us; but if we had no faith in such authority, it will not act upon us. Who can be ignorant, when under a temptation to disobey, how necessary it becomes to sustain obedience, to bring the authority of commend fully to bear upon the will, and how unbelief undermines such authority? We may need protecting power; but if we have no faith in such a power, in the time of danger our courage must fail us. There are contracted views and notions of Christianity. Certain persons seem to suppose, that to be Christians, is to live like beggars upon the divine bounty, or by a kind of hand-to-mouth manner; but Christianity is constituted into a church or kingdom, of which the only begotten Son of God is King. In such a relation, faith goes much further than—"God, be merciful to me a sinner!" God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.

Faith in benevolence or love, in any case, divine or human, may be indistinct or indeterminate, and furnish no clue to practice. The love of God manifests itself, (so to speak) intelligibly, in the gift of his Son. "The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory, as of the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and truth." The love of God, in the gift of his Son, acquires a mental and moral character; it thinks and speaks, it wills and acts,—God mani-

fested in the flesh. The love of God,—"God manifested in the flesh!" Sinful human nature is exalted to goodness and greatness, by faith in Jesus Christ. "We have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father! And the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." The privileges of Christians are represented in Scripture, as very great. Believers are called to glory and to virtue. Precious and exceeding great promises are given unto them, that through these, they might become partakers of the divine nature. The graces of the Holy Spirit are all included, in this eternal life, which is through faith. Is it not strange, while the Scriptures seem to evince the poverty and insufficiency of human language, to express the honor and glory and blessedness which believers receive, through the gift of God's love, that the gift himself should be described by certain persons as no greater nor better than a man; and they should so hold out the opinion, that, whosoever, believeth that the unspeakable gift of God, is but a mere man, that he is not even superhuman or angelical, shall not perish but have everlasting life? Do the temptation and the danger of unbelief, then, consist in leading the mind, to believe too much, instead of the opposite extreme? If so, why did the Jews regard it as an unpardonable offence in Jesus, that, according

to their own understanding of his meaning, he made himself to be the Son of God? The Jews said unto him;—"How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered: The works that I do in my father's name, they bear witness of me. My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand. My father, who gave them to me, is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of his hand. I and my Father are one. The Jews answered him, saying; For a good work, stone we thee not, but for blasphemy, and because, that, thou being a man, makest thyself God." Again;—"What think ye of Christ, whose Son is he? They say unto him, David's. But if David calleth him Lord, how then is he his Son?" This question confounded the Jews. The happiness and glory of the believers, is made to consist in their nearness to Christ, and conformity to him. "That, where I am, (says he) my servants may be also, that they may behold my glory." "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence, we look for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like unto his glorious body." "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." The intention in Scripture language, is to extol the Lamb of God, the all-atoning lamb; to magnify his person and his office;

and not to bring them down to a low and human standard, or to show (as some speak) that the Son of Mary was a good man, or to exhort men to believe in him, because he is a good man, that is, not a bad man. It seems, indeed, that it requires no great effort, even for infidels, to believe so much at intervals!

As those, who incline to advocate the immediate love of God, generally rely upon St. John, as their chief authority, we will give his own words in his first epistle. "He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love. In this, was manifest the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein, is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." This shows, that the conception of the love of God, in the mind of the Apostle, was not an abstract idea of benevolence. He did not conceive, that God so loved the world, as to save sinners in their sins; which would be the same, in effect, as to save them in their unbelief. He has said that the whole world lieth in wickedness, and of course, that it could not be the object of God's complacency, but, at most, of his pity and compassion. This love of compassion manifested itself, in devising and providing means, by which, to save sinners from perishing and to put them in possession of everlasting life. What was the plan? It was to give his only begotten Son, as an object

of faith or trust, and of allegiance, to be confided in and obeyed. To have given him, as an object of obedience only, and not of trust; it would have been necessary to have given him power to compel obedience. But faith refers religion to the mind and to the will or heart. It is well said, that faith is influenced, by evidence or testimony. It is unreasonable, to require men to believe, without some evidence of the kind, the nature of the case admits of. Had no evidence or testimony been given of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead, how could faith in it as a fact, have been required? To believe, without testimony, is an act of little mental or moral value. Men who believe in ignorance, or from deception, or from compulsion, without any evidence, do not believe, after the manner, which the Gospel requires him to believe. "We have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. We are his witnesses." The Apostles did indeed preach, exhort, and persuade men to believe, but they did so, because they were witnesses, and had borne testimony to the facts or truths, they preached. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think, ye have eternal life, and they are they, that testify of me." The argument drawn from the agreement between the prophecy of Isaiah and the crucifixion, turns upon the testimony of the witnesses of the crucifixion. A mere gratuitous assumption of the case, by a preacher, would be of no account. To believe that

God gave his only begotten son and to believe in Him, requires action, and admits of a high degree of it. The manner of the Apostles, was to secure a rational belief, that Jesus was the Son of God: and, if by any means, this faith became separated from obedience, in theory or practice, to demonstrate that such a separation, or faith alone without obedience, was not according to the plan of salvation by faith. Hence, the seeming contradictions between the opposing of works and the opposing of faith without works. If the same person be alluded to, he is supposed to be in two different states of mind. The first argument is to gain the mind; and the second to gain the will. On these two points, much apprehension is common. To exhort men to practice or to action, while we have reason to think that they err in judgment, may prove worse than useless; it may confirm them in error. When a man is known to be on a wrong track, he is not encouraged to quicken his steps. The first attempt, is to induce him to stop, then, to convince him he is on a wrong course, and the next, to set him right.

St. Paul said,—"I bear my countrymen record, that they have a zeal of God, not according to knowledge; for they being ignorant of God's righteousness, are going about to establish their own righteousness." Logic is the proper way, to bring truth to bear upon the mind. To believe the truth, we must know the truth; to believe the fact, we must know the fact. God did not give his Son to conquer men, by

force, against their wills, and so compel them to obey. But, there have been religious warriors and conquerors, who have forced men by the power or terror of their arms, both to believe and to obey, to believe their creeds and to obey their laws; and the sincerity of many of their converts has been well tested. It it not necessary to the sincerity of a man's religion, that he should be reasoned into it. Those who come to the conclusion, that none but the converts of reason are sincere, assume their own premises, without attending to facts. He must know little of human nature, who makes fear to be only a cause, or an effect, or an associate of hypocrisy. It may prove a master passion, which swallows up the rest. The terrifying aspects of ecclesiastical power, are not like occasional gleams and flashes of lightning; but, like a bright, blazing meteor, forever above the horizon.

The New Testament is the most argumentative of all books. It found the world as full of error as of sin. It could not advance a step, without setting wrong-headed men right. The men who were looking and waiting most anxiously for the Messiah, wanted not a Messiah, as an object of faith but of sense. The flashes of his falchion, and not the light of his truth, would have met their anticipations. In the public disputations with Jesus, nothing could have been more perplexing to the Jews, than his answers and arguments. "Now we know thou hast a devil," said they, "why hear ye him?"

The religion of the ancient nations has been transmitted to us, by the poets and the philosophers. The former exhibit the religion of the people, according to their sculptures and paintings; the latter, the religion of the mind or thought, which could not be wholly embodied in imagery, and is called by certain men, the sublime speculations of the philosophers. It is remarkable, that the writings of the priests, or the theological works, in their original form, have not come down to our time. Could it have been, that they were not circulated, among the people, and that they perished in the sanctuaries of the temples? The poems of Homer have been called the Bible of the Greeks, and every antiquarian knows, how nearly the religious descriptions in them agree with ancient sculpture. But, nothing in the poets or the philosophers, is to be found answering to the living gift of divine love, and faith in him, as the medium of everlasting life. According to the mythologists or their theogonies, the gods were not deficient in offspring, but none of their sons or daughters brought life and immortality to light. No one could be relied on, as the saviour of the soul from sin, no one could be followed through the regeneration.

The human mind is so constituted, that the name or existence of a person, when announced to it, gives rise to a train of biographical ideas; but experience teaches us, that these spontaneous ideas are not trustworthy, and we seek for actual descrip-

tion. The incarnations of the gods, in mythology, are evidently allegorical. Now the question,—how did God give his only begotten Son?—can only be solved, by a reference to the four writers of his birth, life and death. They all agree, that he gave him to poverty, and they explain how this fact came to pass. The house of David, by a series of conquests and revolutions, had fallen into great obscurity. It was the interest of conquerors to humble a house, which once stood high; and it should seem, that for a long time, no very distinguished man had appeared in the line of succession. And finally, the title to the throne of David and Solomon, was found in an heiress, who was espoused according to ancient usage, to the heir in the nearest lateral branch. This heiress of the house of David, was Mary, the mother of Jesus. When the Scripture speaks of the poverty of this family, it means, as kings and queens, or princes and princesses. As a prince of Judah, as a branch sprung from the stem of Jesse, as the seed of David according to the flesh, Jesus was poor; but the family property in Bethlehem, was assessed by the Roman assessors, in the name of his mother. We have seen poor, conquered or exiled kings, in our own day. It appears, that Joseph and Mary did not reside in Bethlehem, though their title to their patrimonial inheritance was not invalidated or overlooked, even by the Romans. But, no evidence of affluence appears in the family, while they resided at Nazareth. Enough

is known of the jealousy of the tributary king Herod and his family, and of the vigilance of the Emperors to render it probable, that the only safety of the house of David was in its obscurity. But so it was, by his own showing, the descendant of so many illustrious ancestors had not where to lay his head, during that ministry, in which he went about doing and teaching good.

The absence of all wealth and power and grandeur, was equally remarkable among his chosen and confidential friends: they were all selected by him from the retired walks of life, and while they conferred no honor upon their Lord, waked up no suspicion in the bosom of ambition. When the youngest son of Jesse offered to accept the challenge of the uncircumcised Philistine, who had defied the armies of the living God, to remove all surprise and distrust he referred to his youthful exploits;—"Thy servant," said he to the King, "slew a lion and a bear." The young Jesus of Nazareth had given no such evidence of his prowess; he was not a shepherd, but his early life was employed in the arts. Thus, verifying the language of the prophet;—"As a root out of dry ground, he hath no form, nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we shall desire him." Not indeed, that his youth passed away wholly without notice. At the age of twelve, he surprised the doctors with his precocious knowledge of the law. And when in the course of his public ministry, occasion

called for any display of his power, the people were ready to make him a king, fearless of the consequences from their mighty conquerors; thus showing how strongly they were disposed to regard the promised Messiah, as their temporal deliverer. The relative condition of Jesus to the Sanhedrim and to the Imperial Authority, is one of the most interesting circumstances of his life and ministry. If he did not act the King, the Sanhedrim would not own him as the Messiah; if he did, the Imperial legions would be set in array against him. How eventful, and yet, how apparently natural were the results of his selected alternative! "Art thou a King, then? said Pilate. Jesus answered, Thou hast said. Shall I crucify your King? said Pilate to the Jews. The Jews said, we have no King but Caesar." "And Pilate wrote this inscription on the cross in three languages: *Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.*" St. Paul says, that Jesus witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate. But the Jews, who wanted a king to deliver them from Caesar, acknowledged Caesar as their King. What a confession! Taking all the circumstances into consideration which led to the crucifixion, together with the three years instruction given by Jesus and his disciples, it will be perceived that every page furnishes internal evidence of their fidelity and identity. To no other person and to no other cause, can they have any application. The whole, taken separately or combined,

is faith-producing; is, as is well said, "written that ye might believe,"—that is, written evidence. A biography much more splendid, might have furnished less evidence of the declaration:—"That, as Moses lifted up the serpent, in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." Should an inquiry be made, what certain texts prove?—the answer might be, that Christ died for us; that God gave his only begotten Son to die for us; that he was lifted up upon the cross as Moses lifted up the serpent; that he died upon the cross. This event was constantly in the mind of Jesus. He knew all the causes which would have defeated this purpose. To have acted the King, to have chosen servants to fight, and to have conquered, would only have produced a kingdom of this world, in this world. And in that case more evidence would have been required to prove that the end would be everlasting life, than is now required, to prove the whole gospel.

It is not enough to say that religion offers no worldly motives; if it has them, men may take them. Jesus not only offered no worldly motives, but he had none to offer. Even his miracles could not often have been repeated, without a liability to perversion in worldly minds. To want every thing in this world, and to believe that we shall have every thing in the world to come, may become a motive to a worldly-minded man, in the ardor of battle, to meet death with he-

roism. So, no doubt, many a carnal hearted Jew, had he been permitted, would have fought for Jesus as others did fight for the temple in its final overthrow. But to fight the good fight of faith so as to lay hold on eternal life, we must avoid the stimulus of carnal dispositions as much as the use of carnal weapons. St. Paul, whose aim and effort were to attain eternal life, by the resurrection of the dead, calculated upon a fellowship with the sufferings of Christ and being made conformable to his death.

The common objection against salvation by faith, that faith is not under the control of the will, that it is not in the power of man, to believe what he pleases, has no application to this text. The love of God here, is not a general or an indefinite proposition; its mode of operation is defined. How does God love the world? *So*, and not any or every how. Presumption and despair require preventives and remedies. Presumption is common to the most of men. Despair is the more frequent besetment of the modest, the diffident and the sincere. The men, who are prone to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think, may naturally enough presume that God thinks as highly of them, as they do of themselves. Such men want no condition or criterion or standard, for the communication of favors from God or men. Gifts to them, are rather matters of pride than of humility. They would lay God under an obligation to give,

rather than themselves to receive. Men, so presumptious and proud, must be humbled; and they cannot be so effectually humbled as by faith in the Son of God, as his gift, and as an object of faith. What humbling views must they have of themselves, and of their sins, who believe that they must have perished, without this unspeakable gift of God!

> Was it for crimes, that I have done,
> He groaned upon the tree?
> Amazing pity, grace unknown,
> And love beyond degree!

If the greatness of the danger, and the greatness ef the difficulty of the rescue from it, may be estimated by the greatness of the means provided, surely the danger of the sinner and the difficulty of his salvation must have been great indeed. Oh, presumptuous mortal!—to think you merit the love of God, to think that God delights in you!—Why, he pities you, he has compassion upon you, he is merciful, and gracious, and long-suffering. You are perishing in your sins, and he is not willing you should perish; but rather, that you should come to the knowledge of the truth and live. It is, because his compassion fails not, that you are not consumed. You say you cannot believe, that God gave his only begotten Son; and why can you not believe it? Is it because, that God is too good, or that you suppose, you are too good? You are a great believ-

er in the love of God; you boast, you glory in this faith; and you censure and reproach others, for believing that God is not love, and does not love you! Is it, then, no evidence of the love of God, that he gave his only begotten son? Mistaken man! The cause of your unbelief is in yourself. You are too good in your own estimation, to believe. You have such an exalted conception of your own goodness, that you cannot conceive, how it is possible, that you are in danger of perishing. What! Can I, who have done so much, be in danger of perishing; be a subject of the pity and not the favor of God? This is the reason, why you cannot believe. Let those, who say they cannot believe, place themselves upon the list of sinners, who have come short of the glory of God. Regard yourselves, oh, fellow men! as children of wrath; conceive that the wrath of God abides upon you, that the sentence of death is denounced upon you, that you deserve to be punished with rebellious spirits; and you can then believe, that God loves you *so*, as to give a ransom for your poor, sinful, and guilty souls. This is Scriptural reasoning,—"For scarcely, for a righteous man, will one die; yet, peradventure, for a good man, some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Greater love, hath no man, than this, that he lays down his life for his friend." Your doubts, you must see, all proceed upon the supposition, that you are righteous,

that you are good men, that you are friends to God, and have been so always. The idea of the pity of God shames you; and the gift of his only begotten Son, as the proof and the measure of that pity, confounds and bewilders you. If the men, who have not been convinced of sin, who have not repented, into whose heart the thought has never entered to change their habits of life and to become renewed in the spirit of their mind,—if they have any notion of God, it is, that he loves them, because they are worthy of his love! Being the first and dearest objects of their own self love, how can they cherish the idea that they are objects of pity? Oh, how many self-deceived and deluded creatures are wrapped up and blind folded in self righteousness! Too good in their own esteem for the pity of God, too good to need any means of salvation which that pity provides, they are too good to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ!

But, to desponding souls, on the contrary, these tidings of the gift of God's dear Son, seem too good to be true. They are disposed to think, that they are too unworthy to be subjects even of the pity of the Lord, much less of his favor. Humbled and self-abased sinners write bitter things against themselves; they are slow of heart to believe themselves, to be included among those to whom the promises are offered. They look only at the dark side, or rather, see only themselves and their own unworthiness; and finding no sources of comfort in them-

selves, they become real mourners. In cases of true repentance, when the conscience is over-burdened with guilt, all hope, all comfort comes from salvation by grace, through faith. The Mediator is to be the Alpha and Omega; the All in All. Despairing sinners must be made to hear the love of God in Christ Jesus. "Whosoever believeth in him," —not excepting the desponding, the dejected creatures, who have pronounced sentence of condemnation upon themselves;—"Whosoever believeth," —not worketh, not sacrificeth, not seeks to pay a redemption price, not merits salvation, but believeth, trusteth in the merits of the death and resurrection of the only begotten Son of God, relieth upon him as able to save unto the uttermost, all who come unto God through him,—"shall not perish, but have everlasting life." Words cannot express the sense of unworthiness, under which the heart sinks before God, when it is probed and penetrated by the all-searching spirit of truth. But in love, in pity to a world of sinners, not one of whom can redeem his own soul, or the soul of his brother, God gave his Son to bleed and die; and thus, through the veil of his flesh, to open a new and living way to himself, for us. Faith is the appropriating principle. It is to the mind, analagous to what mordants (so called) are to certain coloring matter and to cloths. It takes hold of the promise, and unites it and the mind. We cannot enjoy or use promises, unless we believe them. All promised grace and

power are lost upon unbelievers, as they cannot be forced upon the mind, nor can the mind be forced to accept them, while the principle of faith in the system or plan of salvation, is rejected. The Scripture pronounces, that unbelief, when the testimony of God is concerned, makes God a liar. God says, —he gave. Unbelief says,—he did not. This is a fearful issue for the unbeliever. And were it possible for him to receive a benefit, while he denies the veracity of the promiser, it would involve strange consequences. "If ye believe not, that I am He, ye shall die in your sins; and whither I go, ye cannot come." We trust, we have now demonstrated, that a religion without faith, could not be rational or intellectual. Religion is not an inherent part of ourselves, not like our passions and appetites. We must be led or guided into religion by the truth, or be deceived into it, or be compelled into it. The plain and obvious course is, to believe the truth.—All use for artifice and force will thus at once be superseded This is the divine plan. All things are possible to him who believeth,—all obstructions are thus removed from the mind, and none exist any where else, which come not within the control of the promised grace.

Let us honor the Son, as we honor the Father, by believing in him. "Ye believe in God, believe also in me." "In my Father's house, there are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you." Did the Father love us? The Son

also loved us, and gave himself for us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood. Let us love him also, because he first loved us. Let us honor the Son, as we honor the Father, with our gratitude and our obedience.

Faith is said to be imputed for righteousness.—For what, saith the scripture? Abraham believed God and it was accounted unto him, for righteousness. The faith was not Abraham, nor righteousness, in itself; but it was like the colorless mordant to the cloth and to the dye. "Now, to him, that worketh, is the reward, not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth in him, that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." The work must be be reckoned of debt, or be due, that is, by a rule of justice. The debtor owed so much, and has paid so much. To believe on him who justifieth the ungodly, tranfers or attributes all the justifying merit to the object of faith, both from the faith itself and from the believer, and hence, it is reckoned of grace. When any thing is said, to receive a reward of grace, is it not plain, that the term, reward, in its proper sense, is neutralized, or that a contradiction in terms must be involved? An ungodly person believes in him who justifies the ungodly, that is, saves him from the consequences of his ungodliness, one of which is condemnation. He is now a pardoned sinner, and in the enjoyment of all the present blessings of adoption. He knows in whom

he has believed. What is now his estimate of his own faith? Must it not be, that the reward is reckoned of grace, not of debt; or that the faith did not merit pardon or any of the consequences? And that, if it has pleased God to count it for righteousness, this is still but a further display of his grace. The manner, in which grace and faith are uniformly coupled or associated together, shows plainly, that the text corresponds with these principles, and that it is the only begotten Son of God, who merits the everlasting life, for every one, that believeth. Faith receives gifts. The mind of the believer is conscious, that it needs them, not that it deserves them. What is presumed to be deserved, is claimed not accepted, as a gift.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE FIFTH.

GOSPEL REPENTANCE.

Him hath God exalted with his own right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins.

Acts v. 31.

The Lord Jesus Christ commanded his Apostles to begin their ministry, by preaching repentance, not in the loose and general acceptation of the word, but the repentance which he would give. The matters or subjects of the gospel may have names, in certain instances, in common with other matters or subjects; and yet, the former may differ from the latter, in several points, and also in origin.—Saviour, for instance, among the Greeks, was a name or title common to their patriotic heroes who defended or delivered their country; but it is applied to the Messiah, as the Saviour from sin. The making of a new nomenclature is not only difficult, bnt it is still more difficult to make the people understand it, when it is made. It is found, that when a system of new names is introduced into a science, it gives rise to two languages, the one of the learned, the other of the unlearned. Such a consequence, in the beginning of the Christian church, would have been attended with great in-

convenience. It was much easier to qualify the meaning of old terms. There was repentance before Christ came, and there was repentance after he came which he did not give; but that which he did give, after he was exalted, had resemblance enough to the others, to authorize the common name. The Greek word Μετάνοια, which is translated by, repentance, is compounded of the preposition, Μετᾶ, *after*, which in composition, means *change*, and the substantive Νοῦς, *thought*, *mind*, so that the proper signification of the term is, *change of mind*, *after-thought*. The Latin translation of the original is RESIPISCERE *to return to a right understanding, to come to one's senses again;* and also, PŒNITERE *to cause remorse or repentance.* Hence PŒNITET *it repents, grieves, vexes or troubles*, and PŒNITENTIA *repentance or after-sorrow.* We derive our English word, repentance, from the Latin one; and the word, penance, is also derived from the Latin. Hence, it has become a usage, to call one who repents, a penitent; and hence also, the idea or opinion of many persons, that repentance means punishment, from the Latin noun PŒNA, penalty, as though repentance was a penalty. And to carry out the idea, we find the term used, to do penance, that is, to punish one's self. There are spiritual instructors and guides who teach and direct persons, to repent in this sense, that is to do penance; and when they have done the penance they are directed to do, and make

known the facts to the guides or directors of their consciences, their pardon is confirmed. Is it not evident that this is not the sense nor the substance of the repentance, which is given by the Lord Jesus Christ? The repentance, which he gives, is not penalty or punishment; nor does he direct sinners to punish themselves, with a view to obtain the pardon or the forgiveness of their sins. He gives change of mind, after-mind or after-thought, reflection or power to reflect upon the causes, the nature, and the effects of sin, not as a punishment for sin but to prepare the mind to receive its forgiveness. Now, the idea of meriting pardon or forgiveness of sins, comes from the belief of the merit of self-inflicted punishment. And, almost all the confusion of language in books and in pulpits, about meriting salvation, originated in the mistaken notion about repentance meaning the same, as *penalty, or punishment self-inflicted.* But the repentance which Jesus Christ gives, is called, by way of distinction, Evangelical Repentance, and also, the Grace of Repentance. So far is it, from being Pœna or penalty, that it is an evidence and a token or proof of the pity of God, showing that he is not willing that we should perish. Repentance, then, is not given as an expression of the wrath, but of the compassion of God. Let not the sinner, therefore, when he cries,—God be merciful to me a sinner!—conceive that he is making an atonement for his sins, by his sorrows for them.

These definitions and remarks prepare the way for the discussion of two disputed points. First,—is repentance a gift or grace of God? Secondly,—how is it given? With or without means?—Or in another form, is this grace of repentance resistible or irresistible? A great deal has been written about the power of men to repent. Two great parties take different sides upon the subject. It becomes necessary, therefore, to weigh well the meaning and bearing of all the terms and arguments. To say that this Exalted Prince gives repentance, would call forth from certain persons an enquiry,—whether it is meant that men cannot repent, and if so, how they are to blame if they do not repent? To say that men can repent if they will, on the other side, would call forth the enquiry,—whether it be meant that men can save themselves? It is desirable, if possible, so to speak on these points as to avoid occasions of these kinds. To conceive, that God does a thing immediately or without means, or irresistibly, or that grace acts irresistibly, does not seem to us to differ from a miracle. A miracle, as we conceive, is an immediate act or an act done without means, and irresistible. Jesus Christ has power to work miracles, and of course to give repentance miraculously; in other words, the Spirit of God may produce repentance without means or irresistibly. We do not see how the possibility of irresistible grace, or of the immediate operations of the Spirit of God upon the human heart, can be de-

nied without denying miracles. But, the question of fact is different. To resolve it, the evidences must be facts. Was this man awakened, was he convinced of sin and brought to true repentance by the immediate operations of the spirit of God, or irresistibly, or without any means? The question is not now a question of possibility, but of fact. And of the instances of repentance which pass under examination, will not the greater proportion of them be found to have been effected by means, and so, of course, not to have been miraculous? We do not associate miracles and means in our minds; but hold, that where the one begins the other ends. If repentance is given mediately,—or by and through means, it may be conceived to be given resistibly; but it may be conceived of as a gift, whether it be given miraculously or by means, whether resistibly or irresistibly, for in either case, the gift-principle is not affected any more than it is by the refusal to accept or by the throwing away of the thing given. We may believe in miraculous repentances, but the number of them who shall determine? Now, if it could be proved, that they are and must be all miraculous, must not means be excluded altogether? The same consequences must follow, if it shall be assumed that all repentance is given irresistibly.

There is one fact, however, in which it should seem, that there can be but little difference of opinion among those who have means of observation, namely, that where the gospel means of repentance

are not to be found, there are few, if any examples of Gospel Repentance. And yet, if repentance be all and always miraculous and irresistible, can any sufficient reason be given, why it should not be as common, where there are no means as where there are means? Means were used, to give repentance to the Jews. The repentance of that blasphemous and injurious persecutor, Saul of Tarsus, can hardly be considered as wholly effected by irresistible grace, or the immediate agency of the Spirit of God alone. "I was not," he afterwards said, "disobedient to the heavenly vision." Does he not seem to imply the possibility of such disobedience? Men, who follow the impulses of their passions and prejudices and their appetites, are thoughtless creatures save in matters and things pertaining to them. By indulging in habits of excess, they become desperately averse from repentance. The power of reflection is almost obliterated from their minds. They sink down into an earthly, sensual and devilish state, and give themselves up to despair of any thing greater or better. Those countries, which have sunk under their own vicious excesses, have generally sunk into barbarism. Society becomes unable to redeem itself, from the effects of social depravity. This imbecility indicates, that repentance is not a natural consequence of sin, or a result of any necessary reaction; but that the proneness of individual and social bodies in vice is from bad to worse. The Jewish people were filling up the measure of their

depravity. Their Priesthood was hastening to its crisis; but before the dissolution of the old system, the foundation of the new one was laid. Christian churches were organized and christianity was carried into effect, without any retaliation upon the persecuting Sanhedrim, or without interrupting the authority of the Proconsuls of the Province. The crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and the Pentecost gave no cause of alarm to the Emperors. The Roman historians indicate enough to prove, that a a war of extermination against the Jews would have followed from their measures, if Christianity had not existed. The disciples of Jesus are not once mentioned among the insurgents; their Master had indeed warned them carefully not to involve themselves in the fatal conflict, but to escape from the devoted city.

Thus, the Prince, whose kingdom was not of this world,—was neither Jewish nor Roman, was preparing the way to give repentance; while the thoughts and designs of wretched men were bent on wars the most bloody and destructive. He taught his ministers to inculcate lessons of reflection, and to make foolish minds wise ones. Oh, that men were wise! Oh, that they would consider their latter end! Moses, with all his wishes, could not give the change of mind or after-thought. This was the gift of Him by whom came grace and truth, of the Prince of Life, the Exalted to the right hand of Majesty on High. All the sayings, the maxims, the precepts, and the

doctrines of the Lord Jesus were calculated as so many means, to produce this after-thought, this reflection or repentance unto life. But teaching alone cannot give it; the Spirit of Grace must co-operate with the means. The Apostles preached repentance, so as to make their preaching the means of it; they directed their discourses to this end, to furnish matter for reflection and motives to induce the mind to review the past and its consequences; and they preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven. Grace carried truth to the hearts of their hearers. The author and finisher of faith gave repentance, gave the humble and the contrite heart which trembled at the word of the Lord.

The common definition of repentance is, to be sorry for sin and to forsake it. But, the possibility of becoming sorry for that which we love, has not it seems been fully proved. Sin must be hated, to become a cause of sorrow. Now, this Exalted Prince gives a hatred for sin. How unlovely, how hateful is sin made to appear by the holy, harmless, and undefiled Prince and Saviour! The converging and steady light which is directed from every part of the New Testament upon sin, upon the sinful heart, shows its whole deformity. "Sin, by the commandment, becomes exceeding sinful," —for it sets the commandment at defiance. Repentance is an agitated, troubled, and conflicting state. "Oh! wretched man, that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" It is, as

a Prince, that Jesus gives repentance. He reigns he has all power in heaven and on earth. "I have set my king upon my holy hill, Zion. I will declare the decree. Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Be wise, therefore; kiss the Son, lest he be angry with thee, and thou perish from the way." There is power and authority and majesty in this giver of repentance. "The Father hath committed all judgement unto the Son; that all men might honor the son, as they honor the Father." Behold! how the Apostle to the Gentiles sets forth this matter. "But now he commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day, in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by this man whom he hath ordained; whereof, he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."—"We must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." "And I saw the dead, both small and great, stand before God!" He, who gives the awful subjects of death, judgment, and eternity, gives the elements of the causes of repentance to sinners against their own souls; to sinners, who have treasured up wrath against the day of wrath, and the revelation of the righteous judgment of God. There is not a principle which appertains to repentance, which is not given in the Word, or by the Spirit of the Lord, the Prince and Saviour.

But, a definition of experience in the repenting state is rendered difficult and almost impracticable,

by associations between the feelings and the different and varying theories. Those persons, who are taught to regard repentance as self-punishment and good works as vicarious and meritorious, experience emotions and sentiments in conformity to their opinions, Every variation in men's creeds will cause some variation in their experience. Certain persons assure us from their own experience, that there is a feeling of enmity and hatred against God, so strong as to dispose the mind to dethrone him, if it were possible. Of their sincerity in this belief, there need be no doubt. The only question is, whether this kind and degree of feeling is necessary o true repentance in every man. We think that it is not; but that it proceeds from a peculiar system of doctrine. Feelings conform to the previous belief, more readily perhaps than the belief does to the previous feelings. Most of the religious forms and ceremonies and the degrees of importance attached to them will have an influence upon the feelings, in this transition state, if repentance may be so called. And it is possible, that some allowance should be made in several of the most remarkable examples, which are mentioned in times of persecution. In these dark and cruel periods it is very difficult to keep the mind balanced and steady. Legal repentance, as it is called, is apt to be regarded as exceptionable, as too formal and defective, in a state of deep feeling. Those persons, who pay great attention to the feelings and lay the chief

stress upon them, are inclined to allegorize their inward emotions. They sometimes compare repentance to the travels of the children of Israel through the deserts of Arabia, and sometimes to the opening of the seals in the revelations and to other figurative representations. We may make a statement of those points which seem to be common to all, or to which there are fewest known exceptions;—1. Fear. 2. Shame. 3. A sense of ingratitude. 4. Painful feelings of humility and unworthiness. 5. All mingled with a greater or less degree of guilt or self-condemnation, or sense of divine displeasure.—Others add despair, but this though it often obtains for a time seems to be accidental, depending in part upon want of information or wrong instruction. The fear of hell or future punishment need not strongly or constantly predominate. A willingness to be damned, as some speak, and on which they strongly insist, is rather a deduction from assumed principles than a necessary feeling. But, a desire of salvation answerable to the desirableness of salvation, we should suppose to be consequential.—How can the mind prevent a desire for what is known as desirable? And religion can only be known as desirable.

The duties of repentance are sufficiently marked by the Prophet Isaiah. "Let the wicked man forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and unto our God, and he will abundantly pardon." "Cease

to do evil, and learn to do well." The strange opinion, that it is wicked for a repenting sinner to pray or use the means of grace, is gratuitous; for the sinner, who is forbidden to use religious means and forms, if he is obstinately and presumptuously bent on sinning, becomes presumptuous and acts the hypocrite.

To give repentance, is to give the command to repent. Neither the authority of the law or the prophets would have been sufficient to authorize a Gospel Repentance. "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men, every where, to repent." It is to give the means also, for the giving of the means is the rendering of the end possible; and finally, it is to give the grace of repentance. The spirit of God convinces of sin; it is a light that makes ignorance, error, and evil manifest, for whatsoever maketh manifest is light. The Prince and the Saviour gives the command to repent; he commissioned his Apostles to go out and preach repentance in his name among all nations. He gives the promise to those who obey the command, and the threatening to those who disobey the command.

As a Prince, he gives repentance; as a Saviour, he forgives sins. Sinners do not repent of their sins because they love them; and when they do repent they do not merit pardon. Hence, the twofold office and character of the Messiah; hence, his double gifts or grace to answer grace.

Saviour and Prince of peace,
  The double grace bestow;
Unloose the bands of wickedness,
  And let the captive go.
Grant me my sins to feel,
  And then the load remove;
Trouble, and wash the troubled heart
  In the atoning blood;
Wound and pour in my wounds to heal,
  The balm of pardoning love.

When the Pharisees asked,—"Who can forgive sins but God?"—Jesus answered,—"That ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say to the sick,—take up thy bed and walk." So he wrought a miracle to convince them that he had power on earth to forgive sins. "His name shall be called Jesus, (Saviour) for he shall save his people from their sins;" but he could not do this unless he pardoned their sins, and he could not have pardoned their sins, without meriting their pardon. He gives the forgiveness; he has the power, the right, and the means to give. God has exalted him with his own right hand. Was he then humbled? Yes, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he descended first into the lower parts of this earth? He that descended is the same, also, that ascended up far above all heavens. Wherefore, God also highly exalted him and gave him a name above every name." The great mediatorial work was confided

to him. He is the dispenser of pardon, holiness, and heaven. The resurrection and the ascension of the Saviour into heaven, give the demonstration of the redeeming merit of his death. Justice or moral law interposed; it stood in opposition to pardon. It makes no provision for pardon. Christ died for our sins. He bears the marks of five bleeding wounds, by which he poured out his soul unto death.

It is evident, that the forgiveness of sins was the point at issue between the Sanhedrim and the Apostles. That the Messiah should be the giver of pardon, was the new doctrine, the strange thing, to the ears of the teachers of the sacrificial law. It was in reference to this, that the cross became a stumbling block. The Messiah was not expected by these teachers of the law, as the forgiver of sins. The sacrificial provision under the law, they considered as all-sufficient for the pardon of sin; and they held these sacrifices, not as types or shadows of a greater and more perfect sacrifice, but as unchangeable as the moral law itself. Hence, the deep interest of the priests and especially the high priests, the sons of Aaron, who had so long presided over the altar. For the Messiah, being of the house of David, was of course of the tribe of Judah; it must follow therefore, if the forgiveness of sins is to be in the Messiah, under his kingdom the priesthood must pass out of the tribe of Levi and the high priesthood out of the house of Aaron. This

whole subject is fully argued in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it is shown that the Priesthood of Christ is after the order of Melchisedec, and not after that of Aaron; the former being immortal, and the latter mortal. And besides the Aaronical Priesthood recognised its own sinfulness, having first to offer sacrifices for its own sins; but the priesthood of the order of Melchisedec is holy, harmless, and undefiled, separate from sinners. But, though a Benjamite could reason thus conclusively and so illustrate the book of Psalms, the house of Aaron had too great a personal interest to be convinced. The Apostles, however, viewed the subject not merely in reference to the tribes of Israel, but to the whole world. "He is the propitiation, not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world."

> Jesus, our great high priest,
> Hath full atonement made!

The writers of the New Testament were evidently most deeply impressed with the vastness of the subject of the forgiveness of sins, and with the majesty and glory of Him whose gift it is. The work was too great, too important to be confided to men or to angels. It was committed to the only begotten Son of God. He alone has power on earth to forgive sins. But how does he forgive them? Conditionally or unconditionally? To this question the Scriptures give one, and but one answer, namely, conditionally. The condition is faith—faith in the

the giver himself. He forgives the sins of those who believe in him, believe that he can and will forgive their sins. Unbelievers have no forgiveness. They are condemned already. The wrath of God abideth upon them. Those who have heard and known and believe not, are condemned because they believe not. Men are justified by faith, and not by works; but the faith which justifies is an obedient faith among all nations: it works by love, but the obedience or love is the consequence not the cause of pardoned sin. When the repenting sinner asks,—what shall I do to be saved?—if he means what work, what act of obedience, what command or precept shall I obey; the scriptural answer is,—none, not one,—but believe, trust, confide in Him who is able to save to the uttermost. Faith, as a condition of the forgiveness of sins, is not only a principle of obedience; it is also the ground of assurance,—"to give the knowledge of salvation through the redemption of sins." Works or obedience must always, in this world, be an imperfect evidence of the state of forgiveness, for works are always in the process of doing; not like one act faith, which is sufficiently complete in itself to enable the believer to have the witness that he is accepted in the beloved. Mere isolated pardon, as experience proves, answers not a practical purpose and leaves not future obedience to the laws. The heart must be laid under an obligation of gratitude to the forgiver, and he must become an ob-

ject of reverence and love. In civil governments the pardoning power involves the offender only, (if one may so speak) in a negative relation. It does nothing for the criminal vicariously; it brings him under no personal obligation. The criminal may not believe nor know, in whom he has believed. The gospel plan bears but few marks of resemblance to the legal or political systems of government. Their beginnings are essentially different. The latter assume or suppose the subjects or members of the community to be innocent or above all blame, and only provide a pardoning power for special cases or conditions of future offenders, but never suppose it possible, that the whole community may become obnoxious to the sentence of the laws. The gospel, on the contrary, sets out upon the view and declaration of the guilt of all. It regards, it treats all the world as guilty before God. It begins without an innocent subject. Its first proselytes, its first disciples, the members of the primitive church, were sinners and received the forgiveness of their sins through faith. This fact is demonstrated in the gospel. "What then," says the Apostle, "are we better than the Gentiles? No; in no wise, for we have before proved that all were under sin." A holy church was, and is to be made out of an unholy world. Sinners are to be pardoned and sanctified; and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, by grace through faith in Christ.

Sinners then, should know or have assurance of their forgiveness; they should have the witness in themselves, or the Spirit of Adoption bearing witness with their spirits, that they are the children of God. These particular objects of the gospel must fail without faith. Not a step can be taken in this experience, without a settled confidence; and without this confidence, there can be no steady obedience. Works done for justification, whether, as it is affirmed, they have the nature of sin in them or not, cannot have the assurance producing nature in them. They cannot generate a knowledge of salvation, through the remission of sins; they cannot authorize their performers to say, that they know experimentally in whom they have believed, nor can they produce love and gratitude for events which follow after them. Infidels allow themselves to talk of the licentious tendency of the doctrines of grace and faith, while they do no good works and are as inattentive to morality as they are to piety. Is it then, for men, all of whom the gospel concludes under sin, to sit in judgement upon the consequences of that gospel? Even Christians are too apt to forget the rock from whence they were hewn, and the hole of the pit from whence they were digged, and to indulge in language better suited to umpires and judges than to dependant creatures, who have nothing save what they have received. St. Paul's words are suited for all mouths, and should be responded to by every heart. "When we were with-

out strength, in due time, Christ died for the ungodly."

All powerful Prince and Saviour, exalted with and and to the right hand of God, how full of grace and truth must he be, to take sinners out of the horrible pit and the miry clay, by giving them repentance and the forgiveness of sins! The conquerors of the world give no repentance. They cannot suspend the love of sin. They cannot make men sorry for what they love. The changes of the dynasties of nations are found to do but little more than to modify their vices. The leaders of victorious armies who have retraced in blood each others steps over the ancient continents,—how little of after-thought have these given, how little remains of the nations they commanded or conquered! Their means were not rational, moral, or evangelical. Devoid of reflection themselves, how could they promote it in the minds of others? Blind to their own folly and madness, they led on armies as blind as themselves, and left the darkness and the shadows of religious death behind them. The death working sorrows of this world followed thick in their train; but godly sorrow, the humble and contrite heart, were not there. Hard hearts and blind minds and guilty consciences are the misery and the ruin of nations. Hail Prince and Saviour! Send down from thy exalted throne the soul converting gifts! Save the nations by grace!

Give us, ourselves and thee to know;
In this, our gracious day;
Repentance unto life bestow,
And take our sins away!

What now are the hopes of the ministry and the church? What their prospects, in behalf of a benighted and a guilty world? And what their motives to persevere? What, but the gifts of their Prince aud Saviour? The residue of the Spirit is with him. His ear is not heavy that he cannot hear. His arm is not shortened that he cannot save. Neither repentance nor the forgiveness of sins need be given up, neither in doctrine nor in experience, neither in theory nor in practice. No substitute can be found for them. A church, constituted so as to exclude these gifts, must prove spiritually poor indeed. "Despisest thou," says the Scripture, "the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But, after thy hardness and impenitence of heart, treasurest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath and the revelation of the righteous judgement of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds?" We see here how repentance is a gift. The riches of his goodness and forbearance and long-suffering are summed up, as the goodness of God, and lead to repentance. But a hard heart and an impenitent mind may despise and reject and resist all. We earnestly urge this important

passage, as a corrective to the fatal tendency to reject the counsel of God. Oh! sinners, you should know, that the grace of the gospel, here called the riches of his goodness, is intended to soften and to melt this heart, to render it lowly and contrite, and to cause thee to weep and tremble at the awful word of the Lord, and the great and dreadful day of judgement which it reveals! You should not only know but deeply consider that it is because the compassion of the Lord has not failed, you are not consumed; that you do not live, because you merit life or deserve to live, but because God is waiting to be gracious. Oh! thoughtless, inconsiderate, presumptious creatures,—know you not, that the goodness of God, that times and seasons of grace, if finally despised, will all be brought into judgement as so many causes of condemnation? What a thought! Treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath, converting riches of goodness, the very goodness of God itself, into sentence of condemnation!

He comes, he comes, the judge severe!

The day of repentance and forgiveness is past. The day of judgement is come. Will the sinner now dare to plead that the gift of repentance was never offered to him—never slighted by him? Will he say no time was given him to repent? The records of mercy aud grace, the records of time, shall determine. The leader was there, the follower only was wanting. The gift did not fail, bnt the re-

ceiver. "I gave her space to repent, and she repented not." There are persons, who are known to despise nothing so much as the gospel means of repentance. Promises and threatenings, persuadings and warnings, only serve to call forth their resentment and contempt. On whatever part they are smitten, they will revolt more and more. Of all the gifts of God, no one should be prized more highly than repentance. And of all sins, what one can involve deeper guilt than that of despising for a life-time, all the calls and means and all the grace of repentance, and all the opportunities for it?

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE SIXTH.

THE LAW OF FAITH.

Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore, we conclude, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law. Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: seeing that it is one God, who shall justify the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith. Do we, then, make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law.

Romans iii. 27—31.

We have here, in express words, the Law of Faith. The fact, that there is such a law, must have been inferred if it had not been expressed. Nothing in a religious system which claims to have God for its author, can be supposed to be subject to chances or accidents. Causes must be operative, and they must operate uniformly or react. In moral or political laws, there must be an executive to bring them to act in and upon society. But the law of nature, so called, may operate upon individuals, and as all society is made up of individuals, a whole society may become affected, without an executive influence or by natural consequences. Many moral and political laws are not in themselves active principles, and so may remain inert in the law book or codes; but many of the natural laws are active principles and depend upon no conventional arrangements. Heat, for instance, is an

active principle, and has its laws of action upon living and dead bodies. In regard to the former, it may preserve or destroy life. Now, the truth of the gospel, in some instances, operate in conformity to or analagous to the laws of nature; individual or conventional will has little or no influence over their result. So, when they are said to be a savor of life unto life, or a savor of death unto death, we see not only the uniformity of the law, but the acceleration. In the disobedient they produce condemnation always and in all degrees.

Faith in the gospel is, what logicians call, a *sine qua non*, or a cause without which, the effect will not come to pass; though it may not be capable of producing an effect by itself. The law is expressed thus:—He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. But, it amounts not to a law, to say,—he that believeth shall be saved, and he shall be saved whether he believes or not. The natural law of cause and effect would not be evident; nor, would it express any conventional law or law depending upon the will of the lawgiver. The reasons of laws, as we take it, are not to be sought for or to be found, in mere volition, but where there is an actual or real relation of cause and effect, they may be sought for; and in general, this relation may be presumed upon, when the subject is stated negatively and positively or reversely. It might, for instance, be made a question, how those might stand affected

who are in a neutral condition, who are neither believers nor unbelievers? And the inquiry might be pursued, to ascertain whether, where the gospel is fully preached and heard there can be any neutral state of mind between believing and unbelieving? We are told, indeed, of those who are neither cold nor hot, but this relates to degrees for they are said to be luke-warm. The presumption, it should seem, is in favor of no neutrality of mind between believing and not believing; we mean not that there are no intermediate doubts, but a balance with no inclination. We regard the law of faith then as coming under or belonging to the class of laws of causes and effects. So that, if no reasons for it are given, they may be sought for and found. But here, let us not be misunderstood. We conceive of positive or absolute laws, or expression of the divine will, in contradistinction to laws of cause and effect not as in any way involving the question of the sovereignty of divine will in the latter case.

But to proceed. It is a law of appetite, that the neglect of it must end in starvation, and the abuse of it in disease. The animal body has its laws of existence and they can be neither deceived nor bribed; they must be obeyed or they will punish. There is a law of sleep and a law of labor. Woe to their transgressors! Social laws may be artificial, and in so far as they are so, they may be artificially enforced. The washing of hands was artificial, not moral nor natural; and as no immediate or direct

injury could follow from a neglect of the law or a deviation from it, so there could be no punishment except by positive or conventional enactment. Not so with the law of industry; laziness, the violation of the law, will clothe a man with rags. The law, in this case, becomes as it were its own executioner. Examples like these, partially observed or illy understood, seem to have given rise to the saying, that every man is the arbiter of his own fortune; instead of saying, that there are laws, which reward those who observe them, and punish those who violate them even in this world. The sun has its laws, and it matters not what the characters of men may be in other respects, if they trangress these laws they will be punished. "The night will come when no man can work." The law of faith too must be obeyed, or it will punish its transgressors. It too has a sword, which it beareth not in vain. The Messiah, when illustrating the prophecy which represents him as the stone which is the head of the corner, added,—"Whosoever falleth upon this stone shall be broken, and on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder." By what law is the Saviour to govern? By what law is his people to be governed? Law, indeed! exclaims one. Does not the Scripture affirm that Christians are not under law but under grace? But there is a law of faith, even under grace. It is impossible upon Scriptural principles or by Scriptural authority, in religious experience, to separate

faith from grace. Gracious souls are believing souls. "He that believeth not, is condemned already." The law of faith is, that the unbeliever shall not approach the threshhold of salvation. Where there is no faith or confidence, if any thing is done in a way of government, it must be done by authority or coercion. Grace alone cannot govern. Government implies two parties, the governor and the governed; but if the latter becomes refractory or disobedient, is grace or favor still to be displayed? A moment's reflection must convince any one that this course would be preposterous.

The text concludes, that a man is justified by faith. Well, let it be supposed that he makes shipwrecks of the faith, is there any law in this case? If so, one might conceive before hand, that it would be a law of consistency. The law is, that the just shall live by faith, and if any man draw back,—"My soul," saith God, "shall have no pleasure in him." Here is the true and genuine spirit of law. The governor is not equally pleased with opposites, nor indifferent to negligence. The believer and he who draws back from the faith, do not continue in the same relative condition; the latter ceases to be justified by the faith from which he draws back. To whomever God saith,—"my soul shall have no pleasure in him,"—in him the life of faith begins to recede. Do we then, make void the law, the moral law in fact, or the principle of law through faith? "God forbid; yea we establish the law."

The law of faith and the moral law operate upon the same principles, and are intended to secure the same ends. The law of faith discrimates the believer from the unbeliever; it saves the former and condemns the latter. So, likewise, the moral law will not hold him guiltless who transgresses it. There is no more impunity in the one case, than in the other; for if unbelief was not condemned, if one event happened to the believer and to him who believeth not, there would be no law operation,—the principle of law would be made void. The ends are the same. The end of the moral law is holiness, and the end of the law of faith is holiness. Why then, cannot men be saved by the moral law, as well as by the law of faith? The reason is, they have transgressed the moral law, or are wanting in moral integrity. Innocent men with holy natures could be saved by the moral law, if they continued to keep it. But moral law cannot justify or pardon its transgressors and take them again into favor. There is no immediate and direct way to pass from disobedience to obedience, as there is from obedience to disobedience. The two processes are not like that of moving backwards and forwards on a plane, but like that of moving up and down a hill, or up and down a stream, or rather, like falling from a height and attempting to regain it. The law of faith differs essentially from the moral law, in having a mediate object which the latter has not. The moral law stands by itself, and can

only operate immediately. Faith has a person or thing to lean or rest upon objectively. To faith or the act of believing, neither guilt nor immoral disposition or nature can be a preventive. Faith does not presuppose innocency and spotless purity of nature. Believers in the gospel are recognised in the gospel as believing sinners, that is, as persons who, before they believed, stood in the relation to God as transgressors of his moral law, and consequently as having lost their innocence and moral integrity. But innocent men with holy natures stand immediately related to God; there is no mediator between God and them. It is, when men become guilty before God, and sinful propensities or desires are involuntary and uncontrollable by the will,—that all intercourse with him must be through a mediator, who is an object of faith. Those who reject all ideas of original sin, and hold that men are born with a sinless nature, do not seem to give themselves much pains to examine into the consequences of thus coming into the world with an innocent nature and without a mediator. But should not the supposition of such a nature, for any length of time or for a whole life, escaping from sin and all sinful desires, be examined with great care? Can any proposition involve more interesting results? Supposing a crisis of temptation and evil desires and consequent evil actions to come to pass, a very possible case surely, hypothesis to the contrary notwithstanding, what then is to be done

without a mediator? Is one to be provided in every case after it occurs, or when he is needed? But temptations to sin and sinful desires and sinful practices do become epidemic,—must there be then a remedy for all, or must all perish? Moral law was made for innocent men with holy natures. The law of faith was made for guilty men with unholy natures. But holiness is the final object and end of both—the one to preserve and the other to restore. The law of faith, then, is founded on a mediator. It supposes the necessity of a mediator, and that he must be provided on the part of the offended God. It does not proceed upon mere accidents. All are presupposed to be sinners, and a mediator is provided for all. "The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead, and they that live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them." The Lord Jesus Christ, as an object of faith, is provided for all. No man is authorized by the word of God to doubt whether he has a mediator, any more than he is, that he is a sinner. The writers of the New Testament take equal pains to prove that all men in the sight of God, are sinners, and that Christ died for all sinners. Even the typical sacrifices did not, as some speak, pass by sinners or leave one and select another. All sinners of the same class might offer sacrifices in common.

But faith regards things past, present, and to

come; and so it differs from hope which regards only things to come. In each of these respects, faith has its law or laws modified to the occasions or objects. "By faith," says the Apostle, "we understand that the worlds were framed." The creation of the world, by the word of God, is matter of of historical record, and faith in it transfers it to our understandings. There is a law of historical evidence or of credibility, on which all historical information depends. The human mind has no ante-knowledge. All that is past without historical testimony, is to us as though it had never been. Faith is certainly the medium of all that we can know of the past. A fictitious history, when known to be such or no longer believed, beco mesn the mind a non-entity, and true history if not believed is the same in effect. We cannot reason upon any matter of record we do not believe. We may, indeed, be deceived or led into error by false or invented history. But true history itself has no power over any mind, while under the influence of unbelief. A catalogue of unbelievers is given in the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, as examples. But of what avail would they be to those who have no faith in their existence? The same neutralizing effects must needs be produced on the minds of unbelievers, respecting all recorded cases of punishment. Who fears the repetition of judgments, he does not believe ever to have happened? The practical effect of unbelief in true history is to reduce

the mind to a state of ignorance. The infidel in bible history knows no more about the creation or the flood, than one who never heard of a bible. He will like the other avow his ignorance, and say he does not know, because he does not believe.

Now, to all who have lived since the records of the Messiah were written, the knowledge of Him, like the knowledge of the creation, is historical. Through faith, we understand that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, was crucified on Calvary, rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven from the Mount of Olives. Those who do not believe this history do not understand it as a record of facts, but as a fiction. Unbelief is, as it were, a non-conductor of historical knowledge. It repels, instead of attracting. This law of faith is well understood among critics in history. After all their labor in collecting evidence, they have found unbelief invincible. The well-known work on the Credibility of Gospel History, has called forth the admiration of many of the most competent judges; but to the mind of unbelief it is like water spilt upon a rock.

Faith has a peculiar operation upon things present. The law of confidence in the intercourse between man and man, is fully understood. Society can only be established upon this law. So the society between Jesus and his disciples was formed; and so the primitive church was formed. There was no coercive power to be brought to bear in either of these cases. If other laws had existed, they

could not have been executed. Each member of society was free to come and free to go. An example of this law of faith or confidence has occurred in our own country in the case of the Bank of the United States. Money was more plenty and commerce more flourishing than it had ever been known to be. An order from the Treasury is issued that the bills of the Bank are no longer to be received in the Custom Houses, or that the deposites of the Treasury are to be removed from the Bank. Immediately money disappears and commerce is checked throughout the Union, and yet the actual amount of money remains the same. In this state of fearful suspense, bankruptcies having commenced, news arrives from Europe of a great rise in the price of cotton, and a premium is actually offered for it in preference to payments in specie; almost instantly money becomes more plentiful than ever and commerce more active. All these fluctuations take place while the amount of money is nearly the same; the fall and the rise were all in the credit, that is the faith. The government which issued the order for the removal of the deposites, had no power over the money holders and lenders. The law which governed was the law of confidence. That law had been broken, was gone. It was restored in consequence of the balance of European exchange being restored in favor of America, by an unexpected rise in one of the principle articles of export. Now, had the power of the government

over persons and property been absolute, there would have been no faith in the case, or none sufficient to make a change so great in commerce. The law of *I will and you shall*, and not the law of credit, would have prevailed. The analogy holds good in all cases pertaining to religious intercourse. The rises and falls are not in the stock of grace, but in faith and unbelief. The grace cannot be made to circulate among free agents without faith. The commerce of grace is carried on (so to speak) upon the credit system or law of faith. Men trust God, and is it too much to say that God trusts men? "In that," says St. Paul, "he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry." "Be faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." "And he did not there many mighty works, because of their unbelief." Is there not as much grace before and after a revival, as there is while it lasts? We pray that God may pour out his spirit, but not surely upon our unbelief. Will he entrust us with his grace unless he account us faithful? Unbelievers are not trust-worthy. Such is the law of faith pertaining to matters and things present, that without confidence in each other, Christians and Ministers cannot have fellowship with each other. They cannot pray for and receive present blessings, cannot please God.

Faith in things to come, the law of faith in particular, is such that it regulates hope. No faith in things to come—no hope in them. Faith is not

only the evidence of things not seen, but the substance of things hoped for. He, who lives without a belief of heaven, lives without hope of heaven. He, who dies without a belief of heaven, dies without hope of heaven. Why cannot a man live and die in hope of that which he does not believe? Why need an unbeliever despair? Let any man make the experiment upon himself, and he will prove the law. It is a law of mind in all tendencies to despair, or as hope fails or proves weak, to fall back upon faith. Hence the difficulty of reasoning or persuading one's self in the absence of true confidence, without false confidence. The last resort of infidelity is, in the eternal sleep of death.

The mind was made for faith, and faith was made for mind. All intellectual operations, are in some mode or degree, connected with faith. No faith, no truth, no true reasoning. The unbeliever reasons about religion, but reasons it away. His conclusion is, that death is nothing, and nothing is after death. To a mind as devoid of hope as of faith, all is here, all is present; an invisible God is not in all his thoughts. How can he who thinks that nothing is invisible think of invisibility? Columbus had faith enough to induce him to embark on a voyage over an unknown ocean. His faith did not fail him during the whole voyage. He discovered land, not the land of Asia he went to seek, but an unknown region, the land of America.

Had the maxim of Columbus been,—nothing is in the ocean, nothing beyond it, he could have made no voyage, no discovery. Unbelief would have been non-entity in his mind. All great attempts and enterprises and all perseverance, depend upon faith. A universal unbeliever can do nothing, can attempt nothing. His mind is reduced to the condition of an irrational animal, he is but a creature of animal instincts. Men of calculation in all the arts and sciences of life have much faith in the past, present, and the future; for the past and the future are connected with man's interests in this life, as well as the present. In religion the faith of Abraham procured him the title of the Father of the Faithful. Through all periods of his eventful life, he ventured upon the dark uncertainty of the future, without a sensible evidence or example to guide him. By faith he sojourned in a strange land, not knowing whither he went. And, in regard to the great, the ultimate subject of the promise, he believed in hope against hope, not only without precedent or probability but against them all. His faith was counted for righteousness. It was in him, the modified principle of all righteousness, the mover to all obedience. By faith he offered up (prepared to offer up) his son Isaac, and for this unparralleled example of obedient faith was called the Friend of God. Behold! how his faith wrought with his works, and how by his works his faith was made perfect—obedience as

has been stated being the end of faith. "Now, the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned."

We hear nothing of a law of miracles, the common definition of a miracle being—a temporary suspension of a law. It has also been argued, that a repetition of a miracle would convert it into a law. And indeed, examples somewhat analogous do occur in natural history, in the form of what is called abortions or abortive germs. If all these germs were to be fully developed they would be considered as monsters; though now they have become so general as to be considered as natural. But justification by faith is not a miracle. It does not suspend any law of nature, or of mind, or of morality. It is only a dead faith that will not work, which is abortive. A false faith or a faith that has a false object will be operative and will operate its own ends. The rewards and punishments of faith and unbelief conform to those of moral law, that is, are equable and not partial. "He that doubts is condemned if he eats, for whatever is not of faith, is sin." The position is exemplified in clean and unclean meats. There is no sin in the eating of of any kind of wholesome food under the gospel. But while the mind of one brought under the law hesitates, or before it is settled upon the principle,—to eat meats unclean according to the law may be sin, for conscience cannot approve of aetions in

doubtful cases. The rule is,—let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. The law of faith extends to self-confidence also. A man who acts from a confidence that he is acting right may be acting wrong, and afterwards be convinced; but this conviction will not affect his sincerity. This was St. Paul's case. "I verily once thought, I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, which things I also did." Had he done things much less criminal in their nature, without thinking thus verily or not being fully persuaded in his own mind, his sincerity might have been implicated and he might not have been able to have said,—I did it ignorantly and in unbelief. When we deal dishonestly with our own consciences our consciences too are apt to become treacherous. He who has followed the best light he has had may deplore his want of better light as his misfortune, but it is not his fault. The miraculous intervention of the divine power in the call of St. Paul did not justify him without faith. "He washed away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord Jesus of whom he had heard and in whom he believed, nor was he backward after he had believed in his heart unto righteousness to confess him with his mouth unto salvation."

Faith then, as we have stated, according to the divisions of the things of God, has respect unto them all,—past, present and to come. We are interested in the past and the future, as well as in the

present. There is a strange disposition manifested by some people to make religion a mere thing of a day—a mere passing occurrence. In this view of it they see of course but little use for prophecies and promises, and much less for the vast provision of redemption and the necessity of faith. But the Father of the Spirits of all flesh is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works. All souls are his; he provides redemption and salvation for the world, for the ages and for the generation, and for eternity. The Messiah said, that "Abraham with joy anticipated his day." And St. Paul says that,—"The scriptures foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached the gospel before unto Abraham, saying,—'In thy seed shall all the nations be blessed.'" If Christ died but once, and at some period of time between the beginning and the end of the world, it follows that the faith of those who lived before he died must have have been in the promise of that coming event, and the faith of those who lived after the event in the history of the fact. Our faith therefore must now go back eighteen hundred years, and this it may do for history never wears out and once true never ceases to be true. But the promises and predictions of the gospel not only carry our faith to the end of time,—they carry it into eternity and are commensurate with the soul's immortality.

Faith in thy changeless name I have;
  Though eighteen hundred years are past,
Since thou didst in our flesh appear,
  Thy tender mercies ever last,—
Lo!—thy promise still is here.

"Jesus Christ yesterday, to-day, and forever the same." Faith looks for and hastens unto the coming of the day of God, when the heavens shall be on fire. It is confident of a day of judgment when Jesus shall come to take vengeance and to be admired in all them that believe, both for his justice and his grace. The law of faith is, that it must be held fast with a good conscience. It is not out of danger of being lost in this world and is subject to a probation. "The trial of your faith being much more precious than that of gold that perisheth, though it be tried in the fire." "Contend earnestly for the faith." "Striving together for the faith of the gospel." "And have overthrown the faith of some." "They have made shipwreck of the faith and a good conscience." These and other texts prove that it is not the confidence of a day which finally saves the soul, but the confidence which endures to the end. The believers who lived before the coming of Christ all died in the faith—the faith of the promised Messiah. If their faith had failed, how could they have continued to please God?

Believers seem to have been beset with peculiar

temptations respecting the practical law of faith. Antinomianism, that is the making void the law, through faith, (from Αντὶ *against*, and Νόμος *law*,) existed from the earliest times. The text evidently recognises the opinion and opposes it. Faith in the merit of the Messiah's death, though it cannot be consistent with the continuance of the legal sacrifices, does not make void the principle of sacrifice but establishes it. So Christ came not to destroy (to make void) the law, but to fulfil (to establish) the principle. The law of sacrifice or sin-offering is, that sacrifice is necessary to pardon or that redemption is necessary to salvation. Now, this law is not subverted when the sacrifice is given for the sinner instead of being given by himself. No law can forbid or prevent a gift from being given; the law is not against the promises of God. If the law cannot be satisfied without a ransom, it must be satisfied with one if it can make no objection to the giver. It is remarkable that faith establishes this very principle of substitution, for faith can have no other objective sacrifice. When the sinner has given the sacrifice for himself it is not properly the object of his faith,—it cannot be so separated from himself to be believed in as not being his own act and property. It is not the faith of men in themselves and their own acts which establishes the law or any law. The text never can be supposed to have concluded that a man is justified by faith in himself

But the main point in the argument is, that faith establishes the moral law, establishes its authority over the believer himself. Believers are to come to judgment.—We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. All must give an account for the deeds done in the body, and all be judged according to our works. It is a common remark that the Scriptures never say,—we shall be judged according to our faith. And why should it be so said, if faith does not make void the law but esiablishes it? In the day of ur conversion we are justified, but not by works. In the day of final judgment we are justified by the evidence of works, for the believer is held bound by his faith in Christ and so is under law to Christ; but the law of Christ is moral and spiritual. "Behold! thou art made whole,—sin no more lest a worse thing come upon thee." "It is better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them." Suppose two men before the judge; the one having never offended, and the other a sinner who has believed and obeyed according to the law of faith. Can the former be rewarded and the other condemned? What is he to be condemned for? For his sins? Not so. He has been justified by faith. Shall he then be condemed for his work of faith? Nay. "The law is fulfilled in us who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." The law then, is the standard in the day of final judgment.

The universe is supposed to be the observers and the approvers of the final judgment; but they can only approve according to law. The works shall be manifest, the day shall declare them. So the law of faith is not incompatible with a future judgment and rewards and punishments.

The doctrine of assurance of faith also claims attention. Is not this long controverted subject, after all that has been said and written upon it, to be settled by referring it to the law of faith? What is the inherent tendency of the principle of faith in respect to this point? Is it to conduct the mind to assurance or to a state of uncertainty? To answer these questions, must not the nature and relation of doubt be decided? How is doubt related to faith and unbelief, or to certainty and uncertainty? We think there can be but one opinion or answer. Doubt is naturally related to unbelief or uncertainty. The tendency of faith is not to doubt. Faith may weaken unbelief and doubts may remain; but they remain as parts of unbelief and not of faith. The progress of faith must tend to destroy them, not to foster them. Faith begets assurances as its legitimate offspring. This is the law of consequence. Doubt is not from faith, as darkness is not from the sun.

Nor mount the shades till he is gone.

Experience furnishes many cases of the progress of faith, in which the mind is conducted to a state

wherein it can no longer doubt. Navigation can no longer doubt the truth of celestial observation. The chemist cannot doubt the result of his experiments. The geometer cannot doubt the length of the hypothenuse after he has measured the legs of his right angled triangle. But these were once doubtful cases. Why cannot a believer arrive at such a degree of faith as no longer to doubt that his sins are forgiven? The cause surely lies not in the law of faith. If there be any cause why he cannot, it must be in something external to faith or the mind. The power of faith over the mind is naturally stronger than unbelief. Great is truth and must prevail; or rather great is the evidence of truth and where it can be brought to bear upon the mind it must prevail. Unbelief is not irresistible. There is a crisis in which it shrinks from an open trial of strength with evidence. It dare not look demonstration full in the face. The law of faith is progressive. "From faith to faith, as it is written; the just shall live by faith." There is a progress in revelation. The being of God, the Mediator, and the Holy Spirit were revealed in succession. The law took precedence in practice, of the Gospel. Repentance is before justifying faith, and justification precedes sanctification. A belief in one truth prepares the way for another. There is a growth in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Whoever contemplates the plan of salvation, can hardly fail to perceive that works as a prin-

ciple could have had no adaptation to it, or to the developement of truth in the mind. The expansive nature of faith seems only to be calculated for an increase of knowledge.

In endeavoring to ascertain the law of faith, it will be perceived that we have not only sought for information from the written text of revelation; but have admitted the method of natural philosophers, to seek for information in experience and observation. But in so wide a field time restricted us to items, incidents, and allusions. But we feel persuaded, that the period cannot be distant when some master genius, by the aid of experience and observation, will give the world a demonstration of the law of faith more clear and satisfactory than some of the examples of inductive philosophy itself.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE SEVENTH.

JUSTIFYING FAITH.

For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

Romans iii. 23—26.

Could a fairer example be found for a theorist or a system-maker, than this text? Why has no religious denomination been founded upon it? It seems to contain the elements of a creed in itself. Do we need an article of faith respecting the sins of men? Here is one. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." Is a formula needed to express the conception of the mind respecting grace and redemption? Can a better one be found than,—"being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus?" Who that reads this passage can help perceiving that free grace and redemption are no unscriptural associations? Is it desirable to have the point settled, whether the death of Christ was sacrificial or only exemplary? Is it not settled by these words,—"Whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood?" In all vicarious sacrifices the blood, the shedding of

blood, is an essential part. Faith in his blood could not be required, if he only died to show how good men should die. Can the disputes, which have continued so long and often with so much violence, about the extent to which sins are remitted be decided more satisfactorily than by the very words,—"to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past?"—not the remission of sins that are past, present, and to come, as some speak. And whether the justice of God is in any wise involved in justification is settled by this passage,—"that he might be just, and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." It is to be inferred then, that it would not be just to justify without faith in Jesus. Wrath, anger or vengeance, when referred to God, are forms of his justice. "God is angry with the wicked every day,"—means that the wicked are continually obnoxious to his justice. Justice constantly demands their punishment. "In the day, thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die,"—means, death shall be thy due and if it be not executed, mercy, not justice, prevents. So in regard to all sin; hence the text speaks of the forbearance of God. Justice cannot be controlled or compelled, unless it be first conquered. Punishment of sin is delayed through the forbearance of God, and the pardon of sin and final salvation are by the grace of God; but neither of them through immediate justice, nor in defiance of it. It is impossible for God to lie; and is it not impossible for him to be unjust?

To justify implies more than simply to pardon; it implies public action or an open expression. When God treats one sinner as an innocent man and not another or another sinner of the same character as a guilty man, some reason will be sought why is this difference. Is not this partiality, is not this injustice? The inquiry is anticipated,—"declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness." This favored sinner believeth in Jesus. God is just in justifying him. He is faithful and just to forgive us of our sins. The unbeliever cannot complain of the partiality or injustice of God when he sees the believing sinner taken into favor and himself excluded for his unbelief. There must be no ground, no cause to suspect the justice of God in the displays of his mercy and grace. But there must be an obvious, a marked line of distinction between those whom he blesses, and those whom he blesses not. No two believers of equal faith can be differently regarded; and no two unbelievers can have separate lots. If all the world have sinned, and God makes a church out of part, and leaves the other part without declaring any reason; as every man however unjust himself has a quick sense of injustice in others, complaints will be made, and if they are not anticipated it will be difficult to answer them. But to see some believers justified and others not, and some unbelievers condemned and others not, confounds in the mind all sense of justice. But this can never happen, for his righteousness is so declared as forever to prevent his

righteousness from being impeached as the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus.

We now proceed to inquire about the faith which renders justification consistent with the justice of God. This faith is in Jesus. On this point the text is explicit. It is usual to regard faith as a single act, and also justification. But should they not both be considered as continuous throughout the period of life? But there must be a beginning of faith or of believing, and there must be a time of the forgiveness of sins that are past. It is hardly conceivable that the sins of a man's past life should begin to be remitted, when he first believes, and continue to be remitted, from time to time by degrees, until they are all remitted. On this point there is much confusion in many minds. There are persons who manifest the greatest repugnance to the idea of instantaneous conversion or justification, as though they really conceived, that sins which are past, are actually to be remitted, as it were, piecemeal. And yet it is difficult to imagine, how they could seriously think of defending so strange and so unreasonable a position. Every unprejudiced and reflecting mind must be brought to the conclusion, that the remission of sins that are past must be one entire and comprehensive act of grace, at one time. Repentance for sins that are past certainly intentionally comprehends them all. No truly awakened and convinced sinner ever thinks of repenting of a part of his sins at one time, and of other parts at

other times. There is a day, an hour, a minute conceivable, when all the sins that are past, of his whole life, are remitted. On the part of God, this conception of the mind meets with no difficulty whatever. If there be any preventive, it must be in faith or believing; but faith in a promise, or a truth, or a fact, or in an offered favor, is no slow and tedious process. It is an act of the mind or thought, and may be as quick as thought, and the consequent emotion or feeling may be almost as quick. Progressive repentance and progressive pardons for past sins, however, have found advocates in books and in pulpits; and a strange course they lead those who attempt to follow them. They may as truly, as mournfully sing;—

> Now I revive, and now I am slain,
> Here I repent and sin again!

The apostle states the case clearly,—that we obtain remisssion of sins through faith in his blood.

Very few, perhaps not one, in their first experience of justifying faith, have an enlarged and a scriptural view of all the bearings and modifications of the objects of faith, or of all the occasions and circumstances under which faith may be called into exercise. The Messiah as considered in his three-fold offices of Prophet, Priest and King, is a three-fold object of faith. And few cases can occur, in which faith in one of these offices can meet all the demands for faith, in the other two offices. It is in his

Priestly office, that we exercise faith in his blood. "He loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." "They washed their robes and made them white, in the blood of the lamb." As a Prophet, his predictions and instructions must be believed; and as a King, his authority and laws must be so believed as to be obeyed. Now in the day of conversion, the believer may be ignorant of many things pertaining to the Prophetic and Kingly offices of the Saviour. But if a repenting sinner could not believe so as to be justified by faith, until he should have a complete knowledge of all the offices of the Messiah, there would be but few justified believers in this world. The blood of the everlasting covenant is made to stand as an identical object.—"In whom we have redemption through faith in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." In the same manner, the cross of Christ becomes indentified with faith and forgiveness; for the cross, the blood of the cross, and the death of the cross, all convey one leading idea, the idea of the merits of the sacrificial death of the Lord Jesus Christ. Repentance is progressive in the mind and in the feelings, though the first impulse which produces it, may be quick and sudden. It commences in knowledge, light or discovery; and the light of the mind, like the material light, takes no long time to make a first impression, though both the light and the mind may need time to perceive all the details of subjects at first seen or discovered in a body or in whole. But justification

or remission of sins that are past, is not the act of the mind, but of God, and with him, it admits of no details. The merit or the redemption price is all procured and ready, and is so apprehended by faith. Pardon or forgiveness of sin then, is not be considered as a book account, between debtor and creditor, in which the debtor pays in parts and takes receipts for what he pays, leaving the balance due still standing against him. This answers to the opinion of those who are charged with holding salvation by works or legal righteousness. And it is against this opinion or doctrine, in some one or other of its modifications, that those writers and preachers, who are called, or call themselves *Evangelical*, so frequently declaim with the utmost vehemence, and who, though they all agree in opposing a common error, are not always agreed among themselves in common truths. Our truism is,—repentance may be a work of years, but remission of sins that are past, through faith in the blood of Jesus, is instantaneous and complete at once.

It is however an interesting inquiry, whether justifying faith does not imply or include a disposition or willingness to know and believe and obey, to the ful extent, that Jesus is set forth in the gospel, in all his offices? Let it be supposed, for instance, that before his conversion a person should know of a certain command of the Lord Jesus, which he was not willing to obey, or of a certain doctrine which he was not willing to believe, though neither of them

were connected with the belief that the son of man has power on earth to forgive sins; would not this unwillingness be an impediment to an exercise of justifying faith? Or, suppose these commands or doctrines should come to be known after conversion, would not a consciousness of this unwillingness to obey or to believe them, throw the mind into perplexity, respecting former experience, if not change some of its views of former experience? There are cases of experience enough to remove all supposition. The prejudices of education, of customs, and of circumstances, have vast influence over the most serious and well disposed minds. The searcher and knower of all hearts, alone can judge of these cases. It becomes not the creatures of these common prejudices, to sit in judgement upon each other in these matters. The general rule seems to be, as far as we can gather it from the scriptures, that, however limited our knowledge may be, justifying faith includes a willingness to know and to believe and to obey every truth of Jesus, or the truth as it is in Jesus, and so contains the germs or stamina of obedience. So it should seem it is accounted for righteousness. That the believer has a disposition or willingness to obey Jesus, will appear from the answer to the question,—is faith an obedient or a rebellious principle? It is an obedient principle. If there be first a willing mind,—but a believing mind is a willing mind, —it is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not. Faith and re-

bellion cannot long exist together. Might God be just and yet the justifyer of the rebellious? No. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Who is he, that overcometh the world, but he that believeth, that Jesus is the son of God? Believers followed Jesus through the regeneration. They were faithful unto death. The more we examine, the more evidence we shall find to convince us that increasing knowledge of the will of our Lord and Saviour will require a corresponding increase of our faith. It is comforting, it is strengthening, to call to mind the gladness of that happy day, when first we knew the Lord, when first we tasted he was gracious; but when, in the order of Providence, we may be called upon to follow Jesus, we shall need the utmost measure of faith in his power, as head over all things to the church, as head over all things to the believer.

St. Paul, at the approach of his martyrdom, says, —"I have kept the faith." He had kept that principle which dictated the enquiry,—"Lord, what wouldest thou have me to do?"—an enquiry which followed immediately after the declaration,—"I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." He had kept that principle which was ready to acquiesce in the future disclosure, signified in the words,—"I will show thee how great things thou shalt suffer for my name's sake." The faith that Paul had kept, must have been greatly increased, and was greatly strength-

ened, when the time of his departure was at hand, and when he was ready to be offered up. In no labor did his faith fail; in no suffering or trial, did he loose it. There was indeed a crisis, in which he became importunate in his prayers, but the answer was,—"my grace is sufficient for thee, my strength is made perfect in weakness,"—and it inspired new fortitude and new joy. The justice of God is exemplified in justifying the believer in Jesus, in all his labors and sufferings, and in all his triumphant anticipations of death. Such visions and revelations, such miracles and providences, such perils and such deliverances,—did they not justify the laboring and the suffering believer in the Lord Jesus? But if so, then God's justice must be defended in such displays of grace and power, to a persecutor of the church, to a blasphemer who had proved so injurious. This difficulty has often been felt, and attempts been made to meet it, by offering as a maxim,—"the greater the sinner, the greater the saint," —or by illustrating the parable of the two debtors, the one owing five hundred pence, and the other fifty pence. Preachers have been heard to exclaim from the pulpit,—who would be a fifty pence sinner? "This is not St. Paul's manner of extolling the grace of God; he does not thus leave the justice of God liable to any imputations of consequences, but as one speaks, he exhibits the divine attributes, as full orbed,—

In all their rounds of rays complete,
Nor dares a creature guess,
Which of the glories brightest shone,
The justice or the grace!

The maxim alluded to, would have been nearer the truth, if it had been,—"the greater the believer, the greater the saint." The great persecutor had become a great believer. As a true son of Abraham, he was strong in faith, giving glory to God. But he says, in so many words, "that he is under law to Christ." He fought the good fight of faith, under the captain of his salvation, and of course, in obedience to his orders. He went not to this warfare, according to his own will, any more than at his own charges; but songht to please him who had called him to be his soldier. He who obtains remissions of sins that are past, may die and go to heaven. But if he does not die, immediately after his justification, he must so live, as to be able to say,—"nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life that I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." No man can say with truth,—I will live,—and not act. Life is emotion or action. And this is as true of the life of faith, as of any other mode of life. St. James therefore says,—"that faith without works is dead." If the believer does not die and go to heaven, he must go to work. His faith, if he lives, must work or it must die. But if faith lives and works, it ought to work to some purpose. Nature,

reason, grace revolt at the idea of labor in vain. The faith of the believer in Jesus takes on the form of obedience to Jesus. Its life is a germ of obedience to him who calls it forth to himself as its object.—The man, who is the object of his own faith, will obey himself only. Now all the attributes and offices, and titles, and relations of Jesus, call forth the obedience of faith or of believers, to him. He is head of every believer, and of all believers collectively in their social or church relation. He is their benefactor and protector. Their happiness and safety are in, and by, and through him. Christ is the head; believers are the body. All bodies obey their heads; they look to their heads for direction. Heads are obeyed as objects of faith or trust. Every community looks to it governor, in time of danger, for protection.

God justifies believers in Jesus, not only by the remission of sins that are past, through faith in his blood, in the day of their conversion, but in continuance; because their faith in his authority and grace preserves them against sin, and assists them to obey his laws, or to walk after his Spirit and not after their flesh. The law of his Spirit of life makes them free from their law of sin and death. The zeal of certain professedly evangelical men, in maintaining that all the merit of the gospel consists in pardoning sin, impels them to maintain, or to speak as though they meant to maintain, that there is nothing but sin in believers. Others, shocked at this

doctine, have manifested no less zeal, in maintaining inherent righteousness in believers. Christians are thus divided, between the doctrines of imputed and inherent righteousness. Amidst these mighty conflicts of opinions and feelings, the following texts still stand in the gospel, where they will foreverstand: —"Now to him, that hath power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is manifest by the Prophets, according to the commandent of the everlasting God, made known to all nations, for the obedience of faith." Obedience of faith is neither imputed nor inherent. It is from him who hath power to establish the believer according to the gospel. "But the God of all grace who hath called us unto his eternal glory, by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered awhile, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen and settle you. To him be glory and dominion forever and ever, Amen!" "I can do all things, through Christ who strengtheneth me." Taking these and similar texts into view, would not *derived* righteousness be more in accordance with them, than either *imputed* or *inherent*,—derived from the Lord Jesus Christ, through faith? So, the passage,—"I am the vine, and ye are the branches" —proceeds upon the idea of derivation, rather than the other terms.

The term justification occurs in connexion with the resurrection. "He was delivered for our of-

fences and rose again for our justification." And again, with faith. "Being justified by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." In these places, though it includes the pardon of sin, it seems to refer to a state or condi tion. Good works as synonymous with the obedience of faith, are rewardable. "God is not unrighteous to forget your work of faith and labor of love." "Be not weary in well-doing for in due time, ye shall reap if ye faint not. Ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." Neither faith as a principle, nor the works what spring from it, are ever regarded as sin, but as opposed to sin. Faith is approved, unbelief condemned. When the believer, who obeys his Lord and King, feels the imperfection of his obedience, he commends him to interceding grace.

> The father hears him pray,
> His dear annointed one;
> He cannot turn away,
> The presence of his Son.

"Ye shall ask what ye will in my name, and it shall be done unto you."

We have taken pains to show how faith conforms to the offices of the divine Redeemer, and especially to show that, as a king, he must be obeyed. What is a king without laws and authority to enforce them? Jesus is the King of Saints. "Ye call me Lord and Master, and ye say well for so I am."

But if I am your Lord, where is my honor; if I am your master, where is my fear? Jesus must be obeyed. "If ye love me keep my commandments." All things are possible to him that believeth in Jesus. His name, his all prevailing name, can give sanction and success to our best endeavors. Without him we can do nothing to religious purpose. The justice of God would be a consuming fire to all other merit.

In illustration of derived righteousness, truth may be an example, as the analogies, though they do not universally hold, apply in the leading points. Truth is neither imputed nor inherent. It is obtained from Jesus its author, by derivation, and cannot be derived without faith in him, as its author. To take his yoke upon us with an intention to learn of him is to believe in him as a teacher. Learners profit nothing by teachers in whom they have no confidence. Learning is a slow process, and calls for constancy and perseverance, as well as strength of faith. There can be no inherent truth, where there is no inherent knowledge. Ignorance is not truth nor the parent of truth. It is only among certain disciples of the old mystic and philosophical schools, that appeals are made from written revelation to the light within, or that natural revelation is preferred before the words of the great teacher. The whole intellectual nature must be brought under the yoke of the meek and lowly Jesus, together with the heart. What are called first

principles are to be learned from Jesus; he gives the elements of truth, the milk for the babes in knowledge, and the strong meat for those who are of full age. Reason is not to be trusted as a leader and guide, in any stage of the progress of religious knowledge. It cannot take a step beyond revelation, and so far as revelation goes faith must go with it. Reason may and must examine the meaning of revelation, but if it questions its authority, it assumes powers and rights which faith never aspires to,—that is, it takes the place of a principal and not of a dependant. Learn of me, always implies, believe that I can teach you. Let the disciple learn of his teacher, let his mind be richly imbued with the wisdom of his master, and let him be interrogated respecting the *who*, and the *how*. Who taught you? Jesus. How did he teach you, or how did you receive his instructions? Through faith. I did not reason, argue, dispute, contend with him as an equal, not to say a superior. I brought my mind, my reason, to his wisdom and knowledge. He taught, I learned. He led, I followed. He shone, I was enlighted. He imparted truth, and I imbibed it. The scholar or disciple in every school is a believer, and when he ceases to be so he ceases to learn; he becomes a reasoner, and meets his former teacher on equal ground. But what disciple of the Lord Jesus can ever learn enough, even in his school, to equal him in wisdom?

Imputed truth or righteousness, as we take it, will

find few if any advocates. To be wise in Christ, without deriving any knowledge from him into our own minds; or in other words, to have all our knowledge in our bibles, will leave our minds but a blank of ignorance. Too many occasions must needs occur to expose the fallacy of such a notion of knowledge, to admit of its being cherished long, even by prejudice itself. Faith in Jesus as a teacher, without the docility of a learner, is dead. Faith in a bible whose contents remain unknown, is dead. Such believers are not justified of God. As learners, would not his justice oppose their justification? Dead faith cannot surely claim of justice the same award as living faith. Nor can he who enters into a school to reason or dispute, expect to bring away the same amount of knowledge or learning as he who enters and continues in it, in full confidence of his teacher's talents. The active righteousness of Christ, so called, that is his personal obedience to the law of Moses, or as it is expressed,—his being made under the law, is said expressly to have been intended, that he might redeem them that are under the law, that is the Jews, as in fact the Gentiles were never under the ceremonial and sacrificial law of Moses. Now if the obedience of the Messiah to this law is imputed, it would only be to the Jews, who alone could be under its curse. This distinction is clearly made and fully argued in the Epistle to the Romans. Now the moral righteousness, that is the moral rectitude of his nature

and spotless purity of life, as the holy, harmless and undefiled One, separate from sinners, made him a suitable high priest for us sinners,—the just for the unjust. But in so far as believers partake of this holy nature, they derive it by sanctification, or being made holy.

The Jews and the Gentiles, to whom the gospel was first preached, were familiar with the ideas of vicarious sacrifices. The remission of sins that are past, by the merit of blood, was associated by some analogy, with every sacrificial altar; and every Greek and Roman country abounded with altars and priests and sacrifices for sins. The peculiarity of the gospel, when it was first preached, did not consist in the doctrine of vicarious sacrifices, but in teaching "that God set forth his Son to be the propitiation through faith in his blood, through his forbearance for the remission of sins that are passed." It was, in declaring at that time, his righteousness. But when those hearers had heard and known enough of this distinguishing doctrine of redemption through the blood, the bloody death of Christ upon the cross, and had faith enough in it to obtain the remission of their sins that were passed, they were only beginners in the school of Christ. These blessed truths were not indeed ever to be unlearned or forgotten; they were foundation truths, upon which the whole superstructure of knowledge and experience was to be built; but they were not the middle nor the end,—"not as though I had al-

ready attained, or were already perfect." By ceasing to learn, by refusing instruction, by learning to their own understanding, believers, when the time should arrive that they ought to be teachers of others, might have needed that some one should teach them again, which be the first principles of the doctrine of Christ,—having become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat—as babes, who are unskilled in the word of righteousness. The progress or growth in knowledge is not sinful, though it be imperfect, for it is of faith. It is not the proud contentions of reason, not the exalting of the unsanctified and vain imagination above that which is written; but the ignorant, though humble and teachable mind, sitting at the feet of Jesus. Ignorance and error, which remain after such humble attempts and dutiful endeavors, such reliance on the name of the Lord Jesus, have not the spirit of disobedience. They are placed to the account of a nature which by sin had come short of the glory of God, but now bears a new covenant-relation to God, through the redeeming merit of the Mediator.

But though neither perfect knowledge nor perfect goodness can be derived unto minds or souls dwelling in mortal bodies, yet true knowledge may be derived, and also true goodness; both may be of the right kind. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who worketh in you, both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure." "Herein is my Father glorified, that

ye bring forth much fruit." "Be ye holy, for I am holy." "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called." It will be difficult to open the New Testament, without finding some proof or argument going to show that its author intended, by the plan of redemption, to produce the greatest amount of wisdom and goodness in believers, thro' its instrumentality, consistent with the effects of fallen nature, or the mortal bodies which are only to be finally made new at the resurrection from the dead. If it were possible for an unbeliever to equal, or come to excel in wisdom and goodness, the most holy believer, his wisdom and goodness being presented before God, as they must be, without the name and the merits of the Lord Jesus Christ, he could not be justified consistently with justice, unless they came up to the standard of the law of innocence. There are but two ways of satisfying the justice of God—first, to fulfil the law of innocence or sinless obedience, and, secondly, faith in Jesus.

It behooves unbelievers, who reject the gospel, to look to the consequences. If they will not have the new covenant, made through a mediator, will they have no covenant at all? Or, will they claim the old covenant, with its absolute law—"In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die?" It is not for dependent creatures to prescribe conditions to their Maker, or establish covenants with him, or to claim exceptions to general principles in their own behalf. "We must all appear before

the judgment seat of Christ." If we might possibly have our own choice under what law we shall be tried and judged, it would surely be as much as we could reasonably require. But how can any man suppose that the decisions of divine justice will be the same, with and without a mediator, with and without redemption, or with and without faith.

Now, the doctrine of imputed righteousness, if it were made only to bear on the remission of sins that are passed, and not to supersede future obedience of faith, or the personal holiness of believers, might, perhaps, be used, technically, as a mode of expressing the justifying merits of the Redeemer. But the history of theology shows, that in almost every age and in every church, it has been so construed, as, by hypothesis, to supersede the necessity of experimental and practical religion. Not only controversial writings, but books on duty and devotion, are often found to abound with opinions and sentiments which confound the best of men and the best of works, with the worst, in such a manner as to furnish arguments by which certain persons have fearlessly maintained that all believers are equally complete in Christ. Examples of these kinds have been so numerous as to induce a class of writers to maintain that the theory of imputed righteousness naturally leads to antinomian consequences, or "to the making void the law through faith." The fact, however, is undeniable, that this opinion has spread

and prevailed, at certain times, to a most injurious extent, and seemed as if, in defiance of Scripture, it would turn the grace of God into wantonness. One has said—let a theory be given to indulge the passions and the appetites, and human nature will take it. But it is found that such a state of things cannot last long without a reaction. Great practical errors lead to their own detection, when mind is left free. Our own times seem to promise better things. The friends of the doctrine of imputed righteousness seem now determined to take the lead of those who favor inherent as well as derived righteousness, in experience and in personal obedience. Their praise begins to be spoken of in all the churches. Do they mean to prove that it was the abuse and not the use of the opinion which caused the scandal? Or has the zeal of the friends of derived righteousness technically provoked them to jealousy? Charity hopeth all things—but fear still whispers that effects have been too general to hope for much from past or limited causes!

We have adopted the expression *derivative* righteousness, in place of the expression *imputed* or *inherent* righteousness, to avoid old associations, so common in controversy. "Now the fruits of the spirit are manifest, which are these,—not imputed or inherent fruits. Experimental religion must necessarily be personal. The spirit is not imputed but imparted. "If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more will

your heavenly father give the holy spirit to them that ask him?" Love, joy, peace, meekness, gentlenesss, patience long-suffering are all in us, and not reckoned or imputed as things without us. When a man hates, love cannot be conceived of as imputed to him. The joys of another can minister no relief to our griefs. The manner in which imputation is sometimes spoken of, and the consequences deduced from it, can hardly be reconciled with personal identity. "The love of God," says St. Paul, "is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Spirit, which is given to us." It is remarkable that when faith is spoken of as connected with our redemption or salvation, none of the graces of the Holy Spirit, no personal virtues, not even love itself, are made the object. Is it not said,—believe in the love of God and thou shalt be saved, or believe on or in the righteousness of Christ, and it shall be imputed unto thee. The blood or the bloody sacrifice of Christ is the object of justifying faith,—"in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

We have had occasion to remark once and again that a redemption price does not, as a general principle, appear to be required in kind, as in the *lex talionis;* an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. This *lex*, law, was penal, not sacrificial. The blood of the victims, which was offered at the altar, seemed to bear no relation to the nature of their sins, for which it made atonement. The Messiah tastes

death for every man, and the common sentence,—is "the soul that sinneth it shall die." One sin merits death in the eye of the law. Laws cannot be made to punish the repeated sin, and not the first sin, without encouraging the number of sins less by one than the number specified. If the law, for instance, should enact that he who shall kill ten men, should be hung, nine might be killed with impunity.

Sanctification is by faith. As a medium for the derivation of wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, it is difficult to conceive any means more suitable than faith. Its very name excludes all self-sufficiency. Its aspects and actions are those of dependence. It cannot take on a single mode of merit. It cannot stand alone. With nothing to believe, it becomes nothing; but as a receiver and a conveyer, it is adequate to the conveyance of every kind of gift to be transmitted through it. Between the giver of every good and perfect gift, and the humble, needy, suppliant sinner, it can transmit all things without appropriating any thing to itself. It looks to Jesus as its author and its finisher.

> That thou can'st here forgive,
> Grant me to testify,
> And justified by faith to live,
> And in that faith to die.

Works done by believers, or the work of faith, or the obedience of faith, are not regarded in the gospel as sinful, for the object of the Redeemer was to

purify unto himself a people zealous of good works. The day of final judgment was in the divine mind or intention, to speak after the manner of men, in the very plan and work of redemption, and of course the principle of justice must have entered into the plan. He will judge the world in righteousness and the people with equity. Now what is the idea of the Antinomian respecting the nature of the justice to be adjudged in the day of judgment? Is it that no righteousness can pass that ordeal, but the righteous acts of Jesus Christ, imputed to believers? But to prove this to be the scriptural doctrine of the justice of God, must not hundreds of texts not only be explained away, but set aside? Not so in regard to derived righteousness. Though it all flowed from Jesus Christ as from a fountain, it becomes the believer's own by experience and practice; it is in his affections and in his will. He loves it as a—"good will doing service."

The declaration is,—they that have done good, shall enter into life. "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

There is, indeed, an imputation, very different from the one commonly received. "In as much as you have done it, ye have done it nnto me." So a cup of cold water, given to one in the name of a disciple, shall not lose its reward. Instead of the imputation by the Judge of his own acts of benevolence and humanity to the believers, he regards them as done by believers unto himself.

All are,—"justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Jews and Gentiles are considered as sinners in the sight of God, and a common redemption is provided for them.—Christ Jesus is set forth, as a propitiation, as a mercy seat, as the reconciliation medium, as the atonement through faith in his blood,—"to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God,"—to declare at this time, in this dispensation, this gracious gospel day of mercy and salvation, his righteousness. God, by setting forth Jesus Christ, his Son, as the all-sufficient meritorious sacrifice, makes a declaration of his rightecusness, demonstrates, that the throne of justice is not displaced, to make way for the throne of mercy and grace. He hath ordained that the redeemer and Saviour of sinners should be the judge of the world. Now he forbears, now he is long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and keeping mercy for thousands; but then, when he comes to judgment, he will by no means clear the guilty. He must be just while he justifies those who believe in Jesus. He,—"will render to every man according to his deeds: to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man, that doeth evil, of the Jew first

and also of the Gentile; but glory honor and peace to every man, that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God."

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE EIGHTH.

THE CHRISTIAN CHARACTER.

For our rejoicing is this the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world; and more abundantly to you-ward.

II. Corinthians i. 12.

Happiness cannot exist without self-consistency, and self-consistency is attested by the conscience.—Not only peace may flow from the testimony of a good conscience, but joy or rejoicing, that is, an active state of happiness. The Scriptures speak of rejoicing in God, of rejoicing in the Lord always, of rejoicing for having now received the atonement, of rejoicing with joy unspeakable and full of glory, and in the text, of rejoicing in the testimony of a good conscience. These causes of joy must be in harmony with each other, and the failure of the latter would derange the rest. A good conscience is a creditable witness of simplicity and godly sincerity. If it testify of their defects and failures, self-displacency must follow.

The Apostle was a new convert to a new religion from an old religion. He made no secret of his happiness in his new religion. But how could these professions be admitted by the professors of the old

religion? How could they admit that he was neither deceived himself, nor meant to deceive others? Could they consistently do otherwise than conclude, that he had forsaken all the true means of happiness, and of course that he was miserable being governed by fleshly wisdom? St. Paul evidently means to meet an objection by the phrase,—"not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God." This Saul of Tarsus,—would not the Jews say?—this disciple of Gamaliel, this Pharisee so conspicuous for his zeal in favor of the law and apparent sincerity has renounced the legal sacrifices and is teaching a doctrine subversive of all their merit; and yet he rejoices, he proclaims that he has found a happy religion but it cannot be so, it must be all self-delusion or hypocrisy. Not so,—he seems to say,—this is not hypocrisy nor is our joy hypothetical; it is not inferred from causes wholly without ourselves, it is not from a bad conscience, not from a confused or disordered state of mind nor is it to be traced to selfish or political calculations. We are not only simple, identical in our intentions and piously sincere, but our conversation in the world and in the church is sustained and regulated by the grace of God, instead of legal ceremonies.

The point of doctrine in the text is, how a man who forsakes an old religion and embraces a new religion, is to form and sustain his character. There is a common-place anecdote which need not have been true to give it an application. The story is,

that a man of an old church went to a man of a new church. The latter when questioned by the former spoke in high admiration of the prayers of his church. The questioner affirmed, that they were all stolen from his church. Then,—replied the man of the new church,—like other thieves we have taken the best. This reply did not obviate the charge of theft, nor by the way lessen the offence if it did not aggravate it. What is taken from an old church into a new one or with a view to form a new one, will not be yielded as common property. The evidence of this would appear in argument, if it should be supposed that the Apostles had transferred the sacrifices of the ancient law into the new Christian church without the consent of the Jewish authorities. Would not the proceeding have been regarded as unlawful and outrageous? In fact, this principle is general if not universal. All denominations are disposed to make the peculiarities of their religion exclusive; some in one way and in some another. The pertinacity about their rights and the divine right of ordination is known to every body. The essence of the sin of non-conformity is considered to be in transgressing authority; the non-conformity is the sign of disobedience, though the spirit of disobedience would still be condemned without the sign. Churches are not willing that church character should be taken out from them. With the question of right and wrong we do not meddle: but the things that have been will probably be hereafter

Leaving then the subject of property or the right of churches to their own forms and names and usages, the grace of God still remains as a basis for a christian and a ministerial character. "By the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world and more abundantly to you-ward." We rejoice in the cause and in the consequence. "Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience." We have rejoicing in ourselves and not in another. We have a tribunal in our own bosom, and if conscience be not judge it is a witness. We rejoice that the grace of God is as free as it is efficacious. By it we live holy in the world; but more holy still in the church.

But what is this grace of God? How is it to be defined? The primary meaning of the word grace is favor, or the sign of a favor, a gift." By grace are ye saved,—it is the gift of God." "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that though he was rich he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be made rich." The grace of God and faith can never be secularized,—if one may use the word. The identity of the believer can never be lost in a partnership. No doctrine is more fully established, than that of the individual accountability of every man before the judgment seat of Christ.—The Jewish church was in several respects a political body. Their principal sacrifice was national. But the unspeakable gift of God's only begotten Son and the grace that came by him, the spirit of grace with which believers are baptized, and the gift of

eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord were not exclusive property of the Jewish Church nor of any man or body of men. "In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free, male nor female;"—all distinctions are lost in that of believer. The notion of the false prophet who cried out,—"Which way went the spirit of the Lord from me to you?" Can have no foundation in the gospel. The spirit of grace is not transmitted from man to man, but from the head of the church to every one that believeth. The church is not the object of faith, but the Lord Jesus Christ. "We believe" says St. Peter, "that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

The Apostles were not indebted to the law of sacrificial and ceremonial works. The new Christian dispensation took nothing of this kind from the old Jewish dispensation which was ready to vanish away. "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature; old thing are past away." "Behold! all things are become new and all things are of Christ who is head over all things unto the church." "In him all fulness dwells." There was no mistake, no deception, no hypocrisy in those Jews whom the Messiah sent forth to preach the gospel. The grace of God was sufficient for them. By the grace of God they were what they were. This grace wrought effectually in them to the Apostleship. They had the witness in themselves of the

efficacy of this grace in the world and in their religious fellowship.

Every Christian and Minister must have intercourse with the world and with the church. "I wrote unto you, not to keep company with the men of this world, yet not altogether of this world, for then ye must needs go out of the world. But concerning brotherly love, I have no need to write unto you, for ye are taught of God to love one another." Duty may call us unto the world, but choice as well as duty call us into the church. "We have had our conversation in the world, but more abundantly to you-ward" Always pure in intention and always piously sincere let us be, whether the men with whom we converse be bad or good, pious or profane. Between the sincere Jew and the sincere Christian, there was opportunity for fleshly wisdom. Between the professors of an old religion and a new one, there are many occasions for temptation or for offence, for there is great scope for hopes and fears. Faith in principles and moral integrity is severely tested by the artifices of logic and the uncertainty of results. And in proportion to difficulties and dangers are the joys of success and the rejoicing in the causes of success. To be sustained in this world, this world of sin and folly, this cruel and persecuting world by the grace of God; to be able to take a good conscience with us from an intercourse with a world of trials and crosses into the society of a new brotherhood; and

in that brotherhood to find the testimony of the conscience strengthened in the sufficiency of the grace of God, are causes of rejoicing indeed. Every person who is fully persuaded that it is a duty to submit to an expulsion for conscience sake, or to change his religious fellowship from one denomination to another, must so count the cost as to place his sole reliance upon the grace of God to ensure success, otherwise, there will be great danger of being betrayed into fleshly wisdom in some form or degree. Simplicity and godly sincerity will be betrayed or defeated, if fleshly wisdom is made auxilliary to them. It is a deceitful alliance. This accounts for the constant and earnest manner, in which the author and founder of Christianity presses upon his disciples the necessity of forsaking all to follow him. He knew what was in man, for he knew the hearts of all men. But human feelings are alike under like excitements. All kinds of error as well as truths reduce themselves into system in the mind; and the minds that sustain them become tenacious of the parts and all the ends and conclusions. These apostilic servants fully verified the truth of their Master's presence. "These things have I spoken unto you, that ye should not be offended." "They shall put you out of the synagogues, yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doeth God service." New denominations may arise and small and feeble ones may revive much faster by the wisdom of

the flesh than by the grace of God; but the faster they are made to rise by this means the more may their simplicity and godly sincerity be encroached upon. The grace of God does nothing contrary to the testimony of a good conscince. Grace crowns none but honest means with final success; and in a new and weak society dishonest means can hardly be concealed. Flattery of pride, gratification of self-interest, and the indulgence of deceitful passions, are facilitated by the accumulation of numbers, wealth, and power and old establishment. Must not the grace of God do every thing for those who have for its sake suffered the loss of all things? Must it not be to them wisdom, strength, motive, comfort? When good men renounce the causes of the success of bad men, it is not to be supposed that they can succeed without any causes. Truth the foundation truth of all religion, is God's truth, and those who engage in it can consistently look to God for help in time of need. Out of his fulness have we all received, and grace to answer grace. All the holy or virtuous qualities which compose a good man's character are graces or fruits of the Holy Spirit.

The questions between the Apostles and their countrymen respecting the Messiahship, were first, the person, secondly, the offices. Some of the Jews agreed that Jesus was the Christ, but rejected his priestly office, and so did not rely wholly upon the grace of God. They did not let all the old things

pass away. Now if the Apostles were right in affirming that the old things had passed away, they were right in the conclusion that all things had become new and that all things were of Christ Jesus. The simplicity of this plan in comparison with the half-old and half-new one, is very obvious. The whole of the priestly office and all the real merit of sacrifice are thus in the Messiah, and the mortal priesthood of the sons of Aaron ceases.

A conversation in the world involves men who have deviated from established religious systems and usages in his controversy. The Apostles like their Lord had to endure the contradictions of the men of the world against themselves. Their was much disputing about their conduct, not in one place only but in almost every place where the Apostles came. The offence they gave was, that they would not hold their peace, but would speak and spare not. They would converse upon the subject of their mission in the world; converse first with the Jews and if they refused to hear then turn to the Gentiles. Their conversation in this world was with men whose prejudices and passions were in a state of excitement. Hence it is probable the term *conversation* is used not merely as meaning a part of but the whole of the moral deportment; for it seems probable, that if their ministerial duty had not made it necessary they would have been apt to shun the contradictors and blasphemers of their doctrines. The account of St. Paul's ministry in the Acts of

Apostles and the references to it in his letters, show that if his doctrinal controversies had not brought him in contact with the world his intercourse with it would have been but limited. This high state of public excitement and emotion, however, became a severe test of temper and disposition. How numerous and powerful the temptations in such conflicts to speak unadvisedly with the lips! What provocation to render railing for railing! And how sudden the promptness of the feelings! We have had our conversation in the world, but not with fleshly wisdom. With this we were opposed. Our opponents were subtle, acute, and argumentative; and their genius cultivated by art was stimulated by fleshly or animal propensities. In our conversation in the world we have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness. Controversy may have features and movements in common with war. The shame of defeat, the glory of success cannot be wholly excluded from the mind in the strife of words. Words may inflict most painful sensations. Religious disputes above all others are proverbial for rendering the feelings irascible and rousing the malevolent passions. The grace of God is the only corrective to these demoralizing tendencies. When two parties equally influenced by fleshly wisdom enter into religious disputation; in the absence of restraining grace, nothing but necessity can prevent them from proceeding to violence, if not in words and actions at least in feeling.

Those men in the world who disputed with St. Paul, when all their controversial sources failed, left no means unessayed to take his life. He rejoiced that the grace of God restrained him from the dreadful spirit of retaliation, and enabled him to return good for evil, blessing for cursing, and to pray for them who despitefully used him.

"Brethren," says he, "my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel (for that Israel who seeks my life, as they did the life of Elijah) is, that they may be saved!" But however efficacious the grace of God may be, in enabling us to sustain the contradiction of sinners, it is or may be more abundantly so in our conversation toward the church. The letters of St. Paul to the churches seem to answer to the phrase,—*and more abundantly to youward.* No matter how remote from the churches, no matter how great his perils or his labors, though pressed out of measure and despairing of life, he could not forbear writing to the brethren. When absent from them, he desired, he longed to see them. His heart overflows in their mutual salutations. The churches were his home like his father's house, were the habitation of his brethren. "Whether I come and see you," said he, "or hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in the Lord." By the grace of God, his brotherly love not only continued but abounded yet more and more. He conversed with them when absent by letter, when present face to face, not with fleshly wisdom. "Ye

are witnesses and God also, how holily and justly and unblamably we behaved ourselves among you that believe. As ye know, how we exhorted and comforted every one of you as a father doth his children, that ye walk worthy of God who hath called us unto his kingdom and glory."

It may be regretted, that Apostles and friends of religious changes and reforms have had to devote so large a portion of their time and talents to controversy; but the nature of the case and the nature of man seem to render it unavoidable. The greater the truths contended for, and the greater the errors opposed, the greater it may be presumed will be the struggle of the parties immediately engaged in the controversy. The matter in dispute between the Apostles and the Sanhedrim, were not mere trifles or forms or points of opinion which minister to nothing good or great. The greatest and longest continued of all religious controversies was, and is, that between idolatry and the worship of the living and true God. Theism and Atheism have not given rise to so much dispute. Christianity at every step had to contend with Judaism, and even now all the questions are not settled. Political agreements between fellow citizens bring them no nearer together on points of religious difference. The elements of strife among professors of Christianity are still in activity. And the common and almost unavoidable conclusion of the observer is, that the opposite and opposing opinions cannot be all

right. But there are few if any among the present reviewers of history, who now maintain that truth was and is always on the side of the oldest, and error on the side of the newest of the polemical parties. But it may be safely laid down as a position, that the grace of God is always on the side of truth. On this position the conclusion is rested that the grace of God sustained the Apostles. The old Jewish opinions were wrong. The opinions of the new disciples of Jesus were right. These men understood and maintained the truth: grace therefore was with them and they were conscious of it and conscious that they had done nothing to forfeit it. Have the friends of reforms in principle or in practice had good and sufficient reason to believe, that they have truth on their side? Then they might well confide in the grace of God, and maintain simplicity and godly sincerity in their converse in the world and more abundantly in the church, and have joy and rejoicing in themselves and not in another.

So long as men are subject to the prejudices and passions, which according to history have been common in all religious controversy, it may be assumed that whoever attempts to form a new religious fellowship, will have to form a religious character anew and in immediate relation to the principles of the new system. But the resources of the parties resolve themselves into only two genera, namely,—fleshly wisdom and the grace God. And in vain shall the attempt be made to unite them or to com-

bine them into one; and the attempt would be as useless as vain could it succeed. Grace itself is all-sufficient. "My grace is sufficient for thee,"—is the common warrant and security of every friend and champion of the truth. "We have access into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." In every age and country in which men have been persecuted for the cause of truth, the Grace of God has brought from the furnace characters like gold tried in the fire. Men who borrowed nothing from, owed nothing to their persecutors; and their persecutors could claim nothing from them. Let men begin at what point they may or in what maner they may, to oppose an error or a vice of long standing reduced to a system and confirmed by habit, if they finally succeed in producing a real change, they will be driven if not suddenly and immediately yet by degrees to take new and independent ground. St. Paul's conversion was as complete as it was sudden. He consulted not with flesh and blood, but began at once to preach Christ. He saw at once into the nature of the work and the whole of the difficulties, and he did not take ground from which he should be compelled to retreat step by step, or be defeated in attempting to maintain it. In the eleventh chapter of his Epistle to the Romans he contrasts the two principles,—the one he embraced and the one he opposed. "If by grace, then it is no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of

works, then it is no more of grace; otherwise work is no more work. "It was impossible to reconcile the gracious sacrifice and the sacrificial works.—"Not by sacrificial works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy he saved us; by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his grace we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

"Our rejoicing is this,"—says the Apostle; so, he was happy. The friends and supporters of old and established systems are happy, and of course are apt to suppose that all those whom they regard as innovators upon those systems, must needs be unhappy by depriving themselves of their common sources of happiness; and the conclusion would be correct on their own supposition that the innovators have lost truth instead of finding it. Now, human enjoyments in these changes are not absolute, but relative and conditional. Paul was once happy in the services of te altar; but when he found another altar, the offerings of which those who continued to serve in the old tabernacle had no right to eat, he could dispense with his former enjoyments as an exchange for greater ones. In going forth without the gate after the crucifixion and bearing his reproach, we hear him exclaiming,—"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ!" Happiness in changes of religious

principles or practices should have truth for its basis, and a consciousness of maintaining it in a manner acceptable to God. Between God and the heart every thing should be conducted with the utmost sincerity. Zeal for truth, however commendable in itself is no compensation for the loss of sincerity. Success may and generally does produce joy, but the cause of joy may be in the success alone without any regard to truth or error. Disappointment and defeat are natural causes of regret and sorrow. Fleshly wisdom is inventive of sources and means of pleasurable emotions. Cunning and wit pander to mirth and laughter. Men are pleased or take pleasure in doing whatever they love to do. They who rejoice with fleshly wisdom love all its promptness, all the artifices of the mind; and all animal propensities when indulged quickly and strongly excite pleasurable emotions. This wisdom (falsely so called) is loved on account of the ease and readiness with which it gains its ends or comes to its conclusions, and gives or receives pleasure. Simplicity or oneness of design is no part of the arrangement of fleshly wisdom, and never limits it in the choice of its means. This wisdom reflects not upon the past, anticipates not the future, but seeks to satisfy itself with the present. As regulating and directing causes of conversation in this world, the contrasts between fleshly wisdom and the grace of God are extreme. The one is the source of all depravity of manners, and the other of all the decencies and

proprieties of life. "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but such as is good for the use of edifying. Let your conversation be seasoned with salt, and be such as may minister grace to the hearers. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these," &c.

But the more abundant religious joys of the reformers are realized in the church, in the society of the converts and friends who also have the testimony of a good conscience, of simplicity and godly sincerity. A conversation in the world cannot be sustained by any solitary individual, without some one or more with whom to interchange mutual sympathies. The first missionaries were sent out two and two; but they were to return to their sender and meet each other in his presence as in a home. When missionaries were recommended to the grace of God for any special work, they generally returned to those who thus prayed for them. Paul never planted a church which he did not desire or endeavor to revisit. The world is too mighty for any single champion of the gospel to contend against alone. It is a true saying,—we must find Christians or make them.

The importance of religious fellowship to the success of the gospel, or the restoration and support of its particular truths, is well understood by the enemies of religion, who have shown as much hostility to societies or churches as to preachers themselves. Of such importance were churches, that they were

organized in families, and even twos and threes composed them in the absence of greater numbers. The character of those who are regarded as singugular or peculiar for any thing above the common standard, are never safe without some friends in whom they may confide. No considerations of danger in times of great persecution, could induce the first ministers of Jesus Christ to refrain from planting churches, as without them their labors must have been lost or rendered useless. The conversation which might have convinced the gainsayers would soon have been forgotten, had they to whom tho gospel was preached been left as unfolded sheep, to wander without social intercourse with those of kindred thoughts and feelings. But friendship is happiness, and religion admits of the highest degree of happiness. This bane of friendship is selfishness and all the vices are selfish ; they all seek their own and not the things that are Jesus Christ's. The grace of God neither generates nor fosters a selfish spirit. There is enough for all, enough for each, enough for evermore.

All the consolations of Christ, all the comforts of love, and all the fellowship of the Holy Spirit are free for all the members and ministers of the churches. In a newly formed church in a time of persecution composed of course out of the poorer classes of society, for in such times not many wise, not many rich and noble obey the call,—the happiness of Christian and Ministerial fellowship and friendship

must be derived from spiritual influences. In such times of peril, when men's lives are in jeopardy every hour and the help of man proves utterly vain, sympathies in human sufferings, in the prospect of heaven, are at once delightful and sublime. Behold! the parting scene; "they fell on Paul's neck and kissed him sorowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more." Well might he say,—"and more abundantly to you-ward." The best evidence of the truth and purity of a new church is to be found in the new church itself, when its ministers and members experience their greatest joy in their mutual fellowship, their greatest sorrow in parting. These are proofs that their love is pure, sincere and gracious. But if in a newly organized church of professed reformers, the members find no happiness in their new relation or less than any where else, and its ministers find no fellow-feeling among them, there is reason to suspect that the root of the matter is not in them. What! ministers of the gospel and members of churches, comparatively unhappy in each others' company! How striking the contrast with those who were glad when the brethren said, "come, let us go up to the house of God together," and who found it good and pleasant to dwell together in unity! According to their own showing, nothing was more contemptible and odious in the estimation of the world than the characters of the primitive Ministers and Christians; and yet in each

others' society they gained a name which is worthy of emulation to the end of time. They compelled their enemies to say,—See how these Christians love one another! Jesus formed his church and called men out of the world into it for the purpose of forming a *Christian Character*. To this end he gave them a new commandment,—that they should love one another. We lay it down as a general rule that all attempts to reform churches will be attended with little success, without a near conformity to the letter and spirit of this text.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE NINTH.

TO KNOW JESUS CHRIST.

But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ: yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.

Philippians iii. 7—11.

Among the Jews to whom the gospel was first preached there were two classes of believers, the one of whom believed in common with the other that Jesus was the Messiah, but still held that the legal sacrifices and all ancient forms of government and worship ought to be retained in his kingdom or church. Persons of this opinion are alluded to by St. James, when he said to Paul—"thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are that believe, and they are all zealous of the law." Those Judaizing preachers (so called) who made so much opposition to St. Paul, were of this number; a particular account of whom and of their manner of teaching is given in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. They came down from Judea to Antioch and taught the brethren;—

"Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses ye cannot be saved." "They finally became a separate denomination of Christians, and are known in history as Nazarites or Nazarine christians. In process of time their name was lost. Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles or of the uncircumcision magnified his office, in asserting and maintaining that it was not necessary that the Gentiles should become Jews or be circumcised in order to become Christians; consequently he argued and he proved that the legal sacrifices and the ancient forms of worship and government were repealed and superseded by the new dispensation of the Messiah. He was therefore not only opposed by the unbelieving Jews in common with the Apostles of the circumcision, but also by most of those who were zealous for the continuance of the law. This opposition was in many instances carried to the utmost degree of violence. Under this kind of double persecution he had suffered the loss of all things, but his privations and lossess did not exceed his purpose and fortitude. His opposers could take nothing from him, which he was not ready and willing to give. "What things were gain to me, those I counted but loss, before I lost them: yea doubtless, now that I have lost them, I not only still count them but loss, but I count all things but loss." This is an example of what he elsewhere describes in the words;—"ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods." Losses that we have

anticipated, that we are willing to suffer, that we experience with resignation and even with joy, cease in effect to be losses. But how is it probable to arrive at this state of mind? The answer is in the text;—for Christ; for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ; that I may win Christ; that I may be found in him, with the righteousness which is through the faith of Christ; that I may know him and the power of his resurrection; and that I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead.

The prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem is not, as is some times supposed, merely to be regarded as an example of the truth of prophecy. It had a special bearing upon the point of doctrine at issue in this controversy. If this catastrophe were to take place at the time and in the manner and to the extent foretold, how was it possible that the law could be perpetuated in the church or kingdom of the Messiah? With the loss of their country, of their temple, and the loss of the last vestige of political existence, must not that law which in the opinion of all pointed to Jerusalem and to the temple, be rendered impracticable in its highest and holiest requirements? With the destruction of that holy place and holy house and holy altar, how could the high priest enter the holy of holies and approach the mercy-seat and offer the great annual and national expiation? How different the conviction of Paul and those who like him counted all things but loss, if any among them survived the destruction of

the city and temple, from the condition of those believers who were zealous of the law and also survived those ruins! Both parties must have been losers of all things. The high-priest could no more approach to the mercy seat for the one than for the other. Behold the difference;—the one anticipated and counted upon them and submitted to them willingly,—the other surprised and confounded was compelled to give up the dear objects of his confidence and hope without a substitute or compensation! The fulfilment of that memorable prophecy was like death which comes to all, but comes to those who are prepared or expecting it and to those who are not ready or willing to die, as welcome or terrible. There can be no doubt but that St. Paul perfectly understood and firmly believed all the predictions to the very letter, that not one stone should be left upon another of that edifice once so holy and so sacred in his own eyes, and also in the eyes of his countrymen who believed that the services of that sanctuary made with hands would be continued forever under the reign of the Messiah.

The prediction then of the loss or the whole Jewish polity, which was to be fulfiled before all who heard it should die and the exact fulfilment of which was witnessed, if there were no other evidence that it must be so, would confirm the belief that that polity must give place to a different one. The minds of all who understood and believed the

prediction, were prepared for the consequences. The inquiry of the disciples by associating the end of the world with the time of the prediction indicates, that their minds were still expecting that the Messiah would reign in Jerusalem until the end of the world. The dissolution of an ancient church and government is, next to great national convulsions and revolutions, among the most interesting and affecting of events. And among those recorded in history, few have been more destructive or more complete than that in this prediction. The desperation and the resistance of the leaders and the people drove matters to a frightful extremity. Nothing was more unlikely nor more unexpected to the Romans, than that the province of India the smallest and least warlike in the empire should attempt a revolt. But their protracted resistance exasperated the legions to the highest degree of vengeance. The orders of the commander-in-chief to spare the temple from the flames, were disregarded. From the seventieth year of our era, when the Romans thus took away the Jewish place and nation, to the present time, Jerusalem has been so trodden down by the Gentiles that it has been impossible to carry the sacrificial law into execution there. Thus is the providential seal of God set to the truth of St. Paul's doctrine and practice. And thus it appears that the opinion of those believers who were zealous of the law, if true, would have involved impossibilities. "He taketh away the first (kind of sacri-

fice) that he might establish the second (that is, the sacrifice of himself for us.)" Neither the Romans nor any earthly power can destroy the heavenly temple not made with hands, into which the great Mediatorial High Priest has entered with the merit of his own blood. The true Jewish believers are to be contemplated in a most interesting point of light. They counted upon and anticipated the end of the old religious world or church, and the resurrection of a new church. How eventful the scenes! When ye shall see them, and see the hearts of unbelievers failing them through fear, then lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh. All that takes place will confirm the truth of my mission and of my doctrine, that I give my life a ransom for the multitudes.

But let us follow the Apostle as he magnified the grace of God. "Yea doubtless, I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things." To know Jesus Christ and him crucified as our lord, is knowledge by excellence. The reality of matter has been questioned in ancient and modern times, and the natural power of vision has been compared to a picture. The world it is said is only in our eye; hence the speculations about material objects. But the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord is Christ in me,—the hope of glory. A child or an ignorant person sees a star. He knows it as a white shining spot at a great dis-

tance off. His knowledge increases and he knows it to be a great globe of vast magnitude, at an immeasurable distance from him. The more a man knows of a star, the more distant he knows himself to be from it. But the more he knows of Jesus Christ, the more nearly he approaches to him until he becomes one in him. "I in you, and you in me." We may know Jesus Christ our Lord in the flesh, through the history of him. We may know him as the Saviour or Deliverer who hath power on earth to forgive sins; and we may know him as our Ruler and Judge as having all power in heaven and earth. In this progress of our knowledge we become more and more intimate with the subject of our knowledge. He is in heaven; his kingdom is not of this world; he is at the right hand of God. The excellency of this knowledge is, that it is in the form of faith; the object comes to us by hearing and hearing by the word of God. It is best suited to our intellectual faculties, by being exhibited to them in the most intelligible form. We believe nothing so firmly and steadily which is presented to our minds through any of our senses, as we do that which can be presented in the form of a proposition, in words so as to admit of an argument and a demonstration of its truth. Experimental philosophy itself makes slow advances without logic. Excellent knowledge! We can walk by it and live by it, and not by sight. We walk by faith and not by sight. "The just shall live by faith." Excellent

knowledge which brings us nearer and nearer to the truth, and our souls nearer to the author of the truth himself! "I know in whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep unto that day that which I have committed unto him." What is the knowledge of the legal sacrifices in comparison to this? Concerning them Paul was blameless. In regard to ceremonial religion he had lived in all good conscience before God. But the objects of this knowledge were all beyond himself; he neve could become one with them nor they with him, that they might be one. They were always objects of sight or sense and not of faith and hope, for what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for?—They were touched and tasted and handled and they perished in the using.

The Apostle accounted all thing that were gain to him as dung, "so that he might win Christ and be found in him, not having his own righteousness which was of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." The points of opposition are strongly marked,—gain, loss, win, find. To find one we must lose the other or count it as lost. The righteousness which was of the law, in all those persons who held or accounted that sacrifices would be perpetuated under the gospel, was in effect a species of self-righteousness. They were apt to trust in themselves that they were righteous. They trusted in their own sacrifices for sin. They did not ex-

pect that the Messiah would offer himself as a meritorious sacrifice for the sins of the Jews and Gentiles. Hence sacrificial works and faith in the sacrifice of Christ became opposed to each other. One must yield or be yielded, before the other could advance. It is testified in the Epistle to the Galatians, that if the gentiles were circumcised Christ would profit them nothing. The Jewish teachers insisted on their circumcision, that they might offer sacrifice. What then became of the sacrifice of Christ? Why these teachers denied its very existence. Well then might the Apostle testify to those who obeyed them, —Christ shall profit you nothing. Christ profits not those who have no faith in his meritorious death, and who trust in the merits of their own sacrifices. In order then to be found in him, "having the righteousness which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith," it is plain, that the merit of the sin-offerings, which were appointed under the law of Moses to be provided by the sinner and to be offered upon the altar by the priest for him, must have been counted as loss if it ever had been esteemed as gain. Now there is no other righteousness of the law, than that which the law ordained. "We have," says St. James, four men, which have a vow on them; them take and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them." This is an example, how the law required the personal observance of its ceremonies, how it required every person not one for another

or a few for the many,—"to continue in them to do them." But the righteousness which is through faith identifies the faith and the believer. "To him who worketh not but believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." The argument is taken from the case of the Father of the faithful himself. "For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh, is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." So in the text,—"I testify again to every man." &c. Faith and grace go together, and works and debt. To believe in him who justifieth the ungodly, is to believe that Christ died for the ungodly. The forgiveness of sins is of grace not of debt. The righteousness which is through the faith of Christ is not in the sense that it is often supposed to be,—the moral righteousness of Jesus Christ imputed to a sinner devoid of personal virtue. If the Messiah had not offered himself as a sin-offering, and if the sinner had not believed that he did so offer himself, there would have been no imputation of his moral or personal righteousness. It was the meritorious sacrificial righteousness of Christ which Paul sought and found by faith. He did not expect to escape from the guilt and punishment of a persecutor of the church of God, merely because the Messiah had never been a persecutor. The grace of our Lord he says was exceedingly abundant.

The last point is,—"that I may know him and

the power of his resurrection, that I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead." This knowledge differs in some respects from the excellent knowledge mentioned above. To know the power of his resurrection, we must be partakers of the fellowship of hts sufferings and made conformable to his death. Much of this experience must of course be painful. But what sufferings are too great to obtain such an end? If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead!" The words *in deaths oft* may be included in "being made conformable unto his death." All the labors of this Apostle were sustained by extraordinary grace and power. How well was such a man qualified to preach Jesus and the resurrection! He counted not his life dear unto himself, so that he might know the power of his master to save to the uttermost. The consumation of all religion is the resurrection of the dead. Paul knew in whom he believed, knew that he was the resurrection and the life in a degree that perhaps no other man ever did. In visions and revelations,—for mentioning which, he was charged, as being a fool,—he seems to yield; but in the fellowship of the suffering of Christ he yields nothing. Into this fellowship he entered, after having estimated all the gains and advantages of birth-right and parentage and education, and religious zeal as being nothing. "For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came unto us in Asia; that we were pressed out of measure, above strength, in so much that we despaired even of life: but we had

the sentence of death in ourselves that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God, which raiseth the dead; who delivered us from so great a death and doth deliver; in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us."

Many of the evidences of the truth of our religion cannot be fully realized by us. Sensible evidence to them who were witnesses, is to us historical evidence only. The great point of controversy respecting the perpetuity of the sacrificial law under the gospel dispensation,—the negative of which is so ably argued in the letters to the churches,—within less than forty years of that time received a sensible demonstration. Jesus, in foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem, had warned his disciples to flee from it, but the believers in the perpetuity of the law sought of course to defend it to the last extremity. They put life and all to hazard; for not only their country but a religious doctrine and it consequences were involved and were to stand or fall with the temple. Their religion all was at stake; that all which the believers in the redeeming merits of the crucified Jesus had already counted as lost, and in so doing had gained an eternal substitute. But though we could not witness the fulfilment of the destruction of Jerusalem, and though we shall not probably witness any more eventful prediction, we may anticipate the dissolution of our own bodies which will be to us the end of all things in this world. Our death is predicted; we cannot doubt the certainty

of it. How desirable is it to us, by any means to attain unto the resurrection of the righteous dead! But can any thing prevent us from obtaining it? If so, whatever it may be, shall we not do well to count it but loss? Many of the errors and all the vices may prevent us from attaining to the resurrection of the just; but whichsoever of them shall do so, it will be because it will seem to us for the present to be gain and to renounce it will appear to be a great loss. A severe conflict of interests will take place in our minds. The real or supposed pleasures or honors or advantages of the present, will be contrasted in our minds with promised or prospective advantages. By this means must our conversion and salvation be impeded, until we count all things but dung so that we may win Christ. However vicious men may be, yet when they begin seriously to think of religion it is very difficult for them to bring their minds to conceive that they can obtain no righteousness of their own and not to despair; there must be some anticipations of the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus the Lord, some idea of the grace and merit of the Saviour, some hope of gaining these by losing those. Do we doubt the truth of religion? Who foretold the destruction of Jerusalem? The Author of religion. Do we doubt the truth of revelation? Who foretold to man his death, and the cause that would produce it? His Maker. Do we doubt the realities of another world? Who brought life and immortality to light? He

who foretold his own resurrection, and did rise from the dead indeed. There have been many truths and facts pertaining to religion which could not be doubted; there are many now which press themselves irresistably upon our minds. Notwithstanding the most inordinate love of the world, we are still convinced that it is passing away. While our desires are strongest to live here forever, we tremble in anticipation of death. Why then do we not embrace religion? Ah!—the gains of this world and the gains of our own righteousness interpose. Our hearts are too strongly attached to them to permit us to count them as lost, until they are lost to us forever. The destruction of Jerusalem was the destruction of the Jewish church and sacrifices. And death is to us as the end of the world. How does the certainty of it fix vanity and vexation of spirit upon all our cares and labors and possessions! Paul loses his old religion, he loses his life; but he gives them up willingly and he gains a new religion, and the resurrection from the dead. Wise and holy choice! will the irreligious never reflect, never consider, how near at hand the end of all things is with them? For a world like this in which all are consigned to death, what can be put in comparison with the resurrection of the dead? What, but error and sin could check the aspirations of the soul for it?

But the text is immediately and peculiarly interesting as setting forth the opinions and experience

of the Apostle to the Gentiles, respecting the difference between his own righteousness which is of the law, and that which is through the faith of Christ the righteousness which is of God by faith. The ten commandments or the moral law, in its very nature, is quite distinct from the law of sacrifices and it is distinct in its purpose or intention. The moral law is called a rule of life, and by it as such is the knowledge of sin. As a standard and directory of men's actions, it was their test. Now the law of sacrifice like the law of penalties, in one sense was not made for a righteous man. A sin-offering was not appointed and commanded to be offered by the innocent. The knowledge of sin was not by it, but before it. Sin is the transgression of the law. Hence the phrase;—"where there is no law, there is no transgression." "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." It it not the meaning,—that Moses gave the law to regulate sacrifice or sin-offerings to be provided by sinners, but the gracious and truly meritorious offering for sin came by Jesus Christ? No order of time we take it was meant to be stated between the moral law, and grace and truth; for no comparison can be instituted between them, unless it be upon the unscriptural supposition that the moral law is a law of atonement. The matter of the moral law was not primarily given by Moses. It is the law of the Creator. "The voice of Abel's blood cried from the ground,"—and the penalty of shedding

man's blood was announced to Noah and his sons, before Moses received the word;—"Thou shalt not kill." Adam and Noah knew that murder was a sin. Moral law is to be obeyed or kept, and makes no provision for those who break it. The reason is, no provision in kind can be made for disobedience. For instance, "Thou shalt not kill," is disobeyed by killing. Well, the guilt of murder is incurred. To cease to kill or murder men leaves the murderer still under his guilt and the penalty of the broken law. The moral law as given on two tables of stone is by itself; is quite distinct from the laws of sacrifice.

"We conclude," says St. Paul, "that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law."—

Now, this faith is a mode of knowledge in opposition to ignorance and error. There can be no faith in a state of entire ignorance, and there can be no true faith when the mind errs on the very subject or object of faith itself. "That I may know him," says the Apostle,—"for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." Many of the unbelieving Jews were ignorant of God's righteousness, and went about to establish their own. Others did the same through error. The mode of operation is, that when a statement is made to our minds we know it as a statement; but if it be true in itself and we do not believe it, our minds transfer their own error from themselves to the statement. Unbelief therefore may be the same in effect as ignor-

ance or error, and each may react. The erroneous opinion of Paul respecting the gain of Hebrew parentage and of a Jewish education and of a blameless life touching the law, was one cause of his unbelief. While this cause remained he could not believe, for he could not understand how the doctrine of the merits of Christ's death could be true. We have no intellectual inability to believe anything we know to be true, for if we feel or conceive that we have an interest not to believe, we are not conscious of any difference between knowing and believing. Thus, we do not perceive the difference between knowing and believing that two and two make four, for the consent of the mind immediately follows the demonstration. And thus, the righteousness which is of Christ or which is of God, namely, —the great all sufficient sacrifice,—is known and believed. It is believed because it is known, and it is knowu as a believed truth. Every unbeliever who has ever heard or read the gospel knows the fact that he has heard or read it, and he knows also that he does not believe it but the causes of his unbelief may remain unknown to him.

But why cannot the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us, without faith? May not the difficulty of knowing it under any other mode of presentation to the mind be one reason? In what would the excellency of the knowledge of imputed righteousness consist? Arguments have been exhausted on all sides to prove that imputed righteousness

s out of ourselves or beyond us, and so cannot be experimentally known or be within us. All fellowship with inherent righteousness is discarded by a numerous class of advocates for imputation. They are as much opposed to it as to works themselves; and it is well known, they admit of no evidence of their religious state either from experience or practice.—On this account, presumption has been strongly urged against them by their opponents. But the righteousness of Christ through faith guards against presumption, while it leaves the foundation sure. The moral, mental, and active faculties are all brought under the influence of truth and grace. The Lord knoweth them that they are his; they know in whom they have believed; and men know them by their fruits.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE TENTH.

RELIGIOUS DIVISIONS.

See that ye fall not out by the way.
Genesis xlv, 24.

These are the words of Joseph to his brethren when they were about to return to their father after the interview in which he made himself known to them. One is apt to exclaim;—what an unamiable brotherhood must these sons of Jacob have been, in so short a time after the affecting evidence of the consequences of their envy and jealousy, to have needed from this injured brother a caution against the indulgence of these dispositions in a journey of only a few days! But when instances occur of deviations from known and general cases, it may be inferred that some unusual cause must have been in operation to produce them. Brotherly love is a natural affection. Charity seems to forbid us to suppose that these sons of a common father were constitutionally worse than other equally numerous fraternities.

Jacob was a national father, a patriarch, and the second in descent from the patriarch Abraham, the father of many nations. Prophecies respecting this line, in contradistinction to the other sons of the

great Patriarch, were preserved in this family. The promises made to Abraham and confirmed to Isaac and to Jacob, it was known to all the twelve sons of the latter, must be inherited by one among them. But could there be any question which of them it should be? Who could dispute the right of the first-born to the kingly and priestly offices in the family or tribe? Was not the right of primogenitorship then universally admitted? Perhaps the facts to be adduced will show marked exception to the general usage. In the order of their birth, we find, Reuben, Simeon, Levi. These had offended their father by high moral offences, and there were reasons to suspect that their birth-rights were thus forfeited. The effects produced on the minds of all the brothers by Joseph's coat of many colors, and the recital of his dreams, make it evident that they considered it a possible, if not a probable case, that Joseph might be appointed by their father as his successor in the kingly and priestly offices. It was, then, the succession to the Patriarchate, which excited the jealousy and the envy of these brethren. It is probable that if Reuben had committed no undutiful act against his father, the succession would have regularly and quietly passed to him with his father's blessing, without any opposition among his brothers. All would have acquiesced in the unforfeited claims of nature. But as his highly unfilial conduct, and the treachery and cruelty of Simeon and Levi had excluded their claims in the or-

der of birth-right, the hopes and fears of all respecting the last will of their father, agitated them to a degree calculated to irritate their feelings, and prompt them to desperate deeds.

Envy and jealousy, in incipient operation, gain strength and activity from doubt and uncertainty. The power of the father to choose a successor seems to have been regarded by all the sons as absolute. Hence the anxiety with which they watched all the indications of their father's affections, and all coincidences, and hence their determination to put Joseph out of the way. Taking all the circumstances into consideration, we shall find that these were men of like passions with us, and that their faults nearly answered, in degree, to the tempting causes. Their temptations were of the princely and priestly kind, not those of individual and private men. It was a great prize, the office of their father; the desire for it was great and led to desperate attempts in pursuit of it.

We propose to consider the text, first, in reference to the causes of religious divisions, and secondly, in reference to their remedies.

The brief notices of Cain and Abel contain an account of their falling out by the way, and the causes of it. The cause of the difference between the two sons of Adam was religion. The Lord had respect to the sacrifice of Abel, the younger brother, and not to that of Cain. The latter was very wroth and his countenance fell. And Cain talked with

his brother Abel—probably upon the subject of their late sacrifices. Was it not a religious discussion? And when they were in the field, Cain rose up against his brother Abel and slew him. Had Cain the worst of the argument? Had reason been on his side would he have been so very wroth as not only to show it in his countenance but to kill his brother? But what cause for this murderous hatred was there in this divine preference of Abel's sacrifice? Was it not in the indication, that the blessing of the first-born would be transferred to the second son? It seems plain that the subject of primogenitorship engaged the attention and interest of the first and second sons of the mother of all the living, and of course that it was coeval with religion. Had Cain done anything contrary to his father's instructions? Had he innovated in sacrifice in the very case of bringing the first fruit of the ground and offering it to the Lord? And if so, was was his motive in so doing religious or avaricious? Or was it a mixture of both? Did he argue in his own mind against offering blood, as unnecessary or improper? And did he conclude that it would be economical to use his own agricultural products, rather than to be dependent upon the flocks of his brother? The whole of the extract or abridgment (the statement in the fourth chapter of Genesis is evidently an abridgement,) indicates, that Adam must have given his sons precepts as well as examples of sacrifice. We cannot from any analogy

conclude, that the sacrifices of the two brothers were mere inventions or experiments. A previous law or rule must have existed, which marked the distinction between the first fruits of the ground and the firstlings of the flock. The respect or disrespect of the Lord for, or his approbation or disapprobation of any public religious service, must have been founded upon some previous signification of his will. Adam the priest gave the pattern;—who followed it? Cain or Abel? Were they both heads of families and priests at that time; or did they bring their offerings to their father as the priest? Either way, it seems that the Lord gave Cain an opportunity to retain his birth-right. "And the Lord said unto Cain; If thou doest well; shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door, (a sin-offering is present.) And unto thee shall be his (thy brother's) desire, and thou shalt rule over him." But it appears that Cain did not offer the sin offering or the firstling of the flock which was lying at the door, that is, he would not. He had disobeyed and would not acknowledge it. If he had done well in the first instance, offered the kind of offering that Abel did, both his offering and himself would have been accepted. Had Cain been taught or did he infer that his birth-right to the priesthood was not unconditional or irrevocable? It would be vain to conjecture all the reasons or motives of this first-born son of man for offering the first fruits of the ground;

though, if we should indulge in conjecture, history and observation furnish so many facts and examples that we would scarcely avoid being led by analogy and so regarding his as the first recorded example of unbelief.

A second instance of religious division occurs in the case of Ishmael and Isaac. In this case too, we see the principle of primogenitorship. Ishmael was the first born of the sons of Abraham. "And Abraham made a great feast, the same day that Isaac was weaned. And Sarah saw the son of Hagar, the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking. Wherefore she said unto Abraham, cast out this bond-woman and her son: for the son of this bond-woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. And God said unto Abraham, —in Isaac shall thy seed be called." This abridged story also bears evidently upon the birth-right of the patriarchate. The son of Hagar must have been sufficiently instructed by his mother, to induce him at that early age to regard the son of Sarah as having inferior claims to the heritage. He shall not says Sarah, be heir with my son Isaac. What had the mocking of Ishmael to do with heirship, if he had had no reference to it? The design of the history is evident. The matter of the inheritance was settled by the oracle;—"In Isaac shall thy seed be called."

From that time to the present, this subject of birth-right between Ishmael and Isaac has been a

source of religious disagreement. The religion of Christians is involved in it. There seems to be no good reason drawn from nature, why an office which is to descend in a family should not follow the line of the first born, if that line be in all other respects equally worthy as that of any of the younger brothers; but it appears to have been a general usage in those times which approach nearest to the date of Scripture records, that the validity of those titles of descent in the first instance depended upon the sanction of the fathers. Many examples are to be found in ancient and even in modern history of elder sons being deprived by their fathers of precedence.

A third example occurs in Esau and Jacob. In this extract of the family record, the birth-right is expressed in form. Jacob seems to have been well-informed that the natural principle of birth-right was in favor of his twin-brother Esau. "And Jacob said, sell me this day thy birth-right. And Esau said, Behold, I am at the point to die: and what profit shall this birth-right be to me? And Jacob said, swear to me this day; and he sware unto him: and he sold his birth-right unto Jacob." The prophecy had before their birth foretold to their mother, that the elder should serve the younger, or that Jacob should be the successor of his father. What a source of eventful movements did this double-birth prove to the two families and tribes! Traces of its effects appear in ages following.

In a fourth case, these birth-right interests involve all the twelve tribes of Israel in envy and jealousy. Judah it is probable had some presentiment, that he should inherit the blessing forfeited by his elder brothers, though he advised and participated in the selling of Joseph. It would be no difficult task to trace almost all the future dissensions of the tribes and divisions to this source. The Reubenites were the prime movers of the revolt against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness. The recollection of their fathers seniority is perceivable in their words;—"Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi." The ten tribes were evidently never cordial in their attachment to the house of David.

But in a fifth instance, we find this same subject producing its wonted effects in the house of Jesse. All the elder sons of that head of the tribe of Judah are made to pass before Samuel in the order of their birth, beginning with the eldest, and the Lord's anointed is not found until the youngest is sent for and brought from his attendance on the sheep. The young shepherd it appears was viewed with suspicious eyes by his brethren, who charged him with ambition in coming to the camp with supplies for them.

We have argued that the elder brother Cain was a transgressor of the law of sacrifice, and on that account his offering was not accepted, it being probably intended by him as a thank-offering instead of a sin-offering. In the Mosaic law which it seems

fair to presume conformed in principle to the original law of sacrifice, a sin offering was always an offering of blood. And the offering of Abel according to the epistle to the Hebrews, was of this nature. "And wherefore, "asks St. John," slew he him? Because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous." Precedence of birth or age gives no right or authority to transgress the divine law, or any positive institution. The reasons of them were to be sought, not in mere moral consideration, but in the divine intention to make them subservient to given purposes. So the injunction to Moses;—"See thou make all things, according to the pattern showed thee in the Mount." In the method of instruction by signs, a change in the sign would be the same as the changes of letters or words in language or the facts or premises in argument. A moral action may remain the same in principle under various modes and circumstances, and the intention of the actor the same. But, in attempting to substitute one kind of offering for another of divine appointment, no human intention could be admitted without at the same time questioning the wisdom or the right of God, and in effect making the authority of God subordinate to that of man. The right of the first-born or of the oldest person or denomination must always be taken with this qualification, that it can give no right to do wrong or to change religious institutions. If Cain had had no brother, the rejection of his offer-

ing would have offended him; but if he had become very wroth it must have been against God, or he must have been displeased with himself. Abel was innocent, and he was a persecuted man. A voice from God might have said;—Cain, why persecutest thou me? Why art thou wroth against me for not accepting thine offering? Thy brothers' obedience to me and my acceptance of him involve in principle no hostility to any other obedient person or act. Cain made Abel answerable for the acts of God. Did he not show his enmity against God?

When older denominations persecute younger ones, wherefore do they persecute them? It behooves them to look well to the causes. Happy will it be for them, if they shall be found to bear no affinity to those which induced the first man to shed his brother's blood! But persecution is in itself always wrong. The elder, in all cases should be examples of all that is great and good to the younger, and especially in magnanimity and forbearance. The older Cain kills the younger Able. Behold, the progress! They approach the same altar together; they present their offerings; that of the younger is answered by tokens from heaven of acceptance; the older brother is wroth and his counsenance falls into the expression of the malevolent passions. God interposes, interrogates, reasons, expostulates. The brothers meet in the field; a conversation ensues; and the murderous tragedy fol-

lows. He who obtained witness from God that he is righteous, dies by malice aforethought of him who obtained no witness. Every reader must exonerate the younger brother of all blame; the cause was wholly on the part of him whose precedence in age demanded better things. But he gained no religious advantage. The grace which he forfeited became the inheritance of a still younger brother.

The case of Ishmael and Isaac seems to involve their mothers chiefly. The oldest son was too young when he gave the first indications of his aspirations to be morally responsible on so complex a subject. Sarah was personally a partner in the promises made to Abraham; she was actually a believer in the promise made to her. The seed of Abraham according to the flesh, in whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed, was to descend from the son of Sarah. The faith of Sarah is expressly mentioned in the letter to the Hebrews. And in the letter to the Romans, Isaac is called a child of promise for the word of promise was,—Sarah shall have a son. It is possible that Hagar might have argued herself into a belief, that her son could have no competitor to the birth-right in any son of Sarah, though she might have had some knowledge of the promises; for even if she was substantially well informed in the first instance every one of the fourteen years since the birth of her own son was calculated to strengthen her hopes in his success. A youth at the age of fourteen under the

influence of a mothers instructions, with no indications of displeasnre from an aged and fond father to discourage him, might feel incipient emotions,—the germs of purposes,—to take by force from an infant who might soon be deprived of parental protection what he might fail to obtain by consent. The Arabians who claim descent from Ishmael maintain his birth-right to the present time, and justify themselves in acts of plunder on the ground of right to a compensation for the fraud to their father; and when scripture is quoted against them fail not to charge the descendant of Isaac with corrupting the text. But the conditions of the promise are clearly set forth in favor of the son of Sarah. It was in an interval of doubt, that she herself laid the foundation for a rivalship to the final fruits of her own faith. The condition of Isaac eppears to have been too obscure to have called forth into action any hostile feelings, which might have been cherished in the bosom of the son of Hagar when he had the power to injure him. The son of Sarah during his whole life was a plain man, and without an increase of family until the decline of life. So domesticated a individual could present no prominent points to excite the latent envy of a rival step brother, who probably could see nothing very desirable in the religious character of his father's blessing any more than in the condition of its inheritor. Ishmael seems to have inherited more of his disposition from his Egyptien mother, than from his

Chaldean father. The influence she exercised over her son would intimate that she was a woman of more than a common endowments of mind. The descendants of Ishmael have always been acknowledged as a fine race of men, notwithstanding the disadvantages of their country.

The rivalship between Esau and Jacob began early after the eventful bargain for the mess of pottage. A mother's interests and iufluence in this case too, are conspicuous. Rebecca had sought and obtained a knowledge by prophecy respecting her twin progeny, as the heads of two distinct tribes and races of men,—that the religious precedence would be transferred to the younger. The comment of St. Paul upon the prediction is remarkable. "The children not yet born, not having done good nor evil; it was said to Rebecca their mother, the elder shall serve the younger, that the purpose of God according to election might stand." The mother it appears had early intimations in the marriage of Esau with the daughters of Canaan, how little trustworthy he was likely to prove as joint heir of the promises with his father and grand-father. But, under all these circumstances their father was determined on giving the blessing to the elder of the twin brothers. It is indeed difficult to conceive how he could have remained ignorant of the prophecy communicated to Rebecca; or if he knew it how he could have ventured to attempt to counteravail it. His preference of the first born was natural

enough; but he could not help knowing that his own case was an exception to any general rule of succession by seniority. The consequences of this family dissension were singularly eventful to Jacob, and gave occasion to develope traits of character which have few parrallels.

When nature and providence and grace combine and progress in unison, the materials of history are generally scanty. It is in the exceptions to the general course of events, that history finds subjects of interest. If the line of succession had gone on regularly in the oldest branches of the family through Cain, Ishmael, and Esau, it is probable that we should scarcely have heard of the names of Abel, Isaac and Jacob; and David too might have remained unknown had the Lord's annointed been found in the first born son of Jesse. We see then the causes of falling out by the way.

But a still more remarkable division presents itself in the origin of the Christian Church and in its claims to supersede the Jewish Church. The breach of all good fellowship on the part of the latter became utterly irreconcilable The idea that the law of sacrifice must give way to the gospel, that the ancient ceremonies given from Sinai must yield to the death of the Messiah, to Jewish feelings was past endurance. This offence of the cross has no ceased to the present day. The thought that the old religion should give place to the new is as shocking as ever. In vain has Paul the Benjamite ar-

gued with his unbelieving countrymen that this case was not new, but so far from it that examples of it occur in the earliest period of their family, and that the claims of the tribe of Judah and the house of David rested upon it. In vain did he quote their own scriptures;—In Isaac shall thy seed be called, The elder shall serve the younger. The pride of birth-right in the old synagogue was too strong to yield to the new discipleship. And are not the same principles still in operation in the Christian Church itself? What new denominations of Christians has appeared, without giving offence to older ones? The fact itself of such an appearance is regarded as heresy. The first significations of a new Christian name, are the signal for a falling out by the way. How it is asked can the older, and especially the oldest of all be in fault? To attempt to prove or to assume that the Lord has respect to the younger or to the offering, in the estimation of the older, is but to aggravate the offence. When new denominations place much importance upon spiritual tokens or revivals, it only serves to expose them to Abel's fate.

The rule will work both ways as individuals and churches are not to be regarded as right because they are old, so they may not be regarded as right because they are young. It is not to be supposed that the head of the church will interrupt any regular succession in the order of seniority, without some rea- in fact or in anticipation. The sovereignty of matters of preference between individuals or

bodies of men, is not to be questioned by mortals. The sovereignty is evident in preferring the race of Jacob to that of Esau, for the choice was made before the fathers were born, before they had done good or evil. If the question were asked,—who did sin, the Edomites or their father Esau?—it could not be answered that the iniquity of the father was visited upon the children. The design according to the Apostle was to show, that, the purpose of God according to election, might stand. But does this mean, that God might be bound by the natural line of succession in the oldest son, and not that he might choose without regard to birth or the order of ages? If the doctrine of regular order and succession admits of no exceptions, how can the purpose of God according to election stand? The right of election or choice implies the exercise of reasons and motives in making a choice. Otherwise, it would have availed nothing for God to have foreseen that the Edomites would be less qualified to fulfil his promises than the Israelites. The choice or the sovereignty of God (to speak after the manner of men) is always regulated by his own wisdom; but he is not bound to give an account of that wisdom to man, neither is he offended that man should discover it and indicate it. The purpose of God not to bind himself nor to be bound by men, to continue his promises to the first born of the families to whom he makes them, seems to set aside the claims of older churches among Christians as well as Jews.

This point is evidently argued in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. What was the objection of the Jews against the Christians? A want of age. How could it be accounted for, that the venerable dispensation of Sinai should give place to the upstart gospel of yesterday? The answer is, because God wills it. How could he will it? Because it is his will. His purpose is, to choose or elect and not to bind himself by the order of human births or events. If Jacob had been the first born, the birth right principle, there can be no doubt would not have been interrupted. Nothing would have been prophecied or recorded about the matter, and so in other cases. We have seen the character of the expert huntsman and that also of the skilful and persevering shepherd. We have the consequences and tendencies of the two modes and habits of life and manners; and knowing as we do, the nature of the mission to be fulfilled, how can we doubt the greater fitness of the shepherd Jacob and his sons for the work?

The schism (as it is called,) between the Greek and Latin churches, is also an instance of the falling out by the way which turned upon the principle of prior claims. Each party contended for the prior right, without an allusion or a reference on either side to the purpose of God according to election, each being equally intent to maintain their favorite claim of precedence. And the reformers, among whom exists the proneness so common to maintain

the doctrine of election and reprobation, never once refer to the example on which they rest their doctrine; but could any example have been more relevant than that of Jacob and Esau? Suppose that the children of Israel had been charged by the Edomites with schism and heresy;—how would they have vindicated themselves from the charge? Would they not have proved that seniority must yield to the choice of God? Would they not have asked whether a precedence in time is to interfere with the purpose of God to choose between the elder and the younger? Why then might not the reformers have retorted the charges of the want of antiquity, by asserting the choice of God in the case of Jacob?

The times in which we live and the country we live in, seem in a peculiar manner to give the text an application to every religious denomination. "See that ye fall not out by the way!" The circumstances under which these States have been settled indicate a Providential intention to set aside all pretensions of birth right as a ground of national superiority. The claims of conscience and of asylum from persecution may be set up by almost all the leading orders of the churches in the Union. In the countries from which they emigrated they had fallen out by the way. They had become a prey to fatal dissensions which nothing could compromise, short of a sacrifice of conscience or an exile beyond the Western Ocean. How has that say-

ing,—the first shall be last, and the last first,—been fulfilled in the wilderness of America!

Hardly a disagreement can arise in any church or society but some question of precedence will come up involving who is oldest or greatest, some claim on one part or some rejection of claim on the other. It is only to look back upon the history of churches in this country, to be convinced that the purpose of God according to election, that is according to the examples of it furnished in the bible, has either not been fully understood or not duly conformed to. Is it not plain, that age and choice may be in opposition to each other? Behold, the illustration! Age is to decide; what then remains? Nothing, but to examane the records for proof of seniority. Choice is out of the question! But it will be said, the choice of God precedes all genealogy; and it has been thought impossible to reconcile this election with the well-known scripture,—"God hath chosen the man that is godly to himself." Well, how could he do the latter if the right of birth must obtain?—The choosing before the birth and the choosing the godly to himself are in accordance. In choosing or electing members of the church of Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free, male nor female. Nations and individuals may be elected or selected to do certain things or accomplish certain purposes; and this choice may be signified prophetically or providentially. Jacob, as the head of the family through

which the seed of Abraham should descend, may be regarded as elect according to the foreknowledge of God. But this election was necessarily limited to the twins of Rebecca. They could not have been both chosen or have been joint-heirs without destroying the identity of the genealogical records, which to be good for any thing must be limited to one son of one father. A divine choice of any other family could not have fulfilled the promise to that family, namely;—In thy seed, all the families of the earth shall be blessed. The sovereignty of God in this instance is plainly limited by the veracity of God. It is impossible for God to lie. To a superficial observer Esau's intermarriages might appear at least harmless; but to the mind of his mother it was portentous of consequences to religion which might subvert the divine dispensations. The weakness of the faith of this son or his indifference to the promises, was manifest in his reflections on the transfer of his birth-right, when it is contrasted with the character of his grand-father who was strong in faith giving glory to God. Esau gave no indications of a faith which believes in hope against hope. Much less, did be manifest any traits of the kind and degree of the faith that would have offered up Isaac to receive him from the dead in a figure. With such faith, the proposition of Jacob would have been repelled and the answer would have been;—I will sooner die than give up my birth-right, for God would raise me from the dead sooner than his pro-

mise could fail. There was then some reason to esteem Esau a profane person for selling his birthright under the influence of hunger, for he found no place for repentance though he sought it carefully with tears. Unbelief is never trustworthy when the promises of God are concerned. The election of God was not the cause of this lack of faith, but the anticipation and the preventive of its consequences. But history abounds in instances of providential selections, to accomplish purposes of mercy or judgment. In these respects the fitness of agents must be judged of relatively to the work they are to accomplish. Esau and his descendants were by no means subjects of Providential reprobation. The tribe soon rose to distinction and power and was respectable as a nation, after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

But the disposition of the human mind is to infer universal and perpetual fitness from particular cases and relations; and hence the modification of the maxim,—once in grace, always in grace,—or the claim of right to new successors upon the merit of old ones. And hence the predilection for perpetual succession to titles and prerogatives. It is possible however that if some of the useful men of former ages or men like them should now appear, they would be found much less qualified for the present state of society. But many of them have eulogists who fall out by the way with all who do not join in their admiration.

The backs of men of former times in their aims to do good, were no doubt in many instances fitted to their burdens; but the nature of the burdens may be now changed. Civilization advances or recedes in different countries in different ages, and the characters of human agencies for good answer in some respects to these states of men and things.

The remedies to religious divisions or dissentions which we proposed in the second place to consider, we have in part pointed out in showing the causes themselves. The spirit of religious tolerance had been gaining ground in Europe by a steady progress, when the rights of conscience and of private judgment began to be legislated upon in our own country. Not the Dutch United Provinces only had risen to the zenith of greatness by tolerating all. England in part had followed the example. And unbelievers had sustained in their own behalf an entire emancipation from all religious ascendancy, when all found themselves side by side in America in the legislative halls, and so equal in power and strength that any want of common attachment was supplied by common fears. Tolerance was not to be named; neither would receive what the other was willing to give. Nothing therefore remained but universal liberty for conscience and private judgment in the statute books. This is the basis for all remedies for religious dissensions. With other denominations we cannot fall out by the way, without falling out with the constitutions and laws of our country.

But we may fall out by the way among ourselves as the sons of Israel did, and as the disciples of Jesus did in disputing who should be greatest. Elements of discord exist among us. They naturally reside in every fraternity, and so soon as the principle of right of precedence is brought into question they develope themselves. The rights of private udgment and of private action are difficult to be adjusted in the way of compromise among equals.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE ELEVENTH.

GOD'S RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that he believeth.

Romans, x. 1—4.

Zeal for religion is always commendable, in opposition to atheism or lukewarmness. Paul felt a deep interest in the welfare of his countrymen who rejected the gospel; his prayers to God were, that they might be saved from the ignorance and error which had misguided their zeal. It is correct and prudent, in attempting to convince persons of error, to commend all that is praiseworthy in them and to manifest all the feelings of kindness towards them; for it is one thing to reprove or rebuke gross vices, and another to instruct and enlighten minds under the influence of ignorance or of error which they mistake for truth. To some who had not the knowledge of God, the Apostle spoke it to their shame; and he calls upon them to awake from sleep and to arise from the dead.

Zeal, to effect any thing good or great, must be

according to knowledge, for without it is heat without light, an emotion without eyes. This zeal without or not according to knowledge was in effect what is commonly called self-righteousness, and was conspicuous in the Pharises, the most zealous and the most influential of all the Jewish sects. The Saducees who denied the resurrection and believed not in angels nor spirits, were more zealous in politics than in religion. Righteousness whether divine or human was matter of indifference to them. Great natural talents improved by eminent literary attainments, it appears from facts, have no immediate power to correct ignorance or error on points of religious doctrince. The learned Gamaliel and his no less learned pupil Saul of Tarsus remained ignorant of the righteousness of God, as well as the great body of the Pharises, and went about to establish their own righteousness. Many learned and zealous Christian moralists are charged with the same kind of ignorance and error in practice.

There are two meanings to the word righteousness,—first moral righteousness, and secondly sacrificial or atoning righteousness. The righteousness of God and its parallels always seem to mean sacrificial righteousness. And if men went about to establish their own righteousness, by doing moral acts or good works that is by doing good to others, it was assumed that these works were meritorious in the same sense as sacrifices are considered to be, that is, may if needs be operate all the effects of

atonement or sin-offering. Almost all the merit of good works and self-righteousness now preached against in modern pulpits is of this kind, for as actual bloody sacrifices have gone out of use they can only be brought into view as matters of history.—Self-righteous christians or christians who go about to establish their own righteousness by works of piety and morality or good works properly so called, work not merely as a duty or in obedience to precept but to compensate for omissions of duty or to make restitution to God or his law for offences against it or acts of disobedience All the laws of sacrifices were made for sinners. So, if a Jew offered a lamb or kid for a sin-offering, the act was an acknowledgement that he was a sinner. This would appear by the question,—what did he do that for? Because he is a sinner. For no Jew would have dared to say, he offered a sin-offering or an atonement because he was a righteous man as the very letter of the law must have convicted him.—Now let the christian be asked;—what did you do that for, what did you fast and pray for, what did you give alms for? And the answer will fix his own character and the character of the action should he answer,—I did it as a sinner, I did it as a sin-offering or an atonement for my sins. So also, if money be given;—what did you give that money for? I gave it as a sinner to procure my pardon for sins] It is plain, that these acts would all be self-righteousness in a Jew and a Christian, would be a go-

ing about to establish their own righteousness. The illustration of the case by our Lord makes it plain also. "So, after ye have done all, say, we are unprofitable servants, we have done no more than it was our duty to do." For if a man does a good act, not as a duty but as an atonement, he must mean to do more than his duty. All these intentional works are to be classed with sin-offerings, and to be considered as an admission of a guilty conscience. A moral righteousness or works well done as duty, are not sacrificed for, either with or without blood. It is only the fault or the defect of a good work that needs mercy. To go about to establish righteousness as the Jews did, by offering victims at the altar, was not to go on to perfection or to finish a course of goodness already begun.

God's righteousness is God's sacrifice for sin, God giving and accepting the sacrifice. The zealous Jews were ignorant of this; they went about to get the sacrifice to offer to God that he might accept it as their righteousness. This was what St. Paul meant by the words,—"touching the righteousness of the law, blameless." He does not intend to say that he never committed a moral evil, but that he had offered all the sin offering the law of sacrifices requires. Writers and preachers seem to be liable to some confusion of ideas in treating of subjects of moral and sacrificial righteousness, and in the ardor of pulpit addresses are apt to become indistinct and strangely unintelligible. When Paul speaks of keeping a conscience void of offence towards God

and men, he does not mean going about to establish sacrificial righteousness or striving to do good works to make an atonement for sins of omission or commission. And when he says,—"not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy he hath saved us,"—the parallelism implies or includes works of sacrificial righteousness which we have done. Moral obedience saves nobody who is lost. The most it could ever or can do, is to preserve. The same parallelism is in the the righteousness of the law and the righteousness which is of God by faith. And again,—"ye are saved by grace through faith, not of yourselves,"—not of works of sacrificial righteousness which have been offered to God. The gift is God's, not yours. Innocent and holy men may do works of moral righteousness in obedience to law. But under the covenant of works, there was no sacrificial righteousness. Before the fall of man there could not have been any sin offering, for there was no sin. The reason why God provided a sacrificial righteousness for all under the second covenant is, that all have sinned or will sin, and come short of the glory of God. The covenant includes the offspring of fallen man, for he could not have saved them himself, from the consequences of his fall. Jesus Christ the righteous is God's sacrifice. Behold, the mystery of Godliness,—God manifest in the flesh! It is well and truly said, that Jesus Christ was crucified under Pontius Pilate the Roman officer, then in

command in the province of Judea. In the judgment of the Jewish rulers, his crime was that he made himself the Son of God; for this, they said, according to their law he ought to die. But this was his true merit;—"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son." Mark the effect of the prejudice of the priest and the elders. They betrayed the Holy One and the Just!

The law of sacrificial righteousness seems to be, that the sacrifice need not be in kind or the same as the offence; but that it must be the same with the penalty denounced upon the breaker of the law, and this is—death. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." A restitution in kind is not legally considered as sufficient to restore an offender against the law to legal innocence. Annual sacrifices are to be traced to the earliest traditions and records of nations, a pretty sure proof of their early origin as well as the early origin of sin. Those who reject the bible have sought for them in the revengeful and vindictive passions of the human heart. But must it not occur to the mind upon reflection, independently of other considerations, that compensation in kind, the basis of the law of retaliation or revenge, in the very nature of things must needs be very limited. The law protects life; how is the murderer to make compensation in kind? By his own life. But that restores nothing. So with property; can the robber or the incendiary make compensation in kind? We speak now upon the supposition that

laws are of human authority only. But the first ideas of mankind were that they were of divine origin and authority. All nations agree in this. Their poets who have transmitted their traditions put life and property under divine protection; and show how offenders against the laws had to offer sin-offerings to placate offended divinity. But by what offering could this be really done? Not surely by any one the sinner might choose. Even when man is justly offended the offender is not to dictate to him terms of reconciliation. The Divinity when offended by a frail mortal must be submitted to; the guilty creature must humbly wait to know whether he may hope for mercy, and must then thankfully accept it on proffered terms. Sinners have neither wisdom nor power to propose to God any terms for their own pardon which could restore the authority of the divine law or secure to it future obedience. God's righteousness can accomplish these ends; not so, any righteousness which sinners may go about to establish. The legal sacrifices though of divine appointment were appointed only as types; they could not purify the conscience as was evident from the acknowledgement implied in each repetition of them.

In general the human consequences of sin are irreparable; and in every instance their immediate tendency is to weaken the authority of law over the mind and to produce an aversion to it. The blood of God's righteous sacrifice shed in his death,

cleanseth from all sin; but among the unaccountable number of sins not one of them is like it. And why should this be objected to? Money the medium of all values is unlike them all. The gospel plan is mediatorial. Not so sin; its effects are immediate and direct. Guilt follows sin without any medium. Not so the pardon of sin or the removal of guilt; this is an act of Omnipotent Will or Power. "There is one mediator to the new covenant between God and men, who gave himself a ransom for us all." Much indeed is said about the active and passive obedience or righteousnesss of Christ, and of the imputation of the former; and even when it has not been said in so many words that the righteousness of God or of Christ means that moral obedience is imputed to us, the language is so incautiously used that it is apt to be inferred. But if it be so, is it not the righteousness in kind or by opposition? Did those zealous Jews refuse to submit to the proposal that the Messiah should be good and righteous for them? If the proposition had been so stated, would not the offence of the cross, have in a great measure ceased? The truth of this case of the active righteoesness of Christ as we understand it is, that though it is not in itself vicarious, it is necessary to the vicarious sacrifice. He suffered, the Just for the unjust, the sinless for the sinner. He made him to be sin (a sin-offering) for us who knew no sin. He was holy, harmless, and undefiled, separate from sinners that he might be

such an high priest as becomes us, and offer himself without spot to God, to redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works,—not to do good works in our stead.

Many of the modern professors of religion do not admit of God's righteousness, though they are not ignorant of the doctrine that makes it consist in God being the giver and the receiver of it, but because their reason is offended with such an idea. They hold it to be absurd and ridiculous that God should give a satisfaction to his own law. But would it still appear absurd to them, if they considered that the end to be answered is to secure the obedience of the pardoned sinner to his law? It is an easy matter to make out an absurdity hypothetically, or by assuming premises or conclusions. We hold the scripture statement to be in substance: that God revealed his laws to secure life and property, that these laws were disobeyed, that the execution of them upon their offenders does not prevent others from offending, that the crimes multiply faster than the punishments, and that to prevent a just and righteous extermination of a disobedient race who have filled the world with violence, God had recourse to the plan of mercy and love, the plan of sacrificial righteousness in which he gives his only begotten Son to shed his own blood or gives his own life upon the cross, and accepts the merits of this offering for sin to secure the obedience to his

laws by the pardon of those who have transgressed them instead of destroying them as justice demands. The Lord is our king, the Lord is our Law-Giver, the Lord is our Judge, but he is the Saviour of Israel too, and the hope thereof. "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." The mediatorial plan as set forth in the gospel as far as words can do it, makes God all and in all. In this plan man gives nothing to God in the nature of an atonement to offended law or justice. The sinner is bought with God's price.

This view of the sacrificial rigteousness of God, which is to the Greeks foolishness, and also to the modern inheritors of their wisdom, is the foundation of faith and makes faith the substitute for man's endeavors to establish his own righteousness. What is the guilty sinner to believe? He is to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. What is he to believe respecting him? He is to believe that he is God's only begotten son, and that God spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all; he is to believe that we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son and shall be saved from wrath through him. A guilty conscience naturally prompts the mind to do something or to despair. Sinners have not been apt to make compensation in kind, from the fact of their bankruptcy in means to do it if for no other reason; but the opinion and feeling are also common in a greater or less degree, that God the lawgiver and judge, as well as man is offended. The

guilt of sin which sinks not the soul into the darkness and blackness of despair, will seek to appease an offended God; and desperate have often been the means to which recourse has been had, to soothe the agonies of conscience even among professors of Christianity. All the world is familiar with the history of the holy wars, carried on by the soldiers of the cross, (so called.) Well, while a leaf of the history of these wars remains all the world may know that these armies went about the four quarters of the globe to establish their own righteousness. Preachers of crusades went through the nations, not with bounty-money to raise recruits but with promises of pardon to all who should enlist in the war against the infidels or heretics. Now is it not demonstrable from the very premises, that such a state of things could not have happened in any age or country, if the ministers of religion and the people had believed that God had provided a sacrificial righteousness for them, instead of requiring them to exterminate races of men to establish their own? Crusaders who were laying waste countries and cities with fire and sword to merit heaven, did not surely believe in justification by faith. The cry of "Behold, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world!"—anticipates the inquiry of the wounded heart,—what shall I do? Those foolish men who make a mock at sin mock also at the righteousness of God and at faith in Christ; but when reflection shall come and conscience shall be

quickened into action, if they be not prepared to believe in the foundation already laid, they must realize to their sorrow that no man can lay any other.

The ignorance of the Jews was only about God's righteousness· Of the means of establishing their own, they were well informed. The law of typical sin-offerings was carried out in all its details, so as to leave nothing to conjecture. The animal was to be of the clean species, to be without blemish; but above all as has been shown the vicarious character of sin-oferings was carefully distinguished from moral obedience. The offerer was taught not to regard the sacrifices of the altar as substitutes of obedience, but as atonements for past disobedience. In this respect Jewish ignorance and knowledge differed greatly from those of the Heathens and of certain Christians. Neither of these has any divinely prescribed form of sacrifice, but they depend upon the priest or their own invention. Heathen priests in certain cases required human sacrifices; but among Christians these are required only in crusades and holy wars against infidels and heretics. The modern advocates for the merit of moral good works have to depend wholly on invention from first to last. The supposition that the crime of taking one man's bread can be atoned for by giving bread to another, or the crime of cursing one man can be atoned for by blessing another man, is altogether antiscriptural. St. Peter has it that his brethren were not redeemed from their vain conversation with corruptible things,

as silver and gold, "but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was made manifest in these last times." Notwithstanding all the objections against faith in the merits of the death of Christ as being injurious or destructive of moral obedience, a fair and full review of the history of the subject in all its relations will go to show, that ignorance or error upon this point has led directly or indirectly to almost all the practical evils connected with religion which have been so much censured or deplored.

What for instance could Priestcraft do with a sacrificial righteousness already provided for the sinner, the benefit of which in the pardon of sin can only be derived by the faith of the sinner himself, the promise being, he that believeth shall be saved not he that sacrificeth? The mind of the religious inquirer is thus naturally led to inquire for the evidence of the truth of the promise, or of the reality of the sacrifice proposed as the object of his faith. And the religious instructor is bound, by the nature of the case to show all that evidence, and to maintain faith in all its integrity. Let the text be,—"God so loved the world &c."—and it is manifest that Priestcraft cannot touch it without assuming the character of a preacher and saying,—Behold I bring you glad tidings, that God in love, in pity, has given his Son,—and so proceeding to excite the confidence of the doubting sinner and to operate up-

on the fears of the unbeliever only. No condemnation can be threatened to the believer. It cannot be said,—if you do not believe the sacrifice must be suspended, the Priest cannot offer it,—for it is already offered and the promise of all its benefits are already pledged to the believer upon the Divine veracity. The faith is in the veracity of the written promise of God, and it is impossible that the writing should lie. Priestcraft can have no more control or influence over the truth of a record, than over the fact recorded. The opprobium of implicit faith can have no place here. It is difficult to conceive how any person, who has any regard to the distinction between virtue and vice, can avoid paying some attention to the defects or imperfections of his own virtues, and help casting about for some means of redeeming them. Of what avail will it be, after the manner of some professors of religion to make the memory a kind of balance sheet of debtor and creditor, and credit one's-self with all conceivable virtues in thought word and deed as an offset against conscience, though care should be taken to reduce the debts as low as possible and to augment the value of the virtues without any regard to any fixed previous standard? Even this mode of going about to establish one's own righteousness cannot stand a moment before the all-searching eye of divine justice, when it searcheth the heart and trieth the reins to find truth in the inward parts.

The antinomian consequences of making Christ

the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, still urged among the moderns in imitation of some among the ancients, it has been already stated, had its origin in confounding moral and sacrificial righteousness. But Christ is not the end of the moral law, that is, he has not put an end to it or in other words repealed it; nor did he so obey it as to free us from all obligations to obey it. And he is not the end of the sacrificial law itself to unbelieving Jews. They do not so regard him. A believer in the meritorious sacrifice of Christ, who relies upon it alone on the principle that Christ is God's sacrifice, the sacrifice of the innocent and not the guilty for the guilty, must infer that the law of typical sacrifices is thus brought to an end The state of Paul's mind clearly illustrated the whole subject. He was intimately acquainted with the ancient law having studied it under the most able and approved masters and being one of the most zealous and conscientious of its observers; but when he came to the knowledge of God's righteousness he discovered a meaning in the prophets and in the book of psalms which he had never perceived before. He found that Abraham and David were justified by faith in a sacrifice to be offered for them by the incarnate Messiah and not by their own sacrificial acts, and also that Abraham became the Father of the Faithful before he was circumcised. And he found moreover that the promises which are the objects of faith were made four hundred

years before the law of sacrifices was promulgated by Moses. The epistle to the Hebrews is a perfect specimen of inductive reasoning upon this subject; showing how the idea of a sinner making the atonement to the offended moral law of God by his own offerings, and how faith in the merits of an atonement made by another for him counteract each other, and how if they do not neutralize each other one or the other must prevail.

And similar conclusions must be arrived at by christian moralists, who aim to make a part of their duty like a sin-offering for omissions or defects in another part of it. The more they rely upon their good works or attempt to multiply them in order to rely upon them, the weaker or more inert their faith will become in the atoning merits of the Messiah. Such a process must therefore naturally lead to an indifference, to say the least, to the death of Christ as a sacrifice. By a similar logical process in the mind, faith in the merits of Christ's death will destroy confidence in atoning good works. The mind cannot without the intervention of some error sustain one proposition in opposition to another, or in preference to another without reason. When moralists say,—We have done all we can and we trust that Christ will do the rest,—if they mean, all we can to merit salvation, their trust is in vain. Experience in almost innumerable instances shows that meritorious morality opposes justification by faith in its action upon the mind, nearly in the same way as the legal

sacrifices affected those who regarded them as meritorious. When the crisis arrives to believe, there is in both cases always something to be done first: the mind is never quite ready, not quite good enough yet. "To him that worketh not but believeth;"—is an enigma which can only be solved by a knowledge of God's righteousness. Those who understand its fulness, its all-sufficiency, can believe now.

Those Jews, who believed Jesus to be the true Messiah and still trusted in the sacrificial righteousness of the law, must have suffered the consequences of half-knowledge and half-measures and could hardly have said,—they knew in whom they had believed,—with the same fulness of persuasion as St. Paul did:—

> Jesus, when I have lost my all,
> I shall upon thy bosom fall!

The letters of the Apostles to the churches have fully carried out the argument in favor of God's righteousness, and furnished all the proof necessary to settle, stablish and comfort the believer in the faith.

The consequences of ignorance on this point are also very evident. We are afraid to remain stationary in the dark and afraid to move for fear of going wrong. Deists themselves in extreme cases have manifested a propensity to self-sacrifice, or to go about to establish their own righteousness. Men indeed must be lost to all feeling of virtue, who can reflect upon a life of vice without any emotion or

desire to do something to make some compensation to heaven and earth, to God and men, for their sins. There is a good deal of intentional or would-be self-righteousness in the world, as well as sincere and zealous endeavors to establish a character by it. Ignorance of the gospel plan of salvation exposes the mind to many winds of doctrine; and not unfrequently to a belief in the doctrine of being so perfect in Christ as to lose all identity of obedience and accountability. To such an extent is the opinion and belief in Christ's personal righteousness sometimes carried! But the words,—"Christ is the end of the law, to every one that believeth,"—mean not, that Christ has left no duties for Christians to perform, or that because he has left no law there is no transgression. Preach the gospel, teaching them whatsoever I command you;—so runs the gospel commission. Christ then commanded some things to be done; hence the words,—"being under law to Christ." The opinion about imputation, which is calculated by inference to suspend the feeling of obligation to personal obedience, is guarded against by the principle in redemption that the price is in value,—not to do the same kind of work for another which the law required him to do, but to secure the principle of obedience in him whose sins are forgiven. The law is;—"Thou shalt not kill." Now if the murderer persuades himself to believe that by faith in Christ he can never again be a separate sinner, being complete and perfect in Christ, and must for-

ever remain so though he kill men again;—how is he obligated to future obedience? Faith is counted or imputed for righteousness, but faith works by love and love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

Behold, an illustration of the phenomena so hard to comprehend namely, zeal for God or religion and wickedness keeping pace with it in all its degrees! The more the conscience is burdened with guilt, the more eagerly it may crave means of pardon; and the more liable will it become to be imposed upon and zealous in following error. It seems wonderful at first view, that men can suppose that there is any merit or religion in killing persons they never knew and who never did them any harm. But when the conscience is agonized with guilt and assurance is given that pardon can be merited in war, the men who love war and are warriors by profession can hardly be supposed to feel greatly shocked at the proposal, especially when made to them by those to whom they have submitted as guides to their conscience. The hero then goes to battle not only with usual hopes of victory, but whether he conquers or not with the full assurance of obtaining pardon for his sins and meriting heaven. How fearful the consequences of ignorance of God's righteousness! All may seem to begin fair. What objection can be taken to the merit of good works? How does the principle differ from the usual phrase;—the reward of virtue? Can motives to virtue be placed

too high? But mark the sequel. Killing men as enemies of God is placed among the best and most meritorious of good works. Guilt too deep to be atoned for by any other merit may find forgiveness in fields of blood and carnage; cruel men may fight their way to heaven. Now a knowledge of God's righteousness destroys this whole illusion and error at once. For that righteousness demonstrates the fact, that there is no sacrificial righteousness or merit in any work or word or thought of sinners which can procure their pardon. The merit of Christ's death is in God's gift. If God was not in Christ, he could not reconcile us to God. All human works, good, bad or indifferent are destitute of atoning merit in the sight or judgment of God.

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit; for the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the (moral) law might be fulfilled in us, (not imputed to us as a sacrifice) who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." So, God sent his own Son to do what sacrificial human laws could not do.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE TWELFTH.

THE FAITH OF NOAH.

By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house; by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.

Hebrews xi, 7.

Experiments and observations upon matter, show that its appearances, combinations and changes, may be traced to causes and laws of action, among which are attraction and repulsion. By the first, two or more bodies or particles of matter unite; by the second, they separate. When bodies are subject to the action of two opposite causes, it is found that those causes, seldom if ever can be made to act interchangeably, or that the results are subject to chances or accidents, but that matter in similar circumstances, will always be attracted or repelled.

Water under equal temperature continues fluid. But if it appears sometimes solid, and at other times aeriform, those changes are produced by cold and heat. Mind too, as well as matter, is found to undergo changes in its modes of action. Faith and unbelief affect it in a manner, in some respects, analagous to attraction and repulsion in matter.

When the mind begins to act, or think, it is soon evident that some of its thoughts are true and some are false. These distinctions are marked and recollected; and as they increase in number and frequency, faith and unbelief become active and influential, and combine and associate with the thoughts. We think of truths and believe them, and of false hoods and disbelieve them. But, we do not perceive, that faith and unbelief are mere accidents, or that they are the mere creatures of the will. There is, however, an intermediate state of the mind between these two, a sort of transition state, through which the mind passes from the one to the other, called doubt. Now, experience and observation discover evidence of a law of action, in all these apparently complex cases. Doubt itself indicates the existence in the mind, of a capacity and a disposition to believe the truth. Why doubt, why seek for evidence, if faith is a matter of choice, or volition, and truth has no natural influence in determining it? A man, who has any regard for his character, would be ashamed to say that he neither does nor will believe the truth, or that he is resolved to believe a falsehood.

The Greeks relate an account of a man of the name of Pyrrhus, who maintained that a philosopher ought to doubt every thing, or believe nothing. Hence the name of a sect of philosophers and of their unbelief. And to the present time, a class of writers maintain, that in pursuit of truth, one must

begin by doubting every thing. This opinion in the extreme is both unphilosophical and impracticable. Some things must be admitted to be true as a beginning, and some things must be hoped for as truth, to sustain the mind in search of truth. To assume that true religion has no existence, and then to set out to discover or obtain it, would be as preposterous as to attempt impossibilities or to discover a non-entity. Those who seek to discover perpetual motion, would not certainly facilitate their researches, by doubt in its existence, or add to the probability of their success. An unbelieving mind has no affinity to the truth. Unbelief acts as a principle of repulsion. A truth, when believed to be false; that is, not believed, cannot act upon the mind as a truth but as a falsehood. But the believing a falsehood to be true, though it may induce the mind to act as though the falsehood were a truth, can have no influence over the nature and properties of the falsehood itself. Our thoughts can have no influence over facts. They cannot change something into nothing, nor create something out of nothing. They are not acted upon or called into action immediately, without the intervention of faith or unbelief, or of doubt. A man sees his friend: he has no doubt of his identity, nor of his friendship; but he may see him under circumstances which may render his disposition or his ability to befriend him doubtful, and some further information may be necessary to remove these

doubts, though there may have been no foundation in truth for them. The law of faith or confidence in this case, is only disturbed by adventitious causes. In every department and upon every subject of knowledge, our faith, there is reason to think, would operate uniformly, if we could detect all the disturbing causes. Men of sagacious minds, by long experience in their peculiar callings, become in a high degree prophetic of results; their faith is not apt to fail them. And nothing becomes more certain to their minds than, that a failure of usual results never can happen, by unsettling or reversing the laws of faith and unbelief in respect to the mind itself.

But, in revealed religion, there is a sure word of prophecy to guide our faith and to mark out the great outlines. Many of these predictions may be retraced and corroborated. Thus if the prophecy, he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned,—be true, some portion of its truth may be presumed to lie within the range of experience and observation. But the great value of these predictions is, that through the medium of our faith, they enable us to know them, before it be too late. But unbelief conducts the mind to no truth, by anticipation, while it rejects all known or discovered truths in the minds of others. "Ye will not believe, though a man declare it unto you." What a proof of want of affinity to the truth!

"By faith, Noah, being warned of God, of things

not seen as yet," &c. The predictions of the flood would not have moved Noah, if he had been an unbeliever in the warnings of God, as the danger was yet invisible. The truth of the warning would have had no influence upon his mind, while it was under the influence of unbelief. This is self-evident. Any man, by putting himself in the place of Noah, will perceive, that the effects of such a warning upon his fears would be precisely answerable to his faith. Here is an example of motives and of emotions, about which so much has been written, and if it does not decide the question in favor of those who argue for the existence of both in religion, it is not to be overlooked. The danger of the flood would have been no motive at all, if it had not been believed, and it would have produced no emotion. This is evident from the conduct of the unbelieving world. They ate, they drank,—they planted, they builded,—they married, and were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and swept them all away. Now, if it were, as it is attempted to be proved, that men ought not to act religiously from motives of fear, and that all fear is selfish and slavish, then Noah was wrong, for he was moved with fear. When a truth is made known to the mind, the mind will naturally believe it, because it is a truth; but if the mind be under some action foreign to itself, that action may generate unbelief. But a belief of a real danger must produce fear, in-

dependently of reason or volition; faith operating in this respect, upon the feelings as upon the senses,—directly. Our natures are constituted with a set of organs, which perform their functions without volition. If volition can interfere with the naturally involuntary functions, and finally render them subservient to its control, converting use into second nature, still the first law is evident. The will is late, under favorable circumstances, in gaining dominion over the feelings which naturally belong to its department. A real danger is foretold,—Noah believes,—will his fears remain dormant until reason is consulted and dictates to the will, and the will wakes them into motion? This is not the common process in ourselves. Under faith or sense of danger, we are apt to be moved with fear. If the coming flood had given general and indubitable evidences of its approach, the fears of Noah would not have been alone. Were those antediluvians Polytheists? Had they become irreclaimably corrupt, from this or from some other cause? Or if they believed in the true God, must not their faith have been dead? It appears, at all events, that they were unbelievers, as it regarded the deluge, in a degree, that no warning from God, through Noah, could alarm them. Judging by analogy from what we do know, may we not conclude, that their errors in principle led to errors in practice, and that from political agency, these vices had become universal? Among the descendants of Noah such has

been the case. Noah escaped from the corruption of the old world, which was through lust. He believed and feared, and was moved to action. He prepared an ark to the saving of his house. The unbelievers willed to be unbelievers; willed not to fear, not to be moved to any precautionary measures; and thus, in effect, willed their own destruction. So, we see how impotent human will is, in opposition to general or universal causes, or the truths which exhibit them. And we see how the mind may be given up to believe a lie. Noah believed religiously; he believed in prophecy. Religious belief always includes a faith in prophecy. A belief, that the dry-land at a certain time will be overflowed with water, is not natural nor philosophical. None of the causes of such an effect are evident to the senses or to science. A deluge cannot be calculated to take place at a certain time, as an eclipse of the sun or the moon can; for upon the supposition that it is produced by natural causes, these causes lie hidden from finite human minds. Faith therefore, in such predicted phenomena or events must embrace the being of God or superhuman mind. Who is he that tells me, that the world will be drowned, and how I may save myself and family from the deluge? How does he know that it will be drowned? Can he know it from the knowledge of the past, or has he fore-knowledge? But knowledge of events of this kind belongs not to man. Many persons do not now believe the histo-

tory; they do not believe it to be possible. Philosophers themselves first propagated the idea of its impossibilty, among the common people. But, they have now assumed the opposite extreme,—that there have been many deluges and may be more. They speak of old land disappearing and new land reappearing. With these learned geologists, the flood of Noah is a mere fact; this submerging of land may be one among so many, and perhaps the last among them, on a great or general scale. A belief of a deluge, upon natural evidence, will, it is probable, become general among unlearned people, who have no religious belief, that it was foretold to Noah. For a long time, the argument most successfully used to discredit the deluge was, that if all the water in the atmosphere were to fall upon the earth, it would only be of a certain depth. But of late years, it has been discovered, that water itself is a compound substance. Philosophers have in consequence of new discoveries, become more cautious in attempting to fix the limits of possibility.

But can the faith of Noah be defended or rescued from the imputation of superstition? It must be admitted that there is, in given cases, a tendency in the human mind to an excess of faith. Examples of it, on a large scale, are frequent in history. The general spread of Polytheism, or of the belief that the universe is God, was, perhaps, among the primary causes of the excess of faith. What might have been, otherwise, natural or philosophical faith

became religious faith. One among the general rules by which it is supposed a superstitious faith may be detected is, an entire disproportion between the cause assumed and the effects produced, or between the means and the end; as, for instance, a revelation of a mere trifle, next to nothing; or, a display of divine power to produce effects which may be daily produced in the ordinary course of events, and which are of no general consequence. But the magnitude of the flood, and of the interests involved in it, are surely great enough, if any can be conceived to be so, to place it beyond this exception. It is now known that races of animals have become extinct. Is it not, therefore, to be inferred that the extinction of the race of men is also possible? On the admission of a deluge, what could have prevented such an effect, especially if it came on unexpectedly, and without any great natural indications, or any intimation save a divine warning? Let the facts and the bearings of the history be admitted to approach to truth, and it will be difficult to imagine how any family could have been saved without superhuman premonition, and some floating life-preserver.

It is not now conceived to be necessary to the truth of the Scripture history of the flood, to suppose that all the dry land at present on the globe was above water before the deluge; for it is known that much land has appeared since that period, as for instance, the alluvials of seas and rivers, and the

matter ejected by volcanoes or raised by earthquakes. The present Mount Vesuvius, near Naples, with its scoria and lava, until the time of Pliny, was a rich and beautiful vineyard. But this is among the smallest of volcanoes. It cannot, of course, be meant that the waters covered the tops of the mountains which have since been produced by fire. The highest mountains are volcanic. None other of the American continent are very high. Instances occur, of high lands which show signs of having been once the bed of the sea, the shells lying as they did when the fish lived in them. Noah lived in a part of what is now called central Asia. The land was elevated, but the flood covered it deep. None of these events are naturally impossible, and are not, therefore, incredible. If the natural and religious parts of the narrative could be separated, and the natural parts be retained, the subject would be involved in greater difficulty. Which, for instance, is the most credible—that God should reveal such a natural event some time before it came to pass, or that Noah alone should have discovered it, and have been so confident of it as to make an accurate calculation of the time and to provide means for his preservation? No claims are set up in favor of Noah's superior philosophy; he is celebrated only for his piety. It is only said in effect that the prediction was true, and that the faith was true and produced a rational fear and precaution, not presumption nor

despair. Real danger when known should be really feared, if it can, by any means, be avoided. A man may meet what he cannot avoid with fortitude and resignation. Noah feared the flood, for he believed that it would be deep enough, and last long enough to drown all flesh. He believed that by building an ark he might save his house; he was therefore moved with fear to prepare it beforehand.

The physical and moral doctrine of emotions is the basis of religious experience. We cannot but think that the subject of experimental religion proceeds upon general and uniform laws. Whatever we may think or believe not clearly and strongly and steadily enough to move to corresponding action, comes to nothing. We must be moved, and we must be moved by our feelings, though not on all occasions by one identical mode of them. It is not said that Noah was moved by love to prepare an ark, or by hope—or by desire—or by interest—but by fear. The circumstances of the case determined the mode of his feelings. No other emotion could have been so well suited to this end. His belief in the divine warning was firm. The vastness, the universality of the threatened ruin were terribly sublime, and calculated to fill the imagination with fearful images. A heart that could remain unmoved or complacent in the contemplation of such a scene, is not to be envied. The sympathies of a benevolent heart will fear for others. Is it not won-

derful with what cold and philosophical formality certain good men can declaim against religious fears, with death and hell and all the judgments of God before them? So did not the prophets; so did not a Greater than the prophets. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." This family was not to stand idly by and witness the surrounding destruction, but work out their salvation with fear. Their escape from the deluge was not to be wholly miraculous. The ark must be built and built in time; delays would be dangerous. The law of self-preservation was brought into full action.

Noah condemned the world by building the ark; "and became the heir of righteousness which is by faith." The Scripture says, that Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord, that he was a just man and perfect in his generation and that he walked with God;—"Thus did Noah, according to all that God commanded him, so did he." These notices are important as they relate to St. Paul's statement in the text;—by faith, he became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. All this did not prevent his most diligent attention to all the Lord commanded him;—"So did he." Writers have represented the Ark as the type of Christ. And it does answer in several points. The type and the antitype differed in this,—that man made or provided the former, and God the latter. This seems to be a general rule. If man made both or if God made

both, there would of course be no principle to represent. Why might not man invent and build a house to typify the house made without hands eternal in the heavens? Because he has no instructions how to do it. God who meant to give the Saviour could alone direct man how to make or use a type, and so perpetuate the faith and hope in the promised Saviour. Noah, not God made the typical ark under God's directions, as Moses did the typical sacrifices.

But it is of great importance to understand precisely the meaning which St. Paul attaches to the righteousness of faith, of which Noah became heir. Was it according to the meaning attached to the word by some persons, imputed righteousness? However the controversy may be settled on this debated question, we can perceive no direct evidence of the doctrine of abstract imputation in the eleventh chapter of the letter to the Hebrews. But if we wanted matter of fact evidence that faith works, we do not know where we could find more of it than in this chapter. The position is given,—that without faith it is impossible to please God, "for he that cometh unto God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of those who diligently seek him." He therefore who believes that God is, but not that he is a rewarder of those who diligently seek him, cannot please God. Now do not the examples of the faith of the ancient believers given in this chapter answer precisely to this position? All these

canonical saints (so called) diligently sought to please God. The building of the ark was certainly not imputed to Noah. He did it according to all the Lord commanded him, so did he; he prepared an ark to the saving of his house by which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. What would he have become, if he had refused to do as the Lord commanded him? Why as the submerged world, an heir of a watery grave. The Apostle says of the Patriarchs, that "if they had been mindful of the country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned," thus showing that their pilgrimage was not compulsory. They pleased God in desiring and seeking a better country, that is a heavenly country. The actions which are coupled with the faith of those ancient believers were of the most difficult and trying kind, and prove the mighty efficacy of their faith. But the leading and prevalent idea in each and every case is that their faith was in the promised Messiah. They did not live to receive or to realize in this world the fulfilment of the promises;—"that they without us should not be made perfect." The words,—"God having provided some better things for us,"—seem to answer to,—"Blessed are your eyes for they see, and your ears for they hear things, which kings and prophets and righteous men desired to see and hear, and died before they came to pass." Noah by surviving the destruction of the world as the only believer, was

the heir, the inheritor of all the righteousness of or by faith. The promises made to all the antediluvian fathers concerning the Messiah would have all been lost, without the faith of this man, who found grace in the eyes of the Lord and walked with God. Had Noah died and the world been spared the faith and righteousness would have been lost, the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head would have failed. Noah was the natural descendant of Seth, the heir and the partaker of the faith after Abel the martyr. In their extreme state of infidel depravity it is reasonable to suppose that Shem, the oldest son of Noah, in case of his father's death, would not have been able to rescue the family.

The world is condemned and drowned. The righteousness of faith floats and survives. Who inherits the faith of Seth and Enoch and Methuselah? Noah. Who was the heir of the depositary of the promises or the primitive bible, which contained the records of redeeming grace? Noah. Did his personal righteousness answer to his faith? It did: he was a just man and righteous in his generation. But was not the personal righteousness of Christ to come imputed unto Noah? The Scripture gives no direct affirmative answer. If the same question were asked of Abraham we could extract an answer from the epistle to the Romans. "Abraham believed God, and it was counted (imputed) unto him for righteousness." The reference is to Gene-

sis. "This (Eliezer) shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." Here is St. Paul's view of the subject. Abraham "staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." If these Scriptures do not illustrate the righteousness of faith, the letter to the Philippians might be quoted;—"That I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." This comes near to the language of the text. But is the righteousness which is through the faith of Christ synonymous with the meaning commonly affixed to imputed personal righteousness? If the term faith were taken out of the passage, would not its meaning be affected?

For example,—" but that (the righteousness) which is of Christ, the righteousness which is of God." These expresssions are not surely identical in meaning with or without the words, " through the faith" and " by faith ;" for if they are, then those words must be redundant. But we know that faith stands opposed to its antagonist unbelief, and that when faith yields the mind slides into doubt, and its tendency to unbelief can only be checked by the recovery of faith. " Holding fast faith and a good conscience." " Cast not away your confidence which hath great recompense of reward."

We have assumed for faith a physical and a mental influence leading to moral consequences. If there were neither truth nor error or if all distinctions between them could be confounded in the mind, there would be no faith nor unbelief and no use for them. They would have no objects to exercise them or to be exercised upon. Eyes are of no use without light, nor ears without sound. Light and sound are the only objects suited to these senses. If we could ascertain the existence of any new natural faculty without knowing the use of it, we might be sure that it must answer some end. We are compelled by analogy to conclude that falsehood or illusion can be no more an object or an end of faith than that eyes were made for darkness. Those who deny the truth of all religion by this analogy infer that there is no true faith. And the conclusion will follow if the premises be admitted, just as the

denial of all light would involve the denial of all eyes, or the denial of all percussions and vibrations of air would involve the denial of the human ear. Now the mind by its mere power of perception may perceive things in a general and indistinct manner, as the eye may see things without distinguishing them. The materials for knowledge and for faith are thus furnished at first, and the process of knowing and believing commences. The rainbow was visible to all the family of Noah, but it became connected with faith by a promise, in consequence of which it was made a sign or pledge; and in so far as it answered that end, it dissipated the fears of another deluge, fears not easily overcome by reason, by those who had witnessed one, or had witnessed its effects still strongly marked on all around them. Faith, then, has truth for its object and righteousness for its end; and so is counted for righteousness. Faith, without truth, or in error would have no tendency to obtain or to produce goodness. It is, as usually called, the instrumental cause of justification, having the true meritorious cause of justification for its reliance. All the great and good things, promised in the gospel, are founded in truth, and are through faith,—through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth. When a truth is perceived in the mind, and becomes intense enough to determine the will strongly and steadily, the maxim is almost realized;—"I can do all things through Christ that strengtheneth me."

All things are possible to him that believeth." Faith, then, becomes a righteous principle, and the effect or action of it corresponds to it in kind. So great a degree of faith in a promise will produce hope; and in a threatening or a warning it will produce fear. But if faith, though true in kind be so weak and unsteady as not to determine the will, it is ineffectual and unproductive of corresponding effects and is said to be dead. Noah was the heir of righteousness. This is the circumstance in which his faith and his history are peculiar. His faith was in common with the faith of all these recorded believers, faith in the truth and power and grace of God. It accommodated itself to the peculiar case of each individual, and prepared the way for the coming of the great Deliverer. The faith of Abraham placed him in the relative condition of the Father of the Faithful, instead of that of heir. It had peculiar bearings on the resurrection. In this relation his faith is counted or imputed for righteousness. Therefore it was not written for his sake alone, but for ours also, if we believe that God raised up our Lord and Saviour from the dead. "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead" &c.—"Being fully persuaded that what he had promised he was also able to perform." Noah must have been a public man possessed of wealth and power, as it is not otherwise easy to conceive how he could have built so great a structure and procured animals and the means of sustaining them. Was he

not a King, one of the last of the antediluvian Kings who worshipped the true God? What could the piety of private men have accomplished in such a crisis?

From the premises we feel warranted in coming to the conclusion, that the faith of this man of two worlds, this connecting link in the chain of human existence, was productive of practical religion; that it is a bright example of ancient believers' working, a fine specimen of antediluvian piety, showing how faith then wrought by works and by works was made perfect. We have stated our view of the action of faith upon the will, when it is strengthened, settled and stablished in truth, and we might have added,—supposed truth,—for the law of faith is the same in both real and imaginary truths. Sincerity in error and sincere faith can exist together in fallible minds. Hence zeal in error is so frequently met with. But in Noah's case there was no error. The danger was not misapprehended. The most fearful parts of the prediction were all literally fulfilled. Nothing therefore short of strong practical faith could have enabled one single man to escape the universal ruin of the world. The promised Saviour was no doubt the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and ending of Noah's faith; that is, he was its Author and its Finisher. This Patriarch could do all things through Christ strengthening him; but he must have had a mind and a body to be strengthen-

ed, and that strength must have operated conformably to the laws of his human constitution. The question whether faith be the gift of God has been discussed as too many other questions pertaining to religion have been, upon the assumption that salvation is according to an immediate and not a mediate system. The affirmative takes it for granted that God made the human mind without faith or power to believe, and that God gives the power to believe by an immediate agency of the Holy Spirit; and therefore not unfrequently they who are of this opinion say, that a man can no more believe than he can make a world, and that the grace which imparts faith is as irresistible as creative power.

In opposition to this theory of immediate divine power, we have argued that faith belongs primarily to the first creation, and not exclusively to the new creation or regeneration; that our minds are so constituted that our thoughts must take on one or the other of these three modes, namely,—faith or unbelief or doubt; that a change in the mind from one to another of these modes neither implies nor requires any new faculty or attribute; and that to make or produce faith evidence must be used. But evidence does not act upon the mind by a mere mechanical necessity; it is not perceived nor understood because it is near or present. Many causes, physical, natural and moral, may so intervene as to obscure or prevent evidence from operating on the judgment and will. And any countervailing cause

whether direct or indirect may help our unbelief or assist the mind to overcome its doubts. More evidence may be thus accumulated and may add to the force of that which already exists. If a well disposed mind understands any truth and finds it difficult fully to believe, it hates the causes of its doubts and seeks and employs all means to remove them. Faith then being a natural action of the mind, nothing could be gained by wishing or endeavoring as some do to believe without evidence. In the absence of evidence and under a disposition to do without it, factitious means must be used to gain or to keep the confidence of the mind; in other words, it must be deceived or imposed upon. God may and often does give faith by giving evidence. So the gift of the Holy Spirit, while Peter was telling Cornelius words whereby he should be saved, gave or produced faith or belief, that unto the Gentiles God also had granted repentance unto life. And in an indirect manner he gave faith to Noah, by foretelling the deluge. This warning or prediction was not first given to an unbelieving world, which would have required all the intermediate evidence to produce faith in God, before they could admit of any evidence that it was God who warned them. By miraculous evidence faith became a gift of God to St. Paul. It is evident that the same kind and degree of evidence would not have produced faith in the antediluvians, which confirmed the faith of Noah. And in the case of Paul, ignorance made

a more feeble resistance to evidence of the truth of the gospel than malice would have done. Men do not require the same amount of evidence from their friends as they do from their enemies. When things are not seen as yet or not foreseen, conscience cannot see or foresee them any more than the eye or the mind. Whatever is concealed in the future must be addressed to our faith in some form of evidence or in some relative connection with evidence. Paul revealed a secret or hidden mystery which had been hid from the beginning of the world, namely, —that the Gentile believers should in all respects be fellow heirs of the blessings of the gospel with the Jews. But while this important disclosure produced no faith in the minds of his countrymen, it had no influence upon their consciences. Before they believed the revelation made to St. Paul to be true, they would not and could not in conscience eat with the Gentiles or new converts from among them.

Noah, in the long and arduous work of preparing the ark and acting the part of a preacher of righteousness to a degenerate and irreclaimable race of men, was sustained by the evidence of a peculiar prophecy superadded to the evidences of his common faith and consequent pious and holy life. As the crisis approached this motive influence must have been quickened, and we can readily conceive that his entrance into the Ark must have produced an indescribable effect upon his feelings. But every

believer, who gives all diligence to make his calling and election sure, in a certain degree condemns the ungodly and becomes an heir of the glorious rewards of faith in heaven.

CINCINNATI, January, 1838.

DISCOURSE THIRTEENTH.

THE FAITH OF MOSES.

By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharoah's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward.

Hebrews, xi. 24—26.

Moses is reckoned among the believers in the Messiah to come; therefore, it is said, he esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. The recompense of reward was in heaven. Had there been no such reward or if he had had no respect to it, his estimation might have been in favor of the treasures of Egypt. But the recompense of reward could only be anticipated by faith. It is also said, that by faith Moses endured as seeing him who is invisible. Faith produces in our minds effects answering to sight. The mind through this medium perceives secret or hidden things and things future. Are we told of mines of gold in particular places, and do we believe our informer? The intervening earth is no impediment to our apprehension. Faith lends its realizing view. The riches of Christ were not only invisible in their nature, but were future.

Faith then looks beyond as well as within the veil. The faith of Moses is not to be identified with that of his parents. They saw that he was a proper child and acted accordingly. But when he came to years of maturity, his parents could no longer believe for him. He had the power and right to choose. One of the motives which were set before him to determine his choice, was an admission to the privileges of an adopted son of Pharoah's daughter with Egyptian treasures and the pleasures of sin for a season. On the other hand, there were sufferings with the people of God and final and eternal rewards in heaven. Between these two his mind was free to choose. Both were present to the mind, the former through the senses and the latter through faith. The loss of the first could only be consequent upon the choice of the second. He might have either, but both together he could not have. Cases may and do occur without such alternatives. Men may have the treasures and riches of this world and go to heaven. It is not the lot of all Christians to have their faith so tested, as to be compelled to lose all to gain all. They may have all the things of this world and Christ too. But when called to forsake all, faith can yield all. This trial of faith was perhaps even greater than martyrdom itself. In every age and country, men have been found who would sooner sacrifice life than make the sacrifices which Moses did. It should seem that Moses in virtue of his adoption by

Pharoah's daughter, ranked as an Egyptian prince of the blood.

The suffering with the people of God must be now, in this world; the recompense of reward was not to be enjoyed until after death. The physical and intellectual action of faith and its intellectual action upon the moral faculties are strongly exemplified in this case. There is an unusual grandeur and sublimity in all the events in the history of Moses. The edict of Pharoah for the destruction of the Hebrew infants, it is the opinion of certain writers, was only intended to reach the children of the principal families. Might not oracles have been given out, that some descendant of these tribes of bondmen might endanger the reigning dynasty? This would have been according to ancient usage. But it is plain, that the parents of Moses did believe in the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage. We concur in opinion with those who think that there was nothing casual in the time and place of the exposure of their child; that the times of the princess were regular in her visits to the river, at or near the same place for the purpose of religious ablution. The Nile was evidently the sacred river of the Egyptians. It may then be supposed, that the mother meant that her child should fall into the hands of Pharoah's daughter. Might she not have had some knowledge of the character of the princess? Probably these facts were concealed from the king. The

form of adoption in Eastern countries accounts for the phrase;—"and he became her son." This secured to the child an Egyptian education. His mother by adoption might not have lived to witness his voluntary adherence to the religion of his true parents. Stephen says, that he was forty years old when he visited his brethren. It is therefore probable, that the king in whose reign he was born might have been no longer on the throne. Stephen also adds, that Moses supposed his countrymen or brethren would have recognised him as their deliverer. But forty years more elapsed in a state of exile from the country, before his attempt proved successful. And a third period of forty years terminated his labors and life on the East bank of the Jordan. Could Moses have sustained his hopes and his labors through so extended a period without faith, or with a faith answering as some suppose it does to a dreamy opinion?

The first effects of his faith were in and over himself, in enabling him to rise above his own immediate personal interests and natural propensities for the pleasures of sin, and to withdraw from the family into which he had been adopted. Here was experience or heart-work. Honor, wealth and the pleasures of sin include the great temptations to depart from the high courses of virtue, and must have operated with great force by their magnitude, by the age of the man, and by contrast with dishonor, poverty and suffering. He refused to be

called the son of Pharoah's daughter. He renounced both title and estate, things which go together in hereditary monarchies and the former of which no one retains long who loses the latter. The pleasures of sin under the age of forty in vigorous and healthy constitutions, are naturally intense. All the lawful restraints are loosened by sin. Physical and moral laws limit excitability and excitement in various ways; but sin aims to increase both infinitely and promises to do it while honor and wealth furnish the means. Laws in absolute governments are made by the powerful and the wealthy, not to govern themselves but others. In Egypt and in all ancient monarchies, the heads of the priesthood were princes. Under such a system, the people of (the true) God in a state of political bondage must have been subject to unbounded contempt. To exchange princely grandeur, to suffer affliction with such a people, admitted no compromise between pride and humility. The two extremes were fully in view. Hypocrisy itself could have no place in such a condition. The costs need not be counted nor the strength of the sides estimated; they intruded themselves upon the mind.

Now the writers who extol the faith of Moses most, are most disposed to refer it all to immediate grace and to miracles and to make little account of means and secondary causes. But did not Moses learn the elements of the true religion of his ances-

tors, by oral instruction and from books put into his hands by his parents? He knew his parentage and he knew their language; could he have remained ignorant of their religion with his mother for his nurse? In those times, those who could read their mother tongue must needs know their mothers' religion, for history and poetry were all religious. We think we see indications to induce a belief, that the faith of the parents of Moses, his faith and the faith of Daniel were derived in part in a similar manner. Daniel it is said calculated the dates of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and ascertained the approaching termination of the captivity. But it has been made a question, whether the Patriarchs understood the art of writing. We take it for granted that they did; and that the book of Genesis was in the hands of the parents of Moses, and that they and he calculated the prophecy made to Abraham of the Egyptian bondage, and were persuaded in their own minds that the four hundred years were approaching to a close. If such were the facts, then faith came to Moses by hearing and hearing by the word of God. Moses might have transcribed the book of Genesis or re-edited it; and so it might have been called his edition and have been bound up with the other four books which carry on the history to the end of his life. The book itself has all the marks of an original prose composition. The style is much more primitive than that of Moses in the book of Deuteronomy.

It is Hebrew not Egyptian. If we look into the book of Psalms we shall find poetic narratives of ancient history which may be compared with this original prose, but nothing resembling the poetry of the Psalms is to be found in the first book of Moses. Had Moses written the original Genesis, we feel persuaded he would have made the language his own. Had he recast the original into poetry, the poetry would have been like his own for he was a poet too. These remarks are all intended to corroborate the opinion that Moses had the written prophecy respecting the Egyptian bondage. Having the incipient bible in his hand, he compared facts with predictions and also times and dates. "And he (God) said unto Abraham, Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also, that nation whom they shall serve will I judge, and afterwards they shall come out with great substance." We mean, that Moses read these words as they were written in a book, not received them by verbal tradition, and that he believed them as Daniel did the writings of Jeremiah. Jacob and Joseph both died in Egypt. Jacob was carried to Canaan and buried. And Joseph at his death by faith made mention of the departure of the children of Israel, and gave commandment concerning his bones. These circumstances too were probably matter of record and so known by Mo-

ses; for—"Joseph took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence." Well, if Moses was inspired to commit these traditions to writing for the first time, he knew them; or if they had been written and he read them he knew them: but however he came to the knowledge he not only knew but believed what he knew.

We spend more time on these points than may seem necessary, in consideration of the manner in which historical faith (so called) is sometimes undervalued. In books and sermons we read and hear of the inefficacy of historical faith, at the same time too that written revelation is maintained and defended! Now what is the bible but a historical record or a history? When men are called upon to believe for themselves, can they believe any thing for themselves that is not written in the bible? And when present faith is urged—believing now—it cannot have any influence upon the objects of faith. If experimental religion were not historically true, how could believing make it true? A promise may be truly recorded; but it is not truly fulfilled until the fulfilment answers to the record. The difficulty we suspect lies chiefly in the understanding; the truth is not clearly apprehended and the mind becomes confused. Let a person be called upon to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and let him reply that he cannot. Why can he not believe? Is it because he cannot believe the

history to be true? And why can he not believe the history to be true? The fact is he may have been rather discouraged from believing than encouraged to believe it. Little or no pains may have been taken to make the history plain, or to exhibit its evidence in order to remove doubts. The adage is, that truth is truth all the world over. Whatever is true in the bible or in history, cannot be otherwise any where else, nor at any other time. Will a man say that he believes it is scripturally or historically true, that Christ tasted death for every man or died for all men, but that he cannot believe he died for him? The reverse on examination will be found to be the case. The difficulty originates in some defect of the faith in the history.

The faith of Moses was based on history; much of the evidence of it was historical. But there is a propensity in the minds of those who contemplate faith to make themselves its Alpha and Omega. But faith in written revelation is progressive,—"from faith to faith,"—from the faith of Abraham to the faith of Moses. The former believed the bondage would be four hundred years; and the latter believed that it had been nearly that time. The one believed the prophecy, and the other believed it was about to be fulfilled. If the anticipation was true, the consummation could not be false. But faith may be false and involve the mind in error. True. Many instances of false faith in true scripture have been detected. Notwithstanding the goodness of the

data and of the evidence of Moses' faith, it was severely tested. His brethren were the first to discredit his mission. Few if any examples occur in the experience of those whose faith proves to be true, in which it has not been tried as gold is tried in the fire. It is generally by providential incidents that faith is tested. But in the hands of Providence unbelievers accomplish nothing except as instruments of ruin. After the failure of the first attempt, the future deliverer of Israel spends forty years in exile from Egypt; he returns from this pilgrimage not only better prepared for his work, but he finds also matters much better prepared for him to work upon. Men who are so schooled and so employed as instruments of God, need much historical faith. And in the history which furnished the objects of Moses' faith analogies were well sustained. The long probations of the faith of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, were not exceeded by the probation of the faith of this believer.

It appears that idolatry first established itself in cities which it made seats of power and wealth and learning. It progressed slowly in the country, except by conquest. Terah and Abraham found an asylum in Upper Mesopotamia from the idolatry of Ur of Chaldea. Arabia furnished a similar retreat for Moses. The dynasty of kings at the time of the Exodus may have been in the highest degree idolatrous, and it is conjectured from the words,—"for this purpose have I raised up,"—that it might have

superseded some old family by usurpation or conquest. But the disasters at the Red Sea seem to have prevented the nation from attempting any conquests on the East of that gulf for a length of time. The Israelites remained unmolested within reaching distance of Egypt, and in one instance actually on its borders. The Egyptian education of Moses and his initiation into the Mysteries enabled him fully to understand the history, nature and consequences of idolatry, and qualified him in an eminent degree to legislate against it. His faith required the utmost measure of attainable evidence to sustain him in this most arduous and complex labor, and to check the excessive propensities of the people towards the visible Gods they had so long been familiar with in the house of their bondage. How can any man who contemplates the movements and the labors of Moses, indulge in declamation against historical faith? What other cause, so much as the want of this kind of faith among these politically enslaved tribes, rendered their emancipation and reformation so difficult? All experience and observation show how difficult it is, either to obtain or to retain faith in conflicts with the passions and appetites without the aid of historical evidence and arguments. Those teachers and instructors who direct men to look within themselves for all their resources and means to conquer the allied enemies in the fight of faith, can hardly fail to leave their pupils exposed as it were to be out-flanked if not sur-

rounded. The whole history of the ancestors of Moses from the time they left their native country in obedience to the divine command to become strangers and pilgrims, furnish evidence to sustain his faith, and thus enabled him to succeed in this perilous enterprise. Those Patriarchs and their descendants in the line through which Christ was to come according to the flesh, must first survey the land in which the Deliverer was to be born and have it confirmed to them by promise; then at the end of a given time they were to take possession of it by conquest. Had Moses been inspired to know things past, present, and to come after the manner of intuition, all external or relative or corresponding evidence would have been unnecessary, for faith would have been unnecessary; he could have walked by knowledge as by sight. It is not for us to say that the human mind is incapable of such intuitive action and consequent certainty; but we venture to infer from the operation of evidence and of faith in the mind, that it does not so act. There is not perhaps one example in the bible of a revelation or an inspiration without external signs or evidence, without some proof beyond the mind itself to confirm its belief. Moses himself needed these kinds of external evidences. An adventitious meeting with his brother according to a prediction, is an instance. One of the strongest proofs of the truth of God is therefore the fulfilment of what has been foretold. All the false Gods are challenged to give

such proofs of foreknowledge. And the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. The influence of the Scripture upon the faith of Christians shows how important historical or recorded prophecy is to faith; for with all their mistakes and errors respecting its meaning, with all their enthusiasm, in some mode or other they all find it necessary to resort to this common standard. The reason is very obvious. The prediction gains in historical character rather than loses by the duration of its period. If the prediction of the Egyptian bondage had limited it to forty years instead of four hundred, its credibility would have been weakened as one generation of men might have co-operated to bring it to pass.—But in the longer space the prescient mind is more evident. Indeed the only ground of doubt is, whether it ever was foretold.

In cases like this of Moses the first effects of faith should be in the believer himself. There are instances in which demoralizing causes do not immediately suspend or destroy the effects of great intellectual or physical operations. There are for example traits in the character of Mahomet irreconcilable with personal virtue; but though they were known to his followers, the success of his arms which these traits had no direct tendency to impede sustained the confidence of those followers in the battle field. But the first movement of Moses proved to him that all calculations on military force must prove fallacious. His attempt to vindicate the per-

sonal injury offered to one of his own friends was betrayed by this very man. The Egyptian probably was a task-master or an overseer. Moses might have inquired into the cause of offence and have attempted to use argument, and this might have exasperated the officer and produced a personal contest. The Hebrew makes no secret of the fact, nor his countrymen of their jealousy of this new friend.

But the future leader and law-giver of Israel's sons was already morally qualified for the moral part of his work; faith had wrought self-denial, and it is only by self-denial that we can gain and secure self-confidence or sincerity as moral or religious teachers and leaders. The deliverance of this people from the house of their bondage was only a preliminary step. Political freedom in a state of barbarism or in a state of idolatry would not have prepared the way of the Lord (the Messiah,) nor have made his paths straight. The appointed law-giver who is to give laws to promote and to maintain the knowledge and worship of the true God and the hopes of a coming Redeemer, must himself give some proof to his own conscience as well as to others that he has the root of the matter in him. He must show his faith by his works of self-denial, and especially by denying the sin that doth most easily beset him or men in his condition.

When men tell of what they will do or will not do in untried conditions, they gain little of the confidence of men of wisdom and experience. The Apostle begins his account of the faith of Moses

with his experience and not with his actions; actions or external fruits follow. "By faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible. Through faith he kept the passover and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first born should touch them. By faith he passed through the Red Sea as by dry land, which the Egyptians assaying to do were drowned." Now had all this been first, and had he afterwards disowned his relation to the daughter of a king and disclaimed the pleasures of sin and spurned the treasures of Egypt, the usual order of practice and experience would have been inverted. But as the facts now stand, (speaking after the modern manner) he appears as a converted man, he has experienced religion, his heart is changed. Like another Paul then, we see Moses not counting all things but loss after he had won Christ but that he might win him. It is well said that,—"hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" So, it is no proof of faith to retain things till we can get or have gotten a substitute for them. Moses too might have said; Not as though I had already attained the recompense of reward. When he endeavored to conciliate his contending brethren, he had made all the great voluntary sacrifices of honors, of sinful pleasures and of riches, but forty years remained to test his patience and perseverance. Did he live all that time in unavailing regrets of a hasty resolution

prompted by ambition, sighing for all he had thus thrown away and lost forever? Or did his God and his conscience bear testimony to the secret devotions of his heart, and that he felt no regrets for the voluntary surrenders he had made in behalf and for the sake of what he believed to be the cause of truth? He lived to be a better and a happier man, and became as it were doubly qualified to prosecute his great work.

Among all the believers who are quoted in the eleventh chapter of the letter to the Hebrews, no one perhaps had his faith modified more in accordance to the faith of Christians, and especially those who are providentially called to act in public and in highly responsible stations. He had to deny himself and to take up his cross. His own personal religion became necessary as a qualification for his ministry, and to enable him to suffer affliction with the people of God. Without faith, it would have been impossible for him to have pleased God by obeying him; for it would have been impossible for him to have obeyed, as all his motive agency was inward and all his motive objects future. In his situation an unbeliever could not at first have acted even the hypocrite. Every power of his soul must have been paralyzed in despair.

We have shown at some length, in how great a degree the faith of Moses must have partaken of the historical; and yet (so to speak) how powerfully it acted on the inner man, effecting instrumen

tally a change in moral sentiment and volition answering in some respects to what is called conversion. And in this, we have to argue that it is the truth which gives the effect; and that the opinion that the letter of the truth is nothing is an erroneous opinion or a misapprehension of the nature of the case. Here we see that the letter instead of being obscure and dead derives efficacy from the very age of the prophecy, and the remoteness of its final accomplishment in the promised Messiah. "In thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." This promise is believed as the promise of him, who it is impossible should lie. The hope that reposes upon faith is an anchor to the soul both sure and steadfast. Let written truth be well understood (and what form of truth can be better understood?) and let it be fully believed; and that love of honor and riches and pleasure which is opposed to it must be deeply rooted in the heart indeed that cannot be made to yield to it. In fact, the faith seems to yield first when the effect fails. The Lord prayed for Peter that his faith might not fail. He that believeth not shall be damned. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharoah's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." The faith of Moses is more worthy of notice, from the consideration that he was of the tribe

of Levi, whose birth-right had been transferred to Judah the next younger brother. His tribe then was not to be reckoned in the genealogy of the Messiah. Why was not one of the tribe of Judah selected to lead in this great cause? Is this idea referred to in the expression;—"Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant?" Did Moses so regard himself? This is probable, and if true augments his faith. No man could have had his personal ambition less excited by hopes of family aggrandizement. His successor in command was actually of the tribe of Judah.

How wise, how holy, was the choice of this faithful servant in the house of God! May we not well repeat, that faith was made for truth, that it is intended for the truth and not for falsehood and thus to promote goodness? Was there ever a truer estimate made than this one between the reproach of Christ and the treasures of Egypt? The reproach of Christ and the recompense of reward are not to be separated. If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him. If we deny him, he will also deny us. So, faith operates on the judgment and upon the will and upon the affections.

Are we believers? Have we faith? What has it done for us? What are its fruits? Are they within us,—in our minds and in our hearts? A name or a relation is easily changed when nothing is to be lost or gained by it. Moses when called the son of Pharoah's daughter, must have been

called an Egyptian by nation and by religion. He did not worship or suffer with the people of God. When he changed his national character and preferred his relation in blood to his relation by adoption, and became truly and publicly religious, he united with the people of God to share their lot of suffering. Then it was that he changed honor for affliction, then it was that his faith was tried and found unto praise and honor and glory!

Between sentiment or feeling and intellect, faith may be modified so as to hold a medium or be made to approach nearer to the one or to the other. Hence the faith of some men can scarcely be distinguished from sense, and that of others passes for opinion. The means also that are used to produce or to sustain faith, are marked with the same peculiarities. The feelings excite the mind to believe; they are quickened to bring it into the act and habit of thinking what to believe and how to believe. Two schools of teachers and learners have been thus formed and have become rivals. And in the ardor of party excitement neither seems disposed to investigate the grounds of their differences, or to admit as facts the tendencies of each other to opposite extremes. We have assumed that the faith of Moses by partaking largely of the historical character, was in a high degree intellectual. This we are disposed to think would follow, even if, as is commonly supposed, he was inspired to write the accounts of events which happened before he was

born, for he must of course have been inspired to know them. But if they were written and transmitted in the families of his ancestors and he read and transcribed them as authentic records, still he knew and believed them. But until he renounced his Egyptian relation his mind could not have been fully under their influence. He must have read and thought much by himself. The religious instructions of the professed teachers of the true religion could not safely have been attended by him in public. That his intercourse with the tribes was not very intimate, is probable from his over estimate of their knowledge. He supposed his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them, but they understood not. They were not generally readers and calculators of the meaning and the dates of prophecies. Examples of this intellectual faith as we call it, are met with in different ages and countries, and they correspond in many points with the faith of Moses. These self-instructed and self-reformed men first appear in the church with all the stamina of virtue, or as having subdued the propensities peculiar to their condition and station. Such men confer not with flesh and blood. St. Paul began immediately to preach Jesus—before all the Apostles knew him. Such men perhaps are generally more apt to obtain self-conquests by their own intellectual efforts, than by social schooling.

We mean not to be partizans of intellectual faith,

nor to censure indiscriminately feeling faith. Both sides may err in their own peculiar way. It is probable, that the larger number of every community of believers feel more than they think, and that it is not easy to increase their faith without exciting their feelings. The superiority we claim for the thinking faculties is exhibited in the small number of the eminently intellectual in comparison with those in whom the feelings predominate. Much art is necessary to bring the mind into full action. But some who think least feel most. It may be thought inadmissible to say that faith is apt to conform to sense, as it might seem to question its inspiration or gracious origin, for most persons of strong religious feelings are apt to be jealous on this point. Let the statement be kept in mind, that in all cases the real and final effect is produced by the truth or that truth is the efficient cause. An error in feeling or in opinion will remain so in despite of all our belief to the contrary. Faith has no power to make error true, nor wrong right. Another objection will be urged against our view of intellectual faith or faith conforming to thought rather than feeling, namely,—that it leads to self-salvation. But by the terms, self-learned or self-taught, we mean that certain men use the agency of their own minds instead of being influenced as some others are by the agency of other minds. The Eunuch was reading the prophecy of Isaiah. Philip asked him whether he understood what he read. He confessed his ig-

norance. Would it be correct to infer that all readers of the bible must be equally ignorant of all parts of it? If the Eunuch had understood the passage he might have believed it and the effects of its truth would have been the same, for Philip added nothing to the truth,—he only aided the understanding. The Eunuch's mind operated instrumentally; the truth was from God. It is no part of the preacher's work to make bibles, or to prevent men from understanding the word of God if they can.

Moses had to use great pains and to address himself almost constantly to the feelings of the people, to excite and keep up their confidence. Now no one can suppose, that the same means were used to excite his feelings. But why did he not need them as much as the people? One reason was, his faith was more intellectual or came more by hearing than by feeling. But no man saves himself by hearing and thinking; his faith may be the more rational but it neither creates nor invents any saving truth. When we say that the faith of Moses was historical or scriptural, that it was eminently mental, we do not mean that it was in no degree sensible or that he did not feel the truths which he believed; but merely that their presence in his mind and influence over his judgment, will and actions were not mainly regulated by his feelings. He could think to a certain extent in one manner, while he might have felt in another and could con-

trol his feelings by his thoughts. Our feelings or their absence are not to be regarded as indifferent to our faith. The most we can do is to habituate them to yield in some degree to thought and to our confidence in truth. In revivals of religion much feeling is usually excited. People believe as they feel and because they feel. Hopes are expanded and prospects brightened and enlarged. But in the midst of mighty emotions, not unfrequently all the feelings subside, the heart becomes dead and the mind dark. The wonder then is at this adverse change, but no one is prepared to hear of any cause short of a supernatural one, or to reflect that religious feelings as well as all other human feelings have finite limits, and that faith being also finite must conform to them in so far as they have had any causation in its production. Unhappily it has come to pass, that intellectual and sensible faith have too often been made to act as antagonist to each other, instead of being made as they should be help meet to each other. Though it be true, that when our confidence or distrust accords with our feelings we are immediately and strongly interested, yet the circle in which the feelings move is too limited for the thoughts and so must check the sublime movements of the mind. Present enjoyment becomes a centre of attraction. But historical faith as we call it, diverts our attention away from ourselves and the mind expands and ranges beyond earthly limits; and when it returns to the feel-

ings, like the voyager who comes back enriched with new treasures, it improves the feelings themselves. How can any person of experience and observation help perceiving, that religious faith when almost exclusively associated with the feelings conforms to the operations of wordly or common faith? It is thus, that Christians manifest a proneness to become believers of a day, and so obliterate the line of distinction between faith and sight. The acts of believing in hope against hope cannot be kept up in habits of impatience. "Ye have heard of the patience of Job; ye have seen the end of the Lord." If then above all things we must let patience have its perfect work, certainly it is necessary to contemplate the promises of the gospel upon the most enlarged scale. The transitions of believers' feelings as disclosed in their diaries and conversations, are singularly curious when contrasted with the great object of their faith,—Jesus Christ yesterday, today, and forever the same. How weak must those eyes be, which are daily and hourly obscured in a clear and steady light!

It is worth while to notice the different effects of faith, under the different circumstances of Joseph and Moses. The former as the Grand Vizier of Egypt could enjoy its honors and its treasures; the latter as the Deliverer of the tribes of Israel must renounce them both. Joseph in the order of Providence was sent into Egypt to save much people alive. And Moses was called to deliver much peo-

ple from bondage. Each in his turn contributes to promote the great train of events which lead to the redemption of the world. Both live and die in a full belief of that glorious promise made to their great ancestor, the Father of the Faithful. And Moses takes care that the oath shall be fulfilled respecting the bones of Joseph. What a precious pledge! This is one of those who died in the faith, not having received the promises but having seen them afar off and was persuaded of them. The faith of Joseph too enabled him to renounce the pleasures of sin for a season of temptation, rather than sin against his God. The faith of Moses is an example of the mode of believing now so much needed by all the churches, and yet if possible more than ever neglected to be taught in the schools. It seems as if it were generally taken for granted, that in regard to historical faith it is now no longer needed. But is it not in truth the one thing needful to our passions and appetites? Instead of having them almost constantly presented to our minds by our teachers for correction, do we not need to have our minds directed quite beyond them and above them? "By two immutable things," says the Apostle, "in which it was impossible for God to lie." How seasonable this relief to the ever mutable feelings! The aim of every believer should be, that his faith as far as possible should take on the eternal character of truth!

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE FOURTEENTH.

THE HOPE SET BEFORE US.

That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.

Hebrews vi.—18, 19, 20.

"God," says the context, "willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath."—The form of this oath was;—"surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee." Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not become fathers until late in life. The former after he had patiently endured, obtained the promise in the son of Sarah against hope. "We desire," says the Apostle, "that every one of you do show the same diligence, (relatively) to the full assurance of hope unto the end, that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises."

Hope and despair stand opposed to each other, as faith and unbelief do. They cannot be made to operate substitutively or to produce the same effects.

They are in religion and morals, what attraction and repulsion are in nature. Hope stimulates, produces strength, vivacity, courage and pleasure. Despair relaxes, enfeebles, discourages and distresses. The foundation of both is evidently laid in the human constitution, for both hope and despair and their characteristic effects may be produced by natural causes as well as by religious and moral ones. Certain classes of diseases depress hope, and others at certain stages of their action increase or revive it. The effects of hectic fevers are well known. Though none recover from the insidious malady, yet all who suffer under it hope to the very last. From facts of this description purely natural, we must infer that hope and despair are not mere factitious or artificial creations, and that they would exist were there no religion in the world. Hope is to be classed with faith and despair with unbelief. Every thing in which we can feel an interest and can think upon, will be in some form associated with our hopes or fears, and fears in excess will terminate in despair. Temporal causes may generate a sufficient amount of despair to destroy life. Religious despair (so called) cannot become universal or perpetual. An extraordinary instance of prejudice is witnessed in those, who gravely and earnestly hold up certain denominations of Christians as the victims of despair, and caution all against embracing these religions. A religion without hope, were it possible for it to exist, must contain the seeds

of its own dissolution. But all religion must begin in hope. The only alternative that can be, is between true and false hope. False hope may end in despair; but nothing can be begun in despair. As soon as a case is perceived or believed to be hopeless, it is abandoned. Despair makes no proselytes. When preachers are accused of preaching despair or driving people to despair by their preaching, it is not to be supposed that they tell their hearers that they will be lost by believing and following their doctrines and instructions. Preachers may tell their hearers that they will be lost without religion or that a false religion cannot save them; and if their hearers believe them they will of course despair of being so saved. But the preacher has gained nothing and can gain nothing by thus producing despair, unless he can inspire hope of salvation in some religion.

Religion without faith and hope never has existed and never can exist, except it be just long enough to pass away. False faith and false hope are the basis of false religion. But hope is peculiarly necessary to religion, because all that is future pertaining to religion is entirely beyond the apprehension without hope. All religions it has been said have their mysteries; for if a religion has nothing in it to transcend the senses, something must be invented and added to it to carry it beyond the senses or it can have no hope. Idolatry which is present to the senses, is found to be too much so. It needs mys-

teries and they were produced in excess; and hopes and fears beyond all reasonable bounds were thus associated in the mind with the presence of lifeless imagery. The state is united with the church to cooperate in the production of hopes and fears. All political and religious movements and measures were under the directions of oracles or omens, and these all required the agency of the ministers of religion. The gospel brings life and immortality to light to excite the hopes; therefore a Christian's hope is said to be full of immortality. But though the church of Christ had no legal or official connection with any government, yet the rise and fall of nations and kingdoms and empires, under which the members of the church must necessarily live, could not be contemplated with indifference by them. Besides, the time which must often elapse in great national movements and the uncertainty which hangs over political events, create in the mind the highest anxiety. Indeed the opinion of the ancients, that civil governments cannot be sustained without religion, still prevails both among statesmen and churchmen. But is there not some ambiguity about this subject and might it not be almost wholly avoided, if hope were constantly used in a definite sense? The heaven and the hell (so to speak) of the ancient idolaters were in effect political. They needed them to imply the want of efficacy in their visible divinities to generate hope in their worshippers. Their religion as has been said was too sensible; it

left its devotees hopeless. The idols that men saw, —why did they hope for? After they had wearied their eyes in gazing upon this dumb show in ignorance of another world, what remained but to make a mystery of the government of this world? But revealed religion which has brought life and immortality to light, which has disclosed moral and spiritual rewards and punishments can do without politics. It has hopes of its own, hopes both sure and stedfast, which as an anchor to the soul enter into that within the veil, whither the forerunner for us is entered, even Jesus.

Now whether the kingdoms of this world can sustain themselves without the aid of religious hopes or not, it is not for us to say; but that the whole structure of the christian religion is more intimately and inseparably connected with hope than any other system of religion, is evident from the slightest comparison and particularly from the manner in which hope is interwoven with every part of its texture and combines with truth and mind. Religious knowledge and experience progress under the most favorable circumstances but slowly. Often when we think we have made considerable advances, future tests correct our opinion and humble us, by compelling us to make a very modest estimate of ourselves and of our attainments—thus leaving ample space for hope or a patient waiting for that which we see not. St. Paul we have seen desired his brethren to show the same diligence to the full assurance

of hope unto the end. But at this very end, we have more to hope for than at any former period, for our prospects of heaven are more than ever brightened.

We may have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us. The ancient poetical image of hope was an anchor; but the image in one respect defeated its own object. It was too visible, too palpable. The Apostle plays upon the trope. "Which hope" he says "we have as an anchor to the soul, both sure and stedfast, which entereth into that within the veil." This anchor therefore is not seen. Jesus Christ our hope, the object of our hope and the author of it, has passed beyond the veil; his risen body is in heaven invisible to us. It has often been noticed how Paul's Greek and Hebrew learning enabled him to improve his style, by combining words found in both languages. Anchor was a Greek word; veil (of the temple) was a Hebrew expression. The sure and stedfast of the former combines well with the hiding or concealment of the latter. Though the great objects of our faith are beyond the veil, they are no less sure and certain. The manner in which the art of man's device has modified the gospel, with a view to make it at once more comprehensible and mysterious, is remarkable. The churches must be filled with statuary or paintings to aid the mind, to assist the understanding. The learner and the worshipper must see as well as hear and think, and this visible and ceremonious religion must

have mysteries which baffle and confound all reason and all sense. The causes of these paradoxes must perhaps still be referred to hope. This christian imagery and show cannot satisfy the hopes of the soul, and offers nothing in fact to it. If we hope for that which we see not then do we with patience wait for it; but the material objects of worship are all seen and what a man seeth,—why doth he hope for? In true religion there is a veil, not a show, through which and beyond which the senses cannot penetrate. There is no use, no necessity, for adventitious mystery to create hope or to furnish it with objects. "Now we see through a glass darkly; and now abideth ——— hope." When Jesus went away then hope came; and then the Comforter came. Then the disciples fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before them, and the Comforter gave them great consolation. Their hope followed their forerunner into heaven.

In the progress of redemption there was no break in the chain of events, no confounding of their order. The birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension into heaven follow in order; but the senses can go no further; a cloud receives him out of their sight. From that time they knew him no more after the flesh. The Apostles are not witness of things beyond the veil. If St. Paul hears any thing there, they are unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter. All future time as well as eternity is a veil to our senses. We know not what a day may

bring forth. To-morrow is an object of hope; but the hope of it is not sure and stedfast. No future day of life is confirmed to any mortal by an oath of God. The promise of eternal life is made sure to the heirs of promise. It is impossible for God to lie.

> Jesus my all, to heaven is gone,
> He, whom I fix my hopes upon.

He ever liveth at the right hand of God to make intercession for us. He is a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.

The idea of a believing Jew flying for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before him, while the dissolution of his ancient church and state was approaching, is touching. What other hope could those people have had, whose belief in the Messiah involved in it his prophecy of the entire overthrow of the ancient system, and also the city and temple so entirely as not to leave one stone upon another? Their ascended Saviour was the only hope set before them, and set before them just at this conjuncture of time, the end of their political and ecclesiastical world. It was not a revolution but a total destruction. The sun of power was to be darkened, the moon was to cease to reflect her borrowed light, and the stars (ministers of religion) to fall from their orbits. Not a vestige of the primary or the secondary power of the hierarchy was to be left in Jerusalem. It was also foretold, that the destruction of human life would be very great, that not one

ray of earthly hope would remain, when the foe in the highest state of exasperation and panting for revenge should be completely victorious. In such an anticipated catastrophe how desirable to have a hope both sure and stedfast!

But every man has for himself personally and in effect an end of the world. Death to us ends all earthly relations. "I die;"—said Joseph. What a word! I die;—must all say, whether they shall say it with or without hope. To die without hope;—who can bear the thought? Few can bear it. Either the thought must be banished, or false and dreamy hopes must by some means be called up. Loss of life and loss of happiness are both shocking;—some derangement in our natural feelings must happen before we can become reconciled to the idea of either. The death of the body may be submitted to and even desired, while it is regarded as the separation of the mortal from the immortal part of ourselves for a time. But annihilation, a total and eternal cessation of consciousness is contrary to the first law of nature. To believe it and to be reconciled to it, is to cherish the principle of suicide. The elements of hope are abundantly diffused in our nature, and the pleasure we derive from it guarantees their cultivation. The pure enjoyments are so desirable that every good man would wish to live forever for their sake. To have a foretaste of heaven and to be willing to cease to be or to lose heaven without ceasing to be, is im-

possible while reason remains pure. No rational man ever yet hated his own soul, and still less its own happiness. Our love is for life, and for happy life; and what we love to have we hope to have. Both love and hope are as immortal as consciousness. Neither of them has a self-prompting agency to remind us how soon they must expire. Were one to be heard calculating how long he would love or hope, would not the soundness of his heart or head be questioned? This longing after immortality proves the relation of hope to the immortal soul.

Oh! short-lived mortal, a storm is gathering, a flood is accumulating. The destroyer is approaching. Have you not fled? Oh! fly then, fly now to the hope set before you. Fly not only with a hope of escape, but fly to the hope,—to Jesus our hope. All who would find refuge must fly to him. He is the anchor of the soul both sure and stedfast; he has entered into that within the veil. It is this fact which distinguishes Christianity from all other systems of religion. The Christian's hope may be as it were all reduced to Jesus.

> My hope is all centered in thee,
> I trust to recover thy love;
> On earth thy salvation to see,
> And then to enjoy thee above!

Jesus is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God through him. When the conse-

quences and the guilt of our sins pursue us, when the judgments of God threaten us, the Mediator is set before us that we may fly to him for succor. There is a period in which presumption and false hopes will fail. The sinner must finally yield to despair. His sins will find him out. The terrors of God will make him afraid. Which way will he fly? How can he escape? He has become the enemy of the Just God, the ministers of whose justice are every where. A guilty conscience confounds the sinner's wisdom and destroys his strength whether he flies or fights. The history of the manner in which the wicked have been often overtaken by the judgments of God shows, that though Julian might not have said (as some say he did) when he fell ;—Oh Galilean, thou hast conquered!—yet in fact the Galilean does conquer.

Happy the souls who have fled for refuge from impending storms, from raging floods, from devouring flames, from the righteous judgments of God!

> Hide me, oh my Saviour, hide ;
> Oh, receive my soul at last!

Many poor, deluded, terrified sinners do flee this way and that way and every way, except to the hope set before them ; and from him they fly to the rocks and mountains to invoke them to fall and hide them from the face of the Lamb, "for the great day of wrath is come," that Lamb who is the Christian's hope and who thus becomes the sinner's des-

pair. Unhappy!—which way he flies, is hell! It is but for a time, for a day of visitation, that Jesus is set before us as our hope. To-day his voice must be heard, while it is called to-day. To-morrow it may be no longer a voice of invitation. Now all the ends of the earth may look and be saved! But behold! he cometh with clouds and who shall be able to stand? When he appeareth on his great white throne, earth and heaven shall flee away from before his face, and there shall be no place (of refuge) found for them.

Error it has been shown may generate false hope; hence the influence of opinion or persuasion over it,—as it is always a pleasurable excitement. The difficulty in certain cases of distinguishing the pleasures of false hopes from those of true hopes, gives an uncertainty to the data of experience and misleads the judgment. But if error always produced despair instead of false hopes, the pleasurable feelings of true hope would in many cases of experience be a good and safe guide to the mind. No man's judgment is questioned when he affirms of one feeling, this is hope, and of another despair. But the case is altered when he pronounces judgment upon two feelings of hope in his own heart; for suspicions will arise in other minds that he may misjudge between true and false hope. This process differs from that of judging the causes of our hopes in the abstract without regarding the hopes themselves, or of compelling our minds to judge of

the effects by the causes; for in this case it would follow that whatever might be the nature and degree of feeling, if the cause is wrong the hope must be so too. But experience may detect errors (when it can detect them) too late to apply the remedy. Though facts may prove the fallacy of our feelings, we may not be able to control them nor to escape from their consequences. The habit of false hopes may become very inveterate. There is for instance a popular morality or religion; and it may have gained its popularity and the sanction of great names on account of the facility with which it generates hope. It may draw largely on the mercy of God and the merits of the Saviour, and that too at the most reasonable and the most seasonable time;—at the very time when they are most needed, that is, when one has done all one can do to save one's self. Now if he has failed, he hopes that God in mercy for Christ's sake will do the rest. Is not this reasonable and a reasonable construction of Scripture? So argues reason. To such conclusions does reason come and thus does it sustain them. But reason may err in its premises while it makes true inferences from them. If there be an error in these premises, all the hope that grows out of the conclusions must be false.

While we have the Scripture and our reason, what course shall we pursue to detect error and confirm truth? We begin by assuming that something more is surely due to the Scriptures than to

our reason. The bible is an old book, our individual minds can never be very old without being infirm, and most of them are still young. Our opinions ought therefore to be the first to be suspected, and of course to be the first to be examined. Our reason and the pleasing hopes we may have built upon it are parts of ourselves; they may be selfish in a greater or less degree. Have we a heaven and a way to get there in our own minds, and do we hope to go to heaven in this way? Now though our thoughts may come from Scripture, is it certain that they do so? Our reason will not be apt to begin with itself precisely as the Scriptures do with it. That old book does not by any means flatter the mental and moral faculties of us men. It charges us with a proneness to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think. And this error may affect the whole process of our reasoning. If the ground be assumed too high, all the conclusions will logically err by excess. The difficulty of getting to heaven, in proportion as we conceive it in our minds to be greater or less, must affect all our views of the way to heaven or (as it is called) the plan of salvation. "Strive to enter in at the straight gate, for straight is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth to heaven, and few there be that find it; and wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat." The straightness and narrowness of the way comes under the consideration of our reason,

and as we judge of it we shall feel the need of help proportionally. Men who suppose they have ample time at their command to do a work which can soon be done, conclude they need be in no hurry about it and indulge in no despondency. The depravity and ignorance of nature, the deceitfulness of sin, and the force of vicious habit do not enter into their reasoning, do not in their judgment help to make the gate straight or the way narrow. They are happy because they hope to get to heaven, and they hope to get to heaven because they err in undervaluing the difficulties and overvaluing their time and means and ability. They reason from false premises. The mercy of God and the merits of a Mediator are not mere appendages of salvation, but are at the foundation, the very beginning of the whole matter. "Without me ye can do nothing,"—not,—do all you can and I will do the rest. But is it not reasonable we should try to do all we can? And may not every man reasonably expect, that if he does God will help him? Where can be the error of such a course? Observe,—if the heart be wicked and deceitful the fact should be known. If we are altogether ignorant of ourselves pride and self-righteousness may be concealed under our sincerity; and our hopes of salvation would be in effect salvation in our sins and not salvation from our sins. Sincerity and hope when based upon error alter nothing and do not directly add to farther knowledge. Peter could perceive that Si-

mon was in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity, though he was negotiating in hopes of purchasing the Holy Ghost with money. The guilty and unsanctified character of human nature is a fact, on which the redemption of man is predicated. The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost. If we should reason away this fact, we should involve the consequences also in the same conclusions. Jesus comes not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. Now the illusive hope we are combatting makes Jesus in effect call the righteous rather than sinners to repentance. These need no repentance, but if they should need any help it is only to make up some defects in their righteousness and in this way they would hope to be saved. But should it prove in the sequel, that they are ignorant of God's righteousness and are going about to establish their own righteousness, how disastrous must the error be! Christian hopes should indeed be rational, and they are so when they are truly Scriptural. The hope of the hypocrite shall perish. This it is rational to suppose must needs be, unless hope were strong enough to withstand this sin. Hope, though among the active of the pleasurable excitements, is the feeblest of auxiliaries to hypocrisy. When the crisis arrives, knowledge gives a death blow to hope and the hypocrite is in despair.

In the order of experience the most common process is, that such a conscious and rational conviction

of the demerit of sin and of the evil propensities of the heart takes place, as to destroy hope or to produce despair of obtaining pardon for sin through any human merit or of changing the heart by human means. Teaching and instruction then show the plan of salvation by grace through faith. Jesus Christ becomes the object of faith and is believed in in the heart unto righteousness; and the spirit of grace begins the work of comfort and sanctification by shedding the love of God abroad in the heart. Now the pardoned sinner stands in this grace as one who has received the atonement not made it, and rejoices in the hope of the glory of God. After this great change hope follows, and the movements and degrees of faith and consolations become strong and full of immortality. It is in this justifying and sanctifying change that experience answers to the language of the text,—"have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." This change is not limited to any definite time; but in the shortest time the transition of the feelings is generally clear and distinct in proportion to the degree in which the plan of salvation is understood. If the faith in the merits and grace of the Saviour is strong and steady, hope cannot be weak and wavering.

> Tears of joy mine eyes o'erflow,
> I have a hope of heaven;
> Much of love I ought to know,
> For I have much forgiven.

The change is indeed often wonderful and can

never be wholly forgotten. Unbounded and infinite fulness of merit and grace appears in the Saviour.

> Like our espousals, Lord, to thee,
> Like the blest hour when from above,
> We first received the pledge of love.

It may be laid down as a general rule, that those who have never been conscious to a degree amounting in effect to despair of their inability to save themselves, have little trustworthy hope in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is in the exercise of repentance that the discoveries begin to be made of our fallen and lost estate, of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and the enmity of the carnal mind to the law of God; but until the heart is quite broken into contrition, humbled and prostrated at the feet of mercy, it will disclose its proneness to catch at the shadow of hope. This is the weak side of human nature in regard to religion. How few have courage enough to expose the fallacy of their false hopes! The idea of laying hold upon the hope set before us is not steady; the mind wanders and creates its own hopes and is ever ready to follow incidents. One of the peculiar evidences of true gospel hope is, that it is provided, prepared, set before us, not adventitious or incidental.

> What did thine only Son endure,
> Before I drew my breath;
> What pain, what labor to secure
> My soul from endless death!

"Before whose eyes, Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth, as crucified among you."

The points of identity in the gospel plan of hope have been strangely neglected or overlooked or suffered to be perverted by the enemy. A religion without a priesthood was unknown to the ancients. The Gospel did not attempt to shock the opinions of mankind by introducing a new religion without a priesthood, nor with a priesthood never before heard of or typified; but it established a priesthood after the order of Melchisedec differing from the order of Aaron in having no succession. Melchisedec stands on record genealogyless. He is historically immortal. So Jesus Christ abideth a priest forever. The resurrection of any one of the sons of Aaron was rendered incredible and impossible, for it would have deranged the whole plan of that succession. But as it was expressly foretold that the Priesthood of the Messiah should be perpetual in his own person, and as his enemies actually crucified him, his resurrection became necessary to the fulfilment of the prophecy; and this fact gives rise to an identity of Priesthood which cannot be imitated or counterfeited. Let all the priests who have ever existed be brought into review, and to which order can the language,—"whither the forerunner for us is entered,"—have any application in truth or in fact? Here indeed there are, there can be no rival claims, no competitors. The point to be provis not, which of the risen and ascended priests or

high priests is our hope, for no other priesthood ever pretended to any thing of the kind. We see how Jesus is made a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedec, how he becomes the anti-type while the other is only the type. No priesthood on earth stands in the way of this great high-priesthood, and it stands in the way of no one. It has entered into that within the veil and entered as our forerunner. The high-priest entered under the law within the veil of the temple. But it was sacrilege for any other person to follow. Jesus our forerunner says, —"where I am, there shall ye my servants be also, that ye may behold my glory." His presence makes our paradise, and where he is is heaven.—"Because I live, ye shall live also." "Them that sleep will Jesus bring with him." "We shall be caught up to the Lord in the air, and so be forever with the Lord." The foundation of God standeth sure. The foundation of our hope is immutable truth. It is impossible for God to lie. His promise has all the legal forms and sanctions. Does the law require that the promise should be under oath? On this point there can be no litigation; the instrument or covenant is valid in form. If there were no true promise there could be no hope, no consolation at all. What God hath not promised, we have no right to expect. We conceive or imagine a thousand things which appear so desirable that we wish ourselves into hoping for them, and we can think of no reason why the Author of all good might not

bestow them upon us, especially as we know not how we can be happy without them. Hence human discontent and murmuring. Men claim as their right what they want. But there must be promises and heirs of the promises. "In hope of eternal life which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began." The great promise, the parent promise of all others, is the promise of the Saviour. And the Apostle has shown that this promise was made to Abraham, four hundred and fifty years before the law was given on Mount Sinai. The promise is grace or free grace, and the law cannot disannul it or make it of none effect. The strength of our consolation is drawn from these two immutable things, the nature and the veracity of God. Self-moved by his love to give his Son, from the day he makes the promise that the seed of the of the woman shall bruise the the serpent's head, He is the hope set before the world until his followers follow him into that within the veil, when we shall see him as he is and be like him. The Christian's privilege of joy unspeakable and full of glory is founded upon the good will or pleasure of God; —"Wherein God willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise." A less display of evidence or testimony might have furnished ground to hope, but a feeble and unsteady hope is accompanied only with a small measure of consolation. But there is a full assurance of hope which may continue to the end of our life and labors. God is not unfaith-

ful to forget his promises or our hopes. The apprehension which certain good people manifest lest they should be too happy in religion, if it implies a fear of an excess in degree in their confidence in the promises, is little in accordance with the letter or spirit of the text. Why did God swear by himself because he could swear by no greater? That those who had fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before them, might have strong consolation. The human feelings are so constituted that a Christian cannot enjoy the highest degree of happiness with diminished hopes. Whatever increases our hopes of heaven must also increase our consolation. Here we have no continuing city but seek one to come. All religion must have a future.

The very essence of irreligion is in the idea,—let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. Reason aspires to immortality. Only the lowest grade of sense is satisfied with the present. But it is the religion of life and immortality, *the hope set before us*, which enobles reason. The notion of the transmigration of souls was brutalizing and degrading, and confounded sense and reason. Jesus is made in the likeness of sinful flesh, he takes the form of a servant and becomes obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, for our redemption. But for our justification, he exalts, he ennobles our nature. His resurrection justifies and warrants our hopes, that those who sleep with him shall be raised by his power. "He shall change our vile body and fash-

ion it like unto his glorious body, according to the power whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." These lively hopes we owe, Lord, to thy dying love.

Arrayed in glorious grace,
Shall these vile bodies shine;
And every shape and every face,
Be heavenly and divine.

"For the hope of the resurrection of the dead, am I called in question by you this day." We have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the risen Saviour. "Concerning one Jesus, who they said was dead, but Paul affirmed that he was alive." Yes, he is alive; indeed death hath no more dominion over him. "If there be no resurrection, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain and ye are yet in your sins, and they that have fallen asleep have perished." "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept."

We hold not the doctrine of unconditional reprobation, because we hold that no good can come of absolute despair. No man can believe himself to be a hopeless reprobate and enjoy the rational pleasures of life, not to say religion. The condition is too miserable to live in; it would tend to injure health and to destroy life. The despair we hold to, is that of going to heaven without making the attempt or of going to heaven in a wrong way.

My message as from God receive;
Ye all may come to Christ and live.

Let us make sure work for eternity. False hopes are most ruinous. Do we hope to be saved at some future time, and therefore put off the present opportunitys? Upon what ground can such a hope be indulged? Not surely upon any positive evidence that we shall live; not from any analogy drawn from observation or the experience of others. Among all the hopes with which short-lived mortals flatter themselves, none are so unreasonable as that one which expresses itself in,—there is time enough yet. How strange, while the vapor of life is every moment vanishing before us, that we should still transfer eternal interests to a future time! Well and seasonably does the Scripture exhort us,—"the rather to give all diligence to make our calling and election sure,"—"to work while it is called to-day, lest the night should come when no man can work."—How solemn, how awful is death! The moment of death, that fearful moment was once a moment of hope, a moment when salvation was to have been secured. Oh, the folly of procrastination! And yet hope is at the bottom of it. But there is hope deferred which maketh the heart sick, the terrible dread of dying before the great work is done, before the blood bought pardon is sealed with the Spirit. This is a hopeful case; the remedy is in believing in hope against hope. Let the dying sinner who is seeking pardon now lay hold upon the hope set before him. In this dark, trying moment when all human hope and help fail, when none but Jesus

can do helpless sinners good, to whom else should a dying creature fly for refuge?

The unsteady and fluctuating hope, the alternations of despair so often met with in experience argue wrong instruction or wrong feelings. All the passions are in their nature unsteady in a high state of activity. Stability in hope like all other human stability must come through the mind. "I know in whom I have believed and am persuaded that he is able to keep unto that day, that which I have committed unto him!"

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE FIFTEENTH.

ST. PAUL'S DESIRES.

For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding; that ye might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God; strengthened with all might according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness; giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.

Colossians, i. 9—14.

Truths are often presented in the gospel in masses or clusters and commonly with some regard to an arrangement in an ascending or a descending scale, or from cause to effect or effect to cause, or occassionally the order is changed by an incidental expression or remark. The mention of joyfulness leads to giving of thanks unto the Father for the sum of all blessings, for making "us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of saints in light." The subject then runs into details or particulars. To be made meet for this inheritance, it is obvious we must be delivered from the power of darkness.

Moral and religious darkness or ignorance and error, differ from natural darkness; the latter being

nothing more than the absence of light to which it makes no active resistance. Hence the rays of light progress in right lines and darkness remains only in shadow. When the rays of light are intercepted by any body through which they cannot pass, they do not bend or make a curve around it; nor do the shadow lines force the rays of light to curve inwards upon themselves. We see these effects from the examples of a candle in a room and the eclipses of the sun and moon. But the light of knowledge or wisdom does not (so to speak) progress or propagate itself through a mere negative or unresisting medium. The darkness of ignorance and error becomes antagonist to it. Truth is not permitted by this active darkness to pass onwards in right lines. There is a struggle and a war of principles. When the mental and moral darkness prevails, the time and the influence are called the hour and power of darkness. Happily this power cannot last forever. The crucifixion of the Redeemer is emphatically called the hour and power of darkness. But the sun of righteousness was not extinguished; it was only eclipsed. There is a state of things in times of inveterate ignorance and error, which seems to answer to preternatural possession. Men act as though they were bereft of reason. The enlightened reader looks back upon those times with wonder and atonishment and can hardly believe it could have been possible, that the human mind could have been so bewildered and so lost to reason. The whole system of idola-

try was a power of darkness. The light of the truth or the knowledge of the true God was opposed and resisted with the most tremendous force. Physical, intellectual and moral power were all combined. The appetites and passions do evidently gain great accession of strength in this union with error. Whoever has seen some of the modern examples of vice in local situations, can readily account for similar effects on the great scale, when as it is said all flesh corrupted its ways. In these hours of the power of darkness, whole communities and races of men grow quickly and universally corrupt. At an early age after the deluge, the cities of the plains filled up the measure of their iniquities. What but the power of darkness could pervert nations into drunkards and gamblers and duellists? "Giving thanks unto the Father who hath delivered us from the power of darkness,"—says the Apostle. The darkness of ignorance and error combines with volition. Men have or suppose they have an interest in sustaining this power, and so they come to love darkness rather than light. To be delivered in this case is, to dissolve associations, attachments and friendships. Our friends will exert an influence and even an authority over us, by operating upon our hopes and fears. It is not enough to see or to know the truth; inclination and resolution must be transferred to it and become strong and steady enough to resist the united will of those who love us and whom we love, as they may not be able to

comprehend how our deliverance can accord with our love to them. The power of darkness has often been the power of life and death, or the power of banishment from society and confiscation of property. The dark power of idolatry was dreadful. It often deranged the appetites and passions, and arrayed them against the truth. If the mind misconceived or the judgment was indecisive, or the resolution and fortitude failed, the antagonist power of darkness was ever ready to press an advantage. Without a bible or revealed truth, how unavailing would all the efforts of human genius or reason have proved in combating a system of idolatry interwoven with the texture of society and government and indeed incorporated into the language of nations!

Those who are disposed to think lightly of the bible as a dead letter do not bring the philosophy of language to bear upon the subject. Words are the signs of ideas. We cannot reason without language. The sounds which animals make are signs of emotions, and like our laughing and crying and interjections, express feelings not ideas. Hence they do not progress, but recur or repeat. Now let it be supposed that a book of idolatry were to be the common and only medium of religious language between a number of persons, and that one or more of them by any means should be led to conceive the idea that there is but one God; how could this idea be propagated or how could argu-

ments be used in its favor or its truth be defended? The supposition need only to be made to perceive the necessity of a bible as a means of our deliverance. Why the language of darkness is dark. The language of ignorance and error cannot be other than their like. Take for example a theogony or a genealogy of the Gods, and conceive it to be the only means the mind has of acquiring any knowledge of God; and must it not be admitted that it would be likely to remain as ignorant as old Hesiod, the author of this book? The Father hath delivered us from the dominion of darkness by giving us a book of light, of knowledge, and of truth, by giving us grace to help our infirmities and to strengthen our hearts and minds in reading, understanding, believing, and obeying this book.

The power of society is commonly equal to the power of sin. Holy persons are not to be looked for in unholy company. Can cordial and mutual friendship be maintained between a sober man and a company of drunkards? Can he feel willing that they should be always drunk, and they feel willing that he should be always sober? Can a worshipper of the living and true God feel willing that his friends should worship idols, and these idolaters feel willing that he should worship one God in spirit and in truth! Can gamblers and those who refuse to gamble feel of one heart and soul? The truth is, that now as formerly evil communications corrupt good morals and good religion as well as

good manners, and to be delivered we must come out and be separate. Two men are friends; they have a union of affections and of wills. The one wills that the other should sin with him. The other says that he is not willing, that he will not. The wills are divided; the friendship ceases. Now comes the crisis. One or the other must yield or the affections must be divided, and then they are enemies. The spiritual worshippers of one God have been sincerely reproached with the unsocial nature of their religion. We need not now attempt to defend them. But we are sure, that if they had been entirely innocent of the charge, idolaters would not have been pleased to have seen their images neglected and no more notice taken of them than of stocks and stones. Wills must go together in religion as in other cases, or they must divide. Society is a test of wills. Enlightened minds, rational convictions of truth, full persuasion of what is right if overpowered by social influence or habit, show that there is a moral cause of evil which is counteracting the understanding. The Father then delivers our wills from the power of those wills which oppose his own. He dissolves our friendship with the enemies of his truth. Then he translates us into the kingdom of his dear son. We have not only a king in God's dear son, but a kingdom also, and fellow-subjects. We are associated with a new society, and find new friends and new friendships in those who also have been delivered from

the power of darkness. In this kingdom we have a new statute book, new laws, laws of knowledge and of truth; new rules of life and manners; new motives and means and helps in the pursuit and practice of truth and goodness. Jesus Christ as we say is the head of the church. He is King of saints. He governs our minds and our affections and our wills. In the Church of Christ there can be no legalized power of error or of evil. In this community every man must speak truth with his neighbor. No man is to go beyond, to defraud a brother, for God is the avenger of all such. There is to be no intemperance, but temperance in all things. Truth and knowledge are to acquire a moral force of general example and of habit. The accordance of the wills of these subjects to the will of their King, is the basis of all that can be mutual between them. The mind that is in Christ being in them, they agree with him in all things.

It is a great change to pass personally from vice to virtue; but a change from a vicious society is also great, and is consequently in the language of the text a translation as well as a deliverance. How must those who came out of the ark after the flood have been struck with the change! That earth which they had seen filled with violence, was now desolated of its inhabitants. But how much greater the change could we imagine that wicked race to have been translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son! What cause of thankfulness have we, that instead

of our perishing under the power of darkness, God in mercy by his truth and grace, hath made us wise unto salvation and brought us under the dominion of his dear Son, into the kingdom of his dear Son in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins? We give "thanks unto the Father that we have redemption through his blood." This is very literal, very plain. By what process of the mind is it, that men who profess to believe the New Testament can prevail upon themselves to deny all redeeming efficacy in the death of Christ? The expressions,—redemption through his blood, and the forgiveness of sins,—seem to be designedly used or placed in the grammatical relation called apposition. In this order of time one is indeed before the other; and they differ in place, the one being on the cross and the other in the conscience. The one also is the cause and the other the effect; but how can the mind think of the forgiveness of sins and not of redemption through his blood? The mention of the one implies the other. The doctrine may be opposed by argument, by ridicule, and it may be contradicted by blasphemers as it often has been, but it is Scriptural. It is a Scripture position laid down, stated, enounced, literally and formally. It is likewise logically maintained by the legitimate modes of reasoning, and applied rhetorically. "Glorify God in your bodies and in your spirits, which are God's." "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price,

not of silver, or of gold, or of precious stones, but with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without spot and blemish. We give thanks unto the Father for delivering us, for translating us, for our redemption and for the forgiveness of our sins.

Gratitude or thankfulness is a mere emotion or instinctive affection. We give thanks not only with the spirit, but with the understanding also. This is rational piety;—to have distinct conceptions or ideas of the causes and objects or ends of our feelings. It is not uncommon to hear persons in relating their experience, referring to feelings which they had and had lost before they were instructed or taught to know what religion is, and which they now perceive were the same in kind with their present ones. So it almost constantly happens to persons of tender consciences;—they go through the exercises of repenting and finding peace in their feelings without knowing the theory of repentance and conversion, and lose all on account of their ignorance. They know not the causes or the consequences. All is dark behind and before them. They have no faith in what they know not. It is so and must be so with all feelings the foundation or the causes of which are not laid in nature. Now these embryo and incipient feelings are not natural, not of the same origin and kind as the appetites and passions; they must therefore become weak and unsteady without the aid of knowledge and practice. Ignorance may foster wickedness but not

goodness or religion. The former is the natural crab-stock and the latter the graft. The one is the ill-weed which grows apace, while the other is the cultivated plant which thrives only under the hand of art.

St. Peter speaks of those who had forgotten that they were purged from their old sins. Were these the persons who did not grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? The memory suffers greatly in the conflicts of ignorance and error. Backsliders who were never well settled in the truth, and those who have become unsettled, do sometimes fall into a vice which injures the memory if not all the mental faculties;—as for instance, sottish intemperance. It requires a well-informed mind, or rather a mind well-grounded in the principles of salvation, to sustain habitual emotions of piety. To be thankful to God for the privileges of Christian fellowship as one of the blood-bought and freely justified souls to whom there is now no condemnation; to know that we have passed from death unto life; to know in whom we have believed;—this is not to walk in darkness but to have the light of life, not to worship we know not what but but to worship God in spirit and in truth. There are indeed persons of high professional piety who are not thankful to the Father for redemption; the blood shed on the cross produces no emotion of gratitude in their hearts, for they hold that it had no redeeming merit in it, that it had nothing to do as a

cause with the forgiveness of sins. The rationale of our devotion cannot exceed its doctrine. Thus what is called the invocation of saints, that is, praying to dead men and dead women to pray for us, must cease entirely when our faith is limited to one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus.

"Epaphras," says the Apostle, "our dear fellow laborer, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ, declared unto us your love in the spirit. For this cause since the day we heard it, we do not cease to pray for you and to desire, that ye might be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual understanding." St. Paul knew what Christians ought to be, and so he knew what to pray for and what to desire for those Colossian converts who had faith in Christ and love to all the brethren whom the Gospel had bought since that day they knew the grace of God in truth. The knowledge of his will is the knowledge of his law or the knowledge of their duty. To be filled with knowledge and wisdom and spiritual understanding, are forms of expression which perhaps answer to the modern term,—practical knowledge. There is hardly any case in which, though we learn rules and copy them with great care, if we cannot fully rely upon our own judgment we are not apt to err. This is so common that some persons dissuade us from attending to rules and advise us to follow nature altogether. No advice is less trust-worthy.

Paul desires the opposite as every practical man must. He would have the law or the rules of life to be incorporated into the mind, so that the mind should be fully imbued with them and that wisdom and spiritual understanding might apply the law to suit the case. The navigator knows all the rules of his art. He has young and expert learners in the ship who keep correct reckoning; but let a storm continue and increase in violence and they will all gladly give place to the commander. He is filled with knowledge in all wisdom; he can apply the rules in a storm. It is thus in all the critical and difficult situations of life. Common sense and experience may almost wholly fail and none but thoroughly practical minds can manage the helm of affairs. Great trials must come; they are to be looked for in the course of events. And when they do come all will see the importance of the maxim;—*not a novice.* Alas, for the community which are then all novices! "I now desire what you all may live to need; I desire that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all kinds of wisdom." Suppose that this Christian or minister is studying grammar, logic or rhetoric. Where is the use of this?—some one might say. What have these studies to do with love to God and men? How will they teach us our duty or the knowledge of the will of God? The answer is;—they are parts of the whole of wisdom. "I thank God I speak with tongues more than ye all."

Where is the use of tongues? They are signs to them that believe not. The gainsayers must be silenced. The mouths of those who subvert whole houses must be stopped. If one kind of wisdom fails, another kind must be employed. All wisdom and all spiritual understanding may be required to promote the cause of truth. All kinds of wisdom strengthen the mind. There is a range or compass in which the mental faculties may be exercised, by which all their powers may be improved. We see this same process in the exercise of the members of the body. No person can call forth all the energies his body is capable of, if he has used one kind of exercise only. The hands, the arms, the legs, the feet, give proportional vigor to each other, as one might say after the manner of the text, in all strength. It is true, that the division of labor (so called) is the most effectual method of despatching work, but it is well known that the workmen are apt to suffer for the want of variety of exercise. Religion prospers most in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, or when knowledge is most extensively diffused in the church. There is not an art nor a science which may not be made to subserve the increase of religious knowledge. The fathers of the church are inferior to the Apostles, for they lived when knowledge began to decline. Those who followed the fathers continued still to decline with the degeneracy of the ages in which they lived and wrote, and all became barbarous. As learning

revived, religious books began to improve. In every age and country, pure religion is found to revive and prosper in proportion as Christians are filled with the knowledge of God in all wisdom.

The Apostle next desires, that they might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being faithful in every good work and increasing in the knowledge of God. There is an external demeanor of morals and manners which has an effect like what is called the language of signs. This kind of deportment or behaviour pleases every body. Such a one is said to be a finished or an accomplished gentleman or lady. The educated and uneducated, the rich and the poor, the old and the young, and the pious and profane are all pleased with good manners. A polite slave pleases. In ancient times, when princes and princesses and persons of refined education were enslaved, they were purchased by the great and the wealthy to teach and instruct their own children or to amuse and please themselves. Many of these were made free, and were known as freed-men especially among the Romans. But is not this accomplished, polite behaviour, so much admired by every body, conformity to the world? Many good people are taught to believe so, and to think that true piety is only to be expressed by rusticity of manners. Much ignor ance and error have prevailed on this subject. Every approach to good manners has been regarded as an approach to pride and vanity or flattery, and as the

first step in the way to vice. How different the associations in the text! "Walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing." But how then could Christians have been persecuted for righteousness' sake? Poverty, ignorance, and rudeness of manners are commonly classed together, because they are supposed to be related as cause and effect. Knowledge springs from instruction and instruction cannot be purchased by the poor; and ignorance however well disposed does not know how to please. So persecutors reason, while they make their victims poor. But there are in general, fewer political obstructions to the Gospel among the poor than the rich; hence the majority of the first proselytes of the Gospel and all new exhibitions of it in a way of reform are of the less wealthy class of society—of course less learned and of less accomplished manners. The first formation of these new converts into religious society is apt to prove a severe trial to their manners. Coming into the nearest and most intimate connection with those whom till now they have only regarded according to the common feelings of nature or of interest, demands are made upon their affections which their habits have not prepared them to supply. In endeavoring to be polite they may become awkward, and in trying to do they may overdo; and instead of pleasing everybody they please nobody. Their sincerity may fall under suspicion. These seem to have been among the causes which have led some to think, that a religious walk in-

stead of being "unto all pleasing," is only worthy of the Lord when it is pleasing to none, and that the most worthy Christians are the most singular if not eccentric. It is impossible that an accomplished scholar like St. Paul, not to say Christian, could desire that the disciples of Jesus should forever remain obnoxious to the reproach of singular and rude manners reduceable to no rules or true standard of correctness. To walk worthy of the Lord must at length become a habit, and the habits of all communities must cease to be singular and become imitative. A church will finally give tone to the character of society. The desire of the Apostle therefore embraced this effect, that the walk of his brethren should be worthy of imitation. Persecution must sooner or later cease. Christianity must become a peaceful condition of the most desirable social form. Many poor Christians will become rich, will educate their children, and prepare them for various stations and professions; and rich men will join the churches. Will then this state of things be worthy or unworthy of the Lord? The truth is, riches and poverty are only relative terms, and as states or conditions they are relative in degrees. In the Roman Empire individuals held estates equal to small kingdoms, and the slaves on estates were like armies. Now when the rich degrade the poor, they act unworthy of the Lord. And the poor act unworthy of him, when they use their piety and

Christian society, so as to claim for their own manners general admiration.

"Increase in the knowledge of God." Being filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and the walking worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing become means by which we may increase in the knowledge of God. Knowledge of laws and manners improve and perfect the taste. Theology will never become profound among a people whose taste is false and vicious. The revival of letters or learning after the darkness of the middle ages furnishes striking instances of learning without taste. The peculiar mode of genius called taste, appertains to religion and morals as well as letters. The thing itself is not easily defined, but its presence or absence in the mind is very obvious from the productions themselves of the mind. Instances of rudeness and grossness of taste occur in the incipient advancements of mind, which are not known while the mind remains stationary in ignorance. We see in the books, that their authors wasted great mental energies and labors to no purpose. And the walk of Christians was but too much like the books. Great zeal was often untempered by knowledge. The fault was not in the quantity of the work but the quality. The historical critic if he does not censure feels compelled to pity rather than to praise. But our plain, unsophisticated, uncorrupted Christians, as they esteem themselves on account of their inattention to matters of taste, claim

all the increase of the knowledge of God and regard them who aim at refinement as superficial. There may indeed be more delicacy of perception than depth of thought; but the bluntest edges and points do not surely penetrate deepest. We increase in the knowledge of God very slowly if at all by any direct action of the mind without the aid of means, and many of these must be moral ones. The moral sensibilities are improved and refined by habits. Immoral men do not like to retain God in their knowledge or to think of a Holy and a Perfect Being. One who walks worthy of the Lord is apt to learn and is also desirous to learn.

Moreover St. Paul desires, that the Colossians may be strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness. Supernatural or divine strength is constantly insisted upon throughout the New Testament. Natural strength like natural life pertains only to the natural man. It subserves only natural ends. Religious or gracious strength is according to his glorious power, that is, the power of his resurrection. He was "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." The gracious power which works in us both to will and to do according to his good pleasure, is as much above nature as is the dead body raised by the power of God. The effects of this glorious power are unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness. That all patience and long suffering should be with joyfulness,

must indeed require divine strength. They naturally depress and exhaust the strength. That man seems to have no constitutional or instructive patience, is evident in children. The first lessons we take in patience are all of necessity. It is this glorious power which converts patience and long-suffering by its strengthening might into joyfulness, and enables us to give thanks to the Father for making us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.

The phrase *making us meet* curresponds with the Scriptural doctrine, that it is not enough that heaven should be prepared for us, but we must also be prepared for heaven. "I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am, there my servants may be also." For these places they were prepared as good and faithful servants. "Well done good and faithful servants, enter ye into the joy of your Lord!" The necessity of preparation for places or situations is evident to observation. An uncommercial people are not meet for a commercial city. A tribe of hunters are not meet for agriculture. A northern constitution is not meet for a southern climate Europe after being much civilized was conquered by barbarians and remained for a long time in a state of barbarism. Civilization did not commence again until the people were made meet. These wild tribes of men underwent great physical changes. Their minds were changed by the instructions they received in the schools. These schools were introduced by learned exiles or by native men of genius.

The arts were revived and children were apprenticed. But the marble palaces and temples of Greece and Rome were not admired nor enjoyed by the the fierce warriors of the East and North. These horse-men and tent-men were not meet for civilized society and religion. The splendid halls were to them like prisons.

> Their march was o'er the mountain top,
> Their home was in the plain.

The inheritance of the children of light is not for children of night nor of darkness; they are not meet for it, for they love darkness rather than light. They would destroy the good in heaven, as the barbarians laid waste the cultivated fields of Europe, and destroyed the works of art. We are made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light being redeemed by the blood of God's dear son, by the forgiveness of our sins,—by being filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, by walking worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing and increasing in the knowledge of God, by being strengthened with his might according to his glorious power unto all patience and long-suffering with joyfulness, and by giving thanks unto the Father.

The little value which religious instructors set upon religious habits seems to be referable to an oversight or an inattention respecting the nature of rewards and punishments. Good and bad habits are rewards and punishments in this world. Their uniformity of consequence shows clearly, that they are not ac-

cidental. Virtue and vice both resolve themselves into habits. We do not merely this or that virtuous or vicious act, but we become vicious or virtuous. Device and aversion, love and hatred become habits. We love to do or say what we do or say habitually. Desire and appetite are anticipated pleasure, and it is well known actually exceed the real enjoyment; for the mind in a state of anticipation does not estimate accidents or the maximum of pleasure. It argues that hitherto there has always been some drawback, some limit, some vain effort or exertion, but the ideas of pleasure which now fill the imagination appear to be all real. No fact is more generally admitted than the delirium consequent upon appetite, or the stimulation of intense desire. Habit is the fatal power which becomes by the effects of volition, by *qui generis* efforts, as unchangeable as the Ethiopian's skin or the leopard's spots. And the reason is obvious in the mode of operation just stated; the very desire or love of sin deranges the mind and the gratification of the desire increases the susceptibility of delirious influence. Hence the mutual and reaching excess which often terminates in death. "The wicked shall not live out half their days." Sin if left to its course would destroy the human race, just as the present system of the universe would be subverted if its laws could be violated. We see daily examples of the destructive effects of sin upon individuals and even upon whole races of men. The Indian tribes of this con-

tinent are passing away before our eyes. They are drunk with revenge, and drunk with ardent spirits, and both combine in effecting their ruin.

I do not cease to desire ;—saith the Apostle. We have stated that desire in this case implies not only knowledge but also foreknowledge. No Jew nor Heathen however wise and virtuous could have desired what Paul did for these people. And his desires did not cease. If all these characteristic traits could have been conceived or understood, they might not have appeared desirable. It was the constant desire of them which qualified St. Paul so eminently to teach them. In order to be a competent teacher of religion, it must be fully known; and the teacher must constantly desire that those he teaches may become all that he teaches them to be. The system-makers seem not always to be fully aware that they have Christians to make also. Every Christian teacher is in a secondary sense a Christian-maker. What kind of Christians will he make? Formal Christians or spiritual ones? The result of preaching may be compared to painting, always making allowance for the difference of the materials,—those of the preacher seldom being passive. The painter conceives the outline of his figure. The colors with which to shade it and the manner of applying them. He proceeds with his work without ceasing to desire that the figure may be a faultless one. But he who attempts to paint without any definite conception of the figure only that it may be a man, and without any correct ideas of

the effects of light and shade, deserves not the name of a painter. He may indeed make a resemblance of a human figure, but it will be only a caricature. St. Paul preconceives the outline of the Christian character he draws it with a steady and skilful hand and shows equal art in the colony. The Christian stands forth upon the canvass complete and requires no alteration or retouching. He shows at once the art and the care of a master. This is not a mere eulogy or a flattering picture of a Christian who has been seen, but it is a portrait of a Christian such as he ought to be. Christianity was then new to the Colossians; they had not seen Christians live and die. How inestimably valuable was this character so drawn for them! And how must such an exhibition of his desires, of his whole heart, have endeared him to them! Who but one of the best of men could have habitually cherished the desire of so many good things for those of whose welfare he had only heard?

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE SIXTEENTH.

THE RESURRECTION.

Not as though I had already attained, either were already made perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize—of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Philippians, iii. 12, 13, 14.

"Not as though I had already attained,"—unto the resurrection of the dead. Hymenaeus and Phi-

letus had erred concerning the faith, saying that the resurrection is past already and had overthrown the faith of some;—construing the word probably so as to give it a spiritual meaning. Not only the truth of the Messiahship of Jesus is rested upon the resurrection, but also that of the whole gospel. To attain unto the resurrection is the consummation of the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ. Our bodies in this world gain no physical perfection from grace or goodness. It is presumable that the health of Paul was injured by his Apostolical labors, and that his life was shortened by martyrdom. Perhaps there are but few persons of exalted piety and eminent usefulness who do not suffer in their health more or less, although religion by restraining vicious excesses may thus indirectly contribute to health and long life. Old age makes no bodily perfection. The organs of thought wear out. St. Paul may have been past the meridian of life when he wrote the words;—"either were already perfect." He was not apprehended of Christ Jesus to attain to bodily perfection in this world. "We that are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened; not that we would be unclothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." "We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body that he may fashion it like unto his glorious body." Brethren, saith Paul, there is but one thing,—the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus: forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are

before, I press toward the mark for that one prize. We are called of God in Christ Jesus to press toward the resurrection of the dead. Our hopes, our labors, and our endeavors should not rest short of it. The mark is the ancient META, limit or bound of the race. He who gains the mark gains the prize run for. The Mosaic dispensation with all its sacrifices and ceremonies was behind. All those things the Apostle once counted his gain, were now behind. There were professed believers who were looking back still to those things. St. Paul had his eye fixed upon those things which were set before him in the promises of the gospel, running and as with outstretched hands reaching forth to touch the mark, and as difficulties and hindrances increased pressing onwards through them. "He that endureth unto the end, the same shall be saved." This is the condition of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. To die in the faith is to attain unto the resurrection of the dead. To believe in the resurrection from the dead and the life of the world to come, to believe when living and dying is to overcome the world and death. The resurrection of the dead;—what a prize!

> The cross despise,
> For that high prize,
> Which thou hast set before us!

There is no going back, there is no standing still in religion. We may well sing:

> Come on, my partners in distress,
> My comrades in this wilderness,
> Who still your bodies feel;
> Awhile forget your griefs and fears,
> And look beyond this vale of tears,
> To that celestial hill!

In times like those in which the Apostles lived, the mind had nothing to rest upon or hope for short of the resurrection! As Jews by birth, the destruction of their temple and their country and the utter dispersion of their nation being foretold by the Messiah himself, they fully believed it all. As Colonists under the power of Imperial Rome, they knew not the day nor the hour the decree might be issued or executed, and thus they stood in continual jeopardy. Well might they exclaim;—As it is written, for thy sake are we killed all the day long, we are counted as sheep for the slaughter even by our own countrymen! How true was it, that here in this world they had no continuing city! They must have died to live a life of glory, and suffered with their Lord to reign. The master's lot was the only one the servant had to look for. The world neither knew him nor his Father; it hated him and slew him. He rose, not to commit himself into its power the second time, but only to stay long enough with his disciples to prepare them to bear witness to his resurrection, and then ascended up into heaven in their sight. "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth." St. Paul too had seen Jesus after his resurrection. He was met in the way from Jerusalem to Damascus, and was shown by Him how great things he must suffer for his sake. He was apprehended by the Lord Jesus Christ for the prize of martyrdom and of the resurrection, and counted not his life dear unto himself. He was ready and willing to die at Jerusalem and at Rome.

Unbelievers exhaust their ingenuity to find out causes and motives to account for the conduct of the first Christians. But all is accounted for by their belief in the resurrection of Jesus. They had witnessed the truth of his predictions respecting himself? Could they doubt his promises respecting themselves and them that sleep in him? The religion of Jesus without the resurrection would be like an arch without its key-stone; it could not be sustained by reason, it could not be sustained as a system. For if the dead rise not then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." If in this life only we have hope, we are of all men the most miserable. The system of Christianity begins in facts which admit of no imagination. These must be true or false. Jesus lives in the likeness of man, he is crucified to death on the cross, his body is taken from the cross and interred in a sepulchre. These are all sensible realities, plain evident facts. Well, if the dead rise not, if Jesus rose not, nothing more could be done; there was an end of the whole matter. All the invention in the world can make no more of it; faith and hope in death and the dead are utterly out of the question. It is ascertained that Jesus dieth no more, that death hath no more dominion over him. Let this statement be reversed; he liveth no more, life hath no more dominion over him,—and all beyond the death of the cross would be a nonenity. The pro-

phecy therefore was;—"Thou will not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." Invention may do much in producing a false religion. There is no lack of humanly-invented religion. But it is found to be a general rule that the beginning and the ending are in conjecture. The life and death of a man are among the plainest and most common of all things. But that the friends of a man should bear witness that he rose from the dead, is a single case and stands recorded by itself without a parallel. Now when a religion is founded upon these facts, we cannot pronounce the first one to be incredible by itself, but we shall find both of the facts recorded pressing upon our attention as incredible. Was the resurrection invented? If so, was it invented before hand? Not surely by these witnesses. This is shown in almost every page of the gospel. But the witnesses themselves really did believe. Men can give no stronger proof of sincerity; they sealed their sincerity with their own lives. Let us now hear the living Jesus. "I am the resurrection and the life; whosoever believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." Here are the materials for the religion of One who was almost daily predicting his own death by violent hands. Let us hear him subsequently to his crucifixion by the Romans. "I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold! I am alive forever more, Amen!"

There never was a time in which the same num-

ber of events combined to favor the establishment of such a religion as Christianity, and the downfall of such a religion as the one which ended with the destruction of Jerusalem. The Babylonian captivity and the return from it though foretold by prophets, bore little resemblance to this ecclesiastical catastrophe. Of the destruction of Jerusalem Jesus was the only living prophet; and he, contrary to all other prophets, proved the truth of his prophetic office in his own person while claiming to be the Messiah so long and so earnestly expected. Those who had heard him foretell his own death and resurrection and seen with their own eyes the literal fulfilment of his words, could not doubt his predictions of things to happen which might have a political accomplishment. This most interesting event was not foretold figuratively nor poetically; the only figurate expressions were quoted from the ancient prophets, and were either explained or used in the meaning commonly understood. The abomination of desolation or the abomination that maketh desolate, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, was not liable to misconstruction. Also the shaking of the powers of heaven and such like expressions, were all familiar to the readers of the prophets. All the old wars and conquests were foretold in this manner. The signs too of these coming calamities were all foretold, so as to come under the observation of some of the living generation. "When ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed about with ar-

mies, then know that the time draweth nigh." This once holy place is still trodden down of the Gentiles. And the daily sacrifices have never since been offered up where the national altar stood, down to the present time. These predictions and their fulfilment not only prove the prescience of Jesus, but are a matter of fact confirmation of the gospel as a dispensation distinct from that of the sacrificial law. For if the legal sacrifices and ceremonies are really necessay in the kingdom or church of the Messiah, either the plan has failed or the Messiah has not come; and before he does come, a new temple must be built in Jerusalem, and a new altar to offer up upon it the daily sacrifices after they have ceased for more than eighteen hundred years!

"But I follow after, that I may apprehend that for which I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." How mysterious, how wonderful in many instances is the manner in which Christians and ministers are called! How nearly in some respects does it resemble the apprehension or arrest of a fugitive, or the capturing of a prisoner! Paul called himself the prisoner of Jesus Christ. He was persecuting or fighting against Jesus Christ; but the great Captain of salvation took him prisoner, not to punish and execute him but to make him partaker of his resurrection. Merciful and gracious conqueror! The resurrection of the apprehended prisoner was not yet attained to; it was to be followed after and to be apprehended by him. "Walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called." What an

ignorant and erring creature is man, and how mischievous may he become! "And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful putting me unto the ministry; who was before a blasphemer and a persecutor and injurious, but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief." The Providence of God subserves the purposes of his grace. Sinners fight against God. What folly! what madness! The prosecutor, the blasphemer is on his way to Damascus to do more injuries to the disciples of Jesus. The eye of Providence is upon him; a light from heaven above the brightness of the Sun suddenly strikes him blind and a voice calls him by name. The heart is subdued, the sinner is convinced of his sins, and he is directed to find the Saviour. The Prince who is exalted to the right hand of God to give repentance to Israel, gives repentance to this son of Benjamin, this self-righteous Pharisee. But though his call to the Apostleship is distinctly signified, he is not miraculously justified. Blind as he is, he is to be led on to Damascus, and Ananias who understands the plan of salvation is to instruct him. "Brother Saul,"—cries the messenger of mercy,—"rise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Strictly speaking perhaps sinners are never miraculously justified, for if they were would they not be justified by a miracle and not by faith? The experience of St. Paul corresponds with his writings. His faith came by his hearing and his hearing by the word of God.

So he too verified the prediction;—"it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved, for the same Lord is rich over all that call upon his name, whether Jew or Greek." His Apostleship is now fully confirmed. The Lord even Jesus who was crucified, appeared unto him by the way and made himself known by name. Therefore he must have risen from the dead. "Have I not" says he, "seen Jesus Christ? Am I not an Apostle, or a witness of the resurrection?"

Awakenings or convictions for sin, conversions or justifications, and calls to the gospel ministry are all intended by Jesus Christ to enable us to attain unto the resurrection of the just. But how many difficulties and enemies are to be overcome, how much labor and suffering are to be endured before we apprehend that for which we are apprehended! The motto of every Christian and minister should be;—"not as though I had already attained." We are called to glory and to virtue, to immortality and eternal life. The prize of our high calling is in the nature of a reward as all prizes are. So run, that ye may obtain the prize. The excitability of the human constitution is adapted to the excitement of motives. And as a proof of the superiority of our nature over the nature of the lower animals, motives of the most abstract, remote, and intellectual kind may be made to act the most powerfully and durably upon us. The hardest earned prizes and victories are the most highly enjoyed. Glory and honor must be won or conquered. There are persons of

minds so peculiarly formed or habituated that they can sublimate the resurrection of the body all away. But notwithstanding the piety and spirituality which they claim to themselves, it is not to be concealed that the resurrection of the Lord Jesus is apt to occupy but a low place in their religion. The question, with what body do we rise, seems to have been coeval with the doctrine. The similitude of the seed-grain carries the subject perhaps to the extent of our comprehension. When we are told that it is sown in corruption and raised in incorruption, we have not sufficient data to reason upon the subject; but it is not so much reason which we need as confidence. The Holy One saw no corruption. He gave his disciples sensible demonstration of his power over death. Our bodies shall see corruption, but shall they be beyond the power of his resurrection? We gain faith in a power over death by a knowledge of the fact, though we cannot follow the mode of operation. But indeed we have more to do than to reason about possibilities. Prizes or rewards are not to be gained by argument but by effort. "This one thing I do,—I press to the mark." There is a point of assurance or confidence to which the mind may attain, in which it will not reason but act. "I know and am persuaded,"—says the Apostle.

The Jewish world or dispensation which once contained all the hopes of the Jews, was hastening to its dissolution. In a few years that ancient system and fabric of things which had survived so many changes and witnessed the destruction of so

many mighty empires, would only exist in history The prophetic word had been heard, understood and believed,—that not one stone should be left upon another of the only temple in which were concentrated all the essential requisites of the legal worship,—and the parable of the budding tree sufficiently indicated the near approach of the time. But the pious and patriotic agonies of the Jewish converts of Jesus were not only relieved,—their souls were inspired with new and immortal hopes by the resurrection of their prophet and teacher. In one sense, their nation and law saw no corruption before they rose again to a new and perfect life in the gospel and the church of Jesus Christ. "He taketh away the first that he may establish the second." What a contrast between these hopes and this assurance, and the utter despair of those who lost their all in the ruins of their city and temple if indeed they survived those ruins! It was well said,—"God hath not cast away his people." Jesus, the risen Jesus was of the tribe of Judah and of the seed of David according to the flesh. Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin. All the Apostles and first disciples were Israelites. While then as true patriots they labored and prayed for the salvation of their countrymen, and looked forward to the time when all Israel should be saved, they had the pledge of that final promise in the resurrection. He lives, he reigns and he must reign, until all his enemies are put under his feet. The wisdom of God is manifest in this whole arrangement and the order of

events. The beginning of these tragical scenes was delayed long enough for the witnesses of the resurrection to give their testimony general publicity, and the days were shortened for the elect's sake. Had they been prolonged to the utmost measure to which such exterminating wars may be carried, no Jewish flesh in the country could have been saved; the believers in common with the unbelievers must have been destroyed. The condition of the first Christians was very different from ours, and our condition would be very different from what it is had theirs been as ours is now. They believed in the resurrection. We reason about it. To them it was the prize, the reward of their losses and sufferings unto death. These converts from Judaism without confidence in the resurrection of their Lord and Master and without any hopes of their own resurrection, must have sunk into the depths of wretchedness and despair. But in this confidence and hope they sought a better country, that is a heavenly one, therefore God was not ashamed to be called their God, and they were not ashamed to be called his believing people, for they knew in whom they had believed, they knew him in the power of his resurrection.

If ever the time shall again come when Christians must forsake all to follow Christ, can any reflecting mind doubt but that they will all have to fall back upon the resurrection? What could the churches now do without this fact and this doctrine, if the scenes through which the primitive Christians

passed, were to be acted over again, if he who should seek his life should lose it, and none but those who were willing to lose their life for Christ's sake should find it? We now can see how the speculations of Hymenaeus and Philetus overthrew the faith of some. The Apostle might well say, that their words will eat as doth a canker; for what foundation was left for faith, or what object of hope if all that had been taught as doctrine and as facts is to be resolved into personal experience? The Acts of the Apostles and the Letters to the Churches must convince every unprejudiced reader, that Paul did not mean merely to eulogize himself. What was his whole life from the commencement of his ministry at Damascus to the day that he finished his course, but a reaching forth and a pressing towards the mark for the prize of his high calling? All worldly and selfish motives would have been out of place here. The convulsions and revolutions which were just at the door, were too overwhelming,—and the prospects of his own martyrdom too certain to admit of any conversation short of eternal rewards to account for his conduct. "Brother Saul,"—said Ananias, "The God of our Fathers hath chosen thee, that thou should'st know his will, and see that Just One, and should'st hear the voice of his mouth; for thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." Every mental philosopher knows, that the human mind may not only be controlled by the influence of its own imagination, but still more so

with facts and truths. What did Paul see? That Just One, that Jesus whom he had persecuted, that Crucified One who had risen from the dead. What did he hear? The voice of his mouth, saying,—"I am Jesus;—I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, as to whom I now send thee to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in me." St. Paul adds:—"Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead and become the first fruits of them that slept."

The purpose, the intention, the resolution of every well informed Christian's mind should be to forget the things that are behind, to reach forth to those that are before, to press towards the resurrection of the dead. For this we are apprehended of Christ Jesus. This is our calling of God in Christ Jesus. But the objection is still pressed, that the doctrine literally understood is incomprehensible and therefore incredible. It was so to the Saducees. But they greatly erred, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God. What creature comprehends the power of God or all its possible effects? We may

know the meaning of the Scripture word *resurrection* in reference to our bodies, and we may know that we live by the power of God. But how life began to be we only know as a fact; and we can just as well believe in reanimation as a fact. The comprehensibility of things past and future is out of all question, unless it be in cases in which we can have samples and specimens present to experiment upon, and the cases be such as may be resolved by experiment. But life in its present mode defies all analysis or experiment. But it seems to require less abstraction or imagination to conceive of a future state when presented to our minds under the form of the resurrection of the body, than in any idea of a disembodied spirit of which we can have no example in this world.

In ancient times, most of the writers who copied the opinions of Hymenaeus and Philetus spiritualized the crucifixion also. How indeed could they do otherwise and preserve any consistency? Professions and confessions of religion must rest on facts or opinions. The christian believes in his heart that the Lord Jesus whom he confesses with his mouth literally or vocally, was raised from the dead by the power of God. Believing this fact must he not believe it as a fact also, that the same Lord Jesus was crucified, dead and buried? There is then no opinion about the matter. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon and

our hands have handled of the word of life,—declare we unto you."

The calling is high. It is of God. It is in Christ Jesus. It is above every thing and every consideration here below. It is of God. This religion is all of God. It cometh down from above from the Father of lights, from the Giver of every good and perfect gift. It is in Christ Jesus. He is the Mediator of the covenant, the head over all things to the church, the beginning and the ending, the All and in All. Without him nothing is and nothing can be done. How numerous have the varieties of religion become! Can they all be right? Let them be tried by these tests. Which calling is the holiest and highest? Which has the most of life and heaven in it? Which can trace its origin most evidently to God? Which can give the greatest indications of the wisdom, goodness and power of God? But above all, which is in Christ Jesus?

Much of the religion in the world is without Christ Jesus; and much that is called by his name is not in him nor he in it. Persons are often found ready to acknowledge a God, while they either reject a Saviour or keep themselves at a distance from him. Truly their fellowship is not with the Son. They know him not; the knowledge of him hath no excellency in their estimation. They are not found in him; they know nothing of the power of his resurrection, having had no fellowship with his sufferings, no conformity to his death. The tendency of unbelief is often first to Deism. It perhaps

never is the case that a believer who retains his faith in a Mediator inclines to Atheism. Sinners seem to be easisy beset with doubts whether they really need a Saviour who is able to save them to the uttermost!

There is a notion of perfection which discloses itself every once in a while in the church. It proves its impracticability by its short career, and in some instances by ending in opposite extremes. Professors of religion should guard against it. Can they oppose a stronger barrier to it than :—" not as though I had attained or were already perfect?"

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE SEVENTEENTH.

THAT YE SIN NOT.

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; and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

I *John*, ii. 1—2.

Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law, for sin is the transgression of the law. To write therefore that ye sin not, is the same as to write that ye transgress not the law. But of what law is sin a transgression? Of a moral law or of a sacrificial law? Of a law in force or of a repealed or expired law? These two questions assist each other in fur-

nishing an answer to themselves. The sacrificial law, according to the unanimous agreement of all Christians, either in theory or in practice is not in force under the gospel. John himself so regarded it in the text; and in the context he says expressly that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. Of course the blood of no other sacrifice or sin offering could have been needed. The sacrificial law was not in force; it was not necessary, for the merits of the sacrifice of Christ were complete and perfect. "A woman," says St. Paul—he is treating this very subject—"a woman which has an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth, but if the husband be dead she is loosed from the law of her husband, so that she is no transgressor though she be married to another man; wherefore my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another even to him, who is raised from the dead, that we should bring fruit unto God." Here it is plainly the Apostle's meaning, that the body of Christ which was crucified on the cross was the true and real sacrifice for sin and put an end to the typical law; so that a believer in the merits of Christ's death is under no more obligation to offer the legal sacrifices, than a woman to remain a widow by the law under which she was married to her deceased husband. We are at liberty to be married not to the dead body but to him who is raised from the dead. "He was delivered for our offences

but rose again for our justification." The sin of a Christian or a believer is therefore a transgression of the moral law; and Jesus Christ the righteous is the propitiation for sin against moral precepts and principles, and not against ceremonial laws which as the Scripture speaks were nailed to the cross. There is no ceremonial law in force under the gospel and therefore no transgression of it. Sinners do not repent because they have not kept up all the form of the law of Moses, they do not repent because they have not been circumcised.

It is remarkable that both St. John and St. Paul use the word *commandment* as if they meant to define by it the moral law. "Wherefore," says the latter, "the law is holy and the commandment is holy and just and good, - - - - that sin by the commandment might become exceedingly sinful, for the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin, for I had not known sin except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." What law said so? The tenth commandment says, Thou shalt not covet. But the law of carnal or fleshly ordinances, of baptisms and sacrifices and offerings and burnt offerings imposed upon the tribes of Israel until the times of reformation, (as one speaks) said nothing about the desires of the heart or truth in the inward parts. Of the commandment which enjoined outward forms, it was never said,—"I have seen an end of all perfection, but this commandment is exceeding broad." But though the tenth commandment did say, Thou shalt not covet, if it

had been repealed, or if it had gone into disuse with the law of types and shadows, from that time forth it could no longer convince of sin. If the ten commandments are repealed by the gospel, they convince no sinner of sin under the preaching of the gospel; but this is contrary to general experience, for the great body of Christians in every age and country have been convinced of sin in the same manner as St. Paul was. The commandment came and sin revived and they died. They were convinced that the law is spiritual and that they were carnal, sold under sin.

Let us return to St. John. "Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning. And ye know that he was manifest to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever doth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." How can any person who reads this help perceiving, that it all refers to the moral law and what is called its eternal obligation. It is the same as though he had said;—I write unto you that ye transgress not the moral law; and if any man do transgress the moral law we have an advocate with the Fa-

ther, we may not go to the legal sacrifices but to Jesus Christ the righteous. He is the propitiation for our sins and not they, and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world. It would be to contradict the whole of the New Testament to suppose that the text was written, to induce the Christians not of Jewish birth to become Jews, to perpetuate the ceremonies of Judaism in the Christian churches. If there ever was a time when the ceremonial law was called the commandment that time ceased with the coming of the Messiah; and since then the services and worship are not in the oldness of the letter but in newness of spirit.

Two errors must have existed in the life-time of the Apostles: first that no change in the legal system could be made by the Messiah,—secondly that he would change the law of Moses and not preserve even the moral part of the decalogue. The text clearly points to these opinions and corrects them. Hence perhaps the unusually strong language of the Apostle in this Epistle, as—he that sinneth is of the devil,—the children of the devil,—he is a liar,—the truth is not in him,—and the like. The rule is, when any thing is changed or altered in religion it must be for the better or to give the greater facility to its operations. The law made nothing perfect but the bringing in of a better hope did. In all the points of comparison between the law and the gospel this is very striking, if they are compared as covenants. "Not as the covenant which I made with their fathers, but this is the covenant which I

will make with the house of Israel in those days, saith the Lord. I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their heart." The carnal gives place to the spiritual. Supposing then that the moral part of the old dispensation had been subject to the same process of change, could any thing better have been substituted in its place? Admitting he had taken away the ten commandments, what better ones could have been given? Take the tenth again as an example, Thou shalt not covet. Can we conceive of any change which would not amount in effect to a permission to covet? But surely that would not be going on to perfection. A commandment that is holy, just and good, that is exceeding broad, that requireth truth in the inward parts one would think might answer for the gospel; for it is difficult to conceive of a substitute for it that would be much better or answer a much better purpose. What commandment could require more than that we should love the Lord our God with all our soul and mind and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves? The question then of the continuance of the moral law under the gospel in a distinct form disconnected from the sacrificial and ceremonial law, may be settled upon the maxims or axioms of the text;—"I write unto you that ye sin not, but if any man sin," &c. There must have been a moral law in full force at that time requiring moral righteousness. "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous even

as he is righteous." All the New Testament was written, that we sin not. All its writers acknowledge and enforce the obligation of moral law. Idolatry and blasphemy and disobedience to parents and theft and murder and lying or perjury and adultery and covetousness find no supporters in theory or practice in this book. Moses and the Prophets cannot complain of Jesus and his Apostles for having made void the law through faith. As far as obedience goes or can go, so far goes the gospel. There can be no works of supererogation. The Son of God came to prevent the works of the devil as well as to destroy them. I write unto you, saith the Apostle, not to sin, and if any man sin or has sinned, I write unto you that we have an Advocate with the Father. If any man sin we have no longer any need of a legal sacrifice. These sacrifices were not advocates, not paracletes or comforters, nor were they righteous, and even as propitiatory types they were confined to ourselves,—we could not offer them for the world. How striking the difference in these points of view between law and gospel, although they agree in morals, for true morals must agree! The first and greatest commandment and its likeness the second, are without variableness like their author and object Jesus Christ the righteous, who is the righteous sacrifice. The most that could have been said of the legal sacrifices was, that they were innocent of the sins for which they were offered. But Jesus Christ gave himself, the Just for the unjust. He was holy as well as harmless. He

fulfilled the law. There was a positive merit in his sufferings and death.

> Who himself bore our sins on the tree,
> By whose stripes we are healed!

He is the propitiation for our sins. He atones, redeems, appeases, reconciles. We are delivered from wrath through him. Sin must be accounted for either by the sinner himself or his advocate. God must have a mercy seat or a seal of justice; a throne of grace or a throne of justice. He may be reconciled with the sinner but never with the sin.

Jesus Christ is our advocate with the Father. Though he died for us, he is still our advocate. He ascended into heaven and he lives forever to make intercession for us. The word is Παράκλητος, PARACLETE, *One who has been called to give assistance, a comforter or consoler.* Jesus says,—"I will not leave you comfortless. I go away from you; I will send you another Comforter, the Spirit of Truth." Here then we have two comforters. But can we have any comfort out of ourselves? Must not all comfort be felt in our hearts? Comfort may be produced directly or indirectly. It is true, we are not conscious of comfort until we are comforted, but ideas may produce comfortable feelings, and ideas may be produced by information. A man may conceive himself to be in the dominion of God his King, and he may be informed that the King's only begotten Son is his best and firmest friend, and that he is together with his Father tak-

ing care of his interests and doing every thing to make him happy. Can he hear and believe all this and not feel comfort? It is not necessary that our friends should be always in our presence to make us happy. The high prerogative of mind is to call into its presence persons and things at remote distances. Faith supplies the place of sight so that its objects are not,—out of sight out of mind. "Whom having not seen ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

Jesus my all to heaven is gone,
He whom I fix my hopes upon.

The legal sacrifices were incapable of personal goodness; they died at the altar to live no more. They could not offer themselves. They could not pray nor intercede. There were priests to force the unwilling victims to the sacrifice, and to burn the incense in sign of prayer. Now priests could not continue long by reason of death and therefore were many in succession. Not one of all the house of Aaron was supposed to be a priest in heaven or advocate with the Father. All the mediatorship of the law was confined to this world. Until Jesus Christ the righteous ascended up far above all heavens, sinners heard nothing of an advocate or comforter in glory on the right hand of the majesty on high. What did the ministers of the synagogue teach? They taught that if any man sin we have an altar to which we may carry the sacrifice prescribed in the law, and the priest would offer it up

as a propitiation for our sin. But the Apostles of this Mediator of the new covenant wrote that the Mediator himself is the propitiation for our sins, and that every sinner must come to God through him, and that he not only died for Jews but tasted death for every man.

It would perhaps be difficult to express so completely in so few words as those in the text or in any other form the intention or end of written revelation. Every writer who contributed to the contents of the bible might have said,—I write unto you that ye sin not. And all the ancient prophets saw or anticipated the day of Jesus as well as Abraham and rejoiced. "A prophet" said Moses, "shall the Lord your God raise up unto you; him shall ye hear." The law and the prophets prophesied until John, and John cried in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. Every preacher and religious writer should preach and write, THAT YE SIN NOT. It is the duty of a physician to caution his patients against whatever may injure their health, as well as to give medicine to cure their disease. To leave men to become sick when we can do anything to prevent it in order to cure them, would not be ingenuous nor kind. The gospel was never intended to be the minister of sin. "He that sinneth is of the devil, and not of Jesus Christ." He came *not* to do the work of the devil—to tempt and deceive men to sin—but to destroy sin. If any man sin, Jesus Christ was not the advocate of the sin or the patron

of the sinner. He came not to destroy the law of sacrifice but to fulfil it, to the end of this law for righteousness to every one that believeth. If he had destroyed the moral law he would have made a short work of it. When laws are destroyed there is an end of all governments, courts and judgments, and punishments must all cease to be, and also all the good consequences of government. When the books are destroyed, the debts cannot be demanded nor proved. In the great day of the final judgment the books are to be opened. They have been kept, not destroyed. The decisions in that day will be according to the law and not by *ex post facto* law. They that have done good shall come, and they that have done evil shall go away. All distinctions between right and wrong are founded on moral law. To suppose that the Messiah destroyed the moral law even by fulfilling it, is to suppose in effect that he destroyed all justice and judgment and the final day of judgment. For a righteous God cannot be conceived to govern righteously without laws, because just and equitable government must have respect to the obedience or disobedience of the governed and they cannot know what is obedience or disobedience without law. The ten commandments have been distinguished as containing two distinct kinds of requirements,—first those pertaining to men,—called the two tables of the law. This division is natural. The first table forbids idolatry and profane and idle swearing, and requires that a certain portion of time should be set

apart for the worship of God. Let it be supposed that this table was repealed or that it is not in force under the gospel, and must it not be perceived that obedience of it could not be enforced nor disobedience of it punished? Idolatry and swearing and neglecting all times of worship would not be a transgression of a repealed law. Laws no longer in force are not brought into court. And if they should be, St. Paul's argument would be urged against them, that we are dead to such a law, and of course it is dead to us or null and void to all legal intents and purposes. But if it be argued that the gospel sets aside this first table to make way for another, can the place in the new enactment be pointed out? Where is it written? Will it still be argued as it often has been, that it is in the spirit not in the letter because the letter killeth? Does then the letter, thou shalt have no other Gods before me, kill? Does the letter, thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath or that is in the waters under the earth, kill? Does the letter, thou shalt not bow thyself down to them nor serve them, kill? If so, what does the spirit do? Not surely give life to these idolators. St. Paul's comparison is, that the letter which was made glorious had no glory in this respect by reason of the glory that excelleth. So the sun makes the moon glorious by the light it communicates, but the moon hath no glory or light of its own; it only reflects a portion of the light that excelleth, the light of the sun. All this is strictly ap-

plicable to the legal types and emblems. But to spiritualize the moral law, the letter of it must be preserved. Thus, it is said that truth is required in the inward parts. The spirit of the law against idolatry forbids it in the heart. God is indeed a spirit, "and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." But how could the abrogation of the second command or prohibition enable one any more effectually so to worship? Idolatry is an error in itself, it is always so. The law makes the fact known to us. How could the concealing of the fact render devotion more spiritual? If the letter kills it kills the idolator, that is, it condemns him for a literal and actual departure from spiritual worship. Is a profane swearer to be told that the Lord will hold him guiltless, or is he to be told that the law is repealed? He must be told the truth. Behold! how the Lord spiritualized the law; I say unto you, swear not at all by any name or thing. The whole spirit or disposition or excitement is wrong. There is not a word about the repeal of the letter, for that would be a giving up of the principle. The principle is expressed in the letter.

In regard to our duty towards men does not the same mode of reasoning hold good? What is the law of life, of property, of character, of marriage? Is it not, thou shalt not? Is not the principle of right in each individual possessor clearly implied? Now if these prohibitions, these thou shalt not were removed or taken away by the gospel, what has it given in their place as greater or better security?

Will it be said that the gospel precepts are more spiritual and control the heart? Do they then say more or imply more than, thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbor's? It is a favorite maxim with wise and good men that God does nothing in vain. And would it not be vain to repeal the literal prohibition, thou shalt not covet, in order to re-enact it? In its primitive meaning it is so exceedingly broad that it seems to be impossible to conveive how it could be made broader in any new version, nor have we any evidence that in the New Testament it is more spiritual or heart-searching. "Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid; but that sin by the commandment might become exceedingly sinful." No two points can be set in greater contrast than the precepts of the moral law and sin. But the moral law has no justifying merit for its transgressors. Most truly it has not, and this is one of the strongest proofs of its distinct nature and office from the sacrificial law and of its not being repealed or repealable. Moral precepts under the gospel would be equally destitute of redeeming merit. The object of redemption is not to get rid of the moral law, but just the reverse. A repeal of a law because it is violated, is in a direct manner to give the advantage or victory to the sinner and to shame and defeat the law principle of government. If any man sin, he is not to go to the law he has transgressed for pardon. Sinners under the Mosaic dispensation did not go to the ten commandments for pardon. It is said ex-

pressly, that he who sins under the written law shall be judged by it, and they who have sinned without written law shall be judged without it and according as they have been governed by a regard to their consciences. Might it not be as reasonable to suppose that the conscience is repealed by the gospel, as that the moral law is? The law is written on the conscience in so far as the knowledge of sin is by the conscience. The maxim is, let him who is without sin cast the first stone. And they being convicted by their own consciences went away one by one. The gospel brings repentance and pardon to sinners. Repentance is an act of homage to law and conscience. "For we know that the law is holy, but I am carnal, sold under sin. If I do that which I allow not, I consent under the law that it is good." To be sorry for sin is to extol the law. Sinners when called to account for sin, if they do not blame themselves, must blame the law. Those who will not repent blame the law. But the language of repentance is; —"against thee and thee only have I sinned and done this evil in thy sight, that thou mightest be justified in thy saying and clear when thou judgest (according to thy law.)" To the pardoned sinner the language of the gospel is;—"Sin no more lest a worse thing come upon thee." God hath concluded all under sin that he might provide redemption for all. Under the law of sacrifice, almost every person and case had its peculiar remedy or modification or atonement. The victims varied and the manner of offering them. But Christ is one and his of-

fering is,—One for all and once for all. Take away the name of Jesus Christ from any thing in religion and it is of no use; hence the cross of Christ is one cross. All other crosses are but Christian's crosses. "Let him take up his cross and follow me,"—has as his cross no merit, nothing to glory in. Must there be propitiation for Jews and for the whole world? Jesus Christ the righteous is that propitiation. Does a holy, harmless and undefiled high priest become necessary for us? He is such an High Priest. Do we need as redeemed sinners an advocate with the Father to make intercession for us? Behold! our Paraclete. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar and his word 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.

The views of human nature which represent it as innocent and impeccable are false in fact. All the covenant relations between God and men presuppose men to be sinners, and treat them and treat with them as sinners. Innocent and holy creatures require no Mediator between them and their Creator. No breach of relation having taken place, no reconciliation is needed. John is the plainest of all writers. "My little children I write unto you that ye sin not." What can be plainer? But this is not enough. What if a man has sinned? Why in that case;—I write unto you, that the law of sacrifices, to which we used to have recourse before we came believers

in cases of trespasses against the moral law, is superseded by the sacrificial death of Christ. I write unto you, that we have an Advocate with the Father. The same Saviour that raised us up if we fall must restore us again. As backsliders, we are not to expect that Jesus must be crucified for us again, or that any new atoning merit will be necessary to the restoration of the lost comforts of religion. As we were at first justified freely through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, the ground of our future faith and comfort must be Jesus Christ the righteous, who is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE EIGHTEENTH.

THE MORAL SACRIFICES.

By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communicate, forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.

Hebrews xiii.—15, 16.

The primary and simple meaning of the word *sacrifice* is gift. The nature of the gift, the manner of giving it, and the intention or design of giving it may modify the signification of the term. The most of the words and expressions which are used in the New Testament and form what is called

its terminology, are taken from the Old Testament. The propriety if not the necessity of this is evident from the Old Testament education of the first disciples of the gospel. Those Hebrews to whom this letter was written were perfectly familiar with the terms *sin-offerings* and *thank-offerings*. They knew that the former were given as an acknowledgment of guilt and in confidence and hope of pardon, and that the latter were given as an expression or signification of gratitude for favors received. The sacrifice of praise is called by the prophet, The calves of our lips. The synonyme of the words used in the passage is worthy of notice,—offer, sacrifice, giving of thanks, communicate,—the radical idea of each being, to give.

The Pharisee who trusted in himself that he was righteous, is a remarkable case. He went up into the temple to pray, but instead of praying he gave thanks; and in consequence of his self-confidence and contempt of others he becomes the chief object of his own thanks. I *do* and I *do not* and I *give* are his words. Where a man's trust is, there will be his gratitude. True and real praise and giving of thanks disclaim all the causes which produce self-praise. Pride and opinions of our own merits may use the language of praise to God but can never feel gratitude. It appears that it is possible for Christians as well as Jews to believe, that they may have a real merit or an equivalent for their sins in their own acts and deeds, if they are done

with that view or given to God as sin-offerings or sacrifices for sin. Indeed ideas are found in the writings of professed Christians upon this subject, which greatly exceed any thing among Jews. It is affirmed that men may not only merit the pardon of their own sins and heaven, but the salvation of other sinners also. But the better informed and conscientious Jews adhering to the letter of their law did not rank moral and devotional acts among the sin-offerings, and seem not to have had any belief in any excess of merit in any legal sacrifice for sin as they were careful to repeat them.

Be the opinions of men as they may in these respects, it should seem impossible that any one can conceive that there can be any merit or redeeming or atoning principle in a sacrifice of praise or in giving thanks. "Not unto us, oh! Lord, not unto us;" —is implied in every act of thanksgiving. But in habitual forms of devotion this important idea may escape from the attention. The highest emotion of gratitude implies the deepest humility. True devotion gives to God the fruit of the lips. What is that fruit? To God the Lord be all the glory. Is no glory then to be unto the giver of the thanks? None. He has nothing save what he has received. How then can he glory as though he had received it not? How trust in himself that he is righteous? People are too apt to consider praise as a pure effusion of joy, and humility as an unjoyous state. And therefore humility is associated with sorrow and grief and all the external indications of wretchedness. Thus

it seems to be a like contradiction to hear humility bursting forth into the sublimest emotions of exultation and praise.

> Glory, honor, praise and power,
> Be unto the Lamb forever;
> Jesus Christ is our Redeemer,
> Hallelujah! praise the Lord.

In truth it is the humble soul that is called upon to be joyful in the Lord.

By him therefore who suffered without the gate, by him who is the Mediator of our praise as well as of our prayers, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name. This sacrifice then is a bloodless one; it is not a sacrifice for sin, not an atoning or a redeeming gift. It is giving literal, vocal, audible thanks to his name. All the gods of the heathens had names, and the saints and angels who were or are worshipped have names. But give thanks to his one and only name. Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift! "Oh! Lord I will praise thee." Was there ever a thankful or a grateful heart that took any merit to itself before God? Why if there be any meaning or truth in the language of praise to God, it must mean the disclaiming of all self-praise. To offer this sacrifice to God continually, is continually to renounce all merit in ourselves, to be continually humble in a consciousness of our dependence upon God.

"But to do good and to communicate, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Here

again sacrifices are gifts, communications. But little good can be done without communicating. He who feeds the hungry and clothes the naked, communicates. These sacrifices differ from the former in their immediate object. Praise is given to God, but good is done to men. God is not worshipped or served with men's hands as though he needed any thing. "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me." God is well pleased with works of mercy and benevolence. It is more blesseed to give than to receive. But in doing good we cannot exceed the bounds of our duty, and therefore cannot bring God in debt to us or merit the redemption of our sins. A good work is never an offset to the demerit of sin. God never says to a sinner,—You have sinned against me, you have transgressed my law, but since you have communicated so and so to a fellow creature I now balance accounts with you; my law or justice has not further demands upon you. Upon the supposition that he does say so or mean so, the relation between the offence or debt and the value paid, would be out of all proportion. The good that creatures do or can do is only in their intentions and wills; the means is all the property of the Creator. Instead of communicating to God, the Mediator communicated God's gifts to his fellow men. Jesus Christ gave himself that he might redeem us from all iniquity, leaving nothing from which we should redeem ourselves or for which we

should have to pay a redemption price. So we sing of the merits of Christ's death,—

> Enough for each,
> Enough for all,
> Enough for evermore.

When good works are said to be rewardable, it is not to be understood that the reward is in whole or in part to be transferred to the account of our past sins. The reward is laid up as a treasure in heaven. "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!" Pardon of sin is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his own mercy. This epistle to the Hebrews points out to them what kind of sacrifices are admissible in the church of Christ. And they carry the evidence in themselves that they are not vicarious and that they have no bearing whatever upon justification. Christ our passover is slain for us. The Hebrews who had been converted to Christianity might have asked;—What shall we do? Have we no sacrifices to offer as believers in Jesus? The answer would have been;—Yes, the sacrifice of praise to God and of good to men. "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me,"—is still a truth; and it is also true that the Lord loveth the righteous. He is as well pleased with such moral sacrifices as are good and profitable to men under the gospel, as he was with those under the law. "While therefore ye have opportunity, do good unto all men and especially unto the household of faith."

Among the numerous texts which have been successfully quoted in defence of good works, why has this one been so often left out of the catalogue? Is there one in Scripture which places good works in a clearer point of light? The principle upon which these good works are called sacrifices, shows that they do not stand in competition with any conceivable sacrifice for sin. Devotion or worship divides itself naturally into prayer and praise, as into two primary modes. The basis of all prayer is desire; but can desire in any proper sense of the word be the basis of a gift to the person to whom it is directed for a favor? Do we give or intend to give anything to God in prayer? No. We ask, expecting to receive.

> Coming as at first we came,
> To take and not bestow on thee!

Prayer is expressed want. It is spiritual appetite manifested. It has no resemblance to a compensation or a price, and is no type of it. It means;—Give me what I cannot myself procure. "Son of David, have mercy on me! What would'st thou that I should do unto thee? Lord, that I may receive my sight." This blind man did not trust in himself that he should see. He gave to the son of David nothing but the expressions of his wants. The mind in prayer is in the condition of a recipient and not of an overflowing vessel. The conceptions and feelings are those of poverty not of riches, of weakness not of strength. But the mind of one who brings a sin offering conceives of it as out of or

beyond itself. Does the conscience feel guilt? A substitute is brought to the altar in the innocent victim, but to think of making a substitute for guilt or for sin of prayer, is preposterous. Giving thanks to his name is to give or to express an acknowledgement for favors received. It is to give to God as it were humility and dependence. We praise him, because when we cried unto him he inclined his ear and came and saved us. "Oh, give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth forever!" Giving of thanks to God is apt to be confounded with the feeling which follows from the deliverance out of any great danger or the fear of it. In this transition the feelings vibrate to extremes before reflection can steady them. But in religious experience the mind is supposed to be convinced by experiment, or by information and instruction that a sinner cannot save himself or merit his own salvation. He prays to God under this conviction; and when his prayer is answered, his humility is not converted into pride but into gratitude, and manifests itself in giving thanks to the great Deliverer. But though the feeling may be exquisite and even overflowing, it may still be rational. "Come unto me all ye that love the Lord, and I will tell you what he hath done for my soul;—he hath put a new song into my mouth, even thanksgiving and praise unto his name." There is no merit in all this. How is the redeeming price expressed or implied in, *Glory to God in the highest*, or in, *Be ye thankful?* The merit of the Pharisee in his

own estimation did not seem to lie in his thanks. "I fast twice a week and give tithes of all that I possess,"—his other virtues were negative.

But to do good and to communicate,—is there not merit in these acts? Do they not contain a redeeming price? To whom then is the good done? Not surely to God. "If I were hungry," saith the Lord, "I would not tell thee; the cattle upon a thousand hills are mine. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof." The absolute merit of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ is, that he bore our sin in his own body on the tree, that he loved us and gave himself for us. He gave nothing foreign from himself; he laid down his life, he tasted death for us. But whatever we may communicate God still retains the proprietorship in it; we are but the stewards. He commands us to do good. No act of our obedience can have any respect to the past. If a lie had been told and afterwards confessed, it must still remain a lie; and a life time of truth-speaking could not obliterate it from history or memory or justify the conscience. "When ye have done all ye can do, say we are unprofitable servants, we have done only that which it was our duty to do." Systems, which make void the obligations of obedience to the moral law through faith and infer that men who profess to do good works as a duty must necessarily trust in them, seem to overlook the nature and relations of men and things. Paul calls a sin-offering a sacrifice and good works also sacrifices. The first was indeed offered to God, but it had no intrinsic moral virtue in itself and had

no relative value save as a type. The last are not offered to God, though given in his name and in obedience to his will. They are beneficent acts to men, women and children. Can any one help seeing the essential difference in the nature of these sacrifices, and the different relations of the givers and receivers? Christ is a gift of God and also a giver of himself; he offered himself without spot to God understandingly and voluntarily. "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." God is also well pleased with good works, but not surely because of any equality or resemblance or parallel between them and his Son. Who will say that good works offer themselves or are offered by others without spot to God? "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord, and he will repay." The idea of the rewardableness of good works is inconsistent with their redeeming merit; for not only are these two ends entirely distinct, but to attribute redeeming merit to good works would be to magnify their importance out of all proportion by making them equal to the death of Christ. If such can be conceived to be the virtue and value of good works, there is no wonder they should generate in the bosoms of the self-righteous pride and self-sufficiency. But the bare statement is enough to show the impossibility of the case. The merits of the Saviour go back with repentance to all the past sins of life; they extend over all the time and space embraced in the promises of the gospel. He was as a lamb slain from the foundation of the

world. He was the hope of eternal life which God who cannot lie promised before the world began. The law which was four hundred and thirty years after Abraham could not disannul the promise made to him. Can any good work become such an object of faith to a believer? Where are the prophecies and promises of the saving merit and power of good works recorded? Has the sinner any promise on which to rest a hope, that at some future time he shall have been able to do good works enough to merit his salvation? Or in other words has he a warrant for his life? What is life, what but a vapor that appeareth but a little time and vanisheth away? Oh, foolish man! Oh, foolish hope! This night the soul may be required and then where will be the good works and their merit? Behold, the night has come in which no man can work! One of the arguments in favor of the language of the text is, that these sacrifices or gifts can hardly be confounded with the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ. If thou believest in in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the the dead, thou shalt be saved. If thou believest in thine heart that God will raise thy good works from the dead, shalt thou be saved? But if a man believes in the merits of good works, must he not believe that God will raise them from the dead? Is it not natural to seek consistency even in error? How strange are the modes of opinion! We hear not only of one man meriting salvation for others, but of a species of redeeming merit from suffering in a future world!

The devotion and benificence of the gospel are

most beautifully set forth in this sacrificial arrangement. A ceaseless song of praise to God is a continual and pleasurable expression of humility. "Rejoice evermore and in every thing give thanks." "Praise ye the Lord, for it is good to sing praises unto our God; for it is pleasant and praise is comely." To give thanks to God is to be happy. Dependance upon God is very different from dependance upon men. Unhappily in the latter, we must be as dependant upon their caprice and ill will as upon their good will. But God can never afflict us willingly but for our profit only, that we may be partakers of his holiness. "It was good for me to be afflicted, for before I was afflicted I went astray."

> Thankful I take the cup from thee,
> Prepared and mingled by thy skill!

Man's first relation is to God; in Him he lives and moves and has his being. Between him and his God, he being a sinner, there is a Mediator. By Him therefore let him offer praise to God continually. The greatest of all the favors for which we should give thanks is this Mediator. To reject him is the highest act of ingratitude. Through the Mediator God is continually giving benefits to man; man therefore should be continually giving thanks to God through him.

Our second relation is to our fellow men. The gospel axiom is;— freely ye have received, freely give. "To do good to men and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." We ought to conceive of God as a being infinitely

self-complacent. He is well pleased with his own goodness. Can he be otherwise than pleased with the reflection of his own likeness? "He is loving to every man and his tender mercies are over all his works." Man should love as God loves. "He that seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels of compassion, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" Might not man be defined as a giving or communicative creature? If we should institute a comparison among animals, should we not find that in all except man the power of doing good and communicating are very limited and the inclination nearly as much so? Other animals are little given to hospitality; they entertain no strangers, provide no food to give to others in the time of their wants and are mostly furnished by nature with a covering. Even those animals which live in flocks or companies seem to have the social sympathies but imperfectly developed, and to have little dependance upon each other for subsistence. In man alone the provident and social principles are capable of the greatest expansion. The pleasures of benevolence are at once rational and sublime and seem to approach to the divine. In the midst of enjoyment and plenty the wants of others may be forgotten. The fellow feelings need the presence of circumstances to quicken them. We have no inherent sympathies with suffering of which we are ignorant. And perhaps in the midst of our own enjoyments we are naturally prone to forget the duties of active benevolence, and even when the soul is absorbed in the sublime

enjoyments of devotion. In attending our duties to God let us not forget our duties to men. And if works of mercy should interfere with our habitual hours of devotion, perhaps the divine displeasure need not be greatly dreaded considering his well-known good pleasure in all human endeavors to make his creatures happy.

Give,—give praise to God, give to him that needeth, give instruction to the ignorant, give consolation to the afflicted, give help to the feeble. The powers of our bodies and minds as our substance are all more or less communicable and may be employed in doing good. Industry and economy in this view become important virtues. He who provides nothing for the morrow, who makes his own immediate wants a standard of his industry and frugality, will not be apt to have much to communicate and may never rank high in the list of well-doers.

Indolence and extravagance become vices in the social system. The poor must needs exist in every community; and objects of benevolence are often greatly multiplied from causes beyond human foresight and control. War, disease and famine leave behind them a fearful catalogue of wants and miseries, many of which can only be relieved by benevolent ministers of mercy.

To the modern imitators of ancient Pharisees and Antinomians these views of this subject are earnestly commended; and the practical believer is exhorted to make full proof of the doctrine advanced. Can

the light of Christianity be made to shine brighter or more mildly? How much confusion and error have come from misapprehensions of the nature of sacrifices! It has been proposed to meet the supposed difficulties upon the principle of reaction, that is, so to believe as though our salvation wholly depended upon our faith and so to work as though our salvation wholly depended upon our works. But this plan seems to admit that faith and works are antagonist to each other. This opposition we hold is not real. No more difficulties exist between them than exist between the different sacrifices. If any unbeliever performs good works with a view to save himself, he must proceed upon the assumption of the integrity of human nature, or suppose that the effects of sin can be immediately remedied. But it is with the *Moral Sacrifices* which do good to men, when made by believers who are renewed in the spirit of their minds, that God is well pleased. Now the motive set before the pardoned sinner to induce him to do good is, reward in heaven. The judge comes quickly, his reward is with him to reward every man according to his work. The believer is laboring not for pardon for he is already pardoned and has received the spirit of adoption; but he is laboring to enter into the rest that remains for the people of God, to lay up treasure in heaven and for the meat that endureth unto everlasting life. Let him bring his offering to the Lord. What offering shall he bring? A thank-offering. What shall he render unto the Lord for all his benefits?

What but the fruit of his lips,—to the end that my glory (tongue) may sing praises and not be silent? "Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion, for great is the Holy One in the midst of thee! Let the inhabitants of the rock sing." But let them remember the poor also; let them not forget to do good and to communicate, nor become weary in well-doing, forasmuch as they know that their labor is not in vain in the Lord, in due season they shall reap if they faint not.

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE NINETEENTH.

THE DAY OF SALVATION.

And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortest me. Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid: for the Lord JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation.

Isaiah, xii. 1, 2.

If there be any change of relation between God and us, it must needs take place in some point of time and not indefinitely without any regard to time. "In that day or time that thine anger is turned away." Does not this bear on the doctrine of assurance? Must not a person who can use this language know that his sins are forgiven? If one can feel comfort and know whence it comes or the causes or reasons of it, how does this differ from the

ideas included in justification by faith? This in the nature of the case is a change which may be wrought in a day or in a short period of time. Faith itself is an act of the mind and partakes of the nature of thought in its quickness. It has none of the slowness of works about it. "The mind dealeth in truth and the hand operateth upon things." The progress of mind in putting forth and exercising its confidence, is not to be measured by the same standard as manual labor. The magnitude or importance of a thought requires not a proportionate length of time to think it. A man may believe the pardon of his sins and feel the comfort of the pardon, sooner than he can express it. All the procuring causes of justification exist as objects of faith, and they may all be confided in as quickly as the mind can conceive or think of them. In those cases in which the difficulty was in the matter of faith or the objects to be believed, the Apostles subjected the minds of inquirers to no long course of study, but if they were ready and willing to believe they presented the principal object of faith at once to them. In the case of the Eunuch a short course of instruction prepares his mind and fixes his confidence, and he asks,—What hinders? The answer is,—If thou believest. His faith was avowed in that day or time. This was all that was necessary to enable him to realize his change of relation to God, or his acceptance with God through Christ. It was here that his pardon was merited by Christ and God was ready and willing to manifest it to him. It was true

that Jesus was the Son of God. It requires not the same length of time to believe a truth as it does to make or place a truth as an object of faith, or to believe a promise fulfilled as it does to bring about its fulfilment. When the fulness of time was come, in that day it might have been believed that it was come. So St. Paul,—"Say not in thine heart who shall ascend into heaven to bring Christ down from above, or who shall ascend into the deep to bring him up from the grave; for the word is nigh thee even in thy mouth and in thy heart, that is, the word of faith which we preach." Say not,—I cannot believe now—to-day, I cannot believe that the Messiah has come until he is come, I cannot believe that he is risen till he does rise,—for all such sayings resolve themselves into positive unbelief. Let the question be,—What if Jesus has come, what if he has risen from the dead, what is then to be done in order to achieve salvation? Must a man work or believe? Not work, but believe. Believe when? Now. The word of faith which we preach is, that if thou believe in thine heart that God hath raised him (Jesus) from the dead, thou shalt be saved. The Lord Jesus can be confessed with the mouth in a day and believed on in the heart in the same day.

The doctrine of assurance rests in part upon the principle of government relation which implies the integrity of the laws and obedience to them, for it is said,—Whosoever keepeth the law but offends in one point, is guilty of offending against all. Now an offence against any one of the laws is an indict-

able offence, and the government cannot protect any of its subjects who do not stand unimpeached or acquitted of all offences. To forgive a man ninety-nine offences and hold him guilty of one, would not amount to a legal pardon, or a restoration to citizenship. The change then of a legal relation when an act of pardon or reprieve is concerned, must depend upon entire pardon. Hence when there are several indictments against a man, acquittal of one leaves him still subject to be tried for the others. Criminal debts cannot be worked out one by one as commercial debts. Criminal law has none of the discretion of a commercial creditor. Conscience and sin may not compromise. Conscience too as well as a jury can only answer,—guilty or not guilty. When God gives the token of pardon to the conscience, if there be no error in theory in the mind, there can be no mistake in the feelings respecting the extent of the pardon; the sense of guilt is all gone, the whole conscience feels at rest and peace. The idea of a pardon in part is theoretically unscriptural. Justification by faith is followed by peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Experience corresponds entirely with the doctrine of full as well as free pardon.

> Pardon for all that I have done,
> My mouth as in the dust I hide;
> And glory give to God alone,
> My God forever pacified!

"This is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I

will remember their iniquity no more." In that day thou shalt be thankful or grateful; thou shalt say or give thanks with thy understanding as well as with thy spirit. Oh, Lord, I will praise thee! For what? Wilt thou know what the Lord hath done for thy soul? "I will praise thee because thine anger is turned away from me, and now thou comfortest me." The knowledge of salvation is given through the remission of sins. It is not only true that where there is no law there is no transgression, but also that where there is no conscience there is no distinct feeling or idea of guilt and innocence. Conscience is to law, what eyes are to light and ears are to sound, not the maker but the distinguisher of right and wrong. Conscience feels guilt, and when it does it feels that some law or principle is offended,—and the conclusion is easily and naturally followed out. The law must have a lawmaker and the offence against it must be transferred to him. Guilty consciences do not philosophise upon the divine nature, so as to deduce the impossibility that God should be angy with the wicked. This is no state of feeling to lead to such abstractions. Guilt, shame, fear fill the whole sense and and all the faculties accord to the feeling.

But we may theorize now upon the subject of anger. It is a human passion. We could have no idea of the word if we had never felt anger. It is most powerful and is capable of inspiring terror and producing great misery. Can God then experience or feel a human passion? What do we gain by de-

nying that he can feel anger? The denial surely is not meant to insinuate, that God has less power to punish those who break his law than men have to punish those who make them angry. Could we prove that there is no anger in God, the words would still remain,—"Our God is a consuming fire." Now a consuming fire is not a human passion, but is it less destructive or more resistible? Who has not witnessed dispensations of Providence or seeming natural events, which have proved to sinners like a consuming fire burning them up root and branch? In our own conscience anger is a natural expression of displeasure, as love or affection or kindness is of our pleasure. The affections of the heart operate in pairs or by contrasts, and may be ultimately controlled by judgment and will. We may think we do well to be angry, but if we are convinced to the contrary we cannot justify ourselves. Should we see a person pleased with every body and with every thing, could we help doubting the soundness of his mind or his morals? Different characters and facts must be responded to in every correct and well-regulated mind. The love or benevolence of God is a favorite theme with many who oppose every idea or reference to the anger of God, and yet they admit that man was made in the likeness of his Maker. But the conception of God which makes him approve and love all contrarieties or opposites, makes him very unlike our conceptions of men or indeed of our actual knowledge of men; for there is noth-

ing in men better understood than that when one of the affections is fixed, there is no power of volition that can fix it at the same time and in the same degree in an opposite one. We may change the objects of our anger and our love, but if we are pleased with what we were once displeased, we become displeased with what once gave us pleasure. Thus while the fallibility of our judgment may be proved, the constitution of our affections is confirmed and placed above contradiction or caprice. "Though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away from me and thou comfortest me." My comfort flows not from thy continued anger; not comfort but punishment must flow from that. The pleasures of religion do not rise or begin from an insensible state or an immediate transition from sinful pleasures, but they begin with a transition from the sorrows of repentance. This is the mystery of experimental religion to natural men. They understand not this thing of the spirit. The idea of joy springing from sorrow or pleasure from pain, is foolishness unto them. But why does the sinner repent, why is he sorry? Not surely that he has pleased God, or that he thinks God is pleased with him. "We love him because he first loved us." But there was a day when his love was first manifested unto us, when we could feel and believe that he loved us, and our love answered to his love. "The love of Christ constraineth us." Before that day doubt and fear prevailed. Thou wast angry

with me—I was conscious of thy displeasure—I believed that I had deserved it, and I could find no apology, no ground of self-justification. Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. God, be merciful to me a sinner! When these distressing feelings give place to feelings of comfort, they are not explained away as ideal or imaginary; they are on the contrary heightened by the contrast. I deserved thy wrath or anger, but it is turned away, and now I am not only relieved from the misery, but thou comfortest me:—I will praise thee for this grace, so rich, so free, so unmerited by me. The Lord hath done great things for us whereof we are glad! How else can we speak of the dealings of God with our souls than after the manner of men, unless we mean to exclude all meaning as it regards the minds of others from our language? The Lord loveth the righteous; "Say to the righteous, it shall be well with him, but all the wicked will he destroy." The anger of God is not indeed a human passion. Upon the supposition that it is like it, no like is the same. The likenesss holds true in this respect;—it administers no comfort and admits of none being administered until it is turned away. But wrath has come upon them to the uttermost, that is, justice. The wrath of God in Scripture means his active justice. It never errs, never mistakes its objects, and its final effects are not mistaken by them. When the consciences of Joseph's brethren reminded them of their treatment of him,

they could not suggest nor sanction any suggestion but that of anger on his part. Reason might have prompted a thousand arguments or drawn them from brotherly love—and all of them most profoundly philosophical—to prove that a brother could not be angry, showing from nature that the thing is impossible; but conscience sets at nought many a specious theory which would seem to prove the impossibility of sin and its punishment. It demonstrated to these very men the envy, the jealousy, and the cruelty, which a brother is capable of exercising towards an unoffending and unresisting brother. Why could not young brother Joseph be angry if one of his elder brethren could be unjust? The mind has no logic to disarm the conscience of this conclusion. He who feels that he has committed an unprovoked wrong, a wrong in principle as well as in fact, must be more than usually dexterous if he can quiet his fears of the consequences of a fair trial of justice. The hardened sceptic who laughs at the fear of the vulgar as mere superstition, has a limit beyond which presumption itself cannot sustain him. There is no scale on which crime can operate, which the justice of God cannot reach. "Vengeance is mine and I will repay," saith the Lord. This is not the language of fatalism. Fate never turns, or turns away its decrees, never administers comfort for wrath. The idea of God turning away his justice and comforting those who were obnoxious to it, cannot fail to suggest the idea of a changeable God. Can he remain just who ministers comfort to the

guilty in the place of punishment? The dispensation of free and full pardon to guilty sinners will ever be the distinctive doctrine of the gospel.

In that day, when the great sin-offering shall have been offered and shall be proclaimed by the heralds of salvation in the name of the great Mediator of the new and everlasting covenant, thou shalt say—for thou shalt know that the justice of God is turned away by that all-sufficient sacrifice,—thou shalt say,—The mystery is explained; God may be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

I trust in him who stands between
The Father's wrath and me;
Jesus, thou great eternal mean,
I look for all from thee.

He gave himself, the Just for the unjust. In that day, when the Prince and Saviour shall be exalted with the right hand of God to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins, when thy lowly and contrite heart trembling at the word of the Lord shall confide itself to Jesus as able to save to the utmost all that come unto God through him, in that day shall thy conscience be relieved from its burden of guilt, and thou shalt say,—

My soul a witness is.

Now I have passed from death unto life, now I feel peace and joy spring up within my soul. The day of justification, the day of the spirit of adoption when the Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, is a happy day indeed,

a day to be had in everlasting remembrance. The words are evidently a prophecy of the gospel dispensation, though like many others it may have accomplishment in degrees. If we are authorized in remarkable deliverances and when we are conscious of our demerits to use these words, how much more are we authorized to use them when the full measure of grace is manifested and brings us into the glorious liberty of the children of God! "Bless the Lord, Oh! my soul, and forget not all his benefits, for he hath not only healed all thy diseases but forgiven all thine iniquities!

It is of importance to make this point plain, as there is an opinion prevailing which prevents those who have embraced it from using the language. It assumes that all the turning or changing is in the sinner, that God is never displeased with the sinner but the sinner with God. Thus the words, "God was in Christ reconciling unto himself," are construed. God, say they, needed no reconciliation to the world as he never was displeased with it. The world only needed reconciliation to God. It offends them therefore to hear of this anger of God as conveying the idea of his being displeased with sinners, or of his justice standing in the way of salvation. The opinion that every sinner may be saved if he will or that sinners may save themselves, in its most exceptionable form is included in this doctrine; for the whole doctrine of divine justice not opposing any barrier to man's salvation excludes the doctrine

of redemption. Now can we form any conception of justice whether pertaining to God or to man as being without any discriminative principle? Would not such justice sink below the mere mechanical action of scales or balances? In these there are just weights, and false ones are an abomination to the Lord. "Lord," said Stephen, "weigh not out to them (his murderers) this sin." The righteous God judgeth righteously. It is plain that if all the reconciliation is on the part of the world, no punishment can follow from its failure. God cannot punish if his justice is not offended, for upon no other principle can he say,—Justice is mine and I will repay. The meaning is the same as,—Justice is mine and I will execute it. Our not being reciled to God, if he were reconciled to us, would be but a minor consideration. But it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God. "Whosoever shall fall upon this stone shall be broken, but upon whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder." God revealed or proclaimed himself to Moses, as he who will by no means clear the guilty. In his law, he calls himself a jealous God visiting iniquities. Love and hatred are constantly placed in opposition. "I love them that love me, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." The laws of nature (so called) cannot be transgressed or neglected with impunity. Those who have thus offended, find by woful experience that there is no place for repentance though it be sought carefully with tears. It is not enough to cease to offend, to

escape a consequence. It is wonderful to see how the champions of nature, who labor to extol her laws in order to undervalue and discredit the justice of God as set forth in revealed religion, can overlook the inexorable character of nature's laws, when every day's experience and observation prove that they leave no hope to those who sin against them save in miracles. Neither fire, air, nor water ever pardons. Nature with all the eulogy of her adorers not only shows no mercy, but she regards not motives nor ignorance. Well meant errors and sincere mistakes find no pity under her irreversible laws. By the law of nature shall no flesh be justified which has sinned against it. One dose of poison, one serpent's bite or reptile's sting may prove mortal. There is no mercy, no forgiveness in nature; it is all in the gospel. What a strange prejudice—and stranger still that it should be persisted in—that sin will not kill! Why the souls that sin are suffering the penalty of death constantly; and the only exceptions that are found, are those who are redeemed from moral guilt and condemnation by the blood of the everlasting covenant. Nature's law is, that health is to be preserved by temperance; but let a man destroy his health by intemperance, and nature will not give him another constitution nor make him physically a new creature. Nature is not quite passive or neuter towards the transgressors of her laws and she can and will punish. She prays not sinners to be reconciled unto her to avoid punishment. She gives no warning but gives the

sinners against her up to hardness of heart and reprobation of mind, often coming to judgment at the moment which yields the sinner her highest pleasures. Destruction comes in a moment. If nature be not angry nor just the transgressors of her laws will suffer no less; and their volition can avail no more to remedy the evil than if justice with a drawn sword were the executioner. The generality of men who reject the Providence of God or an intelligent government of the universe together with revelation, are apt to slide into fatalism and suppose the causes of their misery and their misery itself to be alike unavoidable. What is to be, say they, will be. And if this maxim extends to religion, it cuts off all repentance and conversion in theory and practice.

But Isaiah has it that God is angry, and that his anger is turned away. God is angry with the wicked every day, but when the wicked turn from their wickedness and do that which is lawful and right, they shall live. A moral intelligence is displeased with sin and with the sinner, but the sinner who forsakes sin may become pleasing to moral intelligence. The evidence of a moral and discriminative mind is shown in the consistency of the parts of the whole; there is no accident about it. The relations, the principles and the dispositions involved, together with the time, are identical and peculiar. In that day,—Thou, not another for thee, nor thou for another. It is a personal and a matter of fact experience. I know and thou knowest;—there is

no blind fate about it. The law involved is not a law of inanimate, insensible matter. Here there is power on earth to forgive sins and to turn away the punishment. In mere matters of knowledge without volition or power, gratitude is not generated. We praise not the fire which does not burn us, for it does not turn away its consuming heat.

Love we have said is a human passion. Why then do we apply the word to God? Is it not precisely because it answers to our consciousness and experience? It corresponds to our moral pleasure or enjoyment; it contrasts with our displeasure or anger. But love in man is or may be directed or regulated by mind and by will, when moral subjects are concerned. No words or language drawn from irrational or inanimate nature would convey ideas so appropriate. For man is the only creature which bears such resemblance to the Maker of all. Variety among themselves runs through all the classes of animated beings. Man stands at the head of the moral and intellectual class of beings, if he be not the only species in the genus. He can recognize or identify sin and be angry with it. Behold, a resemblance to divinity! Conscience in ourselves is not wholly imaginary. It is knowledge from two sources,—to know together, or *a union of feeling vnd thought.* We rejoice or conclude that we have undergone a change of relation to God. We have ceased to be his enemies, and he holds us no longer obnoxious to his punishment. We have now therefore no condemnation for past sins,

In that day thou shalt say,—Behold! God is my salvation, not my Saviour only, but my salvation. The nearness the oneness of God and believers justifies or fulfils the prophecy. "I in you and you in me, that we may be one." 'I am the vine and ye are the branches; abide ye in me." "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, &c." The doctrine of the unity or oneness of the head and members of the church, is fully set forth in the New Testament. God dwelleth in those that love, and they in him. "Because I live, ye shall live also." "The Lord is my portion." "Whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." But God is become my salvation, now that his anger is turned away from me. Your sins have separated between you and your God. The guilt of those sins being removed from the conscience, and the love of them from the affections, nothing remains to separate God and the soul. Mutual affection and union of spirit follow. The mystics (so called) have been blamed for their peculiar manner of spiritualizing, and they may perhaps have indulged their imaginations to excess sometimes, but the tendency to this disposition of mind is in the affections themselves. Not only the vastness of the subject but the nature of the feelings lead to poetry even in those who were not born poets. The desire to communicate from a full heart what language at best can only feebly express, lead the mind to sublimate its thoughts. Much of this peculiar manner,

however, it should not be concealed, springs from peculiar taste and association. It is regarded as a sacred style.

"I will trust and not be afraid, for Jehovah is become my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation." If the same meaning is meant to be conveyed, why not use the same words? Is there not prophetic reference to—

> Father, Son and Holy Ghost,
> Who sweetly all agree
> To save a world of sinners lost?

Jehovah is become my strength and my song; and some of St. Paul's trusting and glorying seem nearly if not quite similar. "I can do all through Christ that strengtheneth me." "Rejoice in the Lord always and again I say, rejoice." "I will trust and not be afraid." We may boldly say,—I will not fear what man can do unto me. Strength and song are opposed to fear and sorrow. The divinity of the Redeemer of the world seems to be set forth is this part of the prediction. "Be not afraid, it is I,"—is in effect the language of every passage in which Jesus appears.

> His presence disperses my gloom,
> And makes all within me rejoice.

"In the last day of the feast, that great day, Jesus stood and cried, If any man thirst let him come unto me, and the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life. And this he spake of the Spirit that he should give, for he was not yet glorified." And at that very time,

the people were drawing water and responding the words in this chapter of Isaiah;—"with joy shall ye draw water out of the well of salvation."

Spring up, oh! well, I ever cry,
Spring up within my soul!

Where there is no certainty there is fear. If we ourselves be ignorant, our fears can only be removed by confidence in the wisdom and ability of others or at least of some one who has manifested an interest in our behalf. Jesus is the way, the truth and the life. He knows what to do, though he may not inform us. "What I do thou knowest not how, but thou shalt know hereafter." "I am the resurrection and the life. Believest thou this?" We must believe it as information or truth or we cannot know it. He must be trusted as the resurrection and the life, or we shall be afraid to pass through the dark valley and shadow of death. He also is become my salvation as well as my strength and my song. Let that mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus. Is not this to partake of his nature? "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

Thy gifts, alas! cannot suffice,
Unless thyself be given;
Without thy graces and thyself,
I were a wretch undone.

This three-fold kind of language is very manifest in the New Testament and is often combined thus: —the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ—the love of God—the fellowship of the Holy Ghost. The first of the three mostly occurs alone, or else coupled with

love or favor of God or of the Father. This manner seems pretty clearly to indicate if not prove, that those who baptized in the three names did not use two of them as unmeaning words or forms. The words of a prophet are remarkable,—"Awake, oh! sword, against the man who is my fellow, (partner, equal) saith the Lord." Compare this with;—"Grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ." This is St. Paul's form in most of his letters. We cannot think that so concise and elegant a prose-writer as St. Paul, would use repetitions so constantly in violation of all the rules of Greek criticism; and we are not reduced to the necessity of thinking so, for he is not an innovator upon or an exception to the writers of the three names. Are they all substantive nouns,—not names of things or qualities, not partly substantive and partly adjective? But if it can be proved that the JEHOVAH of the prophet is the JESUS of the Apostles, would not the question be settled? Is not this a name above every name, and a name at which every knee shall bow and every tongue confess? "Should confess that Jesus Christ is *Lord*, to the glory of God the Father." Is it then to the glory of God the Father, that Lordship should be attributed to the Messiah? Here indeed is the point in controversy. The texts in the affirmative are:—"The Father hath committed all judgment unto him the Son, that all men might honor the Son even as they honor the Father,"—that is worship Him. "Jehovah is also be come my

salvation." "God manifested in the flesh—God with us—Christ in you, the hope of glory."

In him eternal life we know,
And heaven's unutterable bliss.

"God hath given unto us eternal life and this life is in his Son."

The order and arrangement of the words are remarkable. In that day, thou shalt first praise God as a pardoning God,—then discover more fully the greatness and the divinity of the salvation,—and finally the power and majesty and glory of Christ as having all power in heaven and in earth and all the fullness of the godhead. So we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to him be glory both now and forever, Amen! The more a believer knows of the meaning of those Scriptures which speak of the glory of Christ, and the more experience he has of his gracious power to save, the more he will extol him. Jehovah is my strength and my song. And they sung a new song, the song of the Lamb, saying, "Thou art worthy - - - - for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people, - - - - and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, "Worthy was the lamb that was slain, to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory, - - - - and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto to the lamb forever and ever." All this was to the glory of God the Father.

The whole creation join in one,
To bless the sacred name,
Of him that sits upon the throne,
And to adore the lamb.
Worthy the Lamb that died, they cry,
To be exalted thus;
Worthy the Lamb, our hearts reply,
For he was slain for us.

It does indeed make sweet melody in our hearts to sing of his redeeming love.

But this we can tell, he hath loved us so well,
As to lay down his life to redeem us from hell.
And this I do find, we two so joined,
He'll not live in glory and leave me behind.

What joy unspeakable and full of glory is there in a song of gratitude in a truly humble heart!

Oh! may I bear some humble part,
In that immortal song;
Wonder and joy shall tune my heart,
And love command my tongue.

The plan of redemption and salvation opened on the day of Pentecost, in all its fulness. Then came the baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost. Then was the gospel preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. What riches, what treasures of grace were then displayed to the souls of sinful men! Then was the proclamation made;—"Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy - - - - without money and without price." The progress of experimental religion is from justification to sanctification. The first evidence of justification does not depend upon sanctification, for it is not the sanc-

tified who are justified in the day of conversion; but the ungodly sinners come with repentance to the throne of grace seeking pardon. So far as ideas of holiness are concerned, they ask the pardon of past sins that they may be made holy, not because they are holy. The first expression of gratitude from a converted soul is limited to his own consciousness. He perceives, he feels his great relative change. The weight of guilt no longer presses down upon his conscience with a confounding and overwhelming influence. Being justified by faith, he has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. To be justified by faith instrumentally, faith ought to precede justification. Whatever is done by an agent or an instrument, follows of course as an effect of the use or application of the instrument. We believe before and while we are justified. Believe what? Not surely what we do not believe, not what we did not know or of which we never heard. To a certain degree, faith must be opposed to error and ignorance. But what follows after justification? What are its consequences? These are all matters of experience, of which we can have a distinct mental perception. The condemned, the guilty soul in the midst of its heart-felt contrition hears of Jesus, hears of his love—of his grace—of his power on earth to forgive sins. All these subjects are subjects of recollection and memory. I know in whom I have believed—I remember that it was Jesus who was presented as the object of confidence—I remember that I gave credence to the

promises and to the declaration, Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved—I did trust in him and I was not confounded. Now what can any one know of Jesus before he hears of him or is informed, and how can he know more of what he has verified by experience than what he remembers? Oh! Lord, I will praise thee, for I remember that thou wast angry with me and that thine anger was turned away from me—I remember my former state—I remember the changes and now I feel comfort. The preacher who describes sin and its consequences and describes repentance and pardon, can and does describe the state or experience of one who is pardoned. He tells the seeker what to hope for when the pearl of great price is found, what the privileges of a new convert are. This first great work done,—the pardon sealed by the Spirit of Adoption and the confidence established,—the converted soul does not necessarily repeat or go over the same ideas and feelings to continue or increase its comforts. Memory does its office. Behold! God is my salvation. Even so,—the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God. Now we have not received the spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? Unto what then were ye baptized? they said unto John's baptism. They were not then baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus nor in the name of the

Holy Spirit. When the day of Pentecost was fully come, the disciples knew that God was their salvation. They had tarried at Jerusalem to be endued with power from on high; and the Spirit of God descended upon them and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE TWENTIETH.

THE PROGRESS OF FAITH.

For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.

Romans, i. 17.

Righteousness, justify, justification, justice and just, all seem to have a common root or belong to one theme and are not identical with love. The righteousness of God and the love of God are not synonymous. If either term or phrase were omitted, the other could not be so used as to supply its place. Care should be taken not to confound them. As for instance, the phrase—not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God by faith—would not have its meaning expressed by substituting *love* and making it read,—not having mine own love which is of the law, but the love which is of God by faith. To be justified by faith would not be expressed by —to be made love by faith. Righteousness always has some reference to a law principle or rule of right.

The righteousness of God may mean the great or superlative righteousness. But in the strict and distinctive sense it means the righteousness which God provides or gives,—the righteous sacrifice. All the sacrifices under the law were, to say the most of them, only innocent. They were not offered, the just for the unjust. The personal and actual righteousness of the propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, is revealed in the gospel from faith to faith. In the law it was but shadowed forth. The revelation is not made from faith to works, nor from works to faith, nor from works to works. The ceremonial and sacrificial deeds of the law have no place in the system from first to last. Jesus Christ is the Author and Finisher of faith, the beginning and the ending, the All and in All. The typical righteousness of the law was all made or arranged according to the pattern showed on the Mount; but the righteousness of the gospel is revealed without such patterns to be believed in, and being an object of trust or confidence it was not mediated by the hands of a Moses or any other mortal. No human labor could add any thing to it. The repenting sinner is to believe in God's righteousness, that is, in his righteous Son Jesus Christ. The just or justified live by this faith.

It is well known that there are persons who call themselves philosophers in the same sense as we call them unbelievers, and hence the common term infidel philosophers in opposition to Christian philosophers. But anciently philosophers did not wor-

ship Gods or a God, and the sense of the term is now modified. Believers in God and worshippers of God may be philosophers in almost every department of science. It is no disparagement to a Christian philosopher as he may call himself, to doubt on any point of inquiry or experiment. No man now pretends to know every thing or to believe every thing. It is generally understood that it is not necessary for a man to be an unbeliever in divine revelation, in order to become a good natural or experimental philosopher. Doubt holds a middle place between unbelief and faith. Mind cannot remain stationary in absolute or entire unbelief. The effects of doubt differ from those of unbelief. It may prove a motive or prompter of the mind to action, instead of holding it in suspense as unbelief must. Absolute unbelief and impossibility are synonymous in effect. The righteousness of God revealed in the gospel is not upon a level with natural subjects or in the same predicament they are; it is not a proper subject for the same kind of doubt for the same kind of means cannot be used to detect error or confirm truth. Moral philosophy itself cannot be permitted in all cases to exercise its doubts upon the gospel revelation of the righteousness of God, for the very obvious reason that all the data of such a revelation are not given to the moral philosopher. He knows but in part; he sees through a glass darkly. Nature exhibits facts to the naturalist. She exhibits portions of them to the senses, to form the basis of experiments and researches by

which we may discover what may remain concealed. The secrets of nature therefore may be said in one sense to be revealed from experiment to experiment, and the secrets of morals from observation to observation. There is in each case something in kind to begin with. But the believer begins in faith and progresses in faith. To the last, there are points in kind different from physics and morals and which no experiment nor past experience can reach. Has he lived a life-time in faith? He cannot leave the world with the same faith only which has brought him to the verge of life. The scene before him is new and untried; he now ventures all upon a promise, the truth of which no man can vouch for. If he ceases to believe in his last expiring moment, he dies in despair. So different is the life of a believer from that of a doubting philosopher, whose knowledge if not extracted from his doubts finds them as it were the prompters to new researches!

Herein is the righteousness of God revealed. The birth, the life, the death and the resurrection of the Messiah are recorded in the gospel. The Redeemer and Saviour is not to come; he has come. In the law and the prophets he was foretold or prefigured; now he is revealed from faith to faith. The progress of faith is from his birth to his resurrection step by step. There is no break in the belief, no cause of doubt. One event prepares the way for another. The Jews may be regarded as theological unbelievers in the gospel, not as doubters. Their minds

were not in a transition state. They do not now believe that the Messiah has come, but they believe that he will yet come. They do not live by faith as Christians do. They were at first placed under the law as a schoolmaster, and their unbelief keeps them under it as it regards practical purposes. Their consciences are bound or they feel under obligation to keep the ceremonial law, so far as circumstances permit. But the law is not of faith. The man that doeth them (the works) shall live in them, and not as the just do, by faith. A belief in the Messiah as having come puts an end to sacrificial works; unbelief in his having come imposes the continuance of sacrificial works. A Jew must work according to his law in order to live or to be a Jew. Without works he would be dead indeed; he would not be religiously known among the nations.

Though we reject the opinion of the author of the divine legation of Moses, namely, that the promises under the law of Moses were only temporal and national; yet it must be evident, that these kinds of promises were made unto the Jews upon the condition of their keeping the law and that they have been literally verified. Now the faith of the Jews in a Messiah or Christ to come must needs take on the modification of hope. It is so far as it remains or while it continues the substance of the thing hoped for. They live not upon the hopes of the future. This distinction is important and is of general application. No man works for the past, or to effect or alter what he believes to

be historically true. Salvation by grace through faith cannot be of works, if the faith be in the past.

If a man believes in the merit of a sacrifice offered up for him nearly two thousand years ago, how can he associate the merit of his own work in offering up a sacrifice for himself? The Jews hope and work, and work because they hope. They endeavor to keep the law that the Saviour may come. But the just who believe the Saviour has come are rich in faith.

Among believers it is well known there is a large body who not only believe the Scriptures, but believe that the spirit of inspiration or infallibility continues in the church or in its ministry. The members of this church do not deem it necessary to read the gospel which contains the revelation of the righteousness of God, but still they profess to believe a book they have either never read or do not deem it necessary they should read in order to believe it. This is a different state of the case from the other two, and has peculiarities to be found no where else. Men believe both the gospel and its ministers to be infallible. Now to balance faith between two such infallibles, cannot but seem to be a difficult task to any inexperienced mind. One or the other of the scales one should think would be apt to preponderate; and the presumption in the case would naturally be in favor of the living human infallibility over the infallibility of the dead letter. We have considered doubt as a middle or transition state of mind between faith and unbelief, and must not

such a state of mind sooner or later be found between two equal authorities? If there must be an infallible ministry to interpret an infallible gospel, probably a better plan could not be well devised to keep doubts out of the minds of the members of the church than to keep the infallible book out of their sight. We have said that doubts hold a middle place between faith and unbelief, but they must not be considered as stationary or as tending only one way. They may have a tendency either to faith or unbelief, and thus they may shift the ground of our faith or unbelief or modify them, though they can never end in entire or absolute unbelief on all sides. The remark for instance has been frequently made, that a believer in two infallibles—an infallible book and its infallible interpreters—when he begins to doubt the interpreters, is apt to end in unbelief of all religion; while those who begin with doubting the book generally stop in some form of religion or worship. Doubts in the first case shaking the faith in the predominant object and meeting with less resistance from the weaker one, have nothing to arrest them; and in the meantime if not checked by the living resistance, they will gain impetus from reaction. But doubts in the book will not be thus pushed to the extreme. But there is a fourth mode of doubt which bears upon the subject revealed,—the righteousness of God. A celebrated European author wrote a book upon the atonement, or rather against it, and he came to the conclusion that he

could not find the idea of atonement in the four gospels. Need there be a stronger evidence of the direction of his doubts? This kind of proof of the tendency of doubts is to be met with in other writers. To the minds of these authors the gospel reveals the love of God instead of the righteousness of God, and it reveals this love to their reason rather than their faith. One of the most eloquent of these writers feels his mind shocked at the ideas of justice and satisfaction, as changing the relation of parental love under which the Scriptures represent the universal Father; and he considers that it makes the laws of God to resemble those of Draco which on account of their severity were said to be written in blood. The tendency here is to exclude all ideas of justice from the New Testament as a revelation, and to resolve it wholly into a revelation of love. St. John furnishes the first leading thought; from him they take the substitute for justice in the term *love*. But though he be called the beloved disciple—the disciple whom Jesus loved—and though he uses the word *love* in all its derivations more frequently than any other writer, and as it were incorporates it into his composition; yet we would be willing to rest the whole matter at issue upon his writings alone, leaving the testimony of St. Paul and his peculiar language out of view. Let us hear St. John. "And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. My little children I write unto you that ye sin not; but if any man sin we

have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Why righteous?" "That he might be the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world." Could Jesus Christ the loving or the lovely be the propitiation for sin; or could his blood, under the characteer of love and not of righteousness, cleanse us from all sin? Or would the language,—if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins,—be equally appropriate? Does it not seem plain, that a law cannot be so abstracted as to resolve itself wholly into love or benevolence? When violated it must be satisfied in some way, or government of course must cease. Justice and love or mercy must not be confounded, nor be resolved into one and the same mode of action. When they are said to meet together and kiss each other, they are not amalgamated into one. "To declare I say," says St. Paul, "his righteousnes at this time, that God might be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Change the words. "To declare I say at this time his love that God might be love and the lover of him who is a lover of Jesus." Is not the difference apparent, and is not all the antithesis destroyed? The revelation of righteousness from faith to faith requires that no doubts should find place in our minds which lead to unbelief in any part of this revelation. Such doubts would be incompatible with the life of faith. We are not justified by love, for the righteousness of God is the object of our justifying faith, and it is

predicated on evidence or testimony. Love is not the first or immediate result from testimony, but confidence or belief. We read again and again the record or testimony that God hath given us of his Son, and of our setting our seal to this testimony or record by our faith in it. Christ died for the ungodly, died for his enemies, died the Just for the unjust.

These cases show how the text may be departed from by different processes in the mind. Revelation may be confounded with creation, or its objects with those of nature. But the substances in nature are not presented or made known to the senses and through them to the mind, from faith to faith. The righteousness of God is revealed as a truth,—as a truth of fact and a truth of doctrine or principle; and as the latter it becomes a historical truth. He who knew no sin was made the righteous sin-offering for us. Jesus Christ was of God made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. Jesus Christ the righteous given of God as a sacrifice or sin-offering, is evidently the righteousness of God revealed in the gospel. God gave his only begotten Son to be believed in with the heart unto righteousness; for it is so, that man believeth with the heart.

CINCINNATI, February, 1838.

DISCOURSE TWENTY-FIRST.

THE LAW OF LOVE.

Let brotherly love continue.
Hebrews, xiii.—1.

A government within a government is a problem which politicians find it difficult to solve. When no advances are made towards its solution, the church and the State commonly are under one head. How indeed can there be two independent heads in the same body? It is now supposed from the oldest known records of India or the Hindoos, that the priestly authority was at first above the regal. The struggle of Christian priests in Europe for supremacy over Imperial and Kingly power, constitutes an important portion of history. Indeed, the struggle is not yet over. And in our own country it may be only suspended. We would be among the last to disturb the present happy truce.

That Christianity was intended by its founder and head to exist in a social state or in a church form, appears from the New Testament. Did the Lord Jesus Christ intend that his Church should be placed in the same relation to the government of Rome as the Jewish church was then placed? That is, that it should have a sanhedrim or a hierarchy, which though without the power of life and death should be permitted to exercise a high religious authority or become religious persecutors like

the sanhedrim? Were the Apostles and Ministers to become (so to speak) a new Christian sanhedrim? No affirmative answer to this question is to be found in the New Testament. The High Priests and elders do not complain of the Apostles as actual or intentional rivals for power. The matters in dispute between them, were Jesus and the resurrection or points of doctrine rather than government. The desires of the Apostles who should be greatest, were among themselves not in regard to other rivals. Now it is well known that the Jewish High Priesthood under the Grecian or Macedonian and Roman sovereignties, was subject to the control or influence of politicians if not of bribery. Had St. Peter been a High-Priest or in the place of the High-Priest to the new Christian Church would not the Emperors have kept a watchful eye upon him? Might not he too have been threatened and bribes have been offered to him? Considering the fact that a toleration as liberal as that of the Romans, gives rise to frequent and strong jealousies and restraints, and that these were felt by the Jewish hierarchy and people as humiliating and degrading, may we not indulge in the belief that the wisdom of the author of our faith devised a plan to avoid such a condition? But if he did so, is the plan to be found upon record? Let us see. "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friend. These things I com-

mand you, that ye love one another. As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you; continue ye in my love. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another. A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you. For this is the message ye have heard from the beginning, that we should love another. Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us and we ought to lay down our life for the brethren. And this is his commandment, that we should love one another as he gave us commandment. Let brotherly love continue."

We assume that church government in common with others, is a means to accomplish an end and not an end itself. Therefore if Christians are governed as well as they need be or ought to be, the end of church government is answered. Why then should any body have a divine right to destroy a government of love if it answer this end, to make way for another that can answer no better purpose? Government is needed to correct order, but to prevent disorder. Laws are not made to punish the righteous. Let it be supposed that the primitive church was governed by the law of love while under the dominion of Roman power, would it have been the same as a government of power within a government of power? What cognizance could the Emperors have taken of this new species of government? In the Acts of the Apostles we have an account of the doings of Herod? These were

evidently sheer acts ef tyranny and persecution on the part of this tributary king. There is no intimation of any resistance to the goverument on the part of the church or its ministers. His object was to vex; his means—he killed with the sword. It was a military not a civil process. Had it been a matter of power or prerogative between Herod and the Apostles, would not the Imperial power have interfered?

An exercise of conflicting power by the Apostles must have proved of all things the most disastrous; it might have ruined the church as it did the synagogue. Even the allies of Rome were virtually conquered; their show of power might be taken from them whenever it suited the policy of the mistress of nations. Was the Son of David rich? No. He was poor; he had not where to lay his head. Had the King of Judah civil or political power? No. He took upon him the form of a servant, and was with his disciples as one that serveth. A display of wealth and power might have defeated all the testimony in favor of his Messiahship, by bringing him into immediate conflict with the Roman power. For upwards of three years during the personal ministry of our Lord, the nucleus of the church existed. He had twelve select witnesses and many other disciples; at certain times and upon certain occasions many believed on him. Had he then during this period no government? Yes; he had a government of love. Why was not the traitor Judas excommunicated?

Would not such an act have been a display of governing authority rather than of the humility of One whose judgment was taken away? Is it not apparent to an impartial mind on a review of the whole ground, that positive evidence of the exercise of the forms of legal or regal power in this new society, might have called forth an indictment against its head for exercising a government within a government? The whole of that part of the process before Pilate which relates to the regal character and titles of the accused, is a very remarkable part of evangelical history. It clearly shows that the Curator or judge was fully convinced that the prisoner was a legal heir to the throne of David, and that under that conviction he ordered the inscription to be written in three languages upon the cross. One reason why the Jews wished the title to be effaced was, they said, that it was only He that said it. When did he say that he was the King of the Jews? "Thou sayest that I am a King." When Pilate put the question;—"Shall I crucify your King?" The Jews replied;—"We have no King but Cæsar. If thou lettest this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." The time of these disclosures and declarations gives them great importance. It was a trial for life or death. Then Jesus witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate. Then the Jews denied the Holy One and the Just and desired a murderer to be granted unto them, making the memorable declaration;—We

have no King but Cæsar. What would have been the effect upon Pilate, if the Jews had acknowledged the genealogy of Jesus? But what had Apostles and churches to do with the precedents and maxims of their Master and Lord, after the day of Pentecost? The quotations made at large from the gospel and the epistle of St. John, show that in the matter of governing power their relation to Roman power or sovereignty was not the same as that of the Jewish church, and that their only safety was in being governed by the law of love.

The whole history of Roman toleration shows, that this government (like other despotic governments) interposed its power at any time or under any circumstances, if it suspected any danger to the state. It was rather a permission or indulgence subject to recall at will, than a right secured by law. The less authority tolerated people manifested, the less was their dependence upon the state, for the less they awakened its jealousy. The miraculous display of the divine displeasure in the death of Ananias and Sapphira, may perhaps be considered in the then infant state of the church to have been intended to avoid a church trial. When such trials commence they must take the legal form. Prudence must not interfere with the forms of human justice. But the justice of God may be immediate.

Now the law of love or its influence over a select number of new converts, can and often does supersede the necessity of the regular forms of discipline. When all obey, disciplinary forms are not needed.

We repeat, that a display of church authority might have brought the new church under Imperial jealousy. Those disciples had the precepts and the examples of their Master to guide them. "I have washed your feet; wash ye one another's feet." The nature of this brotherly love is identical with the charity described in the thirteenth chapter of the letter to the Corinthians. It has been well shown that the properties and operations of this charity relate immediately to men rather than to God. Thus charity is kind,—to whom? Not to God but to men. Again it doth not behave itself unseemly,—to men. It is not easily provoked,—by men. It thinketh no evil,—of men. How were these lambs among wolves to be as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves, if they had at the very beginning displayed all the insignia of power and all its attributes according to the opinion of certain men respecting church polity, the first aspiration of which is—who shall be greatest? Ecclesiastical writers in searching for Apostolical precedents, seem to lose sight of the nearness of the destruction of Jerusalem to the time of the Apostles. All the precedents taken from the fathers, are subsequent to that event and are mostly Grecian. Few if any instances of native Jewis converts to Christianity, are quoted as authority from the early fathers. The Epistles to the churches are all supposed to have been written, while the temple was yet standing. In the life time of St. Paul, among the mixed churches composed of Jew and Gentile converts brotherly love was not continued accord-

ing to the standard, and the consequences began to be realized. In writing to the Hebrews only, he says,—"Let brotherly love continue." In all his other letters he has spared no pains to show, that all causes or excuses for its non-continuance were obviated by the perfect equality of privileges which the gospel gives both to Jews and Gentiles, that Christ had made of the twain one new man, so making peace.

In process of time it should seem that Jewish converts became less frequent or less distinguished, for as we have said, we hear of scarcely any distinguished name of that class among the (so called) fathers; but fathers with Latin names begin to appear. As brotherly love decreased the signs of hierarchical power increased, for brotherly love is the basis of equality. Can men unite and be kept united through any other medium save love or power? Love attracts and power drives. Ambition is too general and too genial to the human heart, to allow of any long interregnum after love ceases. The difficulty is not in the transition from love to power, but in a return from power to love. In anarchy every heart feels free to seek for mastery. When tyranny usurps government, the incumbent and his friends use laws to restrain rival ambition. But successful anarchists often begin as obscure and unknown men.

But church power cannot long continue under any civil government, without gaining superiority over it or having some conflict with it, or creating

fears or jealousies. The union of church and state is predicated upon the tendency of church government to supremacy and political efforts to prevent it. Both parties consent to give and take. In our own country where the two powers are entirely separated by law, the constitutions and the laws guarantee liberty and rights of conscience to all, and we see no formal or professed resorts to the law of brotherly love between different denominations. Each one exhibits its own independent prerogatives and executes its own rules and judgments; but the civil power limits this individual church sovereignty to spiritual matters, and pledges itself to secure personal liberty and property to those who may be spiritually bound. If the union of church and state were suddenly dissolved in a country where all the people belong to one church, peculiar and unforeseen changes might come to pass. We feel persuaded that this interesting subject is habitually connected with too much personal feeling among us in the Republic, to admit of a full and impartial discussion of it in all its bearings. Notwithstanding all our legal securities and all our voluntary professions of liberality, fears are daily expressed and published that church power may triumph over civil power. But fewer instances of fear are manifested that civil power may prevail. And yet if the two powers be antagonist or may be made so, the danger cannot remain all on one side. A one-sided view is a sure proof of ignorance or error respecting the nature and tendency of principles.

But in the midst of these fears, what is the remedy proposed? The watch-word is,—beware of priest-craft. The civil government is to have no confidence in any religious denomination in the Union. Is such a state of feeling to the honor of religion? Behold! the consequonces. Each denomination to be jealous of others, and the government to be jealous of them all. Turn we then to the New Testament and the primitive church; shall we there find a parallel condition? We shall find the Roman government tolerating different religions while it had a legal religion of its own. What then did the Author of the Christian religion do when he introduced into this vast and despotic empire a new church, and how did he instruct his first ministers to act? Did he wear the insignia of office and authorize his Apostles to wear them? Did he assume the titles of office and authorize his ministers to be called by those titles? The first robes of office which Jesus wore, were put upon him by his prosecutors. "And they platted a crown of thorns and put it upon his head, and they clothed him with a purple robe and said, Hail! King of the Jews and smote him with their hands."

This submission of the Messiah to reproach and shame and the sufferings of crucifixion, is in unison with,—"Love one another as I have loved you. Let brotherly love continue." The commandment was new as a basis of a social system and as a means of casting out fear. There was nothing like it in any

other religion in the Empire. Could the Emperors have made it a treasonable offence in the disciples of Jesus to obey this new commandment? It is customary for teachers to consider brotherly love as a form of expressing a high degree of Christian or social friendship, rather than as answering in given cases the end of government or as a substitute for the formal operations of power. It is also said that the commandment is new only as it regards authority and motive. And the effects of perfect love are mostly referred evclusively to God, as though it casts out fear in regard to God only and not the fear of men also. Perfect love casteth out fear; there is no fear in love because fear hath torment. "He that feareth is not made perfect in love." Is it not true that the fear of the church powers that be hath torment? All indeed agree that the highest acts of obedience spring from love.

Had our Lord spent the time which intervened between the calling of his disciples and his crucifixion in teaching them the art of commanding, he might perhaps have found them not inapt learners. Men improve fast under precepts and examples of sovereignty. But his lessons were of a different character and tendency. The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister. Apprentices in the school of power though compelled to be menial, can soon compensate themselves for such humility. But what compensation can be made for the labor of learning to minister unto others? The remembrance of the honor done to a disciple by his

master in washing his feet, may be soon effaced by the recollection of the obligation it has imposed upon him to wash the feet of his fellow disciples. If all denominations were fully imbued with the belief, that Jesus, their common Master and Lord gave as a new commandment to his disciples brotherly love, and that St. Paul enjoined its continuance because when fully obeyed, it would supersede discipline in so far as it would prevent offences by removing almost all occasions for them, and that therefore they should make no display of power and consider it as no criterion or standard of true religion, but regard every instance of the necessity of discipline and teach others to regard it rather as proof of want of religion than as a test of a succession to it,—would not Christianity bear a different aspect towards civil power from what it generally does? We now glory in the fact, that church power in this free country under its free governments is a subject of political jealousy. Why jealousy without cause is wrong, and it is wrong to give just cause of jealousy. The churches which give just causes for political jealousy, do an injury to religion. The idea of a government within a government should be kept steadily in view by churchmen, and the methods by which in the greatest degree the consequences of this relation may be avoided. Let brotherly love be contemplated, as calculated to allay the prejudices and suspicions of the rulers of this world against church power and to wipe away the reproach of priest-craft.

It will be argued we are aware that all the forms of government must be prepared, all the offices be organized, all the officers be chosen, and that the laws also must be enacted before they are needed. Be it so. It is true that offences against the law of brotherly love must come. The love of many will wax cold. Some will depart from the faith and some will leave their first love. But these facts seem not to us to refute our theory. The very office-bearers in the church should be the conservatives of brotherly love. Theirs should be a government of love, and while love prevails the ends of government are answered. Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart and a good conscience and of faith unfeigned. When the members of a church are so far lost to brotherly love as to bite and devour one another, they have lost the true spirit of their profession. Strife for the mastery over such unloving and unlovely people should they be over-awed by power, would prove but a useless victory.

We take it for granted as a position which needs no proof, that the Spirit of inspiration in constituting a system of religion foresees consequences. This indeed distinguishes inspiration from invention. New inventions must be tested by experiment. The most plausible theories are found often to be erroneous in practice. With history itself in our hands, we cannot tell the precise consequences or results of a particular system as we cannot foresee all the adventitious causes and circumstances.

We do know to a certainty that a hierarchy claiming to be exclusively Christian, has triumphed over civil governments and that too by system; and we know too that the system is still maintained as of divine right, and that when it can no longer reign paramount it unites with the state. The prescient founder of the Christian church foresaw these events. But if he said nothing and did nothing to prevent them, may it not be inferred that he willed that it should be so? Much has been said about divine permission to sin. The maxim is common,—God is not the author of sin but permits it. Let us not confound permission with negligence or want of diligence in civil magistrates. The Providence of God bears no resemblance to the coercion of absolute power. Jesus we say, did not permit his disciples to encourage others to call them Rabbi, Rabbi, that is he forbade them. He did not permit them to govern the church as the lords and kings of the gentiles, that is he forbade them. He did not permit them to hate one another. He did not permit brotherly love to cease, for he commanded that it should continue. If the church had continued to be governed by the examples and precepts of her head, every body must perceive that the deviations from them could not have been recorded. The Lord Jesus did not permit ministers to do what he forbade them to do. But he knew what would come to pass, if his authority were not regarded. The spirit of prophecy spake expressly of some, who in the last days would

depart from the faith. They could not exalt themselves unless they departed from the faith. He that keeps the faith must be humble.

Most of the persecutions of the church while the Sanhedrim existed, were under their orders or approbation. The Romans seem to have regarded the disciples of Jesus for some time as a sect of Jews, rather than a separate church. Here we see the wisdom of our Lord in directing and of the Apostles in obeying his directions, not to make any display of power but to let brotherly love continue. That they aimed thus to obey, may be inferred from the fact that they were not involved in the destruction of Jerusalem; for if they had given occasion to the Romans to suspect them, their retreat to Mount Pella would not have saved them. The minor denominations of Christians after the reformation made attempts to separate the church from the state; and to them and their descendants chiefly this country is indebted for universal liberty of conscience. But certain writers on this subject seem not to be fully aware of the consequences of the political jealousies, to which independent church government in a state may give rise. Indeed instances occur of a temerity and recklessness of consequences, as though it were a virtue to set "powers that be" at defiance. Many good men in their zeal show little solicitude to stop at a point where they can check and control the impetus which may continue after the first cause subsides. Enthusiasm may be detected in these cases, but if we mistake not there is an inattention

to or a misapprehension of the nature and relations of governments. Social actions in a state which are not authorised by law, are apt to be suspected if not feared. Though at first the novelty may attract attention yet the uncertainty of the issue may create anxiety. Executive authorities are to take care that the republic receive no detriment. Political prudence suggest that evils should be nipped in the bud. It is one among the unhappy consequences of bad systems and of bad laws, that they cannot be checked immediately even by wise legislation. A decree of an Emperor could have crushed the infant church in a day. His suspicion would have been death. What a comment on brotherly love are these words of St. Paul writing from Rome! "All the saints salute you, chiefly they of Cæsar's household." Cæsar feared not those whom he took unto his household. Writers speak of ten (or of a number of) persecutions under the heathen Emperors or Cæsars. Did all who claimed to be successors of Apostles throughout these persecutions, obey the precept in the text? Is it not true that brotherly love has nothing in it to feed or to flatter the carnal mind? When did Bishops first appear in canonical robes? Was it before or after Imperial jealousy began to be awakened? The persecutions of Nero are regarded by historians among his caprices as a tyrannical and cruel madman?

An opinion is gaining strength in our mind that a new era of brotherly love having a more immediate reference to church government, must arrive be-

fore the Christian can make any great peaceful advances. Among learned writers upon church polity we hear little about a brotherly-love government. And why should we? Whoever heard of such a government? Is it either Scriptural or possible? Was it not the government of our Lord and prescribed by him to his disciples? And if all the learned and pious ministers of the gospel should devote themselves to recommend it in theory and in practice, why might it not be possible? But perhaps this government might require a conversion to love as well as to faith. Brotherly love is more than personal friendship. Church courts answer not their end when conducted merely in the spirit of civil courts. Justice may be awarded where love is but cold and perhaps more rigidly. Justice is a terrible attribute; and if it must always appear in the church with its naked sword, it will become Christians to keeps the secrets of their own hearts locked up in their own bosoms. How would it have been possible for an Inquisition to come into existence, if brotherly love had continued?

The infidel world is jealous of church rule. And there are persons so jealous of the churches they like best as to cause them to delay in joining them. And still all preach up brotherly love in every thing save church government. For a long time we could see no bearing of this precept upon the court of the Lord Bishop, supposing that it concerned the private brethren only. Even now when we hear high-sounding canonical titles, it is difficult to preserve

in our minds their associations with brotherly love. Pastoral charge and Pastor of the church are it is true plain and easy names, but the tone and manner in which they are sometimes repeated is little calculated to excite ideas of reciprocal affection. St. Peter would have brethren to submit one to another, to love as brethren and above all to be clothed with humility.

Nothing now remains to be said in praise of brotherly love as a personal virtue. Its eulogy has been exhausted by poets and orators. Churches are well supplied with versification set to music to be sung in its commendation. But the suspicions of the powers of the world and of those who would be in power against religious or church fraternities, are not allayed. Many of the most ardent friends of liberty and equality have little or no confidence in church power. "Is he a churchman? Then he is fond of power." Could this reproach have come without some cause? Could it have been perpetuated as a mere slander in the very face of the sure and certain marks of discipleship? "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." In states, private opinions generate no public influence. If opinion in any public social body is not sufficient to change a law or usage, it cannot surely be trusted by others. But sleeping laws are not dead. May they not but seem to sleep? Politicians are trained to take nothing upon trust, to judge nothing by appearances. When a class of teachers shall have arisen profoundly

skilled in the science and art of government, and well acquainted with the weak and strong sides of politicians, and yet fully imbued with the spirit of brotherly love as a governing spirit, and shall have converted whole churches to their principles and feelings, then will the jealousy of politicians begin to cease, and will continue to diminish as long as the corrective continues to operate. Can any other means be pointed out, by which confidence can be restored and continued unto the church? But what can brotherly love do with the wild beast of vice? There are cases of depravity which religion can neither control nor punish, and the attempt might endanger its own purity. A determination to persevere in the use of force must end in testing power, and what but power can then decide.

In every lesson of instruction given by our Lord to the ministers of his gospel, there is internal evidence of truth. In the whole course of that teaching which instructed a church how to prevent the gates of hell from prevailing against it, not a life was sacrificed, not a character traduced and not an artifice employed to deceive. That so promiscuous a body of men as those who composed the first churches—not one of whom could have been born and educated in the community or had any historical examples—should have passed through a provoking, insulting, and cruel persecution without retaliation, though their persecutors were not supreme in power, is an evidence how wisely and how well they were instructed. Such wisdom was from above.

It was first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated. The fruits of righteousness were sown in peace of them that make peace. But our churches are wisely and well governed. We mean not to pass an opinion upon any church government where credit is claimed for good intentions. We readily accord it. Errors in theory may accidentally and indirectly increase the sincerity of good men as well as their zeal. If, says the proverb, the instrument be blunt, more strength must be put forth. So if a theory be faulty and the faults are not perceived, new and greater efforts must be used to correct consequences. The aim of all is to secure the ends of government; and assuming a theory to be correct, great efforts are made to ensure success, and as conscience attests sincerity in ignorance or error, the testimony may be urged in proof of truth. How, it may be and often is asked, can so sincere and good a man be wrong? But no suspicion being entertained of the bluntness of the tool or the error in theory, more practical efforts may be put forth by the sincere. If the Apostles had killed one person or caused one to be killed for Christ's sake (they had no lack of provocation,) if they had indulged in a spirit of revenge, they would have forfeited confidence as the ministers of him who came not to destroy men's lives but to save them. Must not all ministers of the church of Christ seek to conform to the primitive standard? Behold! the fact,—that church power has been exerted to the utmost to accomplish its purposes without brotherly love and

with sincere confidence in its efficacy. But the attempts have not only often failed; they have produced suspicion and even odium.

The advocates of the theory which places the earth in the centre instead of the sun, to account for many appearances filled the heavens with epicycles,—a most complex plan. A king fond of astronomical studies, is reported to have said;—Had I been present when the Almighty created the universe (upon this supposed system) I could have suggested some good advice. So no doubt, certain sceptics have thought if not said in regard to church government. But neither the king nor the sceptic knowing the true systems, would have any advice to suggest. Church government has been so modified by wheels within wheels, as to become as complex as Ptolemy's system of epicycles. It is not the church but this sun of righteousness which is the centre of the Scriptural system. Is not brotherly love in the church like the centripetal force or the attraction of affinity, by which members ever towards each other move?

> This is the bond of perfectness,
> Thy spotless charity;
> Oh, let us still we pray possess,
> The mind that was in thee!

But not only in the time of persecution is love the uniting and sustaining power. It is necessary also in prosperity. In worldly prosperity, we feel a thousand attractions which tend to divert our attentions from our duty to our brethren.

CINCINNATI, March, 1838.

DISCOURSE TWENTY-SECOND.

THE SPIRIT OF ADOPTION.

But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.
Galatians iv. 4—7.

The question naturally arises in an inquiring mind, why did not the Saviour appear immediately after sin entered into the world and death by sin? A question of this kind seems to be presupposed by the text,—when the fulness of the time was come." There are times when more advantages can be brought into co-operation and more and greater effects be produced, than at other times—secondary causes being admitted. Nations have times of increase, of maturity and of decline. If the Saviour had been sent forth into the world immediately after the fall, there would have been no time for a promise of a coming Saviour to have been an object of faith and hope. The fact would have been regarded as an object of history, just as the fall of man is regarded as an object of history. But until the fulness of the time did come, the promise of a Saviour to come was to be believed and the fulfilment of it hoped for. That time, that fulness of the time therefore, became a centre point as it were in which faith and hope in a promise and faith in its fulfilment met. Faith in the history or the truth

of the history is fully supported by evidences of facts. But these kind of evidences must be wanting when the object of faith is historical from the beginning or abstractly historical. Abraham and David believed and hoped, that when the fulness of the time should come God would send forth his Son. When that time was come, Simeon and Anna believed that they saw the Lord's Christ. And his disciples were fully confirmed in their belief by the resurrection. The greatest diversity of evidence is thus furnished, and opportunities to detect error or fraud or deception if any there be. In the prophecies of the coming Messiah, there was a variety of circumstances combined into a whole to be fulfilled. One prophet foretold the place where he should be born. Another foretold the time, and others the manner and the incidents of his life. So also of his death and resurrection. Now all these events cannot be combined naturally or artificially into a whole at any time or at one time, as well as at another. And a peculiar time is most convenient for their combination in the order of Providence. The Messiah was made under the law and was made of a woman. This could not have been done at one time as well as at any other time. There were long intervals of time, when the law could not be carried into operation in all its requirements, especially those which related to the country or the places; as for example the time of the Babylonish captivity. Hence the great anxiety of the friends of the law to secure their national in-

dependence and for the return of the people from captivity. In the various changes of the house of David, in order to fulfil the prophecies it was necessary that a time should come when there should be a female heiress. Mary the mother of Jesus was descended from Solomon, and she was espoused to Joseph as the next nearest relative in the lateral branch of the family. The birth-right and title of Jesus as the son of David according to the flesh, were through his mother Mary in default of a male heir. If therefore she had had a brother the case would have been altered. Was this the only instance in the history of the descendants of David, in which there was only an heiress? The coming of the Messiah was promised at the time of the second temple. This temple was built after the return from the captivity, and it was destroyed by the Romans about seventy years after the birth of Christ. The full time was therefore come for the Lord to come into the second temple and thus make the glory of that house greater than that of the former. But the time was passed after the temple was destroyed. There has not been another temple built at Jerusalem by the Jewish people since. A Mahommedan Mosque occupies the eminence on which the temple stood.

The time of the Roman Empire under Augustus Cæsar, the first Imperator or Emperor, who succeeded to his uncle Julius the perpetual dictator and put an end to the civil wars, was a time more favorable to religious toleration and intercommuni-

cation among the nations which yielded to or feared the power of Rome, than any other known period. The West of Asia, the North of Africa, the South and East of Europe had submitted to Rome. Judea was reduced to a Roman province. This was also a time of learning or a learned age. Civilization was never so generally extended over the same countries. Arts and letters may have been carried to a higher degree of excellence in certain places; but the Augustinian age is the learned age of the Roman Empire. Roman laws and Roman legions protected Roman subjects. The Jews and their religion were generally protected and tolerated. It was a time too when language favored intercourse. The Greek language from the days of Alexander the Great, became common in the countries governed by his successors and conquered by the Romans and in the city of Rome itself. It became the language of the New Testament. Empire, learning, science, arts and civilization to a considerable extent prevailed over the countries around the Mediterranean and Egean seas and south shore of the Black Sea, when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea.

The law of Moses was tolerated among the Jews and observed generally with much zeal. The Priests, the Rulers and the People earnestly expected the appearance of the long-looked for Messiah. It was well understood that he was to be of the house and lineage of David, that he was to be born in Bethlehem the property of Jesse of the tribe of Judah,

that the time foretold by Daniel was near and that he would appear in the second temple.

Jesus Christ was born, made or educated under the law. Nobody doubted his legal birth or religion. He observed and fulfilled the law. He came not to destroy the law but to fulfil it. The offerings prescribed at the birth of the first-born were offered. He was dedicated or consecrated in the temple, he kept the passover and attended the synagogues. In genealogical blood he was pure,—a Prince of the tribe of Judah and of the ancient line of kings, that he might redeem them that were under the law.

The law including its sacrifices and all its ceremonies, it was contended by the doctors and is still contended by them, is of eternal obligation. Behold! the great point of controversy. The gospel maintains that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Now both parties agreed that the Gentiles were not under the law or that it was not given by Moses to them. They were not admitted as proselytes unless they submitted to circumcision. According to the doctors of the law, the whole of the sacrificial and ritual law of Moses was to be perpetuated in the kingdom or church of the Messiah, and all the Gentile believers of it were to be bound to become observers of it;—that is, all the Gentiles in order to become subjects of the kingdom of the Messiah must become Jews. St. Paul on the contrary contended that Christ was made under the law and born and

educated a Jew, that he might redeem them who would otherwise continue bound to observe the law,—that is, the gospel converts Jews into Christians or sacrificers into believers instead of converting Gentiles into Jews. Those therefore who accept the merits of Christ's sacrifice by faith, need not offer sin-offerings to atone for their own sins. Both opinions agree in the conclusion, that distinctions between Jews and Gentiles must be lost in the new kingdom. But for the honor of the law, the Jewish teachers contended that it must be maintained in all its forms,—overlooking the honor of the Son of God. In truth however the law loses nothing of its honor, if those who are freed from it are redeemed from it or its curses. How does the honor of the law suffer by Jesus Christ being the end of it for righteousness to every one that believeth? Is not this the highest honor that can be conferred upon it? The Jewish people must have been delivered from the yoke of bondage or the Gentiles must have been brought under it, in order to become equal as members of Christ's kingdom. The plan therefore of redeeming those who were under the law, places Jews and Gentiles upon a footing of equality as free believers. Let the question be put:—What right had the Messiah to exonerate those Jews who believe in him from sacrificing or giving the offerings required by the law? The answer is easy and ready:—he has redeemed them, they are his own. The law has no longer any demands upon them for sin-offerings. The merit of

his one sacrifice for sin is complete. It is not the number and the frequency of the sacrifices, but the intrinsic or actual value of the one-sacrifice of Christ himself, offered by himself in the fulness of the time. The merit of atonement is not in the quantity of the blood, but in its quality. Might we not seem to hear the Saviour say:—I have magnified the law of sacrifices and made it honorable; now do you magnify my sacrifice by believing in it, by trusting in its merits alone for your salvation. Why will you still continue to observe the law of typical sacrifices? Do you suppose that my sacrificial blood cannot cleanse from all sin?—The law of sacrifices as a dispensation never was intended to be perpetual, but like a school-master designed for a state of non-age to bring Jews unto Christ. "Now this I say, that the child though an heir differs in nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all, but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed." To retain the sacrifices in the church under the gospel dispensation then, would be like retaining school-masters for men who have entered upon their estates.

As believers in Christ we receive the adoption of sons, and therefore God sends forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts crying Abba, Father. If the Messiah had been a Gentile and so not made under the law, he could not have redeemed the Jews from their legal obligations. They must have remained under the privation of the inheritance as sons. If he had not been made of a woman he could not have

redeemed any body. The Scriptures say;—Sacrifices and offerings and burnt-offerings thou would'st not, nor hast thou had pleasure in them;—and they also say;—A body hast thou prepared for me. Then said I, Lo! I come to do thy will oh, God! He took not hold on angels or angelic nature, but he took hold on the seed of Abraham. He was made lower than the angels, otherwise he could not have suffered a sacrificial death or tasted death for every man. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us. Now in the controversy respecting the effects of redemption upon the moral obligation of the redeemed, is it not worthy of notice that redemption from the curse of a broken law affects the breakers and not the law which is broken? The redeeming of the Jews from under the law was in effect to change their citizenship, or to prepare the way for a transfer of their allegiance so soon as they should become believers in Christ. And so far it answers to a political redemption. Should the High Priest have demanded of his countrymen;—Why do you not bring the legal sacrifices to the altar?—might they not have answered—We are no longer subjects of the sacrificial law but we have become the subjects of the Lord Jesus Christ by believing in him. But if he had asked a Jew;—Why do you commit idolatry?—could the Jew have answered?—I am no longer a Jew but a believer and a Christian; Christ hath repealed the law against idolatry, and there being no law there is no transgression. What would the High Priest

have said in reply to this? What does common sense say in reply to it? Did Christ come to repeal the law against idolatry? Is the making and the worshipping of idols no longer a sin?

For a Gentile to become a Jew or a convert to the Jewish religion, the law required that he should be circumcised. "I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." This law like other laws makes no exceptions but exacts universal obedience to all its enactments. Christ does not make those Gentiles free from the yoke of bondage who have voluntarily come under it. Those therefore who were circumcised after they had believed in Christ, St. Paul says were cut off from grace. There was a voluntary separation from the gracious government of Christ. The idea is, that we cannot occupy a middle ground,—one while for the law and another for faith, sometimes Moses and sometimes Christ. Jews who had never committed idolatry were not cursed as idolators, and if they became Christians and kept themselves from idols they would still remain exempt from the curse. But idolatry cannot cease to be a sin by reason of any faith in Christ or any act of grace. A professed believer who worships and serves idols, is not held guiltless. To suppose and believe that redemption from the curse of the law means to remove the obligations to obey moral law, would be in effect to reverse the very end of redemption which is to redeem us from all iniquity. "Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us

from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." Redeem? How? What does that mean? Not surely to abolish all law against iniquity, so that what was iniquity or moral evil shall be iniquity or moral evil no longer. For example,—does it mean, not that a man who was a thief should be made to be a thief no more, but that theft should cease to be unlawful because the law is repealed? Now if one man takes the property of another, the loss to him whose property is taken is the same with or without law. But if the law against theft is in force, the thief is obnoxious to its penalty. But when men are redeemed from offering sin-offerings by one offering of more value than all others together, the state of the case is very different. Men leave off doing an action by way of remedy or relief, because another and a better remedy is provided for him by a friend. A sin-offering or an atonement is not in its nature an act of moral obedience, but supposes that moral offence has been committed and that justice demands the penalty of the law and that the conscience responds to it. No man can feel willing to make an atonement unless he be conscious of guilt. The believer who is justified by faith believes in the atoning principle and believes that the atonement for his sins has been made fully and perfectly, and therefore he needs do nothing himself to add to its merits. Sin-offerings cease to be made after justifying faith, as the taking of medicine is dispensed with when the disease is cured. Should we say the law of medi-

cine is repealed or that the law of disease is repealed? The maxim of the Saviour is,—"Behold! thou art made whole, sin no more lest a worse thing come upon thee."

Well, the soul is fully and freely pardoned by grace through faith; the sonship is acknowledged by the sending forth into the heart the Spirit of Adoption crying Abba, Father; and sin-offerings cease and give place to songs in praise of redeeming love. Let us examine now how the moral commandments are affected. Must it not be apparent that they are not and need not be affected at all, but may remain just as they were not being in the way to prevent any good? If the sacrificial law had impeached any Jew for neglecting to bring the offering to the priest before the altar and his moral character had stood fair, his faith would have been a sufficient apology. The question seems to have been overlooked, though it bears some analogy to our modern question of expatriation. Must not a Jew be always a Jew? Not so. He may become a Christian by faith. And a Gentile need not become a Jew in order to believe in Jesus. The principle of redemption intervenes, meeting and obviating all difficulties. "To redeem them that are under the law," saith the Scripture. The redeemed are under the authority of the Redeemer. "Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a price." Ye did not redeem yourselves. What was the intention of the Redeemer? He intended, that all believing Jews might receive the adoption of sons

and be no longer like minors under tutors and governors. "Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son, and if a son then an heir of God through Christ." Hence the contrast;—"Ye are not under the law but under grace." To be under the law of sacrifices is to be a servant. All the believing or converted Gentiles were under grace, were adopted sons. Moses the mediator through whom the law was given, was but a servant; he could not raise those for whom he ministered. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. When a man is condemned to death as a penalty of a broken law,—"The soul that sinneth, it shall die"—he cannot purchase his own pardon. We say that grace is free or free grace, but the words in regard to the pardoned are synonymous. Those who can redeem themselves from the curse or penalty of the law, make void the law.

There are obviously two meanings of the word *redemption* as it is used in Scripture. In regard to the moral law, it means the meriting of pardon for past transgressions of that law. In regard to the law of types and shadows which has intrinsic moral qualities, it means the fulfilling and superseding or repealing of it and all its sacrifices and ceremonies—that faith in Christ may have no object of a sacrificial form or name to divide it, and so it may be concentrated upon the sacrifice of Christ alone. The typical washings of the law having no moral influence or effect when the renewing influence of the Holy Spirit typified by them was shed forth

abundantly, were no longer of any use. If a sign stand for a letter or word in language, it cannot by any rule or reason be made to exclude the letter or word, or to be written in combination with it. The claim or right is in the thing signified. Christ was signified by the types and not the types by him. This is made plain by the following;—"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect; for then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. He taketh away the first that he may establish the second," that is, "the offering of the body of Jesus once for all." The whole passage is a logical demonstration of the doctrine, that the shadowy law is abolished by the presence of the substance or body shadowed. The sacrificing of animals is not the very image of the good things to come, not the *fac simile* of the Messiah bleeding, dying on the cross, and rising again from the dead. We hear no more in the gospel about binding the sacrifices with cords to the horns of the altar; but, we hear—"God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; not by works but by grace."

In regard to sin (properly so called) or transgres-

sion of moral principles, no distinctions are made between Jew and Gentile. All have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and all are and must be justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ. But as has been shown the ceremonial and sacrificial law of Mount Sinai hitherto binding on the Jews alone, must under the gospel have been binding upon both Jews and Gentiles or upon neither, or they could not have been united in one church or worshipping community. Which then was most advantageous for both parties,—to have subjected them both to this law of sacrifices or to have freed them both from it? St. Peter met the question. He says that this part of the law of Moses is a yoke of bondage which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear;—" why then tempt ye God to impose it upon the Gentiles." Considering then the sacrificial law in the only two lights or views in which it can be considered, as a means or as an end,—what is the result? If as an end, the question is settled; it must remain. But if as a means, then it may cease with the accomplishment of the end. So when scaffolding is a means, when the building is completed it is removed. The analogy is universal. The mind of the pupil and not the school-master is the end of education. The work to be done is the end and the tool the means. The first and great principle comprehended in the moral law,—Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c.—is an end and not a means. The distinction between means and ends is well

expressed in the words;—"receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls." Christ has not redeemed us, cannot redeem us from the obligation to love God with all our heart, &c. But the end of his death is, that he may redeem us from the guilt and punishment of not having so loved him. This first and greatest command and the sacrificial death of Christ, stand in no relation to each other of shadow and substance. Redemption indeed lays under renewed obligation to love God and procures for us grace to enable us to obey this law, instead of setting it aside.

We press the consideration of this subject upon the minds of those who are not clear, that redemption does not and cannot weaken or destroy the obligations of the moral law or any moral principle whether written or unwritten. What does a believing Gentile do? He does not become circumcised and resort to sacrifices and burnt offerings and offerings for sin; or if the believer be a Jew he ceases to offer them and to trust in them though they remain in the letter of the law. But for what purposes were those sacrifices? Only as types or shadows of redemption. They never had any merit in themselves. To leave off sacrificing then, involves no moral privation to ourselves or injury to others. While the law was in force disobedience to it referred immediately to the authority of God. Before this fulness of the time, faith was in the Messiah to come that is in a promise, and of course took on the form and action of hope,—hope

that he would come or that the promiser would fulfil it. The observance of the instituted types of good things promised, answers to an expression of that hope. It is like a language of signs. David believed in the merits of a Saviour to come, and continued to sacrifice as expressive of his hope. Paul when believing in the same Saviour as having come, left off sacrificing. But mark the difference though they were both believers. The latter could not, like the former, hope that the Saviour would come, his very faith being in the fact that he had come. Do not all these arguments plainly show why the legal sacrifices should cease after Christ came and made the great atonement? Before that time they signified hope; and after that time hope that he would come, implied unbelief or doubt that he had come. Had David been asked,—Why do you sacrifice? Would he not have answered,—Because I believe the Messiah will come? But had St. Paul been asked,—Why do you not continue to sacrifice? Would he not have answered,—Because I believe that the Messiah has come, I believe that Jesus of Nazareth is the Lord's Christ? And the same reasons continue to the present day. Those Jews now who do not believe that the Saviour has come, believe that he will come. Those Jewish believers who were justified by faith and not in their own estimation by the merits of their own sacrificial works, received the adoption of sons and were treated as sons, not as servants. God sent forth the spirit of his Son into their hearts

crying Abba, Father,—not master,—that Spirit which Isaiah saith dwelt with the child before he knew or was able to say *Ab* and *Im* or *Pa* and *Ma*. The Spirit of his Son, the Spirit of Adoption, and the Spirit of Truth seem to mean the same Spirit. Hence if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his, the Spirit of adoption bears not witness with his spirit that he is a child of God.

But how are we to understand the mode of this spiritual operation? Does it produce a feeling or a sentiment, or an opinion or an idea? The words seem to favor the former. "God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts." It is however not to be overlooked that the language of the ancients in regard to the moral and intellectual faculties and their operations, was more general or less discriminative than it is at present; so that we cannot now distinctly classify the meaning of their terms or tell when they meant feeling and when thought or when both. The centre of the pleasurable and the painful feelings is in or near the physical organ called the heart. This is the place to which we all naturally point or allude when we attempt to describe our feelings. Spirit was commonly opposed to matter and the heart to the external parts of the body; but the thinking faculty is also inward.

Now it is a fact, that we may have thoughts or ideas in our minds distinct and different from the feelings of our hearts; and that we may have feel-

ings in our hearts which have not or do not seem to have any agreement with our thoughts. These facts may have given rise to discussions about religious feelings and opinions, or experimental and theoretical religion. The Spirit of inspiration spoke not in an unknown tongue to those it first addressed, but in a language they best understood. The progress of natural discovery and of improvements in language were not anticipated, for the language would have remained unintelligible until this advanced state of science. A little reflection cannot but lead us to perceive that there is some connection between our thoughts and feelings, though we comprehend not how they are connected. It would indeed sound strange to hear of a loving brain and a hating brain, but should it ever be demonstrated that the brain or organ of thought does feel love and hatred it would be difficult to introduce these new terms into common use. There is a zealous class of teachers who maintain that the Spirit of adoption or witness of the Spirit or assurance, is sentient or a feeling of the heart and in the heart in opposition to the thoughts or ideas of the mind; and they sustain their position by arguing the fact, that this is a spirit of love, and that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. There can be no doubt that the Holy Spirit according to the Scripture, is the Spirit of Adoption which bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God. But the question still remains, is the mode of this operation

wholly sentient or confined to the heart? On the other side, a more numerous body of teachers deny the sentient witness or the feeling of the witness of the spirit. They contend the feelings of the heart are not to be relied upon as evidence of religion, and that Christians have really no such witness that they are the children of God. The common opinion is, that these parties cannot be both right.

They who favor feeling or experience are apt to be positive. They say that they know their own feelings, that the Spirit of Adoption constrains them to cry Abba, Father, and that the love of Christ constrains them to obey. But the moralists regard this as enthusiasm or delusion. And the experimentalists charge them in turn with formality and head religion, and mere opinions. Now is it not possible, that both the parties in this controversy may be partly right? Must not the final proof in this case depend upon the knowledge of the properties or attributes of the brain or thinking faculty. Those who may deny that the organ of thought cannot feel either love or hatred, or emotions of joy or sorrow, will not surely deny that this organ can and does think of these objects. Compelled then as they must be, to admit that thoughts of love and hatred and of joy and sorrow, and also of faith and doubts and hopes and fears are in the mind; must they not have recourse to nice distinctions to sustain the position that the brain can have no religious feeling? The thoughts of love are in the living active mind. Ideas of the causes and consequences

of it may be there. Are then all the feelings or sensations of it confined exclusively to the heart? We may affirm that the heart does not think, but have we equal evidence that the mind or organ of thought does not feel? A natural if not constant expression of love is in the eye, which is nearly connected with the brain by the optic nerve. In disordered or morbid states of the feelings, a corresponding state of the brain or of the mind is commonly obvious,—as for example in intoxication from alcohol. May we not therefore say without using technical words, that when the brain thinks actively it takes on or has certain modes of feeling, and that no feeling which depends upon thought or knowlege is wholly confined to the heart? We feel increased degrees of circulation in the vessels of the head, and it becomes apparent in the whole countenance. Assuming or admitting that the operation or influence of the Spirit of Adoption is experienced in the heart, by what constitutional or physical law are we compelled to confine it to the heart alone?

Almost all the advocates of religious feelings, have to struggle against the fact of the sinking of the feelings in regard to religion as well as in all other cases. When the standard of perfection is made to consist in a constant feeling of the Spirit's influence, the changes and suspensions which take place are referred to various causes without supposing that one cause may be found in the mind itself. Strong sentient action or emotion cannot be long kept up, with-

out affecting the thinking organs. The law of stimulus or excitement holds universally, whatever may be the cause. After a certain time the feelings subside. This is daily witnessed in sleep. Deprived of this natural repose the mind becomes deranged. The generality of persons cannot endure strong spiritual or religious emotion or action for two parts of a day, though they might sleep well for a third part. All preternatural or spiritual excitement fatigues the mind in vigorous health, and when health fails soon prostrates its energies.

Persons who pay little or no regard to mind or thought in religion, have been reproached for living by frames of feeling—all up or all down—and have given rise to doubts respecting the reality of experimental religion. The spirit spoken of in the text which God sends forth into the heart crying Abba, Father, we doubt not may be felt in the heart; and also that it is desirable it should be strongly felt so as to elicit emphatically the expression Abba, Father. Strong and ardent feelings seek to give themselves vent in some corresponding expression. So David moved with grief for the loss of his son cried out,—Oh, Absalom my son! And Thomas in joyful surprise exclaimed,—My Lord and my God! He who feels fully confident of his sonship may cry,—Oh, my father, my father!

'Tis love, 'tis love,
I hear the whisper in my heart;
The morning breaks,
The shadows flee,—
Pure universal love thou art.

The mind as we suppose partakes in fact of the feeling of love; the morning breaks and the shadows flee from it also. The transition from feeling to thinking or from thinking to feeling is not naturally violent nor painful. There is no long break or vacuum. And if we are not always conscious of the relations and changes, they may be real. So objects may really pass before our senses without our perceiving or recollecting them. The laws of the mind and of the senses are not merely mechanical.

A crisis in the experience of one who is adopted as a son, may have come. All is calm and still and without feeling within. The heart seems cold and even dead. How many sad strains have been sung to express this doubtful state or to condole with it! —how many prayers have been offered up for relief, and how many promises applied with arguments and reasons to enforce them—and all upon the supposition of some mystery in the operation of grace, without once suspecting the possibility that the thinking faculty may have been acted on until its power to act is exhausted or that a wrong direction may have been given to it. The habitually pious who think correctly and steadily upon this glorious plan of redemption and salvation by grace through faith, though they may have their seasons of ecstacy and their quiescent states, have not those distressing scenes of gloom and dejection; for if their mental powers are too much exhausted to rise to ecstacy, the Spirit of Truth is to them as a spirit of thought and reflection. It is an error as we suppose to place the word of truth in opposition to the spirit of truth, as the letter that killeth in contrast to the spirit that giveth life. The letter that killeth is not the letter of the gospel or of gospel promises. When for instance a believer thinks or reasons and reflects upon the spoken or written promise of adoption, it does not kill, it has no tendency to damp or repress the ardor of devotional feelings but to remove doubts and confirm and strengthen confidence.

Though many of the writers in favor of religious experience have undervalued religious thoughts,—while the advocates for reason have assumed that the organs of thought, though supposed to be composed of nervous substance or matter, cannot feel and that the heart ought not in order to avoid enthusiasm; it seems to us that if we can be conscious of any one thing, we may be that the heart can feel as purely and correctly as the mind can think, when both are influenced and instructed by the spirit and the word of the gospel, and that religious feelings may be so powerful without being extravagant, that they cannot continue long in the same degree uninterruptedly without exhausting the natural vigor of body and mind. Thus without any sin or sinful cause, our religious feelings may vary and be liable to suspensions. The great importance of feeling or consciousness in regard to adoption and assurance, must appear evident by analogy to all cases in which feeling or thought pertains to the same subject or case. We feel hunger and thirst, and we think of eating and drinking. But what would be the result of reason alone without appetite? So we may love a person and think of the person beloved. But let the affection and the ideas be separated, and what would be the character and amount of human friendships? Is it not of great importance that we should understand well the difference between the modes of the mind and the heart in reference to goodness? Can any one love any good and not think about it? Not it is presumed for any considerable time. Can a person think of any good and not love it? He may think of it to hate it and to oppose it, or to seek arguments and excuses for doing so.

Let a child of God by adoption and grace, feel a full assurance of his acceptance with God through Christ; let him stand in this grace and rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory and let his peace surpass all understanding. Then when he shall become calm and tranquil in his feelings, let him re-

flect and meditate upon the great mystery of Godliness in all its bearings and relations to the salvation of his own immortal soul, and will he not gain wisdom by observation as well as by experience? Nothing can be more plainly expressed than the object of this text, which is to show the great advantages that the Jews would gain by the gospel over those which they had under the law and that these advantages were to be common to them and the Gentiles.

Modern Gentile believers do not perhaps fully appreciate the benefits and privileges, which sincere Jews as believers derived from the gospel. Those words,—having redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,—have an application to those to whom the law was given and who were of course under the law,—the curse being personally and immediately pronounced against them; "Cursed is every man who continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." As strangers to the book of the law Gentiles heard not this curse. Speaking of the sins of the Gentiles the Apostle says;—"the time of that ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent."

Though it was a great favor and honor that the keeping of the oracles of God was confided to the Jews, it involved them also in high responsibilities, from which by believing in Christ they were made free. Thankful then as we ought to be for our high and holy calling, we should never contemplate the blessings of the gospel to the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh without increasing gratitude. Now the distinction between Jew and Gentile is lost in a common equality in grace, and Christ is All and in All.

CINCINNATI, March, 1838.

THE END.