

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/  
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/  
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/  
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/  
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/  
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

- Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur
  - Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées
  - Pages restored and/or laminated/  
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
  - Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/  
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
  - Pages detached/  
Pages détachées
  - Showthrough/  
Transparence
  - Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression
  - Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue
  - Includes index(es)/  
Comprend un (des) index
- Title on header taken from: /  
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:
- Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison
  - Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison
  - Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: / There are some creases in the middle of pages.  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/  
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

*Wm. John Payer*

THE  
CHRISTIAN GLEANER.

NEW SERIES.

---

VOL. I. HALIFAX, MARCH, 1838. No. 10.

---

“ PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD.”

---

SACRED EXTRACTS.

---

IMPORTANCE OF BAPTISM.

“ John *did baptize*, and preach the *baptism* of repentance for the remission of sins.” Mark i. 4.

“ He that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved.” Mark xvi. 16.

“ Except a man be *born of water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” John iii. 5.

“ The like figure whereunto even *baptism* doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” 1 Pet. iii. 18.

“ According to his mercy he *saved us*, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” Titus iii. 5.

“ There is, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.” Ephes. iv. 5.

“ Repent and be *baptized* every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” “ Then they that gladly received his word were baptized.” Acts ii. 38.

“ What doth hinder me to be baptized.” “ If thou believeth with all thine heart, thou mayest.” Acts viii. 36.

“ When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were *baptized*, both men and women.” Acts viii. 12.

“As many as received him, to them gave he power (or privilege) to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name.” John i. 12.

“Ye are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” Gal. iii. 25.

“We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” “God be thanked that (though) ye were the servants of sin, ye have obeyed from the heart, that form of doctrine, which was delivered you.” Rom. vi.

“Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.” Heb. x. 22.

## EXTRACTS FROM THE “CHRISTIAN PREACHER.”

### THE TYPE AND ANTITYPE OF SALVATION.

Pet. iii. 18—21. *For even Christ has once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God? being put to death, indeed, in the flesh, but made alive by the Spirit. By which he also made proclamation to the Spirits in prison, who formerly were disobedient, when the patience of God once waited, in the days of Noah, while an ark was preparing, in which few, that is eight souls, were affectually saved through water:—the antitype, immersion, does also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh; but the seeking of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.—(New translation—Ed.) \* \**

He, who was the only holy and just person that was ever on the earth, suffered for the unjust, and that too, for the purpose of bringing them to God.

“*Being put to death in the flesh.*” One reason why he assumed the fleshy nature of man, was, that he might die. So says an Apostle, “since, then the children partook of flesh and blood, he also, in like manner, partook of these; that, through death, he might vanquish him, who had the power of death.” Had he not partaken of flesh and blood, he could not have shed his blood; and “without the shedding of blood there is no remission:” and without remission, mankind could not be brought back to God.

Though Christ yielded up his life and become obedient to death; he was not always to be confined to the tomb; for he was “quicken’d”—“made alive by the Spirit.” \* \*

V. 19. “By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison.” This expression of the Apostle has been the occasion of

much disputation. It is thought by some to favour the notion of the descent of Christ's spirit into hell, and his preaching to the spirits of the damned, during the period of his interment—while his body was confined to the tomb. \* \* \*

It is that the phrase "he went and preached"—necessarily implies that he did it in person. But the same phrase is used where it cannot possibly be so understood. In Eph. ii. 17—the Apostle says, "He (Christ) came and preached to them that were afar off, and to them that were nigh," i. e. Jews and Gentiles. This he is represented as doing after he arose from the dead.—But it is certain that Christ did not go to the Gentiles, nor even to the Jews, in person, after his resurrection, and preach to them. "He went and preached" is a pleonasm for "he preached:" which he did by his Apostles. What the ambassadors of Jesus Christ did, was done by Jesus Christ himself. In this light, let us examine the place before us. To whom did Jesus Christ preach? The Apostle says—"To the spirits in prison."

To what class of them did Jesus Christ preach? The Apostle Peter answers—those, "who formerly were disobedient."—if we could learn when they were disobedient, we could ascertain when Christ preached to them. Is there any clue we can get to this matter? The next member of the sentence explains the whole. When the patience, or long-suffering of God waited."—God has ever been long-suffering. But the patience and forbearance of God were never more remarkable than in the days of Noah. He commanded them to reform, and gave them the opportunity of doing so—"while an ark was preparing." It was during this period that Christ preached to the sinners of the old world. But how did he preach? The Apostle replies—"by his spirit." This is corroborated by Gen. vi. 3.—"my spirit," says God, "shall not always strive with man."—How long did Christ preach to them? how long did the Spirit of God strive with them?—Peter says Christ preached to the people "while the ark was preparing;" which, it seems, was an "hundred and twenty years." This agrees with the statement in Gen. vi. 3.—"Yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." This was the length of time that the long-suffering of God waited; and during this long period did Christ preach to them by his Spirit. The question arises,—How was this done? It appears evident that words were employed, and a human agent must have spoken them. Christ preached to the Jews and Gentiles, by his Spirit in his Apostles; and with equal propriety, it may be said, he preached to the Antediluvians by his Spirit in Noah: and this is most certainly the way he did preach to them. Noah was a "preacher of righteousness"—(2 Pet. ii. 5.) and by his preaching the Spirit of God strove with the people. He spoke as he was moved by the Holy Spirit, as did all the Prophets; it was the Spirit of Christ which inspired them all—Pet. i. 1-2. What Noah did under the influence of the Spirit of Christ, Christ did by his Spirit; and to refuse to do

what a Prophet, moved by the Spirit, commanded, was and is to resist the Spirit. Stephen accused his persecutors with resisting the Holy Spirit in the same way their fathers did—Acts vii. 51–52. By consulting Nehemiah ix. 30, we learn that God bore witness or testified against the people by his Spirit in his Prophets; and in refusing to obey the voice of the Prophets, they disobeyed the Lord, or in other words, they resisted the Spirit of God. In the same way do sinners now, like the unbelieving Jews, reject the counsel of God, by refusing to obey his word, which has been spoken by his son.

Noah preached to his contemporaries during the long period of a hundred and twenty years, “while the ark was preparing, in which few, that is, eight souls were saved.”—Of the vast multitudes that inhabited the old world, only eight were saved!

God saved Noah, but not without the means of the Patriarch’s faith, the ark, and water; not by the means of faith alone—nor the ark alone—nor water alone; but by them all taken together.

“The like figure—the antitype, baptism, immersion, does also now save us,—by the resurrection of Christ.” “Because some remarkable persons and events,” says Dr. McKnight, “recorded in Scripture, were so ordered by God as to be fit emblems or representations of future persons and events, they are called types, and the persons and things which they represented or prefigured are called *antitypes*. Thus the water of baptism is here called the antitype to the water of the deluge, because the deluge was a type or emblem of baptism.” \* \* \*

Water was only the means of Noah’s salvation. Besides this, his faith and the ark were employed. As his salvation was a type of ours, let us inquire more particularly into the means by which it was effected.

**NOAH’S FAITH.**—This was the *first* in the arrangement or order of the means. God communicated to Noah his intention of bringing a deluge upon the earth, and promised him salvation by means of an ark, which he told him to constitute. Noah believed what God said both concerning the deluge and the ark—the threatening and promise, and this belief is called faith. \* \* \*

Noah did as he was commanded. His faith not only moved him with fear, but led him to build an ark also “by which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.” It was not his faith, but his building the ark by which he condemned the world. By this act he acknowledged the justness of the threatened punishment of sin, and expressed his unshaken confidence in the fulfilment of the awful denunciation, and his firm reliance on the veracity of Jehovah concerning his own preservation.

If we expect to obtain the promised blessings of Heaven, we must obey the commands of God, as well as believe what he

says. Faith without works, like the body without the spirit, is dead, being alone. \* \* \* \*

Noah believed—his faith led him to build the ark for the salvation of himself and family; but the end is not yet accomplished—nor can it be without water. “God is not slack concerning his promise.” Deliverance will be wrought for the faithful \* \*

The ark floats, and in it the faithful few are transported upon the bosom of the waters from the old to the new world. The wicked perish, and the righteous are saved.

“The antitype, immersion, does also now save us—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” \* \* \*

In the type we found faith—the ark—and water. Noah’s faith in the ark was the cause of his being saved during the prevalence of the water. In the antitype we have faith—the resurrection of Christ—and immersion. Our faith answers to the faith of Noah: Christ stands in the same place to us that the ark did to him; and baptism occupies the place to us that the water of the deluge did to him. \* \* \*

Our faith like that of Noah, has two objects; one, like his, relates to the destruction of the world and the condition of the ungodly.—“He that believeth not shall be damned” The other respects the means of escape from sin, and our exemption from the destruction that shall come upon the world. “If you will openly confess with your mouth, that Jesus is Lord, and believe with your heart, that God raised him from the dead you shall be saved.” We are required to believe in the resurrection of Christ in order to our salvation, just as Noah believed in the ark.—“The antitype, immersion, does also now save us—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” “He who shall believe (in Jesus Christ) and be baptized, shall be saved.” \* \* \*

Yes, sinner, Jesus is the ark of safety; and if you are ever saved from your sins, and escape from the deluge of wrath that is to come upon the world, it will be in Christ, “There is no other name given under Heaven among men by which you can be saved.” Do you ask me how you are to get into Christ? Paul answers—by baptism, if you are a believer, a penitent believer in him. Gal. iii. 25.

We will now notice the parenthetical part of this passage; Baptism, says the Apostle, is “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh.”

There is no difficulty in understanding the expression of Peter. He was writing to Jews who were acquainted with his phraseology. They had often practised total washing for the purpose of removing legal uncleanness or defilement. As the same action was performed in Christian immersion, without being better instructed, they would naturally conclude it was for the same purpose. The filth of the flesh was that defilement which a Jew contracted by touching a dead body, &c. and before he could be

clean and return to the congregation from which he was separated on account of it, he had to have sprinkled upon him the water of separation, i. e. water with which were mingled the ashes of the red heifer, and then he was required to bathe himself in water in order to be clean—See Num. 19. Now the Apostle says baptism is not for the purpose of removing this legal uncleanness;—but it is “the answer of a good conscience.” \* \* \* \*

Paul says there is but “one baptism;” and if that be suited to persons who have consciences; does it not appear that it never was intended for unconscious infants? But this *en passant*.

Peter does not mean a clear conscience, but a pure and undefiled, a sinless conscience; which can only be obtained by pardon: and the Apostle says baptism answers this good conscience.

Paul expresses the same idea in these words: “Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.” Again, he calls it the purging of the conscience. This can only be effected by the blood of Christ, the virtue of which is applied to the soul in his submitting to the institutions of heaven. Hence the Apostle says, baptism is the seeking of a good conscience. \* \* \* \*

Schrevelius in his Greek and Latin Lexicon, renders the same word (*eperotema*) by the word “*interrogatio*,” in Latin; which, Young, in his Latin-English Dictionary, translates, “a question, or demand, an interrogation.” Groves, in his Greek and English Dictionary, translates the same word—“question, inquire.”—We have been thus particular to put the word beyond dispute. Its meaning then, is, the asking or seeking of a good conscience. Such is the design of baptism. It is the institution in which a repentant sinner seeks a pure, guiltless conscience. In other words, he is baptized for the purpose of obtaining this pure conscience. How perfectly this expression of the Apostle Peter agrees with what he told the three thousand Jews on the day of Pentecost, when they were pierced to the heart by the sword of the spirit, and their conscience, bleeding at every pore. When they anxiously inquired, “what shall we do?” he replied—“Reform and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”—Sinner have you been smitten by the sword of truth? Do you carry the arrows of God rankling in your conscience? Do you believe in Jesus? Do you loathe sin? Do you detest it as your worst enemy?—as the instrument of your torture? Do you avoid it as you would the most poisonous serpent? Do you want to get rid of its guilt and contaminating influences?—In one word, do you want a *pure, self-approving* conscience?—Then come to the water of baptism. The bath was instituted for such as you. Come to it believing, the promise of Christ, and you shall have a pure, undefiled conscience “toward God.”—God will approve the act, and the motive too. He will pardon you. \* \* \* \*

We will conclude by making some observations on three baptisms.

1. The baptism or submersion of the world by the waters of the *deluge*. Sin was the cause of this dreadful catastrophe; and for the purpose of washing away the stains of guilt and violence from the earth, was the world visited with the calamity. \* \*

The very waters which drown the world and destroy the wicked, save Noah. And why this difference? Because the wicked had water *alone*, and Noah had faith, and the ark, as well as water. If any should be trusting to their baptism for salvation without faith and obedience to Christ, remember the fate of the Antediluvians. Water alone was the instrument of their destruction; but connected with faith and the ark, it was the instrument of Noah's salvation.

2. The baptism of the Israelites in the cloud and in the sea.

Here were two parties; one perished, and the other escaped from their pursuers. And why this difference in their fate? The Hebrews were the people of God; they trusted in him for deliverance. Their faith in his promise led them into the Red Sea; and by faith they were immersed into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea. As they trusted in God, he delivered them.—The Egyptians did not acknowledge the dominion of Jehovah; they defied Omnipotence to arms, and were overthrown in their presumptuous attack. They were submerged, and perished.—Water alone we see will not do. Faith must be in exercise—faith in the denunciations and promises of God—faith that leads its possessor to obey the mandates of the Most High.

Here, as in the case of the deluge, the instruments of the believer's deliverance, proved the destruction of the unrelenting and disobedient.—“These things,” says an Apostle, “happened to them for ensamples to us, and they are written for our admonition.” But I must hasten to the

3. THIRD BAPTISM—the *Baptism of the world with fire.* \*

With respect to the certainty of that day, there can be no doubt. There is as much prospect of its near approach, as there was of the deluge when Noah entered into the ark; or of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, on that fine clear morning on which Lot fled to the mountains. I grant there is no visible appearance of this amazing period; and on this account, a great many infidel scoffers take occasion to taunt the people of God, and exultingly to inquire—“Where is the promise of his coming?” Still we are assured that this day will come—the day “in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth also, and the works therein shall be burned up.” By the *Heavens* here, we are to understand the airy region, the atmosphere; and by the *earth*, and the things therein, every thing belonging to it, as the seas, rocks, and such like.



Sceptics laugh at the idea of a dissolution of the world: "not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God;" "and not considering the principles and facts in the system of nature, which indicate the possibility of such an event." "The atmosphere or air we breathe, is now ascertained to be a compound of two substances, very different and opposite in their nature, viz: oxygen and nitrogen. The oxygen, which forms about one fifth part of the atmosphere, is the principle of flame: a lighted taper immersed in this gas, burns with a brilliancy too great for the eye to bear; and even a rod of iron or steel is made to blaze under its energy."

Water is a compound of two inflammable substances; both of which, if separated, would blaze with a rapidity and intensity sufficient to destroy every thing under their influence.

"Now suppose the Creator should issue forth his almighty fiat—"Let the nitrogen of the atmosphere be separated from the oxygen, and let the oxygen exert its native energies without control, wherever it extends; and let the oxygen and hydrogen of the water be separated;"—from what we know of their nature, we would be warranted to conclude, that instantly a universal conflagration would commence throughout all the kingdoms of nature:—not only wood, coals, sulphur, bitumen, and other combustible substances; but even the hardest rocks and stones, and all the metals, fossils, and minerals, and water itself, would blaze and burn with a rapidity which would carry destruction through the whole expanse of the terraqueous globe." Connected with these—

"See all the formidable sons of fire,  
Eruptions, earthquakes, comets, lightnings, play  
Their various engines; all at once disgorge  
Their blazing magazines: and take by storm,  
This poor terrestrial citadel of man."

Such is the fate to which our world is destined. How different will be conditions and pursuits of men when this period shall arrive. \* \* A few scattered over the earth holding converse with God, and looking out for the coming of Jesus Christ.—Such will hear the trump of God with rapture and lift up their heads with joy, assured that the day of their redemption is come. But the multitude will be inattentive to the things of eternity.—"For as it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be in the coming of the Son of Man. They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came and swept them all away." With what reluctance will the misers let go the heaps of gold they have lost their souls to accumulate. How loath the rich will be to abandon the possessions which they prized more highly than an in-

heritance, incorruptible, undefiled and unfading in Heaven.—How unwilling will Kings resign the sceptres of their burning empires, which they prefer to a wreath of immortality ! It will be a time of universal terror and alarm.

“ Man starting from his couch shall sleep no more !  
Above, around, beneath, amazement all !  
Our God in grandeur, and the world on fire !”

But the righteous shall remain unhurt amidst the general conflagration ; they shall rise above the burning elements ; and the fire which shall destroy the wicked from the earth, and which is a prelude to that lake of fire, the bare thought of which is enough to “ turn the cheek of darkness pale ;”—I say the same fire will consume the dross, and refine the earth, and prepare it for a dwelling-place of the righteous.

Sinner ! the day of wrath has not yet come. There is still room in the ark of safety for you. And while the period is delayed—while the lightnings are confined and the tempest is locked up—you have the privilege of securing your passage to the heaven of eternal rest. This vessel alone can plow the fiery main, ride the waves, and bring the whole crew safely into port. As passengers in the same vessel, we most affectionately invite you to take the voyage with us. This world is doomed to destruction, and Heaven is the only port that promises us safety.

---

## REASON AND NATURE OF THE DIVINE MANIFESTATIONS.

\* \* \* \* \*

Moses has commenced his brief sketch of the early annals of our race, by asserting that “ in the beginning God made the heavens and the earth:” at least, our translators have so rendered his language. \* \* \* \*

To me it appears abundantly plain, that here, where Moses commences his account, in the heavens and the earth, or those hosts of created objects of which the human mind can take cognizance, we necessarily find our limit. Beyond these we cannot go. Any attempt which may be made, is a wasteful expenditure of intellect, and must end in fruitless conjecture. Doubtless there is a great deal beyond these limits ; but it is impossible for us to attain to that which has not been brought within our own mental range. Even our own future state of being is above our comprehension, and is so represented to us in the scriptures themselves. Paul informs us, that when he was caught up into the third heavens, he “ heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.” And John says, “ it doth not yet appear what we

shall be, but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." Of course, if we are not fitted to know, to see or to hear, things which are unrepresented in this material system with which our existence is connected for the time being, we must form our ideas of God from those views he has afforded of himself, and must speak of his attributes as he has *manifested* them. Whatever is beyond this world is mystery, i. e. is a *secret* to us.

It belongs not to man to perceive SPIRIT abstractedly considered. We cannot perceive or know each other's spirit, excepting as it is exhibited in its appropriate form, or by some external act. And as God is a SPIRIT,—so said Jesus to the Samaritan woman,—we cannot know him, unless he shall manifest himself by and in his works, or shall assume personal *form*.—The necessity under which we are thus placed is found in the very constitution of our nature, and must exist so long as it shall be characteristic of us to acquire our ideas by means of our corporeal senses. The divinity of Jesus Christ, to use popular language, is not so *irrational* a doctrine, nor is it so destitute of evidence to be derived from the nature of things, and from the nature of man, as some have confidently pretended. The real truth is, that it is founded in the nature of things, and in the nature of man, and therefore the scriptures have taught it. And those who have defended this doctrine, have, I think, essentially weakened their own argument, by basing it simply on the sovereignty of Jehovah.

It is necessary to pursue this topic a little farther. How can any man explain to me wisdom, goodness and power, as attributes of God? Of abstract qualities the human mind can form no idea, whether they are predicted of God, of man, or of any creature. The scriptures certainly occupy this ground in undertaking to teach us of God. see Ps. xix. 1, 4. Rom. i. 19, 20. Acts xiv. 17.

\* \* \* \* \*

On this simple view of the character of man, or of the necessity arising from the constitution of his nature, must rest the whole *reason* for the fact, and the doctrine, of the divinity of the Saviour. "Such an high priest *became* us"—"in all things it *behooved* him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest."

God having manifested *himself* to us by the works of creation and providence, and that manifestation being made in such a manner as is suited to our mind *in its present mode of subsistence*, is there no necessity that the Creator should proceed farther?—Can we now be satisfied, or will we not pursue our inquiries?—Is it unnatural or irrational to seek after *personal intercourse*, or communion, with that being whose works have introduced him to our acquaintance? \* \* \* \* \*

Of *personal* subsistence we have well defined ideas; and it

that were not predicted of Jehovah, our communion with him must be of the lowest description. We would either become atheistical, or, in spite of ourselves, rushing into *personification*, we should locate the dwelling of the great Spirit in the sun—the moon—a star—a man—an animal—a vegetable. \* \* Nor only so; but we are emphatically told, that man was made in the image and likeness of God. There must therefore be a *personal* manifestation of God. \* \* No impression is more universal or uniform, than this—there is a God; nor any inference more general or natural than this—we owe him our homage, and he ought to be worshiped.

But under this impression and inference the questions necessarily arise—how shall we worship him? Where shall we meet him? in what form shall we address him? with what service will he be pleased? Take Faber's great work on the Pagan Idol, or his *Mysteries of the Cabiri*, or Bryant's *Observations*, for your guide, and see how the heathen world laboured and heaved! Ignorant of the personal manifestation Jehovah had made of himself, and incompetent to estimate the subsequent manifestation in the flesh which he had promised, how ingeniously, yet wretchedly, they systematised their personifications! \* \* Then the host of heaven being blended with their divine heroes, the sun, moon, and stars called for adoration. Nor has infidelity, when she stalks of the great temple of nature, done any thing more than throw the whole together, in one confused, undistinguished, mass; or, falling from the high ideas of *personal* existence, which the nature of man suggests, she abets mere materialism on the one hand, or is irrecoverably lost in profitless abstractions on the other.

Thus we have reached a point where, from the very necessities of our nature, a farther manifestation of God, than that afforded by the material universe, becomes indispensable. There is no intermediate symbol between that general manifestation, and a *personal subsistence*; and to go beyond this last, is to pass out of the system to which man belongs. A manifestation by a personal subsistence (the Word) is the very thing we need.—Withhold it, and mankind must either sink into the grossest superstition, or be conscious of an obligation which they have neither ability nor opportunity to meet. Nor is this all; but turning away from the evils of life, under the strongest desires after glory, honor and immortality, eternity becomes a blank, and men grow frantic with wild conjecture; or sinking into apathy, they die like the brute. The necessity for a *personal* manifestation of Jehovah is found therefore, in the constitution of man.

Again: God is a *spirit*, and man has a *spirit*. Here is similitude. Common attributes and common principles, throughout nature lead to association. Accordingly this is the very basis on which the scriptures have erected their whole moral superstruc-

ture, depending for its strength and beauty on an endless variety of moral affinities. Man, they say, was made in the image of God, and the highest point of intellectual effort which they recommend to him, is to think, speak, and act like God. \* \* \*

Hence we find, throughout the whole history of our race, that men are like the gods whom they worship. If the gods be supposed to be sensual, their worshipers are sensual: if the gods be cruel, their worshipers are cruel: if the gods be intellectual, their worshipers are intellectual. Even now, when men make the world the great object of their admiration, they become like it. When they contemplate the spirituality of the Redeemer's character and government, they become spiritual: beholding or reflecting his glory they are changed into his image. The denominations of christians who view God in all the benevolence which he has written in the scriptures, or carried out in his providence, are observed to imbibe the like gracious affections; while those who think him harsh or always mysterious, go down to the grave unreconciled in their feelings, and doubtful as to their destiny. This is human nature. It cannot be otherwise. The brightest, the holiest, the most philosophical idea which the human mind can conceive, is that of resembling God.

Nor is this all. Association among human beings is founded on the same principle. The child imitates his parent, and grows *like* him; the servant imitates his master, and grows *like* him; the pupil imitates his preceptor, and grows *like* him; the soldier imitates his commander, and grows *like* him; the subject imitates his prince, and grows *like* him. Whatever character a man knows to be above or superior to his own, and which he at the same time admires and loves, he will not fail to resemble; and that just so far as he contemplates it. That God should present himself within the range of human observation, and in the way best calculated to attract our notice and excite our admiration, is the certain and only effectual method of either elevating man when innocent, or restoring him when fallen. I repeat it: this is human nature—both its philosophy and its religion. God manifested in *personal form*, instead of being an irrational view of the divine operations, is one of the most rational in the whole range of morals. The doctrine of Christ's divinity is founded in human nature; while the exhibition of his mediatorial character is the purest display of every moral excellence which it is desirable for man to possess, and is exactly suited to our present state of sin and suffering. He who is like Christ, is a holy, dignified, heavenly, happy man. \* \* \* \* \*

Having shown, as I believe, the impossibility that mankind should form any accurate or satisfactory idea of Jehovah *abstractedly* considered; that the constitution of human nature renders a *personal* manifestation of God indispensably necessary; that theologians, in attempting to lead us beyond the exhibition which

God has made of himself, have done nothing but entertain us with their conjectures, and confound us with their mysteries ; and then when the proposition introduced by Moses,—“ In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth,” is considered as the starting point for such unprofitable speculations, he must be entirely misunderstood ; let us procede to enquire more particularly what the sacred historian does mean.

If we now turn to the Hebrew text, we shall find that a literal translation would very materially change the declaration, at present under discussion. We would then have the following proposition :—“ In the beginning THE ELOHIM made the heavens and the earth ” The term *Elohim* is in the plural number ; so that *plurality* is thus predicted of the Creator. How ? In what sense ? The inquiry is important, if for no other reason, yet because it will lead us away from those metaphysical abstractions in which theologians and philosophers have so freely indulged, when speaking or writing of our general subject.

That the proposition which is now offered may be distinctly apprehended by those who have no acquaintance with the Hebrew language, let it be observed, that the original word which I have merely *anglicised*, has been frequently rendered Gods, by our translators. Thus : “ God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, *Elohim*, knowing good and evil.” (Gen. iii. 5.) “ All the gods, *Elohim*, of the nations are idols.” (1 Chron. xvi. 26. Ps. xcvi. 5.) Suppose for the sake of illustration—and let it be remembered that I make the supposition merely for the sake of illustration—suppose that our present text should be rendered thus :—“ In the beginning THE GODS made the heavens and the earth.” Would not this translation very materially affect the character of the Mosaic proposition ?

The subject therefore which we have now to investigate, is this: what does Moses mean ? what do the whole scriptures mean by the ELOHIM? \* \* \* \* \*

By referring to his account, we find that Cain and Abel, a few years after the FALL, are introduced to our notice. Cain is represented as being exceedingly offended—perhaps because for some misconduct, he had been despoiled of his birthright, and disrobed of his *official* honors, as his father’s successor. The scriptural facts and comments certainly place the character of Abel in bold relief, and shew that Cain was a dishonored, and a dishonorable man. He resents the affront by murdering his brother, and finally departs from the presence of the Lord, to dwell in the land of Nod. His going out *from the presence of the Lord*, is a very peculiar phrase, and imports, as might be readily shown, his abandonment of the ceremonial establishment which God had erected, when he placed the cherubim of glory in a tabernacle, at the east end of the garden of Eden. The service required by

the law of this mediatorial dispensation, it is very evident from the story, he had first despised or corrupted. His departure to the land of Nod, was a virtual, if not a malignant, rejection of the ritual which had been given to his father. In other words, he denied the doctrine, and disowned his allegiance to the authority, of the Mediator. After Abel's murder, and Cain's apostacy, Seth becomes his father's *official* heir. From him proceeds a race of *official* men, known in the history as the sons of God. These sons of God, in process of time, so far lose their integrity as to marry the daughters of men, or the daughters of Cain. The result was *official* infidelity, and most lamentable degeneracy. At last Noah stands alone as *officially* righteous; and Jehovah, entering into covenant with him, brings the flood upon the earth. The crime of the antediluvian age appears, then, to have been the rejection of the Mediator—it was INFIDELITY.

\* \* \* \* \*

But mankind corrupted their way a *second time* before the Lord. \* \* They did not *deny*, but they *corrupted*, the mediatorial institute. They *changed the glory* of the incorruptible God into an *image* made like unto corruptible man. They did not sink into sheer infidelity, but they declined into *idolatry*. And it was in order to counteract this state of things, or to preserve the knowledge of God as revealed in the Mediator, that Jehovah entered upon that new and peculiar course of legislation, which is called, in the scriptures, *the mystery of his will*; and which commenced with the call of Abraham from the midst of his idolatrous family. To carry out this general benevolent purpose, his descendants were first *elected*, as the Gentiles were afterwards. It is in this very connection that Moses receives his commission. He was sent to bring the children of Abraham from Egypt, and to conduct them to their official station in the land of Canaan, as the *elect* of the Lord. Of course the specific object for which Moses was consecrated, and for which the nation was chosen, was to proclaim the knowledge of the true God, in opposition to *polytheism*. "The law was added because of CORRUPTIONS." Gal. iii. 19.

There is not the least indistinctness in the conclusion we have reached. Moses never loses sight of his object, but most solemnly and emphatically charges the people respecting it.—"Here, O Israel, JEHOVAH, our ELOHIM, IS ONE JEHOVAH." (Duet. vi. 4.) In this connexion then, we must consider and explain the term, after whose scriptural import we are enquiring.

Observe, Moses says—our Elohim! Were there any OTHER Elohim? Yes: many, very many. The gods of the heathen, which were innumerable, were called Elohim:—"all the Elohim of the nations," says the psalmist, "are idols."—And this is the contrast which Moses would present;—"Jehovah, our Elohim is ONE Jehovah," or God: the Elohim of the nations are MANY.

But more than this: the nations imagined that there was "a great universal Father, himself one and many," and that from him "a divine emanation proceeded; who, assuming the form of man, has descended from heaven for the purpose of reforming and instructing and reconciling the human race. Nor, according to the speculations of the Gentiles, has this descent been accomplished *once* only: on the contrary it has *often* been accomplished, and at each descent, the emanation is in some sort esteemed a new PERSON, and is distinguished by a new title. This is paganism as explained and received throughout the east; and to this day prevails among the Hindoes." Thus the *Elohim*, among idolaters, included many GODS, and many EMANATIONS, descending in the form of MAN, for mediatorial purposes: but OUR *Elohim*, says Moses, is only ONE Jehovah.

Why then did Moses use the term *Elohim* at all? Would it not, instead of counteracting idolatry, rather countenance and perpetuate it? Or does he intend to convey the idea of a *divine emanation*, proceeding from heaven, and assuming the form of a *man*, for mediatorial purposes? Or if the term *emanation* is altogether unscriptural, and entirely disproportioned to the magnitude of the subject, did he design to teach any analogous doctrine? It evidently appears that the idea of *plurality*, in some form or other, is to be predicated of God, or the word could not have any other than an injurious tendency; as all the idolatrous nations most abundantly testify, by the use they have made of it. Could Moses then jeopardize so carelessly the character of the dispensation he was commissioned to introduce? While he was professedly condemning polytheism, could he so inconsiderately establish it among his own people? Or was it impossible for him to impart the knowledge of the true God, and give a detailed account of the works of Jehovah, without making this representation?

Is it then necessarily true, that there has been an *emanation* from Jehovah, or something analogous to it, appearing among men, and *in the form of man*? I see not how an affirmative answer can be avoided. On the contrary, if we proceed with Moses, in his history, we shall find that he actually, unequivocally, and more than once, states the fact, that God *did appear in the likeness of man*. Read the short sketches he has given of Abraham's life and of Jacob's life. (Gen. xxiii. 33; xxxii. 24-32.) There is no escape from a testimony which is so clear and explicit.—And if there can be no escape, then in the fact of a divine manifestation unto men, we have the reason for the use of the plural noun ELOHIM, and its various adjuncts. From the nature of the case, this ancient apostle could not speak in any other way; and the doctrine which the phraseology implies was indispensably *necessary*, both to correct the aberrations into which idolaters had fallen, and to announce to mankind the ONE JEHOVAH.



It is worthy of special notice that Moses, when he recapitulates the account of the creation with a view of displaying *the political relations* in which Adam was placed, employs the compound term—*Jehovah-Elohim*—as the official title by which God was designated ; and this title is used throughout the last two chapters under consideration. It is, as I understand it, equivalent with LOGOS, or WORD. And had our translators made us as familiar with the Hebrew term JEHOVAH-ELOHIM, as they have with the Hebrew term JEHOVAH ; or had they marked the distinction between the two titles, as they have in the new testament distinguished between GOD and WORD ; or had we noticed the difference between JEHOVAH, and LORD GOD, which the translators have made, the subject of trinity would be, I apprehend, better understood at present. \* \* \* \*

The foregoing argument may be illustrated and confirmed, if we call up a similar representation made by the apostle Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians. Like Moses, he had occasion to condemn the idolatry around him ; and to oppose to it the revelation of the true God which had been made. In arguing on the propriety of eating meat offered in sacrifice to idols, he remarks, “There be gods MANY, and lords MANY : But to us there is but ONE God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him ; and ONE Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.” (Ch. viii. 5, 6.) As though he said,—“The heathen have many gods, and many lords proceeding from them in the likeness of men ; but we have only ONE God, and ONE Lord proceeding from him—THE LORD FROM HEAVEN, in the likeness of man.” (1 Cor. xv. 47.) Is not this the plain and evident meaning of what he has said ?

It might, in reading this passage hastily, or for sectarian purposes, be imagined that the apostle had no intention to represent Jesus Christ as any thing more than a mere man. But where would be the point of the contrast ? The heathen did not think their LORDS to be mere men, but considered them to be so many emanations from the GODS ; which, having accomplished the object of their descent, returned and were re-absorbed in deity.—This is the doctrine which Paul was opposing. And what would an ingenuous heathen understand him to mean by the one Lord Jesus, but ONE EMANATION from the ONE God, and the only one that could be acknowledged ? Here then we have Moses and Paul in the same attitude. Though they lived in very different ages, and were official men under very different dispensations, yet they state precisely the same moral problem. Moses says—“Jehovah OUR ELOHIM is one Jehovah,” and records the fact of his appearing in the likeness of a MAN : and Paul says—“we have ONE GOD, even the Father, and ONE Lord Jesus Christ,” who did appear in the fashion of MAN, and denominates him THE LORD FROM HEAVEN ; and all this too in an argument against

IBOLATRY. Evidently this LORD of whom Paul speaks, belongs to the ELOHIM of which Moses speaks ; and in both cases there is but ONE JEHOVAH:—ONE GOD, of whom are *all things*, the heavens and earth and all their host, and we in him; and ONE LORD, by whom are *all things*, the heavens and earth and all their host, and we by him. The two inspired writers give us the very same ideas. \* \* \* \* \*

But when the fact is thus ascertained, that the scriptures speak so freely of *Jehovah* and *Jehovah-Elohim*, or of *God* and *Lord*, and when the necessity for plural words so immediately follows, what inference shall we draw? Are there two Gods equal to each other; or one supreme God, and another subordinate God? By no means, all the inspired writers would reply. There is no truth about which they are more positive, than that there is but ONE GOD; nor any in which reason would more promptly or entirely sustain them. \* \* \*

Suppose that Jehovah should manifest himself in *personal form*, according to the condition of our nature—would we not speak of him as *God*, and *God manifested*? In this second view, would there be any impropriety in the application of a term, or a title, which would express the *object* of that manifestation, or the *relation* in which Jehovah would consequently stand to us?—Suppose that term, or title, should be LORD:—would there be any impropriety in the phrase God and LORD? \* \* \*

Suppose still further that, amid the many philosophic or religious errors which have been taught in the world, it should have been maintained, that there had been *many* such manifestations, and that these had been proclaimed to us as so many different *lords*; would it not thereby have become necessary to inform us that there is but one God and one Lord;—ONE INFINITE SPIRIT, AND AN APPROPRIATE MANIFESTATION OF THAT SPIRIT? Certain it is whether the explanatory suggestion just made, be correct or not, it contains the very thing that human beings need; and expresses those very peculiarities which are ascribed to the LORD.—He does come to *manifest* God unto us; and on the principles of law which he thus announces, are we governed. He is an *image* of God to us: he is our *king*. Under these two distinct views is he continually represented, in both the old and new testaments. \* \* \* \* \*

May God give us “the Spirit of power, of love, and of a sound mind,” and finally bring us to his heavenly glory, that we may SEE HIM AS HE IS.—*Duncan’s Lectures on Moral Government*,

---

ADVICE.—Think of your sins in connection with your Saviour; of your trials, with your support; of your duties, with the promises; of your privations, with your enjoyments; of your attainments, with your privileges.

## ON PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

\* \* \* \* \*

To realize that fellowship, (of the Spirit) in any of those intellectual exercises to which the truth may invite us, is to feel that moral influence which God exerts—that wisdom and power of God which, through the preaching of a crucified Christ, converts the soul

Such an intellectual operation you distinctly perceive is implied in the moral influence, which is exerted by the Spirit of man; and man is like God—and like him in this very connexion. “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.” The similitude thus traced out offers no violence to true philosophy. It is merely the human mind rising from fellowship with an intellectual creature to fellowship with the intellectual Creator, and that by a direct process—communion with a brother—a father—a minister—a prophet—an Apostle—Jehovah himself. All the way it is communion of SPIRIT with SPIRIT. Physical power belongs no more to one part of the process than another. \* \* It is the communion of mind with mind, and must be explained on the LAWS OF MIND. \* \* \*

Let us exemplify—Some stranger undertakes to counsel a wayward youth. The advice offered is just such as ought to be given. Its TRUTH is unquestionable and easily perceived. Perhaps the youth may bow submissively; for there is nothing unnatural or improbable in the idea that mind may yield to the influence of *truth*, or that the SPIRIT of one human being may strongly affect the SPIRIT of another human being. But the stranger may possibly be considered to be officious and impertinent, and may be treated accordingly. Yet he uttered TRUTH, and in all probability the truth he uttered was distinctly understood. Why then has his advice been rejected, and himself disdained? The objection supposed, you perceive, is personal. Though the stranger has uttered truth, yet he is considered impertinent or officious—the errant boy declines all fellowship with the stranger’s spirit. The father then appears, offers the same advice, and urges the same truth; or it is made evident that the stranger interfered, not on his own account, but as the father’s agent, and the desired impression is produced. What is the difference? TRUTH is declared in both cases. No arbitrary power, no physical compulsion has been employed. Had such power been called in, the impression desired might not have been made. The only difference which can be perceived is, that the *personal* objection supposed has been removed, and that FELLOWSHIP OF SPIRIT has sustained the appeals of truth.

The gospel is preached by a fellow-man, and no good effect follows—the sinner remains unmoved, unconverted. On some

occasion a circumstance occurs which leads that same sinner to recognise the presence of the Spirit of God. He listens, and hears the same gospel which he had before heard unmoved and unconverted. An impression is now made, deep and fixed. He weeps—he repents—he forsakes his sin—he turns to the Lord! what is the influence? The gospel, or truth, is the same in both cases. No arbitrary power has been exerted. \* \* Simply this—He has perceived that God addressed him. The gospel was wisdom, from the first, but now it is discerned to be the wisdom of God; it was power from the first, but now it is discerned to be the power of God; and is not this precisely what is meant by THE COMMUNION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT? The God of love has sustained his own truth, and the combination—truth demonstrated in love by the SPIRIT—has been perceived and felt.

It is not however to be denied, that after this intellectual operation the sinner may continue his course of transgression.—If he should, what is his crime? Has he not resisted—grieved—vexed—quenched—blasphemed the Holy Spirit? Will you bring in physical agency at this crisis? will you throw the sinner into the omnipotent hand, to be remoulded in some of his intellectual qualities; and call it the renovation of his WILL, or the renewing of the Holy Spirit. While this deteriorating process has been going on, much forbearance has been extended. One kind providence after another may have renewed the opportunity of repentance; and thrown the sinner's mind into the centre of most interesting circumstances, betokening the presence, and inviting to the fellowship, of the Spirit of God.

In an age of miracles many mighty works may have been performed. In the ordinary course of human events arguments may have been framed; appeals may have been pointedly addressed; threatenings fearful and alarming may have been uttered; mercies may have been bestowed or withdrawn; afflictions may have been sent; sins may have been visited with appropriate punishment; marked deliverances may have been accomplished; Jehovah may say—"All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people." Every step of this remedial process is like the first which has been described, and when at last the Spirit has been blasphemed, is there any pardon to be obtained? is there any more sacrifice for sin? is there any omnipotent, irresistible, agency to be put forth? is unreserved mercy to be extended, indiscriminately saving ALL? is Jehovah to be censured? or is the sinner alone, and altogether, in fault? \* \* \* \*

I cannot conceive of any other operation of divine power in the case, than that in which God—acting as an intellectual being, and with man as an intellectual creature, on the laws of mind or spirit—accomplishes his designs by appropriate means; unless man shall be stripped of his free agency, and be as destitute of

power of volition as an inanimate machine. That operation of power, as we have seen, Jehovah disclaims :—“ Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.” \* We are kept by his power *through faith*. \* \* \* \*

Some may attempt to meet the difficulty by asserting, that man is not competent to fathom so deep a mystery ; and that God gives no account of his matters to his creatures. Such a reply makes the whole hypothesis equivocal. *Every man should speak very modestly, when he professedly does not understand the doctrines which he advocates.* I see no advantage to be gained, by proclaiming a moral system which is so defective and unintelligible at the very start. Besides, this reply is directly opposed to the facts in the case. *For God has given the reason, why he condemns any of our race, with as much distinctness, as he has explained why he has accepted others.* The law of the moral system is explicitly applied both ways. He who believeth shall be saved—he who believeth not shall be damned. \* \*

Theologians have, however, offered a formal reason for this forbidding hypothesis, which seems to them fully to sustain it.—They tell us that God carries on this system of operation *for his own glory*. But is this dark expression made up of mere words ? or does it contain an idea ? If there be an idea, what is it ? Let us attempt to analyse it. *Glory is manifested excellence.*—Now what excellence is there in God’s saving *some*, and not saving others ? What excellence is there in God’s saving *any*, in a manner which is not consistent with the attributes of their own nature ? or in not saving *all*, if it may be done in a consistent manner ? Wherein is the greater glory displayed—in a scheme constructed on the intellectual free agency of an intelligent creature ? or in one which converts that creature into a mere mechanical agent ? Again ; admitting that excellence may be predicted of the transactions under review, to whom is the manifestation made ? To God himself ? This would be too small an idea to be gravely entertained, in explaining such high concerns. To us, is the display made ? Then what is the excellence, which is thus vividly exhibited ? We are left to admit its existence, without being able to perceive it : and this is no manifestation at all. Can you see the *excellence* of God’s condemning immortal spirits solely for his own glory ? I cannot. My soul shudders at the thought. The angels on the plains of Bethlehem sung—glory to God, peace on earth, and good will towards men. \* \* \*

It may now be objected, that simple as the foregoing views represent *faith* to be, yet after all, the scriptures have argued out the matter at very great length ; from which it would appear, that the subject has not all the simplicity which I have supposed it to possess. But unless I very greatly mistake, theologians have here committed another grievous error. I very much doubt, whether the scriptures ever argue out the question—whether man

can, or cannot, believe the gospel? On the contrary, they positively require him to believe, and unhesitatingly condemn him if he does not believe, the gospel. They certainly do take up the subject of human "ability and inability," and reason upon it at large; but their remarks take a different direction, and are applied to another point altogether. Mankind have been placed under two distinct forms of moral government—the one called *law* and the other called *gospel*. The respective attributes of these two systems have been the frequent subject of discussion. Their reciprocal relations call them up, for the sake of mutual explanations. The *gospel* has been introduced to effect what the *law* could not do, in consequence of "the weakness of the flesh." Of course the *gospel* could neither be illustrated nor defined; it could not be traced to its origin, and defended on the plea of necessity; nor carried forward to its result, and commended on its sufficiency without referring to *law*, the previous institute which had become ineffectual. Besides, the question whether man can or cannot be justified by "deeds of law?" or whether he does or does not need a Mediator? has given rise to a great deal of controversy in the world. The antediluvians abandoned the Mediator altogether; the postdiluvians preserved the external mediatorial symbols, but stammered about their import, as appears from the fact, that Abraham's covenant relations, and official actions, were intended to illustrate "the righteousness of faith;" the Jews were, notwithstanding their zeal of God, seeking to be justified by *law*, and going about to establish their own righteousness. \* \* How then could the scriptural writers avoid discussing the comparative merits of *law* and *gospel*? or informing men, that they could not be saved by *law*, and that they must, as a matter of imperious necessity, flee to the *Saviour*? This is the point of their argument on the subject of human ability and inability.—In view of one institute—man *has not* ability to meet its requirements, according to the scriptures: in view of the other, he *has* ability; and if he does not rise and diligently use it, he must perish forever. \* \* \* \*

A few texts it may not be improper to quote, in order to exhibit this contrast. "By the deeds of law, there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Every man who makes the experiment of deeds of law, will utterly fail; and instead of justification, will acquire the knowledge of sin—the law will charge sin upon him because he *cannot* fulfill it. "Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of law." \* \* \* \*

"Without me," says the Redeemer, "ye can do nothing:" i. e. remove the Mediator, and man is undone; for then he is referred to "deeds of law," and his case terminates in the demonstration of his guilt. \* \* \* \*

The rigid sectarian, who has diverged so far from the sim-

licity of moral philosophy, as to mistake the scriptural argument in relation to human ability, never meets the terms *can*, or *cannot*, in the scriptures, without imagining that they afford full proof of his dogma. And perhaps the general impression is in his favour. Let us quote some examples of its use. "How *canst* thou say to thy brother—let me cast the mote out of thine eye?—Ye *cannot* drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils.—If this cup *cannot* pass from me, unless I drink it.—Christ *could not* enter into the city—his disciples *could not* eat bread.—Christ *could not* do many mighty works, because of their unbelief, —How *can* ye believe, who receive honour one of another?—How *can* you, being evil, speak good things?" A thousand instances of this kind *can* be quoted, and no one will suppose them to imply positive inability. Sometimes an inconsistency is asserted; and at others a breach of law is merely supposed.

Let us select a particular example, which is often adduced in a very positive manner. "The carnal mind, the minding of the flesh, is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed *can* be." Now this has nothing to do with the inability of man to believe the gospel, considered simply as a moral agent. The assertion is applied to him, in view of certain circumstances which are stated. He is supposed to be minding the things of the flesh, or giving his affections and time to worldly pursuits and pleasures. The mind, thus employed, *cannot* obey God; but engaged in actual rebellion against him. The Redeemer has paraphrased this matter thus—"No man *can* serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye *cannot* serve God and mammon." "Doth a fountain," says James, "send forth, at the same place, sweet water and bitter? Can the fig-tree bear olive berries? either a vine figs?" Surely, all this is plain enough: and no one can suppose it to follow, that because a man *cannot* serve God and mammon, therefore, he *cannot* abandon mammon and serve God. Because a man *cannot* see in the dark, it does not follow that he *cannot* see in the light.

\* \* \* \* \*

You perceive that personal responsibility is a perfectly philosophical matter, and of necessity must give form, and shape, and interest to any regenerating or sanctifying influence which may be employed. The plea of INABILITY is nothing more than the refuge of an unenlightened conscience—of an unexercised, and consequently an undisciplined moral sense. And that, not because conscience is by nature dead; but because men have grown carnal amid spiritual privileges, and have become hardened by resisting truth, and impetuously pursuing the gratification of their own lusts; or under false social principles—domestic, fraternal, political and ecclesiastical—have followed the multitude to do evil.

\* \* \* \* \*

O that our controversists did but understand the philosophy of the scriptures, instead of bolstering up that of the dark ages! O that they could rise to think in fellowship with the Holy Spirit, instead of eulogizing the virtues, and portraying the apotheosis of worthies of other days! They would quickly find that a cultivated conscience would be a never failing source of practical efficiency. The individual man, they would perceive, should soon become conscious of personal ability; and truth would govern the world, which physical force has only degraded. God governs man by GOSPEL, not by LAW—by CONSCIENCE, not by FORCE.

\* \* \* \* \*

A good conscience, faith as the result of conviction, and forbearance amid varieties of opinion and interest, form the prominent items of the moral code he has given: and when the ministry come forward with their substitute—power, terror, excitement, feeling—and deceive the people and themselves by the representatives of the good that is done, they try a fearful experiment over which succeeding generations may weep. In such a social state, philosophy is sure to be laughed to scorn as a pagan or infidel heresy; and the love of wisdom must give place to the ebullitions of undisciplined feelings. The intelligent stand aloof, too timid or too powerless to stem the current; or take refuge in infidelity, vainly hoping to find something more coincident with common sense.

Such is the present state of society; and if, in describing it, I incur a harsh condemnation, my refuge is—a good conscience and the Master's truth. But however the censure may be expressed, the revival and education of the moral sense, now become puerile by the oppression of authority or the force of prejudice, is the great object of the Spirit's operations; is the philosophy of faith; and is the mystery in all those laborings of individual mind, while seeking to suspend its eternal destinies on its own convictions, or while aspiring after "salvation" as "the end of its own faith."—*Duncan's Lectures.*

---

He, who collects, is laudably employed; for though he exerts no great talents in the work, he facilitates the progress of others; and, by making that easy of attainment, which is already written, may give some mind more vigorous, or more adventurous than his own, leasure for new thoughts, and original designs.—*Dr. Samuel Johnson.*

When I can truly say "thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." I shall long to be in heaven, that I may do it perfectly.

"All our rest in this world, is from trust in God."



## COMFORT.

When gathering clouds around I view,  
 And days are dark, and friends are few ;  
 On Him I lean, who not in vain,  
 Experienced every human pain.  
 He sees my griefs, allays my fears,  
 And counts and treasures up my tears.

If aught should tempt my soul to stray  
 From heavenly wisdom's narrow way :  
 To fly the good I would persue,  
 Or do the thing I would not do :  
 Still He who felt temptation's power,  
 Shall guard me in that dangerous hour.

If wounded love my bosom swell,  
 Despised by those I prized too well ;  
 He shall his pitying aid bestow,  
 Who felt on earth severer woe ;  
 At once betrayed, denied, or fled,  
 By those who shared his daily bread.

When vexing thoughts within me rise,  
 And, sore dismayed, my spirit dies ;  
 Yet He who once vouchsafed to bear  
 The sickening anguish of despair,  
 Shall sweetly soothe, shall gently dry  
 The throbbing heart, the streaming eye.

When mourning o'er some stone I bend  
 Which covers all that was a friend ;  
 And from his voice, his hand, his smile,  
 Divides me for a little while ;  
 Thou, Saviour, mark'st the tears I shed,  
 For thou didst weep o'er Lazarus dead.

And O ! when I have safely past  
 Through every conflict but the last ;  
 Still, still unchanging, watch beside  
 My painful bed—for thou hast died ;  
 Then point to realms of cloudless day,  
 And wipe the latest tear away.