

A DEFENCE

OF THE

“Gospel Church”

AND

“VINDICATION.”

BY THE REV. JOHN HICKIE,

LATE INCUMBENT OF OMEMEE.

PRICE 25 CENTS:

FOR SALE AT Mr. HICKIE'S STORE, OMEMEE; AND T. & R. WHITE'S,
PETERBOROUGH.

T. & R. White, Printers, Peterborough.

From the Port Hope Guide.

“PRESENTATION OF A PURSE.—Our readers are aware that since the commencement of last July, in consequence of the temporary absence of the Rector, the Rev. Mr. Hickie has officiated for the congregation of St. John’s Church in this Town. Several members of the Church, unwilling that Mr. Hickie, on the expected return of Mr. Shortt, should leave without an acknowledgment of his acceptable services during the above time, determined to present him, on the evening of the 4th inst., with a fund amounting to fifty pounds, collected by the Ladies of the congregation. Three or four hours before the presentation the following preparatory note was sent to the Rev. Gentleman, who, until then, was not aware of what had taken place.” * * *

From the Port Hope Atlas.

“THE REV. MR. HICKIE.—For some time past, the services in St. John’s Church and the duties of the parish have been conducted by the Rev. Mr. Hickie, an able, earnest, zealous, and sensible preacher. The Rector, Mr. Shortt, whose place Mr. Hickie has so efficiently filled, having recently returned from England, Mr. Hickie leaves Port Hope, but carries with him the best wishes, not of his own congregation merely, but of all denominations of Christians here. The following letter shows, very unmistakably, how highly his services are appreciated” :—

Wednesday Morning, 4th November, 1857.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR,—We have much pleasure in communicating that a Fund, collected by the Ladies, amounting to Fifty pounds, has been placed in our hands for the purpose of being presented to you as a gift, at the close of your labours, at the Bible Class meeting this evening. This fund is the contribution of some members of St. John’s Church, of this Town; and is intended to be presented as a slight token of their appreciation of the valuable services rendered to this congregation during your sojourn amongst us. With every wish for the future welfare of yourself and family, both here and hereafter.

Believe us,

Reverend and Dear Sir,

Your sincere Friends,

B. SEYMOUR,
DAVID SMART,
H. H. MEREDITH.

To

The Reverend

JOHN HICKIE.

“The presentation took place in the Temperance Hall, at the close of the Bible Class services, which were conducted by the Rev. Messrs. Brent and Hickie. The Hall was densely crowded. David Smart, Esq., after delivering an appropriate and affectionate Address, in the name and on behalf of the congregation, presented the intended gift. Mr. Hickie made a suitable reply, gratefully thanking his audience for their invariable kindness during his sojourn among them, and for their last valuable proof of friendship. He then with a Benediction dismissed the meeting.”

A DEFENCE

OF THE

“Gospel Church”

AND

“VINDICATION.”

BY THE REV. JOHN HICKIE,

LATE INCUMBENT OF OMEME.

1861

“If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, the servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, *because they know not him that sent me.*” John 15, 18—21.

“Here I am determined by the grace of God to *conquer or die*; and have taken the following for a motto, and have placed it before me on the mantel-piece, ‘stand thou as a beaten anvil to the stroke; for it is the property of a good warrior to be *slayed* alive, and yet conquer.’” *Dr. Adam Clarke.*

THE BISHOP'S COURT.

(From the Ecclesiastical Gazette.)

“Saturday, 29th September. The Court met at one o'clock, the Chancellor, at the instance of his Lordship the Bishop, pronounced the judgment of the Court in the case of the Rev. Mr. Lewis,” (Incumbent of Prescott,) “which was in substance as follows:—“The case against the Rev. gentleman” (“for conduct unbecoming a Clergyman, and tending to bring scandal on the church”) “was considered proved with the exception of the words “false and malicious” contained in *one portion* of the charge.” “It contained an *admonishment* to the Rev. defendant, and condemned him in the costs of the proceedings, suspension to follow *if* such costs are not paid up within a month. Mr. M. C. Cameron applied for leave to appeal, which was noted.

“The case of the Rev. Mr. Hickie was then called on, but the defendant did not appear personally or by counsel. The service of the notice on the Rev. gentleman to attend having been proved, and proof having been also adduced that he was the author of the pamphlet with the publication of which he was charged, the Councillor read from the pamphlets (the same being filed on record in the Court,) several passages denying the doctrines of the Holy Trinity; that our blessed Lord had a reasonable soul connected with his body; and the necessity of the holy sacraments, &c., &c.,—the Court then adjourned to deliberate, and on reassembling, the Honourable the Chancellor by request of the Bishop, read the judgment of the Court, by which sentence of deprivation was pronounced against the Rev. defendant, and he was *further condemned in the cost of the proceedings.*”

The difference in the judgment in the two foregoing cases must forcibly strike the impartial reader. For in the case of Mr. Lewis, in which “*scandalous* and unbecoming conduct was considered proved,” there was only “*an admonishment.*” Not even a suspension, unless the compliant attendants on Dr. Strachan’s Court should be delayed in getting the rewards of their servility in the cause of their lawned benefactor. Whereas I have been deprived of my pension without being charged with any crime, except that I did not act the hypocrite and dissemble my religious sentiments. The “Bishop’s Court, a remnant of tyrannical Popery, is now established by Dr. Strachan and John Hilliard Cameron in Toronto; and we may see henceforward (according to the custom of the Romish Church) the Episcopal Minister stripped of his means of subsistence for a deviation from Puseyite “Orthodoxy,” and the “scandalous” drunkard and debauchee let virtually go free.

“What will become of the Christian Church? Who will endure hardships as
 “a good soldier for Jesus Christ? Where is the Christian, man or woman, that
 “will come out decidedly on the Lord’s side, and diligently oppose the errors, and
 “sins, and follies of the present age?

‘O! sleep not thou, as others do;
 Awake, be vigilant, be brave:
 The coward and the sluggard too
 Must wear the fetters of the slave.’

“O for a baptism of the heavenly fire! O for a light from heaven! O Lord!
 “wilt thou not revive us again? May the clouds of wrath pass away, and the sun
 “of righteousness shine with healing in his wings. May the church awake to a
 “sense of her true condition, “For these things I weep; mine eye, mine eye
 “runneth down with water, because the comforter that should relieve my soul is
 “far from me: my children are desolate, because the enemy prevailed.”” Lam.
 1. 16. (*Methodist Protestant.*)

I would avail myself of this occasion to say, that instead of gaining any pecuniary recompense for the labour which I underwent in writing and getting published the pamphlets of which this is a defence—instead of gaining, I have been at great loss. I distributed several hundreds of the “Gospel Church,” and never accepted money for one of them. I also gave away many numbers of the “Vindication,” and what I did sell did not, at the price I generally asked for them, pay the one-third of what their printing cost. However, I intend, whatever may be the sacrifice, not to cease from circulating what I believe more and more every day to be the unadulterated truth of the Gospel; relying on the positive word of Jehovah, that “He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.” Ps. cxxvi, 6.

ITEMS FROM THE PRESS.

“ A Vindication of the Pamphlet called the “ Gospel Church ” ; by a Clergyman—Peterborough, published by T. & R. White.

“ This pamphlet is, as its title imports, a defence of a former pamphlet by the same author, and which, because of its extremely “ low church,” or, as the writer would perhaps prefer us to call it, evangelical views, incurred the displeasure of a certain Doctor of Divinity, and of the Church Newspaper, “ *The Echo*.” The views propounded appear somewhat original—decidedly not such as we should have looked for from a Clergyman of the Church of England—but the ‘ Vindication ’ affords ample proof that they are not without the authority of Holy Writ, nor do they lack the support of some of the ablest Christian Authors. For ourselves, we unhesitatingly endorse the opinions advanced; for our readers, we recommend them to procure the pamphlet and judge for themselves.”—*Peterborough Review*.

“ The questions, which have for some time agitated the ranks of the Episcopalians in Canada West, lie between the Evangelical and the High Church, or Puseyite wings of the denomination—each claiming to be more truly orthodox and Catholic than the other. Among others, the Rev. John Hickie, an Episcopalian Clergyman of the Village of Omemeé, in the diocese of Toronto, Canada West, went into a careful and thorough examination of the claims of both parties. After a long and faithful investigation, he, undoubtedly to his own surprise, as well as that of others, came out in a new field unknown and unforeseen even to himself. He became satisfied that *both* parties were cherishing erroneous sentiments, and that the Episcopal Church embodied in its creeds and forms much that is unwarranted by the Bible. Being an honest and conscientious man, he at once announced his convictions to the world.

“ The *Peterborough Review*, published in Peterborough, C. W., of the 13th ult., contains a statement of this affair, from which we copy the following extract :—

“ Mr. Hickie, having persistently for a considerable time balanced the opinions of both parties, seems to have come fully and determinately to the conclusion, that both the above parties are in error; and that what are called sacraments were to be only of *temporary* use and obligation, till the early converts to christianity would know the will of the Lord more perfectly at the time of the coming of the Lord with power, that is, at the destruction of Jerusalem; after which time, the meridian blaze of Christ’s truth and glory would cause all the christian worshippers to worship the Father “ *in spirit and in truth*.”

“ Mr. Hickie wrote a pamphlet setting forth his views as to the gross errors which, he thought, prevailed concerning the sacraments. In it he explained

“the doctrine of the Trinity, which should be understood as meaning a three-fold
 “manifestation of the one Lord, and not three distinct individual Beings. He
 “also exposed in it the erroneous notion of our Saviour possessing a human
 “rational soul, when a *sensitive soul only* was necessary; the divine nature per-
 “forming the functions of reason, *and supplying the place* of what we call the
 “*mind*—the spiritual and intellectual principle in man. This pamphlet having
 “been circulated widely during the preceding year, and having been defended
 “from the pulpit and in private by Mr. Hickie, he thought it right to ascertain
 “unequivocally and publicly, whether his ministrations, according to his well
 “known views and teachings, were acceptable to his congregation, and whether
 “they wished him to continue to officiate among them. Notice to this effect hav-
 “ing been given out in the church on Sunday, the 27th of March, an unusually
 “large meeting took place on the next day, when, after hearing Mr. Hickie at
 “length, only one * in the assemblage was found to vote against his remaining.

“On the 8th of May following, a commission, comprising Archdeacon Bethune,
 “and two clerical associate inquisitors, (Messrs. Allen and Short) arrived in Om-
 “mee. No public notice had been given, but such was the interest felt, that the
 “Church was densely crowded. The commission, having commenced to take
 “evidence as to Mr. Hickie being the author of the two pamphlets generally at-
 “tributed to him, and having declared that there was no other charge of any kind
 “against him, Mr. Hickie thereupon rose, and, after having frankly proclaimed
 “himself the author, requested to be heard for *one half hour*; engaging at the
 “same time to show, how the members of the commission were as far asunder in
 “their religious views and teachings as the Poles; and that after speaking the allot-
 “ted time, if he should not succeed in proving his pamphlets to be scriptural, and
 “the doctrines held by the members of the Commission respectively to be error-
 “neous in the estimation of the audience, he would forthwith burn all his pamph-
 “lets. This reasonable proposal the Commission repeatedly and perseveringly
 “refused, stating that they were acting in the capacity of a grand jury to hear
 “only one side of the question, and that an opportunity would be given to Mr.
 “Hickie to speak in his defence before any ulterior measures concerning him
 “would be resorted to. † Mr. Hickie further challenged one or all of the Com-
 “missioners, or any person to be selected by them, to meet him in a public discus-
 “sion on the disputed points, at any place or time, before twelve or more of the in-
 “habitants; but the whole three reverend gentlemen absolutely declined all con-
 “troversy, and refused to hear Mr. Hickie’s defence. Such arbitrary demeanor
 “of the Commissioners, coupled with very uncomplimentary language to Mr. Hickie
 “and the meeting from the two clerical attendants, had the effect of raising the
 “excitement of the congregation to an indistinguishable height. Mr. Hickie pro-
 “duced an address to him from seventy-six of his congregation, which had been
 “signed in two or three days, requesting him to continue among them.

“On the 20th instant it was communicated to Mr. Hickie, that Archdeacon

* This person is a Mr. William Turner, lately a storekeeper in Omeme, who
 had been appointed Church Warden some time before by me, and whose violent
 displeasure I incurred for reprimanding his ill-behaved children in the Sunday
 School.

“Forgiveness to the injured doth belong,
 He never pardons, who hath done the wrong.”

† The “ulterior measures” concerning me were commenced shortly after the
 above occurrence; but the opportunity of speaking in my defence, which was
 promised publicly to me, was never given. The promise, even at the time it was
 made, was judged by all present to be more jesuitical than real.

“Bethune had written a letter to one * of the Church Wardens, to say, that, by the direction of the Bishop of Toronto, Mr. Hickie should no longer officiate in the Church at Omemeé, and that he should be kept out of the parsonage. † The Church was therefore locked, so as to hinder Mr. Hickie and the congregation from meeting there on Easter Sunday. The people were very much incensed, and found means of opening their Church for themselves and their minister; though the latter for peace sake urgently for two or three days previously had pressed his wish for leaving the Church and for preaching in the Town Hall. Finding on the Sunday morning that the Church was open and the congregation assembled therein waiting for him, he gratified their desire, as he had received no *direct* prohibition to do so. For the same reason he presided at the vestry meeting next day, when a number of people attended. On this occasion the obnoxious Church Warden was got rid of, Mr. Hickie was unanimously voted thanks, and was requested to continue to preach in the Church. Mr. Hickie thanked them; but expressed decidedly his determination not to trouble the Church, but to preach in the Town Hall for the future. ‡

“Although this case bears hard on Mr. Hickie, yet, as it exhibits in the clearest light the arbitrary, unjust, and venomous spirit, which is engendered by religious *partialism* in every form, we are confident it will lead to the promotion of liberal Christianity in Canada West. The people will not countenance *persecution* for an honest difference of opinion. Let “Orthodoxy,” persist in exhibiting its horns and hoofs, and in pushing and kicking with the same. It will soon find itself deserted by all the high-minded and generous hearted.”—*New York Christian Ambassador*.

“TO THE REV. MR. HICKIE, OMEMEÉ.

“REV. SIR,—I understand that, on a recent occasion, you invited to a public discussion any clergyman, who ventured to call in question the correctness of certain strange opinions, put forth by you in the pulpit and the press. This was a bold challenge, and, if unanswered, might leave an impression on people’s minds that

* The other Church Warden, Mr. Wm. Curry, was not written to on this occasion. He appears to have been looked upon all through this business as having *no mind of his own*, and consequently to have been the facile tool of his despotic partner in office. “Ullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.”

† I had left the parsonage several months before, with the settled determination of never returning to it, or having anything to do with it. Therefore Archdeacon Bethune’s missive, to keep me out of the parsonage, was a gratuitous and unnecessary insult.

‡ It is to be deplored that, shortly after this, the interior of the Church at Omemeé was daubed with some kind of dirt in the night time. The perpetrators of this foul deed are hitherto unknown. Some supposed that it was done to annoy the rough, vindictive Church Warden, who was almost universally disliked at the time. Others thought that it was done to cast odium on Mr. Hickie’s friends; for that they would most likely be suspected, under the circumstances, for doing harm to the Church which they had evacuated. But, whoever were the guilty parties, it is certain that not one of Mr. Hickie’s bitterest persecutors ever insinuated that he had the slightest knowledge of the transaction, or that he would look upon it in any way but with the greatest detestation.

“your opinions could not be controverted or denied. Now, I beg of you to bear in mind, that at the time of your ordination, you, in the most solemn manner, pledged yourself to preach and teach in accordance with the articles of that Church, of which I am an unworthy minister. If you are, or consider yourself a minister of that Church, there can be no matter of dispute between us, as we both pledged ourselves to defend and promulgate the same great fundamental truths of the Christian religion. If, however, in accordance with the statement in your pamphlet, page 62, (“I am not the hired teacher or obedient instrument of any religious party or denomination,”) you made a public declaration that you have seceded from the Church of England, that you deny her articles and refute her discipline; I shall be most happy to meet you in discussion, when and where you please, it being fully understood that I appear to defend, you to assail, the doctrines of the Church of England.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

JOHN VICARS.

“Lindsay, April 22nd, 1859.

“*To the Editor of the Omeme Warder.*”

“MR. VICARS'S CHALLENGE CONSIDERED.

“MR. EDITOR,—I have lately seen in the columns of the *Omeme Warder*, two letters against a pamphlet called the “Gospel Church.” One of the writers designates himself “an unworthy Church warden,” and the other writer designates himself “an unworthy Minister.” Now, however unworthy they, in their assumed humility, may have considered themselves, or others may have considered them, yet one thing is plain to all reasonable persons who have read their productions, that they are unworthy of a reply. For, what is the substance of the several charges brought against me? Why, that I act inconsistently with what I pledged myself to, “in the most solemn manner,” at my ordination.

“Now, let us look at some of those pledges to be found in the “Ordering of Priests,” in our prayer-books. The Bishop says to the Candidate for the Priesthood:—“Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?”

“Answer—I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

“The Bishop—Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word; and to use both public and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, within your cure, as need shall require, and occasion shall be given?”

“*Answer*—I will, the Lord being my helper.

“*The Bishop*—Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?

“*Answer*—I will endeavour myself so to do, the Lord being my helper.

“When, in accordance with those pledges taken “in the most solemn manner,” I used “diligence in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh,” (which, that all Ministers would do, is the greatly needed and unanimously wished for thing) and when “I determined out of the said Scriptures to instruct the people committed to my charge, and to *teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation*, but that which I became persuaded may be concluded and *proved* by the Scriptures,”—when, I say, after long and laborious study, I determined humbly to benefit my fellow-men with the fruits of my researches, I was immediately assailed with charges of unfaithfulness to my ordination vows, &c. It is true, that the pledges, which I, through ignorance, made, of maintaining man-invented, anti-scriptural doctrines or forms, I considered, on observing their erroneousness, would be (like Herod’s oath) “more honored in the breach than in the observance.” Let any candid person read the sixth Article of the Church, and then tell me how I could have acted otherwise than I have done.

“Here I may be told that in outstripping the Protestant doctrines I outstrip the Reformers themselves. And what if I do? Is there not a cause? For though the Reformers, conducted by Divine grace, did wonders in casting off the great bulk of the incrustations of Popery, yet their hands were too full, and their spiritual insight was of so late a date, that we are naturally surprised how exceedingly well they did in their day. But *we* have not the same difficulties and persecutions to contend with as they had; while we enjoy their invaluable works and example, inciting us, not to indolence and Romish-like unconcern, but to investigation, perseverance, and decision. Mosheim, writing in defence of the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, says in page 83, vol. 2:—“The glorious defenders of religious liberty, to whom we owe the various blessings of the Reformation, as they were conducted only by the suggestions of their natural sagacity, whose advances in the pursuit of knowledge are gradual and progressive, *could not at once behold the truth in all its lustre, and in all its extent*, but, as usually happens to persons that have been long accustomed to the darkness of ignorance, their approaches towards knowledge were but slow, and their views of things but imperfect.” *

* But, besides this, the Reformers did not claim to be infallible, nor do we attribute infallibility to them. We are bound to follow them no further than they

“To the law and to the testimony,” then, and I would even add, look to the prayer-book. For in the last rubrick after the “Communion,” it is said, “that it is “against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one,” or to suppose a corporal presence in the Lord’s Supper; and yet we pray that we may be *partakers* of Christ’s most blessed *body*, &c. But Mr. Vicars will not go with me to the Scriptures, nor to the prayer-book, in discussion; because, says he, “if you are, or consider yourself, a Minister of that Church, there can be *no matter of dispute* between us.” By “that Church” Mr. Vicars means the Church of England; and it surprises me how Mr. Vicars can be ignorant of the well-known fact, how that its Ministers everywhere, for the last three centuries, have had “Election,” “Predestination,” and “Free Will,” as “matters of dispute” between them. And who has not heard of the notorious disputings between the High-Church and Low-Church; accusing each other of respectively sliding into Rome and Geneva; bandying the bickering epithets of Altitudinarians, Latitudinarians, pernicious Heretics, demi-Papists, &c., &c. † Mr. Vicars should, for peace sake, send to the respective parties throughout the British empire, as well as to his clerical brethren in this Diocese, (where both parties are about equally divided) an encyclical letter to awaken them all out of their suicidal revery; for that if they “are, or consider themselves Ministers of *that Church*, *there can be no matter of dispute between them.*”

“Mr. Vicars further says, “if you made a public declaration that you have seceded from the Church of England, that you deny her Articles and refute her

“followed Christ. Their teaching *must be tried* by the “law and the testimony * * *” In what part of the inspired writings are we taught that the influence which renders the ministry effectual is communicated, like an electric shock, by carnal contact? The doctrine of apostolical succession is nothing but a Popish figment, invented to supply a fictitious title to a class of men who have no valid claim to the Christian ministry.”—*Achill Missionary Herald*, Vol. xxi, No. 256.

† Who has not read or heard of the unseemly and dis-creditable scenes which of late have been witnessed at St. Paul’s, Knightsbridge, St. Barnabas’, Pimlico, and St. George’s-in-the-East? The awful ruffianism displayed in the last mentioned Church, in England, on Easter Sunday, 1860, carried on by the Evangelicals or Low Church party and instigated (most probably) by dissenters covertly, was enough, I do believe, to put to the blush the *Fancy* lately congregated at Farnborough, to abet the disgusting encounter between Sayers and Heenan. How very true the remark, that often “an error is crucified, while crime is hugged.” Certainly the Rev. Bryan King, with his intoning Curates and white-robed choristers, seemed to have more regard for religion—notwithstanding all their ridiculous nonsense—than the “stanch Protestants,” who, like the incarnate fiends at the time of the French revolution, chaunted in mockery the praises of God, hurled their bibles, prayer-books, and cushions at the senseless decorations in the Church, and attacked most rudely the silly officials. Such irreligious and disgraceful fruit on the part of the Low Church, shows the nature and quality of the tree; unless they assert with the R. Catholics that “the wrath of man worketh the righteousness of God, James i 20,” and that they “may do evil, that good might come.”

"discipline, I shall be most happy to meet you in discussion, * &c." The Bishop "and clergy may admire Mr. Vicars's heroic determination of entering into the "threatened polemical discussion; but Mr. Vicars has his own private opinion, "and thinks "discretion to be the better part of valour." This is plain from the "indispensable condition on which he can meet me, viz:—That I *made* a public "declaration of so and so, which he well knows I never did—Mr. Vicars wants "me to reject *all* the Articles, doctrines, and discipline of the Church; in short, "to leave it; holding to the adage, "That it is a bad wind that will not blow "somebody good." I have clearly and openly avowed my opinions; Mr. Vicars "knows them, calls them strange in his letter, purposes to lecture on them; and "still will not venture into a discussion of them, but on a certain condition!!!

I remain, Mr. Editor,

Yours very truly,

JOHN HICKIE.

Omemees, April 29th, 1859.

* The following (as I have accidentally heard) is from a layman who lives near Peterborough:—

"To the Editor of the Peterborough Examiner.

"Mr. Editor,—Church Establishments have always been the unblushing advocates of mental slavery. They are unquestionably "great marvels," and are "surely deserving of grateful support, because they abrogate the labour of thinking, and dispense with the fatiguing task of inquiry and private judgment, and "with it the perplexities often attendant thereon!! He, who enters within the "precincts of an establishment, bows his neck to the yoke at the portals; and having pronounced the required shibboleth, sacrificed to the idol uniformity, and "registered his consent and belief to the required propositions, [be they perspicuous or mysterious, consistent or discrepant]—having renounced liberty of "thought, surrendered his judgment, and enslaved his convictions, he prostrates "himself before the authority which stamps him slave, and which, being to him "more potent than conscience, (the arbiter of right) exonerates him from the "consequences of belief. State Churches have, in fact, reversed the legitimate "operation of the intellectual powers; nay, with awful presumption they have "done the same with the teachings of inspiration. The very religion which came "from God has been employed to rear the Inquisition, and kindle fires for the "martyrs. Christianity has no tendency to break the human spirit or to make "man a slave. It contains nothing narrowing or depressing, and nothing of the "littleness of systems, which *craft* and *ambition* have engendered. It contains "no *yoke of ceremonies*; no *outward* religion. It is a State Church which peremptorily decrees to the mind, "Hither shalt thou come but no farther;" "which draws a line, beyond which no energy must presume to pass; which describes a circle, whose magic boundaries must for ever confine the knowledge "and information of man. But their might and power have passed the meridian. "Knowledge in its onward flood has long since swept beyond the sites which support their ponderous foundation. And, as each succeeding wave is silently "advancing, it truly indicates the extent of the progress of moral and intellectual powers in arms against this giant evil, which has been in every age the ally "of the tyrant and the foe of religious liberty."

Ashburnham.

Yours truly,

C. S. D.

To the Editor of the Omemees Warder.

“Omemees, June 8th, 1859.

• • • “P. S.—I again challenge Mr. Vicars to meet me in fair, open controversy, on the points of doctrine on which we differ.

J. H.”

The above challenge *is still unaccepted*, and, in the words of Mr. Vicars, this circumstance leaves an impression on people's minds that Mr. Hickie's “opinions *could not be controverted or denied.*”

October, 1860.

“Nor should a student in divinity imagine that our age is arrived at a full understanding of everything which can be known by the Scriptures. Every age since the Reformation hath thrown some further light on difficult texts and paragraphs of the Bible, which have been long obscured by the early rise of Antichrist: and since there are at present many difficulties and darknesses hanging about certain truths of the Christian religion, and since several of these relate to important doctrines, such as the origin of sin, the fall of Adam, the person of Christ, the blessed Trinity, and decrees of God, &c., which do still embarrass the minds of honest and inquiring readers, and which make work for noisy controversy; it is certain there are several things in the Bible yet unknown, and *not sufficiently explained; and it is certain that there is some way to solve these difficulties*, and to reconcile these seeming contradictions. And why may not a sincere searcher of truth in the present age, by labour, diligence, study, and prayer, with the best use of his reasoning powers, find out the proper solution of those knots and perplexities which have hitherto been unsolved, and which have afforded matter for angry quarrelling? Happy is every man who shall be favoured of Heaven, to give a helping hand towards the introduction of the blessed age of light and love.”—*Dr. Isaac Watts.*

Combe on the “Constitution of Man” relates the observations of two eminent men. The first observation is from the present Archbishop of Dublin, who says: “In proportion as any branch of study leads to important and useful results, in proportion as it gains ground in public estimation—in proportion as it tends to overthrow prevailing errors—in the same degree it may be expected to call forth angry declamation from those who are trying to despise what they will not learn, and are wedded to prejudices which they cannot defend. Galileo probably would have escaped persecution, if his discoveries could have been disproved, and his reasonings refuted. ‘But till the advocates of Christianity will have become universally much better acquainted with the true character of their religion, than, universally, they have ever yet been, we must always expect that every branch of study, every scientific theory, that is brought into notice, will be assailed on religious grounds, by those who either have not studied the subject, or who are incompetent judges of it; or again, who are addressing them-

“selves to such persons as are so circumstanced, and wish to excite and to take advantage of the passions of the ignorant. *Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo.*” *

The second observation is from the Rev. A. Sedgwick, who says:—“A Brahmin crushed with a stone the microscope that first showed him living things among the vegetables of his daily food. The spirit of the Brahmin lives in Christendom. The bad principles of our nature are not bounded by *caste* or climate; and men are still to be found who, if not restrained by the wise and humane laws of their country, would try to stifle by personal violence, and crush by brute force, every truth not hatched among their own conceits, and confined within the narrow fences of their own ignorance.” †

“Now if persons who have picked up these objections from others, and take for granted they are of weight, upon the word of those from whom they received them, or, by often retailing of them, come to see, or fancy they see, them to be of weight, will not prepare themselves for such an examination, with a competent degree of knowledge; or will not give that time and attention to the subject, which, from the nature of it, is necessary for attaining such information: in this case, they must remain in doubtless ignorance, or error; in the same way as they must, with regard to common sciences, and matters of common life, if they neglect the necessary means of being informed in them.” —*Bp. Butler's Analogy of Religion, page 259.*

The following extract is from the “Catholic Layman,” a monthly periodical published in Dublin, by Clergymen of the Church of England:—“The history of such a revolution of opinion as this (effected by Galileo) affords us a striking proof of how little value are arguments by which it is often attempted to prevent any reformers from even getting a hearing. It is of no purpose to ask the reformer, “Do you pretend that all the rest of the world are wrong, and that you alone are in the right? Are you wiser than all the great men who have lived and been honoured before you? Must we look on them as simpletons and idiots?” Questions like these are often addressed to the putters forth of strange doctrine, and seem well calculated to reduce them to silence if they have any modesty at all. And, yet, we see from this history (of Galileo) that it is quite possible that the reformer may be in the right, and all the rest of the world in the wrong; and we learn to be cautious how we refuse a hearing even to what is most opposed to our prejudices, since it may happen to us to find truth where we least expect it.

* The above words of the Latin poet may be thus paraphrased:—“When convinced that in their persecuting position they disqualify themselves from expecting assistance from on high, they will employ evil influences, which can only be derived from the powers of darkness.”

† Yet truth will—must at last prevail,
And raise a shining refulgent flame,
That will dispel the darkness that pervades
This wretched world, and its priest-ridden slaves.

“We have seen several maintain that the question is decided at once against Luther, Melancthon, and the rest of them, by the mere fact that they were *innovators*, and were putting forward views at variance with those held by the great body of Christians in their times. To one who looks at the question rightly, this is just a reason why their doctrines are entitled to a very serious examination. If they had been lazy, unenquiring men, they would have continued to believe as their fathers had believed before them—they would have swallowed everything indiscriminately. The fact that after studying both sides they changed their opinions—that they gave up opinions which had all the weight of authority to commend them, and adopted others which could have no recommendation at all, unless it were the force of truth which compelled them to receive them—this fact is one which ought to induce a candid person to give a very serious consideration to the arguments by which they professed to have been influenced.

“Galileo had to face a powerful party, which, when invited to look on an object in the heavens which Aristotle had never suspected, *immediately* refused all evidence to those senses to which at other times they so confidently appealed. “Plagiarist! liar! impostor! heretic! were the malignant exclamations by which the poor philosopher was unsparingly assailed. In one of his letters he expresses strongly the hopelessness of convincing people who were resolved not to be convinced.” See No. of October 15, 1857. *

* In the “Chronological Tables” appended to Mosheim’s history, we are told that in the seventh Century “Virgilius was also accused of heresy by Pope Zachary, because he was a good mathematician, and believed the existence of Antipodes.” We are there told further of Cæcus Asculanus, who, in the sixteenth Century, “was burnt at Florence by the Inquisition for making some experiments in mechanics that appeared miraculous to the vulgar.” And do we not see “honest Garibaldi” at the present day yielding deference to the imposition long practised by the priests at Naples concerning the liquefaction of St. Januarius’ blood, because he deems it politically necessary to do so? It is the consideration of expediency which causes most people of discernment to reject, or be careless about truth. I have experienced as much indifference to Gospel truth among all the Protestant sects (clerical and lay) as among Roman Catholics; and as much unreasonable bitterness of disposition towards me, especially from the aged who wish to be accounted religious.

“The Christian prays for fuller manifestations of Christ’s power and glory and love to him; but he is often not aware that this is, in truth, praying to be brought into the furnace: for in the furnace only it is that Christ can walk with his friends, and display, in their preservation and deliverance, His own Almighty power.”—*Rev. E. Nangle.*

PREFACE.

I intend in this preface to say but little of myself. The well disposed reader would sympathise with me were he to know the losses sustained by me for conscience sake ; but sympathy from man is not to be relied on. If a person, who breasts the current of ignorance and prejudice, have not comfort and help from above, he is of all men most miserable. For he has not only to endure the rude assaults of the unprincipled worlding, who too often has influence in the congregation and even an official position in it, but he has also to suffer from the jealous insinuations and calumnious reports, industriously circulated by hireling Ministers and their obsequious adherents. However, "I believed, and therefore have I spoken."

"Should earth against my soul engage,
And hellish darts be hurl'd,
Then I can smile at Satan's rage,
And face a frowning world."

Protestant ministers affect to commiserate the want of intelligence, mind, and spirit, observable in Roman Catholics, in a blind obedience to the despotic sway of their priests, who have absolute dominion over the faith of their flocks, and will not allow them *the right of private judgment*. But when their own errors are proclaimed, they then take the very same ground as the priests, and, on the controversial points, forbid their hearers, as stringently and as unreasonably, the exercise of their reasoning powers. They stop enquiry by alleging that the Church has "authority in controversies of faith." Thus the divines of the Church of England, treading exactly in the steps of Popery, enacted the same method for deciding controversy.

In a note in Mosheim, p. 240, we read:—"These divines have been confuted "by the learned Dr. Whitby, in his important work, *concerning the interpretation of Scripture after the manner of the Fathers*, which was published at London in 8vo. in the year 1714, under the following title: *A Dissertation, &c.* "In this dissertation, which was the forerunner of the many remarkable attempts "that were afterwards made to deliver the right of private judgment, in matters "of religion, from the restraints of human authority, the judicious author has "shown, *first*, that the Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith, and that by it "alone we are to judge of the doctrines that are necessary to salvation ; *secondly*, "that the fathers, both of the primitive times and also of succeeding ages, are "extremely deficient and unsuccessful in their explications of the sacred writings : "and, *thirdly*, that it is impossible to terminate the debates that have been raised "concerning the Holy Trinity by the opinions of the Fathers, the decisions of "Councils, or by any tradition that is really universal. The contradictions, ab-

“surdities, the romantic conceits, and extravagant fancies, that are to be found in the commentaries of the Fathers, were never represented in such a ridiculous point of view as they are in this performance.”

In the “Gospel Church” p. 11, I showed from Mosheim the awful state religion was in during the Nicene Age or the fourth century. Dr. Cumming in his ninth Lecture to be found in his late work “Lectures for the Times” draws a more hideous picture (if possible) of the same period wherein the doctrine of the Trinity was established, and concludes as follows:—“We are driven from all systems of Ecclesiastical polity, from all prescriptions of patronage or popular election, simply “to the Law and to the Testimony.” It *alone* is the standard of truth; its testimony *alone* is our protection against error. Whatever is according to this Book, is truth; but if *all* the Bishops, and Fathers, and Doctors of the Universal Church were to assert something not according to it, their consentaneous asserations would weigh but as a feather against one single text taken from the Oracles of God.”

Most of the persons that I have conversed with concerning my view of one individual Spirit or Person only in the Godhead, exhibited in Revelation in his three offices or attitudes of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have, after a dispassionate bearing, admitted their entire concurrence with the same. With regard to our Lord having assumed at his incarnation a rational, human soul, the preconceived opinion proves more difficult of removal. For, owing to the habitual teaching and absence of consideration, there are unhappily connected in peoples minds with the idea of Christ's human soul two things, viz:—the seat of compassion, and the action of mediation. In both these particulars (that is, in the source of compassion, and in the action of a Mediator,) the great high priest is cast into the shade, the sun of righteousness is eclipsed, and the supplemented soul is prominently set forth in his place. The Apostle Paul, in Heb. iv, 14, 15. declares that our great high priest who “is passed into the heavens” in his *official* attitude of Redeemer; (for, as the absolute God, his throne was there from the time of their creation); and who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; (as we see from Jer. xxxi 20, Hos. xi 8, &c., the blessed God always was long before his incarnation); and who was in all points tempted like as we are; (as when Satan said to our Lord, If thou be the *Son of God*, cast thyself down, &c.):—the Apostle Paul declares this high priest to be the *Son of God*, that is, Christ in his *Divine Nature*. Then, when we consider the *infinite* holiness *necessary* in the Atoner, so as to qualify him to offer up an *eligible* expiation to his *infinitely holy* Godhead which was offended, we see the incapability of Christ's human soul to offer *such an adequate atonement*. For the human soul of Christ, even if he had one, was undeniably *finite*. And as the competence and value of the Intercessor depends on the worth of the Expiator, therefore the nature of Christ's human soul's contribution of intercession for us is palpably absurd. Christ's human body was valuable in the way of our redemption; for through its *instrumentality* in passive obedience and suffering, and in its bearing vicariously our sins on the tree, (1st Peter

3. 21,) those who rely by faith on the atonement made by means of it, "are sanctified *through the offering of the body* of Jesus Christ once for all." Heb. x 10. If all this be true, I may surely enquire what was, or what is, the province, or use, of a human rational soul to our redeeming God.

Several of my friends have turned against me because I refused to baptize their children. I think they act unreasonably in requiring me to do what I believe is purely Popish and unscriptural. Besides, in officiating according to their desire, either according to the Episcopal prayer book or the Methodist book of discipline, I should be proclaiming solemnly and deliberately what I believed to be unfounded and false. Look for instance to the introductory address in the *Ministration of Baptism*, where it is said:—Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, None can enter into the Kingdom of God, except he be *regenerate and born anew of water* and of the Holy Ghost, &c. Here the people are unmistakably instructed in the doctrine of *Baptismal regeneration*, * and also in the *absolute necessity*

* It would become the "Low Church" clergy rather to lay aside all evasion and equivocation; and, as long as they use their prayer book office of Baptism, fairly to avow Baptismal Regeneration. This is the opinion of the candid Mr. Montgomery, as the following extract from his "Gospel before the Age" shews: "But there is another view" (he says) "of the subject, viz:—what is the doctrine "which the *honest Churchman*, who professes to act out the spirit of his Church "in her sacraments, and articles, and canons, ought to hold and exhibit? The "question is simply this. Does the Church of England consider the efficacy of "the baptismal sacrament so contingent a thing, and so barren a rite, as to regard "the child in *the same spiritual condition before baptism, as it does after it "has been baptised*. Now we frankly confess the sectarian alchemy, which certain Low Churchmen have applied to our office of baptism, in order to change "into another meaning certain terms which obviously imply *a regeneration to "accompany the sacrament*,—would deserve a description we should be sorry to "apply. Truly those, who have been stricken into horrors at a certain "number "ninety," may begin to tremble at number *one*,—that is, *themselves*. Perhaps "the records of the Church contain nothing more jesuitically unfair than certain "attempts to prove this,—namely, that the Church of England in her office for "infant baptism did not know what she intended,—and does not intend what she "declares * * * * * Against all this, one simple passage in her service is an "ample reply:—"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is *regenerate, &c.*" But is this regeneration no substantive reality? Is it a mere ideal "possibility, a contingent something which faith cannot apprehend? No, we beg "you to listen to the following words:—"Let us give thanks unto Almighty God "for *these benefits*." Here undoubtedly is a return of grateful prayer, not for a "fiction or idea, but for positive and ascertainable good. But what follows is "still more conclusive: "And with one accord make our prayers unto Him, that "this child may lead the rest of his life *according to this beginning*." Now let "us, for God's sake, be candid,—what can the Church mean by "*this beginning*," "except it be a commenced life of the new creature in the second Adam, as opposed to the death of the old life by original sin in the first Adam? *No words "can be more decisive than these: and it is more worthy a Popish controversialist than a minister of our reformed Catholic Church, to bend these "words into a shape and significance which it is impossible the Church herself could ever have intended them to bear.*"

of water baptism. * I am at a loss to conceive what other meaning can be attached to the words, or for what other purpose are they repeated on such occasions. Now, I do not believe that our Lord, in the foregoing passage of Scripture, meant material water; and in this belief I am confirmed by several of the most eminent Protestant divines, whose names I have given in page 57 of my "Vindication," on the authority of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel. I shall only add here what Bishop Taylor says in his *Liberty of Prophecy*, page 213, concerning the passage in John iii 5:—"The water and the spirit in this place signify the same thing; and by water is meant the effect of the spirit cleansing and purifying the soul, as appears in its parallel of Christ baptizing with the Spirit and fire."

Again, in the prayer following the address, our Saviour being baptized in the Jordan is said to have sanctified water "to the mystical washing away of sin," or, "for this holy Sacrament;" and, therefore, shortly after, the sanctification of the water, which is about to be used in the performance of the rite, is besought from God!!! It was the fulfilling of all righteousness, that is, the complying with all the obligations of the ceremonial, as well as the moral law, that our Saviour designed by his baptism, and *not the sanctification of water*. Indeed, it is high time we should give up such Romish puerilities.

Again, the account, (recorded in Mark x,) of young children being brought to Christ, and being blessed by him, is addressed to the people present, who shall stand up for the purpose of attending to it, and who shall be invited to hear it. Who would not believe that there would be some allusion, at least, to water baptism in it, when so prominently brought forward on such an occasion? And yet there is there nothing of the kind throughout.

Again, the salvation of Noah in the ark by water, and the children of Israel being led safely through the Red Sea, are said to have been figurative of God's "holy baptism." If the baptism by God, which is unquestionably "holy," (i. e. conferring and promoting holiness) and which was always felt and experienced, even from the fall of man, by God's people—if the "one baptism" through which "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body"—if this inward baptism by

* I can show from the highest authorities of the Church of England that the explanation of the sacraments being *generally* necessary to salvation, means "*universally i. e. to all men*," as the Provost's Catechism in Trinity College, Toronto, defines the word "generally." I shall here only instance a pamphlet written by the Rev. W. B. Knight, examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Llandaff. This pamphlet is professedly written for the conversion of Baptists, and has been printed and circulated by the great Church Society "for promoting Christian knowledge." It says:—"The third text which I design to examine is John iii 5, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.' There cannot be a stronger proof than this very verse contains, that no person whatever, man, woman, or child, can, in the revealed way, enter into the Kingdom of God, unless he be born of water as well as of the Spirit, as mentioned in the text. *The Spirit is not more expressly declared to be essential than water. Both are essential.*"

God, in his office as the Holy Spirit or Sanctifier, were meant—then I could see how Noah's being saved by water, and the Israelites' safe passage through the Red Sea, were types to the *one* anti-type—spiritual baptism, or, as St. Peter calls it, the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. *

But neither the Church of England nor the Methodists, in their books of devotion, (for I am examining both at the same time) mean the Spiritual baptism, but water—baptism, in the places referred to.

Again, they pray that through their baptism its recipient “may be received into the ark of Christ's Church.” I presume it is the Spiritual Church of Christ that is meant here; and, if it is, those that are born into it are born, “not of corruptible seed,” (such as water) “but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever:” (1st Pet. i 23,) for that only “which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” According to the apostolic doctrine, there is but one baptism now remaining in force: “One Lord, one faith, *one baptism*.” And as the Christian dispensation is that of Christ, the *one baptism* must be *the baptism of Christ*; † which is not by water, but by the Holy Ghost. By receiving the same Spirit, we become of the same Spiritual body. The outward and visible sign may introduce us into membership with such an outward and visible Church as holds with the retention of the sign; but it is the effectual operation of the Spirit of Christ in us, that renders us members of his body, or true spiritual Church.

From all that I can see of the nature, use, and *benefit* of water-baptism; and from the settled conviction on my mind of the gross errors and transparent incongruities to be found in the authorized formularies of the different Protestant denominations concerning it; I should be ranked with those, who not only “teach for doctrines the commandments of men,” but also among those, who “speak lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron,” if I were to practise or countenance what is so much akin to Popery, and so foreign to the true spirituality of a Gospel Church. As an accountable being I claim for myself freedom of opinion, and I freely and fully accord the same to all others.

* The efficacy of Christ's resurrection is the gift of the Spirit, and the Spirit of Christ in a believer rectifies his *conscience*, and makes it *good*, so that it can return a sweet answer to God upon every word of his; for the work of the Spirit in the heart answers every word of faith spoken from God; particularly it can say to God, I was indeed filthy and unclean throughout, but I am now *washed*, and justified, and sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *by the Spirit of my God*. It is this Spirit—baptism which saves, and not the water, which puts away the filth of the flesh only, but leaves the filth of the Spirit as much as ever. The truly baptized first dies unto sin, and is raised up afterwards from sin unto righteousness.

† Zuinglius, writing concerning the Commission of our Lord to his disciples to baptise in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, says:—“Jesus Christ “did not by these words institute a form of baptism which we should use, as divines have falsely taught.”—*Zuin. Lib. De. Bapt. P. 56, Tom. 2, Oper.*

We find moreover, in John iii. 30, the Baptist saying, "He (i. e. Christ) must increase, but I must decrease;" This indicates that as the Spiritual ministration of Christ should advance, John's watery one should recede. Instead of the latter *being joined* with the former, it should fall into disuse by degrees. From the manner in which Paul in 1st Cor. i, thanked God that he had baptized but two or three families, it is evident that the apostles looked not on water-baptism as an essential or integral part of Christianity. We see also that in the apostolic times regeneration was not consequent upon its administration; for the Samaritans received the baptism of the Holy Ghost *some time* after their water-baptism (Acts 8); Cornelius and his friends received it *before* (Acts x 47); and Simon the sorcerer received it *not at all*, though he was baptized with water (Acts viii).

The continuance of water-baptism by the apostles was but an occasional *condescension*; * for it having been an ancient custom, both among Jews and Gentiles, to initiate their proselites by it; and it also having † been administered by John under divine authority, and taken up from him by the disciples of our Lord; it was become a ceremony of considerable account with the generality, who saw not sufficiently into the purity and simplicity of the Gospel: therefore it could not, even after the inward baptism of Christ, (in his *official sphere* as the Holy Ghost) was manifested and experienced, be every where laid aside *suddenly*; neither was it required so to be, but as John intimated, to decrease according as the *power* of Godliness would prevail over its *form*. In like manner, the apostles also occasionally complied with the rites of the Mosaic law in various particulars, viz:—circumcision, vows, shavings, exterior purifications, sacrifices, anointings, &c., all which were permitted *for a season*; yet had the professors of Christianity abode in the Spirit of it, and sincerely sought a growth therein, ceremonies of all kinds would soon have been extinct in the Church. But, instead of growing in grace, and in the saving knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, a falling away began *early* ‡ to take place, and in proportion as the life of religion dwindled, forms and shadows were more and more fastened upon, and gradually increased upon, the declining state of the Church, as the Spirit of Anti-Christ gained ground.

* Paul says:—"And unto the Jews *I became as a Jew*, that I might gain the Jews: to them that are under the law, *as under the law*, that I might gain them that are under the law—To the weak *became I as weak*, that I might gain the weak: I am made *all things* to all men, that I might by all means save some." 1st Cor. ix 20, 22.

† The object of John's water-baptism was typically to *manifest* the purity of Christ's approaching Kingdom of Grace. He therefore says:—"I knew him not: but that he should be made *manifest to Israel*, therefore am I come baptizing with *water* * * * * He that *sent me* to baptize with *water*, the same said into me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, he same is he which *baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.*" John i 31, 33.

‡ Zuinglius, the founder of the Reformed Church, and the earliest as well as he most eminent of all the Reformers, says:—"In the beginning of my book I must ingenuously profess, that almost all those that have undertaken to write of baptism, even from the very times of the Apostles, have, (which I desire may be taken with the favour of all) *not in a few things*, erred from the Scope."—*Zuin, De. Bapt. P. 56, Tom. 2 Op. r.*

I have also been blamed by my friends for discontinuing the administration of the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, I cannot help often expressing my surprise that they, whether Clerical or Lay, having any knowledge of the spirituality of the Gospel, should not only believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, which Dr. Whately, one of their Archbishops, allows to be *unscriptural*, and to be *erroneously* called a mystery, but that they should also repeatedly, in their communion service, call the Lord's Supper a mystery. For not only the plainness of our Lord's directions to his disciples, who were, at the time of the supper, in sorrow at the thought of his departure from them; and the scriptural doctrine of Zuingle (who is said in Mosheim to have been, beyond comparison, the brightest ornament of the Protestant cause); and the doctrines of the other Swiss Reformers, teach us to look upon the bread and wine in no other light than as the *signs* and *symbols* of the absent body and blood of Christ; but also the Spiritual Babylon is characterised in Rev. xvii. 5, as having upon her forehead a name written—"Mystery."

It is astonishing how the miry clay of Popery adhered to Luther all through, for he even believed in *Consubstantiation*. Mosheim says that Calvin's views on the Lord's supper were generally regarded nearly as erroneous as Luther's. How, in conjunction with Popery and Lutheranism, Calvin looked upon the Lord's Supper as a mystery, may be seen from the following, where he says:—"If it be asked me how it is, that is, how believers sacramentally receive Christ's body and blood, I shall not be ashamed to confess, that it is a secret too high for me to comprehend in my spirit, or explain in words"

Again, I feel surprised how any persons, who do not believe in the ubiquity or omnipresence of Christ's created body, and who agree with the Scripture, and with the last rubric after the Communion Service in the Church of England prayer book, that Christ's human body is limited, and is to remain at the right hand (that is the principal place) of power till the restitution of all things; how such persons can pray, according either to the Church of England, or Methodist, Communion Service, that they "may be *partakers* of his" (i. e. Christ's) "most blessed body and blood." It is true, the ministers of both denominations, in the "prayer of consecration," imitate closely the Romish priest in his prayer of consecration at the Mass, by laying their hands "upon all the bread" and "upon all the vessels which contain the wine" but, notwithstanding all the process of the *formal sanctification* of the elements, yet I do not believe that the body of Christ is partaken of, or can be there to be partaken of.

I know how the monstrousness of this doctrine is sought to be obviated by saying, as the Presbyterians do in their answer to "What is the Lord's Supper," that "the worthy receivers are, *not* after a corporal and carnal manner, but *by faith*, made partakers of his," (i. e. Christ's) "body and blood." Now, I believe the R. Catholics would say much the same thing; and would insist on it, that it is "by faith" that they become partakers of the Lord's body. The R. Catholics believe that the consecrated bread becomes the body of Christ. The Protestant very properly considers such a doctrine of Transubstantiation to be nothing more or

less than a gross, senseless error; but still he believes, that he receives the body of Christ in a supernatural way by faith, &c. I, on the contrary, believe with the Swiss Reformers, that we cannot become *partakers* of the Lord's *body* by faith, *or by any other way*; for Scripture and reason point out *its impossibility*. We may be *partakers of the Divine nature*, (2nd Peter i. 4), and of the *benefits* resulting from our Saviour's body being given for us and his blood shed for us, to our "spiritual nourishment and growth in grace"; but the actual flesh of Christ, no matter how spiritualized, profiteth nothing. John vi. 63.

I know also, from conversations I have had frequently with Church people and Dissenters, the surprise manifested by them, when I showed them from their Articles of faith, their Sacramental services, or their Catechisms, what absurdities they prayed for, sanctioned, and consequently professed. They would remark, perhaps, that they were not aware of so much indisputable error belonging to their systems of divinity; for that their ministers slurred over such, and taught from their pulpits only what was spiritual. All this that they say may be true; but, if so, it is putting a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, or, new wine into old bottles. But new wine should be put into new bottles; the old leaven should be purged out so that there may be a new lump serving "in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter"; "for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Rom. vii. 6 and 2nd Cor. iii. 6.

I have shown in the "Vindication" by extracts from Dr. Adam Clark, Bishop Newton, Rev. D. Brown, the Cottage Bible, &c., how that the words "till he come" meant till the Lord come in his avenging power to destroy the city and temple of Jerusalem. I also stated that those whom the Apostle, in the passage referred to, addressed, and reprov'd for impropriety of conduct at the Lord's Supper, *were Jews*, * and consequently *familiar* with the meaning generally attached to the words "till I come," viz:—that they related to the destruction of Jerusalem. I would remark here further, in corroboration of this view of the Apostle's words, that the Lord's Supper is mentioned by Matthew, who wrote his Gospel about the year 38; by Mark, who wrote his Gospel about the year 61; and by Luke, who wrote his Gospel about the year 63. But John, who wrote his Gospel about the year 98, being 35 *years after* any of the others had written their Gospels, or the Apostle Paul had written the epistle to the Corinthians,

* In a work much used and patronized by the Church of England, entitled "Help to the reading of the Bible," by the Rev. B. E. Nicholls, Curate of St. John's, Walthamston, are the following remarks on the first Epistle to the Corinthians:—"Shortly after Paul's departure from Corinth, the peace of the Church was disturbed by one or more false teachers, *probably Jews*, (2nd Cor. xi 22) who endeavoured to draw aside the converts from Paul and his doctrines, by calling in question the authority of his mission, and ridiculing the plain and simple style in which he delivered his instructions. Hence arose divisions and other irregularities among the Corinthians, totally inconsistent with the genuine spirit of the Gospel, such as uncleanness, covetousness, litigation, feasting with idolaters, their sacrifices, want of decorum in public worship, particularly in receiving the Lord's Supper.

which latter contains the disputed passage, and which was written in the year 56—John, the only one of the writers of the New Testament who wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem (which occurred in the year 71) wrote nothing whatever about the Lord's Supper. We may undoubtedly infer from this fact, that the period of time designed by our Lord for the observance of the Ordinance had expired: he having *come* according to his predicted declaration and according to general expectation, and having destroyed the temple and having fully brought about the time of reformation, all thenceforward were to “worship the Father *in spirit and in truth*.”

The “Encyclopædia of Useful Knowledge” (to which I have occasionally referred) speaking of John's Gospel says:—“St. John, therefore undertook, perhaps at the request of the true believers in Asia, to write what Clement of Alexandria called a *spiritual* gospel; and, accordingly, we find in it *more of doctrine*, and *less of historical narrative*, than in any of the others. It is also to be remembered, that this book, which contains so much additional information relative to the *doctrines* of Christianity, and which *may be considered as a standard of faith for all ages*, was written by that apostle, who is known to have enjoyed, in a greater degree than the rest, the affection and confidence of the divine Author of our religion; and to whom was given a special revelation concerning the state of the Christian church in all succeeding generations.”

Dr. McIlvaine, the present bishop of Ohio, in his sermon on John vi 53, 54, says:—“Nor is it any more explicable that St. John, who alone of all the Evangelists gives the conversation before us, should be the *only one* to omit all account of the explanatory institution of the Sacrament; his narrative alone presents the difficulty to be solved, and his alone omits the necessary explanation. “To those, who, *in his days, and afterwards, had no gospel but his, as no doubt was the case with many*, a conversation was stated, on the understanding of which, as containing a duty, eternal life depends; and that conversation referred, for the only understanding and fulfilling the duty, to the institution of a certain Sacrament, and yet of that institution *not a word* is given by St. John. “So improbable an omission of so necessary a key, is strong evidence that the conversation had no primary reference to that Sacrament.” *

* Bishop McIlvaine is evidently right, when he proves that the eating of Christ's flesh, &c., in John vi, has no primary reference to the Lord's Supper; that it was to *the spirit* those words referred—“a spiritual participation of him; which alone could profit them with God; that Christ's words were to be taken in that spiritual sense, and only when so taken would they be words of life to the souls of men.” The compilers of the prayer book, however, seem to have thought differently: for, in the prayer in the communion service, after the “consecration,” we read as follows:—“We do not presume to come to this *thy Table, &c.* * * Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the *flesh* of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean *by his body*, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.” Thus the 56th verse in John vi, which says, “He

I would argue, in like manner, that "so improbable an omission of so necessary" an account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, is "strong evidence"

and eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me, and I in him,*" is alluded to. In fact the 6th of John is artfully *mixed up* and *identified* with the words of the institution of the ordinance, leading the undiscerning to believe that the Lord's Supper *was intended in both*, and thus far sanctioning the line of Roish argumentation, so forcibly contended against by the Bishop of Ohio, but endorsed by the Methodists in their Communion Service, which imitatively follows in the wake of the Church of England.

I may, at this time, be understood to have proved how Scripture is wrested to prove and uphold Calvin's doctrine of the receiving of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper by the *faithful*, which doctrine may appropriately be called the *idolope* of Popery. The Church of England needs this course of action; to prove that the "inward part or thing signified," in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the "body and blood of Christ, which are" it says:—"verily and indeed *taken and received* by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The Methodists need such a course; for they adopt into their 18th Article of faith the following definition, to be found also in the 28th Article of the Church of England. "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; inasmuch, that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a *partaking* of the body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a *partaking* of the blood of Christ." || The Presbyterians require such a course to support what they lay down in their "Shorter Catechism" concerning the Eucharist, viz:—"The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine, according to Christ's appointment, his death is showed forth; and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, *made partakers of his body and blood*, with all his benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace." It is unnecessary to refer also to Independents, &c., to show in their doctrine of the Lord's Supper a close affinity to Popery.

§ The reader, on referring to my "Vindication" ps. 49, 50, would see, that the proper meaning of the Greek word *Koinonia* in 1st Cor. x. (as explained by Burnet) is not *partaking, nor communion*, as it is rendered in English in their 18th Article of faith by the Methodists, and in the 28th Article of the Church of England. (Latin vers. *communicatio*.) but a *joint owning, or joint acknowledgment* of Christ and of his death in the continuing "till the time of Reformation" the rite of the Lord's Supper. Shall here lay before the reader what I believe to be the proper translation of 1st Cor. x 15—22, wherein it will be seen that by translating the word *Koinonia* by the meaning—*joint owning or joint acknowledgment* (a meaning, says Bishop Burnet "which, it is true, it does also often signify") the whole passage will no longer serve as a *prop* to Popery's colossal error, which consists in the profession (communicating or imparting to the faithful) the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. "I speak to wise men; judge ye what I say." The cup of blessing which we bless as for which we give thanks) is it not a *joint acknowledgment* 1 of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not a *joint acknowledgment* 2 of the body of Christ? As there is one bread (or at) so we being many are one (religious) body: for we are all *partakers* 3 of that one bread. (shold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices *joint acknowledgers* 4 of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered, in sacrifice to idols is any thing? or I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I could not that ye should be *joint acknowledgers* 5 of devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be *partakers* 6 of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy? Are we stronger than he?

|| In the prayer of consecration in the Communion office of the Episcopal Church of Scotland are the following remarkable words:—"Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine: THAT THEY MAY BECOME THE BODY AND BLOOD OF THY MOST DEARLY BELOVED SON. * * * * And here we humbly offer and present unto thee, O Lord,

1 Greek, *Koinonia*; (Eng. Trans. *the communion*). 2 Greek, *Koinonia*; (Eng. Trans. *the communion*). 3 Greek, *Metekamen*, a word different from *Koinonia* and therefore very properly translated *partakers*. 4 *Koinonoi*; (Eng. Trans. *partakers*). 5 Greek, *Koinonoi*; (Eng. Trans. *have fellow-*ship). 6 Greek, *Metekemi*; properly translated *partakers*.

that John, who wrote after the age of figurative observances, † deemed it contrary to the Spirit's teaching to advert, in his "spiritual Gospel," to an ordinance, which with others of a similar nature, had given way to the *spiritual* worship of Jehovah, ‡ as foretold by our Lord in his conversation with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well.

† Gibb, in his "Directions for searching the Scriptures," says:—"The *figurative institutions* of the Law, which received a *spiritual accomplishment* in Christ, as their true substance, might here be recommended to attention; but as "their mystical signification and design were scarcely so much as hinted at in "the *Gospels or early instructions* given by the Apostles, but reserved from "babes, for the purpose of being afterward explained, to perfect the knowledgo "of the more advanced Christians, the intelligent inquirer may advantageously "delay the investigation of the ultimate meaning, till he reach the Epistle to the "Hebrews, which is the proper seat of this subject."

‡ The reader will bear in mind, that Clement of Alexandria, calls John's Gospel a "spiritual Gospel." And though it should be granted that the word "baptize," in our Lord's Commission, pointed to an outward ablution of the body, yet the same argument, just now laid down, of John omitting in his Gospel to mention any direction to *baptize*, would show that the inspired Evangelist, who wrote after "the time of Reformation"—"the hour when the true worshippers should worship the Father *in spirit* and *in truth*"—that he (as I have already remarked) deemed it contrary to the *Spirit's* teaching to record for observance, or even advert to ordinances, which were only of *temporary* obligation. It may also be here observed that Luke, who is the *latest* writer of the Evangelists next to John, in like manner omits all mention of our Lord's commission to *baptize*.

But it may here be asked, "Did not our Lord in Matt. xxviii 19, 20, promise that he would be *with those that baptized* "unto the end of the world"? In reply I would say, that it is his "preached Gospel" which our Redeemer (in his office of *Sanctifier*) will ever be with; that *thereby* "all nations should be blessed," and the heathen be justified through faith in the same. See Gal. iii. 8 and John xvi 8. I would add, that it is generally conceded by the best authorities that, according to the Greek language in which Matthew's Gospel was written, the words *Sunteleia tou aiōnos* should not be translated "end of the world" but "end of the age." This would exactly agree with all that I have been saying of outward ordinances being enjoined and sanctioned *only* till the end of the Jewish age, that is, "till the time of reformation," after the destruction of Jerusalem. If the reader will refer to Bishop Newton's xviiiith Dissertation on the Prophecies, he will find the following remarks on Matt. xxiv 3:—"Tell us when shall these "things be, and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the "world?" These are only different expressions, to denote the same period with "the destruction of Jerusalem; for when they conceived would be the destruction "of Jerusalem, then they conceived would be the coming of Christ; and when "they conceived would be the coming of Christ, then they conceived would be "the "end of the world," or rather (as it should be rendered) "the conclu- "sion of the age"—"*Sunteleia tou aiōnos*." "The end of the world," or "the "conclusion of the age," is the same period with the destruction of Jerusalem; "for there being two ages (as they were called) among the Jews, the one under

"ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee, beseeching "thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily RECEIVE THE MOST "PRECIOUS BODY AND BLOOD OF THY SON JESUS CHRIST." Although I have never seen a Roman Catho- lic Missal, yet I would confidently make the declaration, that there is not within its pages a stronger acknowledgment of the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist than is contained in the foregoing extracts.

When it is considered that bread broken and wine poured out, were our Lord's chosen types of his body and blood, as mentioned in the institution of the Lord's supper; and that they were the universal food, at least in eastern countries, and former times, of mankind, accessible to all, and not requiring "priestly intercession for preparation or distribution"—when this is considered, we may fairly conclude that the effects of the body and blood, given and shed thus emblematically, *to speak more properly*, the *spiritual benefits and grace* derived from a lively faith in the *atonement* made by our Lord for us by the giving of his sacred body and the shedding of his blood, come not by the intervention of human hands, can they be prevented from reaching the needy by any human will. Bishop Hovine, in the sermon I have alluded to on the 6th of John, speaking of the manna as a type of our Lord's flesh and blood, gives a better exposition of my meaning than I can do myself. He thus proceeds:—

'The whole tenor of the chapter from which we have selected the text, compels us to understand, that, as in the first sentence of the text, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," our Lord is speaking of a necessity as universal as the nature of fallen man; so, in the second sentence, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life," he is speaking of a remedy equally universal and applicable; one which depends *not on any outward circumstance, institution, or privilege*, which a believer may, or may not, possess; but it is accessible wherever Christ is known, and his word received. Its chosen type was the Manna. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die." But it was remarkably the attribute of that bread in the wilderness, that it was alike accessible to all that needed it. Priestly intervention had nothing to do with its preparation or distribution. Priests obtained it no more easily, or directly, or abundantly, under no more privilege, *of any sort*, than the meanest of the people. The family of Aaron was treated, in regard to the common bread of Israel, not as the sacerdotal family, but simply as a portion of the dependent people of God. It was as before the appointment of the sacramental rites of the ceremonial law that the manna was first given, and its ordinance appointed; and when the ceremonial law brought in its priesthood, and sacrifices, and sacramental institutions, no change was made in the universal freeness of the manna; in its perfect independence of all sacramental, all sacerdotal agency, in its being the unrestrained common bread of all the people of God alike. So it continued until the host

the law, the other under the Messiah; when the city and temple were destroyed, and the Jewish polity in Church and state was dissolved, the former age must of course be concluded, and the age under the Messiah be commenced * * * But here the phrase appears to be used much in the same manner as in the epistle to the Hebrews ix 26,—“But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; “in the end of the world,” *epi sunthelōi tōn aiōnōn.*” “in the conclusion of the Jewish age or ages.””

“had crossed the Jordan, and exchanged the bread of the wilderness for “the new corn” of the promised land. And such is our Lord’s chosen type of his “flesh and blood, as the living bread from heaven, without which we cannot have “eternal life.”

“You will readily perceive, in these remarks, the interpretation I put on the “words of the text. By the flesh and blood of Christ, which we must receive, I “understand *Christ himself*. * We must receive *him* as our life, according to “the connected verse: “He that eateth *me* even he shall live by me.” (v. 57.)

* Bishop Cronin of Huron, at a late meeting of his Synod, and while surrounded by complacent Clerical and Lay attendants, declared that Trinity College, Toronto, (which had been erected and cherished by Bishop Strachan and his Clergy all over Canada West, was the *last place* to which he would send his son to be educated. Shortly after this, in a circular dated August 29 1860, Bishop Cronin assigned the cause, viz. “That in his view the matter taught there was *most dangerous to all the students*” “dangerous in the extreme” “dangerous in the present time, when there is, especially in the minds of the young, *such a hankering after the errors and superstitions of Rome.*” The Bishop further says, that “if baptism, the supper of the Lord, and the authoritative absolution *take away sin and seal the pardon* of the transgressor, then the Church of Rome is right, and our forefathers were unjustifiable schismatics in separating from her communion.”

This is rash language to come from the would-be evangelical Bishop of Huron. For what else is expected or prayed for in the baptismal service, but to have sin taken away by it? It says, “We call upon thee for this *Infant*, that he *coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins* by spiritual regeneration”! So in the authoritative absolution in the “Visitation of the Sick” the Minister says, “And by his authority *committed to me I absolve thee from all thy sins.*” *3rdly*, In the xxvth Article, Sacraments are defined as *effectual signs* of grace, and God’s good will toward us, *by the which* “(Sacraments) he *doth work invisibly in us*, and doth *not only quicken*, but also strengthen and *confirm* our faith in him.” Again in the xxviii Article, Baptism is declared to be “a sign of regeneration or new Birth, *whereby, as by an instrument*, they that receive Baptism rightly” (that is, in due form) “are grafted into the Church, *the promises of the forgiveness of sin*, and of our adoption to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and *sealed.*” It comes to this then, that if the places in the Prayer Book to which I have referred mean anything, it is, that “baptism, the Supper of the Lord, and the authoritative absolution do take away sin and *seal* the pardon of the transgressor;” and if so, says Bishop Cronin, “the Church of Rome is right, &c.”

Several years ago I held more than one long argument with Bishop Cronin, both in my own house and elsewhere on the Popery in the Prayer Book; and on those occasions I told him plainly that he and his ministerial brethren were as open to the charge of the *opus operatum*, or “office and ministry,” ecclesiastical scheme, as the R. C. Priests. In the Bishop of Huron’s covert attack on Bishop Strachan—who, as is universally known, is a worldly minded old man, governed in religion by Archdeacon Bethune, that deep, Puseyite barometer of the Diocese, who with Fabian caution, has been trying for many years to Romanize this Protestant Province—in this *inconsistent* attack, in the midst of the Synod, one is reminded of the damsels at the Inn, buckling up “The Knight of the rueful countenance.” He has passed the night prostrate on the door of the Chapel, and looks grim enough, while the ruddy wenches are bursting with laughter.

But my principal reason for quoting here from the Bishop of Huron’s Circular,

“And if you ask, then, why his *flesh and blood* are so particularly mentioned, I answer, because it is *as having been once offered up* on the cross, a propitiatory sacrifice for our sins, that we are to receive our Saviour; Christ *crucified*—Christ as having been “wounded,” under the sword of the law, “for our transgressions”; as having poured out his precious blood for the remission of our sins. We must always keep that great sacrifice, *of which his flesh and blood were the constituents*, in the eye and embrace of our faith. And then again, by *eating that flesh and drinking that blood*, I understand simply that *habitual exercise of earnest faith in Christ as the propitiation* for our sins *in his death*, and as our unailing life, now that he hath ascended to the right hand of the Father Almighty, whereby we come to him, trust in him, appropriate his benefits to our souls, and live on the daily supplies of his grace.”

is to show the reader more fully, how the *artful* mixing up of the vith of John with the words of the institution of the Lord's supper is *confessedly wrong*. For in the Circular the Bishop says:—“When we add to this that those young men, who are thus taught, in the first year of their university course, to toy with the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, are further instructed that the recipient of the bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper partakes of the *glorified humanity* of the Son of God, I think it will be acknowledged that the teaching is dangerous in a very high degree. Moreover, in this (the Provost's) Catechism, our Lord's words, recorded in the 6th chapter of St. Joh's Gospel, are repeatedly quoted, as spoken concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as in the following answers:—

“Question.—Prove from Holy Scripture, that the Lord's Supper is generally necessary? Answer,—“Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.”—John vi. 53. Question.—What words of our Lord show this? Answer,—Our Lord speaks of the spiritual benefits which should certainly flow from eating his flesh and blood, of which benefits the wicked cannot be thought to partake.—“Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *dwelleth in me, and I in him.*”—John vi. 54, &c. Question.—Prove from Holy Scripture that the *Holy Eucharist sustains the spiritual life imparted by baptism*. Answer,—“Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you.”—John vi. 53.

After thus quoting from the Catechism used in the College, Bishop Cronin concludes to say:—“In these questions and answers, taken from different parts of the Catechism, the student is unhesitatingly taught to interpret the words of our Lord, in the 6th of John, as spoken concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Commentators of the Church of England since the Reformation, and some Roman Catholic Divines, have interpreted the sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel as having *no reference whatever* to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and one of the latter has asserted that “*the Universal Church has understood this passage, ever since its promulgation, to mean spiritual eating and drinking by a living faith.*” One of our own most eminent Reformers, (Archbishop Cranmer) when combating the doctrine of transubstantiation, thus expressed himself concerning this passage:—“Christ in that place of John *spake not of the material and Sacramental bread, nor of the Sacramental eating* (for that was spoken two or three years before the Sacrament was first ordained); but he spake of *spiritual bread*; many times repeating, I am the

It has been remarked to me, that my strictures on the remains of Popery to be found in the liturgies and Catechisms of the various Protestant Churches are just and much called for; and that the time is fast approaching, when the people will no longer tamely submit to erroneous teaching. In confirmation of this change shortly coming round, I am referred to what is going on in England at the present time in the Established Church, and to the fact, that Lord Ebury lately presented a petition, signed by 460 clergymen, "praying her Majesty to appoint a Royal Commission to revise the Book of Common Prayer, with the object of seeing whether it can be made more profitable than it now is for the religious edification and instruction of the people." * This is certainly a move in the right direction: and I am happy to learn from the petitioners' address, that four thousand of their clerical brethren had already expressed their "just scruples" under their signature, hoping for relief from what is called in the petition "semblances of *dangerous error*." In the mean time I see from the English papers that eleven thousand Clergymen have petitioned *against* a revision; so that looking at the case both ways, I think it will be a long time before the "Superiors in ecclesiastical concerns" will do anything in the matter. But even if a "ritual, clear *in terms* from what they are authorized to eschew *in fact*," were allowed by the hierarchy, still it would be only a superficial healing of the rankling wound left as a heritage to the Church by mediæval Popery. Until the doctrines of the Trin-

"bread of life *which came down from heaven*; and of *spiritual eating by faith*; *after which sort he was at the same present time eaten of as many as believed on him*, although the Sacrament was not at that time made and instituted. And therefore he said, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and died; but he that eateth this bread shall live for ever.' Therefore, this place of St. John *can in no wise be understood of the Sacramental bread*, which neither came from heaven, neither giveth life to all that eat. Nor of such bread could Christ did then consecrate so many years before the institution of his holy supper.'" "

The Toronto Weekly *Globe* of September 28, 1860, (the Editors of which are Free Church Presbyterians) noticing this unseemly controversy between the mitred "Lords" of Toronto and Huron, (who like Jeshurim of old, have "waxed fat, and kicked") contains among other remarks the following:—"Suffice it to say, that extracts from the Catechism conclusively show that the glorification of the Virgin Mary, the Intercession of Saints, Baptismal regeneration, the recognition of other Sacraments besides Eaptism and the Lord's Supper, and a *modified form of transubstantiation*, are taught by the provost of Trinity College. It does not lie within our province to enlarge *upon this fact*. If the Episcopalian body in Canada, by whom Trinity College has been built and is supported, desire that Tractarianism shall be taught within its walls, it is not our business to convince them of their error."

With regard to this latter declaration of the Presbyterian penmen I would submissively remark, that they, with others of the various shades of Protestantism who condemn the Tractarians, may *fairly* be excused from the duty of being their "brothers' keepers," while their own formularies of faith or devotion are impregnated with "Baptismal regeneration and a *modified Transubstantiation*."

* The petition states among many other things, "That a beneficial change might be found in discontinuing the congregational use of the Athanasian creed."

ty, the rational human soul of Christ, and the Sacraments, are left altogether to Rome—justly entitled to their troublesome possession from being their *inventor, heir upholder, and their garnisher*—until this is done, the *radical* point of corruption and weakness (comprehending assumed mysteriousness, inextricableabyrinths, and supercilious unreasonableness) will not be scripturally, rationally, and unprejudicedly remedied.

Here I will be suspected of encouraging the Protestant Churches to harmonize with the Mystics of old in the rejection of Sacraments, &c., as the Paulicians and Quakers did. In reply I freely acknowledge that the suspicion of such being my ardent desire is right. And what would be the consequence? Why, instead of a Christianity, for the most part merely nominal, worldly minded, inconsistent, and distracted by hostile contentions, you would witness, admire, and enjoy a Christianity, that would, as designed by its gracious Author, bring “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.” This Christianity would indeed dispense with typical forms, which may be made as doors of entrance into outward and visible Churches, and as marks and pledges of fellowship amongst men; but they are not such to the spiritual community of the invisible Church of Christ, the members whereof, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, st Peter ii. 5.

For the substantiating of my observations, I may be permitted to refer to Moheim, who seems to have been very much disinclined to speak favourably of the Mystics, but, impelled by force of obvious truth, he speaks of them (Cent. 14) as follows:—“A prodigious number of the people, denominated Mystics, resided and ‘propagated their tenets in almost every part of Europe. There were undoubtedly among them many persons of eminent piety, who endeavoured to wear men ‘from an excessive attachment to the external part of religion, and to form ‘them to the love of God, and the practice of genuine virtue.” Again, writing on “the dismal state of the Church,” (Cent. 16) just before the Reformation, he says:—“If any sparks of real piety subsisted under this despotic empire of superstition, they were only to be found among the *Mystics*. For this sect, renouncing the subtilty of the schools, the vain contentions of the learned, *with all the ‘acts and ceremonies of external worship*, exhorted their followers to aim at ‘nothing but internal sanctity of heart, and communion with God, the centre and ‘source of holiness and perfection. Hence the *Mystics* were loved and respected by many persons, who had a serious sense of religion, and were of a tender ‘and devotional complexion.”

From the circumstances connected with the conversion of Saul of Tarsus (as recorded by the inspired Physician) I am encouraged in prayerfully treasuring the hope, that those persons, who for a season may indulge blindly in ascetic intolerance towards me and my pamphlets, may, in the merciful hour of God’s visitation, receive “the ingrafted word,” and experience a “time of refreshing from the

presence of the Lord." My own experience in this respect, of God's long suffering mercy, should authorize me to believe so; it is as follows:—

About thirty years ago, whilst attending one of my quarterly examinations in the Dublin University, preparatively to my ordination in the Church of England; in taking an evening walk through the metropolis, my attention was attracted to a considerable number of persons, who were crowded around the door of a Lecture room. On enquiry I soon understood that a public discussion on the doctrine of the Trinity was about to be held between Swedenborgians and some Collegians. All were waiting impatiently for one of the controversialists from the College. It being considerably past the time of commencing, I was requested to take the place of the unaccountably absent Collegian. It being on the side of orthodoxy and the College, I readily consented. Though of Junior Sophister's standing, or, in other words, in my third year of attendance at College, yet I only knew as much about the doctrine of the Trinity then as the generality of the D. Ds. A. Ms. and Revds. knew about it, and that is, I may say, little or nothing at all. * After this, many years passed away; during which I troubled myself as little about the investigation of the doctrine as other ministers, who have neither inclination nor disinterestedness enough to enquire into it. But when, in the Lord's own good time, the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ shone upon me, then I halted not "between two opinions" longer than to have my sentiments matured. I "conferred not with flesh and blood;" but, constrained by the love of Christ, manifested so graciously in the light and happiness vouchsafed to me in the revelation of his will, I cast my burthen of impediments, which lay in my way Zion-ward, on the Saviour, and determined in the Lord's strength to follow his merciful guidance through good and evil report.

Through the remainder of my life, (which cannot be long, as I have already lived over two score years and ten) and on my dying bed, it will, I trust, afford me the greatest gratification, to take a retrospective view of my disregard of worldly considerations and consequences when the truth and glory of my merciful Redeemer were concerned. Looking back to the period of my decision for Christ and the avowal of his truth, I hope, on the eve of my departure hence, to look up and say:

"Many days have passed since then,
Many changes I have seen,
Yet have been upheld till now:
Who could hold me up but thou?"

Omemeë, October, 1860.

* A Wesleyan Missionary, with whom I lately had a long conversation on the doctrines of the Trinity and the human soul of Christ, told me, that, not having completed his term of probation or trial as a preacher, he should shortly undergo an examination on the doctrine of the Trinity. He jocularly added, that he was quite at ease on that point, for that he was sure of his knowing as much about the doctrine as the examiners themselves.

ON THE TRINITY.

In page 16 of the "Vindication" is the following commentary from the *Cottage Bible* on Heb. i. 3:—"He (the Son) is also asserted to be the 'brightness' 'effulgence, and beaming forth of the Father's glory, and the express *character* 'of his person; so that whatever perfections exist in the nature of the eternal "Father, have an exact counterpart in the person of the Son: just as every mark "or character of a seal is imprinted on the melted wax to which it is applied. "And as God graciously designed from eternity to be manifested in the flesh; so "he was virtually, though *not* actually so, before the worlds were made."

In agreement with the above I would remark that the design or determination in the divine mind was infallibly sure of accomplishment; and therefore, the manifestation of God in his Sonship—character was virtually, and to all intents and purposes, as real from eternity as if it had actually taken place. The wondrous plan of salvation was devised from eternity on the credit of this design, for it was held in the Court of heaven as done and accepted. In this way the *Sonship* of God our Saviour is easily understood to have been *eternal*.

The learned Dr. Adam Clarke, and other Methodist Ministers following in his steps, have denied the eternal Sonship of our Lord, * owing to their not considering what those writers, who are generally held up as the most learned and "orthodox" divines, say concerning the meaning of the term "Son," when applied

* There is a sect of religionists pretty numerous in the States and sprinkled through Canada, who entertain the wildest notions concerning our Saviour. They profess to believe that our Lord *derived* his existence, or was produced, from the self-existent God: and as he did not come into existence from nothing, but partook of that nature from whence he proceeded, therefore he could not (they say) be strictly called a *created* Being. They consider the Son to have been regularly born of the Father, consequently not co-equal nor co-existent with him; but that though he is thus inferior to the Father, yet he is superior, as the *real* Son of God, to both men and Angels. They believe that the Son *died in his divine nature*; that is, that his divine nature actually expired on Calvary Cross for Sinners.

One is here reminded of the *ichor*, or divine blood, represented by heathen writers, in their Epic effusions, as flowing from the grievously wounded Mars and the Goddess Venus; though these ancient poets, with all their license of fabulous flights of fancy, did not subject their Deities to death, as the Christians (or Smithist's) do our Lord's divinity. However, that I may shew the unlikelihood of such delusions being checked by the opinions of Trinitarians, I will instance the remarks made by one of this sect, who, I understand, is their cleverest controversial defender. The work, from which I take the extract, is entitled the "True Messiah"; "By David Millard, minister of the Gospel." In page 96, he says:—

"Dr. Adam Clarke takes the astonishing ground that all of the Son of God "which the Bible reveals to us is *human nature*. and I have in a few instances

to the Lord. For those divines, such as Romaine, &c., truly maintain that the term "Son" as used in the phrase, Son of God, &c., is not a name of nature, or of essence, or in consequence of any kind of generation, such as we naturally imagine it should be from the meaning customarily attached to it by us; but that it is a name of *office*, or *character*, conveying to us the idea of the dutiful and submissive obedience paid by God to the demands and requirements of his own law and justice.

Another reason, owing to which Dr. Clarke and his followers have erred, is the way in which the doctrine of the Trinity is held, viz:—that there are three "persons" or "subsistences" § in the Godhead—that the second person is the *proper, real*, or natural Son of the first person or Father—and therefore the Clarkites assert that it follows naturally and inevitably, that the Son is posterior in point of time to the Father, and consequently that there cannot be an *eternal* Sonship. This is one of the fruits of the absurdities of the doctrine of the Trinity, that it drives its advocates into a denial of the *eternal* Sonship of the Prince of life—disrobes him of one of the characteristics of Deity—and so far makes him a creature.

"heard the same sentiment advanced by Methodist preachers. † The doctor, in commenting on Luke i. 35, remarks.

"We may plainly perceive here that the angel does not give the appellation of *Son of God* to the divine nature of Christ, but to that holy person, or thing, which was to be born of the Virgin. The divine nature could not be born of the Virgin, the human nature was born of her. Two natures must ever be distinguished in Christ; the human nature, in reference to which he is the Son of God, and inferior to him; and the divine nature, which was from eternity. Is there any part of the Scriptures in which it is plainly said, that the divine nature of Jesus was the Son of God? Here, I trust, I may be permitted to say, with all due respect for those who differ from me, that the doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Christ is anti-scriptural, and highly dangerous."

"Now, if these remarks of the doctor be true, what becomes of his favourite Trinity? The doctrine of the Trinity teaches that God is three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Is the Son, one of those three Persons, no more than human nature? Is one third constituent part of the eternal God, human nature? If the Son of God is nothing more than human nature this conclusion is irresistible, or otherwise there is no Son in the Godhead. But if God is now three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he was eternally the same; and if there was not eternally a Son in the Godhead, then the doctrine of the Trinity was not eternally true, and some later change must have taken place in the Godhead to make it true now.' 'How plainly is it manifest that this learned commentator, in struggling to extricate himself out of a glaring absurdity, blunders into a palpable reputation of his own darling doctrines.'"

† Such as Lorenzo Dow, the eccentric Arminian, who joined with Dr. Adam Clarke in calling the eternal Sonship of Christ "eternal nonsense." I believe this denial of the eternal Sonship of Christ is connived at by the Wesleyan body, who allow its continuance by the connivance of Conference, though, for prudential reasons, they will not allow its open promulgation. I may be wrong in what I have just stated; but I have often heard such to be the case. As never having belonged to any but the Prelatical or Episcopal Church, I cannot be expected to have an accurate knowledge of the *arcana* of the different Protestant denominations.

§ *Subsistences: Real Beings.* See Walker's dictionary.

Now it must be admitted that there can be no prescience or foreknowledge of contingencies, or things uncertain of fulfilment, with the Almighty. God from eternity foresaw man's fall, and how man was to be rescued from its awful consequences—by the Godhead assuming the attitude of a Son. He therefore at the same time, that is from eternity, assumed *in the Divine mind* that manifestation of himself, which was actually to be so developed and exhibited in the fulness of time, as that his disciples should behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. Then, considering how the eternal God was so constantly called the "Word" among the Jews, as Bishop Pearson in page 120 says; considering how the Lord "possessed his Son in the beginning of his way, before his works of old," as some think is the meaning of Prov. 8 22; and considering how the Son, that is, God in his representation of himself *in the character of a Son*, as he designed and determined in his own Divine mind, was in this way with the Father or absolute God from eternity; I say, considering the foregoing, I think we may evidently see how that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was *with* God, and the Word was * God."

The reader is probably aware that the words of Scripture last quoted are to be found in John i. 1. In the 3rd and 10th verses the "Word" is declared (1st) to have been the *Creator*. "All things *were made* by him; and *without him was not*

* Trinitarians place great weight on the word *with* in this verse, and they insist that it implies *another beside the Father*. But it is not said, "with the Father"; but "with God." If then the word *with* in this verse be allowed the force they claim for it, the *Word*, that is, Christ would be another and different Being from God; in short, Christ would not be God at all. This inextricable confusion of ideas connected with the logic of Trinitarians is shown up by Unitarians, as the following from one of their ministers (W. G. Eliot) will explain.

"The "*Logos*" is taken as another term for Christ, as if the Apostle had said, "In the beginning was Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ was with God, and Jesus Christ was God." This explanation is thought by those who receive it to remove all difficulty, and to make the whole passage plain. But it is only because they are accustomed to it, and do not perceive the force of the words used. In fact it expresses a direct contradiction, which cannot itself be explained, except by saying that the terms used have no distinct or intelligible meaning. When we say that James is *with* John, we cannot take a plainer way of saying that James and John are two separate beings. To say that James is *with* John and that James is John, is a contradiction in terms. Why does not the same hold true of God and of Christ? *If by the Logos we understand a personal existence distinct from God*, we may say that the Logos was with God, but not at the same time that the Logos was God. To say one is to deny the other. We shall not, therefore, escape the difficulty of the passage by adopting the Trinitarian theory. We may not be quite satisfied with our own explanation, and some parts of it may continue to perplex us, but we cannot receive an explanation which so evidently contradicts itself." *Eliot on the Unity of God. Page 71.* Again, the term "God" by itself is understood by Trinitarians to comprehend and include within it the idea of three distinct persons. But how will this look in the words already cited. "The Word was with *God*." They say the "Word" is certainly one Person; they also say that the term "God" includes three Persons; if therefore the "Word" was *with* "God", there must, according to what Trinitarians hold, have been *four* Persons.

any thing made that was made." "He was in the world, and the world was made by him." Bishop Burnet, in his exposition of the 2nd of the 39 Articles, says:—"The *beginning* also here is set to import, that it was before creation or time. Now a duration before time is eternal: so this *beginning* can be no other than that duration which was before *all things that were made*. It is also plainly said, over and over again, that *all things* were made by this Word. "A power to create must be infinite: for it is certain, that a power which can give being is without bounds. And although the word *make* may seem capable of a larger sense, yet, as in other places of the New Testament, the stricter word *create* is used and applied to Christ as the *Maker of all things in heaven or earth, visible and invisible*, so the word *make* is used through the Old Testament for create; so that God's *making the heaven and the earth* is the character frequently given of him to distinguish him from idols and false Gods. And of this *Word* it is likewise said, that *he was with God, and was God*. * * * *

"All the names, the operations, and even the attributes of God, are in full and plain words given to Christ. He is called God; his blood is said to be *the blood of God*; *God is said to have laid down his life for us*; * Christ is called the *true God*, the *great God*, the *Lord of glory*, the *King of kings*, and the *Lord of lords*; and more particularly the name Jehovah is ascribed to him in the same word in which the LXX interpreters had translated it through out the whole Old Testament.'"

"The creating, the preserving, and the governing † of all things, is also ascrib-

* "God manifest in the flesh" so condescendingly and fully recognized the body prepared for him by his Father, that is, by his *absolute* Godhead, and in which he tabernacled, as to call it *his own* body; and *its properties*, such as life, blood, &c., to call them the life, blood, &c., of God.

† In Isa. ix. 6 7, and Mat. ii. 6, Christ is plainly declared to be our Governor. The Trinitarian will say, the Father also is a Governor and so is the Holy Ghost. But how will this square with the following unintentional overthrow of the doctrine of the Trinity by Bishop Pearson on Art. 1 ps. 24 25, where he says:—"If then there were more Supreme Governors of the world than one, each of them absolute and free, they might have contrary determinations concerning the same thing, than which nothing can be more prejudicial unto Government. God is a God of order, not confusion; and therefore of *unity, not admittng multiplication*. If it be better that the Universe should be governed by one than many, *we may be assured that it is so*, because nothing must be conceived of God but what is best. He therefore who made all things, by that right is Lord of all; and because all power is his, *he alone* ruleth over all. "It is necessary thus to believe the Unity of the Godhead, that being assured there is a nature worthy of our devotions, and challenging our religious subjection, we may learn to know *whose* that nature is to which we owe our adorations, lest our *minds* should *wander* and *fluctuate* in our worship about *various and uncertain objects*". "Upon this *foundation* the *whole* heart of man is entirely required of him, and engaged to him. "Hear O Israel: the Lord our God *is one Lord*: and (or rather, *therefore*) thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all thine heart*, &c. Whosoever were truly and by nature God, could not choose but challenge our love upon the ground of an infinite excellency, and transcendent beauty of holiness: and therefore if there were *more so Gods than one*, our love must

“ed to Christ in a variety of places, but most remarkably where it is said, that *by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible; whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: * and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* He is said to have known “*what was in man, to have known mens secret thoughts, and to have known all things: that as the Father was known of none but of the Son; so none knew the Son but the Father.* He pardons sin, sends the Spirit, gives “*grace and eternal life; and he shall raise the dead at the last day.*”

Trinitarians cannot see how such unquestionable omnipotence and omniscience, as have just been described, are consistent with the state of humiliation in which our Lord placed himself as our substitute in order to obey the demands of his Father's (or Godhead's) justice. They do not perceive how necessary it was for the complete carrying out of his humiliation, and service to the behests of his supreme holiness, that he should, as a Son and Servant, leave in abeyance his intrinsic will, power, knowledge, &c., in order the more fully to connect every thing coming from him with his Godhead which was reigning in heaven. † Therefore

“necessarily be terminated *unto more than one*, and consequently *divided* between them; and as our love, so also the proper effect thereof—our cheerful “and ready obedience, which, like the child propounded to the judgment of Solomon, as soon as it is divided, is destroyed. 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.”

* Thus believed the *Monarchians*—‘a name given to those’ (says the Encyclopædia of religious knowledge) “who seceded from the ancient orthodox faith, “because they insisted upon the divine *unity*, which they considered to be “fringed by the common doctrine, which taught that there are three eternal persons in the divine nature.”

† And yet how otherwise can the circumstance of an angel appearing unto our Lord from heaven, strengthening his human body in its agony, be explained or accounted for. Surely our Lord in his divine nature intrinsically possessed omnipotent strength; but he saw it unfit and unseasonable to exercise it whilst he was in a position of humiliation, and whilst he was carrying through the obedience which was to be the believer's title to heaven. Paul, in Col. i. 19—22, clearly declares this, as follows:—“For it seemed fit that in himself should *all fulness* dwell; and having made peace THROUGH THE BLOOD OF HIS CROSS, by himself to reconcile all things UNTO HIMSELF; by himself, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled IN THE BODY OF HIS FLESH THROUGH DEATH, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in HIS OWN (the Son's) sight.”

In the beginning of the passage just quoted the authorized translation says, “For it pleased *the Father*;” whereas “the Father” is not in the original Greek, and should not be ‘interpolated to fill up a *fancied* ellipsis. But, whichever way the passage be translated, it is certain, according to it, that the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in the Son, who consequently, being fully God, was capable, as an *infinitely* holy High Priest, of making, and he did make, peace; that is, he did offer up an *infinitely* holy and entirely satisfactory sacrifice—his human body being offered up on the altar of his divinity—through the blood of his cross.

they attribute our Lord's not exercising his will and power separately from himself (or his Godhead) in glory to his want of knowledge and power as *man*. But as Scripture and reason will not support this theory, the Athanasian creed must serve the turn. This creed, which is so much objected to, even by Church people, says:—"Perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human

He also reconciled mortals (not unto *another fancied* Person in the Trinity) but unto HIMSELF. And he did all *in the body of his flesh through death*, without the instrumental appendage of a human rational soul, which would be immortal, and consequently could not be "exceeding sorrowful *even unto death*;" but he did all by the instrumentality of the *blood or vital sensitive soul*, which our Lord *poured forth unto death*, Isaiah liii. 12, and *such a soul* as the Psalmist in the 116th Psalm, praised God for delivering *from death*. Here then in this portion of Scripture taken from the first chapter of Colossians we see embodied the four following propositions:—1st. That the Son is fully God: 2nd. That he has made peace, and reconciled sinners unto HIMSELF: 3rd. That he did so by atoning for their sins "*in the body of his flesh*" "through the blood of his cross": And 4th. That the end, which he had graciously in view in all this, was to present his Church "holy and unblameable and unreprieveable *in his own sight*."

Bradley in his sermon on Eph. v. 25, 26, 27, says:—"He (the Bridegroom) presents her to HIMSELF. He takes her in all her abject misery, as the beloved of his soul, and he loves her and delights in her the more, *because no hand save his own* has rescued her, because she owes *all her greatness and happiness to him alone*." [See Jay's observations in page 20 of the "Vindication."]

It seems an insuperable difficulty to Trinitarians to admit that Christ, as is declared in Eph. v., should *present* the Church to *himself*; that God should *give himself* for us, as we read in Tit. ii. 14; or that *God* should speak to God, as in Heb. i. 8. The language of submission, used by God in his *official character* in the heavens before his incarnation, implying obedience to his own Deity (as we see in Heb. x. 7, 9,) seems to them strange and unaccountable; as does also the exclamation on the cross, "My God, my God;" because they are not taught to perceive the *two different positions of the same divine Person*—the one, as the absolute God of justice and holiness, exacting the ransom; the other as man's substitute representatively paying the ransom.

In like manner by a figure of speech called personification, which is very common in the Scripture, "the blood of sprinkling" is said to *speak* better things than the blood of Abel. And by virtue of the atonement made by this blood, which figuratively is said to speak, "mercy and truth" are said to *meet together* harmoniously. In other words, *God the Saviour's* mercy, brought into *lawful* exercise by virtue of the atonement made by him for sinners, meets his justice, which is conspicuous in his attitude of the *absolute God or Father*; turns aside its awards; and thus, what the attributes of God do, may be said to be done by God himself. Wherefore though a mediator is not a mediator of *one*, for there must be two parties to mediate between, yet God is *one—one holy Spirit, one Person*. But as his mercy, *in his aspect as the Redeemer*, pleads with his justice *in his aspect as the holy God*, therefore Christ is *figuratively* said to intercede with the Father for mankind; not that there is actually an *oral advocacy*, but a virtual interposition between the unimpairable justice of God and guilty sinners, as I have endeavoured to describe. Thus *the Lord* remains a *just God and a Saviour*. Is. xlv. 21.

Accordingly when I humbly ask the Father for forgiveness, I ask it of him in the name of his Son Jesus Christ, that is, in the name which he graciously bore officially in the work of redemption, and which he still bears in his virtual intercession between us and his offended justice. How very different this rational ex-

flesh subsisting." Such high-handed decisions on what they do not wish to investigate nor understand may satisfy the generality of people, but such as Arians and Unitarians will only be the more confirmed in their horrid errors by the course of doctrine and argumentation followed by Trinitarians with respect to the Trinity, and the human rational soul commonly supposed to have been created for a residence in Christ's body from the time of its formation. The following quotations from the cleverest Unitarian writers will prove what I have stated. Here then is what they say:—

"There is but one way to overthrow the Unitarian doctrine. It is to prove, not that Christ is "a Prince and a Saviour by the right hand of God highly exalted," but that he is the Infinite God himself, *by whom that exaltation was given*. It is not to prove that the *Father* made himself manifest through the *Son*, as it is written, "the word was made flesh," that is, "the divine wisdom and power were manifested in a human form," but it is to prove that the *Father*, who is the being manifested, *is the same with the Son*, who was the medium of the manifestation. The question between us and Trinitarians is simply this: Did the Saviour, when he said, "My Father is greater than I," mean what he seemed to say, and what he was understood by those who heard him to say, or did he mean that, while there was an apparent inferiority, he was in fact equal with the Father, possessed of the same attributes, being *himself* the absolute and Supreme God. Here is the true point of the controversy."

"Speaking of the day of judgment, Christ says:—Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but my Father. Matthew has it "my Father only." Here our opponents resort to the *two nature* scheme again, in order to evade the force of this. They say, Christ only spoke of himself here, as a man; that is, in his *human nature*, he did not know when that day would be, but that in his *divine nature* he did know. This is a very unfair disposal of the text, besides it indirectly accuses the Son of God with dishonesty. That Trinitarians may see the result of their mode of reasoning, we will suppose the following figure: A certain person is standing before me, and another asks me, do you see that person? I shut up one eye, and look at the person with the other eye, and answer—No. I only mean, I do not see the person with the eye that is shut, although I see him all the while with the one that is open. Who would not accuse me with dishonesty for such conduct? Yet let Trinitarians remember, they lay just such dishonesty to the charge of the Holy Jesus, *in their explanation of this passage.*"

planation of the Trinity is to that given by Trinitarians may be seen from the following defence of God's Tripersonality taken from Nicholls's work, much used in the Church Sunday Schools in the old country. He plainly makes out two Gods, for he says:—"Again, a person is described in the Old Testament under various titles, particularly as the Angel of the Lord, to whom the name and attributes of Jehovah are given, yet represented as distinct *from God*, and acting, as the term Angel imports, under a Divine commission. See Gen. xvi. 7" 111

“By the Trinitarian doctrine of incarnation, we are taught that Jesus Christ is composed of two *whole distinct natures, human and divine*; that in his human nature, he is *truly and properly* a man, and, that in his divine nature, he is the very and eternal God. This doctrine to me appears as difficult to understand, as the assertion that God is three persons. Not content with asserting God to be three persons, Trinitarians would also teach us that the Son, one of the three, is *two* persons. I am, however, aware that they will be unwilling to admit this statement; but if their doctrine does not plainly imply it, I am at an entire loss to know the meaning of the terms they use. As *man*, they tell us Christ possessed a human body and a *reasonable* soul. Every one knows that a human body and a *reasonable* soul constitute a *complete person* or *being*. This is one person. In his *divine nature* they assert that he is the very and eternal God, and this, according to their system, must be at least as much as *one person more*. As *one* and *one* make *two*, the plain conclusion follows, that the Trinitarian doctrine asserts the Son of God to be *two persons!!!*

“But it is asserted, that “the two natures are so mysteriously united as to constitute but one person.” Before I admit the correctness of this statement, I must require some other definition of the *two natures*, than to state the one to be *very man*, and the other very God; for I need not to be taught that *very man* is *one person*, and *very God* another. It would be no more absurd for Trinitarians to assert that God is *three* persons, and yet but *one* person, than it is to say the Son of God is very God and very man, and yet but *one* person. Did I believe that Jesus Christ was “truly and properly a man,” and also the “very and eternal God,” I would far sooner give up the idea that God is three persons than that the Son is two. How Trinitarians get along with this difficulty I know not, for they are generally pretty silent about it. The Nestorians in the fifth century, in asserting the doctrine of incarnation, frankly owned their belief that Christ was two persons. And why are not Trinitarians, at the present day, willing to acknowledge the same sentiment, while their doctrine plainly implies it? It is because they know it would involve a palpable absurdity? and do they aid their course, in the least, by endeavouring to conceal an absurdity which their doctrine so plainly involves? In arguments used by Trinitarians, they acknowledge a plain distinction between the *two natures*, as much as to assert they are two persons. They say Christ sometimes spoke as man, and sometimes as God. That sometimes the *human nature* spoke and sometimes the *divine nature*. That the *two natures* conversed together; that the one nature prayed to the other nature. And from these statements what conception can we form of the two natures, but that they are *two persons*? But to acknowledge this, the support of Scripture would still be needed. What Scripture even asserts that Christ possesses *two whole* and distinct natures?”

“While Trinitarians contend that it is idolatry to worship anything but the *very God*, I would ask, is their system free from danger in this respect? They tell us they worship Christ, and that he is *very man* as well as *very God*. I

“would then ask, do they worship the whole of Christ, or only a part of him? If they worship only a part of him, they are certainly dishonest in their worship; and if they worship the whole of him, they must worship *very man* as well as *very God*. But on this principle, their own statements would prove them *idolaters*, since *very man* cannot be *very God*.” *

I have given these quotations from Unitarian writers, to show how prevalent they are against Trinitarian arguments, though sometimes both the parties unite together against Gospel truth when it mutually answers their purposes. For instance, both the parties refer triumphantly to John xiv. 23:—“Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.” Trinitarians consider Jesus and the Father different Persons on account of the conjunction *and* coupling the two names; though, for the same reason, God *and* the Father in James i. 27, &c., should be two Persons. *God* and *Father* are only different names of *him* whom the *Shorter Catechism* defines to be “*a Spirit*,

* It was owing to such reasoning as the foregoing, that the Monophysites, Eutychians, and Monothelists, who maintained *one will and one operation* in Christ, so long and so successfully stood out against their opponents. As it was through a rabid opposition to the views of Apollinaris, which had been circulated in the fourth century, that Nestorianism sprung up in the fifth century; so in opposition to Nestorianism arose those Christian confederations (which I have just named) in the same century, and which I believe, if *clearly* described as to their religious belief would be acknowledged Apollinarian in principle. It may here be mentioned that Pope Honorius was a Monothelite, as also the Maronites who inhabit Mount Libanus, who as shown by Mosheim, derived their origin from the Monophysites, and adhered to the doctrine of the Monothelites § for several centuries. At length they joined *outwardly at least* the Church of Rome while “one body of them retired into the valleys of Piedmont, where they joined the Waldenses; another, above six hundred in number, with a bishop and several ecclesiastics at their head, fled into Corsica, and implored the protection of the republic of Genoa against the violence of the Inquisitors.” It would have saved the Maronites their present miserable state of degradation, as also the terrible massacres just fallen on them, if they had kept aloof from the Jesuits, who lately incited them to venture on the extirpation of the Druses, who on their part have retaliated with a barbarous retribution. The Jesuits should be held responsible for all the blood that has been shed on the occasion. They are invariably the instigators of dark crimes. They are a curse to every country where they obtain any influence. Though Mosheim says:—“Certain it is, that there are Maronites in Syria, who still behold the Church of Rome with the greatest aversion and abhorrence,” yet having placed themselves under the wing of Popery, they could meet with no other fate than to be influenced by its Machiavelian policy, which has lately plunged the poor people into the greatest bloodshed and misery. Where principle is violated the conduct will be involved in endless inconsistencies. The path of uncompromising rectitude is the only way of pleasantness and peace, both for individuals and countries. Nothing but a return to this straight and onward path can save any nominally Christian people from destruction.

§ “Who maintained, that, notwithstanding the two natures in Christ, viz. the human and the divine, there was, *nevertheless, but one will, which was the Divine.*” See Mosheim (2) 76, for all that I *use* here quoting.

infinite, eternal, and unchangeable," and consequently are only different names of the same Person. So the names of the Father *and* Son, or God *and* Christ, are only different *official* names given to the same eternal Spirit. The Unitarians likewise on their part assert that the Father *and* Christ are two distinct Personal Beings; * and equally with the Trinitarians lay great stress on the plural pronoun *we* in the passage referred to. However, it will suffice to quote Mr. Millard's argument, and then to quote from Mr. Eliot's *choice* Unitarian work what unintentionally, but completely, upsets it. The former says:—

"It appears evident to me that Christ is represented in Scripture, as present with his disciples in distinction from his God and Father. John xiv. 23, "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." The word *we*, always implies as much as *two*; and who would have supposed from reading this text, that Christ and his Father are one and the same being? "And *we* will come unto him, and make *our* abode with him." "Let the passage speak for itself. Mr. Eliot says:—"We can give instances in Sacred Scripture of its (the plural's) use by earthly Kings, by Jesus Christ, by the Apostle Paul, and by many others. In 1st Thess. ii. 18, are the words: "Wherefore *we* would have come unto you, *even I Paul*, once and again, but Satan hindered *us*;" where the Apostle applies the pronouns, *we* and *us*, to *himself*. We might quote other passages showing the same use of the plural, † "but it is not needful." [These quotations are extracts from Eliot's "Discourses on the Unity of God," ps. 17, 46; and Millard's "True Messiah," ps. 60, 61, 62, 126, 155.]

* But they differ from the Trinitarians in this, that they say that the Father is the eternal God, but that the Son was *created by*, or *derived* from the Father; and consequently is not co-equal with the Father or eternal God.

† On referring to the Greek Testament and comparing verse 24 with verses 15 and 16 of Luke xiv., we will see *one* person addressed in the *plural* number; that is, as if three or more persons were addressed—"For I say unto *you*"; (Greek) *umin*. See also John, in the 21st chapter of his Gospel. v. 24, saying of *himself*, "we know that his testimony is true."

The late Rev. Wm. Romaine (to whose copious works I referred in page 73 of my "Vindication," and of whom I there said, that "his evangelical orthodoxy as a Trinitarian Minister of the Church of England is too renowned for me to remark it,") in his viith Discourse "upon the right love of the Lord (God)" sets at rest, beyond cavil or dispute, though unintentionally, the oft-harped-on argument of Trinitarians, viz: that in several places of Scripture the Hebrew for Jehovah or Lord, and God, being *Alehim*, which is in the plural number, and acknowledged to be so by the Jews as well as Christians, shows a plurality of Persons (as they call them) in the Godhead. From the subjoined remarks of Mr. Romaine, we may evidently see that if the personality in Jehovah, as described by the *Alehim*, is plural, then the personality *in each Person* must also be plural; or, in other words, *there is a plurality of persons in one person*, which is the height of absurdity. Mr. Romaine says:—"Each of the persons is called *Alehim*. The Father is so called, 1st Chron. xxix. 10: "And David said, Blessed be thou Jehovah, *Alehim* of Israel, our Father, for ever and ever." The Son is *Alehim*, Isaiah xlvi. 21: "There is *no Alehim* else beside me; a just God and a Saviour." The

It will be thought by the reader that I have digressed from my last starting point, which was the first chapter of John. In the 3rd and 10th verses of which the Word is declared (1st) to be the *Creator*. In the 14th verse the Word is declared (2nd) to be the incarnate *Redeemer*, "And the Word was made flesh"—*simply flesh*, without any *rational soul*. And (3rd) in the 4th verse the Word is declared to be the *Quickener* and *Enlightener*,—or, in other words, *the Holy † Ghost*. "In him was life; and the life was the *light* of men." Further, in order to obviate the erroneous opinion that God saw would prevail in after ages, viz: That it was *another* Person in the Godhead, named the Holy Ghost, and not the Person of the Word, which was universally and perpetually to enlighten, &c., the children of men; therefore it is declared concerning the Word, in his

• Holy Spirit is *Alchim*, Exodus xxxi. 3; "I have filled Bezaiel with the *Spirit* of *Alchim*," *not*, of the *Alchim*;" the Hebrew is, "with the *Spirit* *Alchim*;" "so that the *Spirit* is the *Alchim*."

Mr. Romane in the next Discourse says:—"Their" (the persons') "names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are not descriptive of their nature, but of their offices: they are not to teach us in what manner they exist in Jehovah; but they are covenant names, belonging to the offices which the divine persons sustain in the covenant. The Scripture does not use these names to teach us how the divine persons exist, but how they act; how they stand related to the heirs of promise, and not what they are in themselves, as persons in Jehovah. This is a truth of great importance, which I have endeavoured to defend from the pulpit and the press: and particularly in a printed discourse upon the self-existence of Jesus Christ."

If Mr. Romane only used the singular for the plural, then his explanation would be excellent, and it would run thus:—"His" (the Lord's) "names, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are not descriptive of his nature, but of his offices: they are not to teach us in what manner he exists in Jehovah (or the Godhead); but they are covenant names, belonging to the offices which the divine person sustains in the covenant. The Scripture does not use these names to teach us how the divine person exists, but how he acts; how he stands related to the heirs of promise, and not what he is in himself, as the person in Jehovah (or the Godhead)."

‡ In 2nd Cor. iii. 17, it is expressly said:—"Now the Lord is that Spirit." There is no person, I believe, who would not join in opinion with the Cottage Bible on the same, which says:—"The Lord *Christ* is that Spirit," (v. 6). As then the Lord *Christ* is here said to be the Spirit, (that is, whilst presenting himself in the revealed attitude of the Holy Ghost); so is he called in 1st. ix. 6, "The everlasting Father." Again, in Rom. viii. 2: The *Spirit* of life, (i. e. the Holy Ghost,) is said to be in Christ: so in John x. 38, the *Father* is said to be in him. Again, in John xvi. 8, the office of the Holy Ghost is declared to consist in reproving and convicting the world of sin, &c.; so in Heb. iv. 12, 13, we see the same office attributed to our Redeemer in his attitude as the Holy Ghost: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." It might, undoubtedly, be said of the word of God, as it is outwardly preached, (when applied by the Spirit of Truth) that it is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword. When, however, we view this passage as a whole, we can scarcely fail to perceive

official character as the Holy Ghost, in the 9th verse, "That was the true Light, which *lighteth every man* that cometh into the world."

The prophet Isaiah also (Ch. ix. 6,) declares that *his* (that is, the Son's) *name should be called The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace, and Counselor;*" or, in other words, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In Paul's epistle to Titus ii. 13, 14, we read of our Lord, as "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ who gave *himself* for us;" in John iii. 16, we read of *God* giving "his *only begotten Son.*" Both passages undoubtedly mean the same thing, viz. That God gave *himself* in the character of an obedient Son to the requirements and penalties of his own violated law. And as it was *only* "once in the end of the world" that God, in the manifestation of himself under the *character* of a Son, appeared to put away sin, (Heb. ix. 26) therefore does he *call himself, when bearing that character, the "only begotten Son."*

It may also be observed that as from eternity, or all through the eternal "day," God virtually existed as a Son (that is, in the divine mind,) therefore the Godhead is represented as saying to himself in his Sonship or *official* character, "Thou art my Son, *this day* have I begotten thee. And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son. And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, *O God*, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy "(Gospel)" Kingdom. Thou hast (in thy *official* capacity) "loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God," (or *Godhead*) "hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." * And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt

that the apostle is speaking of the essential word of God: that divine Person "with whom we have to do," and who, in the subsequent verse, is plainly described as "a great High Priest—Jesus the Son of God:" see ver. 14. Such is the express judgment of a variety of able commentators. The *preached* word, with which the apostles were to "teach" and "baptize" according to our Lord's commission, Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c., is in Eph. v. 26, (in the Greek) *Réma*, not *Logos*—"the washing of water by the word." On the supposition then that the passage in Heb. iv. 12, 13, describes the Son of God, it appears very plainly to relate to *his secret operations* in the hearts of men in his capacity of the Holy Ghost.

Even this note ought to be sufficient to convince Trinitarians that in God there is but one Person revealed to mankind *in his three offices* of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

* Anointing with oil had been customary among the Jews on the appointment of their prophets, priests, and kings. But though the practice was discontinued for several hundred years before our Lord's advent, yet, in allusion to the ancient custom, the *accredited* mission of our Lord in his three offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, is so figuratively proclaimed. The object is to shew the entire connection and concurrence of God in his holiness with himself as the Redeemer.

thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." (Heb. i. 5-12).

Paul says, "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son. This simply means that God, to manifest himself in the flesh, came on earth, and *actually* appeared (in the fulness of time) in that Sonship character, which so long, even from eternity, existed in the Divine mind. And when he so appeared under the veil of humanity, the hosts in glory were commanded to worship him; that is, to adore their God in his attitude as the actual Redeemer. This is what the Apostle designs to be understood by that passage in Heb. i. 6 already referred to, "And again, when he bringeth in the *first* begotten" that is, begotten or designed *at the first, in the beginning*, or, in other words, *from eternity*) "into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him."

Our Lord is described as having sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high," that is, in the highest position of power. The meaning of which is, that though as "God blessed for ever" he was from eternity at the right hand of majesty or power, that is, in the chief position of eminence, far above all principalities and powers, yet being *made perfect* or *qualified* through the human sacrifice, which he, the indwelling High Priest, sanctified and stamped with infinite value, he was enabled, harmoniously with his truth, his justice, and his holiness, to take the same position of power as Redeemer and Mediator, and exercise it graciously for the salvation of man. That no *local position* is literally meant, such as is generally thought of when one is said to sit at the right hand of another, † is plain from Rev. vii. 17, where the Lamb, long after his exaltation to glory, is described as in the *midst* of the Throne. In John i. 18, we read of the Son being *in the bosom* of the Father; which description of where our Mediator dwells is intended to convey to sinners the idea of how the absolute God or Father is delighted in viewing himself in the attitude of the Son or Saviour. This

† Bishop Burnet on the first of the xxxix Articles which speaks of God as a Being "without body, parts, or passions," says:—"The language of the Scriptures "speaks to the capacities of men, and even of rude men in dark times, in which "most of the Scriptures were writ: but though God is spoken of as having a face, "eyes, ears, a smelling, hands, and feet, and as coming down to view things on "earth, all this is expressed *after the manner of men*, and is to be understood "in a way *suitable to a pure Spirit*." I might here remark that the circumstance of Stephen at his martyrdom seeing Jesus standing at the *right hand of God*, should be understood "in a way *suitable to a pure Spirit*;" and then, instead of one standing on one side of another (which other is spoken of as "dwelling in light inaccessible," and as "the God whom *no man* hath seen or *can see*") instead of this carnal, childish, and antisciptural idea, we would consider the meaning to be, Jesus standing in the *highest position* of his *Godhead's effulgence and power*, or *in the midst of the Throne*. Milner "on the Festivals," describing how our Saviour sits at the right hand of God, falls into the vulgar error, and displaces the *incarnate God*, not only from "the midst of the Throne," but from the Throne altogether: and assigns to him, as if he were *not* God, or as if he were *another God*, a real literal locality at the right hand of the *Throne*, and of *God's presence* dwelling there. Our Saviour's sitting at the right hand of

taking of delight by God, in viewing himself in his official character of Son or Saviour, seems to me to be the meaning of the words, "beloved Son," "dear Son" * &c., when spoken of Christ.

Our Lord, on the eve of the crucifixion of his body, told his disciples, "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you." He also promised them that this Comforter should abide with them forever. Now mark how the Comforter is no other Person but the Lord Christ in his sanctifying, counselling, and comforting province or character; for he says to the same disciples, "Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. †

God, says Milner, "may import *his sitting in his human shape on the right hand of that bright Throne*, or resplendent glory, which visibly accompanies and manifests some extraordinary *presence of God*. §

* Bishop Pearson (on Article 2, Apostles Creed) speaking of what he calls, "Christ's *right* unto the *title* of the son of God by *commission*, as sent by him," says:—"Secondly, it is as undoubtedly true, that the same Christ, thus born" (as to his human nature) "of the Virgin by the Spirit of God," (that is, by the Spirit of his own Godhead) "was *designed* to so high an office by the special "and immediate will of God, that by *virtue thereof* he must be acknowledged "the son of God. He *urgeth* this ARGUMENT himself against the *Jews*: "Is it "not written in your Law, I said, ye are Gods?" Are not these the very words "of the eighty second Psalm? "If he called them Gods," if God himself so "spake, or the Psalmist from him, if this be the language of the Scripture, if they "be called Gods "unto whom the word of God came," ("and the Scripture can- "not be broken," nor the authority thereof in any particular denied;) "say ye of "him whom the Father hath sanctified and SENT into the world," whom he hath "consecrated and *commissioned* to the most eminent and extraordinary Office, "say ye of him, Thou blasphemest, *because* I said, I am the son of God." Here Bishop Pearson shews from our Lord's conclusive reasoning with the Jews, how the title of *Son* was *justly held in consequence of the filial, Son like obedience paid to the commission from his Godhead*. This, as I have said from first to last, is my view of the *origin and signification* of the term *Son* when applied to our Lord as the "Sent" or Personator of himself in heaven. Let me be permitted to say (as I feel inwardly constrained to do) that the declaration of Protestant divines is shameful and *heathenish*, when they assert that "the communication of the Divine essence, or nature, by the Father to the Son, is a *proper generation*, by which he which communicateth is a *proper Father*; and he to "whom it is communicated, a *proper Son*."!!! See Bp. Pearson, *id*.

† To see this more clearly, let us turn to John xvi. 7, where Christ tells his disciples, that after his departure from them in the flesh *he would send* the Comforter unto them. In John xiv. 16, 26, he told them that *the Father would give and send* the same Comforter to them; therefore the Father and Christ must be one Person. But further, we see in the 18th verse of the latter chapter that *Christ himself was the Comforter* that was to be given, for he there says:—"I will not leave you *comfortless*: I will *come* to you. Thus as Mr. Jay says on Rev. ii. 28, Christ is "the Giver and the Gift; *He is all in all*," and therefore

§ Notwithstanding the generally-reported orthodox theology of Milner and others, as to their meaning of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God, still, while life remains, I shall be delighted to sing:—

Let all creation join in one,
To bless the sacred name
Of Him who sits upon the Throne,
And to adore the Lamb."

Again, Paul says in 1st Tim. ii. 5, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." By which I understand that God, having been from eternity "in the form" of his own glorious Godhead, took upon

there is but one Person in the Godhead, revealed in the three *capacities* of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

Archbishop Whateley, in his "appendix on ambiguous terms," shows how the word "one" "is sometimes employed to denote strict and proper *numerical Unity*, and sometimes *close resemblance*" only. Under the *former* sense of the word, we may view our Lord's declaration, "I and my Father are *one*." Under the *second* sense we may view our Lord's prayer for his disciples, "That they all may be *one*, &c. The archbishop on the next page treats of the word "Person" as follows:—"Person, in its ordinary use at present, invariably implies a numerical-ly distinct substance. Each man is one person, and can be but one. It has "also a peculiar theological sense, in which we speak of the "three Persons" of "the blessed Trinity. It was probably thus employed by our Divines as a literal, "or perhaps etymological, rendering of the Latin Word "Persona." I am inclined to think, however, from the language of Wallis (the Mathematician and "Logician) in the following extract, as well as from that of some other of our "older writers, that the English word "Person" was formerly not so strictly confined as now, to the sense it bears in common conversation among us. Dr. "Wallis's theological works, considering his general celebrity, are wonderfully "little known. He seems to have been, in his day, one of the ablest Defenders "of the Church's doctrine, against the Arians and Socinians of that period. Of "course he incurred the censure, not only of them, but of all who, though not professedly Arian, gave such an exposition of the doctrine" (of the Trinity) "as "amounts *virtually* to Tritheism. I beg to be understood, however, as not demanding an implicit deference for his, or for any other human authority, however eminent. We are taught to "call no man Master on earth." But the reference to Dr. Wallis may serve both to show the use of the word "Person" in "his days, and to correct the notion, should any have entertained it, that the "views of the subject here taken are, in our Church, *any thing novel*."

After such a high encomium by the Archbishop of Dublin on the doctrinal works of Dr. Wallis (a distinguished theological writer of the Church of England) I may, with all reason, bespeak the attention of the reader to the extract *adduced* and *endorsed* by the Archbishop, which *exactly* expresses my sentiments on the doctrine of the Trinity.

Dr. Wallis says:—"That which makes these expressions (viz. respecting the Trinity) seem harsh to some of these men, is because they have used themselves to fancy that notion only of the word Person, according to which *three men* are accounted to be *three persons*, and these three persons to be three men. But he may consider that there is another notion of the word Person, and in common use too, wherever the *same man* may be said to sustain *divers persons*, and *those persons* to be the *same man*: that is, the *same man* as sustaining *divers capacities*. As was said but now of Tully, *Tres Personas Unus sustinet, meam, adversarii, judicis*. (I, the *one* person, support *three characters*—my own, that of my adversary, and that of a judge.) And then it will seem no more harsh to say, The three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are one God, than to say, God the Creator, God the Redeemer, and God the Sanctifier, are one God * * * it is much the same thing whether of the two forms we use. The word Person (*persona*) is originally a Latin word, and doth not properly signify a *Man*. (so that *another person* must needs imply *another man*.) for then the word *Homo* would have served, and they needed not have taken in the word *Persona*; but rather, one *so circumstantiated*. And the *same Man*, if considered in other circumstances (considerably differ-

him "the form of a servant," by *humbling himself to obey* in, and through, the human body which he had put on, the demands of his own righteous law. And "being found *in fashion* as a man" for the purpose of our salvation, his name was called Jesus because he was in this manner to save his people from their sins. * He was also to be the Mediator: for he virtually presents, as it were, the blood (or rather the atonement and satisfaction made by the shedding of blood) which he, being God dwelling in the temple of his body and the High Priest who offered that body as a sacrifice, caused and allowed to be shed—I say, he presents, as it were, all that he in, and by the instrumentality of, his human body did and suffered for man—he presents it as a satisfaction to his justice, and *thus* he is the Mediator between his Godhead and mankind reconciling the world unto HIMSELF.

(ent) is reputed *another person*. And that this is the true notion of the word "Person, appears by those noted phrases, *personam induere* (to put on a mask or character) *personam deponere* (to put off, or lay aside, the mask or character) *personam agere* (to act the part or character) and many the like in approved Latin authors. Thus the *same man* may at once sustain the Person of "a *King* and a *Father*, if he be invested both with *regal* and *paternal* authority. Now because the *King* and the *Father* are for the most part not only different persons, but different men also, (and the like in other cases,) hence it comes to pass that *another Person* is sometimes supposed to imply *another man*; but not always, nor is that the proper sense of the word, *Person*. It is Englished in our dictionaries by the *state, quality, or condition, where one man differs from another*; and, so as the *condition* alters, the *Person* alters, *though the man be the same.*"

Under the same heading "Person" that we see the extract from Wallis, we also see, to the same effect, additional remarks from the Archbishop, wherein he shows how the early Fathers, in their explanations of the words "Let us make man," approached very closely to the Arian *tritheism*. This he makes evident by quotations from Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and Justin Martyr, the last of whom, he says, "*expressly speaks of God as 'One not in number, but in judgment or design.'*" In the page preceding these remarks of Archbishop Whateley, concerning the awfully erroneous doctrine of the Trinity as held by the early Church as well as in modern times, he reminds his readers of the cause why the error was received and the truth cried down, in the following words:—"It is important to remember,—what we are very liable to lose sight of,—the circumstance, that not only there arose *grievous* errors during the time of the Apostles, and consequently such were likely to exist in the times immediately following, but also that when these *inspired* guides were removed, there was no longer the same infallible authority to decide what *was* error. In the absence of such a guide, *some errors* might be received as *orthodox*, and *some sound doctrines* be condemned as *heterodox.*" [See Ap. Whateley's Elements of Logic.]

* Phil. ii. 7, 8. Bishop Pearson (Art. 2) says:—"The *form* then of a servant which he took upon him must consist in something distinct from his sufferings, or submission unto men; as the condition in which he was, when he so submitted and so suffered. In that he was *made flesh*, sent in the likeness of *sinful flesh* subject unto all infirmities and miseries of Adam: in that he was *made of a woman*, made under the law, and so obliged to perform the same; which Law did so handle the children of God, as that they differed nothing from *servants*. As therefore his *humiliation* consisted in his *obedience* unto death, so his *exinanition* (or emptying himself) consisted in the assumption of the form of a servant, and that in the nature of man."

Paul instructs us in 1st. Tim. ii. 5, that *Christ Jesus is the "one mediator between God and men;"* but he tells us also in Rom. viii. 26, 27, that *the Spirit makes intercession for us,* or (which is the same thing) *is our mediator;* therefore Christ and the Holy Ghost must be *one and the same person* under different names. In short, the doctrine of one eternal Spirit or Being in his three-fold office of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as revealed in Scripture, is appropriately explained by resembling the Father to the Sun in its absolute essence and original magnificence; by resembling the Word or Son to it in its illuminating virtue or quality; and by resembling the Holy Ghost to it in its warming and maturing efficacy.

The oft-told legend of St. Patrick converting an Irish Baalite Chief to a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity by exhibiting a shamrock with *three leaves on one stem* is still mentioned to people who are ignorant enough to believe it. But as each person of the Trinity is said to be whole and very God, as truly as the Trinity is God, it follows, that, to have the comparison between the Shamrock and the Trinity hold good, *each of the Shamrock's three leaves must be a whole* and very plant as truly as the triune Shamrock is one plant: such not being the case, the comparison is foolish. For 20, or 30, or *any number* of Persons, may similarly be proved to be in the Godhead by counting the leaves of cabbage growing from the stalk, or the number of branches from the trunk of a tree. I often hear also of the silly comparison of water, ice, and snow, to the three Persons of the Trinity. But as there is here a "dividing of the substance," and an *inequality* in the substances and in the time of their existence, therefore the comparison is quite contrary to the Athanism Creed and to what is taught by the doctrine of the Trinity. *

Wesley, and *of course* the Methodists after him, † speak of the light derived from three candles as explanatory of the grace derived from the three persons of the Trinity, the light from the candles being one and the same as the grace of God from the three persons of the Trinity. But we read also in Rev. i. 4, of grace solicited for the seven churches by John, which must be the same power of grace issuing from the *seven* Spirits, and consequently, according to this mode of argument, we may add the seven Spirits to the three of the Trinity, and then God will be ten persons.

I should not omit to state here what caps the climax of the "old wives fables" commonly told to support the doctrine of the Trinity. The story in its most captivating form I have seen in poetry in the "Toronto *Echo*" of May 27, 1858.

* "And in the unity of this Godhead there be three Persons of *one substance.*" See Church of England "Articles of religion" No. 1.

† I hoped for the credit of the enlightened christianity which is generally supposed to be gaining ground in this latter half of the 19th century, that foolish, childish stories about "haunted places," and the apparition of Ghosts and fairies to frighten children and the credulously ignorant, were only to be heard of among the *most ignorant* Roman Catholics, or the notoriously impious "Rappers."¹⁵

As the *Echo*, in all its advertisements, asserts that it is "The *only* Church of England religious newspaper published in Canada," therefore the more attention is to be paid to the tale when it comes from such an orthodox *Cathedra*. It is substantially as follows:—On one occasion St. Augustine was anxiously occupied in studying the Bible in order to solve the "various doubts" which had arisen in his mind concerning three persons in one God. Being "heated and feverish" from the "puzzling theme" he was engaged in pondering on, he closed the Bible, and took a walk to the sea side, where, still absorbed in thought, he espied a little "urchin" labouring earnestly at the water's brink. Perceiving that the "child had scooped a hole, shallow and narrow in the shining sand, over which at work the labouring infant stooped, still pouring water in with busy hand," the Saint said to him, "Fair boy, I pray, what toil is thine? Let me its end and purpose

But, to my great surprise, I see such delusions are upheld by a denomination which "has shown itself a master piece of social organization for promoting conversion, and securing its conquests." A work called the "History of Wesleyan Methodism," or, "Wesley and his times," by George Smith, L. L. D. F. A. S. dedicated, May 4, 1856, to the President of the Wesleyan Conference, 2nd Edition, has lately been published for the more particular study of the young itinerant Ministers. In page 317, the author says, "It does not seem unreasonable to believe that God should allow supernatural evidences occasionally to appear of the things which are "unseen" and "eternal"!" Presenting this bold front to the jeers forced from the discerning by the recital of such "old wives fables" as he recites, he affects to quote them unblushingly in order to support the generally questioned soundness of mind of the founder of his sect.

Thus in page 82, he gives an extract from Wesley's journal of the strange noises in the parsonage house at Epworth; of the servant hearing dismal groans in the dining room, as of a dying person; knockings were heard in one place, and then in several parts of the house at the same time; rattling sounds, as if bottles were being broken to pieces; footsteps were distinctly heard as of a person walking about; doors were pushed open, and violently shut; and what is most remarkable, these unnatural and unaccountable noises continued for months, and one member of the family was annoyed in a similar way thirty-four years afterwards, although then residing in London!!! Dr. Smith will not listen to Dr. Priestly "who," he says, "argues that where no good end was to be answered, we may safely conclude that no miracle was wrought; and who supposes, as the most probable solution, that it was a trick of the servants, assisted by some of the neighbours, for the sake of amusing themselves and puzzling the family."

In page 559, Dr. Smith, by another extract, shows how George Lukins was tormented by seven devils, which frequently declared the secret of how they might be expelled by the prayer of *seven* ministers. A physician of Bristol contended that Lukins was *altogether* an impostor. One of the seven was very much of the physician's mind; but, knowing Lukins to be altogether illiterate, he asked him a question in Latin, and Lukins at once replied in Latin. This carried conviction to the minds of all the gentlemen, that the contortions of the young man were effectuated by an evil influence, and, by consequence, that Lukins was a demoniac!!! Dr. Smith edifies his readers with other extracts from Wesley's journal, viz: Elizabeth Booth's "possession," and a Somnivangelist's *methodical* preaching, singing, &c., whilst asleep. What intelligent judgment can we expect to find among the Methodist Laity, when ministers *so instructed* are set over them? All this is done to prop up John Wesley's singularities.

In Wesley's *puerile* days (when impressions are most easily made) there pre

understand. The boy replied,—“An easy task is mine, to sweep into this hole all the wide ocean’s brine!” “O foolish boy!” the Saint exclaimed, “to hope that the broad ocean in that hole should be!” “O foolish man!” exclaimed the boy, “thy scope is still more hopeless than the toil I ply.” The lesson desired to be taken from this childish narrative is, that as St. Augustine was prohibited by an angel in the form of an infant from enquiring into the doctrine of the Trinity, so should every one instructed therefrom never attempt to think about it!!!

I may be asked what John xvii. 5 means? For there our Saviour says, “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.” This question should not be put to me by any person who has attentively read my other pamphlets, or the former part of this “Defence.” For all through I have been explaining how our Lord, under the form of a “Servant” or “Son,” (names of office) invariably displayed to the eyes and ears of all within his reach *the connexion of operation* between his absolute Godhead in a state of glory in heaven, and the same Godhead while effecting our

vailed generally a belief in witchcraft, and in what was marvellous and supernatural. § In 1716, a Mrs. Hicks, and her daughter aged nine, were hanged at Huntingdon for selling their souls to the devil, and raising a storm by putting off their stockings and making a lather of soap! This fact modifies the blame attributable to Wesley for his child-like credulity as to hobgoblin apparitions and demoniacal possessions: but for those ministers at the *present day*—who proudly bear his name to characterize them denominationally, and who persuade themselves to follow him in all his freaks of imagination—for those to endorse his sprite stories, &c., when they ought to know better, is almost unpardonable.

Equally with the design apparently of justifying Wesley is the object of Dr. Smith to instil into the minds of his readers a sympathy for the early Methodists, who, he shows, had been in many instances persecuted by the followers of the Church of England. Such an object on his part would be better entertained if the Methodists, at the present day, would shew that indulgence to others, which they in former times so pathetically had claimed for themselves.

Millard speaking of them, says:—“The Methodists ought to be the last people to raise the arm of oppression against dissenting Christians. But a few years since, they well knew what it was to endure such kind of treatment themselves, and I regret that they have so soon forgotten the *wormwood* and the *gall*.” “They are now fast treading in the tracks of their predecessors, and I would to God they would be seasonably apprized of their degeneracy. Of such, I find too many, particularly among the preachers. Reports as false as they were unfavourable, have been carried from circuit to circuit. With such, *Trinity* is their *God*, &c.” Such is the fruit of implicitly following Wesley, who (in the sermon on 1st John v. 7, containing the simile of the candles) absolutely excludes from Salvation all who do not believe in the doctrine of the Trinity as he does, “unless” (as Romanists say when they shut out Protestants from the pale of Salvation) “on the footing of honest Heathens, upon the plea of invincible ignorance”!! In the same sermon Wesley declares the Romanists to be *far more* orthodox than those who hold the doctrine of Calvin as to election! Which doctrine he as grossly misrepresents, as did lately the glib Daniel McAfee in his abusive letters on the sermons of Spurgeon—a candid, straightforward Christian.

§ “Many years ago, I was asking an experienced Physician, and one particularly eminent for curing Lunacy, “Sir, have you not seen reason to believe, that some Lunatics are *really Demoniacs*?” He answered, “Sir, I have been often inclined to think, that *most Lunatics are Demoniacs*”!!!
Wesley’s Sermon on “*Evil Angels*.”

redemption in a state of humiliation on earth; and how, with the desire of impressing this fact on people's minds, he prayed, gave thanks, looked up, &c., to his Deity in glory, or, in other words, to himself who was at the same in heaven. See John iii. 13, and xiv. 3. This our Lord shewed when he said, "He that seeth me seeth him that sent me." John xii. 45.

My interrogator should also recollect how that I am a firm believer in the eternal Sonship of Christ. And if, at the creation of our world, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy," (Job xxxviii. 7) how much more joyfully did those angels give an additional revenue of glory to the eternal King when displaying himself to them in the attitude which, in the fulness of time, he was actually and permanently to assume, and when exhibiting graciously, "before the world was," to the same admiring hosts how he was in this attitude to bring many sons to glory and enrol them among the celestial ranks. to "join the everlasting song and crown him Lord of all." Thus had our Lord glory, before the world was, not only as the *absolute God*; but also glory, *in addition thereto*, as the *declared* and anticipated Redeemer of mankind. The propriety of my viewing the Father and Son as one and the same Person in a twofold attitude, will appear from the following consideration:—

Let us suppose the case of a creditor exacting from a miserably insolvent debtor the complete payment of a debt. Seeing the impossibility of obtaining payment from the debtor he procures it by other means, even by his son, who actually pays the entire sum to him in behalf of the debtor. Though the debtor may feel obliged to his creditor for saying to the son, "If you pay the debt I will allow you to do so, and I will send you for that purpose where you will make out the amount, but, mark, every farthing of what is due to me I must and will have"—though he may feel somewhat thankful for his good will in allowing thus the debt to be paid by another—yet he cannot forget that the debt had to be paid, and that he must feel grateful (at least principally) to him who liberated him by actually paying the debt for him. Thus, according to the Trinitarian hypothesis, the Father is inexorably implacable till he is rendered merciful by the intercession of another person of the Trinity who sits at his right hand for that purpose. Is this a proper light in which to represent the Father of compassion, to whom mercies belong and whose name and nature are love.

Now consider the case of the insolvent debtor according to my humble view of it. His creditor sees that he is utterly unable to meet the claim against him; however, he visits him and says to him, "I know your helplessness and inability to pay me that which a sense of what is due to my justice, holiness, truth, and righteous government absolutely demands. I have made you this visit *not* as an exacting creditor, *but* as one that feels for you. Look upon me in that light; and, as I have to support my word and rule in their integrity, the debt must be paid, but here is the full amount for you. Pay it back now to me; and then, I having obtained literally what I vowed to demand and threatened to exact, can,

consistently with my perfections, shew you mercy, by giving you as full a discharge as if you had paid in the debt from your own resources."

The eternal Spirit required an atonement to be made to his violated laws; man was unable and ineligible to do this; therefore the gracious Lord, assuming the character of Redeemer, made the atonement to his offended justice in and through the human shrine which he had assumed; and he hands over to believing sinners what he did, and what he suffered, through the tabernacle of his body, for them—he hands it over to them, and makes it theirs so entirely, as that they may plead the same as effectually as if they had done and suffered so themselves. Thus our Lord says in Is. lxiii. 5, "And I looked, and there was none to help; and I wondered that there was none to uphold: therefore mine own arm *brought salvation unto me.*"

The King of glory viewed in heaven, as I have endeavoured to describe, in his attitude as the Saviour—the sinner's "all in all;" being their "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption";—is (as Bradley says) the one and *only* object of adoration there. Therefore the "great voice of much people" was heard by John "saying, Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God." The Lord of lords shall thus continue to have *Salvation* ascribed to him, till "the Kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and *he* shall reign for ever and ever." (Rev. xix. 1, xi. 15.)

The opinion generally held of the antiquity of the doctrine of the Trinity keeps back many from investigating it: but it should be recollected, that it was not established as an Article of faith till the latter end of the fourth Century, when the Church, both according to Mosheim and Milner, had made very rapid advances in degeneracy. Milner says, "Flavian" (of the fourth century) "was the first who invented the doxology," "Glory be to the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost." * In the following extract from the *Canadian Independent* of Oct. 16, 1857, may be seen the real reason why the doctrines of the Trinity, the hu-

* This doxology is repeated about eight times in the Church morning service. Nothing but habit could reconcile people to such a "vain" (and, too frequently, flippant) "repetition." In the year 1842 I visited the Township of Wilmot, Canada West; where, after due notice, a considerable number turned out to hear me, being attracted by the novelty of the circumstance, as no Church Clergyman had ever officiated there before. As the service proceeded, and whilst the responses were being made by an Englishman, who was not remarkable either for his sobriety or steadiness, great disorder appeared in the congregation, and seemed to be momentarily on the increase. I stopped the service and enquired the cause, when I was informed by some Yankee Canadians (of whom the congregation was principally composed) that they did not think it right to allow a strange Minister to be mocked and insulted by repeating after him what he said, and that they were about to put the person who did so out of the house. Upon my explaining that what they judged so strange and unbecoming, was the usual way of conducting the Church of England service, they permitted us to get through with tolerable acquiescence.

man *rational* soul of Christ, and the Sacraments, are found in the Church of England Prayer-book :—

“ We find in one of our English contemporaries, a review of a work, entitled, “—*Liturgical Purity our rightful Inheritance*, written by an English barrister, from which some extracts are furnished, which supply the particulars of a “ general statement recently made, concerning the patch-work character of the “ Church of England Prayer-book. Says the author Mr. Fisher, himself a Church-
“ man :—

“ The real truth then, is, that the Prayer-book of our Church is not, as many “ persons too hastily assume, the *genuine* work of the Reformers *properly so-
“ called* : that is, of the martyred founders of the Protestant Christianity of Eng-
“ land. It was not composed by them as an original work, neither do we possess
“ it in the form in which they finally left it. It was, on the contrary, a *compila-
“ tion*, founded upon works essentially Popish ;—namely, upon certain Romish
“ Service-books of that day : and it received its latest, and therefore to us, most
“ important revisions, not under the auspices of Cranmer and his associates, but
“ at two subsequent and distinct periods, each of which was remarkable for a re-
“ trograde movement in the direction of Rome. The revision, which it under-
“ went in the reign of Elizabeth, was *confessedly* a revision of *compromise* ; the
“ *avowed* intention of which was, to make the Liturgy “ such as *neither Roman-
“ ist nor Protestant* could justly except against.” That of 1662, however, was
“ still more decidedly anti-Protestant and reactionary. Romanism and Rational-
“ ism are, at the present moment, fearfully prevalent throughout the land. Both,
“ it is believed, are largely fostered by the SACERDOTAL AND SACRAMENTARIAN ten-
“ dencies of the Prayer-book, as well as by those inconsistencies which may natu-
“ rally be supposed to disfigure the pages of a work, derived from so many, and
“ at the same time, such incongruous sources. Both, moreover, are likely to be
“ perpetuated indefinitely by the continued use, in our various Schools and other
“ Educational Institutions, of a *Catechism* so largely pervaded by the SACRAMEN-
“ TARIAN element, and—we are truly sorry to add—so *entirely devoid* of any dis-
“ tinct enunciation of, or even allusion to, the grand essential doctrines of the
“ Gospel.”

“ Well has Mr. Binney said :—“ It is fearful to think what an amount and depth
“ of suffering lie hid in the recesses of the homes and hearts of the English clergy !
“ How many of them there are that groan under sorrows, which they dare not ut-
“ ter, from the pressure upon them of harrowing thoughts on the language of
“ their formularies ! How many, alas ! have become callous—have given up
“ thought—dare not think—*will* not think ! What terrible toil, intense and un-
“ availing, to repress doubts, and sophisticate the understanding, and to find an
“ interpretation that may be held as harmonizing with scriptural truth ! And
“ what stabs and darts, and shootings through the soul of the flaming arrows of
“ remorse and shame, as ever and anon, while the words of the book are breathed
“ to heaven, repugnance to their meaning lacerates the heart !”

To show persons who are expecting a revision of the Prayer-book the fruitlessness of their expectations, I shall only quote from the "Canadian Church Press" of May 30, 1860, the following extract:—"On the occasion of the discussion in the House of Lords, on Tuesday, (May 8th,) *not a single Peer offered Lord Ebury the least support.* The Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking in the name of the whole Episcopal bench, said, "We think a verbal revision would not be worth its cost, and we think that a doctrinal revision would throw the whole Church into confusion." The Bishop of Oxford would not have a letter of the Prayer-book altered. Against such an opposition Lord Ebury felt it was no use struggling, and he withdrew his motion. In the course of his speech he strongly recommended his brother Peers to read a book by the Dissenting Minister, Mr. Dinney, called "Lights and Shadows." "

I would sum up all that I have said on the doctrine of the Trinity by remarking, that uninfluenced by the cry of antiquity, when it is an antiquity of error; or by the cry of unity, when it is an unity of ignorance; or by the anathemas of the Athanasian Creed and its abettors, when they are in opposition to the truth of God; *

* The Encyclopædia of religious knowledge, speaking of the Athanasian creed, says:—"The eternal *generation* of the Son of God forms an essential part of this creed, as well of the Nicene. Most certain it is, that many of the Christian fathers maintain this mysterious doctrine of eternal *generation*; and it has had able defenders, down to Dr. J. Owen, &c. On the other hand, Trinitarians equally zealous have considered the opinion as both inconsistent in itself, and derogatory to the Son of God—as implying *derivation and inferiority.*" We should not wonder after this at what Dr. Whately says of the effect of the disquisitions of Scholastic divines on the *Unity* of God, viz: that they "have in fact nearly *explained it away*, and bewildered the minds of their disciples." The Encyclopædia further on, speaking of the "damatory clauses" of the Athanasian creed, says,— "Now it is most certain, that we cannot use too much caution on this subject. The Scripture indeed speaks of faith in Christ as necessary to salvation, but refers rather, perhaps, to the vital principle itself, than to any form of confession; and it seems above all things improper to mingle anathemas with our devotions. This has led many of the English clergy and bishops, to wish they were *well rid* of this creed altogether, which is certainly a prevailing sentiment; and were the question now put, on admitting this formulary into the Church service, there are, perhaps, but few, comparatively, that would vote for it. However orthodox it may be, it does not appear to be written in a *Christian Spirit.*"

The distinction of Persons (for the denial of which exclusion from salvation is pronounced by the Athanasian creed) is founded on the occurrence of the Father in heaven, the Son on earth, &c., at the baptism of Jesus. But how often do we read of our Lord being on earth, and speaking to the Patriarchs, Moses, &c., on several occasions, hundreds of years *before* his actual incarnation. Was the Lord God not in his glory in the heavens, when on these occasions he appeared on earth? Will the Trinitarians thus strip the Omnipotent Spirit of his attribute of Omnipresence? And if they will not, how is it that they will not explain the fact of God being in heaven and on earth *at the same time*, by referring to what is frequently met with in the Old Testament, and which is declared by our Lord himself in John iii. 13, vii. 34, xiv. 3, xvii. 24, &c. Thus the power of the Holy One, by virtue of his Omnipresence, manifesting himself in his three attitudes of

uninfluenced, in short, by any consideration, beside the glory of God and the salvation of the immortal soul, I hope prayerfully and perseveringly to go forward

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to mortals, being explained to the Christian world, would liberate it from priestly dogmatism and fettered understandings.

Both the doctrines of the Trinity, and of our Lord having in heaven with him in his glorified body a rational human soul in order to obtain compassion for mortals, are clearly ignored in Js. vi., compared with John xii. 41. Also in Ezek. i. and in Dan. vii. 9—14 compared with Rev. i. Isaiah and Ezekiel show plainly that there is only one Person enthroned in heaven and adored there, viz: the Lord of lords—our blessed Saviour. Daniel vii., compared by Cumming with Rev. i., (See Dr. Cumming's observations in my "Gospel Church") shews the same fact of the *one* Person *only* in heaven; but in the two-fold manifestation of himself, as the "Ancient of days" and the "Son of man." Then again, as in Dan. Ezek. and Isaiah, you also are told in Rev. iv. 2, of the same *one* Person reigning in glory, "And, behold, a throne was set in heaven, and *one* sat on the throne." Our Lord is here in this chapter described to be similarly attended and adored as in the other places referred to. In the 3rd verse we read that "he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone: and there was a *rainbow* round about the throne." The emerald rainbow is the well-known symbol of covenanted mercy. As the various colors beautifully unite in the rainbow, so the different attributes of the Godhead meet harmoniously in God, when he occupies the position of "God our Saviour" "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other."

It must be quite evident that the same *one* person, who is said in Rev. iv. 2, to have sat on the throne, is our Redeemer, who is also described in ch. v. 6, (as also in other places) to be "in the *midst* of the throne." But as in Dan. vii. because the Lord appears in a two-fold manifestation of himself, therefore the conclusion is *inconsiderately* taken up, that there must be *two* Persons meant there. I shall, without further examination of Rev. chaps. iv. v. as to the receiver of "the book" and its possessor, being the same Person in different characters, quote from the "Achill Missionary Herald" an extract from the Rev. Mr. Nangle's late work on the Book of Revelation. From it will be seen that it is the *root*, that is, the *Godhead or Creator* of David, and *not* the *offspring*, that is, the *human nature* of David, that relieves, pities, and assists us.

"And one of the elders saith unto me, "Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the *Root* of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the "seven seals thereof."—v. 5. Here the evangelist was informed that although "no creature could reveal God's secret purposes, one was found adequate to this "great work. The *deity* of Christ qualified him to secure this privilege to his "Church; he is *therefore* described in this verse as "the Lion of the tribe of "Juda," and "the *root* of David," *not* the *offspring*, because he derived the "courage and energy which were needed for this mighty undertaking from the consciousness of his *oneness* with the Father, as *the root or origin of all things*. "What follows (in vs. 6, 7,) proves beyond dispute that it was Christ, *the eternal Word*, who was alluded to by the elder. The *Deity* of Christ was an *essential qualification* for the performance of the work which *no creature* could accomplish; but justice had closed up every avenue through which a gracious revelation could find its way from a God of infinite holiness to fallen and polluted man, "atonement was therefore needed; hence the same person who is described ver. 5, "as the "Lion of the tribe of Juda," and "the Root of David," appears in this "verse as a "Lamb as it had been slain." *This wondrous lamb is further identified with the Godhead*, by being presented to the mind of St. John as "being present at the same time "in the midst of the throne" and in the midst "of God's ministers and people."

in what I have undertaken and openly avowed; leaving the issue in the hands of God, who, whilst he dwelt in our nature here below, told his followers, "Lo, I am with you *always*."

"His purposes will ripen fast,
Unfolding every hour:
The bud may have a bitter taste,
But sweet will be the flower."

From this extract it may be perceived how that when we speak of, or pray to, the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world," we should understand, not the *fancied* human soul of Christ, but his Godhead reconciled to sinners through the atonement made by its dwelling in the "body prepared" for it—the flesh that *rested in hope*; because it was not to be left in the grave, nor be suffered to see corruption. The Lamb is adored in heaven through the medium of this shrine or body made glorious for the residence of Him who "is able to subdue all things to himself. See Psalm xvi. 9, 10.

It is asked why should not we think that Christ had a human *mind* or *rational soul* like what mankind has, and why should not he suffer in that as well as in his flesh, so as that thus the suffering, as we would think, might be complete. The answer to this is, that Christ's soul (even if he had one) could not suffer in the only way in which its property of reflective reasoning would cause it to do so; and, therefore, while "he bore our sins in his own body on the tree," his soul must have been inoperative. I shall further explain my meaning in Bishop Pearson's words on the fifth Article of the Apostles' Creed, where he says:—"There is a worm that never dieth which could not lodge within his breast, that is, a remorse of conscience seated in the soul for what that soul hath done; but such a remorse of conscience could not be in Christ, who, though he took upon himself the sins of those which otherwise had been damned, yet that act of his was most virtuous, charitable, and most glorious act, highly conformable to the will of God, and consequently could not be the *object of remorse*." But I am anticipating what I should reserve for the next division of my "Defence," viz. "The rational human soul of Christ." This much, however, I may premise, that Mariolatry, which consists in giving adoration to the Virgin Mary, and several other errors of Romanism, such as the immaculate conception, merits of Saints, Purgatory, &c., can most effectually be overcome in the minds of Roman Catholics by Protestants eschewing the untenable notion of our Lord having an immortal, governing, soul. For this latter doctrine is the foundation of what has been aptly termed a pyramid of falsehood, based in priestcraft, and culminating in idolatry—persecution and cruelty mounted on every step.

ON THE HUMAN SOUL OF CHRIST.

I have shewn from John i. how the "Word" is there declared to be the Maker or Creator of all things; (2) how he is there declared to be the Quickener and Enlighener of all men; and (3) how he is there declared to be our incarnate Redeemer; or, in other words, how the Word is in the 1st of John, declared to be Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—one Person or Being represented in three characters. But the words declaring our Lord's incarnation say nothing of a human soul; for they only state that the "Word was made *flesh*, and dwelt among us." In other words, the Word, in the fulness of his Godhead, and, at the same time, in the official manifestation of himself as a Son, entered into the "body prepared" for him, and dwelt in it, as in a shrine, *temple*, tabernacle, or temple, and was unto it in the place of an informing soul. The word "dwelt" in the original Greek is *eskēnōsen*; and every classical scholar knows that the literal translation should be "dwelt in a tabernacle or tent."

The Cottage Bible in its paraphrase on John i. 14, says:—"But the same *Word*, by whom were made all things both in heaven and earth, was himself "made flesh." He had often, indeed, under the old dispensation, assumed a *human* or angelic form, and sometimes appeared in the "form of God: " but "now became or was "made *flesh*:" not transiently appearing, *as of old*, in "the human form, but he *tabernacled*, or, as Doddridge expresses it, "pitched "his tabernacle" to abide some time with men: the glory of the Divine Nature "being *veiled* in the humanity, just as that of the Shechinah was *shrouded* in the "accompanying cloud; and as the glory shone at times more or less conspicuously *through the cloud*, so the glory of the Word, "as of the only begotten of "the Father," shone *through the veil of human nature* with beams of grace "and truth." In the note on the word "dwelt" the same commentary remarks: "Literally, *tabernacled* (so *Wesley*) *Campbell*, "sojourned" see Heb. xi. 9. "But Doddridge thinks it an allusion to the Sechinah or divine glory which *resided in the tabernacle*."

The question then is, was there a human soul with the *Word* in the human form in which he often appeared before his advent, or, was there a human soul with him in the temple, where he specially dwelt between the Cherubims to meet and answer his praying people? or was the temple worshipped? For his appearing in human form before his actual incarnation and his dwelling in the Jewish temple were typical of his dwelling afterwards in the temple of his body; and if in the type or figure there was confessedly no human soul nor outward temple worshipped, neither should there be, after the the incarnation, in the antitype.

Bradley, in his sermon on John ii. 21. "He spake of the temple of his body."

says:—"It is the human body of Christ viewed as the temple of the living God. And in looking at it in this light, we must keep in mind the Jewish temple. It is clear that in using the language before us, the Lord Jesus had it in his mind; and it is clear also that he must have seen some resemblance between it and himself. He would not otherwise have so promptly and naturally made use of it to signify himself. We may trace this resemblance in three particulars: It represents our Lord's human nature as, first, a *dwelling place* for God to *inhabit*; then, as a *form* wherein to *manifest* or *reveal himself*; and then, as a *monument* to his praise."

I believe that my opinion of the non-existence of a human soul in the body of Christ is in accordance with the doctrine of the early Christian Church; for even Rufinus, who lived in the fourth century, and who, Bishop Burnet says, was the first that published what is generally, but falsely, called the Apostles' Creed, when writing on that article of the Creed which states that our Lord was conceived by the Holy Ghost, says:—"Huic, quem dudum de Patre natum ineffabiliter didicisti, nunc a Sp. S. templum fabricatum infrasecreta uteri Virginis intellige." "Now, understand a TEMPLE constructed within the Virgin's womb by the Holy Spirit for him, who was of old born in an ineffable manner of the Father."

Paul and the beloved disciple seem to have understood it similarly, for they say:—"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of *flesh and blood*, he also himself likewise took part of *the same*," Heb. ii. 14. "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ *is come in the flesh* is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ *is come in the flesh* is not of God," 1st John iv. 2, 3.

Bishop Pearson (Art. 3) says: "For we are here to remember again the most ancient form of this Article, briefly thus delivered, *Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary*; as also that the word *Born* was not taken precisely for the Nativity of our Saviour, but as comprehending in it whatsoever belonged to his *human generation*: and when afterward the conception was attributed to the Spirit, the Nativity to the Virgin; it was not so to be understood, as if the Spirit had conceived him, but the blessed Virgin by the power and operation of the Spirit."

I shall shew presently from 1st Pet. iii. 19, 20, how that the Spirit, when said a Scripture to act or go in behalf of Christ, is no other Person than Christ himself acting in his office of Sanctifier or Enlivener. I will only add here what Pearson says:—"That no more is left to be attributed to the Spirit, than what is necessary to cause the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother * * * "But as the *bloods* in the language of the *Hebrews* did signify that substance of which *the flesh* was formed in the womb, so we acknowledge in the generation of Jesus Christ, that he was made of the *substance* of his Mother."

When our Lord in the fulness of time was about to put on, or clothe himself with, our nature (this is the way Tertullian de Resur. Carnis c. 34, expresses it by the word *carnem, induerat*), when he was about to come into the world, he said

to his Father or absolute Godhead:—"Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me"; this body was prepared also (2) by the Spirit, causing (as Pearson says) the Virgin to perform the actions of a mother; and this body or shrine of the Deity was also prepared (3) by the "Branch," for he was to build the "temple of the Lord" and he was to "bear the glory" Zech. vi. 13. Bradley says on this last text:—"This is a prophecy of the Messiah. On the first view it may not appear such, but such doubtless it really is."

In short, we see from the Bible, and the early Christian Church, how that a living body, tabernacle, or temple, was prepared in the womb of the Virgin Mary to receive *God*, who through that veil or medium was to manifest himself (that is, his Godhead's attributes, not his human soul's benignities,) to the world; and who, in the preparing of this body or temple, displays himself in his three offices of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as I have shewn.

I now, trusting in the Divine aid, will endeavour to answer the objections which are generally brought forward against my views by those who profess to believe that our Lord has a reasoning human soul, called, in the Greek language, *nous*, and in the English language *mind*.

In a preliminary way I would remark, that I admit fully that our Lord's human body possessed the *psuekē* or soul, the seat of life and of such sensitiveness, as that, being our substitute, it felt so severely the punishment imposed on it for our sins by the indwelling God actuating it, as to have sweated "great drops of blood." I can understand how this soul was in agony—how it "was exceeding sorrowful even *unto death*"—how it was made "an offering for sin"—and

* I should be the last person that would wish to undervalue, or dishonour by an unworthy comparison, our Saviour's sacred body, or the holy life of his human nature whilst on earth. I am far from intending such in the following remarks, and therefore do not wish to be misunderstood in what is merely meant as an elucidation. With this (perhaps to many) necessary introduction, I would remark that nothing is more common than the severe agony observable in beasts or irrational animals by their sweating and trembling not only while suffering in their bodies but also through fear, apprehension, or foresight of approaching suffering. If the *psuekē*—the animal or living soul—in animals is thus actuated and influenced ordinarily by the laws of nature, why cannot we see how the indwelling God of nature made an inconceivable impression of agonizing woe on the *psuekē*, or living soul, which animated his human body?

In order to shew that the *psuekē*—the *animal or living soul* which all allow our blessed Saviour had, and which is distinguished from the *nous*, i. e. the mind or intellectual soul—in order, I say, to shew that the *psueke*, and it alone, was capable of fully undergoing what is recorded in Scripture of our Lord's *internal* sufferings in his human, I would refer to John Wesley's sermon on Rom. viii. 19—22, in which (beside his advice, "Away with vulgar prejudices, and let the plain word of God take place") he says:—"What then is the barrier between men and brutes? The line which they cannot pass? It was not reason. Set aside that ambiguous term: exchange it for the plain word, understanding: and who can deny that brutes have this? We may as well deny that they have sight or hearing."

In 1st Thess. v. 23, there is evidently an endorsement of the distinction which has been generally maintained between the spirit and *living* soul: for Paul in that passage says, "I pray God your whole *spirit* and *soul* and body be preserved,

how it, as the life-blood, was "poured out *unto death*" Is. liii. 10, 12. What does all this mean else, than that our Lord gave "his *life* a ransom for many," Mark x. 45? That "he bore our sins in his own *body* on the tree," 1st. Pet. ii. 24, reconciling sinners *in the body of his flesh through death*, Col. i. 22, and giving them "boldness to enter into the holiest by the *blood* of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the *veil*, that is to say, *his flesh*."

It is asked, how could our Saviour be reckoned a perfect man, or equal to his brethren in all things, if he has not a rational soul in the same way as other men?

The answer to this is plain, viz. That our Lord's human body virtually, that is, *to all intents and purposes*, had a rational soul, and the very best kind of

So." The "Cottage Bible" in a note on the same verse says:—"It is (says Doddridge) very evident, that the apostle refers to a notion which prevailed among the Rabbies, as well as the philosophers, (Pythagoreans, Platonists, and Stoics,) that the person of man was constituted of three distinct substances, the rational spirit, the animal soul, and the visible body." The same authority in a note on the words, *To the dividing asunder of soul and spirit*, says, "see our note on 1st Thess. v. 23, where we have distinguished the *rational* soul from the *animal*: but whether the latter (which is common to brutes) be matter, or an inferior kind of spirit, or a middle substance between both, we presume not to decide. Most certain it is, that many animals are *intelligent*, as well as *sentient*; that they *feel*, that they *recollect*, and that they *dream*; and, therefore, that they *THINK*."

Ap. Whately, in his appendix on "Ambiguous Terms," writing on the term "Reason," says:—"This word is liable to many ambiguities, of which I propose to notice only a few of the most important. Sometimes it is used to signify all the intellectual powers collectively; in which sense it can hardly be said to be altogether denied to brutes; since several of what we reckon intellectual processes in the human mind, are *evidently such as some brutes are capable of*. Reason is, however, frequently employed to denote those intellectual powers exclusively in which man *differs* from brutes; though what these are, no one has been able precisely to define. The employment at will of the faculty of Abstraction seems to be the principal; that being, at least, principally concerned in the use of Language. The moral faculty, or power, of distinguishing right from wrong, (which appears also to be closely connected with Abstraction,) is one of which brutes are destitute; but then Dr. Paley and some other ethical writers deny it to man also. The description given by that author of our discernment of good and bad conduct, (viz. as wholly dependent on *expectation* of reward and *punishment*,) would *equally apply to many of the brute creation*, especially the more intelligent of domestic animals, as dogs and horses."

The reader, viewing the foregoing remarks from a common sense stand-point, (unless his mind is incurably preoccupied by long and imperceptibly erroneous teachings) must be convinced that the *mind*, or immortal principle, was not needed by our Saviour to *qualify* him for the *perception* and endurance of the sufferings *required* for our salvation.

The great charge, brought against the Apollinarians, was, that they drew a distinction between the Greek words *pseukē* and *nous*. The former word (*pseukē*) they said was properly translated *soul*, but did not generally signify the immaterial and immortal spirit in Holy Scripture, but the *appetites* of the human frame. They said, that it was the word *nous* or "mind" which alone formed a *judg-*

rational soul; for the "Counsellor," having taken up his abode in his holy temple, directed, guided, governed it, spoke through it, and thus superseded, and rendered wholly unnecessary, the presence of a human mind, which, to say the least, would be superfluous and inoperative, inasmuch as every thing was said and done in the human shrine, which our Lord wore, according to the Divine counsel.

If, before the application of Steam to sailing purposes was discovered, one of our ancestors had been conversed with concerning the properties of a ship, he would say, that the principal thing to distinguish, or make useful, a ship, was its sails; in fact, that there could be no ship without them. But, if the same person were alive at the present time, he should admit, that it was owing to the want of proper information that he was so determined in his former opinion: for that now, owing to the march of science, there may be a perfect and entirely complete ship,

ment of ideas, and which alone constituted the *immortal reasoning spirit* of man. Bishop Pearson on the Article, "He descended into Hell," says:—"It is most certain that they (the Apollinarians) did not equally deprive Christ of both: but most of the Apollinarians denied a human soul to Christ only in respect of the *intellectual part*, granting that the animal soul of Christ was of the same nature with the animal soul of othermen. They clearly affirmed the *psuchē*, and denied the *nous alone*."

On this subject I would request the reader's special attention to the following extract from the ninth Discourse "upon the right love of the Lord God" by him of whom it was said, that "the church of England had never a more dutiful, affectionate, and illustrious son than William Romaine." It will be clearly seen that Mr. Romaine exactly agrees with the Apollinarians in drawing the same distinction between the *psuchē* and *nous* or *dianoia* to be found in his text, Mark xii. 30:—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, &c." Mr. Romaine having shown that "with all the heart" means "all the affections belonging to the heart" proceeds thus:—

"With all thy soul." "The Hebrew word, here rendered *soul*, does not signify the *immaterial and immortal spirit*, but is generally used in Scripture for the *parts concerned in carrying on the circulation of the blood*, and in which the *appetites* of the human frame are placed. These are to be regulated by the love of God, and they are all to be used in his service. Every *desire and craving, every instinct and passion of the animal faculties*, should be brought into such a cheerful subjection to the Lord God, that to do his will should be their delight. There should not be a motion or stirring of *desire in any of the appetites* but what took its rise from love. There should not be a desire in any one *instinct or appetite* but what sprang from divine love. * *

"But the text goes on to claim the service of all the *rational faculties*; for that is the sense of the Greek word, which is rendered "with all thy *mind*." It denotes that power of the mind whereby it deduces one thing from another: it is what the logicians call *discursus*, or the art of reasoning. The mind having before received ideas by simple-apprehension, and formed a *judgment* of them, is then enabled to reason upon them; and this *faculty of reasoning is here meant*: so that every thing which the mind can reason upon ought to lead it up to God and to increase its love to God. Reason, with all its powers, should be under the influence of divine love. And thus the Lord God expects us to keep the first and great commandment: he requires all the *affections* of *body, soul, and spirit, and all the reasoning faculties* to be invariably fixed upon him, &c."

mostly, or altogether, without sails. He would be forced to acknowledge that the steam ship of modern times was really the most expeditious and useful for all naval purposes. The application of the foregoing comparison to the general opinion of the necessity of our Saviour possessing a rational soul, so as to consider him a perfect man, is obvious. For as steam effectually dispenses with sails, so, in like manner, the "Divine nature of Christ performed the functions of reason, and supplied the place of what we call the *mind*, the spiritual and intellectual principle in man."

It is asked how could our Lord without a rational soul render an active obedience to his Law, so as thereby to give believers in that obedience a title to heaven?

In answering this it should be considered, that it was not the human nature of Christ that in any way was the Agent in procuring us righteousness, but that it was the Divine Nature, which (having been in the Divine mind from eternity "in the form of God" as "the only begotten Son,") did, in the fulness of time, take the form of a Servant by submission and obedience to the Divine Law, and by the instrumentality of the human nature influenced by the Godhead from within to obedience, did perform in, and by it, the righteousness necessary for man to trust in. That we are to look on the Divine nature, and on it alone, dwelling in the "body prepared" for it, as the Agent of our reconciliation, is clear from the whole current of Scripture, which testifies, "that *God was in Christ* reconciling the world unto HIMSELF." My meaning may appear clearer from the following extract from Bp. Pearson on the 2d Article of the Creed:—

"As the gravity of the offence beareth proportion to the person offended; so the value of reparation ariseth from the dignity of the person satisfying: because the satisfaction consisteth in a reparation of that honour which by the injury was eclipsed: and all honour doth increase proportionably as the person yielding it is honourable. If then by every sin we have offended God, who is of infinite eminency, according unto which the injury is aggravated: how shall we ever be secure of our reconciliation unto God, except the person who hath undertaken to make the reparation be of the same infinite dignity, so as the honour rendered by his obedience may prove proportionable to the offence and that dishonour which arose from our disobedience? This scruple is no otherwise to be satisfied than by a belief in such a Mediator as is the *only begotten Son* of God, *of the same substance with the Father*, and consequently of the same power and dignity with the God whom by our sins we have offended."

This reasoning of Pearson is unanswerable. It shews conclusively how our Saviour must have been truly God, to have offered an eligible atonement to infinite eminence; and as Christ's human nature never could be infinite by any union with the Deity, therefore it could not present an adequate righteousness by active obedience to entitle to heaven, nor an adequate atonement to free vicariously from guilt believers in it. Therefore it was God in, and by means of, the body which he assumed, that did all for mankind in the days of his humiliation, and

does all for them now in his gloriously official state of mediation on high. Indeed our great High Priest, who laid down his life, that is, the life of his human body: and who laid on that body the iniquities of us all; must have had an infinite mind to comprehend the vast amount of debt which the human family in all ages incurred.

Pearson on Art. 4, says:—"If then we consider the perfection and latitude of his knowledge; he understood all the sins of men for which he suffered, all the evil and the guilt, all the offence against the Majesty, and ingratitude against the goodness, of God, which was contained in all those sins."

John Bunyan, in his "Pilgrim's Progress," stage 3, Part 2, explains very fully the nature of the righteousness which justifies, in the following manner:—

"Chr.—But if he parts with his righteousness to us, what will he have for himself?"

"Great.—He has more righteousness than you have need of, or than he needeth himself.

"Chr.—Pray make that appear.

"Great.—With all my heart: but first I must premise, that he of whom we are now about to speak, is one that has not his fellow. He has two natures in one person, plain to be distinguished, impossible to be divided. Unto each of these natures a righteousness belongeth, and each righteousness is essential to that nature; so that one may as easily cause that nature to be extinct, as to separate its justice or righteousness from it. Of these righteousnesses, therefore, we are not made partakers, so as that they, or any of them, should be put upon us, that we might be made just, and live thereby. Besides these, there is a righteousness which this person has, as these two natures are joined in one. And this is not the righteousness of the Godhead, as distinguished from the manhood; nor the righteousness of the manhood, as distinguished from the Godhead; but a righteousness which standeth in the union of both natures, and may properly be called the righteousness that is essential to his being prepared of God to the capacity of the mediatory office, which he was entrusted with. If he parts with his first righteousness, he parts with his Godhead: if he parts with his second righteousness, he parts with the purity of his manhood; if he parts with his third, he parts with that perfection which *capacitates him* for the office of mediation. He has therefore another righteousness, which standeth in performance, or OBEDIENCE TO A REVEALED WILL; and that is what he puts upon sinners, and that by which their sins are covered. Wherefore he saith, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. v. 19.

From these expositions of Bunyan and Pearson it is quite apparent that the *infinitely* holy obedience of Christ, after he had clothed himself with the human body, was an *adequate* offering to his *infinitely* holy justice, which demanded such an offering. Thus Christ suffered *in the flesh*, (1st Pet. iv. 1) which was the proper subject of his passion; as through the lust of the flesh disobedience first came

into the world; and through the influence of which everlasting death comes, Rom. viii. 13.

I have been asked by people, "What is the meaning of Luke ii. 52," where it is said that "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature." They ask, "is not the one in respect of his body, the other of his soul"?

It is true, it would appear at first sight that he, whose knowledge is said to have increased with his years, must have had a subject proper for it, viz: a rational human soul. But the meaning, that I believe should be taken from the words, is:—That the wisdom of the indwelling God was *exhibited* and *developed gradually*, and according to circumstances, *through the medium* of his human body. For instance, all the Jewish doctors in the temple that heard Christ, when he was about twelve years of age, "were astonished at his understanding and answers;" and well they might, for the words which this Divine Teacher uttered from human lips—"they were spirit, and they were life" John vi. 63.

The Cottage Bible, commenting on Mark xiii. 32, quotes the following extract from Dr. Pyle Smith's Messiah, vol. 2:—"The Scriptures appear to us, on the one hand, to teach the existence of such a union as produces a personal oneness: and on the other, to exclude the notion of transmutation, or confusion, of the essential properties of either nature with respect to the other. It follows that, whatever communication of supernatural qualities, powers, or enjoyments, was made by the indwelling divinity to the man Christ Jesus, it was made *in various degrees, and on successive occasions, as the Divine wisdom judged fit*: and this necessary limitation would apply to times or seasons which the Father has "put in his own power" (Acts i. 7,) "as much as to any other conceivable class of objects."

From Isaiah xi. 1—4, it is plain, that our Lord's ideas did not originate in a human mind, either by receiving knowledge through the *senses* or through *reflection*—the ways by which men receive knowledge; but that they originated with the indwelling Christ, acting *in his province of the Spirit*, and consequently not through any human experience:—"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, *the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord*: and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears."

Christ's human body, during his humiliation here on earth, was subservient to its Divine resident, passively, and as a medium, to exhibit and carry out the designed display of glory before mortal eyes, John i. 14. The quotation from McCheyne (to be found in my *Vindication* p. 11, 12.) explains satisfactorily what I mean, where it says:—"The feet were *human* feet that stood upon Mount Olivet. The eyes were *human* eyes that looked down upon the dazzling city. The tears were *human* tears that fell upon the ground. But oh, there was the *tenderness of God* beating beneath that *mantle*. Look and live, sinners.

“Look and live. Behold your God. *He that hath seen a weeping Christ hath seen the Father. This is God manifest in the flesh.*”

Can any thing then be plainer than that the declaration of “Jesus increasing in wisdom,” or, as it is in Luke i. 80, “waxing strong in spirit,” means the *progressive manifestation* of the wisdom of that God, who dwelt within; and who (through the *mantle* of our nature, which he had put on) in his conversations, &c., gave such demonstrations that it was the indwelling God alone, without any co-operation from a human rational mind, that actuated and governed all that he did and said—* I say, gave such demonstrations of his Godhead as that, in the words of McCheyne from the place already alluded to, “He manifested forth his “glory, and his disciples believed on him. Almighty power spoke in a *human* “voice, and the love of God, too, *shone in it?*”

It is also objected that in Heb. iv. 15, we can see the feelings of Christ’s human mind there declared to be rendered the more compassionate from his experiencing similar attacks from temptations with sinners: for that the Apostle there says:—“For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; † but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.” On this passage the Cottage Bible has the following note:—“Which cannot be “touched”—Macknight. “Who cannot *sympathize*”—“Like as we are”—“i. e. “in the same points.”

Now it all comes to this—Is the High Priest, here spoken of, the great “I Am,” dwelling in the human body which he assumed, and which he offered up to his offended justice as an expiatory victim or sacrifice, he having power to lay down his (human) life, and having power to take it again. I believe all will answer this in the affirmative. Then as it is the Godhead of Christ, and the Godhead alone, that is the High Priest; § so it is the Godhead alone that sympathizes with mortals.

* “As soon as man had divested himself of God’s image, his shameful nakedness made him run into the thickets; nor could he ever since then look his Maker *directly* in the face, nor endure to hear his *immediate* voice. Therefore, when *God himself* would come and dwell among men, he *veiled* his deity “with *human flesh*: there he stood *behind the wall*, and showed *himself* through “the lattices.”—*Ap. Leighton’s sermon on 2nd Cor. v. 20.*

† Bishop Burnet (Art. 1) says:—“The third thing under the head I now consider is, God’s being *without passions.*” “Yet after all this, there are several “passions, such as *anger, fury, jealousy, and revenge, bowels of mercy, compassion and pity, joy and sorrow*, that are ascribed to God in the common “forms of speech that occur often in Scripture, as was formerly observed, with “relation to those figures that are taken from the parts of a human body.” When “God changes the course of his proceedings, he is said to *repent*: when his dispensations of Providence are very gentle, and his judgments come slowly from “him, he is said to have *bowels.* And thus all the varieties of Providence come “to be expressed by all that variety of passions, which among men might give “occasion to such a variety of proceeding.”

§ “Our blessed *sacrifice*, who was *also Priest and Altar*, offered *himself* up “cheerfully! Then saith he, “Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.” Heb. x. 1. ““And *I lay down* my life for the sheep,” saith the good Shephard.” John x. 15. See *Ap. Leighton id.*

Again, I would ask, is the sympathy spoken of by the Apostle fitly represented as belonging to the Deity, and to the Deity *alone*? No, my opponents answer, such sympathies are affections belonging to the tenderness of Christ's human soul alone; and the expressions, by which these sympathies are described, related palpably to what is human in our Saviour. If this be the case, I would ask, how is it that the Lord is described as having sympathized with his people of old, *many hundred years before his advent*, and consequently before the creation of the human soul which current opinion anti-scripturally attributes to him; for "in all their affliction he was afflicted." Is. lxiii. 9. *

In the 15th and 16th verses of the same chapter we see the Church calling the Lord its Father *and* Redeemer while it looks for sympathy:—"Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of thy holiness and of thy glory: where is thy zeal and thy strength, the *sounding of thy bowels* and of thy mercies toward me? are they restrained? Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledged us not: thou, O Lord, art our *Father, our Redeemer; thy name is from everlasting.*"

In Jer. xxxi. 20, sympathy is expressed by God as felt by him, just as it would be expressed if felt by a human soul; and yet not the slightest idea of a human

* Let the reader but look to "Christian Treasury" in the *Montreal Witness* of Sep. 12th, 1860, and there see this very passage of Is. lxiii. 9, made appositely to explain, by a comparison of it with Heb. iv. 15, how *very unnecessary* is the idea of Christ having a human rational soul in order to have him *feel* for mortals and *sympathize* with them:—

"In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his *pity* he redeemed them; and he bare them and carried them all the days of old. Is. lxiii. 9."

"Divine Sympathy.—How sweet is sympathy!—Yet human sympathy is very often feeble—it may soothe, but cannot help. The kind visit, the loving word, is at times precious; but they reach not our case, they bring us no permanent relief. Love is often without power to assist the beloved object. Not so when God loveth, for then the *loving heart* moves an omnipotent arm, and opens infinite resources. But there is something astounding in the thought, that the afflictions of a worm—a sinful wretch, should *afflict the heart of the Infinite, the heart of God*. Yet such is the testimony of his own word. What an expression of love is that? "They put away the strange gods from among them, and served the Lord; and *his soul was grieved for the misery of Israel.*" What exquisite tenderness is manifested when the *God of the universe* declares, "He that toucheth you, *toucheth* the apple of mine eye"? Tried fellow-traveller, when thy road is rough, when thy strength is small, when thy heart is pained, when thy sighs are heavy, God *sympathizes* with thee. His *eye sees*, his *ear hears*, and his *heart feels*; for like *as a father pitieth* his children, so the Lord *pitieth* them that fear him, *for he knoweth our frame, he remembereth* that we are dust." Believe this, and be sad if thou canst. Believe this, and complain if thou durst. Believe this rather, and go on thy way rejoicing. *What can you desire more?* God your Father. God, as a father pitying you, —pitying you as his beloved child. The *sympathy of God should be thy solace, thy comfort, and thy joy*. "For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

soul is there intimated or meant:—"Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore *my bowels are troubled for him*; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord." † Turn also to Hos. xi. 8, 9, where God, uninfluenced by a human soul, says:—"How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I make thee as Admah? how shall I set thee as Zeboim? *mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together*. I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim: *for I am God, and not man*; the Holy One in the midst of thee."

But still it is objected, that (as we read in Mark vi. 34) it was when Jesus came out, and saw much people, that he was moved with compassion toward them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd. Here, they say, as also in the case of Jesus gazing at the sight of Mary's tears, and of his weeping while he beheld doomed Jerusalem, was it not the sight presented to his bodily eyes that moved the tenderness of his human heart?

In reply I would observe, that if it be so, you must give to Christ's human heart or soul, and not to his Godhead, the gratitude and glory due to such manifestations of sympathy and compassion. However, you will see, that, many hundred years before our God became incarnate, he *felt* and *acted* according to how he *saw* persons and things; or, to speak more properly, the language of Scripture (in which such seeing, feeling, and acting are described) it is accommodated to our very imperfect comprehension, and to our customary manner of speaking. Thus in Gen. vi. 5, we read:—"And God *saw* that the wickedness of man was great in the earth * * * and it *repented* the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it *grieved* him at his *heart*." Look also to Gen. xi. 5, 7. "And the Lord *came down to see* the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said—"Go to, *let us go down*, and there confound their language."

I need not, I hope, say more to shew that it was the Godhead of our Lord that felt and sympathized before, and during, his stay in the human body on the earth; only the language of mortals is used condescendingly to explain the same. The Apostle Paul counted "all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord." Phil. iii. 8. But the knowledge which the Apostle prized was not a knowledge of the tenderness, or sympathy, or any other quality of Christ's human nature, for he says in 2nd Cor. v. 16, "Yea, though we have known Christ *after the flesh*, yet now *henceforth know we him no more*." The Apostle's knowledge then was of Christ, as "the only wise God our Saviour,"

† "Of the two words, *gracious* and *merciful*, which stand first in the name of "God, Exod. xxxiv. 6, the one signifies *free grace*, the other *tender bowels of mercy*." "Yea, at the sound of their (the people's) repentings, *his bowels* "would resound with compassion *by a secret sympathy* and harmony, as one "string, well tuned to another, stirs when it is touched; Jer. xxxi. 20." Ap. Leighton's sermon on Isa. xxx. 15—18.

John 25; who exercises "*lovingkindness*, judgment, and righteousness in the earth"; desiring those that understand and know him as such, to glory in the same; "for in these things I DELIGHT, saith the Lord." The prophet Micah experiencing this knowledge, says:—"Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his *anger* for ever, because he DELIGHTETH in mercy," Mic. vii. 18. It was the same God still, "who, for the *joy* that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame."

Inconsiderate persons (and they are far the most numerous) think that these last words taken from Heb. xii. 2, relate undoubtedly to the manhood of Christ feeling § a prospect of the joy to be indulged in, in the days when the Lord would make up his jewels: and thus here, again, the prevalent error is manifested, of ascribing to the victim or thing offered the praise due to the High Priest or offerer—of ascribing to the human heart what belongs to God*—and of thus worshipping and serving the *creature* more than the *Creator*; Rom. i. 25. Whereas the Godhead, in acknowledging the body which he had assumed to be his body, so identifies himself with it, as to have it declared that he endured the cross, when it was only his body that suffered.

Bishop Pearson's words will explain my views far better than my own words can. He says:—"For the Messiah was to be the glory of the people Israel, yea, "even of the God of Israel; he the *Urim* and *Thummim*, by whom the will of "God, as by a greater Oracle, was revealed; he the true Ark of the Covenant, "the only Propitiatory by his blood; he which was to baptize with the Holy "GHOST and with fire, *the true fire which came down from heaven*; he which "was to take up his HABITATION IN OUR FLESH, and to dwell among us, that we "might behold his glory * * * * That Word which was in the beginning, "which then was with God, and was God, in the fulness of time being made flesh "did suffer. For the "princes of this world crucified the Lord of Glory"; and "God purchased his Church with his own blood." That Person which was "begotten of the Father before all worlds, and so was really the "Lord of glory;" "and most truly God, took upon him the nature of man, and in that nature, being "still the same Person which before he was, did suffer. * * * * "For as the "Word was made flesh," though the word was never made, (as being "in the beginning God) but the flesh, that is, the humanity, was made, and the

§ See note †, on 65th page.

* "It was familiar (i. e. customary) thus to do among the Jews, under their degeneracy; wherefore one came to Christ, and said; "Good master, what shall "I do to have eternal life?" But what was Christ's answer! how did he take it? "Why callest thou me good?" says Christ, "there is none good save one, that is "God." He, that had more right to keep it than all mankind rejected it: and "why? because he saw the man addressed it to his manhood after the way of the "times, and not to his divinity which dwelt within it; therefore Christ re- "fuses it." *No Cross, No Crown: part 1, ch. 9.* By William Penn.

“Word *assuming* it became flesh; so saith St. Peter, (1st Peter iv. 1,) “Christ “suffered for us *in the flesh*,” in that nature of man which he took *upon him*: “and so the Son did suffer, *not* in that nature in which he was begotten of the “Father before all worlds, but in that flesh which by his incarnation he became. “For he was “put to death *in the flesh*, but quickened by the Spirit,” (1st Pet. “iii. 18), suffered in the weakness of his humanity, but rose by the power of *his Divinity*. As “he was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, in “the language of St. Paul, Rom. i. 3, Acts ii. 30; so was he “put to death in the “flesh,” in the language of St. Peter, 1st Peter iii. 18, iv. 1; and as he was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness; “so was he “quickened by the Spirit.” Thus the proper subject and recipient of “our Saviour’s passion, which he underwent for us, was that nature which he “took for us.” †

Seeing from reason and Scripture, that we, who are “partakers of flesh and blood,” could expect no redemption but by him who “likewise took part of the same;” and we could look for no Redeemer, but such a one who by consanguinity was our brother; seeing the wonderful love and condescension of Immanuel in “contriving the wondrous plan” of our reconciliation with his offended Godhead; contemplating all this, we are forced to exclaim with the Apostle, “Great is the mystery of Godliness, God was manifest in the flesh.”

Here I am told that the Apostle means, “great is the mystery of the Trinity.” In reply I will say, that I should either be “walking in craftiness,” and “handling the word of God deceitfully;” or be ranking myself with the shallow-minded, who, like poor ignorant Roman Catholics, receive unenquiringly the prevalent opinion of their Priests; if I were, for a moment, to think that the doctrine of the Trinity was alluded to, while I see plainly, as I have already intimated, that it was a profound admiration of God’s condescending, unmerited, love to rebellious man, that caused the Apostle’s remarkable declaration that has been referred to. In fact, these words (to be found in 1st Tim. iii. 16,) are adroitly used by those, who, in this manner, try to cover their retreat from rational enquiry and from an impartial examination of God’s “Law and testimony.” I must conclude with the prophet that “they speak not according to this word, because there is no light in them.”

But they tell us further, that as we cannot understand the nature of God, nor his attributes, nor the manner of growth of the vegetable, mineral, and animal kingdoms of nature, that therefore we should class the doctrines of the Trinity and of Christ having a human soul in the same category of mysteries.

This mode of evading rational enquiry is nothing less than throwing dust into the eyes of their credulous followers; for it is admitted on all hands, that the *nature* of God, his attributes, and the secret operations of nature, are of the “secret things that belong unto the Lord our God.” Such things are either

† See Pearson on the 2nd and 3rd Articles of the Apostles’ Creed.

established truths recorded in God's holy word, or recognised from experience or scientific researches, and therefore should be implicitly believed. But when we see such eminent divines as the present Archbishop of Dublin candidly condemning the notion, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery or "abstruse tenet," and acknowledging that it is *not* to be found in Holy Scripture as three Persons in one God, but a threefold manifestation of the one Lord such as I believe it; and when we see him declaring that the leaving such falsely-called mysteries to be handled and moulded for us by our "spiritual guides" results from the "indolence, the spiritual carelessness—the weakness, and the dishonest ambition, of human nature"; I say, when we consider all this, and the Archbishop's opinion that the so-called mysteries of the Christian faith are concealed only "from those who wilfully shut their eyes against the light of divine revelation,"* how should we put the doctrine of the Trinity, &c., *on a par* with the divine nature or attributes of God.

I have shown in the "Gospel Church" from Bp. Pearson, how that in Psalm xvi. 10, the word "soul" may be translated in that place, as it is in many other places of Scripture, "body"; and how the word "hell" may be translated "grave." The Bishop, on the Article, "He descended into Hell," also observes, "that in the Aquileian Creed, where this Article was *first* expressed, (about four hundred years after Christ) there was no mention of Christ's burial; but the words of their confession ran thus, *crucified under Pontius Pilate, he descended in inferna.*" From whence there is *no question* but the observation of *Ruffinus*, who *first* expounded it, was *most true*, that though the Roman and Oriental Creeds had not these words, yet they had the *sense of them* in the word *buried*. It appeareth therefore that the *first* intention of putting these words in the Creed was *only to express the Burial of our Saviour*, or the descent of his *body* into the *grave*. They were *first* put in the Aquileian Creed to signify the *Burial* of Christ, and those which had only the Burial in their Creed did confess *as much* as those which without the Burial did express the *Descent*."

I have shown in "The Gospel Church" how in the American Episcopal prayer book, and in the Methodist book of discipline, the Article "He descended into Hell," is left out of what is called the Apostles' Creed; for the reason, I suppose, that it is thought unnecessary, when the word "Burial" (which means the same thing) is there. The reader, who is open to conviction, cannot but see, from the confessed meaning given to the words "He descended into Hell" on their introduction into the Creed—the meaning universally attached to them by the early Church—the capability and probability of those words (as also of the passage in Psalm xvi. 10, on which they are founded) meaning (as Bishop Pearson proves) the descent of our Saviour's body into the grave, or, in other words,

* See in pages 23, 24, and 25 of the "Vindication" extracts from Archbishop Whately's works on what are called "Mysteries."

his Burial—the ignoring totally of those words in modern times by large and respectable bodies of Christians, claiming descent from, and relationship with, the Church of England—I say the unprejudiced reader cannot but see from the foregoing facts that the words “He descended into Hell” *do not* mean our Lord’s soul descending into some fancied place in the invisible world.

Then, let him consider the conclusion to which he must come, according to Bishop Pearson’s decision, viz: “That if it can be answered that our Saviour’s descent into Hell has no relation to his soul, but to his body only, which descended to the grave; I say, if this sense can be affixed to this Article, then the Apollinarians’ answer (that Christ had no proper intellectual or rational soul, but that the Word was to him in the place of a Soul) will be sound, and the Catholics’ argument of no validity.” Such substantially is the verdict of *Pearson*; according to which I must, so far, consider myself acquitted of heresy or error. And furthermore, I consider those in culpable error who differ with me on this subject, and say, that our Saviour’s soul descended into Hell, when at the same time they admit the doctrine to be unscriptural. For instance, the same Bishop on the same Article says:—“Now these words as they lie in the Creed, *he descended into Hell*, are no where formally and expressly delivered in the Scriptures; nor can we find *any one place* in which the Holy Ghost hath said in express and plain terms that Christ as he died and was buried, *so he descended into Hell.*”

But I imagine that I hear my opponents remarking here to me:—“How is it that you do not refer to the well-known passage in 1st Pet. iii. 19, which was notoriously considered by the Ancient Fathers, and also by the Church of England at the time of the Reformation, *an all-sufficient foundation* for their belief of the descent of our Saviour’s soul into the region of departed souls in *Hades*? Are not the Synodical decrees and decisions of the venerable Fathers of the Church, (whose memories have been held in veneration for many centuries) and the opinions of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, to be received in preference to your isolated and new-light assertions? Beside you should bear in mind that the greatest Divines and the most admired writers of the present day, regard 1st Pet. iii. 19, as establishing the Article of the descent of our Lord’s soul into Hell. Only look, they say, at the remarks of the Rev. Dr. Krummacher, whose works of “Elisha the Tishbite,” &c., are admired all over the world. See how in his “Suffering Saviour” he speaks on the subject under our consideration. He there says:—

“But it is undeniable that mysterious passages of Scripture intimate that the Prince of Peace, after having laid aside his earthly body, *had by no means concluded his mission*. For the Apostle Peter says in his first Epistle iii. 19, 20, “that Christ went in the Spirit—that is, divested of his bodily personality—and *preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing*. And, supported by this passage especially, the Apostles’

“ Creed asserts a descent into hell, immediately after the death of Christ. . . .
 “ Now, if Christ entered the habitations of those departed spirits of the antediluvian world, it was in order to announce his victory to them, as the words in the original expressly intimate. That it was also in order to *preach repentance* and *offer faith* to them, and *then to conduct those who believed, as living trophies with him into heaven*, we are induced to think, when combining it with those other words of the same Apostle, Ch. iv. 6 ! !”

I will answer all this; and also shew in the answer what I engaged in the forepart of this treatise to shew, viz:—That the preaching of Christ by his Spirit is the preaching of *Christ himself in his office* * of the “*Quickener*,” and that in that office or character *he raised himself*, that is his body, from the grave. But I will not have the answer in my own words, but in the words of the Bishop, from whose far-famed exposition of what is called the *Apostles’ Creed* I have quoted so much already. A very ordinary reader will glean from the Bishop’s remarks a satisfactory answer to the objections and views of my opponents.

I shall preface the extracts from Pearson by quoting an extract from Bishop Burnet’s exposition of the third Article of the English Church; merely remarking, that Dr. Isaac Watts, in his “*Improvement of the mind*,” says:—“*We should be very curious in examining all propositions that pretend to this honour of being general principles: and we should not without just evidence admit into this rank mere matters of common fame, or commonly received opinions, no, nor the general determination of the learned, or the established articles of any Church or Nation, &c., for there are many learned presumptions, many Synodical and national mistakes, many established falsehoods, as well as many vulgar errors, wherein multitudes of men have followed one another for whole ages almost blindfold.*”

But to proceed with my proofs—I will first quote an extract from Bishop Burnet’s exposition of the third Article of the Church of England, which says:—“*As Christ died for us and was buried, so also is it to be believed, that he went down into Hell.*” On this the Bishop writes as follows:—“*This was much fuller when the Articles were first prepared and published in King Edward’s reign; for these words were added to it, That the body of Christ lay in the grave until his resurrection; but his spirit, which he gave up, was with the spirits which were detained in person, or in hell, and preached to them, as the place in St. Peter testifieth.*” Thus a *determined* sense was put upon this Article, which is now left more at large, and is conceived in words of a more general signification. In order to the explaining this, it is to be premised, that the Article in the Creed, of Christ’s *descent into hell*, is mentioned by no writer before Ruffin, who in the beginning of the fifth century does indeed speak of it; but he tells us, that it was neither in the symbol of the Roman, nor of the Oriental Churches; and that he found it in the symbol of his own Church at

* John i. 4, John v. 21, 28.

“Aquileia. But as there was no other Article in that symbol that related to Christ’s burial; so the words which he gives us, *descendit ad inferna, he descended to the lower parts*, do very naturally signify *burial*, according to these words of St. Paul, “He ascended; what is it, but that he also *descended first to the lower parts of the earth?*” Eph. iv. 9. And Ruffin himself understood “these words in that sense.”

Burnet says more in the same place to the same effect: but I pass on to quote, as I intended, from Pearson, who says:—“But Christ was really before the flood, for *he preached* to them that lived before it; and at the creation of the world, for *he created* it. That *he preached* to those before the flood, is evident by the words of St. Peter, who saith, that *Christ was put to death* in the flesh, but *quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was a preparing.* From which words it appeareth, that Christ preached by the same Spirit, by the virtue of which he was raised from the dead: but that Spirit *was not his soul*, but something of a greater power. Secondly, that those to whom he preached were such as were disobedient. Thirdly, that the time when they were disobedient was the time before the flood, while the Ark was preparing. *It is certain then that Christ did preach* unto those persons which in the days of Noah were disobedient all that time *the long suffering of God waited*, and, consequently, so long as repentance was offered. * * * *

“It remaineth therefore that the plain interpretation be acknowledged for the true; that *Christ did preach* unto those men which lived before the flood, even while they lived, and consequently that *he* was before it. For though this was not done by an immediate act of the Son of God, as if he personally had appeared on earth, and actually preached to that old world; but by the ministry of a Prophet, by the sending of Noah, *the eighth preacher of righteousness*: yet to do any thing by another not able to perform it without him, as much demonstrates the existence of the principal cause, as if he did it of himself without any intervening instrument. * *

“For certainly *he* which was before Abraham was in the days of Herod born of a woman; *he which preached in the days of Noah began to preach in the reign of Tiberius*, being at that time about thirty years of age; *he* was demonstrated the Son of God with power who was the seed of David according to the flesh; *he* who died on the Cross raised him from the dead who died so, being put to death through the flesh, and quickened by the Spirit; *he* was of the fathers according to the flesh who was *God over all blessed for ever*. Seeing these and the like *actions and affections cannot come from the same nature*, and yet must be attributed to the same Person; as we must acknowledge a *diversity of natures* united, so must we confess the identity of the Person in whom they are conjoined, against the ancient heresy of the Nestorians, condemned in the Council of Ephesus. * * *

" For *Christ*, saith St. Peter, was *put to death in the flesh, and quickened by*
 " *the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison* :
 " where the *Spirit* seems to some to be *the soul of Christ* ; and the *spirits in*
 " *prison*, the souls of them that were in Hell, or in *some place at least separat-*
 " *ed from the joys of heaven* : whither because we never read our Saviour went
 " at any other time, we may conceive (according to the opinions of some) that he
 " went in spirit then, when his soul departed from his body on the Cross. This
 " did our Church first deliver as the proof and illustration of the descent, and the
 " ancient Fathers did apply the same in like manner to the proof of this Article.
 " But yet those words of St. Peter have *no such power* of probation ; except we
 " were certain that the *spirit* there spoken of were the *soul of Christ*, and that the
 " time intended for that preaching were after his death, and before his resurrec-
 " tion. Whereas if it were so interpreted, the difficulties are so many, that they
 " staggered St. Augustine, and caused him at last to think that these words of St.
 " Peter belonged not unto the doctrine of Christ's descending into Hell. But in-
 " deed the *spirit* by which he is said to preach was not the soul of Christ, but
 " that spirit by which he was quickened : as appareth by the coincidence of the
 " words, *being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, by which*
 " *also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison*. Now that spirit by
 " which Christ was quickened is that by which he was raised from the dead, that
 " is the power of his divinity ; as St. Paul expresseth it, " Though he was
 " crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of *God* : " in respect of
 " which he preached to those which were disobedient in the days of *Noah*, as we
 " have already shewn."

Here the question should not be forgotten which is sure to be borne in mind
 by those who make it a point to confine their investigations to the opinions of
 their fellow-men, viz: " Have not the decrees of the General Councils, which
 " have been held in the early ages of Christianity, and the three Creeds of the
 " Church, no weight with you as authorities in controversies of faith ? "

In reply I would say, that I should dislike being influenced *in the least degree*
 either by the one or the other. As to the former (i. e. General Councils) the
 xxist Article of the Church of England truly declares, that " When they be gath-
 " ered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not
 " governed with the Spirit and word of God,) they may err, and sometimes
 " have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ori-
 " dained by them as necessary to salvation have *neither strength nor authority*,
 " unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture."

As to the latter (i. e. the Creeds) the whole three are as false in the designa-
 tion which they bear, as in some of the doctrines which they embrace. Even
 Bp. Burnet admits that " none of them are named with any exactness." " As for
 " the Creed called the Apostles' Creed, (says the same prelate) there is good rea-
 " son for speaking so doubtfully of it as the Article does, since it does not appear
 " that any determinate Creed was made by them : none of the first writers agree

“in delivering their faith in a certain form of words; every one of them gives an abstract of his faith, in words that differ both from one another and from this form. From thence it is clear, that there was no common form delivered to all the Churches; and if there had been any tradition, after the times of the Council of Nice, of such a Creed composed by the Apostles, the Arians had certainly put the chief strength of their cause on this, that they adhered to the Apostles’ Creed, in opposition to the innovations of the Nicene Fathers. There is therefore no reason to believe that this Creed was prepared by the Apostles, or that it was of any great antiquity, since Ruffin (in the fifth century) was the first that published it. * * * * The article of the procession of the Holy Ghost, and all that follows it, is not in the Nicene Creed, though it was used in the Church as a part of it, * * * so that the Creed here called the Nicene Creed is indeed the Constantinopolitan Creed, together with the addition of *and the Son* made by the Western Church in the year 447. That which is called Athanasius’s Creed is not his neither; * * * * as indeed *it was never heard of before the eighth century*; and then it was given out as the Creed of Athanasius, or as a representation of his doctrine, and so it grew to be received by the Western Church perhaps the more early.” (viz. in the eleventh Century) “because it went under so great a name, in ages that were not critical enough to judge of what was genuine and what was spurious.”

In addition to the foregoing extracts from Bishop Burnet, he also says:—“We must acknowledge that the Creed ascribed to Athanasius, as it was none of his, so it was *never* established by any General Council.” And yet, this was the first and only Creed, which, for many hundred years after Christ, spoke of his “reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting”; or, in other words, of Christ having an *intellectual* human soul, or *mind*.

But my opponents say, though all this may be the case with regard to Christ’s human rational soul; and though you may say, that you can agree with what is called the Apostles’ Creed in acknowledging your belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but still one Lord or Person in his three official or economical names as declared there; yet surely in the Nicene Creed the doctrine of the Trinity, as generally held, is plainly laid down. For speaking of the Holy Ghost it says:—“Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.”

In reply, I freely admit that a Tripersonality of the Godhead is declared *there* quite contrary to Bradley’s candid declaration, as shown in the Gospel Church, ps. 30, 31. “That we are not to worship *them*, but *him*; that there is only *one throne in heaven*, and *he* who sits on it, is ‘God manifest in the flesh’ &c.,” contrary also to the Apostle Paul’s declaration that it is a ‘Master and not Masters that we have in heaven. (See Eph. vi. 9, and Col. iv. 1); and also contrary to what our Saviour declared in Matt. xxiii. 8, 10, that “one is our Master, even Christ”; and him only should we *serve*, i. e. *worship and glorify*, Matt. iv. 10.

Here the reader should remember what I have quoted from Burnet, that the words “who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.”

with all that follows in what is called the Nicene Creed, were not inserted in that Creed until fifty six years after the Council of Nice was held. For in the year 381 Theodosius summoned a Council at Constantinople, composed of such bishops as he thought were favourable to his religious views, and it was in that Council that the foregoing words in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, and the remainder of the Creed, were first heard of and decided on. Mosheim says:—"A hundred and fifty bishops who were present at this Council, gave the *finishing touch* to what the Council of Nice had left *imperfect*, and fixed, in a full and determinate manner, the doctrine of *three persons in one God*, which is, as yet, received among the generality of Christians." Mosh. (1) 114. Milner in his Church History says of this Council:—"The Council was very *confused* and *disorderly*, greatly inferior in *wisdom* and *piety* to the Council at Nice." "*Fac-tion* was high, and *charity* was low at this time." "This Council very accurately defined the doctrine of the Trinity, and *enlarged* a little the Nicene Creed; they delivered it as we now have it in our Communion Service."

This admission of Milner concerning the confused and disorderly actions of the Council in which the doctrine of the Trinity was first established, nearly four hundred years after Christ, should have considerable weight with the reader; and the more so, when it is known that Milner was an extremely strenuous and laborious supporter of the doctrine of the Trinity.

It appears from Brown's "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," that the first general Council was occasioned in 325 by the Arian heresy, and was held in Nice. Also that the second general Council was held in 381 at Constantinople, "in order to oppose the reputed heresies of Sabellius, Mercellus, Photinus, and Apollinaris, * which heresies were still more or less privately taught."

It may naturally be asked, what accompanied the establishing of the Council's decrees against those so called heresies? In answering this question I have only to look at what Dr. Cumming in his late work "Lectures for the times" says in his ninth Lecture, viz:—"Then, as to persecution, I find it stated in Manse's "Councils, Vol. 3. p. 527,—'But the Emperor (Theodosius) provided, by the most severe laws, that whoever dissented from the Nicene and Constantinople Symbol of faith, should be deprived of their bishoprics, and not only should not be promoted by others, but should be *driven* from the Church, from the walls of the cities, and from the company of men.'"

There are two arguments constantly brought forward by those ministers who baptize infants, and by those who baptize adults, which being specious and plausible are easily caught up, and, of course, repeated by their undiscerning hearers. One of these arguments is, that it is right to continue the Sacraments *not as saving* ordinances, but as outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace; or, in other words, as "significant rites."

* For whose opinions against the doctrines of the Trinity and our Saviour having a rational soul, see "Gospel Church" ps. 12—15.

Here it seems to be overlooked, that typical ceremonies in connexion with Christian Worship *are directly at variance* with the acknowledged fact, that the old Jewish system of types was abrogated by the death of Christ; and that it was our Saviour's own law, that the Father was to be worshipped, not according to the shadowy ritual of the Jews and Samaritans, but in spirit and in truth. Under the Gospel dispensation the worship of God is at once simple and spiritual; it is the communion of the soul of man with his Creator, by his direct influence *in his office as the Spirit*, and through his sole mediation *in his office as the Saviour*. Consistently with this truth, all observances in worship, which are of a purely ceremonial nature, all mere types and shadows, *are by a general law abolished*. They are at once fulfilled and abrogated by the great realities of the Gospel of Christ. The Sacraments exactly answer to this description. *They are in their nature wholly ceremonial*; they are mere shadows or figures. As all Protestant writers acknowledge the Sacraments to be ceremonial in their nature, I shall here only quote from two, viz:—Bishop Hall and Mr. Romaine, who are known to have been strong supporters of the Sacraments.

The former, in his fifth book of contemplations, says:—"I wonder to see the "Israelites fed with Sacraments; their bread was sacramental, whereof they communicated every day, and now their drink was sacramental. * * * * The ancient Jews "behold, their whole meals were sacramental. * * * * Mr. Romaine (in his discourse upon "kept our feasts, and *we still keep theirs*." Mr. Romaine (in his discourse upon ch. 4 v. 6, of *The Song of Solomon*) says:—"The shadows were to flee away. "The legal ceremonies are called shadows in Scripture, because they were outward "and visible signs of inward and spiritual objects. St. Paul says, the ceremonial "law "had the shadow of good things to come," Heb. x. 1; *of the good things "which are now come to us by the advent of Christ*; and it had the patterns "and examples of heavenly things; every one of which had God for its author, "and was instituted by him to be an apt figure, and to raise a just idea of some "spiritual object; as Moses was admonished of God, when he was about to make "the tabernacle. "For see," saith he, "that thou make all things according to "the pattern showed to thee in the mount." Every rite and ceremony was a pat- "tern of some heavenly object, the real existence of which the pattern proved, as "as a shadow proves the reality of the substance from which it is cast, and the re- "semblance and likeness of which is set before the eyes, as the shadow of a body "is a representation of it. The scripture has expressly determined what all these "shadows were to represent: for the Apostle, speaking of them in Col. ii. 17, de- "clares, "that they were the shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." "Christ is the reality of all the shadows of the law; he is the body, and the sub- "stance, of whom they are the pictures. If you take away their reference to him, "they cease to be examples and shadows of heavenly things; but if you suppose "them to represent him and his actions, and sufferings, &c., then they answered "many noble purposes, *until he came in the flesh to fulfil them*; for then these "shadows were to *flee away*; one great end of their institution being answered.

“The observance of them was to be no longer in force: but they were *entirely to be repealed and abrogated*. However, until this blessed day should break, and these legal shadows should thus flee away, the text says, they were to serve a double purpose: they were, first, to be the outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual grace given unto us, and obtained by Christ himself, to be, secondly, a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. This is plainly implied in the last words of the text, in which Christ declares that, *until* the ceremonies were fulfilled by his coming in the flesh, he would be spiritually present in them. * * *Until* the day of his coming in the flesh, the ceremonies served as shadows to raise ideas of him, and as means of grace to support the faith and hopes of his people: they were outward and visible signs of inward and spiritual grace, *in the very same manner as the Sacraments are at present*, signing and sealing to believers the benefits purchased by the obedience and sufferings of the Lamb of God.”

The other argument, so constantly brought forward by those who wish to uphold the continuation of Sacraments, is, the command of Christ. * They say, that the commands to baptize with water, and to observe the rite of the Lord's supper in remembrance of him, should as necessarily be obeyed by us as the commands to repent, believe, pray, and such like; and that as a compliance with the

* It will be seen from the following extracts from a pamphlet published in 1852, by the Rev. Dr. Lewis, the prominent agent to the intended bishoprick of Kingston, C. W., that the perpetuity of sacramental observance rests upon the two arguments—of their being *commanded*, and because they are *significant rites*. Dr. Lewis's pamphlet purports to be a recitation of a pamphlet lately put forth by the Baptist College in Montreal. The Baptist pamphlet lays down as one of its arguments for adult baptism the fact, that “our adorable Lord and Saviour was baptized not in infancy, but when he began to be about thirty years of age.” In answer to this Dr. Lewis says:—“If this objection to infant baptism, founded on Christ's example, proves that we should not be baptized in infancy, it also proves that we should not be baptized till the age of thirty years: but, in fact, *it proves neither*. Though our Lord submitted to the rite, it was *merely*, as he himself said, *to fulfil righteousness*, to set an example as he ever did of scrupulous attention to outward acts of duty, and to exhibit in his own person that descent of the Holy Ghost *which was to be the characteristic of his own baptism*. He could not be said to be baptized into John's baptism, nor yet into christian baptism: he could not have been baptized on a profession of repentance, for he had nothing to repent of. He could not be baptized on a profession of faith in himself, for that would be unmeaning: in short, the argument drawn from the example of Christ is *singularly absurd*.” Further on, Dr. Lewis says:—“Now, though we do hold that *some* blessing invariably attends baptism when *duly administered*,” (that is, when administered with sponsors, according to Bishop Burnet, who in his exposition on the xxviith Article says, “It may be reasonably doubted, whether such a baptism be *true*, in which no sponson is made”) “yet we certainly should err in administering it with that intent. * * Infant circumcision answered no valuable purpose, that we can see, except as a *sign of a covenant, and a test of obedience*; and these purposes may be answered by infant baptism. Surely, if observation proves that those baptized in infancy manifest *the same depravity* as those not baptized, observation will prove *the same* regarding adults.”

latter commands is obviously indispensable, so is our compliance with the former equally so. Now, though I should grant that the direction of our Lord to baptize meant to have recourse to water; and though I thus should classify it with the Lord's supper; yet I would maintain that the commands for the observance of both ordinances were of a nature *simply positive*, and consequently not of *perpetual* obligation. A merely positive precept has no connexion with the *unchangeable* "spiritual" law of God, and does nothing more than enjoin for some *specific* purpose, a practice in itself indifferent. For instance, the ten commandments are moral in their nature, inculcating love to God and man, leading to peace and happiness here and to glory hereafter. And such are the commands to pray, believe, repent, &c. All such belong to that unchangeable law of God, which, when revealed, demands the obedience of *all* men at *all* times. But a mere positive command appears to contain no sufficient *internal* evidence of its being binding on any persons, except those to whom it was actually addressed, and others who were placed under the *same peculiar circumstances*. For example, let us take the command given to the leper in Matt. viii. 4, to "offer the gift that Moses commanded." Though this command was given by the same Almighty Lawgiver, who commanded that men should believe, &c., yet as not belonging to the *moral*, but to the *ceremonial* law, like the sacraments, it was not to be *perpetual*. Mr. Romaine contrasting the moral with the ceremonial law in the discourse already referred to, instances this command to the leper as *identical* with the sacraments, for he says:—"When any person had offended, and his conscience accused him of sin, he was required to bring his sacrifice to the priest, and to lay his hands upon its head, and to confess his sins over it: after this its life was to be taken away, and its blood shed instead of the sinner's life. And this was to be done, even when a person had offended through ignorance. But in what did the merit of the sacrifice consist? Did its blood take away sin? No. It was not possible the blood of bulls and of goats should do that. The sacrifice was only a memorial instituted to bring the Messiah into mind, as if he had said, Do this in remembrance of me; remembering in every sacrifice the future sacrifice of the Lamb of God; and believers did remember him. When they ate of the paschal lamb, by faith they discerned the Lord's body, and enjoyed communion with Christ, our passover, as we do now at the Lord's supper. They found him present in the ordinances, according to his most true promise in the text. *Until the day dawn*, says he, *the great day of my appearing in the flesh*, "and the shadows flee away," the shadows of the ceremonial law be realized and *fulfilled* in my life, obedience, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension; *until these things be*, I will be spiritually present upon mount Moriah, in the temple worship, and upon the hill of frankincense, to render the persons and the services of my people well-pleasing and acceptable unto God the Father."

The intelligent reader surely can see from the foregoing remarks how that Sacraments are *confessedly* unfitted for, and inconsistent with, the Gospel Church

and *spiritual* worship of God. As to the Lord's supper (the only sacrament from which advantage is supposed by most Christians to be really derived) its signification was naturally understood by the twelve apostles, to whom the words "Do this in remembrance of me" were addressed. For they were all Jews, or Galileans, who had long been accustomed to observe the rites of the supper of the Passover. Among those rites were numbered the breaking of the bread, and the handing of the cup, with the blessing and giving of thanks. As they had already been habituated to these customs, so was the Lord Jesus well aware that they would *still maintain them*: for, as it has already been remarked, the apostles continued in the practice of parts of the Jewish ritual, long after the crucifixion of our Lord, and, although that ritual was *in fact* abolished by his death, the *sudden* disuse of it does not appear to have been enjoined upon them by their divine Master. We see Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (which was written A. D. 53) openly reproofing Peter for *compelling* the believing Gentiles to live *after the manner of the Jewish law*, Gal. ii. 14. Having these facts in our view, we may reasonably interpret the words of Jesus as commanding nothing more than that his apostles should call *him* to their recollection, when they met to celebrate the supper of the Passover. "This cup," said Jesus, is the New Testament in my blood." Now, it was not *every* cup of wine which represented the New Testament in the blood of Christ: it was *the cup of wine drunk at the supper of the Passover*—an institution which they were *then* celebrating, and which, in some of its circumstances, was expressly typical of the death of the Messiah. It appears, then, by no means improbable that it was *to the cup of the Passover exclusively* that our Saviour's injunction applied—"This do ye, *as oft as ye drink it*, in remembrance of me"; that is, *as often* as ye meet together *to celebrate the supper of the Passover*, and to drink of *that cup*, which represents the New Testament in my blood, take care that ye forget not the *true purport* of the ceremony—do it in remembrance of *me*. Now, as it is admitted by all Christians that the supper of the Passover is not to be observed, it follows that the command for a *temporary purpose*, of celebrating it in remembrance of our Lord is also not to be observed. Hence the Jews, after their conversion, are said to be under, not the old, but the new covenant; that is, not under the old but the new *manner of administration* of the covenant; for the covenant of grace, as to the substance of it, is for ever the same.

A. FOWLIS & Co.,

Hardware Merchants.

A LARGE STOCK OF
SHELF AND HEAVY HARDWARE

Constantly on hand, at very low prices for Cash.

No. 5, Market Block, Peterborough, C. W.

W. A. SCOTT,

DEALER IN

BRITISH & FOREIGN DRY GOODS,

A SUPERIOR ASSORTMENT OF

SILK, WOOLEN, COTTON,

AND

LINEN GOODS,

suitable for the seasons, at such prices as cannot fail to meet the wants of customers.

The business will hereafter be carried on strictly on the

CASH PRINCIPLE,

and Cash purchasers will find in the Stock and prices, unusual inducements; a continuation of the liberal patronage of the past, is respectfully solicited.

Peterborough, February, 1861.

T. & R. WHITE,

Booksellers and Stationers.

SCHOOL & MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.

Papers, Envelopes,

and a general assortment of PLAIN and FANCY STATIONERY.

ROOM PAVERS, &c., &c.

No. 4, MARKET BLOCK, PETERBOROUGH, C. W.

THE PETERBOROUGH REVIEW.

IS NOW THE

LARGEST PAPER IN CANADA.

Outside of the Cities, and continues to be published at

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

when paid in advance.

The Proprietors have just added to their Printing, one of HOWES CYLINDER POWER PRESSES, and a

JOB POWER PRESS,

and

Cards, Handbills, Circulars, &c.,

which enables them to execute every description of

BOOK & JOB PRINTING,

at very low rates, and in a superior style of workmanship.

SUBSCRIPTIONS or orders for ADVERTISING, or JOB PRINTING, when sent by Mail will be promptly attended to. All orders should be addressed to the Proprietors, (subscribers)

T. & R. WHITE.

NO. 25 N. GOVERNMENT STREET, PETERBOROUGH.

Peterborough, February, 1861.

