

A COMPILATION
OF
SAMUEL TROTT'S
WRITINGS,

AS COPIED FROM:

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES
THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST MESSENGER
THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE.

EMBRACING A
PERIOD OF THIRTY
YEARS.

Volume #2

Supralapsarian Press
2001 EDITION

Table of Contents

A. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	Pg.4
1. THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST ILLUSTRATED.	Pg.14
2. THE GOSPEL MINISTRY. Nov.4, 1832.	Pg.52
3. CERTAIN RULE & FINAL AUTHORITY. Nov.4, 1832.	Pg.55
4. ETERNAL JUSTIFICATION? Dec.21, 1832.	Pg.60
5. A CALUMNY. Jan.7, 1833.	Pg.62
6. A CALL TO THE PASTORATE. February 7, 1833.	Pg.63
7. THE SABBATH. Feb.20, 1833.	Pg.65
8. THE LIGHT OF GOSPEL SIMPLICITY. Aug.8, 1834.	Pg.70
9. REGARDING A LETTER BY OSBOURN. July 15, 1835.	Pg.72
10. NO.1, ON ISAIAH 20th. Sept.26, 1836.	Pg.76
11. NO.2, ON ISAIAH 20th. Sept.26, 1836.	Pg.80
12. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.1. Feb.1, 1837.	Pg.87
13. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.2. Feb.9, 1837.	Pg.93
14. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.3. Feb.24, 1837.	Pg.100
15. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.3. {#2} March 18, 1837.	Pg.106
16. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.3. {#3} April 4, 1837.	Pg.115
17. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.4. April 26, 1837.	Pg.122
18. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.4. {#2} April 27, 1837.	Pg.128
19. FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.5. July 7, 1837.	Pg.136
20. THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION. March 5, 1839.	Pg.144
21. AN INQUIRY #1. July 1, 1839.	Pg.152
22. AN INQUIRY #2. July 5, 1839.	Pg.154
23. A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE ADVOCATE. 1839.	Pg.155
24. ELDER OSBOURN: SABELLIANISM, &c. July 6, 1840.	Pg.157
25. A FINAL JUDGMENT. Part 1. Aug.17, 1841.	Pg.166
26. A FINAL JUDGMENT. Part 2. Aug.24, 1841.	Pg.173
27. THE RESURRECTION. Jan.7, 1842.	Pg.179
28. THE RESURRECTION. # 2. Feb.22, 1842.	Pg.186
29. THOUGHTS ON PREDESTINATION. June 15, 1842.	Pg.189
30. COMMENTS ON LUKE 16:19-31. July 22, 1842.	Pg.191
31. GnosticISM. Oct.12, 1842.	Pg.197
32. THE BEING AND NATURE OF ANGELS. Nov. 23, 1842.	Pg.201
33. THE END OF THE WORLD. May 26, 1843.	Pg.209
34. GOSPEL ORDER. Nov. 8, 1843.	Pg.215
35. CONCERNING SIN. Dec. 21, 1843.	Pg.219
36. CONCERNING HOLINESS. Dec. 21, 1843.	Pg.224
37. CONCERNING ELECTION & CALLING. January, 1844.	Pg.228
38. THE GROUND OF CHRIST'S GLORY. January, 1844.	Pg.235
39. THE BEASTS AND THEIR IMAGE. May 1, 1844.	Pg.242
40. CHRIST'S BEING MADE UNDER THE LAW &c. Sept.6, 1844.	Pg.246
41. THE WHEAT AND THE TARES. December, 1844.	Pg.252
42. REGULATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES. March 6, 1845.	Pg.259

43. SOME OBSERVATIONS FROM GAL.3:3. April 25, 1845.	Pg.266
44. DEPRAVITY & SIN. April 15, 1846.	Pg.270
45. THE BENEDICTION. July 22, 1846.	Pg.275
46. EXPERIMENTAL DARKNESS. April 29, 1848.	Pg.280
47. VIEWS OF HEBREWS 8:11. June 23, 1848.	Pg.283
48. THE TERMS: NATURAL & CARNAL. Aug. 4, 1848.	Pg.288
49. MATTHEW 24:27, CONSIDERED. Oct.10, 1848.	Pg.290
50. REMARKS ON ELDER WILLIAMS' LETTER. July 18, 1849.	Pg.296
51. REPLY TO BRETHREN: SONSHIP & UNION. July 18, 1849.	Pg.303
52. REPLY: THE NEW BIRTH. Part 1. April 21, 1850.	Pg.311
53. REPLY: THE NEW BIRTH. Part 2. April 26, 1850.	Pg.318
54. THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE. Part 1. Dec.5, 1850.	Pg.326
55. THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE. Part 2. Dec.17, 1850.	Pg.331
56. VALID BAPTISM. April 22, 1853.	Pg.339
57. SOME OBJECTIONS NOTICED. Aug.22, 1856.	Pg.345
58. A CALM REPLY. Feb.25, 1854.	Pg.349
59. THE SEALING OF THE SPIRIT. August 21, 1854.	Pg.408
60. SOME VIEWS REGARDING MANASSAH. Dec.9, 1855.	Pg.412
61. SOME THOUGHTS ON HEB.11:40. Jan.28, 1856.	Pg.416
62. VIEWS ON MARK 8:22-26. Feb.6, 1856.	Pg.419
63. VIEWS ON I JOHN 3:15. Feb.13, 1856.	Pg.423
64. VIEWS ON MATTHEW 12:43-45. June 23, 1856.	Pg.426
65. BARREN FIG TREE & VIEWS ON ZECH.1:8. Aug.20, 1856.	Pg.429
66. SOME OBJECTIONS ADDRESSED. March 6, 1854.	Pg.434
67. VIEWS ON I PETER 4:17-18. Oct.9, 1856.	Pg.441
68. VIEWS ON GEN.3:22. Dec. 26, 1859.	Pg.447
69. VIEWS ON ISAIAH 2:4. Jan, 2, 1860.	Pg.454

CIRCULAR LETTERS

70. RELATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES AND MINISTERS. 1833.	Pg.459
71. REMARKS ON I JOHN 1:3. 1842.	Pg.467
72. ON THE REIGN OF CHRIST. 1848.	Pg.471
73. UNITY OF THE BRETHREN. 1849.	Pg.476
74. THE LORD THY GOD. 1850.	Pg.479
75. THE LORD SHALL COMFORT ZION. 1851.	Pg.485
76. GOD'S GRACE. 1851.	Pg.489
77. SAVED BY THE LORD. 1852.	Pg.493
78. THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT MADE FOR SIN. 1853.	Pg.499
79. THE NEW BIRTH: EXPERIMENTALLY CONSIDERED. 1855.	Pg.504
80. BROTHERLY LOVE AND UNITY. 1856.	Pg.510
81. PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH. 1858.	Pg.514

Biographical Sketch

Samuel Trott

{1784 to 1866}

Samuel Trott was one of the leading Baptist frontier ministers; a firm Predestinarian, an Exalter of Christ Alone, and one who contended in earnest for that "faith once delivered unto the saints." Along with Gilbert Beebe, he was one the most influential of that group of Particular Baptists which came to be known as "Old School." Born in Walpole, New Hampshire, he first joined a Presbyterian Church and in his own words, became a "pretty strict formalist" and a "legalist." In time he was brought {under the teaching of the Spirit} to a gospel perception of the finished work of Christ, and sought out those of like-minded faith, and was consequently baptized by Elder Parkinson of New York, on December 22nd., 1810. In 1816, we find him in Ohio where he taught school and preached. In 1820, he travelled as far west as the Licking Particular Baptist Association, where, after preaching in the home of Elder Ambrose Dudley, he baptized his son, Thomas P. Dudley. Still later, we find him in Virginia, where he served Frying Pan Baptist Church at the Fairfax County Court House. He was a contemporary of Elder Gilbert Beebe and a frequent contributor to the "Signs of the Times." He also was an author of the Black Rock Address; {which was a manifesto of a meeting that took place in Black Rock, Maryland in May, 1832,} consisting of resolutions against "uniting with worldly societies," and a declaration of non-fellowship with those who had done so. By "worldly societies" were meant Missionary, Sabbath-school, Bible, Tract, and Temperance Societies, &c., against which the brethren of the Black Rock Meeting protested, as being at that time practiced among the portion of the Baptist denomination which at that time were known as Fullerites.

Hassell in his Church History, notes the following: "Numerous Scriptures forbid the intimate association of God's people with the heathen or unbelievers {Ex.34:11-16; Deut.7:1-11; 22:9-11; Ezra 9; Neh.13:1-3, 23-31; Ps.26:4, 5; 44:20, 21; 106:35-48; 1 Cor.15:33; James 4:4; Jn.15:18, 19,} for the expressed reason that such associations are invariably corrupting to the people of God. Especially corrupting must be such alliances as are based upon money,

which is represented in the Scriptures as the god of this world, and the love of which is a root of all evil {Matthew. 6:24; Luke 16:13; 1 Tim. 6:10.} From such money based societies let it be deeply impressed upon our minds that Peter, who had no silver or gold, and Paul, who had to work day and night for his daily bread, and even the Lord Jesus Christ, who had not where to lay His head, would have been debarred, unless some friend had paid their fee or a miracle had been wrought for that purpose. Can it be possible that such Egyptian or worldly alliances of the children of God, so repeatedly and pointedly forbidden in both the Old and the New Testament of Scriptures, are of the Lord and will be blessed of Him? Besides corrupting the people of God, these alliances demonstrate confidence in the flesh and a lack of faith in God; that is, a departure and alienation from God, and, to the extent they reach, and identification with unbelievers. God solemnly calls upon all His dear children who have been ensnared and carried down into Babylon— "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues" {Rev.18:4.} Babylon was an idolatrous nation; and it is demonstrably certain that, if human language means anything, the language employed by a large number of high officials in these modern religious confederacies represents these human means and methods as the most important and indispensable requisite for the conversion and salvation of the world; that is, they represent these human institutions as gods, and thus, confederating with Babylon, professed Christians have become idolatrous too, just as the Scriptures abundantly warn us. Christ and His Apostles, let it be indelibly impressed upon our minds and hearts, instituted absolutely none of these forbidden, unhallowed and contaminating, idolatrous and ruinous Egyptian and Babylonian confederacies." {Hassell: Church History, 1886}

In reference to the BLACK ROCK ADDRESS itself, Hassell writes: "When the Fullerite heresies had been introduced among the Baptists, and produced great discord and turmoil, some of the old veterans of the cross met at Black Rock, Maryland, in 1832, and published a solemn protest against all the newly introduced innovations upon our former faith and order, and made the rejection of the new departure a test of fellowship. To distinguish those who retained the apostolic doctrine from those who departed from it, we consented to be known by a name which had been given us by our opponents, viz., Old School Baptists." {Hassell: Church History, 1886}

In 1832 Elder Samuel Trott became Pastor at Welsh Tract, and in his corresponding letter he says: "We receive

Christ as our pattern, hence we do not walk in the observance of many things which have been introduced among the Baptists generally, and received as great importance in advancing the cause of religion, &c. We desire to keep in His footsteps, believing it to be the safest path. We rely on His wisdom and power to gather in His elect and extend the knowledge of His salvation."

We insert the following information from Hassell's Church History regarding this assembly of believers. "The WELSH TRACT CHURCH, whose meeting-house is two miles from Newark, in New Castle County, Delaware, is the oldest Old School Baptist Church in the United States, and the only American Baptist Church that was regularly organized in Europe before emigrating to this country. It was constituted, in the spring of 1701, by sixteen Baptists in the counties of Pembroke and Caermarthen, in South Wales, with Thomas Griffith, one of their number, as their pastor. A "Church Emigrant," they embarked at Milford Haven in June, 1701, and landed at Philadelphia September 8th, 1701. They first settled about Pennypack, near Philadelphia, where they continued about a year and a half, and where their membership increased to thirty-seven. Then they procured land in Northern Delaware from Messrs. Evans, Davis and Willis, who had purchased upwards of 30,000 acres of William Penn, called the "Welsh Tract," and in 1703 they removed to that location, and built, near Iron Hill, a small meeting-house, which stood until 1746, and was then succeeded by the present substantial stone house of worship. In the yard around the house rest the bodies of many of the pastors and members who, during almost two centuries, have met and joined here in the service of God. The Welsh Tract Church was one of the five original churches that, in 1707, formed the Philadelphia Baptist Association (the oldest Baptist Association in America), and for many years it was the most influential member of that body. The Philadelphia Confession of Faith, published by this Association in 1742, was the old London Confession of 1689, with two other Articles, added principally through the influence of the Welsh Tract Church—Article 23, Of Singing of Psalms (in Public Worship), and Article 31, Of Laying on of Hands (on all Baptized Believers). Until 1732 the Church Book was kept in the Welsh language; and for about seventy years the pastors were of Welsh extraction. The pastors of Welsh Tract Church have been as follows; Thomas Griffith, Elisha Thomas, Enoch Morgan, Owen Thomas, David Davis, John Sutton, John Boggs, Gideon Farrell, Stephen M. Woolford, Samuel Trott, William K. Robinson, Thomas Barton (from 1839 to 1870, when he died,

after having been sixty years in the ministry), G. W. Staton, William Grafton and Joseph L. Staton, the present pastor. The church owns a residence and tract of land, which the pastor occupies." {Hassell: Church History, 1886}

Strange, and truly contemptible is the fact that in this definitive History of the Old School/Primitive Baptists written by one of their own {Hassell: History of the Church of God, 1886} no mention {apart from his name, in conjunction with Associational Meetings, and churches for which he preached} is made of Elder Trott. One cannot but conjecture that perhaps his name was entirely blotted out by Sylvester Hassell, who revised the work prior to its first publication, after the death of his father Cushing Hassell {died 1880} to whom the book, for the most part, is attributed. The younger Hassell compromised some of the leading principles which distinguished the earlier Baptists, principles which Trott warmly advocated, and for which he was despised & hated.

Samuel Trott's own personal testimony of God's Grace in Christ was published in the Old School Baptist periodical the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, in 1851; from which we extract the following: **Childhood:** I was born in Walpole, New Hampshire, was one of three children my mother had. My sister died before my mother and my brother was burned up with the house in which he lived a year or two after, and my mother died when I was eight years old. My father who had been for several years riding as sheriff, and had thereby become involved, was about this time broken up as to property, and shortly after broke up housekeeping. From that early period in life, though my father lived several years after, I never knew the comforts of a parent's home, nor the solace of a brother or a sisters society. I had no near relatives on my father's side, and none that I knew; on my mother's side I had several, but circumstances around the above time caused me to become estranged from them. My father procured a kind and comfortable home for me, where I enjoyed all the advantages of a common school education, usual for boys in New England to have. I continued in this family until I was nearly fifteen, when I went as an apprentice to a trade. **First Impressions & Presbyterianism:** From my first religious exercise, I thought it important, I should, on the first opportunity join some church, as a part of my religious service to God, and as calculated more to establish me in my resolution to seek God. When I became located in Cooperstown I thought this opportunity was afforded me. There was however one difficulty in the way: the Presbyterians I had understood professed to believe in the doctrine of election, that I could not profess, my

heart was bitter against it, so much so that as I was one night in my room reading the 8th and 9th chapter of Romans, I was so incensed against those chapters because of their containing so fully the doctrine of election and predestination, that I actually thought of cutting them out of my Bible and casting them into the fire. Nothing but a sense of its being God's Word prevented me. This difficulty however was soon removed, for shortly after, some persons were received into the church, and I had an opportunity of hearing the church covenant to which they were to assent, read, and found to my joy that election and predestination were not named therein. The next month I applied to the session, and was received into the church. In the spring a young Presbyterian came to study with Mr. Neal with a view to the ministry, who was better indoctrinated in the Presbyterian faith than I was. As he boarded and roomed with me he soon found out my opposition to election, and set about reforming me from my error. By his reasoning from the Scriptures, and by reading certain writers on the subject to which he referred me, I was convinced that election was a Scriptural doctrine, and became a strenuous advocate for it, that is as held generally by the Presbyterians in connection with general atonement, general offers, invitations &c. Having joined the Presbyterian church in March, I think, 1808, I was strict in observing the Sabbath, as I considered it, in reading a certain portion of Scripture daily, in prayer and in morality, was during that year a pretty strict formalist, and got along comfortably. Not that I thought I had attained a safe state, this was what I was labouring for, and I hoped that God had begun the work in me, and therefore that I should be able to persevere and attain to a safe state before I died. This as high as I can recollect was about my views. I from this time became about as laborious a legalist as was to be found among the Presbyterians. **Instructions in Grace:** In looking at some of the entries in my diary during this Summer, I should think that they had been penned by a tempted, doubting believer, were it not for the legality so apparent in them. I speak in them about my inability to do anything, that God must do all for me by His grace, and of my entire dependence on Christ for acceptance, &c., and yet there is a rotten legal self doing spirit running through the whole. My reading was of the more evangelical class of authors, as they are called, such as John Newton, and even Dr. Hawker's "Zion's Pilgrim" was a favorite book with me. I no doubt imbibed their mode of expression. I mention these things, to show how the natural mind may be molded into a gospel mode of thinking and expression, whilst we are ignorant of our helplessness, though I was being taught to feel

the power of my corruptions, though ignorant of Christ. **Conversion:** {His conversion experience as related by himself was as follows:} Immediately upon this, {under great conviction of sin,} as I was there on my knees, the account of Abraham's offering his son Isaac as in Gen.22 was brought to my view. Isaac as bound and laid upon the altar, appeared as representing the case of the heirs of promise, and as fully representing my then case, as bound by the law and doomed by its condemnatory sentence to death; as Abraham knew nothing but to inflict the death blow, so the law knew nothing but to inflict the curse upon the sinner. My attention was then turned to Abraham's arm, being arrested by the angel's call to him, and the ram caught in the thicket by his horns being taken by him and sacrificed in the place of Isaac. This ram appeared to represent Christ as involved in the demands of the law, in the power of His Godhead, by virtue of His headship and union with His people, and therefore as made to suffer the penalty of the law in their stead. My views then were not as distinct on all these points as I have here {in The Signs} given them; but the substitution of Christ in the place of the condemned sinner was fully presented to view. And the atonement of Christ appeared so full and so exactly adapted to my helpless, guilty and condemned case, that surely, I said to myself, as I viewed it, God must have had me in view when He made this rich provision in His Son. I was therefore enabled confidently to rely on His atonement for pardon, and to plead it for my acceptance with God, and the sense of condemnation was gone...self was in a great measure lost sight of, and God in His glorious character and sovereignty occupied my view...I had never before felt such meltings of heart on account of sin, nor saw sin to be so vile as now; - not as contrasted with the demands of the law, but as contrasted with the goodness and mercy of God. **Confirmation:** {He goes on to relate some consolation received by the writings of William Huntington} As I went out of the study door, the thought occurred to me that I would go into my lodging room, and pray to the Lord to go with me and direct me. Whilst there thus engaged, my mind became somewhat composed, and the idea was suggested to me, that I had better go back into the study, and read a certain pamphlet which had been laid on Elder P's table a few days before. I went back and took up the book; which was the experience of a person in England written by himself in a letter to William Huntington, and was by him thus published. As I read it, I saw the path in which the Lord had led me delineated step by step. Like myself this man had been a professor for some years previous to his being brought into gospel liberty,

had been a zealous legalist; had had his foundation suddenly all knocked from under him, as mine was, and afterwards, Christ had been revealed to him as the substitute of the sinner, and the end of the law for righteousness. As he described these exercises as a being killed by the law, and a being born again, born into gospel liberty, I was led to understand such to have been the nature of the exercises I passed through during the months of Sept. & Oct. 1810, as before described, that then it was, I was slain by the law, and then that I became a believer in Christ, and was born of God. The cloud that I had been so long under now in some measure broke; and I enjoyed a comfortable hope of being a new creature. From this I was led on to see what a galling yoke of bondage, the law and legal religion was; and how lovely and glorious was gospel liberty and gospel grace as contrasted with legal service. **Call to the Ministry & Further Establishment in the Truth:** Soon after my mind received satisfaction in reference to the ministry. I returned to the vicinity of Morristown, with the expectation of preaching for that church. But I went not with my mind impressed with a desire to convert souls. I went deeply impressed with the evil of that legal bondage which I knew by past experience was so prevalent in that region among the Presbyterians and others. I went therefore with the design of bearing my testimony against it, and to hold forth salvation as being of rich, free and sovereign grace reigning through the righteousness of Christ. I soon by that kind of preaching aroused a pretty severe opposition against me, both in and out of the church; I was charged freely with being an Antinomian, with bringing forward new things, and with creating divisions, &c. This drove me to search the Scriptures and to enquire more earnestly at the mouth of the Lord, and resulted in my becoming stronger in my views and in the defense of them. From that day to this, the most aid I have received from man in forming my religious views, has been through their opposition; thereby driving me from men to look to God and the Scriptures for my guidance. I have learned in my early experience, many ideas from men, but have had again in many instances to unlearn them. I know that it has been my desire to learn of God and not of man, and He I think taught me that desire, in my early experience. Notwithstanding the opposition raised against my preaching at Morristown, the church in the course of the summer called me to ordination. And I was ordained August 30, 1812, not as the pastor of that church, for that I declined, finding no Scriptural authority for it, but to the gospel ministry. {Signs of the Times 1851}

From the Signs by Gilbert Beebe

ELDER SAMUEL TROTT - DIED AT AGE 83. Elder Samuel Trott has laid off his armor, received his passport, and gone, as we fully believe, to the bosom of his God and Savior. For several months his strength has been gradually declining; so much so as to prevent him from visiting the churches, as he has been confined to his house or immediate neighborhood ever since last May. At that time we met him at the Baltimore Association, where we heard him for the last time, preach a short but very impressive sermon from John 3:3, "Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." His voice was feeble, and his physical power scarcely sufficient to support his debilitated frame. He remarked that that was in all probability the last time he should ever attempt to preach to us. But the ardor of his spirit arose to an irrepressible earnestness, in solemnly impressing upon the brethren the important doctrine of his text, that whatever amount of human wisdom, literary acquirements, or human talent a man may possess, or however sound in theory, none are competent to preach the gospel of Christ, who have not seen the kingdom; and none can possibly see that kingdom who are not born of the Spirit. His last solemn admonition to the saints on this important subject fell upon our ears, and sank deep in our hearts, as our dear aged father was summing up in a few words what had been the burden of his ministry for more than sixty years. His stand point, bordering on the verge of the eternal world, with the eye of faith uplifted to the glory of the upper skies, and wings expanded for his rapturous flight from earth, only waiting to pronounce the finishing sentences of the ministry which he had received of the Lord, to testify the gospel of the grace of God. If we mistake not that was the last time he in a formal manner attempted to preach. But as long as he continued in the flesh, he ceased not, as opportunity presented and his receding strength would allow, to speak of his Redeemer's kingdom, and to talk of his power. We called on and spent a night with our dear brother in August last, in company of Elders Leachman and Durand, after the close of the Corresponding Meeting in Loudoun County, Va. In our last interview, as far as strength would permit, he reaffirmed the position he had so long held, and the testimony he had so long and faithfully born to the truth of prophecy, and of what he had understood to be its import. To us, his clear and lucid interpretation of those prophecies concerning the twelve

hundred and sixty days of the papal beast, and the corresponding time of the two witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, was wonderful. And that he should have published his views nearly forty years ago, and that he lived to see that his views were correct, in the literal humiliation of the pope, and extinction of his temporal, or secular power, just twelve hundred and sixty years after the inauguration of that power in the year 606, is evidence that he was endowed with more light upon these subjects than had ordinarily been enjoyed by his contemporaries. We have been personally acquainted with our dear departed brother about 45 years, and from our earliest acquaintance, have looked up to him as to a father, for counsel, and instruction, which he has been enabled to give. We have always found him ready to speak a seasonable word to us when occasion has required. Like David and Jonathan, we have loved each other; facing the same foes, bearing the same testimony, engaged in the same conflicts and participating in the same victories, suffering the same reproaches, encountering the same persecutions for the truth's sake. Is it strange, now that he is taken from us, that we should exclaim, as did Elisha, when he saw Elijah taken up to heaven in the fiery chariot? "My father! My father! the chariot of Israel, and the horseman thereof." More than an ordinary tribute to the memory of this dear servant of God is due from us, and a very large space in our columns should be devoted to a becoming notice of his departure. No other correspondent has contributed so liberally to our columns from the first number of our first volume, until prevented from writing, first by the late war, and since the war, for debility. Indeed it is doubtful if we could have succeeded in sustaining our publication had he withheld his support; and now that his pen shall no longer write for our edification, it is meet that we should record how greatly we have been aided by him, and how sadly the announcement of his departure has fallen on us. Brother Trott leaves a widow and one daughter, and has one surviving son residing in Texas. His first wife and all his children, except the one son and one daughter, had been called away before him. With our dear bereaved sister Trott, and the surviving daughter, who were with him to the last, we most sincerely sympathize in this, their deep affliction, and may their sore bereavement be sanctified to their good, and may they, with the absent son, be divinely sustained by the strong arm of the Lord. To the churches of our order, especially those who have enjoyed the labors of the departed, we would speak words of consolation. It is the Lord, and he is able to comfort you, in this and in all your sorrows. Look up to

him and pray him to send forth faithful laborers into his harvest. To the readers of the "Signs of the Times": we shall greatly miss that familiar signature and those deeply edifying epistles of love, which, for thirty-four years have afforded so much instruction and comfort. But our God hath raised up many other witnesses, and has assured us that he will not leave himself without witnesses. Long will you cherish the memory of our dear departed brother. To our brethren in the ministry: a valiant soldier has laid aside his armor; a veteran has received his passport to his mansion in the skies; our hearts are saddened, because the places that knew him once shall know him no more; but he is not dead, but sleepeth. His trials and conflicts are over, and all his tears are wiped forever away. A few more days of trial, temptation and conflict remains for us to fill up, and then, like him, shall we close our weary eyes on all the vanities of earth, and go to dwell forever with the Lord. {Signs of the Times 1866}

Elder Robert C. Leachman, referring to Elder Trott's ministry said that; "his ministry was not with him as; alas, it is with too many, a work of convenience or of secondary importance, but regarded as the great and leading business of his life. Through sunshine and storm he was faithful to his appointments, and seemed to be always laden with gospel treasures. No man seemed to feel more sensibly his dependence upon God, and none seemed to be more constantly furnished unto every good word and work. His preaching seemed to me like a voice from the grave, rebuking the foul spirit of fanaticism, and testifying that the boasted and boastful religion of the time amounts to nothing. His last moments were marked by no special demonstration. Yet his death was just such a one as I would wish to die; with no particular disease, his body not racked with pain, his mental powers in full exercise to the last expression he was able to give, he quietly fell asleep like an infant in its mother's arms."

THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST ILLUSTRATED

And The Signs Of The Times, Set Forth In Seven Letters, Written By Elder Samuel Trott, Pastor: Baptist Church – Welsh Tract, New Castle County, Delaware. Published For The Benefit Of Mankind, By Gilbert Beebe, Pastor: Baptist Church – New Vernon, Orange County, New York. 1832.

To the Reader.

IF the dark gloom of Priestcraft and superstition, which prepared the way for Pagan Idolatry and Papal usurpation; if the horrors of an infatuation, which has repeatedly drenched the earth with human gore, racked and tortured the dear people of God, and prostrated every liberal institution in civil government on earth; were a sufficient reason why the Watchmen in Zion should "lift up their voice like a trumpet, cry aloud and spare not" even to sound an alarm in God's holy mountain, there is no apology necessary for the appearance of this Pamphlet. If it were deception for Pagans to teach the worship of imaginary Deities, it is no less deceptive for professed Christians to teach the worship of a bankrupt God, whose resources are exhausted, or whose disposition or will transcends his power. If it were deception for the Pope of Rome to teach men that salvation could be bought and sold for money, it is equally absurd for any of the Clergy of the present day to teach that the salvation of mankind depends on moneyed institutions; as Bible, Tract, or Missionary Societies, Theological Seminaries, or Sabbath School Unions, or any other system of Works. If it was unlawful for the Pope to sell indulgencies, or passports through Purgatory, or pardons, or titles to Eternal life, for money; how is it less criminal for modern speculators in divinity to sell Birth rights into Religious Societies? What more is required at this day, to constitute a man orthodox than to pour forth his cash into the grand Reservoir of Priestcraft? Or what less than the name Deist, or Infidel, is stamped on the man who conscientiously withholds his support from worldly institutions, and comes forth boldly to avow the Eternal truths of the Bible? Are not the signs of the times alarming? Are not our religious rights disputed? Are not our Republican Institutions threatened, by what is called "a Christian party in politics?" Who that loves his country, or his God, can be an uninterested spectator!

It is due to the author of the following Letters, to state, that they were written by my request, and intended to comprise the substance of an address, by him delivered, before the Central New Jersey Baptist Association, and in presence of the New Jersey Baptist State Missionary Society, convened at Herberston, N. J., Oct. 1830; and although they were not written originally by him with a design of printing them, yet upon my special request, he has consented to their publication. I therefore cordially submit them to the citizens of the United States in general, and to my Baptist brethren in particular; praying that God may attend them with his divine blessing, and make them edifying to you, as they have been to me, for a dear Redeemer's sake. Amen.

GILBERT BEEBE. 1832.

LETTER I

Near Lambertsville, N. J. Nov. 20th 1830.

Brother Beebe: - Agreeable to your request, I will give you my views concerning the Witnesses and the Image of the Beast, as I partially stated them before the Central New Jersey Association.

You will recollect that in opposition to the motion to recommend the Missionary plans, &c. the ground I took was the rights of conscience. After stating the manifest evidence there was of our being conscientious in opposing these schemes, in that we did it at the expense of popularity, in the face of reproach, &c., I attempted to show that the Scripture Testimony justified our conscientious opposition to the schemes of men being introduced into the concerns of religion. In proof of this, I brought several passages from the Scriptures to show that in all our religious transactions, we are to *acknowledge* Christ as the one *King of Zion*, are to *follow* him as the *Shepherd* of his sheep, to *hear* him as our only prophet and instructor, that the apostles were commissioned to make known the regulations the King would have observed by his church, and that the *order* thus established by them is equally binding upon the Church in all ages; hence he tells his disciples that "when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory," evidently implying whenever he shall thus sit, that is, during the whole period, till his second coming, - "Ye shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Matt.19:28. Also, that to follow the directions or contrivances of men was so far to turn away from Christ. As proofs that we

are not to do this last on any consideration, I quoted Deut.13:1-5, Matt.24:23-26 & II Pet.1:19. I then said there was another kind of testimony which I should now produce from the Scriptures to the same point. This I remarked was the testimony of prophecy, which is as much the word of God, and as unchangeable as are the promises of the gospel.

I then turned to the prophecy concerning the reign of the *Beast* during *forty and two months*, Rev.13:1-10; to the prophecy of the church, under the similitude of *a woman clothed with the sun*, and being in the *wilderness*, where she hath a place prepared of God; during the period, said verse 6, to be a thousand two hundred and three score days, and verse 14, to be for a time and times and half a time, Rev. chap. 12, and to that of God's *two witnesses*, who shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and three score days, clothed in sackcloth, Rev.11: 3. I remarked that some suppose the witnesses have already been killed, but that this could not be the case, for as the periods of the reign of the *Beast*, of the Church's being in the wilderness, and of the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, are of equal length, they must, from the nature of things, have commenced about the same time, and consequently end about the same time; for the Church's fleeing into the wilderness, was in consequence of the persecution of the *Beast*, and the witnesses prophecy in sackcloth in consequence of the Church's being in the wilderness. But I would rather say, as more strictly Scriptural, that the Witnesses prophesying in sackcloth in consequence of the court that is without the temple being given to the Gentiles, and the Holy City being trodden under foot by them. This amounts to the same as the other expressions used. For the term *Gentiles*, is another name to denote the *Romish Church*, or the *Beast*, used as expressive of its having become conformed to the idolatrous Gentiles, in having borrowed so many of its ceremonies from them. By the court which is without, &c. I understand formal or nominal professors; and by the Holy City being trodden under foot by the Gentiles, I understand the true Church's being oppressed and persecuted by the *Beast*. As I remarked before the Association, it is manifest from the above consideration that the witnesses cannot as yet have been slain, because the *Beast* is still in power. In addition to the above considerations I would remark that the connection clearly proves the fall of the *Beast*, immediately after the witnesses are raised up again by the spirit of God entering into them, for, "The same hour was there a great earthquake, &c." And they will be raised just

three years and a half after they are slain; that is, *three days and a half* prophetic time. See Rev.11:11-19.

It may not be amiss here to add a few remarks relative to the different terms used to denote the period of a *thousand two hundred and sixty years*. The terms used to denote the period of the Beast's reign, are *forty and two months*, Rev.11:2 & 13:5. Hence his continuance, and the time of his treading under foot the *Holy City*, are of one length, *forty and two months*, allowing thirty days to the month, according to the ancient method of reckoning time, make just a *thousand two hundred and sixty days*, the same length of time the witnesses are to prophecy in sackcloth. Dr. Gill, if I mistake not, observes with a good deal of propriety, that the *reign* of the Beast is measured by months, to denote the Romish Church's being so much governed by the moon or months; the most of their ceremonies and holy days being governed by the moon, as was the case in reference to the Jews and the Heathen, from both of whom they borrowed ceremonies. The time of the Church being *nourished in the wilderness*, is expressed in Rev.12:14, by the terms *a time, and times, and half a time*; and in verse 6, it is said to be for *a thousand two hundred and three score days*, which shows that these different computations are of the same amount, and also that the church is to be in the wilderness, for the same period that the witnesses are to prophecy in sackcloth. Again, Daniel represents the time of the saints being given into the hands of the Beast, denoted by the *little horn*, by the same terms in substance. He says, *a time, and times, and the dividing of time*. See Dan.7: 20 – 25. By comparing this with Rev.11:2, we find also that these denote the same as *forty and two months*. Taking *a time* for a year, and *times* for two years, and the *dividing of time*, or a *half a time* for half a year, we have just *three years and a half*, which amounts to forty and two months, or a thousand two hundred and sixty days. With regard to a day, prophetic time, being taken for a year, we have an instance in Ezek.4:4-6, again in Dan.9:24-26. Seventy weeks were appointed for the coming of the Messiah, which at seven days to the week, amount to four hundred and ninety days; and the event proved it to be just four hundred and ninety years. I said nothing before the association, as to what I understood by the *two witnesses*, but perhaps you would like to know my opinion upon this point. Some have supposed that the two Testaments were meant by them; but the whole description of them, Rev. chapter 11, is too personal to admit of the idea, in my mind, of the Scriptures being intended. Others have supposed that by the *Two*, were intended the

preachers of the gospel as the one, and the Church of Christ as the other. But I think that the idea of prophesying is not applicable to the Church as such, and I cannot conceive of the Church's being *killed*; besides the state and situation of the Church during the same period, is distinctly described in the 12th chapter. I understand by the two witnesses no other than the succession of *Gospel Preachers*, to them the idea of *prophesying* as well as bearing *testimony* is properly applicable. And those who have borne faithful testimony concerning the *truth* and *order* of the gospel, not going to Mother Rome, nor to any of her *daughters*, to learn what they should *testify*, have had to prophecy, or preach under very discouraging circumstances, as far as regards their reception from the most of the professed Church of Christ. The same is still the case. Hence they *go mourning*. It is said, vs. 4, "These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth." There is in this a manifest reference to Zech.4:3,11,14. The primary design of the vision as mentioned in verses 2 & 3, was to show Zechariah, and through him Zerubbabel and Joshua, that notwithstanding their meekness and the opposition they met with, the temple should be built; and it thus would be manifested that the Lord's hand was in it. With still more propriety may it be said of the gospel church; the antitype of that temple in the building of it up, that it is "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit saith the Lord of hosts." How is this manifested? In that it has pleased the Lord to do it, instrumentally, by the *foolishness of preaching*; and as Paul says II Cor.4: 7. "We have this treasure in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." The station of the two olive trees, or as they are called, verse 12, *olive branches*, in the vision, and type, fitly illustrate the relative situation of Gospel ministers in the antitype. In the vision they are represented as standing [verse 2,] on the two sides of the *bow* that is on the top of the candlestick, and in ver.11, as standing by the two sides, the *right* and *left* of the candlestick. In the vision there is but one candlestick, but having *seven lamps*; in the case of the witnesses two candlesticks are mentioned. This difference is suited to the different state of things under the different dispensations. In the type, the Jewish Church-state, it was but one, it had no branches; yet in the vision the candlestick though *one*, had its *seven* branches, being figurative of the Gospel Church in all her fulness of branches. In Rev.11: 4, the view is adapted to the actual state of things under the gospel, the several branches of the gospel church being actually independent churches. Hence as many

candlesticks, in this case, are spoken of as *olive trees*, or *witnesses*, not to show that every preacher must have a distinct church, but that every gospel preacher stands by the side of, or in relation to a gospel church, in all his ministrations, being sent forth and constantly sustained by the fellowship of the church, as the lamp or candle is sustained by the candlestick. And as in the vision the *olive trees* stood on the sides of the bowl at the top of the candlestick, so real gospel ministers stand connected in their ministry with Christ the head of the Church, and He being the Grand Treasurer of all the gifts and grace of the church, they receive from him their ministerial gifts suited to their stations, and depend on him from time to time to fill their earthen vessels with the golden *oil* of gospel grace, or *treasure*; and which, as they receive it, they, like the olive branches, constantly empty out of themselves, for communicating light, that is, comfort and instruction to the saints, the priests of God. How different this from going to Theological Schools to get furnished for the ministry, and from standing accountable to Mission Boards, for the manner of fulfilling their ministry, and depending on them for being supported? The witnesses also empty the *oil* through the *golden pipes* of christian experience; that is, instead of lecturing upon the doctrines of the gospel, they preach the gospel in its relation to christian experience and practice.

But why are the witnesses limited to the number *two*? I answer because that by the Jewish law, two, and not less than two witnesses, were sufficient to establish any important fact; see Deut.17:6. So in this case, there is a sufficient number of faithful gospel preachers, and but a sufficiency to corroborate each others testimony. Hence they are said to be *two*, and only two.

The next things in order, will be to notice the remarks I made relative to the place and time of the witnesses being slain. But as my sheet is sufficiently filled, I will defer this to another opportunity.

I subscribe myself your brother in the trials of the gospel.

SAMUEL TROTT.

LETTER II

Near Lambertsville, N. J. Jan. 5th 1831.

Brother Beebe: - After a longer lapse of time than I had intended, I resume my pen to give you a further statement of my views relative to the *two Witnesses*, &c. Having already given my reasons for believing that the true gospel ministers are represented by these two Witnesses; I am now to notice the place and time of their being slain.

1st. The place of their being slain: I remarked before the Association, that the general notion was that the Witnesses would be slain only in those countries which are under the power of the Pope; but I presumed the place of their being slain would be that, wherein they are principally found bearing their testimony for the truth; and that as a retreat has been provided for the church, in her wilderness state, in this country, since her being driven from the valleys of Piedmont, here we of course shall find the Witnesses.

I will enlarge a little upon these several points: 1st. The notion that the Witnesses are to be killed only in the dominions of the Pope, is probably taken from what is said in Rev.11:7 & 8. "The beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit, shall make war against them and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." This being understood to be the same beast with the one described in Rev.13: 1. But I think rather that this is the same with the one described, Rev.17:3,8,14; and which is there distinguished from the church of Rome, represented by the *woman* seated upon it, and is therefore distinct from the beast in chapter 13:1. But again, another objection to the idea of the Witnesses being killed in this country, may arise from the circumstance that this beast was designed to represent the Roman Empire. It is true that the Roman Empire as the fourth beast in Daniel's vision [Dan.7:7,] is represented by each of these beasts, but by each as standing in a peculiar relation to the church of Rome. In chap. 13, as I may have occasion hereafter to illustrate, the Romish church is particularly characterized as succeeding to the seat of the Empire. But in the passages referred to in chap. 11 and 17, the Roman Empire under particular circumstances, is brought to view as sustaining that church in her bloodshed and adulteries, and raising her to power. What the particular circumstance connected with the Roman government is, which constituted it "the beast that

ascendeth out of the bottomless pit," is an important and difficult point to decide. But I will submit a few remarks upon it. The seven heads of the beast, besides representing the seven mountains or hills on which Rome was built, answered to the seven forms of government which had or should exist in that city, and "the beast that was and is not, is the eighth and is of the seven," Rev.17:9,11. Hence it was neither of the seven forms of government as such, which constituted this beast. And yet it is said, the beast *was*, whilst the sixth head was still in power, and therefore before the seventh or eighth had succeeded; consequently before the Pope had arrived to his power. A particular difficulty in deciding upon this subject arises from the two dates which present themselves to our minds, either of which might be supposed the one assumed in this description of the beast, namely; the period at which the revelation was made to John, or the period at which the church of Rome shall be seen riding into power as the eighth head or form of government. The idea perhaps, which would be the most readily received, is that the period at which the Apostle wrote, was the date here assumed; hence the Imperial is considered the sixth form of government; that is, that the Pagan Emperors constituted the sixth head. But what in this case, should this beast be, that it was then said, it "was and is not." If the Roman power as such be supposed to be the beast, it was then but just passing the meridian of its glory; if the persecuting edicts of the Emperors, be supposed to constitute this beast, John was at this time suffering under them in his banishment to the Isle of Patmos. Besides, I think it would be difficult for anyone to show in what sense either, could be that, on which the church of Rome rode into power, or was seated. I am therefore, from these and other considerations, led to the conclusion, that the time of the beast of chap. 13, "rising up out of the sea," or of Popery's coming into power, was the period or date assumed. Indeed I think the kingly government of the Ostrogoths, which succeeded the fall of the Western Empire, properly constituted the sixth distinct form of government; and the provincial government under the Eastern Emperors which followed, was of course the seventh. If we consider that union of Church and State which was established by Constantine, as represented by this beast, we shall find the description given of it to correspond. This union was certainly sufficiently irrational to be viewed as beastly; and it must have been a device of hell, [certainly not of heaven] and therefore "ascended out of the bottomless pit." And it was manifestly this *union* which raised the church of Rome to its worldly power; she is therefore fitly represented as seated upon this

beast. Again viewing this union as constituting the beast "that shall ascend out of the bottomless pit," and at the time, which I have supposed assumed as the date of the prophecy, it might correctly be said, "The beast that was" – it had existed under the reign of the latter Emperors – and is not – this union not existing in form, that is, by law, under the Ostrogothic kings – and yet is – for the power and wealth which had been lavished on the churches and Bishops, especially on the church and Bishops of Rome, gave a worldly influence, still increasing through their artfulness, beyond even what they had possessed under the Emperors – "and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit." This *union* being still to be more completely manifested as the *birth* of hell, and as a scarlet colored or bloody beast, when the Popes should assume the temporal government of Rome and the adjacent districts and should exercise an authority over the kings of the earth, equal to what the Caesars had possessed. Hence the Popish, should then become an eighth form of government, and yet completely identified with the seven, being still the government of Rome. Hence also in the 11th verse, the Popish power is designated by this same Beast; this Beast existing in its fullest rage in that power; and also in chap. 13: 1, by a similar Beast. As this union of Church and State, of Religion with Politics, constitutes this Beast; wherever this union has existed there we have seen this Beast red with the blood of saints. Should this union then once be formed, directly or indirectly, in this country, here the Beast will be found, ready to devour the Witnesses. "The streets of the great city which spiritually is called Sodom," &c., may denote those places, where the power of Antichrist is publicly displayed, whether that power be displayed in a mitred head, or in a more complex form, like Missionary Conventions or a Sunday School Union; as the streets of Rome was the place where the Roman Emperors used to display their power and glory. To this application, the description given, will be found by a little reflection, to correspond.

2nd. To the remark I made before the Association; namely, *That the witnesses would be killed wherever they are principally to be found*, I will just add, that it appears to me a self-evident proposition, if the Witnesses be, *both to be killed*, that wherever the principal portion of them may be found; bearing their testimony; there they will be killed.

3rd. The conclusion that they are principally to be found in this country, because here the church is sheltered in her *wilderness* state, is, I still think, a correct one. For those who are witnesses for gospel truth and order will of course be found

standing in gospel order. If so, they will have their standing in connection with *gospel churches*; the churches being the candlesticks from which the gospel light is to shine forth.

The same facts which I noticed in the former letter as proving that the Witnesses had not as yet been *killed*, prove that the Church is still in the wilderness. This being admitted, and the Church of Christ being found in this country, it will, or ought to be admitted, that she is here in her wilderness state, as in other places where she is found. But the idea which I advanced before the Association was, that this is peculiarly the place of her retreat, since her expulsion from the valleys of Piedmont. To this point I will confine the few remarks I shall offer upon this subject. I have not found the idea thus advanced, simply upon the fact that her situation is in the wilderness, for that might denote no more than that she is in a scattered and oppressed situation, but what I principally rest it upon, is, that which is said in Rev.12: 6. "And the woman fled into the wilderness where she hath a place prepared of God," &c. It is this *prepared* place that I lay the chief stress upon. That the valleys of Piedmont were a place prepared of God for the retreat of his Church, from the rage of the Beast, is generally admitted. But the time; times and half a time, that the church was to be *nourished from the face of the Serpent* were not ended when she was driven from this place of refuge; for, as I have already showed, her time of being in the wilderness, or of being *fed* in her prepared place, must run nearly parallel with the Beast's being in power. Where then shall we find a prepared place, after the former retreat was broken up? Europe, even including England, did not afford a place where she might be in safety from persecution. But when we turn our eyes to America, we discover not only a retreat, but a place bearing evident marks of having been prepared of God. Roger Williams, as early as in 1644, had obtained from the Earl of Warwick, a free charter for the now State of Rhode Island, by which equal freedom was secured to all religious denominations. This was eleven years previous to the severe destruction of the Waldenses in 1655; and forty-two years previous to the final expulsion from the valleys of Piedmont by the French armies. The religious freedom secured in the charter granted to Rhode Island and Providence plantations, was such as had never before been enjoyed by any State or Kingdom. And certainly the hand of God must be acknowledged as peculiarly manifested in providing this asylum for his oppressed church. The subsequent dispensations of God towards this country, in granting us a free national constitution, and in continuing us in the

enjoyment of the liberty thus granted; whilst the other nations of the earth, all have been burdened with religious establishments, speaks volumes to me, in confirmation of the fact, that this is a place *prepared* of God as a retreat for his Church from the thralldom and persecution of the *Mother of Harlots*, and of her daughters, however different others may view this subject. Indeed, I have in times past thought, that as God hath hitherto preserved our government from giving its power to the Beast, by intermeddling with religion, the whole storm raised by the Beasts, and which will terminate in their destruction, would pass by without molesting us. But I now see several reasons for altering my opinion. One, besides that already noticed, I will mention. The visible church, having been greatly prospered in this good land, with increase and peace, has like her prototype Jeshurun "waxed fat and kicked," she has become weary of the government of Zion's King, and is desirous of being like the nations, or religious sects around, and of choosing a king from among them.

2nd. The time of the Witnesses being slain. We are told, Rev.11: 7, that "when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them." That is, as I understand it, when they shall have prophesied during the period mentioned, verse 3, of a thousand two hundred and sixty days, or years. If then we would fix with certainty upon the time at which this period commenced, there would be no difficulty in calculating when it would end. It is evident however, that it will end at least three years and a half before the reign of the beast terminates, as for that length of time their dead bodies are to be unburied previous to their being raised up again. It is also manifest that there is such an intimate connection between the witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, and the reign of the beast, as that the one could not have long preceded the other in its commencement. Hence I remarked before the Association, that as it was generally acknowledged, the beast must have been fully manifested when the Pope was declared Universal Bishop, by the Emperor Phocas, in the year 606, his reign must of course terminate in 1866, and therefore as the Witnesses must be slain at least three years and a half previous, it cannot be more than thirty-two of three years before this event will take place. I made these observations, and left it for them to enquire for themselves, how this Divine prophecy would correspond with their boasted triumph of the Sunday School and Mission cause over every obstacle, till they shall have brought in *full orb'd*, the latter day glory. I moreover stated certain reasons I had

for believing that the reign of the Beast must have commenced at a still earlier period. But as my sheet is full, I must defer the recital of them till another opportunity.

I remain yours,
SAMUEL TROTT.

LETTER III

Near Lambertsville, N. J. Jan. 29th 1831.

Brother Beebe: - Agreeably to the remarks at the conclusion of my last letter, I will now state some of those circumstances which led me to think that the reign of the Beast, or the thousand two hundred and sixty days, or years commenced at an earlier period than A D. 606.

1st. I would observe that the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, which I think the sixth head of the beast, or distinct form of government established over Rome, ended A D. 552. Then the *seventh* head, or a provincial government, under the Eastern Emperors commenced. For though the Lombards afterwards got possession of the greater part of Italy, yet they did not of Rome, nor of Ravenna, the residence of the *Exarch*, the provincial governor. Indeed at this time the Bishops of Rome seem to have exercised the principal jurisdiction over Rome both civil and ecclesiastical, and therefore was in this sense of the *seven*, or as many understand it, the *seventh* head.

2nd. The Western or Roman Empire was conquered, and divided into ten distinct kingdoms, signified by the *Ten horns*, both of John's Beasts and of Daniel's fourth Beast, as early as A.D. 486, and hence the way was prepared for the *little horn* of Daniel to spring up. Dr. Robertson, as quoted by Jones in his history of the Waldenses, says, "Such however, was the extensive influence of the Papal intrigues, that there were few among the princes of the Western Empire, that were not virtually brought into a state of subjection to the authority of the Bishops of Rome, before the close of the fifth century." And during the sixth century we find not only the Bishops of Constantinople contending for the honor of an equal dignity with the Bishops of Rome, and also Kings and Emperors striving to resist the power of the Bishops of Rome; from all which, it is evident that the *little horn*, during this century, had arisen with a mouth speaking great things, &c., although its power was not as yet admitted by all, neither had the *three horns* fallen before it. See Dan.7: 20-24.

3rd. The event of the *taking away the daily sacrifice*, and the *setting up the abomination that maketh desolate*, spoken of by Daniel chap.8:11-13, 11:31, & 12:11. These passages appear to have a threefold reference: 1st. The expressions as they stand in chapters 8 & 11, primarily related to the taking of Jerusalem and polluting the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. 2nd. They also applied to the taking of Jerusalem by the Romans. See Matt.24:15. The *abomination* in this case designing the images of the eagle on the Roman standards. And 3rd. To the establishing of the power of the beast. See Dan.12:11. It is in reference to this third application that I would consider these expressions. The *abomination that maketh desolate*, in the former applications referred to the setting up of images, and before the conclusion of the sixth century, we not only find images set up in most of the churches, and in some instances worshipped, but also that the worshipping of relics, and praying to departed saints, &c., had come into general use. If the setting up of those things was not an abomination according to the Old Testament use of that word, I know not what would be. And these absurd rites, certainly made *desolate* the churches where they obtained of everything like pure and vital religion; and became the rallying point for desolating the assemblies of the real saints, for the observance of them was the standard of orthodoxy, and the non-observance of them the ground for persecution.

Again, the *Mass* was substituted in the place of the Lord's Supper by Gregory the Great, before the conclusion of the sixth century. In submitting to this innovation, the Roman worshippers lost sight of the one complete sacrifice made by the Lord Jesus Christ, as taught in the Lord's Supper. Hence the *daily sacrifice* may be said to have been *taken away*. At any rate, if these circumstances, without the grant of the Emperor Phocas, be not considered as completely establishing the Pope as the Beast, still they are such as irresistibly lead us to the conclusion, that the Church of Christ, not being able to submit to such abominations, had before this period, [that is, A D. 600] separated themselves from all connection with those who submitted to the power of the Roman Pontiffs. Accordingly, Mosheim speaking of the Donatists, a sect whom in conformity to the Catholics, he terms heretics, but who are by Jones, in his history, represented as a body of christians who had two or three hundred years before this separated from the established church on account of its impurity, and had hitherto kept themselves from the corruptions of the Catholics, though having their churches intermixed among the others, especially in Africa, and had adhered to the doctrines and ordinances of

the gospel. Mosheim, I say, speaking of these says, "In this century the church of the Donatists dwindled away to nothing, and after this period no traces of it are any where to be found." This he ascribes to the success of Gregory's schemes to put them down. But from what he just before says of them, I can account for their thus disappearing only upon the ground of their having retired from the storm into the wilderness. And they in all probability, passed over into Spain, and from thence into the valleys of Piedmont. See Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. Cent. 6th. Part 2nd. ch. 5th.

Another circumstance which leads me to expect the termination, at least, of the wilderness state of the Church, if not of the reign of the beast before A D. 1866, arises from two prophecies in Daniel. The one is found Dan.8:13,14, where we have a period of two thousand and three hundred days, given for the *daily sacrifice to be taken away*, [as in vs. 11] and the *sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot*. At the termination of this period the sanctuary is to be *cleansed*. The vision which Daniel relates in this chapter seems to be a more particular description of some of the events included in the vision of the four beasts, as in the preceding chapter. The *Little Horn* of this vision, no doubt, primarily represented Antiochus Epiphenes, who was an eminent type of Antichrist, or the beast from the *bottomless pit*. And therefore whilst the days of this prophecy, taken literally, may designate the time of Antiochus' assaults upon the Jews, the same, taken prophetically will denote that number of years, and point out the period when the Church of Christ, the antitype of the sanctuary, shall be purged, from the errors she has contracted from antichrist, and be seen coming up out of the wilderness. And if this period commenced with the commencement of the 70 weeks, or 490 years of chap.9:25-27, [which seems the proper period to date its beginning, since the vision commences with the dominion of the Medes and Persians,] and recollect that the 490 years terminated with the crucifixion of Christ, A.D. 32, that is, allowing for the four years of error in the beginning of the christian era, we shall find the 2300 years terminating A D. 1842. Thus subtracting 32 from 490 leaves 458, which taken from 2300, leaves 1842.

The other prophecy is contained in Dan.12:6-12. It appears to me evident that this prophecy embraces in its scope the deliverance of the Church from the oppression of the beast, and the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and their subsequent conversion. And to this last event I consider the third period, or *one thousand three hundred and five and thirty days* as referring. Hence the expression, in reference to

Daniel's people, *blessed is he that waiteth and cometh*, &c. Consequently the second period, or thousand two hundred and ninety days of vs. 11, must refer to the destruction of the Mahometan power, preparatory to the restoration of the Jews. And *the time, times and a half* or thousand two hundred and sixty days, of vs. 7, is, as in other parallel passages, to be referred to the deliverance of the gospel church. If then we may suppose that the reign of the Eastern Antichrist, or Mahometan power is, as is generally admitted, of the same duration as that of the Western or Papal Antichrist, that is, a thousand two hundred and sixty years; then as the Mahometan era commenced in A D. 612, it must terminate in A D. 1872. Consequently the thousand two hundred and ninety days will then end. Hence as the *scattering of the power of the holy people*, or the oppression of the church of Christ, will terminate thirty years earlier, it must terminate in A D. 1842; the same time at which the 2300 days, according to the preceding calculation, end. And therefore the 1260 years of the church's being in the wilderness, must have commenced in A D. 582. From the circumstance of these two prophecies, which commence at different times terminating at the same time, one might conclude, that this is the important period, when the wilderness state of the church shall end, or at least when the last scattering of the holy people shall take place in the slaying of the witnesses. But still I must confess that I do not feel all that confidence in this calculation which I could wish. Did it terminate ten years later, that is, in 1852 instead of 42, I should feel more confidence in its correctness. For the pontificate of Gregory the Great, that is, from A D. 590 to 600 appears to me as the more probable period during which the Church retired to the wilderness. On the other hand, I know not what more consistent references can be made of these prophecies, if we allow them to have any reference to gospel times, nor what more correct calculations can be made upon the dates therein given. And from their connection with the other prophecies of Daniel, I do think they have a reference to gospel times. Indeed allowing 1842 to be the period of slaying the witnesses, as hinted above, then '45 or 6 would be the time of their being raised, and it might still be 5 or 6 years more before the church would clearly be manifested as coming up out of the wilderness. And although the tenth part of the city shall fall at the time of the witnesses rising, still it might not be before 1866 that Babylon would be utterly thrown down. {*On further reflection it appears to me evident, that as A D. 606 was the period, not when the Popes of Rome first assumed the prerogative of being universal Bishop, but when

their arrogant pretensions were confirmed by the decree of the Emperor, so the termination of the 1260 years from that date, that is, 1866, will be the period when the ten horns, or kingly powers into which that empire was divided, shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate, &c. Rev.17:16. Hence as the killing and raising of the witnesses, the great earthquake, by which a tenth part of the city shall fall; the sounding of the seventh angel, and the proclamations that the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, &c. see Rev.11:7-15, must all precede the final destruction of the beast; they must of course take place before A D. 1866.} And this having different beginnings and terminations to the period of a prophecy, is not uncommon. Thus the 70 years of the Babylonish captivity, may be referred to different dates for its commencement, according to the difference of captives being carried away from Jerusalem, and to each of these captives there was a correspondent returning of the Jews from Babylon as under Zerubbabel, Ezra &c.

I am now to give my views of the Image of the Beast, and the probable manner of the witnesses being slain in this country. But before proceeding to this I will close this letter with some additional remarks relative to the witnesses being slain in this country. Since writing the last letter I have had an opportunity of examining Dr. Gill on the subject, and he has helped me to some additional reasons for believing my position correct, although contrary to his design.

He, speaking upon the dead bodies of the witnesses being in the street of the great city, &c. [Rev.11:8,] observes that, "As the street of a city denotes a public open place in it, a place of concourse and resort, the dead bodies of these witnesses being said to lie here, may denote the publicness of their silence, disgrace and contempt." Now is not this country completely like a public street in this respect, being a place of free and public resort for persons from all the nations of Europe? And the event of the witnesses being put down here, would be more generally noticed and gloried in, than the same event in any other place, because the eyes of all Europe are upon us, watching the movements of our government.

Again, the Doct. remarks, "Or else this street may design some part of the Romish jurisdiction, and Great Britain may be particularly designed; for where should the dead bodies of the witnesses lie but where they are slain; and where are they, at least where are so many as in these islands?" Dr. Gill did not live in this day, to be acquainted with the spread of the gospel of these United States. But to pursue his remarks, he adds, "It may be objected that Great Britain is not a part of

the sea of Rome, does not belong to the jurisdiction of it. To this it may be replied, that in this last war of the Beast, the outer Court will be given to the Gentiles, the bulk of the reformed churches will fall off to Popery, and their countries again fall into the hands of the Pope, and among the rest Great Britain." I have no doubt that the British Government, and the other Protestant governments of Europe will again give their power to the Beast, for a little season, being of the original *ten kingdoms or horns* into which the Roman Empire was divided. But instead of the bulk of the reformed churches, either in Europe or in this country, *going off to Popery*, I think it a far more probable supposition, that they will be engaged in erecting the Image of the Beast and giving life and power to it. Again, the Doct. says, "The fears of Dr. Goodwin seem to be too just and well grounded, that the prophecy in Dan.11:45 respects our island, which speaks of Antichrist planting the tabernacle of his palaces between the seas in the glorious holy mountain, or the mountain of delights, &c. Now where has God such a mountain of delight, or a people that are the darling of his soul as here? Where in all the globe is such a spot where God has so many saints?" To these several questions I answer that the United States in all these surpass Great Britain. And certainly there is no country like this so much a *mountain of delights*, where God has delighted to shower down blessings both spiritual and temporal, and to crown them with civil and religious liberty. Dr. Gill further asks, "What place between the seas is there to which these characters can agree but Great Britain?" "Here then," says he, "Antichrist will plant the tabernacle, &c., but it will be but a tabernacle or tent; it will be but for a short time, as it follows, *yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him.*" It is true that Great Britain is an island *in* the sea; but the expression *between* the seas, does not appear to me a natural description of its situation. But when we recollect that in Scripture language the *ocean* is called *sea*, we have but to look on the map of North America to be convinced how appropriate the above expressions are to the situation of the United States.

We see our country completely between the seas, extending its borders from shore to shore completely from the Atlantic across to the Pacific. And may I not retort the question and ask, what other country is situated like this, between the seas? But by Antichrist, as the antitype of Antiochus, whose reign is described in that 11th chap. of Daniel, from ver. 21 to the end; I understand it not in the limited sense, as denoting a beast, that arose from the sea, Rev.13:1, but in his more

general opposition, as designated by the beast from the *bottomless pit*, as described in the preceding letter.

Yours affectionately,
SAMUEL TROTT.

LETTER IV

Near Lambertsville, N. J. Feb. 17th 1831.

Brother Beebe: - My views of the *Image of the Beast* come now in course. But to arrive at this, it will be necessary previously to notice the two Beasts mentioned in the preceding part of the chap. [Rev.13] And as the views I have of the several parts of this chapter, differ considerably from the exposition which Dr. Gill gives of this part of the prophecy, and which is generally received by the Baptists as correct; it is incumbent on me to state some of my reasons for dissenting from him.

According to the Doctor, the first beast, or the one with seven heads, designs the temporal power of the Pope; the second beast, designs his spiritual power, and the Image of the Beast designs the whole of Popery, or what was denoted by the two beasts. It requires but a little discerning comparison of this exposition with what is said in the scriptures concerning these several things, to discover its total inconsistency. In the first place, he makes the Pope or beast to arise to his temporal power, and to receive from the *dragon his power, seat, &c.*, of course to rule over the nations in temporals, before ever he is seen arising in his ecclesiastical or spiritual tyranny; whereas it is manifest that it was by the exercise of their ecclesiastical tyranny, that the Bishops of Rome arrived at their temporal authority. Secondly, it is evident that the description of this beast as given from the 4th to the 8th verses, can only relate to the ecclesiastical usurpations of the Pope. It is as the *successor of Peter, vicegerent of God, &c.*, that the Pope is worshipped. As such he assumes those blasphemous titles, &c., alluded to in the declaration, that he *opened his mouth in blasphemies against God, &c.* And it was only in this relation that *power was given him over all kindreds and tongues*; for as a temporal sovereign he at most exercised a jurisdiction over three of the *ten kingdoms*, into which the Empire was divided, denoted by three horns being plucked up by the roots before him. Dan.7:8. And this indeed the Doctor evidently explains the verses referred to. Thirdly, Dr. Gill, in order to carry out his views, remarking on ver.11, which begins thus: "And I

beheld another beast coming up out of the earth," &c., immediately subjoins, "the same with the first, only in another form; the same for being and person, &c." I have not much confidence in that exposition, which directly contradicts the declaration of the text. The Scripture not only directly calls it another beast, but describes its origin as different, being from the earth, whereas the other was out of the sea, and the description goes on to represent it as distinct from the first beast; speaking of it as directing an image to be made of that beast, &c.

Fourthly, his explaining the Image of the Beast, as designing, either image worship, which was introduced, or the two beasts combined, I am sure can never be received as consistent, by any but by those who read the exposition as though it must be true, because the production of a great man, and who therefore do not step to examine for themselves.

I will now give briefly as I can, my views of these beasts and the Image. The beast which *ascendeth out of the bottomless pit*, I have already spoken of as distinct from these beasts, and as denoting Antichrist; as he is the more generally manifested, being arrayed against the kingdom of Christ.

Antichrist, as assuming the name of christian, in distinction from the Jewish and Pagan Antichrists, was first manifested, systematically arrayed against that kingdom which is *not of this world*, in the national establishment of Constantine.

The beast which John saw *arise out of the sea*, and which is described in this 13th chapter [Rev.13:1-10,] I think denotes Popery in all its power. It is said to *rise out of the sea*, to denote its coming into power out of that convulsion of the nations occasioned by the influx of the barbarians, which was indeed comparable only to the commotion of the troubled ocean. See Rev.17:15. He has the *seven heads and ten horns* of the beast from the *bottomless pit*, to show not only that he occupied the same seat with that beast in his previous manifestation, namely: Rome; but also that in this beast Antichrist was most fully and distinctly manifested. He is represented as having in part the likeness of the leopard, the bear, the lion and the dragon, to show that he was the antitype of the *little horn* of Daniel's vision, and also that this was the intervening general *power*, before which the nations of the earth should bow, between those four extensive monarchies, and the universal establishment of the kingdom of Christ on the earth, signified in the vision, by the coming of the ancient *of days*, and the judgment being given to the

saints of the Most High, &c. See Dan.7:14 & 22. It's further said that the *dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority*. By the dragon I understand with Dr. Gill, Satan as he was enthroned in the Pagan Empire, and as he continued to annoy the church through the influence and opposition of Paganism; which power and authority, together with his seat – Rome – he transferred to Popery when that arose, and now waged war through this channel against the saints and Church of God. John further had a view of one of the *heads* of this beast, as *wounded to death*, and again of this *deadly wound* as being healed. Dr. Gill thinks that this denoted the destruction of the imperial government, which he considers the *sixth head* of the beast; and that the healing of this wound, was the introduction of Popery. The Doctor must have forgotten that he had already given it as his opinion that the whole beast which John saw *rise out of the sea* designed Popery in its secular power, and that he had assigned several reasons to show that this beast could not be designed to denote the Roman Empire, and that among other reasons assigned, he remarked that the arising of this beast, was showed to John as something future, whereas the Roman Empire was already in power, and also that the duration of this beast, be *forty and two months*, did not agree with the time of the Roman Empire. It is very strange that the wounding of one of the heads of this beast, should denote an event which took place before the beast came into existence. Besides if this beast had been in existence when the Roman Empire was overturned, the forty and two months of its duration must have expired before this time. Further, it does not appear very consistent, that the *sixth head*, should be represented as being healed when according to the Doctor's exposition, it was totally taken away, and what he considers the *seventh head*, brought into power. The healing of this head, whatever it be, must denote the restoring of the same head to its power. Dr. Gill afterwards notices with some approbation, the opinion of some, that the wounding of this head, denoted the wound given to Popery by the Reformation. But that wound has never been healed, besides it was not properly a wound inflicted by a *sword*. I should suppose by his *head's* being wounded, &c., that we are to understand the wounding of the power of the beast in some shape, and I think by the expression, *one of his heads*, we may understand, that usurped headship, or influence, which the Popes held over the kingdoms of Europe, in distinction from their authority over the *Catholic* church. Hence, as I remarked before the Central N. J. Association, I think there has no event taken place since the establishment

of Popery, which bears any comparison to the wound which Bonaparte gave to the power of the Pope, especially if we allow, as I have just supposed, that by this *head* we are to understand the secular power of the Pope, or the superiority he assumed over the kings of Europe. Bonaparte certainly did, by his *sword*, completely prostrate that power, so as to oblige the Pope to submit to his will. And this wound has since been healed; that is, the Pope's authority has been re-established over those States which were previously under it.

The Beast which arose out of the earth having two horns like a lamb, as already intimated, I consider to be, as the text describes it, *another Beast*, that is, a Beast distinct from the first.

I did not state before the Association what I considered this Beast to be. And indeed I feel a delicacy in giving my opinion now, upon it, not only because of its being so new, but also on account of the violent opposition it will meet with, should it be generally known; and still more because I suppose it will be construed, though unjustly, as unchristianizing all who have been connected with this Beast. {*The fact that from the commencement of the reformation, down to this time, many eminent christians, including Luther, at any rate, in the number, if not Calvin, have belonged to those churches which make up the two horned Beast, I gladly acknowledge. But I at the same time confidently believe, the time not to be far distant, when all *real believers* will be brought out of them, either by death, or by being convinced of the errors on which they are founded, and those churches will then be left mere loathsome carcasses, made up wholly of carnal professors. Why the Lord has suffered his true visible church, so long to languish, and to be composed of so small a company of the poor of the flock, whilst so great a number of his heaven born children, have been permitted to turn aside to the flocks of his companions, must remain a mystery, at least till the time of the sounding of the seventh Angel. See Rev.10:7,11 & 15. Yet when we discover from prophecy, the purpose of God, to suffer his church to remain in this oppressed wilderness state during the thousand two hundred and sixty years, we see the necessity of her remaining for that period, *a little flock*, and consequently of a great portion of her Lord's children, being suffered to treat her with neglect and contempt. Unless we were to suppose that during this period the salvation of God was narrowed down to a much smaller compass, than we would wish to believe the case, or than we have reason to believe.} But as the Beast has been particularly described by Divine inspiration, and as I think I discover it; well answering

the description, existing among us, {and I have had it for several years under consideration} I will state my opinion. Should I be mistaken; it will not be more than has happened to others who have given their views of prophecy. Neither will my views of this Beast be more unpopular than were the views which the Waldenses, in their day, held concerning Anti-Christ or the Beast; the correctness of which, every year's experience since, has confirmed. In a word, I consider the *Reformation*, or the *Reformed Churches*, designed by the *two horned Beast*. Its description: It was seen *coming up out of the earth*. By the earth in chap.12, as distinguished from heaven, I understand the Romish Church, as distinguished from the Gospel Church. "There was war in heaven ... and the dragon, that old serpent ... was cast out into the earth." Dr. Gill explains this of the dragon's being driven out from the throne of the Empire, by Constantine becoming christian, &c.; hence he had power only with the baser class of the inhabitants. If this was the case, how had he power to persecute the woman, the church of Christ? See ver.13. In some other parts of the New Testament, heaven denotes the gospel Church; understanding it used in this sense here; then whilst the visible gospel Church remained connected with the establishment, the dragon had influence in the Church to raise up wars, as in the case of the Arian heresy, &c. But when the true Church was separated from the establishment, the dragon was left with only the earthly or carnal part of professors; hence he ceased to raise wars in the establishment, and used his influence to raise persecutions against the Donatists and other members and churches which had separated from the establishment. It is true that in the estimation of carnal professors it would rather appear that Michael and his angels were cast out, than that the dragon was; but not so in the estimation of the children of grace. To be permitted to meet with brethren whom they fellowshiped, separated from others, and to have that worship unclogged with that mass of human inventions which had been obtained in the worship of the *establishment* was cause of rejoicing and praise to the poor Donatists, even whilst persecuted. Hence I feel justified in supposing that by the *earth*, out of which this Beast arose, we are to understand the Catholic Church as distinguished from the Gospel Church. And it is a well known fact that the Reformed Churches came out of this corrupt Catholic Church. They carry the mark of their origin from *this earth* in their frontlets, by denominating themselves *Reformed Churches*. Secondly, this Beast has *two horns like a lamb*, by which I understand Luther and Calvin, the two eminent leaders of the Reformation. These horns were

indeed lamblike; for they appeared to be, and indeed were, in several respects contending for the simplicity of the gospel of Christ. "And he spake as a dragon." The language of the dragon was, that all should be conformed to him in religion. So said the Reformers, Luther and Calvin; they could give no toleration to the poor Anabaptists, nor to any that differed from them. The same language has in times past, been held, by all the Reformed churches where they have had power to exercise this dragon-like disposition. We see the Lutheran historian, Mosheim, whilst he in one case, vol.4, pgs. 442 & 443, more than half acknowledges the Anabaptists to be the descendants of the Waldenses, yet he gives currency to almost every base calumny against them, and what is wanting in him is fully supplied by his Calvinistic translator, Maclain, in his notes. Mosheim represents these Anabaptists as suffering death in its worst forms in all the countries of Europe, and preferring it to a retraction of what he calls their errors. And this suffering was under penal laws in the enacting of which, the Lutheran state of Saxony, took the lead, and was followed by other states and among the rest, the Calvinistic magistrates of Switzerland, and the Hollanders. See notes to pg. 419, vol. 4. Again he tells us, pg. 498, "There were certain sects and doctors against whom the zeal, vigilance and severity of Catholics, Lutherans and Calvinists, were united, and in opposing whose settlement and progress, these three communions, forgetting their dissensions, joined their most vigorous counsels and endeavors. The objects of their common aversion were the Anabaptists and those who denied the Divinity of Christ, and a Trinity of persons in the Godhead." This I think was speaking like *the dragon*; but witness further, the putting to death of Servetus by Calvin, and the persecution of the Dissenters by the Church of England, and of the Baptists and Quakers by the Congregationalists in New England.

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first Beast before him." 1st. In requiring the temporal authorities to compel by law the observance of their religious forms. 2nd. In raising the ministry, above the churches, and transferring to them principally the government of the churches. 3rd. In requiring the ministry to be supported by taxes levied upon all classes of people. 4th. In claiming the direction of the consciences and the pastoral care over all persons, from the infant upwards, within the bounds of their parishes. All which has been practiced by the Reformed churches. Hence the Reformers retained the beastly nature of the Catholic church; in that they taught a union of the church and the world, and of the kingdom of Christ with the government of the world.

“And causeth the earth and them which dwell therein, to worship the first Beast whose deadly wound was healed.” There is certainly some difficulty with me in deciding as to the precise meaning of the Holy Spirit in this passage. By “the earth and them which dwell therein,” we may understand as before, the Catholic Church, and those dwelling in Catholic countries. Previous to the Reformation it appears that in all the countries of Europe there were many persons groaning under the civil and ecclesiastical tyranny with which they were burdened. When the Reformation broke out, many supposed they were now to be relieved. Hence the commotion at Munster which the Paedobaptists talk so much about as being the origin of the Baptists. But when the Reformers and those Governments connected with them, instead of soothing the wounded feelings of these persons who had been goaded on by oppression to excesses, by giving them assurances of the enjoyment of a liberty consistent with the spirit of the gospel, they calumniated them as enemies to all government, and then made use of armed force to put them down; and when afterwards the Reformation settled down in religious establishments without any toleration to dissenters, it seemed to blast the hopes, and dispirit the minds of those, who had been looking for relief; and led all dwelling in Catholic countries, excepting such as had an experimental acquaintance with the Kingdom of Christ, tamely to settle down in submission to Popery. Or by the “earth and them,” &c., we may understand, the governments of the world and the subjects thereof. And though the reformed churches are distinct from the Catholic, as the daughters are distinct from their mother; yet they have brought so much from their mother church, which is contrary to the work of God, that none can implicitly submit to what they have taught, without in effect acknowledging the supremacy of the Church of Rome. As for instance, the doctrine concerning the divine right of kings to govern. From whom did they obtain this right? From no other than the pope, who established all the original reigning dynasties of Europe; that is, of all the ancient ten kingdoms. The establishing of religion by laws, and giving governmental preference to specific forms, embracing particular creeds, &c., has the same origin with the preceding. The same may be said of the superiority of the ministry over the churches; and of their being acknowledged as a *clerical* class; of the ministry being supported by legal provisions; of infant membership; of changing the ordinance of baptism into sprinkling; of implicitly confiding in the instruction of the *clergy* because of their peculiar learning, and other things which

might be named. And all the civilized governments, other than the Catholic and Greek, with the exception of our own, have been influenced to respect these things under one modification or another as of divine origin, whereas they wholly emanated from Popery. And it seems they are determined to give our government no rest, till they shall have inducted it into these principles, by causing it to establish by law, the first day of the week, as the sabbath, or at least, to give a legal preference to those who thus regard the *first day*; and it is very doubtful whether they stop here. Indeed the causing *the earth and them that dwell therein, &c.*, may imply that all the governments, and all the carnal professors, within the *range* of this Beast, will submit to this order of things. Yea it may have special reference to our government; for the other governments have only been caused to continue their homage to the Beast.

And he doeth great wonders, *so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men*. I do not understand by this, material fire; but as the fire coming down and consuming the sacrifices of Elijah was a decisive evidence that he was the prophet of the true God; so the accompanying of the preached word, by the power of the Holy Ghost, so as to make the word as the *fire and the hammer* to break *the rock in pieces*, is an evidence that the Lord owns the word preached, and is generally considered an evidence that he owns the preacher. But this is not a fire which the Lord sends down; it is a fire which the Beast *maketh come down*. Hence it must refer to those great revivals which the preachers of some of the reformed churches are so famous for getting up and carrying on by human exertion, and which like the fire in the case of Elijah, even burn up the stones and the dust, and lick up the water, or seem so to do. And these revivals are in the sight of men; they are public things. They not only are frequently appealed to as evidences of God's peculiar favor to that church, to this and that doctrine, and are trumpeted abroad; but they are viewed in this light by the multitude. Hence it is said in the next verse, *and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth, by the means of those miracles {or wonders} which he had power to do in the sight of the Beast*.

We thus come to the direction which this Beast gives, to make an *Image, &c.*, the examination of which I shall again have to defer to another letter.

I remain your friend and brother,
SAMUEL TROTT.

LETTER V

Welsh Tract, Cooch's Bridge, New Castle County,
Delaware, June 24th 1831.

Brother Beebe: - I again proceed in the prosecution of my object. That which next comes under consideration, is the direction which the *two horned* Beast gives to them that dwell on the earth, saying unto them that they should *make an image to the Beast which had a wound by a sword and did live*.

We will notice first, the persons to whom the direction was given, namely; *them that dwell on the earth*. By the *earth* here, I think certainly, we cannot understand the Romish church, nor by the persons intended, the members of that church, or the inhabitants of popish countries; because it is inconsistent to suppose, that the reformed churches should have the influence, implied in this direction, over the Catholics. And the difficulty is not diminished, by supposing with Dr. Gill, that the Beast here speaking designed the Popish powers; for neither the Popes, nor the church of Rome have ever manifested any disposition to divert the obedience or worship of mankind from that establishment to anything else, nor has the church of Rome ever represented itself to be the image of a preceding power, but constantly affirms, that it is the original church, and in it is invested the original, and supreme power established by Christ on earth. Hence the solicitude manifested to confine the obedience of mankind, not excepting the kings of the earth, to popery itself. And herein is the inconsistency of the Doctor's exposition of this thing. I therefore understand by the expression *them that dwell on the earth*, earthly minded professors of the true church, or those dwelling interspersed among the earthly churches. And the same are the persons deceived by the *miracles* which this Beast had power to do.

I will now state what I understand by the Image of the Beast that had a *wound with the sword and did live*; and wherein it is already manifested. The first Beast according to the views I have already expressed concerning it, denotes the whole of popery. This Beast is in every instance described as a monster. In Dan. chap.7, the Beast from whence the *little horn*, by which Popery was designed, arose, is a nameless thing. So in this 13th chapter of Revelation, this Beast is represented as blending in its composition all that is most terrible in the beastly creation. And popery indeed, embraces in its constitution all that is represented by the Beast of Daniel. We see in it the *iron mixed with the miry clay*. It pretends to

power and authority derived directly from God, and yet depends on human governments, human force, the influence of money, and on intrigue and cruelty to maintain its authority. It pretends to be the church and kingdom of Christ, and yet is composed of earth-born subjects, and is blended with the kingdoms of this world. It pretends to dispense pardons for sin, and to bestow eternal glory, &c., and yet ascribes the whole of acceptance with God to the merit of good works. Lastly, it pretends to be engaged in promoting the salvation of men and yet is seen *drunken with the blood of saints and martyrs*. This is a living Beast; its union with the governments of this world gives vitality, action and power unto it. An image of this Beast, must be a form, made to resemble it, in its general appearance, but without vitality.

Again, the description particularly given of this Beast, as having had a *wound with a sword*, &c., necessarily implies that the making of this image, is an event subsequent to the wounding and healing of the Beast; consequently subsequent to the rise of Bonaparte.

By noticing the manner in which the Beast grew into existence, we may judge of the progress of the Image towards a perfect formation. I speak of the Beast's growing into existence. For though the Beast was seen rising out of the *sea*, or what was intended by that, out of the inundations of the barbarians into the Empire, yet he then arose a Beast ready grown, and the rising was the coming into power. He must therefore have been previously growing into existence. This growth took place within the visible church of Christ; and there we are to look for the formation of the Image.

The first limb of the Beast may be supposed to have owed its origin to that anxiety which the christians would naturally feel to have their children distinguished from the heathen, and to have them become christians and enjoy the privileges of the church. Growing impatient of waiting for the Spirit of God to convert their children, they contrived the plan of doing the work themselves. Hence the catechumen classes in which children and such adults as were willing to submit to the discipline, were instructed in what they considered the first principles of the christian religion. These after being thus taught, and having manifested an orderly deportment, were admitted to baptism and the privileges of the church. The churches thus came to be supplied with members, who gave no other evidence of their being subjects of grace, than their being able to repeat the creed, and their professions of renouncing their *sins*, particularly the *devil and his pompous allurements*. See Mosh. Eccl. Hist. Vol. I., pg. 112.

And wherein are Sunday Schools, and Bible Classes different in principle and effect from the institution of catechumens? I mean not those Sunday Schools designed for teaching such poor children to read, as cannot enjoy the privilege of attending school on other days of the week; but those schools, the professed object of which are to teach the children religion; or in other words, to do that which the Scriptures teach me, the Holy Ghost alone can do.

Another limb of the Beast, formed about the same time with the other, seems to have grown out of an anxiety to draw into the churches, the philosophers and great men of the age; and whereas they had not the power of humbling the hearts of these persons, to submit to the self-abasing religion of Jesus, their only resource other than to submit to the will of God in this thing, was to conform the religion to the proud notions of men. Hence the blending of the Grecian philosophy with the doctrines of the cross; the substituting for the simplicity of gospel worship, a pompous show made up of Jewish and heathen ceremonies, and the establishing of schools at Alexandria and other places, for teaching those intended for the ministry to preach a philosophized gospel, and to preach it scientifically. And are not the systems of theology and the theological schools of this day the same in design and effect with the establishment at Alexandria? They tell us that society has become more generally polished than formerly; and that if we should see the learned and polite part of society brought into our churches, we must have a polished gospel, and a learned ministry. Hence the simple doctrines of the cross, and those plain preachers who with Paul are determined not to *know anything* among the people *save Jesus Christ and him crucified*, must retire to the back woods and give place to the fashionable divinity, and to those *clerical* gentlemen who are flocking from the seminaries; and these in many instances are but an excuse for men of science. They have to be sure, learned enough of the Scriptures to know how like Peter, to *fish for money*, and they have learned to feel their own importance, to sway the churches, and to preach so as not to offend the world.

A third limb of the Beast was a natural growth from the preceding. For those philosophized preachers, not only considered themselves entitled, on account of their scholastic acquirements, to the care of such churches as were more eminent for being planted in the cities, &c., and accordingly wound themselves into such stations; but they also considered themselves entitled to a pre-eminence over the neighboring preachers. Hence we find, shortly after the establishing of

those schools, certain preachers claiming, in consideration of their being the pastors of those churches, which were more eminent as mother churches, an oversight over the neighboring churches, and the right of appointing their preachers; sometimes reserving to themselves the right of administering baptism; or what was more common, delegating to the preachers the privilege of baptizing, but reserving to themselves the right of confirming the baptized. The one class of preachers came soon to be called distinctively *bishops*, the other *presbyters*. What less dignity and superiority than this is claimed by the boards of Managers of our modern Mission Societies, who assume the oversight over the destitute churches, and parts of the country, and the right of appointing to these churches their preachers, and to the preachers their fields of labors, &c.

A fourth limb is found in those rich endowments which were bestowed on the churches, and those distinguished honors conferred on the Bishops. A corresponding part of the Image we find in those vast funds which are accumulated for Mission and other professedly religious purposes, and committed to the disposal of the several boards. And the having the exclusive control of these funds, will be found to give to these bodies an influence greater than did those honors conferred on the Bishops, give to them.

There were other things which undoubtedly entered into the composition of the Beast, such as the multiplication of ceremonies, the formation of religious societies other than gospel churches, as the different orders of *monks*, &c., the custom of persons aiming at superior holiness, and becoming secludes and submitting to great self mortification; veneration paid to relics, and the like unscriptural practices; and even correspondencies to some of these, if I mistake not, are already showing themselves. What less than an idolatrous veneration for relics is that which ascribes to those *little tracts*, circulated with so much zeal, an efficacy quite equal, or indeed superior to the Scriptures, in leading persons to believe in Christ, and which are mostly represented as the experiences of persons dead, or extracts from dead authors? In truth, what are all those expositions and those *systems of divinity* which are substituted by our modern Theologians for the Bible, but as rotten bones compared with the Scriptures of Eternal Truth? But that which gave vitality and power to the Beast, was the establishing of penal laws, the observance of the christian religion in its then prevailing doctrines, ceremonies &c., making it the religion of the Empire, and the Emperor the Head of the church, which headship was ultimately transferred to

the Bishop of Rome. The image of course has not a correspondence in this particular, for an image has no inherent vital principle; to this image however life is to be given, as will be noticed.

Yours, &c., S. TROTT.

LETTER VI

Near Cooch's Bridge, New Castle County, Delaware, July
8th 1831.

Brother Beebe: - I will now call your attention to the circumstance of the giving of life to the *Image of the Beast*.

It is said, *He had power to give life unto the Image of the Beast, that the Image of the Beast should both speak and cause that as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast should be killed*. Hence it is manifest, this second Beast will have power to give life to this Image. How this Beast, or the *reformed churches*, will obtain this power is principally conjecture; because the event is yet to be accomplished. In saying this, I would be understood as referring more particularly to the power to *kill*. The Image already has received power to speak, and we have heard him uttering from the Press, and by his *Legates*, in Associations and elsewhere, language like this, namely; that these religious schemes must triumph, and that all opposition must be put down; yea, that all who will not unite in supporting them must fall; which is speaking as much like the dragon as an image is like its original. From the source of this power we may form some conception whence the *killing* power will be derived. Indeed I should judge from the connection of this passage, that this giving *life* to the Image does not imply that the image will be made a living Beast, that is a national religious establishment. I presume that it means something like a general control, which these religious societies combined, will obtain over the public, and probably over our national government, through the influence of the reformed churches, and by which they will be enabled to put down every person, who does not favor their plans. The object of the Reformed church, will not be so much to exalt these institutions as existing among the Baptists, as to obtain through them, as existing among themselves, an influence and power which will satisfy them, in place of being established by law. And the Baptist schemes being like their own, will share with theirs in the honor and power obtained. The Baptists indeed, in several instances are connected in the

same *union* with the Paedobaptists, and bring but one in connection with several, they are but exerting themselves to promote the schemes of the Paedobaptists.

But I think we shall know with more certainty what is intended by the giving life to the Image of the Beast, that it shall cause as many as will not worship the Image, &c., to be killed, after that the Reformed churches shall have established their control over our national government in carrying their point relative to Sunday Mails, and in some other arrangements, which they will propose to Congress when they shall have triumphed in this. These points they will carry not so much by their general *fasts* as by making the members of Congress, and others, feel that in order to secure their popularity, and their election to office, they must humor these things. I will pass on to notice the several circumstances mentioned in the three concluding verses of the chapter. Rev.13.

Before proceeding to give my views on the several circumstances mentioned in these verses, I will remark, that I necessarily differ from all others, so far as I am acquainted, who have attempted an explanation of them. This difference arises from the circumstance of others understanding the Beast herein mentioned to be the *seven horned Beast*, whereas I understand it to be the *two horned Beast*. I think myself justified in thus departing from the beaten track, by the connection of the subject. In the expression *the mark or the name of the Beast*, what other mark of the Beast can we suppose is intended than the *mark* which *he* caused *all, both small and great &c., to receive*? But the *he* of ver.16, referred to the *two horned Beast*, therefore this is the mark of *that Beast*, or that which he imposeth upon *all*.

In giving my views of these verses, I will notice first the *mark* which the two horned Beast caused "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond to receive in their right hand or in their forehead." I understand this to have an allusion to the custom of persons marking their things, and in some cases, their servants, to designate them as theirs. So this Beast extending his claims to all, or at least his desires to bring all under his influence, causeth a mark to be set upon them, by which he may claim them as subjected to his control. Some he causeth to be marked in the right hand, and some in the forehead.

As this marking is connected with the giving of life to the Image of the Beast, it cannot refer to infant sprinkling, for that has been in practice ever since this Beast arose. It has indeed been used as a mark, hence we find those who practice,

uniformly claiming the right of a control over those they have sprinkled. But the component parts of this Beast now want a more powerful claim upon *all*, both *small and great*, they are therefore engaged in fixing a more prominent *mark* upon them. The causing *all* to receive a *mark*, seems remarkably to point out the great exertions which are making at this time to bring all classes and all persons into a profession of religion, and consequently under the influence of the clergy. This may be considered the *mark* in the *forehead*. The great success which has attended the several plans recently brought into practice for converting sinners, or rather for bringing them into the churches, but especially the *Four day* meeting plan, now in vogue, affords a striking comment upon the text now under consideration, as well as upon the circumstance of this Beast's bringing *fire down from heaven in the sight of men*. Indeed they speak of the success attending these Four-day meetings as being a repetition of the events of the day of Pentecost; that as the Holy Ghost then descended, so he now descends in answer to their prayers. But they either lose sight of, or do not understand the difference between the Holy Ghost being *sent down* by Christ upon his *disciples*, in fulfillment of his promises to them, and in confirmation of their faith in his being seated at the right hand of the Father, as the intercessor of his people, having *all power in heaven, and in earth*, and the coming down of what they call the spirit, in obedience to their prayers; or else their arrogance is unbounded. For what is this comparison which they make of their meetings with the day of Pentecost, short of a comparison between the testimony given the disciples, of the prevalency of Christ's intercession, and that which they claim as a testimony of the prevalency of their prayers.

The mark in the *right hand* being less conspicuous, may refer to that influence which is established over those who are induced to unite with the reformed churches in their great *American* or in corresponding Institutions. This marking is extended to many Baptists and to many who have joined no church, and we see too many instances of obsequiousness not to discover the power of the influence exerted.

However the *mark of the Beast* may also refer to some mark which should be established by the authority of this Beast, other than the gospel standard, as a criterion of religion. Such a mark has been established as was published several years since in periodicals, and from the pulpits. It is this; a support extended to what are called, the benevolent institutions of the day as the proper mark by which to judge of a person's true piety.

We pass to the *Name of the Beast*. This seems to mean nothing more than the name by which this Beast is designated. It may refer to the individual name by which either branch is known as well as to the collective name *reformed*. Being a member of a reformed church, the individual is termed a reformer in distinction from a papist. And the collective name as well as the name of the particular church passes from the church member to his children while they continued attached to the congregation. Probably it is to these members of the congregation that this has particular reference in distinction from those who have the mark.

I will now offer some observations upon the *Number of the Beast*, or as it is called in verse 17, the *number of his name*.

It is said to be the number of a *man*, and his number is 666. By its being termed the *number of a man*, the most natural inference would be that it is a specific number used by man. Do you ask, how is the number 666 used as a specific number? I answer, in decimal arithmetic it is used frequently as the decimal of the fraction two thirds – $2/3$.

Let us then according to the wisdom which may be given us, count this number. First, we will count the figures of which it is composed. In doing this, we find the first, the central and the last alike. In applying this counting to the reformed churches, we shall find, if I mistake not, a striking correspondence. What was the beginning of the reformed churches? They themselves tell us, that it was *corruption*; for from the corruptions of the Church of Rome, they profess to have reformed. What is their intermediate state, but as marked by many corruptions, which they brought from their *mother church*? And what can their end be, other than corruption, judging from their almost universal, and woeful departure from their originally professed doctrines, and their former strictness in receiving members? Secondly, let us count the number decimally; in doing this, we find it but an imperfect expression of the fraction $2/3$. We may go on with the operation of reducing the fraction to its equivalent decimal; till we multiply the decimal expression *ad infinitum*, and still it remains imperfect. The application of this to the reformed churches is easy. Their coming out from the Church of Rome was with the professed design of expressing in their constitutions the true visible Church of Christ. But this so long as they remain upon their original foundation is impossible. For the church of Christ is a *kingdom not of this world*, but they are founded upon principles conformable to the Abrahamic Covenant. Consequently, their natural posterity, as such, are

brought in to participate with them in the privileges and blessings of their covenant. Hence they are, in part, at least, kingdoms of this world, propagated by natural generation. They may reform as often as they please, yet so long as they retain a standing on their old foundation, they remain imperfect, viewed as expressions of the kingdom of Christ. They may have correct confessions of faith, as some of them have had; they may have many heaven-born christians among them, as no doubt has been the case; they may have sound gospel preachers, as some of those churches frequently have had; they may immerse candidates upon a profession of faith, as they have occasionally done, still while they bring in their natural offspring, as such, they remain in part worldly, and therefore cannot be *a kingdom not of this world*. Thirdly; we will now count this number, by computing its assumed value. This as has already been noticed, is two thirds. By turning to Zech.13:8 & 9, we read, "And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the Lord, *two parts* therein shall be cut off and die, but the *third* shall be left therein; and I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them, as silver is refined, &c." Compare this with Rev.14:9-12. I leave the application of this to be made in the accomplishment of these two prophecies.

Hence according to the view thus taken of this part of the prophecy concerning the two horned Beast, and the Image, it appears that he is preparing the way for issuing his decree, that *no man may buy or sell*; that is, figuratively, no man may preach or enjoy the privileges of public worship, except those who are brought under the influence of the clergy, and marked either in the hand or forehead; or such as belong to some one of the reformed churches, or congregations, and thus have the name of the Beast, or such as have the number of his name; that is, those who have in some way, conformed to those corruptions, or those plans, by which the church and world are blended, and the visibility of the church of Christ, as a kingdom not of this world is lost. This event when it takes place will evidently bring out the worshippers of the Image, and thus leave the adherents to truth to be put down and the witnesses to be slain.

I remain yours with Christian affection, S. TROTT.

LETTER VII

Cooch's Bridge, New Castle County, Delaware, Aug. 11th
1831.

Brother Beebe: - On reviewing what I have written relative to the formation of the Image of the Beast, I conclude you are ready to enquire whether the Image is composed of the *popular institutions* as they exist generally among all denominations; or only as they exist among the Baptists. If we take the first Beast as a pattern in this case, we find that he grew out of heathenish ceremonies and sentiments as they were adopted by the professed church of Christ; not as they were practiced by the Dragon. Of course, we must conclude that the Image is primarily composed of these modern worldly schemes as they are pursued by those who professedly belong to the visible church of Christ. It is true that as in the former case the Dragon or the Beast from the "bottomless pit," became so completely blended with the *seven horned beast*, as that it was said of it, "The beast that was and is not, and yet is;" so there probably will be a general blending of the *two horned beast* with the Image. The direction which I have already noticed as given by the two horned beast, corresponds with the idea above advanced; for it is not said that this Beast, which I have supposed represented the Reformed churches, made the Image, but that he said to "them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image," &c. Rev.13:14. You will recollect, as I formerly stated, that they who were directed to make the Image, were they who were deceived by the miracles of the *two horned beast*; namely, "they that dwell on the earth," by which I understand, principally, worldly minded or carnal professors and preachers of the Baptist churches. The reformed churches hold forth this language chiefly by example, although they are not wanting in other exertions to induce the Baptists to rear up the Image. We will notice the influence of this example.

In the first place; These *dwellers on the earth*, see the multitude adhering to the Reformed Churches, in consequence of having been *sprinkled* in infancy, and thus brought within the pales of their churches, and under the pastoral watch of their ministers; and they are anxious to gain a similar influence over the multitude. They have therefore resorted to Sunday Schools as a substitute for infant membership, hoping by these to attach the rising generation to their congregations and even bring them into their churches. In this the Reformed

churches continue to animate their zeal by pursuing the same course. Secondly; These earthly minded professors seeing the learned, the polite and wealthy part of society joining the Reformed churches, feel solicitous to have their churches filled with such respectable professors, instead of those of the lower circles in society from whom the Lord has mostly sifted his people. And as they ascribe this success of the Paedobaptists to their learned and polite ministry and to their *philosophized* gospel, they are using every exertion to supply the Baptist churches with such preachers and such a gospel. Thirdly; The ministers of the Reformed Churches, appearing not satisfied with that authority which their ecclesiastical courts give them over their churches and congregations, are seeking a more absolute authority in the organization of those several religious Societies which they are forming under various pretences. And what a perfect obsequiousness do the popular Baptists manifest, in following the example set! No person can examine the arrangement of the modern mission societies, without discovering the Methodist Episcopacy {the most absolute of any short of Popery} copied out, with this exception, that in the *mission episcopacy*, aristocracy is substituted for simple monarchy. Fourthly; The Clergy of the Reformed Churches appear artfully engaged in accomplishing that which they cannot directly obtain under our government; namely, independency of the people for their support. And the Baptists where they are not blended with the others in the same scheme, are evidently treading directly upon their heels. Could we come at the correct amount of funds in this country, under the influence, if not under the direct control, of the Clergy, the interest only of which is annually expended; such as the funds belonging to the Mission and Bible and the like societies, and those connected with Theological Schools, Colleges, and Academies; also the additions yearly made by collections, subscriptions, &c., together with the profits arising from the printing establishments of the Bible, Sunday School and Tract Societies; and add to this amount the sums collected upon the spur of some new project, such as supplying every family with a Bible, and the recent fifty or eighty thousand dollar scheme of establishing Sunday Schools in the valley of the Mississippi; I say if the amount of all this was known by us, we should be convinced that the period is not far distant, when these funds will be sufficient to give the body of the clergy an independent, moneyed control over the institutions of learning, over the pulpits, and over the printing establishments, if not over the congressional and legislative halls of our country.

Fifthly; We see the Baptists not only following the example of the Paedobaptists in forming religious societies, other than gospel churches; but also forming them upon the principle of worldly societies; uniting all in the same profession and privileges of membership who will pay the stipulated yearly sum, whether they make any pretensions to being subjects of grace or not. If these mission and other like societies, be religious societies, then to become a member of them, is to be religious according to that standard. A cheap way of making ourselves or others religious, by paying the yearly dollar for us or them. It is no wonder that Dr. Ely should purchase a life membership for his deceased children in the Sunday School Union. This is certainly equal to anything found in the *first* Beast.

I would offer one remark more upon this point; namely, That it is not only manifest from appearances that the Baptists are in these things copying after the Paedobaptists, but we also hear them repeatedly and in every place, appealing to the practice of their Paedobaptist brethren, as good and sufficient reason, why the Baptists generally should engage in these schemes.

But still, from the fact, that it is the combination of these institutions as existing among all denominations, which is giving them such a complete control over the public mind, some will more readily conclude that the Image is to be found in this combination, than admit that it is confined to that branch of them which exists among the Baptists. To such I would say, First; The reformed churches, are in their original constitution, formed upon the plan of a national establishment, and based upon a union of the church and the world; it is therefore but the acting of that *beastly* nature which they brought from their mother the *church of Rome*, to adopt worldly plans, and act upon worldly principles, in extending the bounds and number of their churches. These new projects are perfectly congenial to their constitution. Not so with the Baptists, their church was constituted as a *kingdom not of this world*, as a body chosen out and separated from the world by the influence and power of Divine Grace. When therefore we find worldly projects, worldly influence, and worldly wisdom, introduced among the Baptists under the pretence of extending and supporting that church, we see at once that they are heterogeneous from its constitution, and that they can be nothing less than an Image of the *beastly* nature of the worldly churches.

Secondly; Although I have admitted that it is the corroboration of these institutions as existing among all

denominations which gives them their general influence, yet I very much doubt whether this combination, if the Baptists were clear of these schemes, could with all its power ever produce the slaying of the witnesses in this country. And I think it will ultimately be found that it is the power given to these worldly institutions as existing among the Baptists alone which will accomplish the slaying of the witnesses and the scattering of the *Holy People*.

In a former letter you request some explanation respecting the kingdom of the Ostrogoths, which I mentioned as the *sixth* head of the Beast. I would say that during the fifth and sixth centuries the Roman Empire, especially the Western Empire, or that of which Rome was the capital, was repeatedly overrun by hordes of hardy barbarians, who uniting under some bold and enterprising leader would come down like a mighty torrent upon Italy and the other ferthe parts of Europe. These barbarians came from the northern parts of Europe and Asia, and are distinguished by different names, as Huns, Vandals, Goths, Ostrogoths, &c. It was Odoacer, a chief of the Ostrogoths who overturned the Western Empire and established himself as king of Italy, in the year A.D. 493. This kingdom lasted till 552 when it was again overturned by the arms of the Eastern Emperor, the seat of whose Empire was Constantinople. Although the Lombards, another barbarous nation, soon again overrun Italy and established a kingdom there, yet they did not get possession of Rome, nor of the adjoining province of Ravenna. These remained subject to the Emperors of the East, and were governed by a provincial officer called an Exarch. The kingdom of the Ostrogoths I consider the sixth distinct form of government established over Rome; consequently the sixth head of the Beast. And the provincial government of Exarch, under the emperors of the East, I consider the seventh form of government, and the seventh head. The preceding five forms of government, or heads over Rome as I reckon them; were 1st, Kings; 2nd, Consul; 3rd, Decemvirs; 4th, Dictators; 5th, Emperors. Tribunes which some reckon a distinct form of government, were only distinct officers connected with the Consular form. Neither was the Triumvirate, which has also been counted as a distinct form of government, ever established. And the reason why these were ever counted was that expositors have thought they must make up the seven up to the period that John wrote.

I now leave this subject with you. So far as I have given a correct view of it, may it prove profitable to you. So far as

my views may be wrong, may the Lord enable you to discern the error and reject it.

I remain yours in gospel bonds, S. TROTT.

FINIS.

THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.

BROTHER BEEBE: - As I proposed in my last communication a further consideration of Mr. Dennison's famous argument, by which he seems fondly to anticipate the complete conversion before the next meeting of the Philadelphia Association, of those Brethren who have hitherto had no more *benevolence* than to suppose that the plans drawn by Christ himself for publishing his Gospel among the Nations of the Earth are sufficient for them to attend to, I will now attempt to show the vast difference there is between these things to which those brethren object, and those which Mr. Dennison enumerates as parallel instances of departure from the Scriptures as a rule of practice.

That this gentleman should not have discovered the difference which so manifestly exists between the practice of human inventions as substitutes for things which have been particularly appointed by the King of Zion, for the observance of his Disciples, and those things which are practiced, not as parts at all, of positive institutions, but merely as conveniences, even admitting that there is no Scripture Warrant for them, is not so much to be wondered at, he having till lately been connected with the admirers of Peter Edward's manner of getting rid of Divine appointments. But that Baptists who have been used to consider a *thus saith the Lord*, as of more importance in reference to positive institutions than all the reasonings that the wisdom of men could devise, when Baptism has been under consideration - should themselves resort to the same kind of human reasoning to invalidate proofs taken from the plain declarations of God's word in reference to the dispensation of the Gospel, which is as entirely a positive institution as is Baptism, is well calculated to show what man is, with all his boasted wisdom.

That the Gospel Ministry as entirely originated from the express appointment of the Lord, as did either of the ordinances of the Gospel must be manifest to every reflecting Christian. Consequently the obligation to pay a strict regard to all the divinely prescribed parts of this institution without altering, adding unto, or diminishing from them, is tantamount

to the obligation to own the Author of the institution as Lord. See Luke 6:46, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord; and do not the things which I say?"

The Lord has given particular directions in his word, on the several following points, relative to this appointment of Heaven, for making known the *glad tidings* of salvation.

First, in relation to those who are to officiate in this important work, as in the command given; *Go ye teach*, &c., being originally directed to certain baptized believers, chosen for the work. Matt.25:16,19. We find those first employed in this work, were called directly by the Lord himself and sent into the work; afterwards as in the case of Paul and Barnabas, we find the precedent set of the preachers of the Gospel, being called to the work by the Holy Ghost, and being *recommended to the grace of God for the work*, or separated to it, by the Church. See Acts 23:1,2, compared with Acts 14:27,27. Again it is declared that the *ministry of reconciliation*, is given to them of God, II Cor.5:18; and that they are given especially to the *churches for the work of the Ministry of Christ*, and consequently are made manifest to the Churches, by their peculiar gifts, given to them by the Holy Spirit, I Cor.12:4,7,8, & 28; or as expressed in I Tim.3:2, being *apt to teach*. See Eph.4:11,12; consequently it belongs exclusively to the Churches to separate persons for the work of preaching or teaching the Gospel, and they have no more right to send others into this work, than they have to authorize others to baptize; the authority to *teach all nations*, and that to *baptize*, being both found in the same command.

Second, these designated persons are commanded to *preach the Gospel*. This preaching is not as Allen Campbell says, a simple proclamation of the fact of Christ's incarnation, death &c. It is a teaching; compare Matt.28:19, with Mark 16:15. By referring to the Acts, and to the writings of the Apostles, we learn what they understood the word of reconciliation committed to them to be. It was not a Gospel divested of Doctrine, that they preached, it was an illustration of the situation of man, as under the curse of the Law, and a development of God's *purpose*, and *plan* of saving sinners, by expounding and testifying the Kingdom of God and persuading concerning Jesus out of the Laws of Moses, and out of the Prophets, &c. See Acts 28:23. As the *preaching* was a *teaching*, so the *teaching* was a *preaching*, not a *reading* or *writing*. See Acts 28:31.

Third, the command given to the Eleven, contains the authority to *teach all nations* and to *preach the Gospel to every creature*; consequently God has appointed the same

ordinance for making known the Gospel to the heathen and to the young, as to others.

There are several other circumstances relative to this institution, particularly appointed by Divine Authority; as First, in the case of a deficiency of *laborers*, the command is express, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that *he* send forth more laborers into *his* harvest." Are not the plans in vogue, at this day, for supplying preachers, in direct violation of this appointment? Second, persons called to preach the Gospel are not to let even the *burying of the dead*, hinder them from that work; what right then have such to bury themselves and their talents, for years within the walls of Classical or Theological Seminaries? Third, it is expressly declared in the word, that, *It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe*. It pleases men, to save by the *wisdom of Mission, Tract, Sunday School, and Bible Societies*; whose pleasure will stand? Fourth, "the Lord hath *ordained* that they which preach the Gospel should *live of the Gospel*." The wise men say, that preachers would starve were they to depend on the *living* their preaching would induce the people to give them; they therefore ordain that men shall preach because they receive a *support* from *mission funds*. Still I think their plans do not overturn the ordinance of God, for on examination it will be found that those who preach because they are hired or because they *have been maintained from the King's Mission Palace*, do not preach the Gospel. As the avowed object of Mission, Tract, Sunday School and Bible Societies, is to make known the glad tidings of salvation, they are as manifest substitutes of human contrivance for that order which God has particularly appointed for publishing the Gospel, as infant sprinkling is for believers Baptism.

Again, in reference to these several human institutions, they have Societies connected with them, composed of professed believers and unbelievers, who are united together upon the ground of money payments; and which assume the stand of religious Societies. Herein therefore they are opposed to the following plain declarations of scripture: *My kingdom is not of this world; My dove, my undefiled, is but one, she is the only one of her mother; There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness*.

Thus, Mr. Dennison, it is manifest that the ground upon which those Brethren, whom your brother of the PIONEER would denominate *Anti-mission Baptists*, object to these several institutions, which to you, and to the majority of your

venerable Association, are so precious, is the same as that upon which you would object to infant sprinkling; namely, because they are substitutes of human contrivance for a *positive* command of God. Remember, Sir, to do something else instead of that which is commanded, is not merely a doing what is not required; it is a plain *refusal to do as commanded*. Now, Sir, admitting that as you insinuate, there is no Scripture warrant for the practices which you enumerate in your inquiries, can you show in one instance, that either of them is a substitute for something particularly commanded of God? If you can; then are we thus culpable in conforming to such practice. But if you cannot, as is evidently the case, there is no proper comparisons between these things, and those which you denominate charitable institutions.

I will leave you to reflect on this subject for a little season, and when another opportunity offers, I will examine your allegations, concerning those practices which you name as not being warranted by Scripture.

I again subscribe myself,
A WALDEN SIS.
Valley of Achor, Nov.4, 1832.

SCRIPTURE: THE ONLY CERTAIN RULE & FINAL AUTHORITY.

BROTHER BEEBE: - Agreeable to my promise to Mr. Dennison, in my last, I will now examine the correctness of his intimations concerning those practices which he mentions, as not being warranted by Scripture.

Mr. Dennison addresses his enquiries to those brethren referred to, as to Particular Baptists; and from what he has before said concerning their views, I presume they are "Old School" Particular Baptists. As one of this class of Baptists, I will, previous to enter into an examination of the particular circumstances, lay down the following general position as received by us; namely, that what the Apostles *loosed*, is as much loosed to us, as what they *bound*, are bound to us. That is, wherein they left on record, a circumstantial practice as having no specific order to be observed, we are warranted from Scripture to observe that order which appears most convenient, as much so, as we are required to confine ourselves to a specific order or practice, when such are

particularly pointed out. And we of course, will no sooner submit to be bound by men to a particular order in the one, than to be led into an indifferent practice in the other case.

Now with this general principle in view, we will proceed to notice the particular articles of inquiry. Mr. Dennison's first inquiry is, "Have you any Scripture warrant for formularies of faith?" I answer that we have the following Scriptures as proofs that the primitive Church was of *one faith*: Acts 2:42, "and they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine." Acts 4:32, "and the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul." Jude 3, "that ye should earnestly contend for *the faith* once delivered to the saints;" and from I Cor.1:10, it is equally evident that it is incumbent upon the Gentile Churches to maintain the same unity of faith; for the apostle says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." From these texts it is manifest, that there was in the primitive church, and that there is required in the Gentile Churches, a perfect understanding of *the faith* received, and to be *contended for* &c.; but whether this understanding among the Members of the Church was had, or is to be obtained merely by their conversing together upon the doctrine preached by the Apostles, or whether this doctrine was committed to writing for the mutual examination of the views of the members of the church, is not said.

Hence the fair conclusion is, that whilst the Churches are warranted and *required* by Scripture, to maintain a unity of faith among the members, they are left at liberty either to have their views of doctrine, or faith, committed to writing, for the convenient comparing of the views of persons to be received; or to enter into a verbal examination and comparison of their views. So much for *formularies of faith*.

His next inquiry is relative to "*plans of decorum*," - in answer to this inquiry I observe that *old fashioned* Particular Baptists think themselves by a *divine right*, entitled to the plan of decorum which the Apostle has left them; I Cor.14:40, "let all things be done decently and in order;" and with this they generally are contented. If he means by *plans of decorum*, certain written rules, drawn up by the wisdom of men and taken from the usages of worldly bodies, not from Scripture, he must propose his inquiry to those who adopt such in their churches, not to us; for we do not approve of them.

Mr. Dennison's third inquiry is relative to our Scripture authority for a *medium of record attached to each Church*.

That there was some medium of record, or *remembrance* connected with the Apostolic Churches, that portion of Scripture called the Acts of the Apostles is a standing proof; and a further proof we have from the accounts given in that book of the number of the disciples at one time, as in Acts 1:15, of the number added at one time, as in Acts 2:41, and of certain transactions that took place in particular Churches; as in the Church at Antioch, Acts 13:1,3; 14:27 & 15:1,2, in the Church at Jerusalem, Acts 6:1,7; 15:5 – to the 30th, as well as in other cases. Whether this medium was in the first place *traditional*, or whether it was a committing of the events, &c., to writing we are not told. It is enough for us to know that there was some *medium of record* attached to the first Churches, and that we are left at liberty to adopt such a medium as is most convenient.

The fourth inquiry is, "Where is your Bible authority for choosing moderators and clerks;" as to choosing moderators, in case the Pastor is present in the Church, there is no Bible authority for it, but it is an infringement upon a divinely appointed office. If a church has a right to act upon business in the absence of a Pastor, it is right for someone to lead either voluntarily or by the request of the church. And it is more conformable to that scriptural rule; "let each esteem others better than themselves," to wait to be invited.

With regard to choosing Clerks, as we have Scripture proof that there was some *medium of record* in the primitive churches, and as we have no proof that this was merely traditional, we are authorized to keep in remembrance the transactions of a Church by means of a written *record*, consequently the Church is left at liberty to appoint someone to record the additions and transactions which they wish remembered.

The fifth inquiry is, after our Bible authority for *singing and praying before preaching*. We have Bible authority for singing and praying in the Church, and that as spiritual worship, see I Cor.14:14,16, Col.3:16, Acts 12:5, Eph.6:18, and many other passages; and it is equally evident that there is no established order given to us in the word, as to the time of singing and praying, consequently we are left at liberty to adopt what order we please; so that we do not introduce confusion, as was the case in the Church at Corinth, by neglecting all order. I Cor.14:26,33. But we are not left at liberty to give up the singing in the Church to a choir of unregenerated youths, because we are required to *sing with the spirit*.

The sixth inquiry is, "Where that authority for partaking of the Lord's Supper in a sitting, instead of a reclining position." With the strongest confidence we may demand of Mr. Dennison, to show us any command to confine ourselves to a *reclining*, or to any other posture in partaking of the Lord's Supper; or to prove from Scripture that the Apostolic Churches confined themselves to any one posture in observing the ordinance. Without the command of Christ, or uniform example of the Apostles, no man may bind us to a particular posture or form. Paul states to the Church at Corinth; what he received of the Lord relative to this ordinance, but does not mention having received or having delivered to them a command to observe any particular posture in receiving the Lord's Supper. And we do believe that as a faithful servant, he delivered to them the whole message received, and therefore, that he specified to them everything essential in this ordinance. He adds, and we have confidence in what he says; "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he comes," without any limitation as to the posture of the body. I Cor.11:23,26.

The seventh inquiry relates to the same ordinance, and demands our authority *for omitting to administer that holy ordinance always in an upper chamber*. I answer it is plainly contained in the passage we have just noticed, I Cor.11:23,26; the latter verse evidently contains full liberty to administer it and to receive it, in *remembrance of Christ*, and in any convenient place, where it may be done decently, and where the Church has come together into one *place*, verse 20 of same chapter.

His last inquiry is, "Where even that for the erection of Meeting Houses, with their *cushioned pews* and *baptisteries*?" As to cushioned pews, baptisteries and other furniture, and ornaments of worldly splendor, we old fashioned Baptists plead not guilty. Such things, as well as extravagant houses are generally found among those Baptists who boast so much of their benevolent exertions for the salvation of men, and preach so strongly the necessity of giving money to their *benevolent institutions*, in order to *help save* the heathen from *perishing* in their sins. If you believe what you preach, why not sell your damask cushions, costly carpeting, extravagant chandeliers, &c., and content yourselves to worship in a plain house, that you might have more to give yourselves, and show yourselves less conformed to the world. But the evil of this extravagance does not stop here; many of these churches have run heavily in debt to get up this pompous show, and then admit anything into their pulpits, but the Gospel, that they may draw a

congregation of the rich to help them keep down their interest. Yea, some of these *popular benevolent* Churches have contrived to cheat their creditors out of their just dues, and still hold their splendid Meeting Houses.

But in reference to our authority for building Meeting Houses; if we have no example of the primitive Churches, building houses particularly for worshiping in, we have abundant authority from the example of the Apostles to consider the place of meeting altogether an indifferent thing. We find the disciples meeting in the *temple*, a house built purposely for worship, Acts 2:46; in an *upper room*, Acts 1:13. We find Paul preaching by the *river side*; in the Jailor's house and in *Synagogues*, buildings erected expressly for worship; in his own hired *house* and in the *school* of Tyrannus. Hence, we have Bible authority for meeting in any place, most convenient, and even of occupying houses built for worship, when *such* can be had in peace, see Acts 19:8,9. But we have no authority for consecrating houses, for places of worship, or in any way giving sanction to the idea of one place being more holy than another; for not only did the Apostles teach us by their example to consider the place as a thing indifferent; but the Master has also taught us the same; see John 4:21,24. It is manifest, who they are that ascribe peculiar holiness to particular places, such as certain houses, and certain seats in the houses; not the Old School Particular Baptist.

Thus, we see that of this mighty catalogue of charges which Mr. Dennison has brought forward against the old Baptists, of departures from the word of God, there is but the one, of choosing Moderators that will stand against them; and even that fails, unless it can be proved that a Church has no right to transact business in the absence of a Pastor, unless there are Churches, who in the presence of their Pastor, throw contempt upon that scriptural office, by choosing one to preside in their meetings, if so they must answer for themselves. Now one word, upon Mr. Dennison's very *modest* remark, "We for one shall be satisfied to go on as we have commenced, desiring to labor, with all our might in the *broad field of benevolent effort*." This *broad field of benevolent effort* evidently is the *charitable institutions of the age*, which he tacitly acknowledges have no other scriptural warrant, but what he calls *authorized implication*. It of course, is not the field which the Baptists of past ages, nor even the Apostles labored in. This he modestly terms the *broad field of benevolent effort*; theirs by *authorized implication* was the *narrow field of scriptural selfishness*.

His authorized implication, to which he alludes as warranting the practice of those humanly contrived institutions, is we presume, the success which they boast of as attending them. How long have the Paedobaptist been raising this same argument to support infant sprinkling? As long as I have known anything about them; but to all such arguments, and *warrants*, we may well say, *we have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well that we take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.*

Farewell,
A WALDENSIS.

ETERNAL JUSTIFICATION

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I see that you have copied into the SIGNS OF THE TIMES from the WORLD, the communication signed T.J.K. on the subject of justification. The sentiment advocated by this writer, relative to the elect having been justified in eternity, is one which has generally been received by our *Predestinarian* Brethren, and is certainly ably handled by him. Although I am a Predestinarian in sentiment, and classed with those, whom the *law-gospel* religionists call by way of reproach *Antinomians*, yet the arguments of T.J.K. has left my mind, as they found it, possessed of what appears to me strong objections to this sentiment. As T.J.K. appears to be intimately conversant with the subject, and as capable perhaps as any other of removing these objections, if they can be consistently answered, I beg leave through the medium of your Paper to propose some of them for his examination; hoping that, not for my sake only, but that there may be a correct understanding of this important subject by all those who are desirous of being established in the truth as it is in Jesus, he will enter into a candid discussion of the subject. Before stating my objections, I would remark that none of those objections raised by the popular religionists against this sentiment, and which grew out of a denial of the *eternal union* of Christ and his Church, find any place in my mind. But I object to the sentiment that the elect were justified before the foundation of the world.

First, because the Scriptures, nowhere as I can find, declare this to be the case, or directly imply it. Now to us Waldensis, this is a weighty objection; for being an inhabitant of the valley, and not having our residence on the *hill* of

Theological Science, we have never learned to receive as *revealed truth*, those notions which are only found by drawing inferences from the *major* and *minor* propositions of the logicians. We are plain men, and require plain and direct Scriptural proofs for what we receive as *articles of our faith*. Thus *eternal & personal* election we find plainly stated or necessarily involved in the declarations of Scripture; the everlasting love of God to his people is also clearly revealed, and the eternal union of Christ and his Church, and the individual members thereof, is also evidently declared in such texts as these, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," and necessarily involved in the doctrine of the *headship* of Christ. So of the other particulars of the doctrine of the everlasting Gospel.

Second, I object to it, because to defend the sentiment its advocates uniformly find it necessary to make it an essential pre-requisite to the everlasting love of God. T.J.K. does not say this in so many words, but he seems to think it inconsistent to suppose that God would choose his people in Christ, without considering them as justified, which amounts to the same thing. But the Scriptures, I think, as uniformly represent the love of God to his people to be the moving cause of his making the necessary provision; that is, giving his Son that they might be justified. If so, I do not see how we can get rid of acknowledging it the *primary* cause of their justification; which is exactly reversing the subject.

Third, I object to the notion of eternal justification, because that in supporting it, its advocates seem necessarily to blend the law under which Adam was created, with the everlasting Covenant under which Christ, and his posterity were set up, and the relation of the elect to Adam, with their relation to Christ. For justification, I believe is uniformly admitted to be a law term, and to effect man's standing as existing under the law; so I think the Scriptures speak of it. This being the case, I cannot conceive how justification can *entitle us to heaven and eternal happiness*, unless the inheritance come by the law; but the Apostle tells us, "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise." Gal.3:18. Neither can I comprehend how they could be justified {justification being a clearance from a charge of guilt,} whilst they had no being, but as they existed in Christ, unless they existed in him as under the law; nor can I understand how that which was alone necessary to the elect, as existing in their relation to Adam, could be necessary to effect their standing in Christ, if their relations to the two *Adam's* be as distinct as are their two headships.

Last, I object to this notion, because, as justification relates wholly to the requirements of the law, the idea of *eternal justification* must involve in it the existence of the law from everlasting. But how could a law exist without subjects? And who were the subjects of law before the creation of the world, if we admit that Christ, and his people in him, were wholly set up under another Covenant?

A WALDEN SIS.

Valley of Achor, Dec.21st, 1832.

CALUMNY.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - In my late excursion into New Jersey, I was informed that a Mr. T.J., a Baptist Preacher, who had passed along a week or two before me, on his way to visit a certain Church in the Warwick Association, which is destitute of a Pastor, had represented the Welsh Tract Church with which I am connected, as being quite strict in disciplining its Members for departure from sound doctrine, but as paying no regard to their maintaining good works; that to his certain knowledge they had retained a Member in standing with them, who was a notorious drunkard, without ever calling him to account. Whether his intention was to give an unfavorable impression with regard to me as a Preacher, or to give this as an instance of the doctrines of grace tending to licentiousness, I feel bound to contradict the report as false. The only member of this Church since my acquaintance with it, who could by any fair construction of the terms be called a notorious drunkard, was several years since taken under dealings, but on professing repentance, and promising reformation, was restored to fellowship, and thus remained till shortly after I became the Pastor of the Church, reports having got to the ears of some of the Members, of his having given way to drunkenness again, a complaint was laid against him, and after waiting perhaps two months to give an opportunity to appear before the Church, and answer for himself, he was excluded. If Mr. J. knew of this man's sin before this, he was himself culpable, that he did not bring his case forward, he being a Member of this Church till the time of their agreeing to call me, when he took a letter. And in every other case, I take it upon me to say there has not, since my being with the Church, been a single known instance of a member's falling into that, or any other known sin, but that Gospel steps have been taken to reclaim him, and when these have failed, exclusion has taken place. And as to the general and known characters of this

Church, previous to my coming into it, and that for considerably more than a century, I venture to say it will bear a comparison with any other Church existing in the United States, for anything like the same length of time, whether in reference to a constant succession of sound, able and esteemed Pastors, or in reference to a steadfast adherence to the faith, and covenanted order on which it was originally constituted. It is true that a conscientious adherence to that faith and order, which in years that are past, commanded the esteem of the Baptists of those days, exposes it to the reproach of modern Baptists; but this only shows that the Baptists are not what they once were.

Yours, S.TROTT.

Iron Hill, New Castle County, Delaware, Jan.7th, 1833.

A CALL TO THE PASTORATE.

BROTHER BEEBE: - Having been particularly requested to send you for publication the subjoined call and invitation, together with my answer, I, for the satisfaction of Brethren concerned, and for the sake of informing my numerous correspondents, that after the 8th of April, my residence and place of address will be near Fairfax Court House, Virginia, if providence prosper my intentions, comply with the request. S.TROTT.

The Frying Pan & Mount Pleasant Churches Fairfax County, Va. - To Elder Samuel Trott, Pastor of the Welsh Tract Church, New Castle County, Del., send Greetings:

VERY DEAR BROTHER: - This is to inform you that we have by an unanimous vote at our respective Church Meeting of business, chosen you as our Pastor; and you are to receive this as our joint call.

The Ebenezer Baptist Church, Loudoun County, Va. - To Elder Samuel Trott, &c., sendeth Greetings:

VERY DEAR BROTHER: - This is to inform you that at a special meeting, called for the purpose on Wednesday, March the 6th, we unanimously agreed to invite you to commence preaching for us, conjointly with your commencing to preach for the above named Churches, with the understanding that we will settle the call with you in due form, after you come on.

Signed, in behalf, and by order of the above named Churches, by: WM. GILMORE. February 7, 1833.

*To the Frying Pan, and Mount Pleasant Baptist
Churches, Fairfax County, Va.*

BELOVED BRETHREN: - Having received your joint call, signed in your behalf by our beloved Brother Wm. Gilmore, and bearing date, Feb.7th, 1833, to become your Pastor, having from the commencement of a correspondence on this subject, endeavored to commit the case unto the Lord, and prayerfully to watch the unfoldings of his providence relative thereto, and having from thence been led to the conclusion that the Lord designed my coming among you – that he was *teaching me to go in that way*, and *guiding me with his eye* thereunto, agreeable to an application of Psalms 32:8, to me, in an hour of much agitation of mind on this subject; and having also laid the subject before the Welsh Tract Church, of which I was then Pastor, and obtained on Lord's day, March 3, their unanimous consent to resign my pastoral relation with them, that I might accept your call.

I therefore, hereby certify my acceptance of the call, you have been led, I hope through the influence of the Holy Spirit, to give me, praying that the *presence of God* may go with me, if he bring me to settle among you, and that his grace may enable me with faithfulness, and in love, to labor among you in *words and doctrine*, and to Minister unto you Spiritual comfort and edification, according to the measure of gifts he has been pleased to bestow upon me, for the work of the ministry.

To the Ebenezer Baptist Church, Loudoun County, Va.

BELOVED BRETHREN: - I hereby certify my acceptance of your invitation, through our much esteemed Brother Wm. Gilmore, the authorized organ of communication between us, to commence preaching stately for you, on the days of your monthly meetings, connectively, with my commencing with the Frying Pan & Mount Pleasant Churches, leaving it with the Great Head of the Church to direct, as shall be most for your good, and his own glory, whether I shall in due time become regularly your Pastor or not.

I would further state, that if providence permit, I shall be with each Church on the Saturday, and Lord 's Day, of your respective monthly meetings in April, commencing with the Frying Pan Church, the second Lord's day.

In testimony whereof, I subscribe myself, though unworthy, your servant for Christ's sake.

S.TROTT.

THE SABBATH.

BROTHER BEEBE: - Though an abiding inhabitant of the *Valley of Trouble*, which the Lord I trust, has given me for a *door of hope*, I nevertheless feel considerable anxiety about what is passing on the *hills* of worldly and religious establishments, believing that numbers of my Father's children are wandering there. I am therefore induced to trouble you occasionally with my views on such subjects, as I feel particularly interested in; hoping that they may prove beneficial to others. For instance, I wish to bear my testimony against anything which is calculated to make those *hills* more troublesome to the children of God.

Finding from a quotation in the first number of the *SIGNS*, from the *BAPTIST REPOSITORY*, that the cry of infidelity is still kept up against Col. R.M. Johnson, on account of his Report on the *Sunday Mail Question*; the object of which is evidently, to prejudice the minds of the public against the principles of that Report, and to prepare the way for establishing the opposite principles; I wish therefore to bear my feeble testimony against those charges.

Let us examine the ground upon which Col. Johnson is charged with infidelity. First, he denies the necessity and the right of Congress to legislate upon matters of religion, or to establish by law the creed of one party, and thus to infringe upon the equal rights of others. It is then in the estimation of those persons, unbelief, or infidelity, to believe that the *Kingdom of Christ is not of this world*; and that Christ is able to do it and will sustain his own religion, alone by *the word of his power*, and will by the power of Divine love shed abroad in their hearts, constrain his people to receive his doctrine, and to observe his institutions, and that independent of any coercive aid of human laws? If this is Deism, what is Christianity? What is it to believe the opposite of this kind of Deism, but to deny Christ? And what is this, but *Anti-christ*?

But again Col. Johnson evidently favors the opinion of those Christians who observe the *first day* of the week, not as a requirement of the law, but as a Gospel Institution; these observe it not as Disciples of Moses, but as Disciples of Christ. This was enough to draw upon him the charge of Deism from all the Legalists in the Country. Such charges, however contain no other proof, than that of a want of argument with those who make them. The important inquiry is, Do the Scriptures

support the views of these Christians relative to the *first day* of the week? If the word of God was allowed to contain a perfect revelation of the will of God upon this question, the question would at once be decided, for it contains no direct authority for observing this day peculiarly as a day of worship, but that of Apostolic example. If any deny this assertion, we challenge proof, Scripture proof, to the contrary.

It cannot require any argument to show that whatever is practiced on the ground of Apostolic authority, is practiced as a Gospel Institution, and not as a legal requirement. I know that many inferences are drawn, and positions are assumed to establish, if possible, the fact that the Apostles only changed the day of the Sabbath from the *seventh* to the *first*, still observing it in obedience to the fourth Command; it is also assumed as a *granted point*, that the fourth Command in the letter of it, is a moral precept, equally with the other Commands of the Decalogue. But perhaps we may be allowed to draw a few inferences on the other side of the question, and to test the correctness by the word of God.

If so, we infer, first, that neither Christ or his Apostles ever instituted meeting together of the Disciples on the first day of the week, as an observance of the Sabbath of the Decalogue. We draw this inference from the fact, that although Christ sanctioned this practice by once and again meeting with his Disciples on the *first day* of the week, and the Apostles as in Acts 20:7 & I Cor.16:1,2; yet this is never in the New Testament denominated the Sabbath; that term being still used to designate the *seventh* day. This could not have been the case, if the first day had become the proper Sabbath of the law, unless we were to admit that the Apostolic history was designed to mislead us upon this point.

Second: We infer that the Command to observe the seventh day as a Sabbath, was not in the letter of it, a moral precept, like the other Commands of the Decalogue. By a moral precept we mean that which enjoins the observance of such things as were morally obligatory upon man as the creature of God, and which do not depend on any express Command for their fitness and obligation; and which of course can never cease to be obligatory and fit, so long as man stands in the relation of a creature to God, such are the other nine Commands of the Decalogue. We infer that the Command to keep the *seventh day holy*, as a Sabbath is not in this sense a moral precept, from the following Scriptural facts: First, had it been thus moral, as delivered from Sinai, it would have remained obligatory upon man, under the Gospel as under the former dispensation, the Gospel not altering, but *establishing*

the law, Rom.3:31. We should also in this case find the New Testament sanctioning the observance of this Command, and the Churches cautioning against the sin of transgressing it, as is the case in reference to each of the other of the Ten Commands. Instead of this we do not find the observance of this Command once enjoined upon the Disciples, either by the Lord or his Apostles; nor Sabbath breaking once noticed in the New Testament, excepting as it was charged upon Christ and his Disciples by the Jews. When therefore we look into the New Testament we readily discover to whose company those belong who are so zealous about the Sabbath.

Second, the law, in reference to its moral precepts, we are informed is spiritual {Rom.7:14,} but the separating a specified portion of time to be holy to the worship of God, is as much a thing of sense, as the setting a part a particular place to be holy to his worship. But the Master informed the Woman of Samaria, that the Spiritual worship required under the Gospel was opposed to such local holiness. John 4:21-24. It is equally opposed to such periodical holiness, for we are authorized to worship at all times, as well as in all places, and therefore have one High Priest, *who ever liveth to make intercession.*

Third, the Institution of the Sabbath is spoken of in the Old Testament as a *positive* Institution, *given* to the *House of Israel* for a *sign*. "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." Ezek.20:12 & 20. See also Exod.31:12 & Neh.9:14. In conformity with this idea the Lord Jesus told those who accused him of *Sabbath breaking*, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," Mark 2:27; and in the following verse, we are told that, "the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." This can mean nothing less than that he has authority to dispense with the observance of the Sabbath. Were we to admit, that as God, it is consistent with his nature to dispense with any moral obligation, of the law, which however we do not, yet when we consider that as the Son of man, *he was made under the law, and came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many; that he came not to destroy the law or the Prophets, but to fulfill* {Matt.5:17, 20:28 & Gal.4:4,} it certainly cannot be supposed that as such he had authority to dispense with any moral precept of the law. The conclusion is therefore irresistible that the Jewish Sabbath was a positive and not a moral Institution.

But fourth, whilst the Sabbath was given to *National Israel*, as a positive Institution, it was designed in reference to

Spiritual Israel, to be a shadow of another *rest*, see Heb.4:4-10. Hence the Apostle connects Sabbath-days with *New-moons*, and with *meats and drinks* and other shadows, whose *body was of Christ*; see Col.2:16,17. Again, the Apostles speaking of Jewish days in which the Sabbath of course, must have been included, considers the observance of one day above another as a thing indifferent; his expression is, "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Rom.4:5. The Body - Christ, having come, the shadow is of course done away.

We therefore think our inference, that the fourth Command in the letter of it, was not given as a moral precept is amply sustained by the Scriptures of truth; that instead thereof it was in reference to the Gospel dispensation, only a shadow. Hence, our other inference that the meeting together of the Disciples on the first day of the week for worship, was not an observance of the *Sabbath of the Decalogue*, stands also well sustained by the Scripture view of the subject.

Still however, the question may be urged with some plausibility, Why is the Command to *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy*, placed among the moral precepts of the Decalogue?

Many suppose it is because its literal requirements are equally moral with the other precepts. Of this class among the professors of Christianity, the seventh day Baptists are alone consistent in practice with their belief. To believe that the requisitions of this Command are morally obligatory, and to believe that, "one jot, or one title {the *smallest letter or even point*,} shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," and at the same time to believe that in this Command, one *word* or *day*, may be substituted for another, involves a complete absurdity. In addition to this absurdity, by this alteration, the reason assigned for the Command; namely, that the Lord *rested the seventh-day*, is completely made void. Others suppose that this Command was included in the Decalogue, because that, although the requisition to observe the *seventh day* was positive, yet the obligation to observe one day in *seven* was moral. This explanation refutes itself. If man is under moral obligation to devote one day in seven to the service of God; why not the *seventh day* agreeable to the reason given for the Command. This explanation, however is very convenient for those religionists, who think the seventh part of their *time is enough* to devote to the service of God, or to be religious in. The spiritual Christian can never adapt such an idea to his feelings. He wishes all his time to be holy to

God, and to be spent in his service. Such will consider the following explanation of the subject, as more accordant with the spirit of the law as written upon their hearts; namely, that as the term seven and seventh are repeatedly used in the Scriptures to denote a full amount or a completeness; so this Command, while in the letter of it, was a positive Institution to the Jews, and a shadow of good things to come to the Gospel Church, had a spirituality in it, like the other parts of the Decalogue, figuratively set forth by the letter, which included a moral obligation, *to wit*, that the *fulness of our time*, or in other words *all our time*, as well as all our faculties, should be holy to the service of God, as the Apostle explains it, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do," "do *all* to the glory of God." I Cor.10:31. Hence we see a propriety in its being placed in the Decalogue, as it is like the other Commands Spiritual, and as such moral, though the letter of it being adapted to the external religion of National Israel, was not moral, but positive. Had the letter of this Command as delivered to National Israel, been commensurate with its Spiritual requisition, considering the nature of their service being external, it would have allowed them no time to till their land.

When therefore the Christian, taking the New Testament for his guide, devotes the first day of the week to the exercises of public worship; he does it in commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ, in obedience to Apostolic example, upon Gospel principles. He will not on this account be disposed to neglect this any more, than any other Gospel Institution. Yea, he feels it to be a privilege to assemble himself with the people of God. As he does not need, so neither can he approve of the compulsion of human laws to enforce the observance of this day, more than in the case of Baptism or other New Testament ordinances.

There is at this day, as there was in the Apostle's days, much Judaism prevalent among Christians. Those who are under the influence of this, will still be disposed to look at the day with *Moses' veil* on. The Apostle's direction is, *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind*. I wish not to offend the conscience of a Brother, whose mind is thus shackled; but I wish each one to examine the subject for himself, in the light of the New Testament. If after such examination, any should not be satisfied, relative to the day, to leave Moses the *servant*, and follow Christ the *Son*; still I think they will not be disposed to denounce as *Deists*, all who differ from them relative to the obligation to observe the day; especially if they

attentively consider Rom.14:1-10; not the *gloss* that may be put upon it, but the *passage* itself.

THE WALDEN SIS.
Valley of Achor, Feb.20th, 1833.

THE LIGHT OF GOSPEL SIMPLICITY.

BROTHER BEEBE: - Although full, heart and hand, with things requiring my attention, and the difficulties with which I am encompassed, and arising principally from the bitter opposition of those who have claimed to be Old School Baptists, yet I cannot let the last number {the 16th} of the SIGNS pass without dropping you a line upon its contents.

I will begin with those things which have been gratifying to me; namely, the Letters from Brethren Hartwell and Hovey. It is really refreshing to hear of those churches in Maine coming out from the mass of corruption, both in doctrine and ceremonies, with which I had supposed that whole country was covered; and of their setting up a standard in the behalf of the purity and simplicity of Gospel doctrine and order. It is certainly a favorable indication that the Lord has much people there which he intends bringing out as witnesses for himself. May all the Lord's children be led to distinguish between the light of Gospel simplicity of which the Lord has given them a *lamp*, and the darkness of human systems and schemes, and come out from their errors and rally around the standard their brethren have erected in the name of the Lord. But in thus coming out, they must expect opposition, and reproach. If enabled so to conduct in all things, that their opposers may *have no evil thing to say* of them, in truth, reproach will not hurt them; they will find a blessing in it, though it is not pleasant to the flesh.

But Brother Hovey's account of the little band of faithful ones at Brighton is the most surprising. The existence of such a company of witnesses for the truth in that situation is one of those remarkable instances in which God has at all times displayed the power of Sovereign Grace in rearing up and preserving a standard to the glory of his Name in the midst of everything calculated to prostrate it. It is like a living fire amidst surrounding waters; it is like some of those little companies of spiritual disciples which during the dark ages were occasionally found and hunted down in the very heart of Rome.

For there they exist, the humble followers of Jesus, amidst the wealth, the grandeur, the hurry and pride of the Emporium of the Eastern States, and which perhaps surpasses in these things, any spot of the same size in America. Again, they have on one hand in this vicinity the Unitarian College, called Harvard University, and not far from them the Baptist Theological School at Newton, and near them in Boston, the Baptist Foreign Mission Rooms, and Board of Missions in all the splendor of their operations, and are encompassed with what are called *the Baptist churches* of Boston, of Charleston, Cambridge and Newton, with their great D.D's for pastors. And yet these Brethren have had boldness given them to come out from all this *pomp* in religion and to meet by themselves for the purpose of worshipping God in the simplicity and spirituality of his instituted worship. Then the humble, meek and quiet spirit which Brother Hovey's letter breaths, renders it more estimable, than a million of such Reports of great human exertions, as emanate from the *foreign mission rooms*, with Dr. Bolles' or Dr. Sharpe's name appended to them. I did feel on reading the letters of these brethren as though I should be rejoiced to visit them, were I at liberty to roam among the scattered bands of my Master's *little flock*.

I now pass to notice some of those pieces less pleasant. I will commence with the extract on *Sinners coming to Christ*, which you have credited to Emmons, I presume Dr. Emmons. Perhaps many of your readers will be surprised, and perhaps think me wild, when I say that this piece is one of the greatest or most complete counterfeits I have ever seen of the New Birth. That either the writer was a stranger to Divine Quickening or was so accustomed to the dialect of Ashdod that he could not speak intelligibly in the Jews language. There is much said of *God's teaching*, but it is apparently the *natural man taught*. There is an intimacy formed between the sinner and Christ, like the branches and Vine; but it is not the branches growing out of the Vine – it is *His divine and human excellencies, and his mediatorial offices* from the views they have of Him as the brightness of the Father's glory, that *concur to unite them to him as the branches are united to the Vine*.

There is a coming to Christ for salvation, but it is not a finding of salvation *in him*, but in their *coming* to him.

To show the justness of my remarks, I will quote a few of his expressions. He says, "By being taught their own characters and the character of God, they are fully convinced that no mercy can be found out of Christ." Again, "They cannot see how it is possible that God should be just, and yet justify

any but those who came to Christ and believe in Him for salvation." He speaks of God's *terms of mercy* in a way of implying condition. His idea of the failure of the similitude of the Prodigal is I think incorrect. Sinners when brought to return to God in the penitent spirit of the Prodigal, know no more in reality of the Mediator than the Prodigal did, until he is unfolded to them, as in figure he was to him, in the *robe, feast* &c. He says, "They are willing to come to Christ and rely upon his mediation and atonement as the sole ground of their complete *restoration to the divine favor.*" If they are willing to come to him, they know not that they may come, till his work is applied to them; the *best robe must be brought and put on them* &c. But I will not multiply quotations. A little attention will show that his was a *legal gospel*, and an *un-regenerated unborn, renewed man*; if I may use the expression.

I had intended to notice your New York Scraps, but I must let him pass for this time. Only requesting the next time he writes that he would give us Scripture quotations in proof, and not mutilated Scripture neither, as in his extract from Rom.8:1.

S.TROTT.

Fairfax Court House, Va., Aug.8, 1834.

REGARDING A LETTER BY OSBOURN.

BROTHER BEEBE: - I fear I shall make myself liable to the charge of being censorious, and also that I shall intrude upon the patrons of the SIGNS by the frequency of my communications recently. I had scarcely finished my remarks occasioned by brother S.'s letter, when I received the 14th number of the SIGNS, containing Elder James Osbourn's Letter, No.1 & 2, to Brother Hassell, in which there are two or three points, upon which I was truly constrained by my feelings {and I hope they were correct feelings} to drop a few remarks.

1st. He has brought to view certain ideas relative to the present and succeeding state of the church for *many years to come*, which have not to my knowledge, been generally entertained. The ideas are that the saints are dieing a *mystical death*, are suffering an inward martyrdom, from a famine that is now upon us, &c., and that this state of things is to remain for many years; that this is all the suffering worth speaking of that they need to fear for many years, &c.; that this famine is not to be accompanied by the sword; that we are not near unto persecuting times, &c. Now these are Elder Osbourn's

thoughts; and they may be correct thoughts; but his thinking so can be no authority for my thinking so. If he shows me good and Scriptural grounds for his conclusions, then I shall receive them as true. I am not; and I hope most of our Old School Baptists are not disposed to receive any man's assertions as authority in religion. Now what I want upon this point is that Elder Osbourn should give us his authority from the word of God for these views if he wishes us instructed by them. The Lord by Amos says, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets." Amos 3:7. If therefore the Lord has determined to bring and continue such a state of things upon the church as Elder Osbourn describes it stands recorded in prophecy, in the scriptures of truth; and as he speaks positive as to what God's thoughts are in this matter, I think we have good right to expect of him that he will show us the prophecy and its application to this time and case. He has, it is true, given us some texts. But the point is; has he applied them correctly? He quotes Jer.14:2 & 3, as being a prophecy of the calamity that is now upon gospel Zion. I am not disposed to dispute its application, but if admitted, his hypothesis falls, for the sword and the famine and the pestilence are to go together, see verses 12, 15 -18. And so we know in fact, they went together in the primary fulfillment of this prophecy as it relates to the Jews. Lam.1:6, is liable to a similar remark. Again, he quotes Dan.11:34, evidently as a prophecy relating to this event, saying, "But in this calamity {that is of the famine,} of ours, we shall be holpen, &c." Now by taking verses 33 and 34 together, we find that the calamity from which they are to be *holpen* is that of the sword and flame and captivity. So that I cannot find anything there to support his view. Again, Jer.30:17, is no more favorable, for it is from the wounds of a cruel enemy that they are to be healed, and those that have *devoured* Zion, and who were adversaries and preyed upon her, &c., that were to be destroyed; see the connection from verse 14. He also quotes Rev.3:2, as applicable. I will not say it is not, but am however inclined to believe that in the order it refers to an earlier period than this. And whether it does or not; it is not those who are ready to die, but, the things which remained that are ready to die, as it stands in the text.

The 2nd point relates to what he says of those who preach the *truth of the gospel*, in distinction from those *judaizing teachers*. In the first place I would like to know whether the *nine tenths* who are on the *sick list*, and whom he calls *gospel preachers*; are to be considered persons who are subjects of grace, and whom the Lord has sent forth as

laborers into his harvest or not? From the expressions above quoted I should conclude he views them as such; but what he says in his 1st Letter, and quotes I Cor.13 to support, and from his saying that most of our pulpits where the truth in the letter is preached, are *void of holy unction and heavenly dew*, and some other expressions, I should conclude he meant to represent them as total strangers to a life of faith on the Son of God and to true gospel grace in their hearts. Then the Lord have mercy on us, for I know not who of us will stand. If such a portion of those whom, we Old School Baptists are used to consider gospel preachers are to fall short at last, I have every reason to fear that I shall be of that miserable number. I would like to be informed of what he means by that *holy unction*, which the *few* have? I have read of an *unction from the Holy One*, which is distinguished as teaching all things &c. I John 2:20, 27. And I have thought that those whom we call *gospel preachers* manifest more of this latterly than formerly, in the clear illustrations they give of scripture and scriptural truth.

If he considers these nine tenths as persons whom Christ has gifted and called into the ministry; the next enquiry I would make is, whether the ministry mostly *becoming a dry breast*, and *clouds without water*, &c., is a fault of ours or owing to a peculiar dispensation of God wherein he would afflict his church? If the former, may the Lord give us repentance; if the latter, I entreat the *few favored ones* to have compassion on us, and not speak tauntingly concerning us; for surely the affliction of being thus *barren*, towards our brethren is sufficient.

I know very well that gospel preachers, at this day labor under very peculiar discouragements, both from within and without, that they truly prophecy in sackcloth. I also know that there is a general dearth in Zion, and I have myself concluded that a famine was coming upon the church. But the idea that it is a separate thing from the persecution which awaits the church in the last struggle of the beast, and to last of itself for many years, throws such an additional gloom upon the prospect before us, and appears so different from anything I had conceived of the prophecies concerning Zion, and of Christ's tender care of his church as the Great Shepherd, that I cannot give in to it without some pretty clear Scriptural proofs in point. And yet if I have been deceived in my views upon these points, I wish to be undeceived.

And in reference to what he says of the ministry; that is, what he admits to be gospel ministry, I may misapprehend him; but I think he speaks rather too contemptuous of us, and

not to manifest that fellow sympathy which he ought to feel for our deplorable state if we indeed are Christ's ministers. If he is more favored in his own soul, and in being enabled to administer *savoury food* such as *deeply exercised can feed on*, he has nothing whereof to glory.

But the 3rd point is one in which as Paul said to Peter {Gal.2:11,} he is, as I think, to be blamed. It is simply an allusion in his 2nd Letter; but he refers to the ninth part of his life, {a work which he published this past winter,} for a full account. He in that chapter of his own biography, speaks very disrespectfully of a brother who stands firm as an Old School Baptist. This brother is considered by some as rather severe in his manner of preaching against errors; but it is nothing he has borrowed, it is simply his own peculiar manner of expressing himself, and to those of us who have had some familiar acquaintance with him, he appears to possess much of the spirit of meekness and humility; yea, in every respect more of the spirit of the gospel than many who make higher pretensions to holiness. I will not say what was the substance of this brother's preaching at the period to which Elder Osbourn alludes, for he was at that time on a high pinnacle of popularity, a station which I do not myself believe favorable for administering wholesome food to the *poor* or afflicted of the flock, but since that, he has been through the fire, with the furnace much heated, and during the whole has been a steadfast, firm advocate for gospel truth. If Elder Osbourn cannot be himself reconciled to him, so as to fellowship him as a brother, still as others whom he acknowledges as saints, do feel a fellowship for him; I should consider it more consistent with a gospel order and spirit for him to have borne his grievance by himself, seeing it is nothing he can make a proper subject of discipline, rather than to have published him as he has done. And especially I think the SIGNS ought by no means to be made a vehicle for conveying these attacks on the feelings of a brother already suffering oppression on every hand. This I think my brethren will generally admit, when in addition to what has been said, we consider his steadfast and disinterested course in support of truth, notwithstanding all the opposition and discouragements he has had to contend with in the city where he resides. Instead of leaving the little company of disciples, who adhered to him for the truth's sake, to be scattered or find pasture where they could, because they could not furnish him a support, as others have done, he has engaged in a laborious but honest business for his own support while he continues to preach regularly unto them.

In conclusion I will observe that my remarks on the first two points might more properly have been omitted till I had an opportunity of seeing his third Letter, should it be published, were it not that I knew the feelings of our brother must be wounded at seeing such an allusion to him in the SIGNS, and I did not feel disposed to leave him any longer than I could help, to feel as though he had no brother to sympathize with him. Besides from the manner in which Elder Osbourn appeared to shape his subject, I thought it not likely he would furnish any more light upon the points on which I wanted information, and if this should reach him before his other was published he might perhaps be disposed to gratify my wishes before he closed his subject. For I truly wish to know the ground upon which he establishes his views relative to the present state of the church.

S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., July 15, 1835.

NO.1, ON ISAIAH 20th.

BROTHER BEEBE: - On reading the 20th chapter of Isaiah, several months since, I was forcibly impressed with the idea that this passage of Scripture had reference to these times; in a word, that here we had declared the result of the struggle which is at present going on between the Catholics and the Benevolent Societies of the day, for preeminence in the valley of the Mississippi. On some reflection upon the passage, and it has been repeatedly on my mind since, and on comparing it with certain other passages of Scripture which I shall have occasion to notice in the following remarks, I feel more confirmed in the conclusion, that this portion of prophecy is yet to have its fulfillment, and that in this country in part at least. If correct in my present views of this prophecy, I may have been mistaken in the supposition I gave in my "Letters on the Image of the Beast," relative to the Witnesses being killed by the influence of the Image, or of the reformed churches through that Image, rather than by Popery.

This and the preceding chapter of Isaiah had no doubt a primary reference to events which in part have already transpired relative to national Egypt, though I doubt whether that part of the prophecy contained in the 19th chapter, from the 18th to the 25th verse, has as yet had its primary fulfillment, or will have, until the time of national Israel's being brought under the power of the gospel; when there will be no

longer an Assyrian or Babylonish captivity, Egyptian bondage or Israelitish infidelity to oppose the Church of Christ.

That Egypt was typical of, or represents a *spiritual interest* which is to exist in opposition to the church of Christ in the latter days of her *wilderness state*, is evident from Rev.11:8, where it is said of the Two Witnesses that, "their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt," &c., as Babylon also, the capital of Assyria and Chaldea, is made to represent another opposing interest; namely, the Church of Rome. See Rev.17:5, 14:8, 16:19, and 18:21. That Egypt and Babylon or Assyria cannot with propriety, be considered as designed to represent the same thing spiritually, is evident from the fact that in Scriptural history and prophecy they are represented as entirely distinct nations and often opposing powers, whilst both are brought to view as distinct from Israel, and often its oppressors. Having made these preliminary remarks, I will now present some of my thoughts relative to the spiritual import of this 20th chapter of Isaiah. Not that I will presume to give a full illustration of the proper application of the whole passage.

Assyria being synonymous with Babylon, evidently represents spiritually the Church of Rome. Egypt as has already been noticed, being uniformly presented, in the Scriptures, as distinct from Babylon or Assyria, must refer to something other than that *interest* in the prophecy under consideration. If we can determine what is intended by that "great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified," Rev.11:8, we shall undoubtedly get at the true application of the name in the prophecy. The name *Egypt* signifies *bondage*, and Egypt in the Scriptures is called the *house of bondage*, having been such to Israel. Israel soon passed into the house of bondage after being distinguished as Israel, or as *having power with God*, the import of that name. The church of Christ, after being manifested as the *true Israel*, or as *having power with God*; that is, as having boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, &c., {Heb.10:19-20,} soon passed into a *house of bondage*, under the introduction of Judaism and a multiplication of ceremonies, or that mystery of iniquity which began to work even in the Apostles days. It was under the influence of a religion of this kind among the Jews, a religion which made void the law of God by the traditions of men that our Lord was crucified. As in Egypt literally, so in this case, the *task masters*, which bound heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and laid them on men's shoulders, would not move them with one of their fingers. And

all their works they did to be seen of men, as the Egyptians kept Israel making bricks with which to build their Pyramids, those standing monuments of their ostentatious folly to this day. See Matt.23:4 & 5. So the Apostles say in reference to the binding of the burden of circumcision upon the disciples, that "our fathers, nor we are able to bear;" again, "as many as wish to make a fair show in the flesh constrain you to be circumcised," &c., it is added, "For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law, but desire to have you circumcised that they may glory in your flesh." Acts 15:10, Gal.6:12,13. Thus the *house of bondage* is clearly traced down from ancient Egypt, to New Testament times. And are not the *bondage* and the *glorying in the flesh* above noticed fully copied out in the popular religion of this day? With all their benevolence, are not the managers, the *modern task masters* binding heavy burdens upon those under their influence, in their proposed conditions of salvation, in their multiplication of ceremonies and plans of benevolence, and in their tithing or taxing all the increase from the farm, the purse, the servant girls weekly wages, &c., down to the rag-bag? And is not the same external show, and glorying in the flesh, manifested now as anciently? How often are we informed of their persuading persons to sign their Temperance pledges, for the sake only of the influence of their names, or their inducing persons to head a subscription with a round sum with the understanding that it was not to be paid; of their obtaining the passage of resolutions recommending the benevolent schemes, in Associations where they expect nothing further? Of the flaming reports of Agents and of Missionaries, who like the Missionary within the bounds of the Abington or Bridgewater Association, Penn., that reported through the American Baptist, 400 baptized, but who on being questioned about it, acknowledged an error, and on being questioned further, had to reduce the 400, considerably? And do the managers in these schemes manifest any greater disposition than the Scribes of old, to share the burdens? No; but rather thereby to increase their own means of worldly grandeur and show.

But this is called a *Great City*. And truly it is; men in all ages have manifested a fondness for a conditional salvation and a showy religion. In all ages the priests, the task-masters in the humanly contrived religions have been disposed to gratify the public whim, by loading their religion, with ceremonies and parade, and the more they have burdened the people with these things, the more popular they have been, and the more they have fattened on the spoils. This city has many streets. There is Mission street, which has Presbyterian

Mission Alley, Baptist Mission Alley, &c., running out from it; there Bible Society Street, and many others. But there is one Main street or thoroughfare, where all the citizens intermingle, and where the "dead bodies of the Witnesses are to lie."

But this is also called Sodom, spiritually – not literally – remember. The sin of Sodom therefore, practiced here is in a spiritual or religious sense. And can this sin be found in the city we are describing? Yes; as the Prophet says of Jerusalem, "The shame of their countenance doth witness against them, and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not." Isa.3:9. Look at the whole mission and moneyed concern; is there any intercourse with the *bride the Lamb's wife*, or with her daughters, the individual gospel churches, as such in these things? Any consultation of pastor and church in managing those society plans? Not at all. The Boards of the various Societies, composed mostly of preachers, have all the intercourse among themselves. They send out the Agents and Missionaries, appoint their fields of labor, finger the money, what is not swallowed up by the Agents in the collection, and manage the whole business; it is altogether a *male concern*; Sodomy to the full! Yea, more. For as the Apostle speaks {Romans, chapter 1,} of a sin which was not even mentioned in Sodom; so in this great city we find female Tract Societies, female Mite Societies, female prayer meetings, &c., in which females *religiously* associate together, not as in churches, nor as churches, where "there is neither males, nor females, but all one in Christ Jesus;" but as females by themselves.

Having thus pointed out spiritual Egypt as exemplified in this *great city*, I am, I think, safe in supposing the same intended by Egypt in this 20th chapter of Isaiah. I would here make a passing remark; that the view here taken of Rev.11:8, if correct, goes to confirm the position I took in my "Letters on the Image of the Beast," relative to the place where the *Witnesses* are to be killed.

But there is another character connected with the Egyptians in the passage under consideration; namely, the Ethiopians. These were a nation bordering upon Egypt, situated above it, on the same *troubled* and *muddy* River, the Nile; the waters of which both drank.

Ethiopia and Egypt are repeatedly connected together in Scripture prophecy. I however find no direct figurative application in the Scriptures, of Ethiopia, or the Ethiopians, except in Jer.11:23, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil?" This was addressed to that adulterous generation of the Jews who were about to be carried captive to

Babylon, and corresponds in idea with the prophecy of Daniel, concerning the Egyptians of our day; namely, that "the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand." Dan.12:10. Amos 9:7, also may be considered a figurative application of the term, where speaking of Israel as being rejected of God and about to be driven from their land, the prophet says, "Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, saith the Lord?"

The Ethiopians in the passage we have under consideration, may refer to a distinct class from the Egyptians, but I am inclined to the belief that they are designed to prefigure the same people, and to designate them as being of the same character, having the same blackness and depravity of heart, now they have floated down the broad stream of their *troubled* and *muddy* systems, till they have got into Egypt, and near the great Sea of Babylonish corruption, and of destruction which awaits the whole mass of the *Man of sin*, as when they started at the source of this over-flowing river. The term may also show, that notwithstanding the *white washing* they may have put on, and their great pretensions to the peculiar favor of heaven, they, instead of being recognized of God as his *free-born sons*, are to him, as the *children of the Ethiopians*, and destined to be subject to perpetual bondage.

Having thus arranged the several characters brought to view in this prophecy, I will leave further consideration of the subject for another opportunity.

Yours, as ever,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax County, Va., Sept.26, 1836.

NO.2, ON ISAIAH 20th.

Brother Beebe: - Having in the preceding letter noticed the principal characters of the great and awful *drama* predicted in this chapter, I will now examine the facts prophetically assigned to each. We will commence with the Prophet's part as specified verse 2: "At the same time spake the Lord by Isaiah the son of Amoz saying, Go and loose the sackcloth from off thy loins and put off thy shoe from thy foot. And he did so, walking naked and barefoot." According to verse 3rd, He thus *walked naked and barefoot, three years for a sign and wonder upon Egypt and Ethiopia*.

As Isaiah and other prophets had to endure in their measure the same afflictions they were directed to pronounce upon the people, so the Great Prophet of Israel, the Antitype

of those prophets, not only endured the same temptations, persecutions, and afflictions which he has appointed for his people, for *he was tempted in all points like as we are*; but he also subjected himself to the same wrath which is due to transgressors. And as Isaiah was *three years* a sign of what Egypt and Ethiopia was to suffer, so our Lord was three days a sign of what awaits the transgressors, the finally impenitent; for in his being subjected to the curse of the law in his death, we see exemplified that eternal curse which awaits them. Hence "this gospel of the kingdom is to be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." But herein he far excels the type, Isaiah was only a sign, the Lord Jesus besides being thus a witness unto all nations of the wrath due them from the divine law, and hence his declaration. *If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?* But he also suffered as a substitute for his people, and was *made a curse for them*, "to deliver them from the curse of the law." Gal.3:13.

Again as the prophets were thus made to feel the afflictions they prophesied of, so the true ministers of the gospel have to be made acquainted, in their own experience, with the various temptations and trials, to which the people of God may be subject, among whom they minister; that they may know how to speak a word in season to those who are in trouble.

But 3rdly, the Prophet here, I think, represents the church of Christ; and as he had to endure beforehand nakedness and shame, representing that, coming upon Egypt and Ethiopia; so Peter assures us, I Pet. 4:17, that the *time is that judgment must begin at the house of God*; and adds, "And if it begin first at us, what shall the end of them be that obey not the gospel of God, &c." The connection is evidently applicable to the gospel of God in every period of the gospel day, and so I understand the Apostle as intending by the *time*, the gospel time; that is, that such is the order under the gospel dispensation. That no less, than in the coming of the judgment upon literal Jerusalem, must it be in the judgment of God, coming upon the *Egypt where our Lord was crucified*, or the *man of sin*; that *judgment must begin at the house of God*, by which is meant the Church of Christ; hence Peter says, *if it begin at us*. It must there begin for the trial of the faith of the saints, {verse 12 of the context,} and also for purging of the churches; for it is written, "Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away." But the same afflictions or persecutions which the Lord, for wise purposes, suffers the *Egyptians and Sodomites* of this day, to inflict upon his people;

he will visit upon them in a more awful degree. He giveth *blood to drink, to those who have shed the blood of saints and prophets; he that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity,* &c. Rev.16:6, & 13:10.

But an important inquiry in this case, is, what is intended by Isaiah's *walking naked and barefoot*? 1st. It was an emblem of captivity. 2nd. Of degradation and shame. As Isaiah bore the emblem, so the church must bear these. She has been for a long time in the wilderness, but she is now approaching to a state of captivity; that is like captives, the churches of Christ will be deprived of their religious liberty, and be driven from their homes, the places where they now meet in the family circle, the tents where they are sheltered from the storms of the world. In addition to this, they will experience a famine; "not of bread, nor of water; but of hearing the word of the Lord." All this will be evidently in connection with the killing of the Witnesses.

As to the degradation and shame, this was in the case of Isaiah, only so in the eyes of the people, in truth it was not so, for he was walking in obedience to the command of God; so in the case of the churches of Christ, and of the ministers of the gospel, every attempt will be made to *turn their glory into shame* by those who *seek after leasing*; or deception. And too successful will these benevolent Egyptians be in heaping shame and contempt before men, on those who will not tread mortar in their brickyard, or in other words, who will not do their dirty work of filching pennies from widows, orphans and servants, to increase the funds of what they call the Lord's treasury; or their slavish work of *grinding at their mills*; and who prefer the simple *manna* and the *water from the Rock* of the wilderness, to eating the fish, and the leeks and onions of Egypt. And truly this is the diet on which the Egyptians of our day live. For as the eating of fish increases a man's thirst, so the system which they live on, as gospel, is continually increasing their thirst both for money and for the praises of men. And as your breath will publish aloud the fact, if you eat leeks or onions, so these persons must have published, all their religious doings. Such will be the shame heaped at this period upon those who will not conform to have religious burdens imposed upon them, and will not admire their parade, that it will be too insufferable a disgrace to be an Old School Baptist, for any to endure, but such as choose rather to obey God than man, and who, like Moses, have been brought by Divine grace to esteem the reproaches of Christ greater riches, than the treasures of Egypt, yea than all the funds connected with their benevolent Institutions, and all their glory. As these

things must be immediately connected with the killing of the Witnesses, that event must certainly be fast approaching, for these things *begin to come to pass*; therefore the direction is; *look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh*. Luke 21:23. But that which I particularly wish to notice, is the prophecy upon Egypt and Ethiopia; namely, that, "So shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, even with their buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt." Verse 4. As this is to be understood of a spiritual or religious captivity, it can mean nothing less than that these Egyptians shall be brought under the power of the king of Assyria, that is, of the Pope; and not only loose their liberty and forms of worship, and be oppressed as they have oppressed the true church of Christ, or as quoted before from Rev.13:10, as they *have lead into captivity so shall they go into captivity*; but they shall be lead clear off, that is, as I understand it, be led to submit to, or embrace popery. For it cannot be a mere persecution, or force put upon them, because it is to be to the *shame of Egypt*; and no shame can be attached to the persecuted as such.

Again the expression used in reference to the nakedness of these must imply something more than Isaiah's walking naked. To me it is probable that Isaiah wore breeches such as the priests wore, Exod.28:42, and such as those Africans which *go naked*, wear. So the churches of Christ will not be left to expose themselves to shame by acting out the corruptions of their hearts. But these Egyptians will have no such covering; all their uncleanness and vileness will be exposed to open view. The shame and contempt which they have endeavored to put upon the Old School Baptists, will be heaped four fold upon themselves; for when they go over to popery, their deception, and the tendency of their religious frenzy, toward that corrupt and beastly religion will be fully manifested.

Verse 5 and 6; "And they shall be afraid and ashamed of Ethiopia their expectation, and of Egypt their glory. And the inhabitant of this isle shall say in that day, Behold, such is our expectation, whither we flee for help to be delivered from the king of Assyria; and how shall we escape?" The term is frequently used in scripture to denote countries beyond the sea whether properly islands or not. The *they* of verse 5, and the *inhabitants* of verse 6, do not refer to the Prophet or the church represented by him; but to the inhabitants at large. There is, at this time, a considerable excitement among the citizens of this country on account of the great increase of

Catholics among us, and the attention seems generally turned to the Home Mission, Bible, and Sunday School Societies, as preventatives to the Catholics gaining the ascendancy in our country; and the advocates of these Institutions are encouraging this excitement, and this expectation, and turning it to their advantage; to the increase of their funds and influence. Hence the sentiment which has been once and again advanced, by the advocates of the Home Mission Society, that *it has a claim upon us as citizens* to support it. And in thus *fleeing to those institutions for help*, they are building them up, increasing their influence, and thus empowering them ultimately to *scatter the holy people, and kill the Witnesses*. And when the expectations of the people, becomes a little more intensely fixed on these institutions, to save the country from the horrors of popery, they will sanction the putting down of those who oppose the progress of these institutions, as do we Old School Baptists, upon Bible grounds. But how awful will be the disappointment of the people, as seeing the leaders, agents, and notaries of these institutions, going over to popery. Well may they in their confusion cry out, *Behold such is our expectation!* The fact is, the putting down the Old School Baptist preachers, and scattering the churches, will directly hasten the consummation of this amalgamation of the Mission interest with popery; for contemptible as we may be in their eyes, whilst we have liberty to bear public testimony against their innovations and *trickery*, and to hold forth the doctrine and order of the New Testament. We have considerable influence in restraining them from going the whole length of their corrupt desires. Instances no doubt will occur to most of the readers of this, exemplifying the above position.

In the winding up of this great drama, will be fully exemplified that which is written, *Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world*, and also, *God taketh the wise in their own craftiness*. I Cor.1:20 & 3:19. As it ever has been, so it will be in this case, when men lean to their own understandings to guide them in religion and thus exalt the wisdom of men above the wisdom of God, they will run into the grossest absurdities. And *God will take* these, who are so *wise* to devise for Him, *in their own craftiness, sending them strong delusions*, by suffering them successfully to add scheme to scheme, until they land in popery, and thus turn the flattering expectations of the people, into disappointment and disgust, as the Ten kings, after giving their power *one hour* to the Beast, will be made to know the abominations of the *whore and to hate her*, &c. Rev.17:12, 16. Besides being thus allured along by their vain imprudence and presumption into popery,

these Egyptians will become finally identified with the Beast, and involved in the sudden destruction that awaits that whole interest, and the declaration of God will be fulfilled in them, "That if any man worship the beast or his Image and receive his mark in his forehead, or hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture," &c. Rev.14:9, 10.

Owing to the remark I made in the commencement of the former Letter, "That I may have been mistaken in supposing that the Witnesses would be killed by the Image or two horned Beast, as expressed in my Letters on the Image of the Beast," &c., it will be proper here to make some additional observations. On first contemplating this subject I concluded it probable that the *killing of the Witnesses* would be brought about by the Catholics getting the ascendancy in this country, and of course by the power of the seven horned Beast. Hence the remark above quoted from Letter 1st. But on a closer examination of the subject, I feel convinced, from the connection of events, and of prophecy, as above developed, that the Witnesses will first be killed, and then will come the captivity here prophesied of the Egyptians as Christians, the professors of the church. There the dead bodies of the witnesses will be seen lying not in Babylon, but in the great City which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, &c. This seems to me to receive additional confirmation from the specified period Isaiah was *to walk naked and barefoot for a sign and wonder, &c., namely - Three years*. The dead bodies of the Witnesses are to lie before *life from God enters into them, three prophetic days and a half; that is, three years and a half*. And as the three years captivity of these Egyptians is to terminate in their being involved in the destruction of the Beast, by the pouring out of the *vials of the wrath of God*, as has been showed in part, and is fully confirmed by Rev.16:2, this period certainly cannot terminate previous to the killing of the Witnesses, or after the commencement of the *Three and a half years*.

You see I am again at my old practice of *counting numbers*; but as *periods* and *numbers* have been, by the Holy Spirit, connected with the prophecies concerning the Beast and his Image, I do not feel that I have any more right to throw away, or to treat with neglect these numbers or periods, than I have any other parts of the prophecies. Brethren therefore, I hope, will excuse me for trying to count or compute these numbers, not to display my wisdom, but for a better understanding of the wisdom of God therein revealed in a mystery. I must also beg the excuse of certain brethren, if I

have or again should, make my objections to anything delivered as Divine prophecy which seems to stand for support, not upon the direct portions of the *more sure word of prophecy, which we have*, but upon strong impressions made upon the minds of those who deliver such. If I err in this, may the Lord and my brethren forgive me. A word to the wise is sufficient.

But to return to the subject before us. At what ever period this captivity may come upon Egypt. It will be a rapid conquest which the Catholics or spiritual Chaldeans will make according to Hab.1:5-11. The description given of it by this prophet is terrible. That this prophesy had not a final accomplishment in the captivity of the Jews by the king of Babylon's army, is evident from Paul's quoting the 5th verse, and addressing a caution therefrom to the Jews to whom he spake. See Acts 13:40, 42. As therefore an accomplishment of the prophecy was looked for since the commencement of the gospel dispensation, and of course must refer to Chaldea or Babylon spiritually, no event seems more to correspond with the rapidness of the conquest here predicted, than that last grand struggle of the beast, when the kings *shall agree and give their kingdoms unto the beast and receive power as kings one hour with the beast &c.* See Rev.17:12,17. But rapid and terrible as may be this last prophecy of popery, the church of Christ may adopt the language of Habakkuk in verse 12th of the same chapter and connection, "Art thou not from everlasting, O Lord my God, mine Holy One? We shall not die, O Lord, thou hast ordained them for judgment; and, O Mighty God, thou hast established them for correction."

Again, the prophet Isaiah compares this same conquest by the spiritual Assyrians, to the overflowing of a mighty river, Isa.8:5,8. This overflowing is to *fill the breadth of Immanuel's land*, the conquest therefore is to extend over all countries where the churches of Christ are. It must be a very contracted and forced construction that would confine the prophecy of this and the preceding chapter to the conquest of Israel and Judah literally, by the Assyrians. Notice the sign given, chap.7:11, and compare that with what has just been quoted from verse 8, chapter 8.

I have thus given the views my mind has been led to receive from this 20th chapter of Isaiah, and from a comparison thereof with other Scriptures referred to. The time I think is short, in which the correctness or incorrectness of these views will be decided. I have no idea that they will be found perfectly correct, or so in every point. They may be wholly wrong, I leave others to form their own opinions from

an examination of the Scriptures referred to, and others relating to the same subject. One thing is certain, the word of God will abide, and every prophecy therein contained will receive its just and full accomplishment, and at the appointed time, whether we or any of us, have wisdom given us to discern the signs of the times as they approach or not, and in spite of all the devices of men to change the times. Daniel says, *the wise shall understand*, and *none of the wicked shall understand*. Into God's hand would I commit my times and ways, and wait patiently for him. Still I think it my duty to seek and to understand what he has been pleased to reveal, and to discern the *signs of the times*, and if he give me understanding therein, to him belongs, and to him will result the glory and the praise.

Yours, in Brotherly Affection,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Sept.26, 1836.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.1.

BROTHER BEEBE: - As I am at this time pretty much confined at home by indisposition, I will, in accordance with the request of our brother J.D. Green, of Georgia, commence some remarks on the 4th chapter of Isaiah.

In being thus forward with my observations, I do not wish to forestall brother Leland, should he be disposed to give his views on this portion of scripture. The fact is, that even if I should be so happy as to agree in views with him, there is no danger of my so exhausting the important subject before us, as not to leave abundant room for brother Leland to bring forward something new. The probability is, that we may differ in our exposition of parts of the chapter, hence our different views may be presented for the consideration of our brethren.

The chapter commences with this well known passage, "And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach."

The expression, *in that day*, will lead us to look to the preceding chapter for the time referred to; following the 3rd chapter back to its beginning, we shall find that also directly connected in subject and in form of expression, with the 2nd chapter, thus shall we be led back to find the period of this prophecy designated in these words, in chapter 2, "and it shall come to pass that in the last days the mountain of the Lord's

house shall be established in the top of the mountains, &c." Thus we have the period of this prophecy fixed under the gospel dispensation; the expression *last days* being a Jewish phrase to denote the reign of the Messiah as being the grand concluding dispensation. Besides the event in this and the following verses, and those in verse 2, chapter 4 can only refer to this dispensation. But the enquiry arises, is the phrase, *the last days* to be limited to the beginning of the gospel dispensation? Or does it embrace the dispensation at large; leaving the particular periods of this dispensation to be determined by the nature and order of events? The enquiries here suggested are important for the right understanding of the subject before us. For if the phrase used, fixes the period of the prophecy, to the commencement of the gospel dispensation, then the denunciations and the sins against which they are leveled, mentioned in these several chapters, must be referred to the Jews nationally. But if the period extends more generally through the gospel dispensation, then these predicted crimes must be considered as belonging to the anti-christian interest, or perhaps, more particularly in some of the instances, to the corrupted gospel churches; that is, such as have fallen off from the simplicity of the gospel in which they once stood, and hence still called *daughters of Zion*. By reference to particular events of this prophecy, we shall be led unavoidably to the conclusion, that the *last days* here spoken of cannot be limited to the beginning of the gospel. The events, for instance, predicted in verse 4, chapter 2, have not yet had their accomplishment, neither will they until after the destruction of the anti-christian powers. The prediction in verses 11 – 17, chapter 2, will only receive their general accomplishment when *there shall be one Lord, and his name one over the whole earth*. Again, the prediction, verse 19, chapter 2, and that which is very similar in verse 21, is, by divine inspiration, applied both to the Jews and to others; verse 19 reads, "And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth." The Master foretelling to the women which followed him, the awful destruction coming upon the Jews, says {Luke 23:30,} "Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us, and to the rocks, Cover us;" intimating that the above quoted prophecy would then begin to receive its accomplishment in them. Again, at the opening of the sixth seal {Rev.6:12-17,} when heathen or imperial Rome fell with a great destruction, it is said, "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and

the mighty men, and every bondsman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and said to the rocks and mountains, Fall on us, &c.," thus showing that the above prophecy had an accomplishment when the powerful interest fell. If thus referred to both these interests, it can scarcely be doubted, that it will have an equally full accomplishment in the destruction of that interest, the Romish Anti-Christ or Beast, which is made up of parts borrowed from both the others; the ceremonies of the Church of Rome having been borrowed both from heathenism, and Judaism. And in the destruction of this power the Lord *will arise no less terribly to shake the earth*, than in the other cases.

Having thus clearly established the facts that the general prophecy connected with this 4th chapter, has a reference, as well to the Romish as to the Jewish Anti-christ; or perhaps more correctly, to Anti-christ at large; I will briefly notice, as I pass, with a view to this general application to Anti-christ, that a portion of the prophecy more immediately connected with this 1st verse, chapter 4; namely, that beginning with verse 16, chapter 3, "Moreover the Lord saith because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with outstretched necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet." As Jerusalem which is above, is the mother of us all, those churches which were constituted in accordance with gospel principles, are fitly termed her daughters, or *the daughters of Zion*. What a full portrait picture is here given of many of the churches of this very day, which a few years ago, stood upon gospel principles! How manifestly drawn by him who, with certain eye, looks through all futurity, *declaring the end from the beginning*! For instance, is there not a great deal of pomposity displayed from their pulpits? And do they not frequently treat with much *haughtiness* those who will not submit to their *conversions* or to their *dictations*? Do they not with many *wanton* looks and actions court the embraces of the world? Many of their plans and forms being avowedly adopted, for the purpose of attracting the attention of the learned and great, and of obtaining what they call respectable congregations. And do they not occasionally cast forth lascivious looks toward *governmental patronage*? Again, do they not make a great *tinkling* with their feet? If they walk forth in the Mission, the Bible, the Sunday School, or even the Tract or Temperance cause, their silver *leg bands* {ornaments, verse 20,} must tinkle. Not only must there be a *tinkling of money*, but also a noise made to attract the gaze of the multitude toward all their *benevolent* steps, with the same immodesty that would be

manifested by a female should she deck her feet with tinkling ornaments to attract notice. Without stopping to give a particular illustration, I will just call the attention of my readers to the representation given in the following verses of this chapter, of the *precious jewels* and *ornaments* of human device, with which the churches of this day are decking themselves. More especially would I entreat them to mark well the denunciations of God upon all these ornaments, and upon those that wear them. And may these denunciations be a warning to the children of God to separate themselves from all such wanton churches and professors.

And in that day, at the period when it shall come, in which God shall thus visit these corrupted *daughters of Zion* for their abominations, they will have arrived at such a pitch of madness in their religious zeal, or to such a state of desperation, that *seven women will take hold of one man*, saying, "We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel; only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach." The impression of many is, that this prophecy is fulfilled in the popular frenzy of the day, of making profession of religion. By way of accommodation, this text certainly serves, aptly, to illustrate much that is passing, at this time, in religion. It has become quite a reproach, to make no profession of religion, especially not to join any of the popular societies. And the most that appears to be wanted, is to be called *christians*. They can mostly weave, what they think, a very good covering of righteousness; they want not the imputed righteousness of Christ for justification. And they can fatten or bloat upon their frames and feelings, and *benevolent* doings; they of course want no other bread. In fact it is to be seriously apprehended that two-thirds of those who join the Baptist Churches at this day, do it for the purpose of taking away their reproach. Their teachers and their consciences reproach them with being sinners; and with not having done what is necessary to *make peace with God*. To remove this reproach, they engage in *making their peace*. What they have to do, according to the present standard, is to bring their minds to a willingness to be saved by Christ, submit to the ordinance, join a church, and adopt a certain prescribed religious form and zeal. Having done this, they set down satisfied, without ever having been brought to such a sense of their wretched, starving state, as to know, that unless Christ gives them of his flesh *for bread* they must forever perish; or of their loathsomeness and nakedness being such that unless washed in a Savior's blood, and clothed in his pure righteousness, they must remain eternally condemned and banished from the presence of God. Whereas

those who are truly taught of God, go to Christ, far more from a sense of the necessity of being fed with that bread which he alone giveth, and of being covered over with his righteousness, than from any desire to be called by his name before men. The circumstances, that the affirmation is of women, might be considered to correspond with the fact of females being so much foremost in professions of religion.

But still if we consider this passage as having any reference beyond its literal accomplishment in the Jews, and the whole connection of the prophecy, I think, obliges us thus to consider it, we must see the phrase *seven women* as having a definite meaning. And what other meaning are we authorized from Scriptural use to affix to the term *women* in a spiritual sense, than that of *denominations* or *sects* of religion, distinct from the true church or bride of Christ? For says Christ in the Songs, "My dove, my undefiled, is but one; she is the only one of her mother, &c." It is true that the church of Christ in reference to her being divided into distinct branches, is spoken of in the plural; but in this case, if I mistake not, the term uniformly used, is *daughters*, daughters of Zion, &c. The term *virgins*, as used in Psalms 45:14 & Rev.14:4, I think used rather to express the distinguishing quality of Christ's sheep. And in the last quoted text, we have the term *women*, evidently used in the sense I have above given to it, as meaning false religions or false churches, and religious societies. The term *seven* being so frequently used in Scripture, to denote the *completeness* or *fulness* of what is represented by it; that I think the term *seven women* in this case can mean nothing other than the various denominations and societies that are distinct from the true church generally, or in the whole. But what *one man* will these denominations take hold of? I answer, the leader of some system, or perhaps nothing more is meant, than that they will agree on some connecting point or bond of human designation. Though, from the views I have entertained on the 20th chapter of Isaiah, in connection with this, I am inclined to believe that the Pope of Rome will be the man, and papacy, popery, &c., the name sought.

But brother Green will anxiously enquire, what is the reproach they will seek to escape by this art? Not only do the Catholics reproach the Protestants for being divided into so many sects and parties, but others point to it as a reproach upon their religion; and they reproach one another for adhering so closely to sectarian views. And the various denominations seem, at this day, to feel that it is a reproach to them, to keep up their sectarian barriers; hence the disposition

manifested, to keep those barriers, or denominational peculiarities, as much as possible from public view. Hence also the boast of the superiority of the great national societies, seeing that in them, all which they are pleased to term *evangelical* denominations, unite in one common cause.

What I therefore think, intended by this prophecy, is that the various denominations will unite in one general *name*, and under one general head, while each will retain its own peculiar views of religion or doctrine; *eat their own bread*, and retain its own particular forms; *wear their own apparel*. Something like this I think must be intended by this text. And nothing less than this can be implied, as I presume will be admitted, in these texts: "All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him {the beast,} whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," Rev.13:8; and this; "And he caused all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark, &c." Rev.13:13. However improbable such an event may appear, certainly those texts imply submission to one general *head*. Besides the idea of a general union has been repeatedly mentioned, and even the beast has been made, that the different denominations are approximating toward such a union. I know not, however, that the plan of uniting under popery, or any one name, has as yet been proposed.

When in connection with these several prophecies, and the circumstances above mentioned, we take into consideration the frenzied state of the religious and political world, and the evidence from past history, of how men will rush headlong to destruction, when given up of God to their own confusion, and to *believe a lie*, the improbability of this general union under one head, and even under popery, in name will vanish. In this way the anti-christian party will prepare themselves for the destruction, which is to come upon all *whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, &c.*, compare Rev.13:8, with Rev.14:9-11.

Under this view of the subject, how precious, and how applicable, how important to be attended to, is the heavenly proclamation, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Rev.18:4.

S.TROTT.
Fairfax Court House, Va., Feb.1st, 1837.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.2.

Verse 2: "In that day shall the Branch of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit of the earth shall be excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel."

We here have the same *day* referred to, which was noticed in the preceding; namely, the period when a general falling away of the churches shall have prevailed, and when God shall visit them for this apostasy. But the reference is to show the state of the true disciples of Christ during, or at that period, described as those "who are escaped of Israel."

The term *Branch* is so frequently used by the prophets to denote the Messiah, that there can be no hesitancy as to the Lord Jesus Christ's being here intended. The term *Branch* in most of the texts in which it occurs, has a special reference to Christ in his kingly office, or as the Son of David. This is very clearly the case in Isaiah 11:1, Jer.23:5, Zech.6:12, and it of course may be supposed to have such reference in this passage. In Isaiah 11:1, there is also an allusion to the circumstance of Christ's birth, as being at the time when the house of David would be very low, or nearly extinct. Joseph could trace his lineage to David, but was in obscurity, and the throne was possessed by the family of the Herods. After the destruction of Jerusalem, if after the butchery of the infants about Bethlehem, the lineage of David was no further to be traced, and was probably extinct, excepting as it existed in this one *righteous Branch*. Hence in that passage the figure employed is that of a stem, or branch, springing up from the roots of a tree, which had been cut down, or become dead.

We have, in the circumstances connected with the birth of Christ one of those special instances in which God accomplishes his wise purposes by instruments, to human view, entirely foreign; and by leaving those instruments to follow their own ambitious inclinations. It was important that the fact of Joseph's being of the house of David should be publicly established; and this not by the design of men, lest it should be thought to be a mere device to raise the reputation of Jesus of Nazareth. This was fully accomplished. A "decree went forth from Cesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed." Under the operation of this decree, Joseph is brought to Bethlehem to show his lineage and be taxed. Jesus was then, and there, born manifestly as a *branch of the house of David*.

In this passage Christ is called emphatically the *Branch of the Lord*; by which we are evidently taught that this was the peculiar King, the Lord had in view in raising David to the throne of Israel, and in establishing his covenant with him, and his seed after him. See in confirmation of this, II Sam.7:12-17, and Psalms 89:3,4, compared with several following verses.

The term, *Branch of the Lord*, may also be used to show the divine superiority of Christ, as king of Israel, over David and all his natural posterity. He is the *root*, as well as *offspring* of David, and *David's Lord*. See Rev.22:16, and Matt.22:42.

Christ as king, is called a *righteous Branch*, Jer.23:5. It is said he *shall reign in righteousness*, Isa.32:1. And he is called *king of righteousness*, Heb.7:2. From all which it is evident that Christ's becoming the *end of the law for righteousness*, and *bringing in an everlasting righteousness*, is connected with his kingly office, or in other words, that he establishes the law, and fulfils its righteous and eternal demands, in the stead of his people, whilst he delivers them from under it, and *makes them kings and priests unto God*.

Again the term, *the Fruit of the earth*, is evidently used to present the Lord Jesus Christ in a different point of view. It has, I think a special reference to the atonement of Christ, or to Christ's death and resurrection as the substitute of his people. Hence the comparison which Christ makes relative to himself when he says, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." John 12:24. It may also be used to designate Christ as that *peculiar and precious fruit* which the earth was destined to bring forth *from the beginning*. Isa.66:8. Under this view of the subject, we shall be led to contemplate the creation of the world, and of men upon it, the entrance of sin, the preservation of man amidst all his corruption, rebellion and depravity, the dividing and dispensing the families of the earth, the various promises, and institutions of God, all as parts of the husbandry of God in the culture of this precious faith. See John 15:1.

I will now notice the persons here connected with Christ, and described as *them that are escaped of Israel*. Not national Israel; though what is here affirmed is true of those Israelites or Jews who *escaped* in the sense here intended. The fact is, that as the term *Israel*, originally belonging to the whole twelve tribes, and was afterwards retained by the revolting tribes, so the term used in a figurative sense, frequently denotes the whole professed or visible Church of Christ. As in the division, ten tribes revolted from the house of David and

turned from the Temple of the Lord, so of the professed Church of Christ, a great proportion has in ages past, revolted from the government of our spiritual David, and turned to their *golden calves*. It is remarkable that the anti-christian interest is represented by ten horns, or kingdoms.

That we are not to understand what is here said of Israel literally, will be manifest from a notice of the fifth verse, as it is evident that cannot be taken in a literal sense.

Of the characteristic here given to the people designed, there is an *escape* which the children of grace experience in their new birth. As they lay exposed to the everlasting wretchedness, and all hope of deliverance by human exertions has failed, the Holy Ghost opens to their view a safe way of escape, and leads them into it. That way is Christ Jesus. As Israel on the shore of the Red Sea, sang the delivering hand of the Lord, who had made a way through the sea, for their escape from the Egyptians; so the believer, in view of what he feels is a miraculous escape, in songs of praise, ascribing his *salvation to the Lord*.

But the escape which I understand to be more immediately intended here, is an escape from being carried away by the *flood* of errors which is *cast out of the mouth of the serpent*. This escape the Apostle Peter aptly defines as an *escape from the pollution that is in the world through lust*. II Pet.1:4. This escape is often spoken of in the scriptures as a *narrow escape*, and is ascribed to the electing Grace of God; and so the believer in his experience finds it. The Master's declaration is, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Again, speaking as before in reference to his coming in the destruction of Jerusalem, but also in reference to his future comings, he describes the signs and wonders shown by the *false christs* and *false prophets* to be such that "if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect." Matt.24:13-24. Here we are taught that nothing short of the *electing love of God* could preserve them. Peter also speaks of this *escape* as a very narrow one; his words are, "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" I Pet.4:18. Once more, Paul, speaking of the *man of sin*, and of the *strong delusions* by which others would be led to *believe a lie*, expresses his confidence in the escape of the Thessalonian brethren with thankfulness to God on the ground of God's having "from the beginning chosen them to salvation." II Thes.2:13. These facts also afford the precious assurance that the elect of God shall all finally escape.

When we come to experience on this point, we find the believer ever ready with a deep felt sense of the fact, to

respond the language of Paul and say, "By the grace of God I am what I am." The natural feelings of the child of grace so strongly incite him to avoid reproach, and to seek worldly ease and applause, his natural propensity to go along with the multitude is so great, the current of his affections run so strongly toward his listening to the affectionate persuasions of others, and toward his going with his old friends and associates, those whom he had accompanied with delight to the house of God into those measures which they recommend so highly as calculated to promote the cause of Christ, and as productive of such good feelings, &c., but more than these, the finding himself so much alone, whilst the more talented, more learned, the wealthier, and more showy baptists, have engaged with zeal in the promotion of the new measures; and connected with this, the sense he has of his own weakness, and the distrust he has of his own heart, and the consequent fears that he may not be actuated by right motives; and worse than all, he feels himself to be such a disobedient, ungrateful child, if a child, that he is often ready to doubt whether it can be possible that the Lord should so distinguish him, as to give him so much clearer light in the doctrine and order of the gospel; I say the child of grace having all these struggles within, together with fightings without, and finding himself still urged by a sense of duty to maintain in the face of opposition, a steadfast adherence to the word of God, as the rule of his faith and practice, realizes in the following language of the poet, the breathings of his heart,

"O! To grace, how great a debtor,
Daily, I'm constrained to be!
Let that grace, Lord, like a fetter,
Bind my wandering heart to thee!"

Whilst he knows how to appreciate the feelings of David when he says, "As for me, my feet were almost gone, my steps had well nigh slipped;" he, like him, also finds his relief in *going into the sanctuary of God*. That is, when he tests by the scriptures the religious notions of those, at whose prosperity he had felt envious; when the preached gospel, like the dew, distils upon his soul; or when he can truly wait upon God for guidance and support, he realizes such a divine beauty and excellency in the simple gospel of Christ, and order of his house, and such a difference between these and the devices of men; Christ to be so sure a foundation to rest his own salvation, and the salvation of the church of God upon; and the *standing* of those who depend on human exertions for

salvation, to be so *slippery*, that he finds his mind settled in the conclusion, that whoever else may leave Christ, to follow the contrivances of men, and how popular soever it may be to trust to an arm of flesh, he must trust in Christ as his only hope, and follow him as his only guide, the captain of his salvation. See Psalms 73.

But I must pass to the consideration of what Christ, as the *Branch of the Lord*, and as *the fruit of the earth*, is to those who have experienced this *escape*.

As the *branch of the Lord*, or as the *King of righteousness*, and *King of Zion*, he is to his people *beautiful and glorious*; or as some render the original, *for beauty and for glory*. 1st. Whilst the *deceived ones* are seeking to adorn the gospel of Christ with their school divinity, and with their additional ceremonies and plans, thinking it too plain without such embellishments to attract the attention of the polite; the *escaped from Israel* see such a divine beauty in Christ, as that *branch* which the Lord alone brought forth, and caused to grow, as they are enabled to discover him budding and spreading throughout the scriptures, and as he is manifested in their experience of salvation, that in their estimation, nothing has been or can be, added by man to the revelation made by him, which does not tend to deformity. 2nd. Whilst others are decking themselves with their faith, their repentance, and their *benevolent* doings, &c., to render themselves beautiful as religionists in the eyes of man, and as they vainly think in the sight of God, the child of grace has seen so much pollution attached to all creaturely acts, that he wishes to be clothed only in the righteousness of Christ; to appear clad alone in that before men, as the ground of his hope, and before God, as his plea for acceptance. Having the evidence that he is covered over with the robe of Christ's righteousness, he feels a confidence in professing his religion before men, and in pleading at the throne of grace, disturbed with the apprehension that he has substituted something else in the place of Christ's righteousness, he feels ashamed and confounded, both before God and men. Thus Christ is to the believer, *for glory* as well as *for beauty*, as he is received as the *Lord their righteousness*. 3rd. Christ considered as *King of Zion*. Whilst others esteem the bulls of Popes, the decrees of councils, the decisions of assemblies, the recommendations of conventions, or the precedents of certain eminent D.D.'s, as giving great importance to religious ceremonies and plans, and whilst the simple institutions and orders established by Zion's King, are pronounced by such, as *inert* and *inefficient*; a *thus saith the Lord*, is that alone, which to the true disciple of Jesus

gives beauty to a religious rite, and renders it precious in his sight; and without that nothing can give value to a ceremony in his estimation. The knowledge that *his Lord has commanded* it, is to the believer, a ground of glorying in what he performs as religious, which no sarcasm, no reproach of men, can diminish in his esteem. With this plea, he with confidence can face councils, and kings in justification of his acts. In a word, the *escaped of Israel* would put on Christ as their only beauty, and glory alone in the conquests of his grace.

As the *fruit of the earth* – Christ is to the *escaped of Israel*, excellent and comely, or for excellency and for comeliness.

First: Christ viewed as the *fruit of the earth* in relation to his atonement. Whilst those who follow new systems, divest the atonement of Christ of its divine excellency, representing it as *indefinite, uncertain*, and an *unsafe* thing to trust in for salvation; even practically, ascribing more direct effect to tears, repentance, and prayers of an individual toward making his *peace with God*, than to the blood of Christ; and presumptuously boast of a virtue in *missionary money* to save souls which the death of Christ would leave to sink to hell; those, who by grace, have escaped those delusions, not only have seen the entire deficiency of everything else to redeem them from destruction, and to make their peace with God, but have also revealed to them by the Holy Ghost, such an excellency in the atonement of Christ, that with confidence *they trust their whole salvation there*; and knowing its excellency, from its meeting their own ruined, helpless case, they feel the assurance that not a soul for whom Christ died can be lost.

Second: From the little which has been said in these days, of the work of Christ, and the abundance that has been said, of what men can and must do to save themselves and others; we must judge that the multitude of professors see no comeliness in the atonement of Christ. But the *escaped of Israel* see such a comeliness in it, that they not only delight to look upon it themselves, but they wish constantly to be presenting it to the view of others, as the way of salvation. They feel that there is a kind of peculiar *comeliness* or *suitableness* {as the word might be rendered,} in it to their case. They feel its suitableness, as meeting the awful guilt and pollution of their case, from which nothing but the blood of the Son of God could redeem and cleanse them; as honoring the Divine law, and maintaining the purity of the Divine throne, whilst it constitutes a channel through which mercy flows freely to them, as condemned sinners; and bringing them to

feel their entire dependence for salvation on that God against whom they had sinned, cutting off all boasting, excepting in the grace of God and all *glorying save in the cross of Christ*.

Third: Christ viewed as that *fruit which the earth from the beginning was destined to bring forth*. The believer has seen such an emptiness in the world, and such an excellency and comeliness in this *fruit*, that he has been made willing to give up the world with all its allurements as his inheritance, and to take Christ as his only portion. Whilst others manifest a disposition to make worldly gain of all their religious acts; the child of grace, however much he may, at times, be tried by a worldly mind, when brought to the test will cheerfully forego all worldly advantages, for Christ and for the honor of his cause. The world without Christ, can afford the believer no happiness, no real enjoyment; with the assurance that Christ is his, and he is Christ's, he is happy in any situation; the frowns of the world cannot mar his peace.

It is true, that in the present tried state of the church, the believer has often to mourn in darkness; many and long are the seasons when his *Son of righteousness* withdraws his shining, when he dares hardly say, that he sees any *beauty and glory* in Christ, when he doubts whether he ever has known the *excellency and comeliness* of Christ in truth. But can he in those gloomy periods find anything in the world to make up the deficiency he feels, or to satisfy the mind? No, he is like the lonely dove, which mourns the absence of her mate. But even these gloomy feelings afford him a gleam of hope that he has known something of Christ, and that he shall again be *brought forth to the light*. And at times, his mind experiences a temporary relief from the application of some precious promise to his case, from a manifestation of the love of God to him, or from a review of his past experiences. The prophecy before us, as I understand it, gives the precious assurance, that at the period intended, when the *apostate ones* have got to the worst, then they who are *escaped of Israel*, will realize such *beauty and glory* in Christ as the *branch of the Lord*, such *excellency and comeliness* in him as the *fruit of the earth*, that their minds will be fully sustained under whatever persecutions they may be called to experience, and with the disciples of old, will "take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, knowing in themselves, that they have in heaven a better and an enduring substance." Hence also will be fulfilled the prophecy of Zechariah, that, "At evening time it shall be light." Zech.14:7.

S.TROTT.
Fairfax Court House, Va., Feb.9th, 1837.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.3.

Verse 3-4: "And it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem; when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning."

We have here a purer state of the gospel church mentioned as succeeding the period referred to in the preceding verses. But to arrive at this purity, the visible churches must be purged of God, from their filth and blood, or from their borrowed schemes, represented under the figure of vain female ornaments, in the latter verses of the 3rd chapter.

As the state of the church described in verse 3, is the result of what God will do to the daughters of Zion, as mentioned in verse 4, and consequently in the order of events, follows verse 4; I will notice the latter verse first.

Before speaking of the *filth of the daughters of Zion*, I will speak more particularly of what is properly intended by the *daughters of Zion*. In No.1, I represented them rather as corrupted or fallen off gospel churches, but on a further examination of the subject, I am convinced that we must understand gospel churches at large; that is, those constituted upon gospel principles and order, and still professing to be on that ground, whether fallen away in reality or not.

The terms *daughter* and *daughters* are frequently used in scripture, to denote a people, or people dependent on that which is represented as the mother, either in regard to government or by descent. Thus we read of the *daughter* of Babylon, of Edom, of Egypt, &c., denoting the community or people under those respective governments. So also we read of the daughters of Samaria, of Sodom, of Tyrus, meaning the different towns or cities dependent on the government of those metropolises. When the people of the Jews are meant; I think the term *daughter* in the singular is used, as the *daughters of Zion, of Jerusalem, of my people, &c.*, and with propriety, for the Jews remain, as they ever have been, one peculiar people. But the term *daughters* is also used in reference to the gospel church, or that people of whom Christ is the *Salvation* and the *King*. As in Isaiah 62:11, "Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold, thy salvation cometh;" and Zech. 9:9, "Rejoice greatly O daughter of Zion; shout O daughter of Jerusalem, behold thy

King cometh unto thee," &c. The term *daughters of Zion* is used only in this prophecy; that is, in this passage and in the preceding chapter, verse 16, 17; and in Song 3:11, and as before observed refers to the gospel church as divided into branches. In Song 3:11, considering Solomon as representing Christ, we can I think understand no other than gospel churches represented by the term *daughters of Zion*, and also by the term *daughters* of Jerusalem in the preceding verse.

That the term in the passage under consideration cannot be designed to represent the Jews is to me evident. For 1st, if the passage be applied to them, in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, then the prophecy fails, for there were none left in Jerusalem, and those who were spared of them have not been holy in the special sense of our text. 2nd. If it were applied to them, as a scattered people, and in reference to what is future, I think the scriptures will not support such reference; for, not only does the Master speak of the *days* of God's judgment upon them being *shortened for the elects sake* {Matt.24:22,} and the Apostle said that, "the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost," {I Thes.2:16,} but their being left in unbelief is rather for the sake of the Gentiles, than for purging away their iniquities, see Rom.11:11-13. Besides, though according to the declaration, Lev.26:39, they are left to *pine away in their sins*, yet instead of being threatened with any future judgments for cleansing them, God has promised to *cleanse them from all their filthiness*, &c, by *sprinkling clean water upon them*, &c. Ezek.36:25-33.

The term *daughters of Jerusalem*, or of *Zion*, properly belongs to the gospel churches, not only as they are the descendants, in a strict sense, of the church at Jerusalem, but also the gospel church, in its visible form, lay in embryo and in type, in the Jewish church state. Hence Zion is represented as travailing in the birth of Christ and of the gospel church called a nation, Isa.66:7-12.

I therefore see no other place to look for the filth spoken of in the passage under consideration, than the visible churches of Christ, or those constituted according to the pattern in the mother church at Jerusalem.

In entering upon this part of my subject, I am admonished that I shall have to refer to portions of the scriptures and use allusions, which to the polite will appear unseemly. But whilst I would avoid an unnecessary use of expressions or allusions, which might offend the most delicate, I believe every figure, and every illustration, employed by the Holy Ghost to have been chosen with wisdom and propriety, and to be holy in their use; I therefore, dare not neglect on

proper occasion, to bring forward the instruction thereby given, for fear of being thought impolite. The fact is, that if we could examine those texts of scripture, to which I shall have occasion to refer, with that sober mindedness of which I may again speak, instead of being offended at the indelicacy of the figures employed, we should only be disgusted at that wretched vileness of our own hearts, and with those awful pollutions which even the churches of Christ have contracted by their inconstancies, and which nothing short of such figures would represent.

I shall notice the term *filth* or *filthiness*, as the Hebrew word is more generally rendered, in two senses in which it is used in the scriptures, as being found in the visible churches.

1st. It denotes excremental uncleanness – see Isa.28:8. This figure strongly illustrates the vile eruptions of our hearts. Says the Psalmist, *I hate vain thoughts*, Psal.119:113. So I think every child of grace will say; and yet, in this day of declensions, instead of covering over these thoughts, as they arise from our hearts, according to the law relating to the figure, {Deut.23:13,} how many of us too often suffer them to flow disgustingly out to public view, in our conversation and actions. Addison, I think it is, has said, "If the minds of men were laid open, we should see but little difference between that of a wise man, and that of a fool. There are infinite reveries, numberless extravagancies, and a succession of vanities, which pass through both. The great difference is, the first knows how to pick and cull his thoughts for conversation, &c." The same may be said in reference to a prudent christian, and others, with this exception, that vain thoughts and conversation indulged in, generally engender other thoughts and actions of the same, or a more corrupt kind. This course again leads others, with whom we have intercourse, especially if they have confidence in us, into the same habits. Upon this point, confident I am, from the information I have received, that persons who can look back with distinct recollection on the subject, see a very great difference between the baptist churches now in their outward acts, and those of that period, and also in the general walk of members now and then. There was formerly a regularity of deportment, a strict integrity, a sober mindedness, a separation from the world &c., manifested in the whole walk of the baptists, which is seldom seen at this day. Now we are much more assimilated to the world in our outward walk. I am no less confident that no christian can read the New Testament with attention, without feeling conscious that we fall very short of the pattern there drawn of the walk of a disciple of Jesus. I would not have it

understood that I am an advocate for that *sanctimonious* face, and air, and voice which some assume on special occasions. I dislike a mask. I have thought that a disgust at these borrowed appearances, has been one means of leading some of us to indulge too much in lightness, and to lay too little restraint upon our vain thoughts from flying out. And the flowing out of evil thoughts, is *that which defileth the man*, see Matt.15:19,20. The fact is, that sober mindedness, whilst it restrains us from lightness and corruption, has a direct tendency to promote cheerfulness in mind and appearance. This is evident to the experienced christian. I have touched but one point of this subject. The corruption has spread its defilement over us as preachers. It has produced on us too much of worldly speculations, and ideas of worldly respectability, on our entering and pursuing the ministry. We are not reconciled to be accounted the filth of the world; we therefore *defile* our consciences by conforming too much to the notions and spirit of the world.

A similar contamination has been extended to the churches. It may be seen in our discipline and order, or rather in the manner in which they are maintained; in a disposition to construe scriptural doctrine and commands with as favorable a leaning to the prejudices of the world as we can, &c. My brethren generally may not view these things thus, or be perplexed with them as I am, but I think I speak the experience of some at least, when I complain of not being in any relation I sustain, what I believe the primitive disciples were; and I may add, that I find myself altogether inadequate to bring myself, in feeling and practice, to what I believe a disciple ought to be.

But perhaps this figure may more properly refer to such as Jude speaks of, as *having crept in unawares*, and whom he denominates *filthy dreamers*, and who instead of *preaching the word* preach their own speculations in religion, or the *lucubrations* of those, who in more senses than one, have *studied* out their systems of divinity by *night*.

The other sense which I shall notice, in which the filthiness is used in the scriptures, is its denoting the abominations of idolatry, as illustrated by the uncleanness of an elicit and debasing intercourse of the sexes. It is thus used, Ezek.16:36. The Lord frequently uses the figure of adultery, &c., to illustrate the baseness of his professed people in departing from him and his ways, and choosing their own ways and religion. Adultery is strictly the proper figure. In relation to national Israel, the covenant relation in which they stood to God was similar to the marriage of man and wife. For whilst

God chose and redeemed them to be a peculiar people unto himself, he required them *to have no other gods before him*; to honor him as the exclusive object of their fear, their worship, their trust, &c. Hence he says unto them, *I am married unto you*. Jer.3:14. Although many who may admit the truth of these remarks as relating to national Israel, seem to have no sense of their just application to Christ and his church, yet the scriptures authorize me to say, that this relation in its fullest and strictest sense, even as in the case of Adam and Eve, exists spiritually between them, see Eph.5:22-33. Hence there is evidently a corresponding baseness manifested by the visible churches of Christ, when they depart from him as their only Lord, fear, trust, &c., and go after other *lovers*, or embrace systems, and practice forms of religion, which he has never instituted. Consequently the figurative language employed in Jer.2:33-36, 3:1-5, Ezek., chapters 16 & 23, Hosea chapters 1,2,3, and other places, serve to illustrate, as well the extreme vileness of the corrupted daughters of Zion, in tampering with false religions, as of the Jews in practicing idolatry. Does not the Apostle so teach us, when he says, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning?" Rom.15:4. Again he says, after naming some of the corruptions of Israel, "Now these things happened unto them for examples; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come." I Cor.10:11. I will therefore briefly notice a few of the instances in which the *daughters of Zion* in our day, have like ancient Israel and Judah, defiled themselves, as shown by the Prophets above referred to. For instance, as Ezekiel charges Jerusalem, Ezek.16:25, so the baptist churches, for some years back, have to a great extent, welcomed to their embrace every stranger that passed by; have given countenance to every new religious society and religious scheme; have admitted to their pulpits, every one who came as a baptist preacher, whatever kind of a gospel he may bring; yea, they have manifested a fondness for *new things*, and a great partiality for the vermilion painted gentlemen {Ezek.23:14} *of the schools*, in preference to those plain gospel preachers, whom the knowledge of their own hearts, has made humble and unassuming, and whose knowledge of the preciousness of Jesus has made them solicitous, to know nothing, and to hold forth nothing, in their preaching, *save Christ and him crucified*. Again, as Ezekiel depicts the extreme baseness of Jerusalem, chap.16:32-34, so with the baptist churches; the *strangers* above mentioned, have not come to them, without their hire. The churches have lavished upon them their contributions of

money. Had these been withheld, the *strangers* had not come to them. So, also like their type, other denominations and societies have not followed them to imitate their doctrine and order; but they have followed others, see Ezek.23:14-30. When they saw the church of Rome sending out their Jesuit Missionaries, they doted upon the missionary plans; when others formed their Home Mission Society for securing the whole West to themselves, they must also have to do with this scheme, and for the same object; when others turned Sunday Schools into a *religious machine* for discipling the children of the country sectarianly to themselves; they also must have in their embrace the *lovely* object; when the *enlightened* of France employed *tracts* to disseminate infidelity, they also fell in love with this scheme, and must have Tract Societies in their bosom. We might follow on the detail in reference to Theological Schools and other things, but enough has been said to show the filthiness of the daughters of Zion.

I will conclude this head with one other remark; the idolatrous Jews that went into Egypt, answered Jeremiah thus, "When we burnt incense to the queen of heaven, and poured out drink offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship her, and pour out drink offerings unto her, without our men?" Jer.44:19. So the mission baptists say, that since they have commenced practicing these new measures, their churches have increased much more rapidly than before. Yea, from time to time in their reports, they glory on this account over those churches which remain faithful to Christ and to his doctrine and institutions, and wish no increase, but such as have him for their Father. These mission baptists and churches also justify their connection with those babylonish strangers, to refer back to the figure of Ezekiel, on the ground that they are thereby converting the people, and increasing the family of Christ much faster than it would increase were they to remain faithful to him as their only Lord and Husband. But, alas, for those churches, when the Lord shall visit them with the *spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning!* Will he then claim their base born children as his sons? No, they shall be burned up as stubble, and it shall be with such churches as with those Jews in Egypt, above referred to, according to the declaration of Jeremiah, verses 26-28, of the same 44th chapter, or like Jerusalem shall they be destroyed.

S.TROTT.

Fairfax Court House, Va., Feb.24th, 1837.

P.S. On looking over the 1st Number of my remarks on this 4th chapter as published in No.5 of this Volume of the SIGNS, I

discover that I expressed myself in one instance, in a way quite contrary to my views of the subject. The instance is where I commence remarking on the 1st verse of chapter 4. I say, "*And in that day, at that period, when it shall come, in which God shall thus visit these corrupted daughters of Zion for their abominations, they will have arrived at such a pitch of madness, &c.*" From which expression it would appear that I meant to represent the *seven women* as the same with the *daughters of Zion*. It is true that I afterwards show that I consider them entirely different; which of course appears a contradiction to the sentence just quoted. I will therefore here say, as I shall have occasion hereafter to show, that the *daughters of Zion*, or those constituted according to the pattern of the mother church at Jerusalem, will, excepting in cases where they have gone clear off so as not to have any spiritual life or living members in them, be purged and kept distinct from the Beast or their Image. I ought therefore have said in that passage – *And in that day, &c.*, in which God shall thus visit these corrupted *daughters of Zion* for their abominations, the various denominations or religious societies other than gospel churches, will have arrived at such a pitch of madness, &c. I will just remark that there can in reality, be but little difference between the various religious combinations, excepting in the enormities they practice, however constituted, if not constituted according to gospel order – that is, whether constituted on the basis of money, of birth-right or any other human devise, whether by law or otherwise. It is true, the scriptures make a distinction, in name, between the two later classes, representing the one as being wedded to the kings and governments of the earth, the other class as having or seeking to have intercourse with the governments of the world, but not established by law. Hence the one class are called *queens*, the other *concubines*, as in Songs 6:9. For these as might be showed, do in many instances praise the apostolic or gospel church, but only the *daughters bless her*.

S.T.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.3.

{Continued}

BROTHER BEEBE: - I proceed to the further consideration of verses 3 & 4; verse 4 being more immediately the subject of remark in the preceding letter in which I endeavored to point

out what was to be viewed as the *filth of the daughters of Zion*, mentioned in the same verse.

As the *daughters of Zion* of the text, are so manifestly, the visible branches of Zion or churches constituted upon gospel principles, we must from the connection in which the two are here placed, understand the term *Jerusalem* also to have reference to the gospel church. That the term Jerusalem is repeatedly used to denote the gospel church, will, I presume, be admitted by most conversant with the scriptures. Paul uses it in this sense, Gal.4:26, where he calls the gospel church in distinction from the Jewish, the *Jerusalem which is above*. Among other texts of the Old Testament in which the term Jerusalem is used to denote the gospel church, see Psal.147:2; Isa.33:20; and Jer.33:16. We are not however to understand the terms, *Jerusalem, daughters of Jerusalem, daughters of Zion*, &c., when used by the Holy Spirit in reference to the gospel church, as used without regard to a distinct idea conveyed by each. In the passage before us, the distinct idea of each term is manifest. The expression, *daughters of Zion*, as I have before showed, designates the gospel church in her distinct visible branches. Jerusalem, signifying the *vision or possession of peace*, properly denotes the true body of Christ, as none but living members have had the *vision of peace* or *possess it*. And Jerusalem as a *city builded compactly together, and builded of the Lord*, {Psal.122:3, 147:2,} fitly represents the body of Christ in its collective relation.

But the most difficult point to be understood in this case, is what is intended by the *blood of Jerusalem*. Is it literally the blood of saints which has been shed by persecution? No; that is to be visited upon the inhabitants of the earth; the *earth shall disclose her blood; and blood shall be given them to drink*, whilst the Lord's people shall be *hid in their chambers*, compare Rev.16:6 with Isa.26:20,21. But the *blood* under consideration is to be *purged from the midst of Jerusalem*. Is it then the blood of persecution which the saints have shed? Certainly not. They have been in every age, a people *sought out* by persecutors, and have been *as sheep in the midst of wolves*; not only in that *like sheep*, they have been subject to be devoured by their persecutors; but also in that they have never returned devouring for devouring. The blood here spoken of is evidently connected with idolatry, or the *filth* of the text. And looking to typical Jerusalem, we find the *shedding of blood* charged upon her as connected with her idolatry, and which is without doubt, figurative of the subject of our present enquiry. The Lord charges Jerusalem, in

connection with her filthy abominations, with taking *her sons and her daughters*, which *she had born unto him*, and sacrificing them unto the images of men which she had made, of the gold and silver which the Lord had given her. He adds, "Is this thy whoredom a small matter, that thou hast slain my children, and delivered them to cause them to pass through the fire for them?" Ezek. 16:12-21. In this passage, I think we have in figurative language, a full development of the blood of our text. We have also similar charges against Jerusalem in Ezek.22:2-4; and 23:37-39. Jeremiah also in charging upon Jerusalem her corruptions, says, "Also in thy skirts is found the blood of the *souls* of the poor innocents &c." Jer.2:34. I would just remark here, that I do not understand the Prophet in using the term *innocents*, as having any reference to the idea of native innocency; but that he uses the term simply in relation to the crime of idolatry which he is charging upon Jerusalem, and thereby accuses her of making those participate in this corruption who are involuntary, and therefore without guilt in the act.

But my brethren will be surprised that I should suppose there is to be found in the gospel churches, what answers to the odious crime of sacrificing children by the typical Jerusalem. But I think I shall show, that figuratively, *the blood of the souls of poor innocents* is to be found upon the *skirts* of the gospel churches and that without *secret search*. To prove this, I will produce the Apostle's remarks, I Cor.8:11, "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died." To understand the Apostle here, we must consider the different senses in which the term *perish* is used, as meaning, *to lose, to fall away, to become useless, &c.*, as well as *to die, to be damned, &c.* For instance, a person's arm *perishes* when it withers and becomes useless. In this sense, the weak brother might *perish* or wither, not only as to his comforts, but also as to his usefulness to the body of Christ, and be, as Paul was afraid he might become *a cast away*, that is from the visible church. In this sense some perished, who are mentioned in I Cor.11:30. In this sense, I think many of God's spiritual children have been sacrificed in years past, by the churches of Christ, to the vain notion of competing with the worldly denominations as to worldly respectability. That is, they have been made to *perish* as to their usefulness in the gospel of Christ, and as to their enjoyment of those precious consolations, and that liberty which the truth imparts. How many, for instance, of God's children have been left to *perish*, like the Prodigal, {Luke 15:17,} *with hunger*, in consequence of churches choosing for their pastors such preachers as

would, by their oratory and learning, be likely to draw a respectable congregation, and such in preference to the plain, faithful gospel minister? How many promising gifts for the ministry have been buried, been destroyed, as to their usefulness in feeding the sheep and lambs of Christ, by being encouraged by their churches, {and some of them by the persuasion of older members and preachers, in whom they had confidence, involuntarily, like Jeremiah's *innocents*,} to seek to fit themselves for the work, by resorting to literary and theological schools; and which only fitted them for promoting a speculative religion, and feeding the *goats*. Multitudes, it is true, enter the ministry with no other idea than that of qualifying themselves by education for making their profession honorable and profitable. Such characters I have nothing here to do with. Again, there are those, who have been highly esteemed by the saints as able ministers of the New Testament, but have since been flattered by their churches to aim at obtaining fashionable congregations; and where are they now? Going with all their influence in support of the *man of sin*, in its various new measures; and if they now touch the gospel string, it is in a lifeless, discordant manner. We are not, I apprehend, capacitated rightly to appreciate, at this day, the depth of the evil which has been produced by the churches having sacrificed the entire usefulness of many of the children of God, as to that *kingdom*, which is *not of this world*, and the gospel peace and consolations, to a great degree, of all, as peace offerings to the world and its prejudices, see Psal.81:6-16; and Isa.48:17-19. Those of us now on the stage, came into the church in its defiled state, and as we began to suck the breasts of our mothers, the churches into which we were brought, we imbibed much of a defiling conformity to the spirit and notions of worldly religionists, so that it became incorporated into our feelings and views. As a consequence of God's Israel having joined himself to *Bael-peor, the god of shame*; that is, *having become ashamed* of the old fashioned doctrine and order as revealed in the gospel; and having eaten of the sacrifices to the *gods of Moab*; that is the *world's means of salvation*, how many of the children of Israel have *died of the plague*; that is to the visible church of Christ, is not for me to say. See for the type, Num.25. I have therefore believed when any departed from the doctrine and order of the gospel, who once professed them, it was because they never loved the gospel in truth; that is, were not subjects of grace. And this, no doubt, is the case with many who fall away; their open opposition to simple gospel truth proves it. But from the view I have been led into upon this subject, I now believe that many

of God's children have been heretofore *sacrificed* or have *perished* in the sense I have given. {I say heretofore, for now seems to be approaching a separating time between those who are receiving the *mark of the Beast*, and those whose *names are written in the Lamb's book of life*.} The Galatian brethren's having been *bewitched*, Gal.3:1; the texts I have already quoted, I Cor.8:11; and 11:30, and what Peter says of some, "that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit," {I Pet.4:6,} all go to support the idea that the children of God may awfully depart from him, and his word, and as Peter says, "be judged {or punished} according to men in the flesh," whilst they shall live according to God's electing, redeeming and regenerating love *in the spirit*; and will therefore be found among the *innumerable multitude* which shall stand before the throne and the Lamb, though not of the hundred and forty and four thousand, who were *sealed in their foreheads* as the *servants of God*, and who are not defiled with women, but are virgins; not having been seduced off, to intermingle with those corrupt religious combinations or societies formed upon worldly principles. See Rev.7:3-9; and 14:4. But still my brethren may think that these departures from the purity and simplicity of gospel doctrine and order, can never be so odious in the sight of God, as to be pointed out by the charges of *sacrificing children*, and shedding of blood. But are not God's spiritual children as dear to him as were his typical children? And the one's therefore, being deprived of living in the enjoyment of the blessings of the *gospel land of promise*, {by which I do not mean Heaven,} be viewed by him as being as great, as that of the others being deprived of *animal* life and the enjoyment of temporal blessings in the land of Canaan? God has given in his word ample testimony of his great displeasure at a departure from the word. Witness the case of Saul, I Sam.15:22-36; the case of Uzza, I Chron.13:7-13, compared with 15:11-13; and also the case of the *man of God* sent out of Judah *by the word of the Lord* to prophecy against the altar at Bethel, I Kings 13. If this *man of God* after prophesying faithfully according to the *word of the Lord* must be killed by a lion, for suffering himself to be seduced by a lying prophet, to eat bread among the idolatrous people; can those hope to escape the rod, who, though as we believe, they preach the gospel of Christ, will still make a practice of *eating and drinking* with the open worshippers of the *golden calves* of our day? Yea, have we not need to watch and pray, lest we be beguiled by some lying prophet, or lying spirit, to depart from the word of the Lord?

It seems proper here to make some enquiry relative to the manner in which these corruptions crept in, and got such a hold on the gospel churches. The Lord has said that the *leaders of this people cause them to err*. Isa.3:12 & 9:16. But still it appears from the context in both cases, that the people were to be judged for suffering themselves to be led astray. There is a natural propensity in christians to be more easily affected by objects of sense, even in things pertaining to religion, and hence to be pleased with what tends to resolve religion into outward acts and show. On the other hand, the experience of the christian teaches him that his religion to be acceptable to God or profitable to his own soul, must be spiritual. The fear of God also operates as a restraint upon his mind to prevent his departing deliberately from the express direction of God's word. A sense also of his own ignorance in spiritual things, and of the deceitfulness of his own heart, prevents his leaning to his own understanding, and disposes him to cleave to the Scriptures as the man of his counsel. Hence, until some person has obtained the confidence of a child of grace, as a guide, and leads him off by degrees, he will not easily be drawn away from the gospel rule. But so far as we are left to give ourselves up to be governed by the dictations and examples of men, we become peculiarly attached to the schemes and views we have received from them. The reason is obvious; namely, that every device of carnalizing religion, tends to make it more congenial to human nature. Again, persecution shows the christian by real feeling, the evil of a carnal religion, makes him abhor such religion, and drives him to the throne of grace, and to the word of God for counsel and support. Consequently, it places him in circumstances to be less influenced by the desire of pleasing men in his religious concerns, and to be more cautious to know that he has a Divine warrant for what he believes and practices. But still the *steps of a christian are ordered by the Lord*. If God leaves him to the influence of carnal leaders, or his own natural inclinations, he will go astray; but if he *hedges up his way* as God has said he would do to his church, {Hosea 2:6,} he will be kept back, &c.

Having made these general remarks relative to this subject, I will come to particulars. As that which more immediately concerns us, is the second defilement of the gospel church, or in other words a defilement since her separation from the *seven-headed Beast*, I shall of course begin where this corruption begins to manifest itself. This was as the Baptists began to emerge from the severity of persecution in England, and were emboldened to put forth a

public declaration of their faith. As this had the effect to wipe from them the stigma under which they had suffered, of being *Arians, enemies of all government, &c.* They began to feel themselves as standing on a footing with the other dissenting denominations; their preachers of course began to aspire after the same respectability in the world, as was enjoyed by those of other dissenting congregations. Human learning was necessary for this, and a corresponding support. Here Satan displayed his utmost art in helping them to a plan by which they might sway the churches into their ambitious measures. The plan of constituting the churches into associations was devised – not as *ecclesiastical courts*, such a proposition the churches would at once have rejected; but as *advisory councils* – a less assuming name at first view, but not much less so in truth. Has God said, “If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all liberally, &c.,” and has he set before us the evil of not asking counsel of God, as in the case of Joshua and the Gibeonites, Josh.9:14, {see also Psal.106:13-15; 107:11,12, and Prov.1:30,31,} and has the Lord said, “Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom; I am understanding, &c.” Prov.8:14; and is the Lord Jesus Christ *made unto his people wisdom*, and has he given them his word, *that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works*; and shall any body of men, with impunity, organize themselves into a *standing council*, for the churches to apply to for advise and direction? Judge ye. It was not, depend upon it, owing to the mildness of the pretensions set up in favor of those *advisory councils*, that they have not ruled the churches with a heavy hand, but to the mercy of God in *hedging up their way*, by inspiring his churches, to watch with a jealous eye, the movements of these self-constituted bodies. But still, the leaders by having their efforts combined in these associations, and by inducing the churches to repose a considerable confidence in their *advise*, have been enabled to establish many customs, in the churches, generally, which have no foundation in Apostolic practice. Among other devices, early after the formation of Associations, the churches were swayed to countenance and encourage the plan for obtaining a ministry, learned in the sciences of the world. Hence, Dr. Going, as quoted in the SIGNS, Vol.5, No.5, page 39, was not so much mistaken in saying, “That the Baptists, both in England and America, from the time they became organized into associations, have approved ministerial education.” His assertion that they approved of missions at so early a period, wants proof. But does this Baptist D.D., by referring to that period as the height of baptist antiquity, and denying our claim

to be Old School Baptists, because we differ in this thing from the Baptists of that day, think to gull his disciples into the belief of such a position? I pity their ignorance of the New Testament if they know not that the Baptists existed as a religious people long before that day. Or is it indeed a fact, that the Baptist schools have received the hypothesis of the Paedobaptists, that the Baptists had but just before that, sprung into existence? If so, we may well expect our learned Baptists to be found among the *seven women, taking hold of one man, &c.*

From the countenance which the churches in many parts were led by degree to give to an educated ministry, the plan ultimately succeeded so well, and so many learned ministers got into the churches, who necessarily in their display of the wisdom of this world in their pulpits, inculcated also much of the spirit of the world, that a series of corruptions both in practice and in doctrine, has grown out of it. Those who could succeed best in appearing to harmonize the doctrine of the cross with the spirit and prejudices of the world, have in all ages of corruption of the church, been considered the most learned divines, and most readily obtained the honorary title of D.D. It is not necessary for me to follow on in detail, the history of the introduction of all the new things of this day. Suffice it to say, that many of those modern measures have manifestly been brought in to provide a support for the swarms of *clergymen*, their many schools are turning out; and that the associations continue to be, in a great measure, the *advisory councils* in which their plans are matured. Hence the cant phrase of the day, about meeting in associations to *devise means* for the spread of the gospel, and the *building up of Zion, &c.* But on the other hand, there have been a few churches and preachers that, amidst the greatest rage for education and missionary operations, have never drunk in these corruptions to the extent to which they have prevailed among the great body of the Baptists. And besides, the extent to which these filthy abominations have been carried, has had the effect to awaken others to a deep sense of the evil of departing from the simplicity of the gospel, and make them willing, at the expense of reproach to retrace their steps, and to seek to cleanse themselves from the whole source of defilement. And thus the Image of the Beast, like as did the original Beast, is by the excess of its human devices, driving the true church and the saints from it, and leading them to bear their public testimony against those innovations, the introduction of which they too much countenanced. But as the *daughters of Zion* have polluted themselves, the defilement

must be *washed away*; and as the true visible church by countenancing the introduction of those plans by which many of her children have been sacrificed and thus as Jeremiah says, "The blood of the *souls* of the poor innocents is found in her skirts," it will there remain until *purged away*. Hence the peculiar propriety of the expression used in our text, in speaking of purging away the *blood of Jerusalem*, from the *midst thereof*. It is the *blood of Jerusalem* that is the causing to perish of the living members thereof, as explained before, that stands charged against the churches of Christ, and it is to be *purged from the midst thereof*, for this purging has relation only to the true churches, so far as they have participated in this iniquity.

Before closing this letter, I would say, to prevent misunderstanding, that in the remark I have made relative to an *educated ministry*, I had reference to what is generally intended by the expression; namely, Persons being educated with a special view thereby to qualify them for preaching the gospel of Christ. Education in itself considered, has no tendency to injure the usefulness of a minister of Christ. Hence Christ has evidently called some such to the work. But in doing this, he has, as in the case of Saul of Tarsus, first humbled them, and made them esteem all their attainments *as loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus*; hence Christ Jesus, and not their learning, will be that which they wish to set forth. On the other hand, the class we object to will, from the importance they attach to learning, be putting that foremost in their preaching.

I must beg the indulgence of the brethren, in having to continue this number on to another letter. It is an important subject, though I much doubt whether I feel it as did those marked for preservation, {Ezek.9:4,} I think I know something of the evil I would describe. Is it not manifest that the gospel church at this time, is separated as in her pollutions, from the presence of her Lord and husband, according to the law relating to another figure, recorded in Lev.15:19. But these days of separation will assuredly pass away, for *her Maker is her husband*. Isa.54:5.

S.TROTT.

Fairfax Court House, Va., March 18th, 1837.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.3.

{Continued}

Having in the two preceding letters on verses 3 & 4, spoken of *the filth of the daughters of Zion* and *the blood of Jerusalem*, as found among the Baptist Churches at large, I cannot say, *having fully described them* – I now come to speak of the means by which this *filth* is to be *washed away*, and this *blood purged*. The *spirit of judgment* and the *spirit of burning*, are the means which the Lord will employ for this object. The expressions are rather singular. Peter speaks of "judgment beginning at the house of God." I Pet.4:17. And Paul speaks of the "fire trying every man's work;" in reference, as I understand him, to the materials which 'gospel' ministers build into the churches. I Cor.3:13. But here we have the *spirit of judgment* and *spirit of burning*. The term *spirit of judgment* is used, Isa.28:6, but it is there used to denote the special gift imparted, as for instance, in the case of the *seventy elders*, on whom the spirit which was on Moses was put. Num.11:16,25,26. And this prophecy is, that the Lord shall be unto those whose province it is to *sit in judgment*, in the gospel church, *for*, or in the place of this spirit of judgment. The churches will, no doubt, in a more eminent degree, at the period when this cleansing takes place, experience the verification of this promise, than in seasons past. And the Lord's being unto them for a spirit of judgment, will enable them to judge more correctly between truth and error. But still I think the expression in the passage under consideration, has a different reference. It may denote the peculiar energy and effect of the *judgment* and *burning* with which the churches shall be visited, as well as signify that the afflictions shall be mental, not a material burning, as of the Israelites at Taberah. Num.11:3. Nor external judgments like those with which God often visited national Israel. It may also denote the special agency of the Holy Spirit in the thing. That the churches in consequence of their disobedience must experience severe chastisements, is manifest from many passages of Scripture. The text, I Pet.4:17, which I have already more than once quoted, goes to prove the fact. The Apostle in this passage seems to refer to the prophecy in Ezek.9, in which the men with *slaughter weapons* in their hands, were directed to "slay utterly old and young, both maids and little children, and women," but were forbidden to come near any man upon whom was the mark, and were ordered to begin at God's

sanctuary, verse 6. The men reserved, were those who had been marked for having "sighed and cried for the abominations done in the midst of Jerusalem." And Peter's declaration as I understand it, is, that now, under the gospel dispensation, is the time that judgment must begin at God's sanctuary, or as he calls it, the *house of God*. In this prophecy of Ezekiel, those were to be preserved, who mourned over the abominations practiced in Jerusalem. Another text corresponding with this, and which seems to harmonize the two ideas of judgment, and the spirit of judgment, being visited upon the church of God is found in Zech.10:3. "Mine anger was kindled against the shepherds, and I punished the goats." The Lord's anger is kindled against the shepherds, the *leaders which cause his people to err*. But the punishment will fall upon the goats which they have brought in and mingled with the sheep of their flocks; or according to Paul, I Cor.3:11,16, the *wood, hay, and stubble* which any pastor has built into the church, shall be burned up, but he himself *shall be saved, yet so as by fire*.

Another important enquiry relative to the *spirit of judgment*, and *spirit of burning* is, when and how are they to be made manifest? I am strongly of the opinion that the Lord is at this very time making them manifest. If I am not mistaken in this thing, the spirit of burning is showing itself as the effect of the word of truth. For wherever this word is now preached in faithfulness as the divine standard, both of doctrine and order, it is acting as a refiner's fire, in separating between the precious and the vile. It is burning out from the churches where the truth is maintained, those whom the Scriptures denominate the wicked; that is, those who are connecting themselves with *that wicked which is revealed*, and are wickedly departing from God, not keeping his ways, contrary to the Psalmist, 18:21. Not only is the word thus burning them out of the churches, but it is, in the estimation of the *wise who understand* burning them up as stubble, root and branch, according to Mal.4:1. That is, it is burning up their standing as disciples of Christ, showing them connected with another interest than the church of Christ, and burning up the works which they are *branching* out, on the right and left, making them as *ashes under the feet* of those *who fear the name of the Lord*. It also burns in the hearts of those subjects of grace, who are placed under a corrupted ministry, or in corrupted churches, compelling many of them to separate themselves from such connections as it burned in Jeremiah, when he held his peace. Jer.20:8,9. God calls his *word a fire*. Jer.23:29. And the effect of burning is repeatedly ascribed to

it. See Jer.5:14, Psalms 97:3, Isa.66:16. And in reference to the *spirit of judgment*; truly the rents and divisions in the churches, the distress of mind occasioned by these things, together with the coldness, and other evils connected therewith, constitute a severer judgment upon the churches and saints of God, than any external persecution would be, which the church has ever passed through. Further, this spirit of judgment and of burning, which we are experiencing, is purging the saints and churches from many things, which a while back they looked upon as proper, and even necessary. From the effects already produced, this spirit appears likely to cleanse the churches which remain as *daughters of Zion*, from every polluting scheme they have adopted; and to burn up every vestige of the traditionary ornaments which they have borrowed from the *queens* and *concubines*, and to bring them to a strict conformity to the word. For the truth is this fire which is kindled, I trust, by the Spirit of the Almighty, must burn so long as any combustibles in the churches. Hence, seeing the *spirit of judgment and of burning* is abroad in the churches, it is not to be wondered at, that Old School Baptists cannot settle down upon the practice of those esteemed Regular Baptists thirty years, or even two hundred years back, when as I have before noticed, *constitutional* associations, and the idea of an educated ministry began to be introduced. If I am mistaken as to this being the period intended and something different is to be experienced to cleanse the churches, we must wait the development thereof, before we can understand what is properly intended.

One remark more upon this head. Although, as I have before remarked, I understand the term *daughters of Zion*, to embrace all the churches constituted upon gospel principles, yet I have no idea that all such, nor than a third of them, will be left standing on the *foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, when the spirit of judgment and spirit of burning, shall have accomplished their work. The few saints which may have remained in the apostate churches, will ultimately be burned out of them, and have to seek a home elsewhere, among their own kindred; as the corrupt professors will be burned out of the purified churches. Thus it was, as before remarked, when the Beast was manifested. There was a general connection among all the churches after much corruption had brought in, and all continued to be recognized as churches of Christ, until those corruptions had got to such an extent, that the saints could no longer submit to them, nor fellowship, as disciples of Christ, those who approved them. They had then, to separate themselves from the mass of

professors, and their corruptions, and to retire, a small remnant, to the wilderness. Thus it is like to be, and thus we might expect it to be, in the setting up of the Image of the Beast, with the exception of not having to retire anew to the wilderness.

I now pass to notice the result of this trying session, as described in verse 3. "And it shall come to pass that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem. That is, every one who is not driven away by the fire of gospel truth, nor drawn away by the *strong delusions* which God *shall send* them that believe not the truth, *shall be called holy*, &c. The explicative added; namely, *every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem*, may be understood to mean the same as having their *names written in the book of life of the Lamb*, &c. If this be the sense, the idea conveyed will be, that the elect will all then be manifested *as holy*. Or the expression may mean, as I think it does, *numbered or accounted among the living*, &c. In this sense the term *written* appears to be used in Psa.69:28, Ezek.13:9, and in several other texts. If this be the true meaning here, then the expression implies that all who profess to have been quickened, will be called holy – no unholy professors left among them. This accords with the declaration of our Lord, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." *Unto the end*; that is, through the days of tribulation. Matt.24:13.

Again, the expression *written among the living in Jerusalem*, shows that the persons composing the Jerusalem or true gospel church, are living persons, in a sense in which others are not; consequently they must, in this peculiar sense, have been made alive by a life-giving power. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." "And you hath *he* quickened," that is, God. John 6:63. Eph.2:1. Hence the Campbellite churches, which know nothing about the special operations of the Spirit, are not *Jerusalem churches*; they are unacquainted with the *visions of peace*. The same must be the case with the New School churches of this day, as their leaders say, they have no notion of these *miraculous conversions*. An Apostle hath said, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." II Cor.5:17. And every child of grace knows from his own experience, that the power of nature never made him acquainted with what it is to be in Christ. Those who can believe that nature can produce a *new creature*, may as well come out atheists at once, and ascribe to nature. Brethren if we are of the *living in Jerusalem*, we have nothing to glory of, over others; but at the same

time, whilst it becometh us to be humble under an abiding sense that grace alone has made us differ from the most self-confident, and from the vilest, we, on the other hand, from a due regard to the glory of God, should not for a moment, in any way, countenance the idea that creaturely exertions ever has changed, or can change a natural heir of hell, or the child of wrath, into an heir of heaven.

In addition to the pleasing idea that when the *daughters of Zion*, are of God *washed from their filthiness*, &c., they will then be composed altogether of saints, or persons made holy. This passage also, I think, gives us to expect that all who are written among the living in Jerusalem, will, in that happy day, be, in a peculiar sense, *holy*. The expression *called holy*, being the same with *declared* or *pronounced holy*, properly implies that they will be then manifested as holy beyond what they had been before that time. But the question arises, how will they then be holy beyond what the saints now are? Not in reference to their eternal salvation. For in this sense all the children of grace, in every age, are alike sanctified or holy; all alike *sanctified by God the Father*, or chosen in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love. Jude 1 & Eph.1:4. Christ is of God made unto us sanctification. I Cor.1:30. And all alike, "from the beginning chosen unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth. II Thes.2:13 & I Pet.1:2. But it is in reference to their lives, and in the sense in which Paul prays God to *sanctify* the Thessalonian brethren *wholly* {I Thes.5:23,} and in which he exhorts the brethren at home to "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable," &c. Rom.12:1, that we may expect the saints to be more manifestly holy. This is no other than living under the influence of the internal sanctification of the Spirit, or *working out*, or rather acting out their salvation, which is through the sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, "with fear and trembling," Phil.2:12, compared with II Thes.2:12, as this holiness is an acting out of our salvation, and the salvation is a being saved from sin or from all iniquity, it necessarily implies an abstaining from all iniquity, and as the whole world lieth in wickedness, an abstaining from a conformity to the world. On the other hand, as our salvation is not a being delivered, whilst we live in the world, from our natural lives, nor from our relations, connections, infirmities, &c., of this life, this holiness does not imply a withdrawal from the world, nor from the several duties or relations of life.

Again, as this holiness is *holiness to the Lord*, it will lead us "whether we eat or drink or whatever we do, to do all to the

glory of God." That is, our meat and drink will be received with contentment and thanksgiving, and used for our health and bodily activity; and all our acts will be in the fear and love of God, and in the faithful discharge of the duties of the respective relations, stations and callings in which God has placed us, both in the church and in the world.

But further, *holiness to the Lord*, under the Mosaic dispensation, implied a strict and exclusive regard to the commands of God in all their religious performance; a conformity to the nations around them, or a borrowing of their rites being strictly forbidden. It can imply no less under the gospel. The Apostle says, {Heb.2:1,} "We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard lest at any time we should let them slip;" and this he says, from the considerations brought to view in the preceding chapter; namely, that God, instead of speaking to us by the prophets, as under the former dispensation, hath spoken to us by his Son, and the superior dignity which the Scriptures ascribe to the Son, over the angels. Hence the inference which he draws in the two verses following the one above quoted. And if the Jews, on even to the close of the Old Testament's prophecy by Malachi, were directed to remember the law of Moses, the servant of the Lord, with the statutes and judgments which God commanded to him in Horeb, Mal.4:4; will not holiness to the Lord under this vastly superior dispensation, this *so great salvation*, as the Apostle calls it, lead those on whose hearts it is inscribed, to continue to remember the statutes and judgments and the *law of faith*, which he has appointed by the infinitely superior personage – not a servant, but his well beloved Son, whom he has given as a leader and commander of his people? And will not the voice sounding in their ears, *hear ye him*, forbid their looking elsewhere for direction, or going about to devise *ways and means* for themselves, as though they had no leader? Judge ye. The views which I have here given of the holiness intended in the passage before us, is sustained by the description which Zechariah gives of the state of the church when the *man of sin* is destroyed, and for entering upon which, the churches are to be prepared, as pointed out in this passage. The description referred to is this, "In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD, and the pots in the Lord's house, shall be like the bowls before the altar; yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah, shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts; and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and seethe therein; and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts." Zech.14:20,21. I

will notice a few of the expressions. 1st. *Upon the bells of the horses, holiness to the Lord.* As the horses and their bells belong not to religious, but to secular concerns, this shows that in that day the very trappings of our worldly concerns, will be holiness to the Lord; and this whether it relates to war or peace. 2nd. *The pots in the Lord's house, shall be like the bowls before the altar; yea, every pot in Jerusalem, &c.* The bowls of the temple were of gold, pots were some of brass, but mostly of earth; they were evidently an inferior vessel. If we understand those vessels according to the use of the term, in II Tim.2:20,21, to signify persons; then, at that day, there will be no distinction between *clergy* and *laity* in the church, no set of men who, on account of their scholastic learning, will set themselves up as superior to their brethren, and as having a right to *lord it over God's heritage*. And every member in the church will consider himself according to his gifts and station, alike bound to live to the glory of God. Yea, the watchmen shall see eye to eye, and there shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days, &c. None to say, "Ah! Lord God, I cannot speak, for I am a child." Isa.52:8, 65:20, Jer.1:6. Or if we take these vessels to typify rites or instructions in the gospel church, as perhaps what is said, verse 21, would require, then this passage denotes that every institution, down to the most common ceremony in the church, will be alike sacredly observed according to the command or pattern given in the word. Yea, that nothing will be admitted in Jerusalem, or the church, but what is holiness to the Lord, as being set apart by divine appointment to its special use. "In that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the Lord of hosts." There shall be no more in the church, those who are doomed to destruction, or under the curse. Of course, no unregenerated professors, much less those who have submitted to the *mark of the beast*. How different will that state of the church be from what it is now. Now, the purest churches, it is to be feared, have their *Canaanites*, and have their pots that are not *holiness to the Lord*, religious customs that have no command or example laid down in the word. But the Lord is now evidently *bringing* many of *them through the fire*, and we have reason to believe, is *refining them as silver is refined*, &c. The process of separating the silver from the dross, it is true, is to us painful, and our unbelief sometimes leaves us to think the fire is too hot, and that it will burn up the silver. But it becomes us to remember that the Lord himself *sits as the refiner*, tempering the heat with infinite skill. Besides to keep down our impatience it becomes us to keep in view the result; for when the Lord shall

have accomplished the purifying of his churches, their prayers will then be in faith, for the Lord will hear them, and *He will say they are his people, and they will say the Lord is my God,* see Zech.13:8,9.

Have we not reason, my brethren, to rejoice in the fiery trials which are beginning to come upon us, seeing they are appointed to accomplish such a glorious event, and are so necessary on account of our defilements and the pollution of the churches. Woe to the churches which are, or shall be, left without these trials, and to be like Ephraim, *a cake not turned.* Hosea 7:8.

S.TROTT.

Fairfax Court House, Va., April 4th, 1837.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.4.

Verse 5: "And the Lord will create upon every dwelling place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night, for upon all the glory shall be a defense."

I have already remarked that the cleansing which the churches are to pass through, as described in verses 3 & 4, is a preparing of them for entering upon that happy state, which is to succeed the destruction of the *man of sin*. In this, and the following verse, some things relative to that purified state of the church are brought to view. In the intervening time, when the churches, by the *spirit of judgment* and the *spirit of burning*, are prepared for it, and before the *man of sin* is destroyed the *Witnesses* must be *killed*. The affliction consequent upon this event will be short – but three years and a half. Hence says the prophet, "Therefore thus saith the Lord God of hosts, O my people that dwellest in Zion, be not afraid of the Assyrian; he shall smite thee with the rod, and shall lift up his staff against thee after the manner of Egypt. For yet a little while and the indignation shall cease, and my anger in their destruction." Isa.10:24 & 25. It would seem from this that the Assyrian is to smite the people of Zion, with the *rod*, the sign of civil authority, and to lift up the *staff* against them; the *crozier*, the sign of ecclesiastical authority, with the attempt to bring them into bondage to his ceremonies, as the Egyptian attempted to keep Israel in bondage.

The descriptive expressions used in the verse under consideration are, as I understand them, applicable to the

church in all periods; the promise that of an increased blessing at the period in view.

I will notice the expressions having this general application. First, the *dwelling places of Mount Zion*. This has evidently a reference to the distinct branches of Zion. The expression *dwelling places* answers well to another figurative expression found in Jeremiah 31:1, "At the same time saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel," &c. As spiritual Israel or the Church of Christ is divided into these families, so each has its home or *dwelling place*. Thus the church is called a house, and is said to be *buildd*, &c., in Jer.30:18 – the dwelling places are called *tents*.

As these figurative expressions are calculated to cast some light upon the relation of gospel churches, one to the other, I will offer a few reflections upon the term *families of Israel*, as well as that of *dwelling places*.

First. *The families of Israel*. This expression, whilst it shows the church divided into families or distinct branches, shows also a peculiar relation as existing between them. Though national Israel was divided into families, these families were not independent of each other. They were bound together by the ties of brotherhood, were one people, had one father, Abraham, lived under one covenant, under one set of laws, and bound to see that each other observed those laws. See for instance the law concerning idolatry, Deut.13:12 - 18, "If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities, which the Lord thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, Certain men, the children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known; then shalt thou *inquire*, and *make search*, and *ask diligently*; and behold, if it be truth, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought among you; thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, &c."

The spiritual relation among the families of Zion, can be no less close than was the natural relation of the families of national Israel. These are members of the same one Body, profess the same salvation, faith, order, &c., own the same Lord, have the same father, {not as Abraham was the father of the nation of Israel,} but Christ the *Everlasting Father* of his people, being the Husband of his bride in all her branches, is the Head of each gospel family, and the immediate Father of all their *true born* children. The ties therefore of fellowship among these ought to be considered no less binding than were the ties of nature among the other. If when one of the families

of Israel were reported to have gone into the idolatry of that dispensation, the other families to clear themselves from being accessories to the same crime and to vindicate the honor of God and his religion, were required to enquire diligently, &c., and finding the thing so, to destroy the idolatrous family, or city, with the edge of the sword, that is, so cut them off from their land of promise, and to cut off the natural relation that existed; can it be any less obligatory on the families of spiritual Israel when one of the families, or churches shall be reported to have gone into the idolatry of this dispensation, to enquire concerning it, and if found true, to cut off such family from the claims of relationship to them, by severing publicly the ties of church fellowship, and thus to wipe the stain of such crime from the religion of Christ, which they profess, and to clear themselves from the charge of holding fellowship with those who thus basely desert from the God of salvation.

Second. *The dwelling places of Mount Zion.* These, as already said, are the homes of spiritual Israel. This therefore brings to view the separate interest of each family. Here each family apart meets in its family circle, attends to its own affairs, partakes of the family repasts, if the Master is present, they are truly *feasts of fat things*. Here they retire from the storms that are abroad, and if the Father of the family is with them, feeling composed under his protecting wing, the raging without is like the *storm against the wall*; they hear the sound of the blast, but it only makes them feel the preciousness of their shelter. Here they talk over the incidents of the way, which each has met with, whether of joy, or of grief; where proper affection, or fellowship reigns in a family, with what heartfelt confidence do they unburden their minds one to the other, and listen to the advice of the older members of the family, especially to the words of their Father. Whilst their friends, who may be occasionally with them, participate in the repasts, the joys, sorrows, &c., in the family circle, there are certain circumstances connected with the family circle, and dwelling place, which it would be intrusion, in these friends, to intermeddle with, unless requested. I have here drawn, probably in too high colors, the happiness of these *dwelling places* to suit the experience of most of our churches at this day, but some of our brethren have in recollection pleasant scenes like these, in their church relations in times past, and such scenes will again be realized, when the Lord shall have *washed away the filth of the daughter of Zion*.

As a brother has recently, by letter, requested me to give my views, through the SIGNS, relative to the propriety of our Old School Brethren uniting with a mixed church, where

the original constitution was sound; and it seems with some degree of propriety to come in, in this connection. I will offer some additional thoughts relative to that point.

First. When a person is received as an inmate into a family, it is usually under the impression that he comes in for peace, and with a disposition to submit to the order and regulations of the family. If however, disorderly members have been received, the order of the family is attempted to be subverted, and confusion is in the house, it appears to me not consistent with the gospel of grace, to become an inmate in this confusion. As I have already remarked, there is a common interest among the families of spiritual Israel, or ought to be, if therefore wickedness or disorder prevails in one family, others will feel the wound, and for the honor of the cause seek to correct the abuse, but if the disorder so prevails as not to be corrected by the counsel and admonition of brethren, and if the members of the church professedly adhering to the original constitution will not clear the church from the disorder by exercising gospel discipline, or themselves from it, by separation, they themselves become implicated in the disorder, and hence orderly churches should disown them, until they see their error and correct it.

Perhaps the typical law concerning *leprosy in a house*, may cast some light upon this subject, as being strictly applicable to it. For I think a little reflection will convince any one that the house in the type, built up of stones, &c., can only represent the *spiritual house built up of lively stones*, or those professedly so. This law is found in Lev.14:33-53. Verse 35, "And he that owneth the house shall come to the priest saying, &c." The owner of the house is the Lord Jesus, the chief shepherd; but the elders of the church are pastors and shepherds, and they should not be hirelings, or take the oversight of the flock for filthy lucre, but being *ensamples to the flock*, and as having an interest in their welfare; and being watchman, it is their duty to watch and give warning at the approach of any evil or error. The owner was not to decide himself on the leprosy, but must go to the priest. The Lord Jesus is the high priest of our profession, but his people are made *kings and priests unto God and the Lamb*. We have in the New Testament the decision of our High Priest, through his apostles, upon all things belonging to his church; and it is the duty of the *priests*, the members of the church, to bring every difficulty to the test of the word. The house was first to be emptied of everything, &c. Does this not teach that the church cannot travel while she is in difficulty, owing to corruptions, errors, &c., and therefore ought to suspend the ordinances,

and everything else religious, to attend to the removing of the plague. Must not the communion and worship of the church, if attended to whilst the minds of the brethren are fretted with the confusion and disorder among them, partake of the uncleanness of the plague? Verse 37. The signs of the leprosy. *If the plague be in the walls of the house with hollow strakes, greenish or reddish, &c.* All error, whether in doctrine, in order, or in discipline, is of an eating nature; it takes away from the foundation, the truth of the gospel, or from the liberty, the privileges, the consolation, &c., of the people of God, and leaves a hollow, an unevenness in the walls, in the harmony and fellowship of the church, and something wanting to form a consistency. These errors when introduced appear *greenish*, young, something new, which attract, by their novelty, are *new gods that have come newly up*. They also assume a reddish hue, in a little while they burn, in their votaries with anger against the truth and those who advocate it. It must be in the wall to occasion this attention, in those who are built into the church, and effect the plastering, the fellowship. Verse 38. The priest, after looking upon the plague, *shuts up the house seven days* for further observation. So the church, having taken this difficulty under investigation, it is proper she should not proceed too hastily, but give time for cool reflection to those who have imbibed the error, or are under the influence of the corruption. *Seven days*, that is from one regular meeting to the next, whether it be weekly or longer. Verses 39,40 & 41. If on the priest's further examination, *the plague be spread, &c.* If these persons, instead of seeing the evil of their error and repenting, become more confirmed, and are trying to disseminate it, &c., as the stones of the wall in which the plague was, were to be *taken out and thrown into an unclean place*, so these members, being *heretics*, and having received the first and second admonition, should be rejected, cast out into the world. The walls of the house were to be scraped inside. What heart searchings do these difficulties in the church, produce in the people of God? How careful to clear themselves in this matter, should they be? And to cast away all the dust they find in themselves, and all the coldness and formality which had taken the place of true fellowship in the church, whilst this error or corruption was tolerated? See II Cor.7:11. Verse 42. They were to take other stones and put in the places of those removed, so the stations in the church of those removed, if officers, are to be filled with other members, and the church again to move on, and receive into fellowship such as the Lord may add unto them. They were also to take fresh mortar and *plaster the house*. Not *untempered mortar*,

nor are they to *daub the wall*. And is it not the genuine effort of a church of Christ's having passed through such heart searching difficulties, that the members which have stood fast, get fresh evidences of their own, and of each other's gracious state, feel a fresh and increased fellowship for each other, and now move on with affection and harmony? Verse 43-45. The type goes on to say that if the *plague come again* after the *stones have been removed*, &c., the house is to be *broken down*, &c. In this, and all other simple types, there must be a deficiency to shadow forth the substance clearly. The one figure could not illustrate the course of procedure, where but a few members of a church are affected with a plague of error, &c., and at the same time, show the proper course, where the majority, or body of the church is effected with it, but by this supposition and regulation. But this addition I think sufficiently clear to be understood, shadows forth the case in distinction from the preceding, of an error or corruption prevailing in the church, so that in regular order, the sound part being the minority cannot deal with, and exclude the errorists. In this case the house is to be broken down, or in other words, the true, orderly members are to come out of the disordered body which will in effect be pulling it down as a Church of Christ, however firm it may continue to stand as an unclean anti-christian interest. Or there being none to come out, other orderly churches should disown it. Verses 46 & 47. Which speak of persons contracting uncleanness by going into the house, eating, or sleeping in it during its being shut up, teaches that those who extend tokens of fellowship to a church while in its manifested unclean, disordered state, participate in the sin of the corruption by countenancing it. In reference to the form of cleansing the house, Dr. Watt's brief application of the type, though not properly an explanation must suffice at this time:

"No outward forms can make me clean;
The leprosy lies deep within.
No bleeding bird, nor bleeding beast,
Nor hyssop branch, nor sprinkling priest,
Nor running brook, nor flood, nor sea,
Can wash the dismal stain away.
Jesus, my God, thy blood alone,
Hath power sufficient to atone."

So feels the child of grace under a sense of his various wanderings.

To return to my subject. The term *assemblies* as connected with the dwelling places, is I think used to show what I have tried to keep in view, that by the dwelling places are not to be understood any of those *material places* which the fashionable world call churches, but the assembly or the gathering together of the disciples in one place.

I will now defer the remainder of this subject to another letter; and here meet with a few remarks, an objection which I am aware will be made to my quoting so much from the Levitical law, to illustrate gospel order. 1st. An inspired apostle has authorized us to consider this law as *having a shadow of good things to come*. Heb.10:1. Being then shadows or types given by divine revelation, they must have been designed by infinite wisdom to teach the knowledge of the substance. And thus the apostle employs many of them in the epistle just quoted. See for instance, Hebrews, chapter 9. 2nd. We are told that, "all scripture is given by the inspiration of God, and is profitable, &c." II Tim.3:16. 3rd. Paul says thus relative to his preaching, "Saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." Acts 26:22. With such an example, and such authority, I think I shall be sustained in these references to the Old Testament, providing always that I do not *darken counsel with words without knowledge*.

Yours, as ever.

S.TROTT.

Fairfax Court House, Va., April 26th, 1837.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.4.

{Continued}

Verse 5. "And the Lord will create upon every dwelling place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for upon all the glory shall be a defense."

I come now to notice the expression, *A cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night*. The figure is a little varied, but the spiritual idea is, no doubt the same as that represented by the *pillar of cloud and pillar of fire* in which the Lord *went before Israel by day to lead them in the way, and by night to give them light, to go by day and night*. Neh.9:19. This I take uniformly understood as typifying the gospel ministry, which is given for a guide and light to the Israel of God, by day and night. As this cloud, when the angel moved between Israel and the Egyptians, was a cloud and darkness to the latter, whilst it was light to the former,

{Exod.14:19, 20,} so is the gospel ministry; it is a light to the people of God, but darkness to the legalists or bondmen of our day; and a faithful gospel ministry will in a great measure keep a separation between the two. As the cloud produced a refreshing shadow to Israel in that parched desert during the day, so is the preached gospel to the people of God, when scorched with persecution or legality, &c. Again, there are other instances in which clouds are made to represent the *ministry of the word* as in God's covenant with Noah. He says, "I do set my bow in the cloud;" again, "And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud." Gen.9:13,14. So in the ministry of God's raising up, the bow of the *everlasting covenant* is always to be seen. Again, Zechariah says, {10:1,} "Ask ye of the Lord rain in the time of the latter rain; so the Lord shall make bright clouds, and give them showers of rain, &c." So the gospel clouds or ministry, which the Lord maketh are *bright clouds* – not *towering* – and they give refreshing rain. Hence false teachers are compared by Jude to *clouds without water, carried about by winds*, of course only calculated to deceive and bewilder those who would follow them.

But I will notice the other expression; that is, the *smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night*. It is a well known fact, that when the fire burns sufficiently clear, that which appears as smoke by day, is a shining flame by night. Hence, the smoke here spoken of, which is as the shining of a flaming torch by night must proceed from a burning fire. I had occasion in the preceding number to show that truth or doctrine of the gospel is comparable to fire and is so repeatedly denominated in the scriptures. It is equally true that pure gospel preaching proceeds from the fire of divine truth burning in the heart of the preacher. Thus Jeremiah, when he would refrain from speaking any more in the name of the Lord, says, "His word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay." Jer.20:9. Thus Paul says, "A necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel." I Cor.9:16. So when Isaiah was to have his mind prepared to offer himself willingly to go and publish the message of the Lord, and was depressed under a sense of his entire uncleanness, "then flew one of the seraphims unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar." Isa.6:6. Thus the true gospel minister often feels his entire unfitness to preach the gospel, on account of the awful corruptions of his heart; but when the gospel in its cleansing nature is applied by the Holy Spirit, to his case he

goes forth willingly, and with delight preaches that gospel which he so sensibly feels the power thereof in his own heart. Every gospel minister also knows how much of a task it is to attempt to preach when he has to go to the people with a cold, stale, relation of what he knows to be sure, is truth; and how pleasant it is to preach when *his lips are touched with a live coal from off the altar*, when there is given to him a fresh view, by faith, of the doctrine of the cross. When the fire thus burns in the heart of the preacher, the people of God will see and feel the effects of the preaching. If it is a time of darkness with them, they will see the *shining of the flaming fire*, and know that the *gospel cloud* is still near as their *guide*. If it is a time of light to their soul, they will feel the evidence that the true fire is burning in the preacher, and as Israel by marking their course by the cloud, knew that they were traveling in the right way, so these by comparing their experience with this gospel smoke, know that they and the preacher are taught by the same Spirit, and that their teaching is in accordance with the word. If true gospel preaching is like the smoke which rises hot from the fire, then that preaching which is so fashionable as this day, and which is no other than a flowery composition made up in the coolness of the study, of parts, of gospel doctrine, of human reason, of the science of the schools, and of quotations from the scriptures, and from the poets, or consist of recitations of what the preacher has stored his mind with, of dead men's brains; though it may reflect the colors of the rainbow from being opposite to Christ, the believer's sun, and with its beauties, please the fancy of the hearers, still not being sent forth by the fire of gospel truth, being not the effect of heat, but of cold, it is nothing but *fog*. So the people of God have ever found it by its producing *chills and fevers* upon them.

Another kind of preaching, very popular, is more like a *cloud of dust* than *smoke*. It consists of exhortations to creaturely duties, and of legal threatenings for failures to perform. And as dust it clouds the eyes and obstructs the breathings, so this kind of preaching beclouds the faith of the believer, when exposed to its influence, leading his views off from Christ, and directing them to his own doings for comfort and acceptance, and by obscuring his views of Christ, it hinders his prayers, or obstructs the breathings of his soul.

In reference to smoke, properly so called, it is sometimes unpleasant, and to weak eyes and weak nerves it is painful; but this is only when the fire does not burn clear, or there is some obstruction in the atmosphere or otherwise to its ascending up. So when the gospel preacher is left to himself,

and his mind becomes confused, his preaching is often unpleasant to gospel hearers. And when the faith of believers has become weakened by their being overcome by the world or other temptations, or when they have been exposed to the blasts of the *winds of doctrine*, the declaration of clear gospel truth becomes painful to them. But still the preaching of the gospel will be of use in such cases; for as smoke expels noxious vapors, frost, &c., and drives away mosquitoes, so faithful gospel preaching, though at first painful to the believer in a backslidden state, will be likely to produce a reaction, reclaim him from his wanderings, and expel those vapors and frosts which had preyed upon his soul. It will drive from him also those swarms of modern mendicants, which had been sucking – not his blood – but an eleven-penny bit here, and an eleven-penny bit there, whilst he was exposed to their ravages, in the darkness of *new-schoolism*, or in the swamps of *middle-groundism*. It is not the sucking of blood, but the person infused, by the mosquitoes that causes the swelling and pain; so it is not the extracting by these traveling agents of the money from the pockets of those on whom they prey, that does the mischief, but the infusing into their minds the vain idea that they are thus doing something to *help on God's work*, and the leading them to bid God-speed to this iniquitous course. Some reasons why the gospel ministry is pre-figured by smoke, I shall have occasion to notice before I close this.

I will now notice the special promise contained in this passage; namely, that “the Lord will create upon every dwelling place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke &c.” The import of this evidently is, that in that day the Lord will provide all his churches with the stated ministry of the word – with “pastors after his own heart, who shall feed his people with knowledge and understanding;” for they shall be of the Lord's creating, such as the Lord shall qualify and call to the work. What then will become of the various machinery for manufacturing ministers, and the multitude which they have produced? They will all fall; no place any longer to be found for them among the churches of Christ.

As this happy day has not yet arrived, and I have no idea of men's hastening it, I will here notice an enquiry which naturally arises from this subject, relative to the present time; namely, whether it is now the duty of each church to have its own pastor, and preaching every Lord's day? That in the apostolic age, elders were ordained in every church, and the churches met regularly for worship on the first day of the week is to me clear. The Romish Church appears to have continued

this as a uniform practice. Those denominations which have reformed from that church, have also generally followed the same practice; perhaps not so much in reference to apostolic example, as from their bondage to the notion of a legal Sabbath. The Baptists in England, when they began to aim at being on an equality with the other dissenting denominations, as noticed in a former number, seem also to have copied after them in this thing. As the Baptist emigrants from England to this country, have formerly, more generally settled in the Northern and Middle States, and thither their educated preachers have principally been imported; there we find a general conformity to the English Baptists. There a Baptist College was early established; and there, were early established the notions of a legal Sabbath, and of having a pastor to each church, and he somewhat educated for the work, if it was only to go to a common school, or to some supposed *Gamaliel* for a time, after his first impressions to preach.

But the early start of the Baptists in the Southern States, appears to have been in a great measure independent of this foreign influence. Take Virginia for a specimen; a few plain preachers came here from the Middle States, and a few others the Lord soon raised under their ministry of the same uneducated stamp. The motive which these had to preach, appears to have been their love to Christ and his cause, their pay mostly persecution, and their guide, as to their field of labors, the openings of Providence; and their calls here and there, where there was an anxiety manifested to hear. Thus following the leadings of Providence, they preached one Lord's day in this place, another in that; and as the Lord raised up churches under their ministry at different places, instead of confining their pastoral care to one church, and leaving the others destitute, they preached each, to several churches exercising a pastoral care over them. Hence the difference in the customs of the Southern Baptists from those in the more Northern States and in England. The question is, which order is most correct? But say some of my Northern brethren, can there be any question upon this point, when in the apostolic age, elders were ordained in every church? Do you not hold that apostolic example is binding upon the churches in every age? I do; but there is no example, remember, for a legal Sabbath to be observed by the churches, nor for the churches to provide themselves with gifts for the ministry, or to make themselves preachers, or to establish schools to make preachers for them; that is in the scriptures; in the practices of the two Beasts there are examples enough of this sort. The

case before us is similar to that of adding members. There was an instance in the church at Jerusalem of three thousand being added in one day. The number then added depended altogether on the sovereign act of the Holy Ghost in regenerating them; the number therefore can be no example for churches in after ages to imitate. The order of their being added, was then established by apostolic example, as the order in all after ages; such as being first baptized after *receiving the word with joy* and then being *added to the churches*, &c. So in the case of pastors or elders. The Master gives but one direction upon the point of providing for this office. It is this; "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into the harvest." Matt.9:37. This amounts to a prohibition of the churches attempting to provide them themselves. In accordance with this is the Apostle's testimony; namely, that the Lord Jesus when he ascended up on high, gave gifts unto men; and this, not according to the notions of men, but according to the purpose of the Father, for he received these gifts. According to this purpose, *he gave some Apostles, &c., and some pastors and teachers*. Eph.4:8-11. Consequently it is not the work of men or money to provide these. But then the ordaining to the work, those which the Lord gives for it, even to a plurality of elders in every church, is Apostolic example. The pattern for ordaining elders is given, as I think, in the case of Barnabas and Saul, Acts 13:2,3. As several worthy brethren differ from me on this point, I will beg the indulgence here to say – not to provoke disputation, but to explain my own views – that it was in defense of a cardinal point in our Old School principles, that on a former occasion, well recollected by some, I thought it important to write on this subject. I still attach more importance to the subject than some others do – not to the form, as a form simply considered – but on account of that point in our principles above referred to; namely, the perfection of the Scriptures as a Rule, both of Faith and Practice. Throw away Acts 13:2,3, as a pattern for ordaining to the ministry, and we find it appointed to ordain elders, without any direction or example by which to inform us in what this ordaining consists. And throw away Acts, chapter 6, as a pattern for appointing and setting apart to the office of deacons, and we shall have certain officers named in the apostolic churches, as in Phil.1:1 & I Tim.3:8, and no intimation given how they were introduced into the churches, what is their office, or how they are to be appointed to it. If the scriptures are thus deficient in those points, their perfection, as a Rule, is destroyed; we are at sea without

compass or stars. Such a view of the revelation which God has made of the religion of his own appointing I cannot admit. To return to my subject; admit Acts 13:2,3, to be a pattern in the case, and we shall find the order for setting apart to the ministry, harmonizing with the testimony that the gifts are imparted by Christ according to the purpose of the Father, for they must first be designated to the office by the Holy Ghost; that is, in their special call to the work, before being ordained. Thus as is salvation, so is the gospel minister, the work of the *Three that bear record in heaven*.

Here is the grand error, upon this point, of the English and our Northern Baptists, they appear to have taken the example of ordaining those gifts which the Lord gave and manifested to the primitive churches as a pattern for providing themselves with a supply of preachers. And they not only have absorbed all the *gifts for exhortation* in furnishing their supply of preachers, but in many instances where those have offered who did not possess the requisite gifts, they have concluded that by sending them to some famed *Gamaliel*, or school, or college, an image of the gift might be carved out of the candidate's mind, or be stamped upon it by communicated ideas. Thus have they presumed to usurp that prerogative which the Lord has reserved in his own hands. And this awful presumption, with its accompanying *filthiness and idolatry*, has, lamentable to say, not been staid at the North, but all its evil consequences has overspread the South and West.

If it should be asked, Why are not the churches now as fully supplied with gifts as were those in the early ages of the gospel? I answer, because the Lord hath so purposed, hence the churches were left to corrupt their ways, and were *allured and brought into the wilderness* {Hosea 2:14,} which is of course a state of considerable privations. See also Psa.81:13-16. Hence when the Lord shall have performed his whole work upon Mount Zion and upon Jerusalem, he not only *will give her, her vineyards from thence*, {from the wilderness,} Hosea 2:15, but he *will* again "create upon every dwelling place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, &c.," will furnish every church with a full supply of gifts of his own providing, and which he himself will call into active exercise. And this promise fully sustains the position I have taken; for it clearly presupposes that such was not the state of the churches previous to the period intended.

One more enquiry I must anticipate; namely, whether during the continuance of the wilderness state of the church, those gifts which the Lord does impart to the churches for the ministry, should be confined, each, to one particular church, or

whether those endowed with them, should labor to feed the sheep and lambs of Christ, wherever they find them *bleating* for food, within the reasonable range of the locations respectively assigned to each by Providence? To me it appears clear, that the scriptural direction and example is in favor of a *pastor or teachers* extending the sphere of his labors beyond the limits of his one church. We read, it is true, of the elders of the church at *Ephesus*, and of elders being *ordained in every church*. These scriptures show that they are to take the *oversight* of the churches where their lot is cast, but cannot, I conceive, be justly construed to imply that their labors were to be confined each to one church. Hence, Paul's address to the Ephesian elders; he says, "Take heed to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." What are we to understand by *all the flock* in this case? The Apostle himself explains it in the next clause. "To feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood." Will any Old School Baptist say, that the *church of God which he has purchased with his own blood*, and which of course Christ *loved and gave himself for*, was no other than that particular branch or church planted at Ephesus? I think not. The direction then must be general, to feed the church of God over which the Holy Ghost had made them *overseers*, that is to labor where he specially calls them, according to Acts 13:2, or in other words, wherever the Holy Ghost gives them to see it is their duty to go, there do the work of an *overseer* in taking *heed of all the flock, to feed*, not the goats, but the *church of God*, &c. Peter's direction to the elders which were *among* those to whom he wrote, is equally general – not to feed their *respective flocks* – that appears to be a more modern idea – but to *feed the flock of God*, not everywhere; that those elders could not do – but *which is among you*, &c. That is, the *flock of God is to be fed*, and wherever the elders find it, *among them* or themselves among it, let their attention be turned to this work.

I now leave this, which may be considered a long digression, and come to the last clause of the verse under consideration; namely, "for upon all the glory shall be a defense." This evidently has reference to the preceding part of the verse. The glory may be the glory of that purified state of the church, when the glory of the Lord shall have arisen upon her, and the Gentiles {the nations} shall come to her light, and kings to the brightness of her rising. Isa.60:1-3. The defense, the Lord having set watchmen upon the walls of Jerusalem that will never hold their peace – that will see eye to eye, {Isa.62:6,} and the light of the gospel being so clear, the enemy will no more be able to make inroads with his *other*

gospels, or to set up in the churches his ministers *transformed into the apostles of Christ*. Or the glory may be, the peculiar glory and light of the gospel in that day; and the defense, the *dispensation of the gospel* being still committed to men of *like passions* with others; this *treasure* will still be in *earthen vessels*. And herein is the reason I was to give, why the gospel ministry is compared to *smoke*. The smoke is not the pure fire, but the heat and light of the fire ascending through the evaporation it causes from the fuel. So the preached gospel is not the pure revelation of God which he makes of himself in Christ; but it is that revelation and truth irradiating the human mind, and through that denser medium shining forth for the instruction and comfort of the people of God with a tempered brightness, so that the *word of life* as thus *declared and manifested unto us*, we mortals, can *look upon, and handle*, can examine it deliberately and composedly. See I John 1:1-3. Hence by this *defense* upon the glorious brightness of the divine truth of the *gospel of the Son of God*, it is tempered to suit mortal vision.

S.TROTT.
Fairfax Court House, Va., April 27th, 1837.

ON THE FOURTH CHAPTER OF ISAIAH. No.5.

Verse 6: "And there shall be a tabernacle for a shadow in the day time from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from the storm, and from rain."

From what is said here, and in other passages of Scripture, it is evident that what is called the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, has its antitype under the gospel dispensation, and that this anti-type, as to its external protecting coverings, and to its glory, will be more fully displayed at a further day. In Ezekiel 37:27, having reference to the same period with the above, God says, "My tabernacle also shall be with them." In Rev.21:3, it is said, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men and he will dwell with them." This anti-typical tabernacle the Apostle describes as one which "the Lord pitched, and not man," {Heb.8:3,} and again as being a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands; that is to say, not of this building, and of which Christ is the High Priest. Heb.9:11.

This anti-type is what we have now to show. By the tabernacle proper, that is the *curtains of fine linen* and the *boards* of the tabernacle, {Exod.40:18,} together with what it contained, I understand the gospel church, with its Head and

under its peculiar dispensation prefigured; by the several coverings, that protection which is provided for it. The several parts of the type we will briefly notice. First, the ark of testimony, with its enclosed tables of the Law, and covered over with the *mercy seat of pure gold* represented the Law as magnified and made honorable by the obedience of Christ, and as covered over, or divided from his people by that perfect and divine atonement which he made, *pure*, and *independent* of all the works, exercises, feelings, &c., of creatures. As the Ark with the mercy seat and cherubims upon it, the golden pot of manna, the golden censor, with Aaron's rod that budded, were all placed in the most holy place where alone the high priest had access, so Christ as the head of his church, is seated on the throne of his glory, where he remains as their *life*, as their *righteousness* to perfume their prayers, as the *fountain* of gifts, sovereignly to dispense them to his church; and where he will ever remain to be seen as their *bread of life*. As the high priest entered into the holiest once every year, not without blood, &c., so Christ as the High Priest of spiritual Israel, *entered in once into Heaven itself, having obtained eternal redemption for us, and to appear in the presence of God for us.* Heb.9:7,12 & 24. As the Ark was brought forth and carried in the center of the hosts of Israel in their journeyings, so Christ walketh in the *midst of the seven golden candlesticks*, and is with his churches in all their difficulties and tribulation.

Second. In the holy place where the golden candlestick, the incense altar and the table of shew-bread; so in the gospel church and in its gifts for the ministry, we have the golden candle stick and its lamps burning, to give light to all that are in the house, and answering to the pure olive oil, which the bowls of the candlestick contained to feed the light, we have the Holy Spirit who dwells with and is in the saints, and who feeds the gifts for the ministry, making them useful. In the ministry of the word, and in the supper is held forth as the Lord our righteousness, by which the people of God are encouraged to go to the throne of grace, as if encompassed with a cloud of smoking incense; and is thus also held to view as the *bread of life*. The priests, the sons of Aaron only might enter the holy place; to them it appertained to *order* and *trim* the lamps, to burn incense on the golden altar, and to set in order the shew-bread on the table and to eat thereof; so none but believers, the sons of Christ our Spiritual Aaron, and who are *made kings and priests unto God and the Lamb*, have a right in the church or to interfere in its institutions, and it is their province, being in the church, to order and trim the

lamps, to judge of the gifts, and to see that they give true light; and no stranger might come nigh to meddle with these things; yea, not even the Levites, lest they and the priests both die. See Num.18:3,5 & 7. How will mission societies, mission boards, theological schools &c., compare with this ordering of the furniture, and Law of the tabernacle?

Third. The Altar for burnt offerings, was in the outer-court, before and near the door of the tabernacle, and the brazen laver between that and the door of the tabernacle. The altar being thus without the tabernacle, taught first that Christ and him crucified is to be preached to the world at large as the only way of salvation; second, that the atonement or offering of Christ should be applied and received by faith before a person should be admitted into the church. As the altar was near the door of the tabernacle, so there needs not much space between a person's laying the hand of his faith on Christ as his great sacrifice, and coming to the door of the church. As the altar and its vessels were under the charge of the priests alone, {Num.18:3 & 5,} so the preaching of Christ crucified to the world, belongs only to believers, and to be under the direction of the *royal priesthood*, the church, and no stranger should be allowed to interfere in these things, even though he would give his hundred dollars, twice told, for directorship.

Fourth. As the laver was placed between the altar and the door of the tabernacle for the priests to wash their hands and feet at before they entered into the tabernacle, or came near to the altar, Ex.40:30-32; so believers, notwithstanding their having felt an application of the blood of Christ for pardon, should have clean hands and feet, an upright walk and conduct, before they are allowed to enter and enjoy the privileges of the church, or to minister at the altar. The Master saith, "He that is washed, {that is in the fountain of a Savior's blood,} needeth not, save to wash his feet;" implying that if the walk of a believer is clean, he is altogether clean.

I now pass to the tabernacle proper. Here a difficulty presents itself as to which is innermost, the boards, or the curtains of fine linen. The general idea is that the boards are innermost, thus it has been described, and thus Calmet, and others have given drawings of it; and so any of us, no doubt would have made and set it up, if left to our own discretion. But Moses had the *pattern showed to him in the mount*. From all the examination I have been able to make of the descriptions given in the word concerning the tabernacle, I find nothing warranting this general idea; but by comparing Exodus 36:13 & 14, with 40:18 & 19, I am constrained to believe that the tabernacle of fine linen was set up innermost, and the

boards being put together by their tenons and bars, formed a protection to it; the tent of goat's hair, with the other coverings, being over the whole.

Hence the tabernacle of fine linen is first to be noticed. "Moreover thou shalt make the tabernacle with ten curtains of fine twined linen and blue and purple and scarlet; with cherubims of cunning work shalt thou make them." Ex.26:1. By this tabernacle I understand the everlasting covenant, as being the *heavenly places* in which the people of God are *blessed with all spiritual blessings*, {Eph.1:3,} to be represented. Parkhurst, in his Lexicon on the word *shesh*, here rendered *fine linen*, makes it so named to denote the cheerful, vivid whiteness which linen is susceptible of. The root signifies to be *sprightly, cheerful, to rejoice*, &c. It therefore fitly represents that peace and joy which a soul feels when by faith it views itself sheltered under the provisions of the everlasting covenant, or enabled to take hold of its better promises. It was *twined linen*, made strong; so the covenant in all its provisions is made *sure*, and all its blessings ultimately connected together, not to be separated, its *promises* are not *yea and nay*. These curtains were also made with blue, azure, or sky blue. So the blessings of this covenant, are not earthly, but heavenly and spiritual. They were also made *with scarlet* and *purple*. So the everlasting covenant, whilst it recognizes the inflexible demands and purity of the *fiery law*, shows also the purple fountain of a Savior's blood as having satisfied the law's demands, removed its wrath, and changed it, from being an object of dread, to an object of delight and confidence to the believers.

These curtains were also wrought with cherubims of cunning work. There a difficulty occurs as to what the cherubs were, and consequently as to what they represent. The literal idea of the term, may be *as a child*, or *young man*, to *increase in knowledge*, or *to become great*, &c. If we look for a description of them, we find none in the history of the tabernacle or temple, excepting that they had wings and faces. In Ez.1:5-12, compared with 10:6-9, we have a particular description of the cherubim which he saw, and which corresponds with the *four beasts* or more properly four *living creatures*, of Rev.4:6-8, and which are generally thought to be like the cherubims on the mercy seat. By turning to Rev.5:8-10, it is evident these unite with the Elders in worshipping the Lamb, and in saying, "Thou hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood, out of every kindred, tongue and people, &c." Hence the cherubims could be designed to represent, neither the Trinity in union with the Man Christ, or angels, for these were not

redeemed out of the *kindreds, people and nations*. They must represent some chosen from among men. And from their standing upon the mercy seat which represents the atonement of Christ, one on the one end and the other, on the other, with their faces inward looking toward the mercy seat, I think the prophets which prophesied before the coming of Christ, and the Apostles are intended, or rather the prophetic gifts; hence Christ is spoken of as the *foundation of the apostles and prophets*. Eph.2:20. The appearance and several faces of these cherubims, were designed to represent the qualifications of those for their office; but I will now take time to particularize. As the apostolic stands at the head of the several gifts for the ministry, so through them I understand the ordinary gifts according to their measure represented. But corresponding to the cherubims on these curtains, we find cherubims and palm trees carved on the wall of Solomon's temple. I Kings 6:29. And corresponding to these we find Ezekiel describing the cherubims and palm trees carved on the wall of the temple of which he had a vision. Ez.4:1,18 & 19. As these cherubims were so intimately connected with palm trees, so that each of the faces of a cherub described looked toward a palm tree, and as palm trees seems intended, as from Ps.92:12, and Songs 7:7 & 8, to represent gospel churches, they seemed intended to represent ordinary gospel ministers. These cherubs had only two faces, *the face of a man*, denoting that they possessed understanding, and the *face of a lion* to denote their boldness in declaring the truth and testimony of God, and each face looking toward a palm tree to denote their entire relation to, and dependence on the churches. Therefore they are not our modern missionaries. Whether these cherubs had the bodily appearance of a man, to denote the ministers of the gospel being men of like passions with others; *straight feet* and *divided hoof*, to denote the steadfastness and correct walk which ought to belong to a minister, and wings to denote their soaring above the earth and earthly considerations in the ministry of the word, as those described, Ez.1:6-12, had, is not said. But from their bearing the same name it is presumable they had the same general appearance. Now from the cherubims being wrought on these curtains we are taught that the gifts for the ministry are an important provision in the everlasting covenant.

Next to, and connected with the tabernacle were the boards of shittim wood, overlaid with gold, and fastened together by tenons and bars, so as to form one building. These boards, being of incorruptible wood, and overlaid with gold, and thus closely connected together, represented the whole

mediation of Christ in its various parts, and as embracing the union of his divine and human natures. As the tabernacle was thus encompassed with these boards, so by the mediation of Christ the church is secured and the everlasting covenant is sealed and its blessings made sure to the heirs of promise. The sides only were enclosed with the boards, the top only being left open, teaching that the mediation of Christ was not designed to secure to the people of God an earthly inheritance, nor to confine their views and expectations here but to lead them to look forward toward a heavenly and eternal inheritance; and also to raise their hopes and expectations heavenward for their salvation and defense. The east side was not enclosed with boards, but pillars of the same wood, and overlaid in the same manner with gold were placed on that side; and on these were suspended for the door of the tabernacle, a *hanging of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen, wrought with needle work*; this to afford a passage in and out for the priests.

The hanging, like the curtains of the tabernacle represented the spiritual blessings with which the people of God are here blessed, as before showed. But no cherubims on it; ministerial gifts are not to be manifested, but in the church; neither are they to be the door of entrance into the church. This hanging was wrought with needle work and suspended on the pillars, to show that the blessings thereby represented must not be merely learned but *wrought* in the experience of a person, and he brought to hang entirely on the mediation of Christ, without any other standing as to his acceptance with God; in order to his being entitled to the privileges of the house of God.

I now pass to notice the coverings of the tabernacle. The first was the tents of goat's hair, that is curtains made of goat's hair spun. This formed a tent well calculated to turn the weather. As goat's hair is distinct from *sheep's clothing*, there may be some difficulty as to what is to be understood by it. It may denote that outward protection to the church and religion of Christ derived from the world, signified *by the earth's helping the woman*. Rev.12:16. Or rather I think, it denotes the worldly deportment of believers; that is, their intercourse with the world, and in the business thereof. This being upright and harmless as it ought to be, is well calculated to secure to them toleration of their religion and protection to their persons. This may properly be denoted by goat's hair; first, to distinguish it from their religious acts and exercise, more properly termed *sheep's clothing*, and because this intercourse is the actings of the natural life, and relating to its concerns;

though it ought always to be under the influence of their religion. Second, because when believers look at their own outward deportment they see nothing good in it, and often think it bespeaks their being goats. Hence the surprise of those on the *right hand*; Matt.25:37-38.

Over this tent was a covering of ram's skins died red. This was calculated to denote the *fiery law* of God and the influence it often has in restraining the enemies of the cross from doing violence to the people of God.

Outside of all was a covering of badger's skin. There is a great diversity among Lexicographers and translators as to the true meaning of the word *theshim* rendered by our translators *badgers*. That badgers were not intended is pretty evident from the fact that they are northern animals and not likely to be found in Arabia. Calmet thinks a color resembling sky colors was intended. The Editor of Calmet suggests that seals were the animals intended. Pagninus gives as the meaning of the word, the yew-tree, hence supposes the bark of that tree used, but quotes the Targum as thinking an animal of many colors designed. Parkhurst gives *azure blue* as the meaning, but thinks it a lighter sky color, than the color generally called blue, and suiting the more ordinary appearance of the sky. This also was the rendering of all the ancient translators. Hence the two leading ideas on the subject have been; on the one hand, that something coarse was intended, on the other, that the colors of the heavens are designed. To us the most natural idea would be that this outside covering designed to protect the others from the weather was something coarse. And in reference to the church, as it has existed, it is evident that its having been led to assume the coarseness incident to a wilderness and obscure state has been a great protection to it. But to me it is no less certain, that, that heavenly and divine interposition {denoted by the sky colors of this covering, which after the destruction of the Beast and the churches coming up out of the wilderness, will be so clearly seen as having been exerted in her preservation during the reign of the Beast, and now so gloriously exerted in her deliverance, the *God of Jeshurun being seen riding upon the heavens in her help and in his excellency on the skies* {Deut.33:26,} will strike a dread upon all who remain unregenerated, and deter them from making any attempts to annoy the people of God; as the miraculous deliverance of Israel from Egypt, struck a dread upon the nations around. Hence I believe it was designed of God that these two ideas should be attached to that word, suiting the

two states of the church, its oppressed, and its more glorious state.

The promise in the passage under consideration contains two leading ideas. 1st. As suiting also the promise already quoted from Ezekiel 37:27. "My tabernacle shall be with them," it implies that as the tabernacle was, in all its parts made according to the pattern showed in the mount, and of God's appointing, no human planning about it, so that the church, when it shall have been washed from all its defilements, and brought out of the wilderness, shall be in all things conformed to the word of God, that God shall then be worshipped and served, not according to the plans of men, but according to his own revealed order, and by his own appointed institutions. 2nd. That then the protecting coverings of the church will have their full effect to preserve the people and religion of God from every annoyance, so that, according to Isa.11:9, "They shall not hurt, nor destroy in all God's holy mountain."

We are not to understand by this that the Church of Christ has not now, all these protecting coverings for her defense. But as I have before noted in the course of my remarks upon this chapter, God has left his church and people to experience these buffetings for their good, and to reclaim them from their base wanderings from him; and that they might experience these severe rebukes from those *lovers* which they have gone after in their conformity to human religions. God, as he hardened the heart of Pharaoh, has suffered the hearts of the enemies of truth to become enthralled by their false systems of religion, has *given them up to believe a lie*, and thus to become emboldened to assault the truth and people of God, in the face of those awful threatenings in his word against them. But then these false systems by which men are led to think that they are doing God service in reviling and persecuting the saints, will all have been swept away in the destruction of the *man of sin*, and the saints will be shielded by a correct walk, protected by the declarations of the divine law, and upheld by the manifest interposition of an arm almighty, so that none will dare to molest them. May this glorious period soon arrive, and may we in the mean time, have grace to take patiently all the ignominy and persecutions that may be heaped upon us by those who are rearing the Image of the Beast.

S.TROTT.
Fairfax Court House, Va., July 7th, 1837.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

Explanation Of Views Heretofore Advanced On Justification.

BROTHER BEEBE: - In offering an explanation of my views of the scriptural doctrine of Justification, it seems necessary to give a very brief view of my understanding of the distinct headships of Christ and Adam, and of the distinct relation which the children of God bear to each.

In reference to the headship of Christ, my understanding is that the children of God derive from him a real principle of life, a spiritual life which constitutes them children of God, manifests them to be of his *flesh and his bones*, or one with him; and which is as distinct from the existence they derive from Adam as a head, as Christ is from Adam. Brother Beebe, in giving his views on Eph.2:5, {No.4, of present volume of the SIGNS,} has so fully anticipated me on this point, that I need not now dwell on it. I will just repeat in substance what I said on this point, in my second communication on Elder Water's pamphlet, namely; that as the children of God as they were produced in Christ, being one with him, and with him, sons and heirs of God, like him they stood, not under the law, but under grace. Hence I cannot conceive that in this, their standing in Christ, and oneness with him from eternity, as he ever dwelled in the bosom of the Father, they ever needed to be, or there was any room for their being justified from the demands of the law, their existence in Christ being as independent of the law under which creatures exist, as was that of the Son of God their Head. And they also, were like him pure and holy.

But, whilst it was the pleasure of God to bring forth Christ as a head, from everlasting, having his posterity in him, called his seed; it was his purpose that this spiritual seed should in time, become one with creatures of the dust, and be manifested only in this connection; and that the individuals thus quickened, should in this complex existence, as born of two heads, in their first, and second birth, be recognized as the sons of God. Hence for this purpose, man was to be created, of the earth earthy, *in the image and after the likeness* of his Creator; that is, Christ, having his bride and his posterity in him; and to be created a rational and accountable being. From the posterity of this man, as present with God in eternity, an election was made of those *predestinated to the*

adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself; and given to Christ, to be by him, preserved, redeemed, and quickened with that life which was in him. Hence the *purpose* of God, given to the elect in Christ from before the foundation of the world, as I understand it to be developed in the scriptures, instead of being a purpose to hold them from eternity justified from the demands of the law and freed from sin, was a purpose to create them in Adam under the law, and leave them in him, to fall into sin and depravity, that they might thus become proper subjects to be redeemed from under the law, and that, becoming dead to the law, and of course, to their relation to Adam, as their head under the law, through an application of the law by the Holy Spirit, they might in their whole complex persons as born of Adam, and born again of Christ, or of the Spirit, be recognized according to their second birth, as members of Christ's body, and sons and heirs of God; and through Christ's conquest over death and the grave, to be raised with their bodies changed to spiritual and incorruptible bodies, to live and reign with Christ in glory. And thus where *sin reigned unto death*, the grace given them in Christ before the world began, shall reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord; making even the reign of sin subservient to the eternal purpose of bringing the elect to reign in glory.

Having premised thus much concerning the two headships, and the distinct relation which the people of God bear to each; that from the one, the first Adam in reference to the manifestations of the elect, they derive an earthly, but rational and accountable existence, together with depravity and condemnation; from the other, the Lord from heaven, a spiritual, eternal and heaven-born life. I will now show what part I understand Justification to bear in this great and glorious purpose.

I will here repeat, what I have heretofore said, that Justification is a legal term, and relates to the law under which man was created. The text {Rom.3:24,} "Being *justified* freely by his grace through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus;" compared with Gal.3:13, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," would satisfy me that Justification relates to the clearance of the elect from the law, were their no other texts to the same point. Hence it is a provision made in Christ to meet the situation of the elect, as under the law in their relation to Adam.

It appears to me, that God, in his purpose to unite that life which was in the Word, with human beings created under the law, and left to fall into sin, designed both to make them

know and rightly appreciate the *good* of holiness, of submission to God, of the heavenly inheritance, &c., by their experience of the contrast thereof, sin and misery, and thus making the forbidden tree to them, truly the *tree of knowledge of good and evil*, also to make himself known to them, and angels, in his glory as the only object of love, trust, &c., by a display, in their salvation, of all his divine attributes; his justice, holiness, sovereignty and power; as well as his love, mercy, &c. Whilst God therefore created man under a law as the standard of eternal right, and left him to his own creaturely weakness, and thus to fall, that creatures might see manifested their entire dependence on God, and that sin might appear as *exceeding sinful*, in being a transgression of that which is holy, just and good, and the love and mercy, &c., of God might be fully manifested in redeeming, saving and glorifying such transgressors; his holiness, justice and truth must also be maintained and shine forth in their deliverance. This could not be done, without the inflexible purity and majesty of the divine law being maintained. This again could not be done by inflicting its rigorous demands on fallen creatures, without sinking them to eternal ruin, as showed in the case of devils and impenitent men. Nor by inflicting those demands on another, on their account, excepting it should be one on whom the law had no demand on his own account, one who could honor the law and live, of whom the law could in justice demand and receive satisfaction in behalf of those for whom he undertook; and who by stepping into their law place could actually represent them, so that his obeying and bearing the curse should be as though, they did it in person. These requisitions could be found in none but in Christ. On him therefore help was laid; he perfectly answered to the occasion. For, as I have on a former occasion observed, Christ in being brought forth in that life which constituted him the Head and Representative of his people, was not brought forth as a distinct being or person, but that life was conceived in him as God, as the self-existent and independent Jehovah. This life never existed in a relation distinct from him as God, so that he, who is Christ, and the Head of the Church, having his people in him, is the essential Jehovah, equally with the Father. And the Church as the bride of Christ, and his people as the seed of Christ, are nowhere known as distinct from Christ, but as personally one with him. He is the Head, and the Church is *his body, the fulness of him, that filleth all in all*. Eph.1:23. He is the *life* of his people, and *their life is hid with Christ in God*. Col.3:3,4. Hence, the law, or any enemy spiritual or temporal, before it can come at that life which

constitutes the believer a son of God, must come at Christ. This being the relation in which the Church, and children of God have ever stood in to Christ, being in him and one with him; they as such have ever been dealt with and viewed only in and through Christ. No evil could come to them in this relation without coming through Christ, and no good comes to them but through him. Hence, Christ could and must represent the Church and people of God, or they could not as such be represented; for I know of none having a right to represent a bride but her husband, or an unborn posterity but their head. Hence, I cannot think that the Church could have been justified before the foundation of the world, excepting in and through her Head and Husband Christ as representing her; and if this had been the case, he could not afterwards have been condemned, or made a curse as her representative.

Again, Christ being the self-existent Jehovah equally with the Father, he was dependent on, and accountable to none; no law therefore could bind him, none could exact of him obedience as in himself considered. Hence when he condescended to be made under the law, that as Husband and Representative of the Church, he might meet and cancel the demands the law had against her, he could obey in her behalf; which no created being could do, because on such, the law would have a previous demand on the ground of their creaturely existence. And the law could in right demand and receive of him obedience, when he thus came into her law place, in being made flesh, seeing that the Church was represented by him, she being in him. Until he proved inadequate to answer all the demands of the law against his Church, the penalty could never reach her; seeing it was, as she antecedently existed in him, that in her members, she was afterwards created in Adam under the law; hence, he as her then representative, was of right considered her Surety, that the law should be honored. When he thus by his obedience unto death, fully satisfied the demands, law and justice had against his people, it was as though they had made the satisfaction in person.

And as the act of Justification is nothing other than a public declaration by the judge of the clearance of a person against whom charges had been preferred, so I understand the act of the Justification of the Church was, when the eternal Judge declared her cleared in, and through her Head and Husband, from all the demands of law, by his resurrection from the dead without seeing corruption; or, in other words, when it was thus made manifest, that through the satisfaction rendered by Christ as the Substitute of his people, the divine

law was honored, and eternal justice now harmonized in the entire deliverance of his people from the demands of the law, and from sin.

Here perhaps some further explanation may be necessary. It may be asked how the transgressions of the law by the elect could involve Christ in accountability to the law as their Head, if, as I have said, there is a plain distinction between the headships of Christ and Adam, and between their respective seeds or posterities, and the law has a demand upon the elect, only as they exist as the seed of Adam.

I answer, 1st. That I certainly do not conceive that the natural life of the elect, that corrupt nature which they derive from Adam, constitutes at all, their union with Christ; they never derived it from him as a Head. Hence in their experience, they must die unto Adam as a head, or to the law which is the same thing, before they can be *married* to Christ, or made manifest in their union to him. Rom.7:1,6. The elect children of Adam were given to Christ in the everlasting covenant, they were *his portion*, {Deut.32:9,} as such they were known and preserved of him, in their seminal existence from the creation of Adam on down to their being born in the flesh, and from that, until they are born again, so that not one of their ancestry could be destroyed until their descent was or is secured. In reference to their natural life, they only stand in the above relation to Christ; they do not actually exist as members of Christ's body, until they are *born again*, born of that life which is in him.

But, 2nd. Christ as the Head of his Church, was the Head of her as composed of the elect quickened by life which was in him. This was the eternal purpose as has been showed, in the production of that life, that it should be communicated to creatures of the dust, and that it should be made manifest only in its communication to such creatures. For the accomplishment of this purpose also, Adam was created and the elect in him, that this life should be communicated to them; they are born that they should be born again. And as the elect when born again are recognized as members of Christ's body, or as his posterity, so as Adam represented all his posterity that ever should descend from him, involving them all in depravity by his fall, all being known to God; thus Christ represented all his posterity that should be born of him, known as his from eternity, given to him, that they might be made partakers of the life which was in him, and left to fall that they might be redeemed by him, &c. Hence as Adam was constituted in his creation the head of his posterity as they should be born into the world, and therefore when they come

into the world they are born in a state of depravity, so Christ in being brought forth, and constituted as the Head of his Church and people, was thus constituted their head as they should be born again; and therefore when born of God, whether before the coming of Christ in the flesh, or since, they are born into a state of Justification, and of peace with God, those before the coming of Christ being thus born in anticipation of Christ's redeeming them from under the law, and their faith embracing him as revealed by types and in promise. Hence again as Adam was the head of all his posterity by anticipation of their being born of him, so Christ was the Head of his posterity in anticipation of their being born of God, and as Adam's posterity were involved in his previous transgression by their union to him, and as he went with his bride into transgression, so Christ was involved in the previous transgression of his posterity by his union to them, and he voluntarily without being deceived, went with his bride into the transgression in which she had gone. The union in both cases being so close, that where either the head or the body had transgressed, the other must be involved in the same transgression, *vice versa*, when the Head, as did Christ, honored the law, the body were considered as honoring it in him, and were therefore in him justified from its demands, by virtue of the same union, which involved him in the transgression of his body.

Again. I would remark, that as it was only in and through Christ, that the people of God could be justified, or in other words, that the law could be honored, and the justice of God made apparent in delivering them from under the law, so it is only as persons are born again that their individual Justification can be manifested, for it is only by this second birth that they are made manifest as members of Christ's body. Herein I think some seem to err, in supposing that it is the elect as such that are justified. God can view them redeemed and justified, because their second birth is as present with him as is their first birth; but as creatures they cannot be known in their relation either to the first or second Adam, only by their being manifested. Hence as has been showed, Justification through Christ being a Justification for his people as represented by him their Head, so the scriptures I think speak of none being righteous or justified in a gospel sense, but believers. *Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness*. If I could be made to know any as being of the elect while in a state of unregeneracy, I should think myself required by the scriptures to speak of them as *children of wrath, even as others*,

{Eph.2:3,} and to say unto them, "Except ye are born again, ye cannot see the Kingdom of God." John 3:3. But when they are born *again*, they are born right into that state of Justification in which Christ has placed his Church by redeeming her from under the law. And this is what I understand to be experimental Justification or Justification by faith. And as the experimental Justification of the Old Testament saints was in anticipation of the redemption of Christ, so that redemption looked back to their Justification, and manifested the justice of God therein, as well as in the Justification of those that believe in Jesus under the gospel. See Rom.3:35,26.

I will now notice the text, {Songs 4:7,} which some think cannot consist with the idea, that the act of Justification of the body of Christ did not take place until Christ was *manifested to take away our sins*. This text I apprehend is like Psa.45:13,14, a prophetic description of the gospel church. Yet I admit that it is true of the Church of Christ; as such, in all ages, in certain views of her, that, "Thou art all fair my love, there is no spot in thee." I will show wherein. 1st. The Church as brought forth in Christ, and ever being in him, must always have been viewed of the Father as having that spotless purity, and heavenly glory which he, her Head and Covering possesses as the only *begotten of the Father*. 2nd. The body of Christ as manifested in the world, whether in its scattered state under the former dispensation, or in its collected state under the gospel, is and must be composed only of those who are actual believers in Christ as revealed either in promise before his coming or in gospel testimony of his having come; hence it is composed wholly of such as are born of God, and therefore born into that state in which the righteousness of Christ, as a spotless robe, covers them, leaving no legal blemish on them.

One word now to those who seem so hard to comprehend how the saints under the former dispensation, could receive the effects of Justification in their experience, if the body of Christ collectively, were not then actually justified. 1st. Was the infallible purpose of God which he purposed in Christ Jesus a sufficient authority for him absolutely to promise Christ unto the fathers as a Redeemer and Savior? 2nd. Was the absolute promises of God made unto the fathers sufficient authority to warrant the faith of the Old Testament saints therein, and for them to rest upon in the hope that they should be redeemed from under the law and saved from their sins by the promised Messiah? If so, I can apprehend no difficulty in their enjoying peace with God; not in God's accounting them

righteous as foreseeing that Christ would bring in everlasting righteousness in their behalf. But if these were not sufficient grounds for God's promise and their faith, then I conceive there could have been no safe grounds short of Christ's having actually died on the cross for their redemption before they became sinners.

There are some points which have been brought into this discussion which I might have noticed, but I pass them.

I have given, I hope such an explanation of my views of Justification as will be understood by those who are disposed candidly to examine it. And such I trust, whether they receive my views as correct, or not, will not find anything in them so very alarming to an Old School Predestinarian Baptist as to justify the demand to have them excluded from the SIGNS. It is true that the ingenuity which could deny the truth of a self-evident proposition and which had been advanced by an inspired Apostle, in order to represent me as taking false grounds. See Elder Waters' pamphlet, {page 12,} on the text Rom.4:15; "For where no law is, there is no transgression;" and which, for the same object attempts to show by a Greek criticism upon Heb.9:26, that instead of Christ's having *appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, the putting away of sin* was a something which previously existed, abstractly from, and independent of Christ's coming in the flesh, and which he, when he appeared in the flesh, entered into as a something prepared to receive him. See pages 11 & 12, of same pamphlet. I say, the ingenuity that can thus torture both the letter and the doctrine of scripture, can make anything but *truth* and *sense* out of this explanation I have given. My object however in writing this was not for the accommodation of such, but for the satisfaction of those who would not designedly misapprehend me. Brother Allen thinks I was not sufficiently plain in giving my views in my "Thoughts," but it is to be remembered that "My Thoughts" were not written so much to illustrate my views, as to assign some of my objections, and the ground of them, to the use of the expression *eternal justification* by Old School Baptists. My views of the subject were but incidentally and briefly given. I thought that probably that communication would produce such enquiries or discussions as would lead me to a full expression of my views. Instead of this however, it drew forth attacks and answers such as I had no anticipation of. The kind of opposition my "Thoughts" met with from many Old School Baptists, was to me entirely unexpected, as coming from such, and I really cannot to this day see what there was in that communication which could give such offence to those who are

Old School Baptists in principle. I had conscientious objections to the use of that term among us, as calculated to convey wrong notions, and which was not in itself a scriptural term; those objections or some of them, I published, designedly for the candid consideration of my brethren; in doing this I tried to use language respectful to their feelings. I will not pretend to say that in answering some of those attacks, I have pursued a correct gospel course. I find it very hard for me to obey the Apostle's injunction, "Be ye angry and sin not." Eph.4:26. And I certainly have felt wounded by some things published, and others not published in the SIGNS. But having given the above explanation, I have done I think with the discussion, in this way, of the subject of justification, unless I should have occasion incidentally to touch it in discussing other subjects.

There are some points touched in this communication, my views of which brethren may not fully comprehend, and at which they may feel objections; should they feel disposed to bring forward their objections to those points in such a way that the subjects may be discussed in the spirit of meekness, I shall have no objection thus to discuss them, and to explain my views fully on them. I entertain no views which I do not conscientiously believe to be truth and supported by scripture; I am therefore not ashamed of them, nor unwilling to have them canvassed in the spirit of candor; but of the kind of discussion, such as the greatest share which has been had on the subject of Justification, I think myself we have had enough through the SIGNS.

Before taking my leave of this subject, I wish to express my thankfulness that such able advocates as Brethren Goldsmith, Beebe, and others have stepped forward to my aid in discussing it. I also would say that I think I have felt grateful and humbled before God when brethren have acknowledged themselves either instructed or comforted by my writings on the subject of Justification, as some have done through the SIGNS, and others in communications to me.

Farewell,
S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., March 5, 1839.

AN INQUIRY #1.

BROTHER BEEBE: - In the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE for June 1839, there is a letter from Elder James Osbourn to the Editor, containing some remarks which I wish to bring to the notice of

our Western Old School Brethren. Elder Osbourn, after noticing his book, which professes to be an exposure of missionism in the great valley of the Mississippi, refers to errors of a most pernicious kind as existing in that country, and then says, "I shall venture to say that the great darkness and the odious errors now alluded to, are to be found and there too I found them, among men and churches professing orthodoxy, and the true christian faith. But forsooth orthodoxy and Old Schoolism are terms which stand but for little, &c. Hence a man may be a full grown Quaker under the unmeaning term, as it is now mostly used, of *orthodoxy*; or a gross heretic of the Sabellian kind under the abstruse and new-fangled term of Old Schoolism. And in short, thus it is with the people now referred to in the far West. They indeed greatly pride themselves in what is called orthodoxy and Old Schoolism, and yet they *literally hiss at* and make *common sport* of a TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE ETERNAL GODHEAD, and insultingly call the divine Father, PA, and the Holy Ghost a TOOL. And hence under this orthodoxy and Old Schoolism we clearly see heterodoxy and downright blasphemy, &c."

I think there must be some mistake in this matter. But mistake or not, the thing has gone out, through what is recognized as an Old School periodical, as an indiscriminate charge against our Western brethren, for the New School party to rejoice in. If the above charge is true, I do not blame Elder Osbourn for pronouncing it blasphemy. Not that I am disposed to consider it blasphemous to deny that the Three, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost are in any sense three Gods, or that they are three distinct persons, or that they blaspheme who dissent from the Nicene Creed, or from *my creed* concerning the divine Three, in which the One God has revealed himself, providing that either of the Three is not degraded. But when we consider that *Father*, is one of the names by which God has been pleased to declare himself, as expressive of a relation which, he, the Father sustains in the economy of salvation, as he is declared to be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Christ says to his disciples, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God;" I say when we consider these things, we must conclude that no person having a becoming reverence for God, whatever may be his views of the doctrine of the Trinity, can trifle with or make sport of this name and relation in which God has revealed himself. Neither can we conceive that any such person would either deridingly or considerately speak of *him* as a *tool* of whom Christ thus speaks, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that

he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of Truth, &c." John 14:16,17. And again, "But the *Comforter* which is the *Holy Ghost*, whom the Father will send in my name, *he* shall teach you all things, &c." I hope therefore that some of our Old School Brethren of the West will set this matter right; if it is a wrong charge which Elder Osbourn has made, that they will clear it up; or if any do hold in contempt the names and relations, Father & Holy Ghost, I say not, as declared in the Athanasian Creed, but as declared in the Scriptures; I desire that they may be made manifest; and be no longer recognized as of us. If this charge had come from our avowed enemies it might well be passed unnoticed; but coming from the quarter it has, I do think it calls for some attention.

May the Lord enable all who profess to be of the Old School stand, to believe, speak, and act, consistently therewith.

Yours, &c.
S.TROTT.
July 1, 1839.

AN INQUIRY #2.

BROTHER BEEBE: - At the same time I received the 15th number of the SIGNS, containing my call to our western Old School brethren, to vindicate themselves from the charge preferred against them by Elder Osbourn in the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE for June, I received the number of the ADVOCATE for July {No.1, Vol.3,} containing another communication of Elder Osbourn, in which he enlarges upon the charge against the Old School Baptists of the West. This communication is addressed to a clergyman of the Dutch Reformed Denomination; and so {I find,} was the other; hence I mistook in saying that it was addressed to the editor of the ADVOCATE. In an extract of a letter from brother I.T. Saunders, which he gives in this latter communication, is manifested what I anticipated was the mistake in Elder Osbourn's former communication; that is, that instead of representing, through ridicule, the Father as PA, and the Holy Ghost as a TOOL, brother Saunders makes use of these expressions to illustrate what he understands to be Elder Osbourn's system of the Trinity. However, it was not a mistake in Elder Osbourn; for he evidently, as manifested in this latter communication, considers his system of *Three Divine Persons in the Godhead*, to be the only true doctrine of the Trinity; and a peremptory denial that there are three divine persons in the Godhead he

considers as constituting infidelity. And the reason why any do not attach the same *vast magnitude* to his system of the Trinity as himself and others do, he says, "Is evidently owing to the serious darkness of theirs, interwoven with the whole system of salvation, and with the whole covenant of grace, and with the whole life of faith, and the triumphs of a christian." Elder Osbourn, I confess here hits me, and it may be correctly; for I certainly have a great deal of darkness to mourn over; but certain it is, that while I consider the doctrine that God essentially exists as Three and One, of the highest importance, yet the system that will make the Three to be *three distinct persons*, and only to be expressed by the term *persons*, I do not consider in a light that would justify me in pronouncing as *infidels* all who do not admit the correctness of the Athanasian explanation of the *modus* of God's existing as Three by the special phrase of *three distinct persons, the one person begetting, the second being begotten, and the third being breathed forth by the other two.*

How Elder Osbourn may be right or wrong in his system of explaining the Trinity I will not here attempt to decide, nor what are the sentiments concerning the Trinity of brother Saunders and the hundreds of Old School Baptists in the West, whom Elder Osbourn pronounces Sabellians, I will not say.

My object in writing this is to show that Elder Osbourn has himself explained what I had wished explained; namely, in what sense it was that our Western brethren represented the Father as PA, and the Holy Ghost as a TOOL; that is, not as they are declared in the Scriptures, but as these brethren understood Elder Osbourn to represent them. Hence I recall my request for these brethren to give an explanation. However, brother Saunders, as he is personally pointed out can do as he pleases in speaking for himself.

S.TROTT.
Centerville, Fairfax Co., Va., July 5, 1839.

A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE.

BROTHER JEWETT: - I am pleased to learn that so many are being led, I trust by the Holy Spirit, to a more scriptural view of the important doctrine of Justification, and of the order of gospel churches; as being designed by their Great Head to be independent of all other religious ORGANIZATIONS or bodies; and that yourself among others have been thus led. As thou hast received the gift, my brother, so minister the same; freely

and boldly impart the light given thee in the Scriptures; relative both to doctrine and practice. What is told thee in darkness that speak thou in the light; and what thou hearest in the ear, that preach, or publish, upon the house-top; whether in illustration of truth, or exposure of error.

I am truly rejoiced to find you where you are, on a little spot, surrounded by vast and diversified fields of error; and that the Lord has led you on step by step, to this spot, giving you an opportunity to examine each place as you passed along, and unfolding to your view the mystery of iniquity, as under the assumed garb of *religious benevolence*, it stalks abroad in various forms of doctrine and practice.

As to the trials you have experienced, in being constrained to renounce as error, that which you once held so sacred, having been taught in the *schools of men*, to receive and practice it as a zeal becoming the gospel of Christ; I think I have in my own case known something of the feelings you have endured in being thus stripped of so many good things, and being made to account them as *loss*, as real nuisances, for the sake of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, as the Savior of sinners, and King of Zion, as revealed to your mind by the gospel under the teachings of the blessed Spirit. I still occasionally find myself a learner in that lesson, and am conscious that to be right in sentiment, in feeling and in practice, I need to be taught much more of this lesson in that inimitable and divine way, in which the Holy Spirit imparts instruction. But, my Brother, if Socrates could with propriety say in reference to the fleshly wounds made by his chains, that the pleasing sensation felt in those parts when the pain subsided, fully compensated for what he suffered in being thus galled, well may the christian *account it all joy*; both in that he should be made to experience the pain and mortification of renouncing and loathing those errors which he held sacred as truths; and especially as by this operation of the Holy Spirit, he is led to behold the beauty and glory of that truth revealed in the gospel, as contrasted with the deformity of that which he had learned as truth from men, and which he now knows to be deception.

Again, you know the more mellow the ground is made, the deeper the seed sown therein, takes root; so the harrowing up of your feelings in having all that worldly *wisdom* and *polish*, which you had derived from the schools, stripped of its gaudy beauty, as compared with the simplicity of the doctrine of the cross, has but prepared you to have a deeper and more lasting impression made upon your mind by those

truths imparted, to receive them with greater delight, and to hold them in higher estimation.

But then, having been associated with the admirers of the wisdom of this world, the advocates of scientific religion, in now taking a stand with the *unlearned* disciples of the Nazarene, you and others in like circumstances, must expect a peculiar share of reproach. This will be considered necessary to be heaped upon you, in order to hide the cause of your having departed the ranks of missionism. It will however do you no hurt. Being conscious that you have been led by the Holy Spirit to the understanding you now have of gospel doctrine and order, the reproaches heaped upon you on account of your embracing that doctrine and order, will but endear them to you, and give you the greater boldness in defending them.

And you, my brother, the more you are brought to see and feel the marked distinction there is between divine revelation and human science, will you be disposed to adopt a motto corresponding to our republican charge, that where liberty is, there is my country, and say that where gospel truth and christian experience is clearly presented to view, there is the composition which you admire, and the learning which you prize.

S. TROTT.
Centerville, Fairfax Co., Va., 1839.

ELDER OSBOURN: HIS CHARGE OF SABELLIANISM, &c.

BROTHER BEEBE: - As the several pieces published in the SIGNS on the occasion of Elder James Osbourn's charging the Old School Baptists of the West with Sabellianism, have raised quite a resentment against you and the SIGNS on account thereof, from certain quarters; and as I was the first to call this subject up to the notice of our brethren, I feel disposed to say something further on the matter. I shall not attempt a defense of all which has been said through the SIGNS on the occasion. And indeed those letters of brother Saunders which have been so much denounced call for no defense. If after the repeated acknowledgements published by brother Saunders for certain expressions used in those letters, and the declaration made by brother Beebe, {SIGNS, volume 8, pg.15,} that previous to the publishing of those letters, brother Saunders had requested him to correct the unguarded expressions used in them; and that he had failed to do it in consequence of

being unavoidably absent when they went to press, persons will denounce the SIGNS on account of those expressions, as the Woburn and North Berwick churches have done in their letters published by Elder Osbourn in his recent pamphlet, they may as well be let alone to denounce on, until they come to a temper which will dispose them to receive a brother's acknowledgements.

At the time I called upon our western brethren to notice the charge Elder Osbourn had published against them, I did not design engaging myself in any discussion on the subject; but as, owing to the abuse poured forth, I feel disposed to take up my pen as a friend of the SIGNS and of our Old School cause, I may, before I close, touch the whole matter in debate, and also show mine opinion. The first thing I shall notice is the very uncandid course taken by Elder Osbourn and his special friends to impress the public mind that the present excitement has grown out of an attack of I.T. Saunders and the SIGNS on Elder Osbourn, as a servant of God. Whereas the plain state of the case, as we shall further show, is that it has arisen from an attempt of Elder Osbourn to brand the Old School cause as connected with the SIGNS, through our western brethren, with the charge of Sabellian heresy, and the opening of the pages of the SIGNS by brother Beebe, to the brethren thus directly charged, to show the injustice of such charge. Previous to Elder Osbourn's pamphlet coming out, Mr. Booth of Dayton, Ohio, wrote a communication for the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE, in which he attempted to lead the attention of his readers off from Elder Osbourn's unchristian like charge, to brother Saunders' letter, which was designed originally as a private friendly communication to Elder Osbourn; and construing that letter about as uncandidly as Elder Osbourn himself has done, he has endeavored therefrom to fix upon brother Saunders; 1st, Osbourn's charge of Sabellianism; and 2nd, censure for presuming to make any objections to Osbourn's mode of expressing himself, and especially as Osbourn is so *experimental and spiritual a man*. Having noticed Mr. Booth's communications, I will add, that apparently to settle the point in dispute, it is a little amusing that he should give an extract from Romaine which strikes a blow at the fundamental and most objectionable point of Osbourn's system. Romaine as represented in that extract, separate from his use of the term *person*, and his telling more about the Eternal Three's entering into a *covenant agreement among themselves*, than the scriptures do, has given quite a correct view of the design of the term Father, Son and Holy Ghost as designating the Three. His language is, "They took these names, not to describe the

manner in which they exist, but their manner of acting; not what they are in themselves, but how they stand related to us in the economy of Redemption, &c." What then becomes of Osbourn's position relative to the term *person*, as on page 43 of his *Calm Investigation*; namely, "that it is expressive of that perfection of the divine nature whereby it subsists three different ways, as in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, each of which persons possessing the divine essence after his peculiar manner, thereby becomes a distinct person;" that is, the Son being a begotten god in distinction from the others, and the Holy Ghost being a breathed forth god, &c.

But to return to the enquiry as to where the fault lies in this case, let us notice the facts as they have transpired: 1st. Elder Osbourn in preaching at the Miami Association in 1837, expressed himself in such a way as, in the estimation of brother Saunders, and others, to convey the idea that the *Three* were *three gods*. Brother Saunders believing that Osbourn did not in reality hold what his words implied, and that the using of such terms unexplained, would injure his usefulness, he immediately wrote an affectionate letter to Osbourn for the purpose of trying to show him the impropriety of expressing himself in so strong terms on that point, &c. The spirit of this letter shows for itself, as it is now published. The greatest fault in the letter, in my estimation, is its containing too much flattery; but Saunders was evidently induced to speak in the highest terms he could of Osbourn's preaching, in order to prepare the way for touching the other point without giving offence. Now I appeal to the candor of any man who has not embraced the idea that Elder Osbourn is something higher than the *ordinary gifts* which the Great Head of the Church bestows for the work of the ministry, to say if there was anything wrong in Brother Saunders addressing that letter to Osbourn, under those circumstances. Was it not brotherly in him to do so? And ought not Osbourn, if he considered himself in any wise amenable to his brethren for the sentiments he advanced among them, to have thanked brother Saunders for his kindness in this, although he dissented from his views? But Saunders used in that letter some very unguarded expressions in illustrating the subject. True, he did; and Osbourn and he had shortly after an interview on the subject, and an explanation, and Saunders here considered the matter as dropped, ought not Osbourn to have so considered it? But no, Elder Osbourn treasured up those expressions for after use. He occasionally showed this letter to a few where he thought it would have effect. He also communicated those objectionable

expressions, perverting entirely their application from that which Saunders manifestly designed in their use, and representing him as using them in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, to a certain Dutch Reformed Minister, in two letters together with inferences therefrom of his own, and charges of Sabellianism founded thereon, against the Old School Baptists of the West indiscriminately. Whether he expected his Paedobaptist brother to communicate these letters for publication in some Paedobaptist journal, or not, I cannot say. But one thing I can say; namely, that the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE having gotten into extensive circulation, and from the flattering respect it had paid to his communications and other publications, and he having flattered it and its conductor much in several communications, and apparently concluding that here was a periodical that would serve his interest, and having laid claim to it as such by asserting that "I have nothing to do with any other periodical at present, nor do I intend to have, &c.," {ADVOCATE, Vol.2, pg.246,} he sends on copies of those letters containing the charge against the western Old School Baptists to be circulated thereby abroad. From all the circumstances connected therewith, I do feel justified in entertaining the belief that he intended by thus throwing a firebrand into the ranks of the Old School Baptists to scatter them, and draw off a party who should follow his lead, having the ADVOCATE for their flag; and those who would not thus rally around his standard, were to be published before the whole host of the Philistines as *heretics, graceless professors, dry breasts*, &c. Now I again appeal to common candor to say whether on the principle of his having in any way identified himself with Old School Baptists, it was christian-like or honest for Elder Osbourn thus to put afloat among a denomination on which we cannot recognize as belonging to the visible gospel church, a charge of *gross heresy of the Sabellian kind* against the Old School Baptists, limited only to the bounds of what he calls the *far west*, and afterwards to publish the same through the ADVOCATE. See the number for June, volume 2, page 367. Was not this an attack of the most wanton kind, founded as it was upon an individual's expostulating with him upon the use of certain terms, in a private and friendly way?

And I, a third time appeal to common candor to say whether those assailed brethren ought not to be allowed to come forward in their own defense, even though it was against the eminent *servant of God*, Elder Osbourn? And was it anything more than common justice in Brother Beebe to open the pages of the SIGNS to those brethren to publish in their

defense, seeing his paper is *devoted to the Old School Baptist cause*? I am well aware there are Old School Baptists, who seem to think that Elder Osbourn must be allowed the privilege of labeling individual preachers, in standing among the Old School Baptists as *dry breasts*, and of charging whole communities of Old School Baptists with being *graceless professors* and *gross heretics*, and no reply must be attempted lest the *unity* of the Old School Baptists be marred. Such may think for themselves, and I will think for myself.

Having mentioned my belief of Elder Osbourn's intention to make the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE the flag of his party, it is but justice to add that in this I imagine that he is mistaken; and that Elder Jewett, by the impartial course he has pursued relative to this affair, since the first error of admitting such unqualified charges against the Old School Baptists, and which was undoubtedly occasioned by the confidence he had reposed in Elder Osbourn, will find himself a sharer with Old School Editors in Elder Osbourn's resentment. Elder Jewett has admitted communications into the ADVOCATE on the Trinity, far more liberal than Elder Osbourn would allow, and giving I think a better view of the subject than his. See the sermon of Mr. Burder's furnished by Elder Herrick, in the number for February, 1840. Mr. Burder says, "We are not bound to adopt the mode of expression used or enforced by any particular divines or churches. Some good men in their attempts to explain the doctrine have rather perplexed it. Some good men have said the Father is the fountain of Deity, that he communicated his whole essence to the Son, *that the Son is eternally begotten of the Father*, and that he is *very God of very God*, &c." See pages 186 & 187. Is not this passage directly opposite to Elder Osbourn's high stand, that all must be held as Sabellians who will not adopt his mode of expression *that there are Three proper and distinct persons in the Godhead*? And does not Mr. Burder think those persons, rather perplex the doctrine of the Trinity who talk of the Son *being eternally begotten*, that is, as God, that *he is very God of very God*? And yet this is a prominent point in Elder Osbourn's adopted theory. Again, whilst Mr. Burder would justify the use of the term *person* in relation to the Divine Three, he admits that it *is not scriptural* and that it *conveys an idea somewhat too gross*. He adds, "But we contend not for the word, but the thing. It is enough for us to say with the text, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost*." How does this comport with Elder Osbourn's denouncing all as *heretics* and *unregenerate*, all who will not say the Three in the above text are *Three*

persons, or with Mr. Booth's pre-judging that brother Saunders is a Sabellian on the supposition that he will not admit the Three to be *Three persons*? Again on page 188, he gives a similar view of the import and design of the names Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with that given by Romaine in the passage already quoted as furnished by Mr. Booth.

But in addition to these pieces published in the *ADVOCATE*, Elder Jewett, in his editorial on the *Tri-unity of Jehovah*, in the May, 1840 number, correctly recommends an adherence to *simply facts of revealed testimony* as the only correct premises for discoursing on this sublime subject, and as being better than *all the decisions of wise men and councils*. Very different this, from Elder Osbourn's tying us down to the terms he has borrowed from the school-men.

The idea is being much insisted on at this time, by some, that opposition to the sentiments advanced by Old School Baptists should not be allowed in the Old School periodicals, and some have denounced Old School papers {without naming any} on this ground, in more severe language I think than I have seen used on any other occasion by Old School writers against the Old School, excepting in Elder Osbourn's denunciations of our western brethren. But their remarks, if correct, will not apply in this case, for Elder Osbourn has never come into the Old School ranks. His doctrinal views, on many points are the same with those generally advanced by our brethren, and he has ever opposed and been severe against the New School party and measures, but he has never attended any of the general Old School meetings, though held near Baltimore and published long enough beforehand for him to have so ordered his arrangements, had he wished to attend; yea, he has been known to leave Baltimore for a tour on the very week such meetings were to be held in connection with the Baltimore Association. He has manifested nothing more like regarding the principles of fellowship towards the Old School than towards the New School. I do not mean this in reference to controverting their sentiments, for that can be done where fellowship is maintained, but in denouncing them. He has allowed his communications to be published in Old School papers, apparently for the sake of advertising his books, and has himself communicated for the *DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE*, and professed to admire it. This has no doubt led many to suppose he belonged to the Old School ranks. But the fact is, he is and ever has been one by himself, with the exceptions of his keeping a membership in some church, and being associated with certain individuals, without distinction of denomination or

regard to church relation. See his correspondence with his *Dutch Reformed Brother*. I have considered him as more directly identified by himself and them, with a certain peculiar sect who have ever valued themselves on their soundness in doctrine, according to the standard of a class of English authors esteemed high-toned Calvinists. Their peculiarities are; 1st. Strong assurance of their own gracious state, and having more than ordinary unctions of the Holy Spirit; 2nd. Claiming to have special revelations made to them by the Spirit; 3rd. A neglect or disregard for the ordinance of baptism and church relation; 4th. A confident denouncing as *graceless professors* all who do not warmly approve of them and their standard. The first knowledge I had of this sect was in 1811; it was then composed of six or seven females, among whom was Mrs. Ann Fradgely and Mrs. Bogart, whose names have appeared in the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE; with Mr. Doughty as their leader. They professed and appeared to have the strongest assurance, as they said communicated by the Spirit to them, that they should live to see the millennium brought in; and that Mr. Doughty was to be, under Christ, the leader in introducing it, as he professed to have his commission, if I recollect right. He used to attend public places, to make known as opportunity offered the speedy approach of the special reign of Christ and the down-fall of sects and governments, &c. I recollect of being at a place where two or three of these ladies were at tea, and hearing them assert that they had the same assurance of living to enjoy the millennium as they had of being subjects of grace; that the knowledge of both was communicated by the same Spirit; if they were deceived in one case they were in the other. So I understand Mr. Doughty contended. They mostly, if not all of them, had separated from Paedobaptist churches; Mr. Doughty and perhaps the others from the Dutch Reformed. They acknowledged believers baptism to be right, but said they were not to submit to it until the coming of the millennium. They, I believe held stated meetings for Mr. Doughty to expound the scriptures to them, but had no church relation. But after several years Mr. Doughty died without introducing the millennium; I do not recollect in what year, but when I removed back from the West in 1821, he had thus left them in extreme disappointment. They however after a length of time, as I understand, became reconciled, having an explanation wherein Mr. Doughty had been mistaken. About this time one G.H., formerly a member in the 1st Baptist church, was trying to be recognized as a leader among them, though I believe without effect. Sometime between 1824 & 1826, two or three men who had on one

account or another separated from Baptist churches, united with the remaining followers of Mr. Doughty in procuring a place for worship, and Elder Osbourn located himself among them as the preacher of this mixed company of baptized and unbaptized persons and continued with them a year or more, his family remaining in Baltimore. After he left New York they became, I expect, pretty much scattered; though some of them I find, especially Mrs. Fradgley and Mrs. Bogart keep up an intercourse with certain of the Old School party of the Dutch Reformed church, as appears by a correspondence between Mrs. Fradgley and minister C.Z.P., published in the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE, for April 1839; and I presume in conjunction with Elder Osbourn, as he has an intimate intercourse with the same party of that denomination, as evinced by a considerable portion of his correspondence as published in the ADVOCATE. Mrs. Fradgley, after Elder Osbourn made the ADVOCATE the special medium of his correspondence, sent on a letter which was published, but the number containing it I cannot now find, in which she professed that by a *vision* or special revelation of some kind she was introduced to the knowledge of that periodical, as a cloud from which she would derive some refreshment.

Now to the point of Elder Osbourn's being identified as of this peculiar sect. 1st. As to his soundness according to the standard of certain English authors, and his professing great assurance, like that sect, of being in a gracious state, and of enjoying extraordinary unctions of the Spirit, his writings abundantly testify. 2nd. To his confidently denouncing as *graceless professors* all who dare to differ from him, his writings and his resentment towards the SIGNS bear full testimony. 3rd. His disregard for the ordinance of baptism in common with that sect, is showed from the following instances. 1st. Previous to his ordination he confessed to the pastor of the church to which he then belonged that he was in favor of mixed communion; hence this pastor would take no part in his ordination, and has from that time been the object of his denunciations. 2nd. In his preface to his first bound volume; {the book I have not, and therefore quote from memory,} he, speaking of others contending for the ordinance of baptism, says, *let them give themselves to the tithing of mint and anise, whilst I will attend to the weightier matters of the law*. Thus, he contemptuously compared a contending for the ordinance of baptism to the Pharisees *tithing mint and anise*. 3rd. His consenting to settle down as the preacher to that mixed company in New York is another proof to the point, as his *brotherly* inheritance with those Paedobaptist preachers

is a fourth. 5th. I shall mention, is this: At the time of the division in the Dutch Reformed church, about 1826, a family residing in New Jersey, who had separated from the New School church in that place, had thoughts of joining the Baptists, they were evidently enquiring on the subject. Baptist preachers were invited there to preach. Elder Osbourn being at that time with his party in New York repeatedly visited them and preached; I by invitation once visited them and preached. After this I enquired of a relative of this family on whose information I could rely, whether they had concluded to join the Baptists, and she said no, they had given it up, that Elder Osbourn advised them so to do, the ordinance he said was not material, and in the present state of the church, they would be more comfortable out of connection with the Baptists, than in it.

4th. That Elder Osbourn, in common with that sect, believes in special revelations communicated to him aside from the scriptures, is evident from his letters to C.B. Hassell, published in the SIGNS, Volume 3, numbers 14 & 15. In these numbers he represents the church to be in a sickly and famished state, and makes the positive assertion that this state of things is to last for many years, and that there is to be no persecutions by the sword during that time, and this without giving one scripture as proof, but gives as his authority in the case, this declaration, "I know and am persuaded of the Lord, that my mind has been led into those things by that very Spirit which testified of Christ to my soul many years ago." See Vol.3, page 226. If this is not a plain declaration of having received a special revelation in the case I know not what to make of it; and this aside from the scriptures, for he in the same piece pronounces it a "whim for to undertake to find out this secret by calculations of numbers, times and seasons, &c.," which are given in the scriptures. Does not this then come up to Mr. Doughty's revelation concerning the millennium, and like Doughty, his confidence in it, rests upon the same ground with that of his knowledge of Christ. If the same spirit made both revelations, he must have been mistaken in one case, for the views given concerning the prospects of the church by the two are very different, and how can we know that he was not mistaken in both cases; as Elder Osbourn shows us no miracles in confirmation of his prophecy. If they are allowed to have been different spirits, one is as liable to have been mistaken as the other, from all we know. We have no evidence in favor of Elder Osbourn from a comparison of the spirit and lives of the two men. Mr. Doughty was, separate from his delusion, an example as to a

conscientious deportment and amiable walk, with whom Elder Osbourn would not bear a comparison, as I could show, if disposed to run a parallel on certain points.

Hence, as the Old School stand; if I rightly view it, is on the scriptures as a perfect and only rule of faith and practice, Elder Osbourn, and his sect with their *new revelations*, are as far removed from that stand, as are the New School with their *new measures*. The Old School brethren profess and gladly feel a dependence on the Holy Spirit to lead their minds to an understanding of the scripture revelations, but not to give them new revelations. And the moment we get beyond the scriptures, we have no standard by which to try the spirits, whether they be of God or not. I noticed Elder Osbourn's special revelation formerly in the same volume of the SIGNS and somewhat to the giving of offence to Elder Osbourn and his friends; but I wished then to test the point whether the SIGNS were to be the medium of new revelations. This if published, may give greater offence. I do not wish to give offence, but as Elder Osbourn has given notice in his pamphlet of making a division in the Old School ranks, if any who read the SIGNS are disposed to follow him, I wish to let them know who they are about to follow, at least in part. Thus much for Elder Osbourn.

S.TROTT.

Centerville, Fairfax County, Va., July 6, 1840.

A FINAL JUDGMENT.

A Dissent from Brother Beebe's Views On a Final Judgment.

PART I

BROTHER BEEBE: - In your editorial of July 15th, {No.14, Vol.9, of the SIGNS,} you propose a friendly discussion of the subject you there introduced; namely, A FINAL JUDGMENT; as I have to dissent from your views on some important points advanced by you, I will avail myself of your proposition, hoping the discussion will not prove un-important.

I will however first say, that from your remarks at the Delaware Association, particularly your concluding remarks, and from some things which afterwards transpired, I had looked forward with a good deal of anxiety for your

explanation through the SIGNS, fearing you would extend your views so as to involve a denial of the resurrection of the bodies of the dead; and consequently that there would be a split between us, and perhaps one far more extensive. But I am much relieved since you have distinctly avowed your belief in the final resurrection of the bodies both of the saints and the wicked; that they will be raised, the one *to the resurrection of life*, and the other *to the resurrection of damnation*. This being the case, I would have it distinctly understood that, although I dissent from you, as before stated, in important points contained in your editorial; yet the difference is not such as does, or ought to mar my fellowship towards you, as I at present view it. Other brethren may, perhaps, differ further from you than I do; such I will leave to discuss their own points; hoping however it may be with a desire to vindicate truth, not to resent a difference of opinion.

In reference to the judgment of the saints, I differ nothing from the views advanced by you. Never, since I was brought, as I hope, to know Christ as the *end of the law for righteousness*, have I been able to acquiesce in the notion that the saints at a final day are to stand with the wicked and be again judged. You have justly said that the elect of God in reference to their relation to the law and to their being transgressors thereof, have been brought to judgment. Yes, all their sins have been brought forward and the sentence of the law, in strict justice, has been passed and executed in reference to their sins, upon their adorable Head, Husband and Surety, Christ Jesus. For, as said the prophet, "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;" again, "He was wounded for our transgression," &c. Isa.53:5,6. Peter testifies thus, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." I Pet.2:24. Paul's testimony is, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law; being made a curse for us." Gal.3:13. Again it is said, "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb.10:14. In view of the testimony of these *two or three witnesses* I cannot conceive how the elect can be made again to stand in judgment, upon the demands of the law. But this is not all; believers have been made individually to participate, or have fellowship with their Head, both in receiving the sentence of the law, and in being released from it; that is, in their being arraigned, convicted of the enormity of their guilt as transgressors of the law, made to feel their just condemnation, &c., in their experience, and then in receiving by faith the sentence of justification on account of the perfect satisfaction

made to law and justice by Christ's obedience in the stead of his people. Having then had their justification declared from the throne of God by the resurrection of Christ Jesus as their Representative, from the dead, and the same being witnessed to them with their individual participation therein, by the Holy Spirit; how can the saints legally be made again to stand in judgment upon the demands of the law, unless the judgment of the court of heaven, thus sealed by the Holy Ghost, can be first set aside? And if such were to be the case, would it not involve Christ Jesus, the Head, and Husband, in a second judgment, as well as his body and bride? Again, I might show, that all the descriptions given in the New Testament of the events connected with the resurrection of the saints, indicate that they are on, that event, to be manifested as participants with Christ in his glory; rather than to be associated with the world in the final judgment thereof. But I will forbear at present.

But when you deny that there is to be a *final judgment* of the wicked, I decidedly dissent from you, because I believe that the scriptures as clearly declare such a judgment as they do the resurrection of the dead.

I will first notice some of the grounds taken by you in support of your position, and then bring forward some of the testimonies in favor of the idea of a *final judgment*.

1st. You appear to place a *final judgment* of the wicked and of the saints upon the same grounds, blending both together, and opposing both by the same arguments. But I understand the case of the two to stand upon very different grounds. It appears to me evident, from the whole course of God's government as declared in the scriptures, that every act of the dispensation of his justice, is so ordered as to manifest his righteousness therein, even as his *setting forth Christ Jesus to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, was, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past; and to declare it, that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.* See Rom.3:25,26. Now I cannot conceive but that God would have been equally just in acquitting from the demands of the law, all in whose stead Christ should have suffered the penalty of the law, had not Christ been thus publicly set forth to suffer before the world and his enemies, and without having his crucifixion published from age to age, as now, but his justice then would not, as now, have been made manifest in justifying *him which believeth in Jesus.* Even in the case of Christ himself, there appears to have been a summing up of the charges against him, as the Surety of his people, as well as an executing of judgment upon him, hence

the *laying on him the iniquities of us all*, was, as represented by the High Priest's *laying his hands* on the head of the scape-goat, and *confessing over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel*, &c., {Lev.16:21,} an actual bringing to view, those iniquities for which he was to suffer. These texts also, "By his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," and, "though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered," {Isa.53:11; Heb.5:8,} seem to me to import that he not only had *his work before him* and knew for whom he was to suffer, but also that he was made to know in his own soul, his people's sins, and the guilt thereof, and the justice of the wrath to be inflicted. Hence his agony in the garden, and his saying, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," &c.

2nd. You admit that the regenerate are *brought into judgment, that the mountains of their guilt are set in order before them, and that the law of God, in flaming precepts, bears testimony against them*, &c. Why all this? God knew before that they were his people, that Christ had redeemed them, had been made unto them righteousness; he knew their sins, for he had laid them all on Christ. It was not then that God should acquire any clearer knowledge of their case, that they were thus brought to judgment at the bar of conscience; but that the justice of God should be made manifest to them, both in their condemnation as transgressors of the law, and in their justification through the obedience of Christ, &c.

3rd. If we examine the cases of natural judgments recorded in the scriptures, we shall find in connection with the execution of these judgments, a manifestation made of the justice of God therein. Take for instance the judgment of God upon Egypt. God had told Abraham, more than four hundred years before, that his seed should be afflicted by the Egyptians four hundred years, and also that this nation *he would judge*. Gen.15:13,14. Here then was a determination of the event beforehand, and this declaration may as well be called a passing of sentence upon Egypt as may the declaration of Christ; that, "He that believeth not shall be damned," be considered as a sentence passed upon the unbelievers *eighteen hundred years ago*. Yet Moses and Aaron must be sent to Pharaoh with message after message; and the rebellion and hardness of Pharaoh's heart is made manifest, and sentence was passed in consequence thereof in reference to each plague, and the justice of God was thus made manifest in pouring his plagues upon Egypt.

In the case of the various judgments executed upon Israel, we find that in all the idolatry, disobedience, &c., of

that people, the law of Moses condemned them and denounced the punishment, &c., as much as do the scriptures condemn the world for their course; and yet the execution of every particular judgment, was preceded by a prophet's being sent to them, to point out to them the sins for which they were to be visited, and to pronounce sentence in the case. And when Christ came to execute judgment upon the Jews, they were left so to manifest themselves, and the justice of the vengeance against them, that even Titus the Roman general said that he *was only an instrument in the hands of heaven which manifestly declared its wrath against the Jews.*

Here then is the difference between the case of the saints and that of the world. The saints have been brought to special judgment, both in themselves and in the Head, as you admit, and their condemnation and justification both have been made manifest, as being in accordance with strict justice. But are the unregenerate thus judged in this life, and their sins in their true colors, and the justice of their condemnation manifested to themselves and to others? Certainly not; excepting that the saints know from their own experience, the justice of God in condemning the wicked; and excepting the instances of national judgments as such, which can only take place in this world, as all national relations are dissolved with this life. Hence the reason for a future judgment in relation to the wicked, and in distinction from the saints, is, I think, fully manifested. But I do not understand this future judgment to involve that arminian mass of nonsense which you connect with it, and by doing which, you have not done justice to the sentiments of your brethren, who differ from you. Neither will it be a process of enquiry, to give Christ, the Judge, a knowledge of their characters and crimes. But it will be a summing up of the evidence of their guilt, as given in their lives, and thus making manifest the justice of the final sentence then to be passed and executed upon them.

This leads me, in the 3rd place, to notice the fact, that you have in your editorial blended the legal enactments, the investigation of charges, and the giving judgment thereupon, all together in the idea of judgment. The term *to judge*, may in some instances be used to denote the whole of a trial; but more strictly its import is, to pronounce sentence according to the testimony elicited in the previous trial, or investigation. In this latter sense, I think the words *to judge* and *judgment* are generally rendered. Hence, from your advancing the idea that the wicked were judged in this life, those universalists who were present at Welsh Tract, were so highly pleased with your preaching, saying that you had advanced exactly their

doctrine; inferring, and with much propriety, that if you held the wicked to be judged in this life, you would also hold that they received their punishment here. I hold as firmly as you do, that all have transgressed the law of God, and are therefore already condemned by the law; so the laws of man condemn every transgression thereof, and declare the penalty due the transgressor. But you I believe would not on that account approve of the murderer's being immediately *lynched*, or summarily executed, even by those who might have been eye witness to the murder, but would say that he should first have an impartial trial, and that judgment should be regularly passed, and then executed. Again, I admit that the wicked are in a measure tried in this life, not that they are probationers, for when a person has once transgressed, he is no longer a probationer under the law transgressed. But that God in bearing long with the world, is giving occasion to the wicked to give evidence of their native enmity to God, both by their opposition to the gospel, and by their worldly deportment, and consequently of their being transgressors of the law. And judging from the experience of the regenerate, I believe this evidence given by each individual in his own case is recorded, though in many cases unnoticed by him, in the book of his conscience, and when this book in connection with the book of the law comes to be opened by the Judge, {and which are called *books*, Rev.20:12,} the guilt of the sinner, and the justice of the sentence then pronounced against him, or the judgment given, will be manifested. Now I think that you, yourself, will not contend that the impenitent have in this life any just knowledge of the extent of their sinfulness and guilt, or of the justice of their condemnation. If so, does it not prove that they are not fully judged in this life, and consequently, the necessity of a judgment beyond this life?

3rd. In reference to the arguments brought forward in your editorial, they mostly tend, and were probably designed to prove, that the saints will not again be made to stand in judgment; they do not therefore require an answer. The one drawn from the fact of Christ's being seated on his judgment seat when he executed judgment on the Jews, is perhaps excepted from the above remark. But I cannot conceive that Christ's having assumed his judgment seat, not *when* he came to execute judgment on Jerusalem, but thirty-six years before, is any proof that he will not retain that seat until *he hath put all enemies under his feet*. Remember, *the last enemy to be destroyed is death*. I Cor.15:25,26. Neither is the fact that he judged and executed judgment on the Jews at the appointed time any proof that he will not at the set time judge the anti-

christian nations among the Gentiles, for their persecution of the gospel, or that he will not before giving up the kingdom to the Father, bring to a *righteous judgment* all them "that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," according to II Thes.1:5-8. But rather, I consider the former exemplary judgment a sure pledge that these other predicted judgments will be also fully executed. Your views on Matt.25:31-46, I do not in general object to, provided that passage be understood to be a figurative representation of the genuine effect of the coming of Christ in his gospel, whether before, or after the destruction of Jerusalem, or after the two Witnesses shall be again raised up and Babylon destroyed. For whenever he thus comes in the clouds or on the *white horse* of the gospel, the preached gospel will have that discriminating effect. But in this view of the passage, I should consider the last verse to be a summing up of the figure by a positive declaration, that as the gospel points out the characters of these two classes, so their final ends will be. One exception however I must make, I cannot agree with what you intimate, that the preached gospel distinguishes between nations as such; setting one nation on the right hand, the other on the left. Peter's view I think more correct; namely, "That God is no respecter of persons, but *in every nation* he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Acts 10:34,35. The declaration, "Before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats," &c., allowing for the brevity used generally in such figurative representations, does not necessarily require that the word *them* should have the word *nations* for its antecedent. The example referred to, that of a shepherd's dividing the sheep from the goats where they were all flocked together, leads to a different construction. The shepherd, we must conclude, must take his flock by individuals to make the separation.

The next thing in course would be to bring forward the testimonies of scripture in favor of a *final judgment*, but this I will reserve for another communication.

Your brother,
S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Aug.17, 1841.

A FINAL JUDGMENT.

A Dissent from Brother Beebe's Views on a Final Judgment.

PART II

BROTHER BEEBE: - In pursuing this subject in the order I proposed, my next point is, to show some scriptural testimony in favor of a *future* judgment of the wicked.

I shall select but a few of the passages pointing out such an event. I will commence with Acts 10:42: "And to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of the quick and the dead." If he is ordained to be the Judge of the dead, I think it a consistent conclusion that this judgment will not take place until they *hear his voice* and *come forth*. If you say by the *quick* here we are to understand those made spiritually alive, and by the *dead*, those in a state of unregeneracy, I would ask you to reflect a moment, and consider, whether this would not place both those classes at the same bar.

Acts 17:31, I also refer to: "Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." This passage I think cannot be made to harmonize with your views without wresting the words from their plain import and connection. In the first place the expression, *because he hath appointed a day*, must mean some period then future, and therefore cannot be construed to mean the gospel day, or dispensation, which the Apostle refers to as then present, and as contrasted with the period going before, by the expressions, *But now commandeth all men, everywhere, to repent*. Besides the expression, *hath appointed a day*, clearly designates a specific set period, a *day*, for this object. And who are to be judged on that day? The *world* - not the saints. Again, how does the fact of God's having raised Christ *from the dead*, give *assurance unto all men* of this judging the *world* on a set *day*, except on the ground that his resurrection from the dead, is a sure pledge of the resurrection of the dead? Consequently the judgment must be subsequent to that event. If we take Rom.2:12 & 16, in connection with the above text, we shall find that the *appointed day*, is a *day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ*. And brother Beebe certainly will not contend that the *secrets* of men of the world are

judged in this life, that every *secret thing* of the wicked is in this life, *brought into judgment*.

In reference to Acts 24:25, I will simply ask brother Beebe, what Paul could have meant by a *judgment to come*, if it was not a *future* or *final judgment*?

Heb.9:27, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment," demands some attention. I am aware of the turn you attempt to give this text; namely, that the *appointment unto men to die*, was to die in *trespasses and sins*; or to die unto the law. In reference to the first of these ideas, I would ask, did it remain for the appointment to take effect in reference to a single individual of the human family, to become dead in trespasses and sins, when this text was written? Certainly not, all that died in Adam and come into the world, in this sense, dead. How then in reference to this death, can it be said, "It is appointed unto men once *to die*?" Or has brother Beebe adopted the idea that infants come into the world pure, and that they die when coming to years of discretion by contracting the disease of sin? In reference to the other idea, that of dying unto the law, I will only remark; 1st. That the word *men* is here clearly used as denoting the species universally, and certainly all mankind do not become dead to the law; and 2nd. That the experience of the children of God shows that their *death* to the law is in consequence of the *judgment* had in their case, the judgment therefore in this case precedes the death. No, my brother, the plain import of the text points to that appointment contained in the decree, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*. And the judgment being after this shows that it must be beyond this life. But you may say, that as it is appointed unto the saints, in common with others, the above construction of this text, would involve the idea, that they also shall be judged beyond this life. Not so. It is true, that in reference to their relation to Adam, the saints were in the same condemnation; the Apostle therefore notices this fact, in order to show their redemption from it through the substitution of Christ. For the very essence of his argument here, is, that as this appointment to death and judgment stood against *all*, "So Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of *many*, {not *all*,} and unto them that look for him, {*by faith*,} shall he appear a *second time*, without sin unto salvation." His *one offering* then was as a substitute, to meet the judgment in their stead, to deliver them from it, and even from death as a penal evil. Hence when he comes a *second time*, it will be without sin, not to bring to remembrance again their sins; but, *unto salvation*, to the full experience of their salvation. One other scriptural testimony to

this point I will notice; namely, Rev.20:11-15. There is much diversity of opinion, and much absurdity afloat relative to the thousand years reign spoken of in the preceding part of this chapter, and which the judgment spoken of in the passage above quoted, shall succeed. Of that thousand years reign I shall not express any opinion, save to notice certain facts stated in the account of it. 1st. This is expressly declared to be the *first resurrection*. 2nd. John saw as having part in it, those that "were beheaded for the witness of Jesus," and those that "had not worshipped the beast, nor his image, neither had received his mark, &c." These of course must include all those whose names are written in the *Lamb's book of life*. See Rev.13:8. 3rd. It is declared that *these lived*, &c., by which I understand that they had been raised to life from the dead; else, what can be meant by that which immediately follows; namely, "But the rest of the dead *lived not again* until the thousand years were finished?" In reference to this judgment, John declares that he, "saw the dead, both small and great, stand before God, &c.," and the "dead were judged out of those things written in the books, according to their works." Now these dead thus judged were such as had been in the sea, and in death, and hell; and certainly they cannot be men living on the earth, and who are only *dead in trespasses and sins*. Now, my brother, I do think that on a calm reconsideration of this whole subject, with the proofs in favor of a *future judgment*, you will abandon the notion, which you perhaps took up and advocated too hastily.

But it is not alone in reference to your rejection of the idea of a *final judgment*, that I dissent from your editorial under consideration. Your quotation of, or rather reference to several texts of scripture, applying them to the coming of Christ in the destruction of Jerusalem; and thereby representing all those several *comings* of Christ spoken of in the New Testament, to have received their accomplishment in his judgment upon that city and people, must receive my decided dissent. On this point you are sustained by the expositions on Hebrews, by our esteemed and talented brother Klipstine; but though he or you or an angel from heaven advance the idea, if it is not according to the doctrine taught in the New Testament, I am required not to receive it. But to the point, you say, "He went to receive a kingdom, leaving with his saints the kind assurance that he would come to them again – that he would associate his little flock with him in that kingdom – that it was needful for them that he should go away, but that he would return before some of them should taste death." In these extracts connected as they are with these words – "to

take vengeance on the Jews, to break up and forever abolish the temple worship, &c.," you clearly intimate that the promises of Christ's coming, &c., contained in the following texts in connection with others, are all to be referred to the one period, and all received their accomplishment when Christ poured his vengeance on the Jews. The texts are these, Luke 20:29,30; John 14:18-28; Matt.16:28; and Mark 9:1. Now, if the promises contained in these texts, of Christ's appointing to his Apostles a kingdom; of seating them upon twelve thrones; of Christ's coming to them again after his crucifixion; of the Son of Man's coming in his kingdom, and of the kingdom of God's coming with power, &c., received not their accomplishment until the destruction of Jerusalem, and if till then the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was not broken down; then the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples on the Day of Pentecost, and upon the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius, and the account we have of the church at Jerusalem, and of the planting of churches among the Gentiles, and of all that is contained in the Acts of the Apostles, and the death of all the Apostles, except John, all took place before these promises were verified, before the *kingdom of God came with power*, and of course all was under the legal dispensation. I do wonder if brethren Beebe and Klipstine will insist on a position so inconsistent, a position which with one sweep takes from us all pattern, all example, all apostolic authority for a gospel church, and its order, when freed from the *bondage of the law* by the *overthrow of the legal dispensation*, to borrow brother Klipstine's expressions. And if the Apostles were not seated upon their thrones, and Christ did not come in his kingdom, until after the death of all but John, who alone lived until Jerusalem was destroyed, I would ask what *power* that was which the Apostles were to *tarry for in Jerusalem*, until they were *endowed with it from on high*? Luke 24:49.

There are also other texts which you, by your extracts, apply with equal indiscrimination to the taking vengeance on the Jews, and which I am about to show, clearly relate to future comings of our Lord Jesus; as in this passage, "Nor was that coming, nor those signs to be deferred, &c., but should take place when he should descend with a shout as he went up, and come to be admired by all who waited for his appearing, but to take vengeance on the Jews, &c." I find but one text which speaks of the Lord's descending with a shout; that is, I Thes.4:16,17, which reads thus, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ

shall rise first; then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, &c." Now, if anything like what is here declared took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, or has taken place from that day to this, I am ignorant of the history of it. The expressions, *The Lord himself shall descend from heaven*, can mean nothing less than his personal coming, such as the two men in *white apparel* told the Apostles should take place, when they said, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as you have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1:11. Their seeing him go into heaven, was a *personal, or bodily* going into heaven; in *like manner* was he to come again. Such an event I have no idea took place when Jerusalem was destroyed. His coming then, as in several other instances, was only in his power. By the expression, *come to be admired by all who waited for his appearing*, I know not to what you can allude, except it be II Thes.1:10, which reads thus, "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, {not by them,} and to be admired in, {not by,} all them that believe." I would ask brother Beebe to tell us what this text, or what the persecution this church was enduring {see vs.4,} had to do with the destruction of Jerusalem, or what that event had to do with this Gentile church which was not situated even in Asia? Or how he was at that period *admired in all them that believe*, when he was then, and for many years after, suffering, *in them*, persecution throughout the whole Roman empire. In the expressions, "Destroy his enemies by the spirit of his mouth, and consume them by the brightness of his coming," you must have had reference to II Thes.2:8, and thereby applied that prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem. The text reads thus, "And then shall that Wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy by the brightness of his coming." Now notice that, that *man of sin*, that *son of perdition*, that Wicked whom the Lord shall *consume* and *destroy*, was not *revealed* when the Apostle wrote this epistle, and there was a *let* which must be taken out of the way before he could be revealed, and also a *falling away first*, &c., verses 4-7. But certainly the Jewish nation and their wickedness also, had been fully manifested at that time; and of course this scripture had no relation to the destruction of that people. Other texts which you refer to, I will pass by. Hence it appears manifest that you referred on the one hand, to declarations and promises which relate to Christ's coming to his disciples from the dead, and his coming in the person of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost; and on the other hand, to texts which contain direct declarations

concerning his coming to destroy that *Wicked*, the anti-christ among the Gentiles, and concerning his personal coming, when the *dead in Christ shall be raised*, and those saints *alive shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and shall be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air*; and the whole you have applied to the one event, his coming in the destruction of Jerusalem, thus making that period and that event the center point of nearly all of the New Testament prophecies. If you and brother Klipstine are correct, I would like to be informed whether we have any good authority to expect any further coming of Christ, excepting as he has been coming in the preached gospel for the last eighteen hundred years. I know of no promise of his coming, which may not as consistently be made to apply to that favorite event of yours, and brother Klipstine's; namely, his coming in the instrumentality of the Romans in his judgment upon the Jews, as some of those promises you have so applied, or as the promises in the Epistle to the Hebrews may be made so to apply.

I should have liked to take a more particular notice of brother Klipstine's confining the application of the Epistle to the Hebrews to those Jews residing in Jerusalem or Judea, and particularly his so confining that precious ground of consolation to the *heirs of promise*, the spiritual seed of Abraham at large, contained in Heb.6:13-20. And your views of Matt.24. Not that I do not believe the prophecy contained in that chapter, had a particular application to the events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem; but that I also believe it, like several other prophecies, had a two-fold reference and that its ultimate accomplishment has not yet taken place, in answer to that part of the disciples enquiry relating to the *end of the world*. Also the idea advanced both by you and brother Klipstine, that the *breaking down the middle wall of partition* between Jews and Gentiles, and the freeing of the gospel church from the bondage of the law, was accomplished in the destruction of Jerusalem. But I will let them for the present pass, excepting I will just say in reference to this latter point, that the Apostle ascribes the *abolishing of the law contained in ordinances*, and the *partition wall*, to the crucifixion of Christ. See Eph.2:13-17; and Col.2:13-23. If not so, and your views are correct, why does Paul charge the Galatians with being *bewitched* in submitting to circumcision?

Your brother,
S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Aug.24, 1841.

THE RESURRECTION.

Reply To Elder Goldsmith On The Resurrection.

BROTHER BEEBE: - Elder Goldsmith's queries touching the resurrection now demand some attention from me, as my name is particularly referred to therein. His first position or query, imports that the resurrection spoken of in the New Testament is one and the same thing with being born again, or that the impartation of spiritual life in regeneration is the resurrection. His words are, "Now we believe that the whole body of the church were dead in trespasses and sins, according to the Apostles' doctrine; resurrection is the opposite of death, or deliverance from it; and there is no deliverance from death, but resurrection, &c." I do not wish to be severe, but really these expressions imply that Elder Goldsmith is as ignorant of the nature of the new-birth as was Nicodemus; for they imply that the being *born of God*, is only the having a life again brought into exercise which had been before lost in death, as Nicodemus supposed from Christ's doctrine that his natural life must be a second time brought into existence. The natural and scriptural import of the word *resurrection* being that of reinstating in a life which had been lost in death; so also the word *raised* as used in reference to the dead, as in the case of Lazarus, John 11:23-25; and 12:1-9; and Matt.11:5, also in reference to the bringing up from the grave the body of Jesus, as in Matt.16:21; Acts 2:31,32; 4:2; and 17:31,32, and other places. Indeed the proper import of the word *resurrection*, is a *revival from the dead*; a *return from the grave*; so also the Greek word *anastasis*, rendered *resurrection* from the word *anisteemi*, to excite, to awake or stir up. Our English word *resurrection* is formed from the Latin word *resurgo*, which signifies to *rise again, to flourish again, to be renewed*. So that the idea conveyed by this word is clearly that of a renewal of a former principle of life or action; very different this from the idea of bringing in a new and distinct life or principle of action, which is embraced in the notion of being *born again*. *Being born* is never understood to be a *reviving up of an old existence*; it is a *beginning to exist*. Consequently, being *born again* or with another birth, is the commencement of a new and distinct existence, not a new beginning of the old existence as was Nicodemus' notion of being born again, and as is implied in the idea of a resurrection. According to the view I have given of the *new birth*, the Master explains it, when he says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and

that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit." John 3:6. A resurrection does not come up to this idea at all, it is a raising up of that which had before died, a springing up of that which had been sown; whereas the believer is manifested in a spiritual existence, in a relation to another headship. And thus other scriptures describe it, Peter says, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, &c." I Pet.1:23. Paul says, "Therefore if any man be in Christ Jesus he is a new creature, &c." "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, &c." II Cor.5:17; and Eph.2:10. As the texts in Eph.2:1-5; and Col.2:13, are frequently applied to the new birth, and as the expressions used, might be construed to import something like a resurrection, though not necessarily involving that idea, I will assign my reasons for believing that regeneration is not what is intended by those declarations of the Apostle. The *quickening* is one in which Christ participated with his people in; and their quickening being with, must have been in Christ. The expressions are, *hath quickened us together with Christ*; and in Col.2:13, the same in substance. Now this mode of expressions, is never used, nor the idea ever conveyed by the description given in the scriptures, of regeneration or the *new birth*, the latter being, if I understand it, descriptive of a work performed in the creature. And the idea of Christ's participating in such a *second-birth*, such as he informed Nicodemus was necessary to enable a person to see the *kingdom of God*, is contrary to the whole of divine revelation. But in the execution of the *judgment to condemnation*, upon the posterity of Adam, the people of Christ lay under the curse of the law, or in a state of banishment from God, which is no other than a state of *death in sin*, having lost that *uprightness* in which man was created, and being barred from the tree of life; and thus held by the law in a state of corruption and depravity; this is of course fitly denominated a being *dead*, &c. This legal condemnation, this curse of the law, Christ became subject to, when he came into the law place of his people; not to their depravity, but without this, to the full curse or hell which the law could inflict. Hence the expression, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." From this death Christ was quickened, in receiving a full discharge from the demands of the law, when he arose without seeing corruption; and as he *was raised again for the justification* of those for whose *offences he was delivered*, they participated in his quickening; that is, they were together with or in him quickened or raised up from the *judgment to condemnation*. Although some seem to think there is no distinction between this and regeneration, yet those whose eyes have been opened, will I think on

reflection see just the difference between the two doctrines, that there is between our relations to Adam and to Christ as heads, or between redemption and regeneration. This quickening was accomplished by Christ for his people in his own person; hence they are quickened *together with him*. Not so with regeneration, his people are not regenerated together with him; they are regenerated *individually* when they are made to receive the *spirit of Christ*, or the *spirit that is of God*. If indeed the death we died in Adam were a spiritual death, or a loss of the same life, which Christ's people afterwards received from him as a Head, then with propriety might regeneration be termed a resurrection, because it would be a reinstating us in the same life we had once lost in death. And if a single text of scripture can be produced which manifestly speaks of regeneration or the being *born again* as a resurrection, then I must believe that God's *sending forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts*, is nothing more than a raising us up again to the same life or standing which Adam had before he fell, and of course that heaven is nothing more than an earthly paradise. And then might we believe that the whole glory of the New Jerusalem church is seen in this life, and that the *glorious appearing of the Great God and our Savior Jesus Christ*, which the saints through Titus were exhorted to *look for*, was nothing more than his executing judgment upon Jerusalem. Let these believe such notions who desire it, but I desire to thank God that I have a hope that goes beyond the events of this life, as my anchor. But I feel confident that no text can be produced in which the distinctive idea of being born again is represented as a *resurrection* or being raised up; the two ideas, that of being raised from the dead, and that of being brought into distinct existence as the seed of Christ, are kept separate in the scriptures, by the use of distinct terms and modes of expression. It is surprising that a man of Elder Goldsmith's mind and acquaintance with the scriptures, and withal his *freeness from prejudice*, should so confound ideas and doctrines which the Holy Ghost has so manifestly kept separated, and more so, considering that he himself speaks of the confusion which results from getting *aside from truth and the consistency that is in it*.

Another query is, *whether we can receive Christ without receiving the resurrection?* I answer, No. For as he is the *Lord our righteousness*, in receiving him, we receive a release from the *judgment of condemnation*, and are raised up from that death under the sentence of the law which came by the *disobedience of one man*. And as Christ has triumphed over death and the grave as the representative and *first fruits* of his

people, in receiving him we receive the pledge of a glorious resurrection from our corruption and graves.

Elder Goldsmith's 3rd set of queries are these, "Does not animal life belong to animal bodies, or natural life to natural bodies? And is the resurrection only a resurrection of natural life to mankind? It seems to me that Elder Trott's notion lead to the last named conclusion, &c. It appears to me that the saints of God are to have a body like the seed from whence it grows, of course to a spiritual seed a spiritual body. Is not Elder Trott's notion, that the spiritual seed shall have a natural body, or their old body reanimated?" These queries lead at once to a consideration, not of my notions, but of the doctrine of the resurrection as taught in the New Testament. My notion, if it be a notion, is, that what is declared in the plain language of scripture concerning this subject, will stand true, whether we can comprehend the *whys* and *wherefores* thereof or not. Elder Goldsmith and some others speak of the *old body of dust* as though it were a very contemptible thing. I wonder if, like the Quakers, to show his contempt of the body and the idea of its being raised again, he would carry into practice the principle of Pope, "And not a stone tell where I lie," or, if after going thus far with them, he would not, as do they, still show some great regard for this *old body*, by having the place of its deposit fenced with great strength and care. But contemptible as the body may be thought to be, remember that the Son of God not only condescended to be clothed in one, but after his death he raised it again and took it with him in his ascension to his glory with the Father. And I do not believe the three disciples thought it so very contemptible a thing when they saw it in his transfiguration on the mount. But let the Apostle speak on this subject, and upon what he says, fairly interpreted, in the 15th chapter of I Cor., passing by other proofs to the same point, I am willing to rest the support of all I have written in favor of the resurrection of the body. His words are, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain, &c." Verses 12-14. Here the Apostle connects the resurrection of the dead so intimately with the resurrection of Christ, that to deny the one, is in his estimation to deny the other, and to overturn the whole doctrine of the gospel. Let not Elder Goldsmith think this an error to be easily overlooked. Now if it be insisted that the *resurrection of the dead* here spoken of, is no other than the being *born again*, then it follows necessarily that the doctrine

of Christ's resurrection, is no other than that he was born of the *water and of the spirit*, preparatory to his being able to see the *kingdom* of God; for the Apostle so connects the two that what is the resurrection in the one case, is in the other. But the expressions here used will not admit of the idea of the impartation of a new and spiritual life; they are, *the resurrection of the dead, the dead raised, &c.* Can these literally or strictly mean anything else than that the very identical part which was dead, is in itself the subject of the change expressed by the words, *resurrection* and *raised up*? Should it be asserted that it is only in reference to the resurrection of Christ that the Apostle is here speaking, we have but to refer to some of the following verses to refute such idea. After using several modes of expression showing that he is contending for the resurrection of the saints, he says in verses 22,28, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, but every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." It must be then that the Apostle is here treating of a resurrection of the saints corresponding to the resurrection of Christ; if, of course, we can understand what is meant by Christ's being raised up, we shall arrive at a clear understanding of what is meant by the resurrection of the dead. Need I argue the point to show that the resurrection of Christ means that the very same body of his which died on the cross was raised up, was reanimated? The disciples had full proof of this fact, as when he said to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side and be not faithless, but believing." And when he again said to his disciples, "Behold, my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself. Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." John 20:27; Luke 24:39. This then being so clearly a fact that the *resurrection of Christ*, consisted in his being raised up in that same body in which he was crucified, it must be that the Apostle means by the resurrection of the dead, their being raised up in the same bodies in which they died. Again, the Apostle speaks of Christ's being the *first fruits of them that slept*. What were the *first fruits* under the former dispensation, but a part and of the same kind and an exact representation of the coming harvest? What then can he mean by this expression, other than that the resurrection of Christ was an exact representation, and sure pledge of the resurrection of them that slept, and of the same kind? If he means what his words in this case plainly imply, then he means that as Christ was raised, so will they be that are his, at his coming; that is, in the same bodies in which

they died. Before Elder Goldsmith can get rid of these conclusions, and admit the Apostle's doctrine, he must show that he did not mean what he said; an unenviable task. Elder Goldsmith quotes verse 38, "But God giveth it a body, as it hath pleased him and to every seed its own body," or rather he makes an assertion, founded I presume, upon this text. But he certainly could not have noticed the connection in which that text stands, or methinks he could not have thought of a spiritual seed in this relation; and, indeed, I should have thought him too well acquainted with the nature of seeds in general not to have talked of a *spiritual seed* producing a *spiritual body*, &c., even if the Apostle had said nothing on the subject. But what says the Apostle in the immediate connection? See verse 36, "Thou fool; that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Here the nature of seeds is presented in few words. But it is proper here to notice the ground on which the Apostle introduces this and the following figures. He seems to anticipate in verse 35, some man, making the same objection to his doctrine, which Elder Goldsmith has actually made to it, on the occasion of my having incidentally referred to it, without having given any illustration of my views thereon; the objection appears to be, that there cannot be a resurrection of the body without its being raised in the same corruptible earthly state in which it was sown. To refute this notion by plain common sense observations, he brings forward the figure of seeds sown, in which resurrection in figure is an every day occurrence. The seed in its original form does not come up; it dies, becomes extinct in that form, and yet there is in that very body sown a principle which is quickened, and identity of the body which springs up, and this identity is fully preserved in the after growth, so much so, that you have no expectation from a seed of wheat sown to reap barley, as the Apostle illustrates in the 37, 38th verses. This figure, to be sure, falls short, as all figures do, of a full illustration of the subject, but as far as it goes it illustrates what Elder Goldsmith calls *my notion*. The fact is, I have no notion on the subject, excepting just what the Apostle has taught in this chapter, with the further illustrations and confirmations found in other portions of scripture. I make no pretensions to ability to philosophize on the subject, or to understand the *modus operandi*. The Apostle then goes on further to illustrate, and insist on the fact, that the identity of the body must be preserved in the resurrection, though it be raised a heavenly and not an earthly body, by showing that every distinct body must have its peculiarities, as in the different flesh of different things, and also that there

may be a difference of glory between the heavenly or risen body, and the earthly or sown body, and yet the identity be preserved, by showing that visible heavenly bodies have their distinct glories, as that "there is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, &c." And this is what the connection shows is the import of the Apostle's argument in saying, "For one star differeth from another star in glory;" a text which men are fond of *abusing*, to support their notion of different grades in glory among the saints. See verses 37-41. He then goes on to declare, not in a figure, but in plain terms, what is the fact relative to the resurrection. He says, "So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," &c. Verse 42, and on to verse 45. He herein clearly shows, not only that it is the resurrection of the body, and not of the soul of which he is speaking, but also that the identity of the body is preserved in the resurrection. He declares that the same thing, the same *it*, which is sown in dishonor, is raised in glory, &c. He goes further, he names the *body*, and declares that, "*It* is sown a natural *body*; it is raised a spiritual *body*," &c. How can Elder Goldsmith get rid of these positive declarations of the Apostle in support of the doctrine of the same body that dies, being raised, not in its earthly form, but in a heavenly, without wresting the scriptures from their plain import? Some difficulty may be stated to this view of the subject, from the fact that Christ arose with his body in its natural state, having flesh and bones, &c., as is evidenced, as already noticed from his disciples handling him, and also from his eating before them after his resurrection. See Luke 24:42,43. It was necessary that he should be thus raised, to show that he saw no corruption, and thereby to show that in his death justice had received its full satisfaction for the sins of his people; as it was necessary that he should die in the peculiar manner he did, to show that in it he was *being made a curse* for them. But the peculiarity of his resurrection no more than the peculiarity of his death, affects the general principle of his being in his resurrection, the *first fruits of them that slept*. It is the fact of the resurrection of the body, and of its identity in its resurrection, that the Apostle shows is established by the resurrection of Christ. I will now state what is my *own notion* on this subject; though even in this, I consider my views sustained by plain inferences from scripture. My notion is this, that though Christ was raised with his body in its fleshly state, yet that it was changed at his ascension, to a spiritual body. I infer this from the text, "That flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," {I Cor.15:50,} compared with this, "Who shall change our vile

body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," &c., Phil.3:21, taken also in connection with the fact that those saints who do *not sleep* at the *coming of Christ*, will be *changed* at their being *caught up* to meet him; and also that Christ gave an example of the change in his transfiguration. See I Cor.15:51,52; I Thes.4:16,17 & Matt.17:2.

One remark more, of Elder Goldsmith's, demands some little notice; he says, "Nor does it appear matter to break fellowship on." I have no wish lightly to withdraw fellowship from those who have been recognized as brethren, nor excepting on scriptural grounds. But does Elder Goldsmith, or does he not hold that any other resurrection awaits the saints, than that which they experienced in receiving Christ by faith? Does he, or does he not hold that those bodies which return to dust are again raised? If he does not hold those points, does not his views relative to the resurrection imply that it has passed already in reference to all that have believed? If so; wherein do his views differ from the declaration of Hymeneus and Philetus? If he cannot show an important difference, am I not required by what the Apostle says to Timothy, to withdraw fellowship from him? He says, "But shun profane and vain babblings, for they increase unto more ungodliness; and their word will eat as doth a canker, of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred; saying, that the resurrection is passed already, and overthrow the faith of some." II Tim.2:16-18. I shall be glad to know that Elder Goldsmith is not involved in this Apostolic sentence; and that all other correspondents of the SIGNS escape it, in carrying out their positions. I wish no break in our ranks if it can be avoided, and truth and order maintained.

I remain your brother,
S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Jan.7, 1842.

THE RESURRECTION. # 2.

A Reconsideration Of Reply To Elder Goldsmith.

BROTHER BEEBE: - On looking over my reply to Elder Goldsmith, touching the resurrection, as published in the fourth number of the SIGNS, current volume, I find one expression which I much regret should have slipped my pen. It was this, "But really these expressions imply that Elder Goldsmith is as ignorant of the nature of the new-birth as was Nicodemus." In the first draught of that communication I find

there is a little variation of expression, and additional word which perhaps would have prevented the force of the expression being applied to an object different from what I intended. For it is not the severity of the expression that I now regret, but its liability to a wrong conclusion, as though I intended to infer from Elder Goldsmith's remarks, that he was *experimentally* ignorant of the *new birth*, that he was *not a regenerated man*. It was not my intention at all to convey such an idea, but only to convey the idea that his expressions, in themselves, conveyed as wrong a notion of the new birth as did Nicodemus' remarks, as I go on to show in what follows. I have no disposition to judge the man, but only to judge his sentiments. Indeed, I have seen nothing in Elder Goldsmith's writings, {and through them is the only acquaintance I have with him,} that would lead me to believe that he is not a subject of grace. We frequently hear and see a direct denial of what the christian knows is the essence of an *experience* of grace and also a denial of the true ground of a believer's hope; in such cases we are constrained to believe that the persons are ignorant of an experience of grace; but on the other points, I am far from being prepared to set the limits as to how far a person may advance error and yet be a subject of grace, unless the criterion is discovered in the spirit manifested. But this I know that God hath purposed to *destroy the wisdom of the wise, and to make foolish the wisdom of this world*, and therefore, it is that he doth not suffer even his children to attempt to be wise beyond what is written on subjects of revelation without making foolish their wisdom by leaving them to run into error; and the stronger confidence they have in their own understanding, or that others have in the powers of their mind, perhaps the greater error they run into.

But to return to the subject. I regret the more the unguardedness of my expression above referred to, lest any should suppose that I was hurt of Elder Goldsmith's accusing me of prejudice, and that I said what I did in answer to his views, in a spirit of retaliation. It is true, I noticed that accusation for the sake of other remarks, and afterwards touched the subject once and again in a jocular way, to show that I was not hurt at it, and that my object in writing was not to retaliate for that. The fact is, I felt more deeply wounded, than such an expression would wound. I felt as though, instead of having the SIGNS continued as a faithful beacon, a banner, a kind of rallying point, we were likely through it, to be split all to pieces. A series of communications were being published, in which, although a denial of the resurrection was

not directly made, yet according to my understanding of things was fully implied. For if the coming of Christ promised in the scriptures were consummated in his coming to take vengeance on the Jews; and therefore no future coming is to be looked for; then of course no future resurrection is to be looked for; and then when Elder Goldsmith by his queries implied a direct denial of the resurrection of the body, I felt as though Quakerism; yea, infidelity was to be inscribed on our flag in company with truth. I therefore designed and aimed to present the subject of the resurrection in the strong light in which it is presented in the New Testament, in hopes it might lead those who had erred, to a reconsideration, and awaken our brethren generally to a consideration of the importance of that doctrine. That the scriptures declare that a denial of the resurrection involves fully a denial of the resurrection of Christ, and therefore involves *infidelity*; and also that the advancing of the sentiment that the *resurrection was passed*, was not future, tended to overthrow the faith of those that received it. Hence it is evident that this point of gospel doctrine is placed on no ordinary footing in the New Testament; it is declared, defined, and the consequences of its rejection are pointed out with peculiar care. I remark further, that this point of doctrine is presented to us in the New Testament as pure revelation, as exclusively an object of faith, human reason cannot begin to investigate it further than to enquire what is written; it must at once be resolved into the display of that sovereign power which the Father hath committed unto the Son according to his declared will. The instant we depart from this rule we plunge into error.

So far as anything is contained in my communication, that has the appearance of sparks of anger towards the man, or that may be construed as judging him, I beg leave to recall it, so far as it is an expression of my decided testimony against the ideas involved in his queries; and of a determination to hold such sentiments as entirely heterogeneous to the Old School Baptist doctrine, so far it must stand until refuted by the scriptures.

And I beg that what I have herein said may not be construed as an attempt to set myself up as a standard; no, my brethren, let the New Testament, and that alone, be our standard, and let everything be tried by that.

Neither would I wish by any means to dictate, brother Beebe, to you what is to be admitted into the SIGNS; that is, what is to be admitted as Old School sentiments, for error may be published as error, without incurring the charge of sanctioning it. Nor do I desire the SIGNS to be closed against a

candid discussion of such points of doctrine, or of circumstances connected therewith; such, as brethren may honestly differ on. But what I wish to be at is, that there are certain limits relating to doctrine, as well as to measures, which, when passed, it ceases to belong to the Old School cause; and whilst my confidence, brother Beebe, in you remains firm, that you would not directly sanction what would be a passing such bounds, I would say, let not your confidence in man, neither in brother Trott, nor any other brother, lead you to admit speculation, as from them, and as Old School sentiments; which are manifest and self-evident departures from, or going beyond the limits of consistency, as Old School views.

I may be too strenuous on the subject of the resurrection and other points connected therewith in the estimation of my brethren. Well, brethren, let the New Testament, in the plain declarations thereof decide. I ask no quarters, no stay of judgment, no wrapping up, if I stand condemned at that judgment seat of Christ; that is, by his Apostles, so let it be declared. But at the hands of Christ, I do ask for mercy, mercy to forgive my errors and backslidings, and mercy to deliver me from falling into error.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Feb.22, 1842.

THOUGHTS ON PREDESTINATION.

Addressed to P.A.L. Smith, Esq.

DEAR BROTHER: - Although you have not named me in your communication in the SIGNS, volume 10, number 9; yet as it is well known to several that you wrote in consequence of a dissent on your part to certain expressions used by me in preaching, and of a discussion we afterwards had on the subject; I feel called on to notice your communication.

As this notice is designed simply as a contrast of my views with yours, I will briefly state the occasion of your communication. It is no secret with Predestinarian Baptists that their peculiar doctrine is represented by others, as making God the author of sin, and as implying that he made the wicked for the express purpose of damning them, irrespective of their character. Such in substance had formerly been charged upon my views of absolute predestination, in the neighborhood where you live. I have taken frequent occasion

in preaching to rebut this slander upon our doctrine. In preaching to the church of which you are a member, in February last, from Songs 2:3 & 4, I was remarking on the absoluteness of the expression, "His banner over me was love," endeavoring to show that in no point of view did the gospel involve anything but love; and in the course of these remarks I took occasion to meet the above named objection, as it had been made against one point of gospel doctrine; namely, election, and speaking in a way calculated to draw attention, I remarked that the final condemnation of the wicked was not on the ground of their not having been elected; perhaps I said the non-election of the wicked was not the ground of their condemnation, but that they were condemned as transgressors of God's law. This is what you took exceptions to, and what afterwards brought on a discussion between us, in which you advanced and advocated the ideas that God *made sin*, and *made the devil, a devil*. As I did then, so do I now, maintain that the wicked are not condemned for not being elected, but for being transgressors of God's law. And am I not sustained in this by the scriptures of truth, from the condemnation passed upon the serpent, "Because thou hast done this, &c.," upon the woman, {Gen.3,} upon Adam, {Gen.3,} upon Cain, {Gen.4,} upon the old world, {Gen.6,} and on, in every recorded case of condemnation to the end of Revelations? As I did then, so do I now, reject the idea, that *sin came directly from God*, the Fountain of all good and holiness, although its introduction was a consequence of God's creating goodness; that is, had intelligent creatures not been brought into existence, sin could never have had a being. And I did then, and do now, reject the idea that Satan, as the *prince of darkness*, came such from the creating hand of God, who is *Light*, and in whom is no darkness at all, and as the *father of lies*, from him who is the God of truth. To the contrary of this, I have uniformly maintained from the analogy of God's having created Adam in uprightness, and from his attributes, as declared in the scriptures, that Satan must have come from his hands an innocent or upright being. If bother Beebe as editor, and the patrons of the SIGNS generally, can suffer such sentiments as the following extracts from your communications, to pass uncontradicted, as Old School Baptists sentiments, so be it. These are the extracts: "Who was made the prince of darkness to infuse his deeds into the world, whereby causing sin, sorrow and death." Page 66, column 2. And this in the same column; "It was for this he made the serpent, the devil, that old dragon, and he made a people in him spiritually who should

come into the world through Adam," &c.; and this on column 3, "Always a devil – such he was made, and such he will be."

As for myself, if I have had any experimental knowledge of God and of sin, it has taught me to view them as such complete opposites, that I think it not an unguarded expression, when I say, I can have no more fellowship for the idea of a *devil-creating* God, that I have for a *god-making* devil. The devil has introduced into the world many gods as objects of worship, for which I have no fellowship. Neither can I have any fellowship for the idea that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the fountain of all good, is at the same time the immediate fountain from whence has directly flowed that stream which has carried with it through the world – sin, sorrow and death, or that he is by direct creation the Father of the *father of lies*. Such idea confounds all moral distinction between sin and holiness, and destroys the notion of justice; for it represents God as making the devil, a devil *to infuse his deeds into the world*, and then punishing him for doing it. In conclusion I will express my sorrow to find you, a professed Old School Baptist, uniting with arminians in giving the same representation of the precious doctrine of predestination. They say that predestination *makes God the author of sin*; you say, to carry out predestination we *must view God as creating sin*. They design their remarks as a reproach; you do not design yours as such, but still as your view of predestination is the same in substance with theirs, if theirs is a reproach, so must yours be also. For you know that it is a problem in mathematics, that things which are equal with the same thing, must be equal with each other.

Yours, &c.,
S.TROTT.

Centerville, Fairfax County, Va., June 15, 1842.

COMMENTS ON LUKE 16:19-31.

BROTHER JEWETT: - After so long delay, I in conformity with the request of yourself and another, will now give you my views of that portion of Scripture contained in Luke 16:19-31.

This passage is, I believe, very generally understood to be a parable spoken by our Lord. The parables spoken by him are of different kinds; some are figurative illustrations, the figures being borrowed from natural things, of things spiritual and pertaining to the gospel and church of Christ; others seem only designed to enforce some important truth. The former

class is known by being prefaced with such expressions as, *The kingdom of heaven is like*, &c. These expressions to me convey the idea, not only that the parable relates to the Gospel and things pertaining to it, but also that there is a likeness in the figure to the thing represented; as in the parable of the marriage of the king's son. Matt.22:1-14. Some brethren, however, understand certain parables thus prefaced, as having special reference to the Jews; as those found in Matt.25:1-30. But, from the fact that the term, *kingdom of heaven*, is so manifestly used to denote the gospel church or dispensation, distinctively from the Jewish, the one about coming in, the other about being removed; the one *heavenly*, the other earthly; {see the 12 commissioned, Matt.10:7, "As ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand,"} I cannot think, that we can apply the parables thus designated by our Lord, to the Jews as such, without doing violence to his words.

But the parable about to be considered is not said to be *like the kingdom of heaven*; I therefore consider it to be one of those used to enforce some important truth. Others however make it a figurative representation, and think they find a correspondency to the figure, by making the rich man represent the Jews, and Lazarus the Gentiles, &c.; but I find no authority in the parable or its connection for to so understand it. I therefore believe the design of the parable is primarily to enforce the truth contained in the last verse, in reference to the Jews, that "if they believed not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." Christ had before spoken of that people as a wicked and adulterous generation, *seeking after a sign*, and had said, "There shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas," &c. Matt.12:39,40, and Luke 11:29,30. And now by this parable he shows, that even that *sign* shall fail, so long as they believe not the testimony of Moses and the prophets. It 2ndly shows the important fact in every age, that so long as men believe not the testimony of Moses and the Prophets, concerning Christ and concerning themselves, they do not and cannot in truth believe the gospel. Christ's words on another occasion, are, "If ye believe not his {Moses} writings, how can ye believe my words." John 5:47.

But while I believe such to be the design of this passage, I do contend, that it is in itself a *parable* in distinction from the idea of a *fable*; that is, that the figure contains nothing inconsistent with the nature and order of things; nothing which might not be truly matter of fact. I cannot think of charging our Lord with using fabulous representations, when the Holy

Ghost has through the apostles so fully cautioned the saints against turning to fables, giving heed to fables, &c. We have then, besides the general instruction designed by the parable, the following ideas presented by it as general truths: 1st. That the souls of the dead, both of the wicked and the righteous still have a distinct and active existence, either in a state of torment or of happiness. 2nd. The ministration of angels in reference to the dead. And 3rd. That the wicked still retain, after death, their ignorant, Arminian notions. To these general heads, we shall endeavor distinctly to attend.

First. That the souls of the dead, both of the wicked and the righteous, still have a distinct and active existence, the one in a state of torment, the other in a state of happiness.

This position presents the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, independent of the spiritual life communicated to it in Regeneration; a doctrine which I understand to be denied by some in your region, and is, I see, denied by one writer in the PREDESTINARIAN BAPTIST, the No. for June 1st, pg. 117, 118. It seems to have been extensively supposed, that the burden of proof, relative to the immortality of the soul, must be borne by the advocates of that sentiment. This is a gross mistake; it involves a requisition to prove a negative, as I shall show. The scriptures do not take that ground. I shall lay down this position, controvert it who can; that we have no authority for believing anything that God in his providence has not made evident to the faculties of man, nor declared in the Scriptures. We believe that man's body is material, both because the Scriptures declare, that God made man of the dust of the earth, and speak of him as flesh, &c., and also because it is demonstrable to our natural senses. We know this fact. And those of us who believe in God, believe that he so made man. We all know, that man is mortal, that he is subject to death, and his body to become decomposed. How do we know it? Is it because we have, with vain philosophers, discovered that there is a natural necessity in matter to corrupt, and therefore that the nature of man was to be mortal? Or in other words, that we have discovered a defect in God's creating power, that he could not make matter incorruptible, or a necessary liability in God to change, to bring things into existence, and then bring them to destruction? No; the truth is, God never gave to proud man the opportunity to discover such defect in His creating power, or a natural necessity for man's mortality. God permitted man to offend, and sin to enter the world, for an infinitely wise purpose; and to illustrate the true nature of sin, and to punish man for his transgression, God gave him, the created lord of this world, and all his dominions up to its

corrupting influence and effects. The sentence was passed, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, &c., cursed is the ground for thy sake &c., for dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return." The whole history of man's mortality and of the world with all its changes from that day to this, is but the effect of the brief sentence's being carried out, which God passed upon man, upon the woman, and the serpent. Gen.3:14-19. And the gospel of Christ alone develops the gracious purpose of God in permitting this corrupter to enter his creation. What then was left for man to discover in this matter? So far from the Scriptures leaving it to be correctly inferred, that the dissolution of man, and of nature is the effect of a deficiency in God's creating power, they in reference to the dissolution of the old world, represent it as the effect of *repentance* {figuratively,} in God. Gen.6:6. That is, God is here represented as turning about and exerting the same power to sweep man from the earth, which he had put forth in creating and sustaining him upon it; just as man would do, if he repented of any work he had made. Not that there was any change in the mind or purpose of God. So much for man as made of the dust of the ground. Is the soul material also, was it made of the dust of the ground? If so, then it is evidently subject to the same sentence, Dust thou art &c. If not, then it requires proof direct to believe it subject to that sentence. But have we a soul or spirit distinct from animal life? Yes, we know we have an existence within us called a *living soul*. 1st. Because the Scriptures declare, that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. Gen.2:7. 2nd. Because we are conscious of its existence. We know it is not matter, because we cannot bring it to the test of any of our natural senses. We can neither taste, smell nor see it; neither can we hear or feel it, as we do the wind. Yet we know it is within us; an intelligent something which can think &c., a something which remains active whilst our natural senses are locked up in sleep. Besides it was the breath of God. It must therefore be a spiritual existence. We know that it exists, and that its existence is from God; what authority can we then have that it will ever cease to exist, unless God has declared his purpose, that it shall so cease, or we can prove that it necessarily must cease to exist? Have we any Scriptural testimony that the soul is mortal? None. Sensible evidence we of course have none, because we cannot bring it to the test of our senses. Have we an inward consciousness, that the soul will die with the body? How stands this point, you that deny the immortality of the soul? Have not some of the most hardened infidels given evidence in death of a consciousness of

an existence beyond death? Upon what authority then does the declamation rest, that the soul which we know exists, and exists from God, will cease to exist? There is no authority, either Scriptural, or rational for it. As rational beings we are then bound to reject it, till proof is brought to sustain it. But again, what is the mortality or death of the body? It is not annihilation; annihilation is not a doctrine of the Bible. Death is a cessation of animal life, and an ultimate decomposition of the particles of matter, of which it was formed, or a returning to its original element, dust. Will the advocate for soul mortality, contend that the souls of wicked persons at death become decomposed and return with all their depravity to their native element, the breath of God? I think not.

The Scriptures I admit contain this sentence, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ez.18: 4 & 20. But the term *soul* is evidently used in these, as in many other texts of Scripture, to denote personality or individuality. The import is the same as if it had been said, *The individual that sinneth he shall die*. There is another sense in which the Scriptures, as I understand them, speak of a death which has passed upon man, in which both soul and body are involved. "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," was the decree. "Dead in trespasses and sins," is the declaration of the decree having taken effect, whilst the individuals still retain a conscious existence both of body and soul. I do not understand this death to be a loss of any spiritual life which man originally had. But it is an extinction of that uprightness in which man was created, a sinking under the curse of God's law, and a dissolution of everything in him tending to his happiness, whilst he remains alive to everything sinful and tending to misery.

The writer in the PREDESTINARIAN BAPTIST, already referred to, has made a discovery which rather surpasses any made by philosophers going before. It is this, "If man was wholly *natural* in creation, then of necessity he was wholly mortal, nothing immortal about him." Whether he here by mistake used the word *natural* for *material* and meant thereby to convey the idea, that the *breath of God*, which he breathed into man, was matter, and of course, that the soul is something, which can be handled; or whether he used the word according to its proper meaning, and intended to convey the idea, that if man was wholly what God made him, then of necessity he was wholly mortal, &c., I cannot say. But it is astonishing to what extremities men, and even good men, will run, when they undertake to be wise above what is written. God expressly declares in his word that sin made man mortal,

"By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;" and "as sin hath reigned unto death." Rom.5:12,21. And yet this writer has the presumption to say, that from necessity man was wholly mortal in his original creation; that is, that God from necessity so made him. He has also some wonderful discoveries, as to how it was, that man became capable of transgressing God's law, different from anything which the Holy Ghost has told us on the subject, in the Scriptures. But as I would prefer depending on what God has revealed, to trusting to his discoveries, I will leave him.

I have already said, the Scriptures do not take the ground of those, who suppose the burden of proof lies on the advocates for the immortality of the soul. God has declared that the soul was produced by him, and has made its existence manifest to every man; he has never declared his purpose again to take it out of existence, it would therefore have been something like supererogation for the Holy Ghost to have given express declarations in the Scriptures, that the soul will not cease to exist. But at the same time, whenever the Scriptures speak of the soul in connection with the death of the body; its language is such, as corresponds only with the idea of its separate existence after the death of the body. Thus in the case of Rachel, Gen.35:18, her dying is expressed by her *soul's departing*, not by its ceasing to exist. In the case of the son of the widow of Zarephath, Elijah prayed unto God, not to give the child a new soul, nor to revive his old one, but that his soul might come into him again; and we are told that, "The soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." I Kings 17:21,22. Again, Christ, cautioning his disciples against the fear of man, says, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, &c." Matt.10:28. Does he not here clearly teach that the soul is not subject to the same death, to be *killed* as the body is? It may be said that, Christ spoke this to his disciples. True he did; but it is equally evident that he said it not in reference to their regeneration, but spake to them as men, because he immediately speaks of God's being able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Besides it is expressly of the soul, and not of spiritual life that he speaks. Passing other texts which may be supposed to relate to the persons as saints, I will come to the case of the rich man in the parable under consideration. The rich man died and was buried, and yet in hell he lifted up his eyes &c., and he saw and knew Abraham and Lazarus afar off. Of course his rationality, his soul still existed in its full vigor and he was conscious of existence. As evidenced by preceding remarks, I

do not understand this parable as designed to reveal the immortality of the soul, but I understand Christ as employing such ideas in his figure, as were familiar to his hearers, and such as he himself endorsed; for certainly none can think that the blessed Jesus would convey ideas, which in themselves were false. In this view of the parable, it fully sustains the doctrine of the immortality of the souls of the wicked, because it only accords with such doctrine.

In reference to the terms used to denote the locality of these souls; the expression *Abraham's bosom*, is a Jewish phrase, and appears designed more to convey the idea of the happy state of such souls, as partaking, as his spiritual seed, in the blessings of Abraham; than to designate any particular locality. The place where the rich man lifted up his eyes, in the translation called *hell*, in the Greek *Ades*, or *Hades*, in Hebrew *Sheol*, seems by its general use in Scripture designed not so much to denote the final place of everlasting punishment, as a general receptacle of souls after death. The Greek and Hebrew words denote a *secret, hidden place*. According to the parable, as according to any notion we can have of the happiness of departed saints, the location of Lazarus is impassably separated from the place of misery. In accordance with this idea of *Hades*, or *hell*, both *death and hell* are represented as *giving up their dead*, when the final judgment, or judgment of those, who have not a part in the first resurrection, takes place. Rev.20:12-14.

The other two leading ideas in the parable, marked for notice, will necessarily have to be deferred for another communication. And although, when I commenced this, I designed expressing my views fully on them, yet circumstances, which have since transpired, have led me to conclude, that I, perhaps, may as well just let them pass with only the brief notice above taken of them.

I subscribe myself affectionately,
S.TROTT.
July 22, 1842.

GNOSTICISM.

BROTHER JEWETT: - As you seem disposed to call me out to say something on the subject of *Gnosticism*, as you with propriety call it, I will give a few general remarks concerning it.

A strong evidence to me that the church of Christ, at this time, is not only surrounded with Babylonish confusion,

but is about to find herself captive in Babylon, is the great propensity manifest by our brethren to *refuse the waters* of Shiloh that go softly, and to rejoice in something new or strange, something which has the velocity of human imagination in it. Whilst Judah was content to drink the waters of Shiloh which flowed from the foot of Mount Zion, they were kept of course from being far scattered from their home. But when they must take other and untried waters, God for this discontent, *brought upon them the waters of the river, strong and many*. See Isa.8:6,8. So of spiritual Judah, if they would be content with the simple testimony of Scriptural revelation, made plain in their experience, they would be of one heart, and speak the same things. But whilst we must have human expositions on the one hand, or on the other, allow imagination to stretch itself to bring in something more *full* and more *rapid*, than what we find in the Scriptures, we shall be confused in our views, and scattered in our feelings; and God will bring upon us the strong waters of Babylon and cause them to *go over* and *reach even to the neck*. Ah, they may reach *even to the neck*, but their proud waves must stop there; Zion's Head cannot be brought under; whilst this is her case, though she may be greatly *chilled*, there is no danger of her *drowning*.

If Old School Baptists could agree to appoint themselves a Pope to imagine for them, they might not be so much scattered, though in a strange land. If we could unitedly give this honor to Doctor Gill, or to the Faculty of any theological School, or to yourself, Brother Jewett, or to brethren Beebe or Newport in your editorial capacities, and receive your dictation as to what we are to receive as truth, there might be union of sentiment among us. But so long as while some wish to adhere to just what the Scriptures declare, others wish Dr. Gill to be taken as the standard, and others again wish to imagine for themselves, and to sweep away every ancient landmark by the boldness of their fancy, we must continue to be scattered until the great Shepherd shall be pleased to bring us back, and to *lead us by the side of the still waters*, and to make us to *lie down in the green pastures* of his grace. The time I think cannot be far distant, when those of us who remain, will be found – *not floating down* – but *sitting beside the rivers of Babylon*, one by this, and another by that, *weeping in remembrance of Zion* and its peace, with our *harps hung upon the willows*, saying, "How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land."

I was somewhat surprised to find our excellent and gifted Brother Newport, in the Predestinarian Baptist, coming

to the conclusion that of all the *opinions he had heard* concerning the origin of the devil, *the one which represents him as the eternal opposite to God, is to him the most rational and reasonable.* As to the rationality of the thing I have nothing to say; Satan and sin occupy too conspicuous parts in the revelation which God has given, for me to admit them as subjects of *rational enquiry*, instead of revelation. The *reasonableness* of Brother Newport's conclusion is not very apparent. To me it is quite *unreasonable* for one who believes in the perfection of divine revelation, to leave that revelation and like the Gnostics of old go to the Magi or ancient worshippers of fire to learn the origin and nature of a being with whose acts the revelation of God is so full. But there it is, men want something more *full*, more *overflowing*, on the origin of the devil, than God has given in the Scriptures, and human imagination must be resorted to. The Scriptures on the origin of the devil, as on many other points, *go softly*, instead of presenting a set treatise in biographical form of his parentage, birth, &c., they give us *here a little and there a little*, leaving the honest enquirer after truth to find out what God has declared on the subject, by comparing Scripture with Scripture. And we may rest assured that, wherein God has withholden, neither the ancient Magi, nor modern Philosophers can give us the truth on the subject, so directly a subject of revelation as this.

The preceding remarks I had written, previous to receiving the 18th number of the SIGNS, in which Brother Beebe proposes to publish in pamphlet form, a "Scriptural Refutation of the Two Seed Doctrine." I shall now omit the remarks I had intended on that subject. I will go on to remark that the origin of the devil, so far as it is viewed merely in relation to his existence, is a subject not worth contending for. But when men will, in advancing their opinions on that point, publish that which reflects on the character of God, or the truth of Divine Revelation, no lover of God's truth can, I think, consistently hold his peace from bearing testimony against it. If one opinion is attempted to be pulled down, merely to build up another equally imaginary, it is labor poorly spent. When the sentiment is advanced among the Old School Baptists that the *devil was made such* of God, I feel bound to bear testimony against it, because it represents sin and holiness to be both on a footing as to their origin, making both to proceed directly from God, contrary to that revelation which God has given of himself, as a God of infinite holiness and purity, as "Righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works." Psal.145:17. On the other hand, in representing the devil as a

self-existent being, he is set up as a competitor with God for the sovereignty of the universe; each alike existing in the universe by his own independent power, each so far as I can conceive, might, on this principle, have an equal claim to the sovereignty. Besides it is giving to the devil a claim to the name Jehovah, which is expressive of self-existence, when the Scriptures declare that *God's name alone is Jehovah*. Psal.33:18. Beside this, it strikes a fatal blow at the doctrine of predestination, making the whole purpose of God going before, concerning the plan of redemption, and the events which should take place in the world, a matter of entire contingency. For if the devil exists by his own pleasure and independent of God, then his acts would be alike independent of God and according to his own and not God's counsel. It is true, Elder Parker to obviate this, lays down the position, that the devil by coming into God's dominions comes under his law and was subject to his government. But were we to admit the consistency of this idea, it would not obviate the difficulty in the way of God's having beforehand and certain purpose as to the government of the world. It, from the nature of things, is impossible, that God could have known beforehand, with certainty, that the devil would enter the garden of Eden, unless he from the beginning so existed in dependence on God, as to give God a governing control over all his movements; and without this certain knowledge that the devil would enter the garden and tempt the woman, it is gross absurdity to suppose, that God could with certainty have predetermined those events which *have transpired in the world consequent upon sin*. Brother Newport's Declaration of Faith, published in the 1st number of the Predestinarian Baptist, is as good as any I ever read; and how it is, he can thus believe in the predestinating purpose of God, and yet believe that the devil, who has had so great an agency in all the events of the world, existed independent of God and therefore entirely without his control, until he appeared in the garden, is to me strange. I wish he would explain this point for us, and let us know how far back, according to his and Elder Parker's views of the existence of the devil, God's predestinating purpose can be extended. Elder Parker I am told has published an answer in the Predestinarian Baptist to my remarks on his *Third Dose*. He may in that have offered some explanation on these points, as I have never seen it, for although most of the Numbers have been sent me by the kindness of some friend, the Number containing that, with some others, has never reached me.

One writer in that paper has challenged me to show, that angels were ever created, others have represented me as adopting Milton's poetic representation of the fall of Satan from heaven. I will therefore I think ere long give my views on these points, if you will publish them. And I will try not to give speculation for Scripture declaration.

I remain Yours, &c., S. TROTT.
Oct.12, 1842.

THE BEING AND NATURE OF ANGELS.

BROTHER JEWETT: - We can arrive at but little certainty on the testimony of Scripture concerning this and many other subjects, unless we can come to a conclusion, how we are to receive the words dictated by the Spirit of inspiration. If we go to the scriptures under the belief that the Holy Spirit of Truth, in condescending to employ the languages of men to declare what it has been the pleasure of God to reveal, has directed to those terms and forms of expression best calculated to convey intelligibly and distinctly the ideas intended to be conveyed; I cannot think, that there would be much difference of opinion on the subject of our enquiries, among the honest and humble enquirers after truth. But if we go to the Scriptures, believing that the spirituality of the revelation of God exists in the words employed as well as in the subjects treated of, and that the Spirit, and not the laws of language, must guide us to the import of the words used, we are then thrown loose upon the sea of God's word, without any compass, without any standard by which *to try the spirits whether they be of God*, and without any certainty in the case; because we are so liable to mistake a lively imagination for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, without some fixed rule by which to test the point.

In reference to prophecy, it is a generally admitted fact, that the words employed in prophetic declarations are generally used not in a literal, but in a figurative sense, and hence we have to wait the fulfillment of prophecies to understand clearly their import. Hence the inconsistency of taking words used in positive declarations according to their import in prophetic style, unless we suppose all Scripture alike figurative with prophecy. For I cannot believe that, unless God, in condescending to allow the Scriptures to be written in the languages of men, intended the words used to be understood according to their legitimate import, he would have suffered

them thus to be written, but would have appointed a sacred language to be used.

Had the children of God taken the Scriptures as their own plain interpreter of the letter of them, and their own experience as the best expositor of the spiritual doctrine therein contained, they would not have found themselves as now in Babylon, or Confusion. You, Brother Jewett, seem to hope better things concerning our Old School Brethren, than I have expressed in my preceding communication. The view which I am compelled to take of their case, is, I assure you, to me, for the present, not joyous but grievous, nevertheless I am as fully persuaded that the prophecies in Isaiah, chapter 8, and Psalms 137, to which I referred in that communication, will have to be experienced by the spiritual Israel of God, as that they are recorded. Though I did not so fully realize their application to the gospel Church until very recently; when their import seemed clearly illustrated by the events through which the Old School Baptists are now passing. Hence, though I feel bound to bear my testimony against that which has been, and is, the occasion of this confusion among us; namely, a departure from the simplicity of Scripture declaration, yet I have no expectation of stopping the progress of the confusion. In fact, if this captivity must come and the Witnesses be killed, the sooner it takes place, the sooner will the church experience her promised deliverance. But on the other hand, as I cannot hasten on the event by anticipating these prophecies; so I would not wish to make the confusion and differences among us greater than they really are. You, my Brother, must however have entirely misapprehended my remarks concerning a *Pope*. I had no design of expressing a wish for a *Pope*, but to show the difference between Old School Baptists and others on this point; namely, that whilst others can appear united, because trained to think on religious subjects as do their leaders, true Old School Baptists will enquire for themselves, and speak as they believe; hence differences among us are more manifest. Whilst therefore I can agree with our Sister in the Oct. No. of the Advocate in the aspiration, "May Old School Baptists be of one heart and one mind," I cannot agree with her in the remark, "But if any difference of sentiment be found among them, let them not publish it to the world;" because in the first place, Old School Baptists have no business with religious sentiments which they are not willing to publish on the house top. And secondly, according to her plan, if one has published a sentiment, however erroneous, another must not expose it, lest the difference between them should become public. We might as well have a Pope at once to think

for us, as to be debarred from expressing our dissent from what we conscientiously believe to be an error. I so far at least agree with Jefferson's view of toleration, as this. That if Error is tolerated to be published among us, Truth should be left free to combat it. But I do desire that our Old School Brethren would be careful to publish nothing, under the guise of Old School sentiments, but what is sustained by the plain declaration and construction of Scripture; then the occasion for dissensions among us would be removed, and our Sister's benevolent wish would be accomplished in a safe way.

I will now come to the subject proposed. My first position in describing the being, &c., of angels, is, That in the Scriptures, the term *angels*, when not used in the figurative language of prophecy or parable, is descriptive of a distinct order of Beings. This I prove from Heb.2:16. "For verily he took not on him the *nature of angels*, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Not to insist on the term *nature* in the least, as it is in italics, yet the expression that *he took on him angels*, in distinction from the *seed of Abraham*; that is, the promised seed, must exclude everything human to which the term has been applied, and we must therefore understand the Apostle as meaning a distinct order of beings distinguished by the term *angels*; and the term *angel* must therefore mean such a distinct order of beings in its proper Scriptural import. For he certainly took on him *human nature*, he took on him the office of Messenger, of Servant, of Apostle, Prophet and Priest; the apostle could not therefore mean human nature, nor any of these offices by the term *angels*, neither anything connected with the seed of Abraham, either natural or spiritual, because according to the flesh he was a Jew.

My second position is, that the angels are spirits and so made of God, therefore that they are the creatures of God. This I prove from Ps.104:4 & Heb.1:7. "Who maketh his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire." In reference to this passage as found in the 104th Psalm, could the order be changed without doing violence to the established usage of the Hebrew, so as to read, *Who maketh spirits his angels*, &c., or as some would construe the passage, *winds his angels*, then there might be a propriety in supposing the term *angel* to mean merely a *messenger*. But not only does the usage of the Hebrew require us to preserve the order in which it stands, but the quotation of the passages, Heb.1:7, in an argument showing the superiority of Christ as a Son, requires us to understand by *angels* here the highest order of created beings. To suppose with Dr. George Campbell that this text is quoted to show that the sonship of Christ is superior to the office of

messengers, by showing that even inanimate things such as the wind, are God's messengers, is superlatively ridiculous. Not less so, than would be the idea, that man must be great because a worm is so insignificant. When we consider, that the Holy Ghost directed the Psalmist in the original declaration, and directed the Apostle to make the quotation in proof of the superiority of Christ, as Son, over all created beings, we shall understand by *angels* in this first chapter of Hebrews, that superior order of beings which Christ took not on him, and that which man, and Christ in his humiliation, was made a little lower. Psal.8:4-6 & Heb.2:5-9. If so, we must believe that, whilst God maketh his ministers, whether natural or spiritual, a flaming fire to communicate light and heat and to burn up all that would oppose, he also maketh his *angels spirits*, that in ministering to them who shall be heirs of salvation; they may perform their office without being discernable by the natural senses of man. But if God maketh his angels spirits; angels must be his workmanship, and therefore his creatures. What then becomes of the challenge of our western brother to me; to prove that angels are created beings?

My third position is, That angels are heavenly, not earthly beings. This I show from such texts as the following, in reference to the *holy angels*. "For I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." Matt.13:10. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven." Matt.24:26. "But are as the angels, which are in heaven." Mark 12:25.

The fourth position I shall lay down, is that the angels which have not left their first estate, have their standing secured by the *purpose of God in election*. This is proved, first from the fact that in Scripture they are repeatedly denominated *holy angels*. They cannot be in themselves independently holy; because as has been proved they are creatures of God; hence are dependent on him not only for their existence but also for existing as they are. Persons are, according to Scripture, sanctified or made holy, by being cleansed from pollution; as national Israelites, ceremonially, by water and blood; and saints, spiritually, by the blood of Christ. But we have no evidence, that these angels were ever polluted. Again, saints are holy, by being partakers of the *new man*, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. In this they were created in Christ Jesus, and come into actual existence in this relation by being born of God. But only the saints are represented in Scripture as being created in Christ Jesus. The only other sense in which the Scriptures represent creatures as becoming holy, is by their being appointed or set

apart of God to his special service. In this sense then it must be that the angels are holy, in being set apart by the electing purpose of God, in their innocency and uprightness, to be his messengers to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation. But, secondly, this position is proved from I Tim. 5:21, "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels." Here a regular gradation is observed in the order of invisible beings, in whose sight Timothy is thus reminded, that he acts, whether seen of men or not. By the Apostle here, the purpose of God, by which these angels are set apart to holiness, is showed to be according to election by which they were chosen whilst others were passed by. But in reference to this text, we are met by an assertion, and a bare assertion it is, not having a particle of Scripture proof to sustain it, that the *elect angels* here mean men; namely, the presbytery who ordained Timothy. There are repeated instances in the New Testament in which the term *angels* is used in the figurative language of prophecy, to denote ministers, as in Matt.24, Rev.1 and the 12th chapters, but in no instance where the term is used in positive declaration, in the translation, is there anything in the connection, or any other authority for understanding it to mean anything else but *angels* in the proper sense of the term. Nor in the Greek, do we find the term used merely for *messengers*, excepting in cases where the connection shows them to be messengers of men; as in Luke 7:24, *messengers of John*, so Luke 9:52, and James 2:25. But further we have nothing in the New Testament sanctioning the idea of electing particular elders to officiate in ordaining any individual. There was no selection spoken of in the church at Antioch, Acts 13:1,2. In the case of Timothy, be it remembered, that he was an Evangelist, II Tim. 4:5, and therefore received his ordination to the work directly from apostolic authority. And though the laying on of the hands of the presbytery is spoken of in I Tim.4:14, yet this term does not necessarily involve the idea of plurality, it simply denotes the office of eldership; and to settle the point, Paul in II Tim.1:6, speaking of the gift in Timothy, the same gift undoubtedly that is mentioned in I Tim.4:14, speaks of it as being in him, simply by the laying on of his own hands. Surely Paul would not thus connect himself with God and the Lord Jesus in his charge to Timothy. Hence in no view which can be taken of the subject, on Scriptural grounds, can we find any apology for the above noticed assertion. By the same rule that one may assert that the presbytery which ordained Timothy, is intended by the *elect angels* in this passage, another might assert another class was intended, and thus the

language of the Scriptures would be rendered entirely indefinite. Besides, such a construction of the passage countenances the Arminian notion, that the Election of the New Testament, is merely an election to office. I think, therefore, that those, who are disposed with childlike simplicity to receive the language of Divine Inspiration, will believe, with me, upon the authority of this text, that the *holy angels* have their standing secured, not in their own strength, but by the purpose of God *according to election*; and that boasting is excluded from them, as well as from the saints; so that instead of raising, in heaven, the notes of self-glorying that their standing has been preserved by their own purpose and strength, they also will give God the glory of their being what they are.

My fifth and last position is, That some of those spiritual beings designated by the term *angels*, kept not their standing in uprightness, but sinned. My proof for this is found in II Pet.2:4, "For God spared not the *angels that sinned*, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness," &c., and in Jude 6, "And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." Attempts have been made, in order to get rid of the proof these texts afford of a future judgment, to make us believe, that these angels were Jews, or national Israelites. But where is the proof for such an idea? It is not found in the connection, not in the scriptural use of the term angel, nor in any corresponding passage of Scripture. As has been noticed, inferences drawn from prophetic language cannot be authority in construing terms used in positive declarations. Peter is showing the certainty of the punishment of the false teachers, who would arise after the manner of the false prophets among national Israel, though they might escape in this life, as is also Jude; this he proves from the judgment of God upon the angels that sinned, as being first in order. From them he passes to the old world, as the next signal instance of God's just judgment overtaking the wicked, and from that to the case of Sodom and Gomorrah. The punishment of the false prophets and teachers, is what these apostles are showing as certain, though they escape in this life, therefore they cannot be intended by the *angels*. These Apostles speak of *angels*, and what right have we to say they do not mean what they say; especially when, by representing them to mean something else, we turn the beauty and harmony of the order observed by Peter, into confusion? We are therefore warranted by these texts, taken in connection

with I Tim.5:21, in the belief that whilst some angels were elected to holiness, others being passed by and left to themselves, sinned, and in sinning left their first *estate*, or that uprightness in which they were created. We are not directly informed that these sinning angels are the devils spoken of in Scriptures; but we know that like the devils they are *wicked spirits*, and are reserved in *chains of everlasting darkness*, or in everlasting opposition to God who *dwells in light*; and like the devils have hell for their habitation. What particular *occasion* occurred to lead them to sin, we are not informed, unless it be found in Heb.1:6. But we know, that they transgressed the law, under which they were placed; for "sin is the transgression of the law," and they sinned. Hence they cannot have been created with a wicked nature, because no law would require them to act contrary to their nature; neither could they have been self-existent, for then they would have been without law, and where no law is, there is no transgression.

The five positions, which I have laid down relative to the being, &c., of angels, are showed to be supported by the Scriptures I have quoted, if we will allow them their plain and natural import, and by others to which I might refer. Why not then let them stand as revealed truths? And why not be satisfied with the plain declarations of God's inspiration? What is gained by launching out, without compass, into the ocean of speculation? What by torturing and wresting the Scriptures from their natural import to establish the belief of no future judgment? Or that of the Sadducees, that there are neither angels or spirits? I cannot believe that anything would be gained, but much lost.

Although no Scripture has been or can be brought to prove the contrary to these positions, yet certain ideas have been advanced against the possibility of spiritual beings having sinned, which in conclusion, I will notice.

The first is, That angels in heaven could not be subject to temptation and therefore would have nothing to lead them to sin. Whilst it is admitted that there is no account of their being tempted; yet the idea that angels could not sin without being tempted, wants proof both from reason and Scripture. We are informed that they sinned, they were of course as before noticed, under a prohibitory law; this is proof positive that they were liable to depart from the rectitude in which they were created, else why prohibited by law? And as a law only commands, without providing the principle of obedience in the subject, it would not remove their liability to disobey, if left to their own choice. And whilst God's having created them,

involved them in an obligation to obey him, it involved on him no obligation to constrain them to obey. So that this argument has evidently nothing to stand upon.

A second idea which has been presented as an argument, is, That the angels existed in heaven, they must have been in the presence of God, where sin could not enter. In one sense I admit, that neither sin, nor sinful creatures can be in the presence of God. That is, as such can never receive his smiles or approbation. In another sense they can be, and are in his presence, for God fills immensity with his presence. "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit; or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there, if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there, &c." Psal.139:7-12. And we are told, "There was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord and Satan came also among them;" in another text it is added, "To present himself before the Lord." Job 1:6, 2:1. If those who use the above argument mean thereby to prove that angels could not sin with God's approbation, or that they would not be beholding the *face of Christ's Father which is in heaven*, as do the holy angels, they are attempting to prove what will not be denied. On the contrary Peter as quoted shows that God disapproved the sin of the angels. But if they mean to deny, that the angels would have sinned, where God was present in his being, and under his notice, they cannot sustain their position; it would go to deny the possibility of Adam's having sinned, as well as that of the angels.

A third idea advanced, is, That if angels could sin and fall from heaven, saints might do so too when they get there. If those angels which have been established in holiness by God's electing purpose were to fall it might afford some plausibility to this argument. But even this would not establish the truth of their position. Nothing short of proof, that Christ is liable to fall, can prove the liability of the saints falling from heaven. This argument therefore shrinks away at the first touch. Nevertheless, as so much stress is laid on the idea of the angels being in Heaven, in these arguments, we will notice that idea a little. But no candid person would infer, that the terms *heaven* or *heavens* as found in the Scriptures, always denote the place of heavenly glory, where Christ in his glorified body is enthroned at the right hand of the Father. Paul speaks of a man whom he knew being taken up to the third heavens; {II Cor.12: 2,} and Solomon says, that the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain God. I Kings 8:27. According to these texts there are more heavens than one; so that these angels might have been in heaven, without being

where the glorified body of Jesus is. As to Milton's poetic phantasma, I have never quoted him as authority, and therefore no one has a right to charge his visions upon me. In speaking of the angels which sinned as being in their creation heavenly beings, I consider myself sustained by the fact that they were *made spirits*, and therefore not earthly, not serpents, nor any other beasts of the field, and as the Scriptures speak of but two regions or spheres which God created, the *heaven* and the *earth*, they must of course be heavenly. Thus much I infer without assigning them a place in the *third heavens*, or *heaven of heavens*.

If the view I have thus given of the being and nature of angels is sustained by the plainest and most natural construction of Scripture, it must be the best view we can have of them. I know of nothing which can be produced from the Scriptures according to the literal import of them, to forbid the idea of its being the correct view. And until it be clearly shown, that the Scriptures require a different view, I would entreat our brethren not to reject it for speculations.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Va., Nov. 23, 1842.

THE END OF THE WORLD.

EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW 24:29-51.

BROTHER JEWETT: - Having been from home three weeks, and having seen your request in the April Number of the *ADVOCATE* for my views of Matt.24:29-51, I will now, as opportunity may offer in my journeyings, endeavor to write them out for you, though I may not finish the communication before getting home.

This subject has considerably occupied my mind for some time past, in consequence of certain opinions advanced among Old School Baptists on the one hand and Mr. Miller on the other. Between these two, the two distinct comings of Christ revealed in the Scriptures, are as completely mixed up and confused, as ever any subject was. The prophecy or prophecies contained in this 24th of Matthew, have in part been differently understood by me at different periods; though at no period have I been able to receive the idea, that the whole received an entire accomplishment in the destruction of Jerusalem and events connected therewith, for reasons which I shall have occasion hereafter to notice. But recently my mind

has been led to what is to me a clearer view of the subject, than I have formerly had; whether by the Spirit of God, I will not presume to affirm.

That the prophecy contained in that portion of the Chapter from the 4th to the 22nd verse, inclusive, received a full and distinct accomplishment in the destruction of Jerusalem and events preceding it, history fully evidences. Whether the *then*, which commences vs.23, refers to the period embraced in the preceding description, and the events mentioned in that and the following verses on to the 28th are a further description of what relates to the Jews, is not certain. These verses have generally been applied to the Jews, though I doubt the correctness of such application; but as these verses are not included in the part of the chapter, which is requested to be expounded, I pass them without further remarks, and will come to the portion desired to be considered.

Preparatory to an explanation of the chapter from verse 29 onwards, I will remark, that I understand the disciples to have proposed two distinct questions to the Master in verse 3; the first relating to the destruction of the Temple, the second having a reference to the *second coming of Christ and the end of the world*. In reference to the first query, Christ in answering the disciples, points out events relating to themselves and to the Gospel as preceding that event; gives them correspondent warnings and describes the great leading events, relative to the gospel and gospel Church, which were to intervene between the destruction of Jerusalem and his second, personal coming.

Verse 29, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened," &c. Some expositors, setting aside the order which Christ here gives to these events, as being *after the tribulation of those days*, represent the *darkening of the sun*, the *moon not giving her light*, and the *falling of the stars from heaven*, as being accomplished in the destruction of the temple and the consequent overturning of the legal ceremonies, priesthood, and worship. But I cannot admit, that any light remained in any part of the Mosaic economy, after Christ had fully come out of it in his resurrection, ascension, &c., as he was the whole light and substance of the economy, whilst he remained buried in it. Even Dr. Gill makes the *sun being darkened* represent the Shekinah or divine presence being withdrawn from the most holy place, when the temple was destroyed. He should have recollected, before making this blunder, that the Shekinah, or God's presence communing with the high priest was from off

the mercy seat which covered the ark and from between the cherubim, and that consequently, as the ark of testimony was involved in the destruction of the first temple, and the gold of the mercy seat and cherubim was carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, the second temple was entirely deficient of all these, only as Christ, the grand antitype and substance of them, came to this temple agreeably to Hag.2:6-9. The truth is, that as Christ describes that *tribulation* to be greater than any which had been *before* or should *come after*, verse 21, so the *tribulation of those days* can be nothing less, than the entire destruction which came upon the Jews, their city and temple. Hence it being *after the tribulation of those days* that the sun should be darkened; this must be an after event; and therefore as above remarked, must be an event preceding the second coming of Christ. But the word *immediately*, requires some attention – “immediately after the tribulation,” &c. If by this expression we are to understand the event to be one directly connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, and in quick succession according to our notions of time; then as we find nothing recorded in history answering to the declarations in this verse, either literally or figuratively, as having thus taken place, we are placed in the deplorable predicament of believing that our blessed Lord delivered a prophecy, which failed to be accomplished, or at any rate, one, the truth of which is left very doubtful. But if we understand the word *immediately* to point out the next leading event in the history of the church after the destruction of Jerusalem, as it may with propriety be understood, then we shall escape such unpleasant predicament. So I understand it to be used, and by the expressive and figurative language of this verse, according to the order of prophetic style, I understand the whole rise and power of the *man of sin*, on to the witnesses being killed, as being prophetically described. By the *sun darkened* I understand the gospel as being obscured in the rise and reign of antichrist, and as being entirely hid from public view during the time the two witnesses shall lie dead. By the *moon not giving her light*, I understand the church as departing from the purity and simplicity of gospel doctrine and order, and ultimately at the time of the witnesses being killed, as deprived of bearing any public testimony to the truth of the gospel. And by the *stars* in like manner, in falling from heaven, I understand the ministers of the gospel, falling from gospel doctrine, into a mixed system, and ultimately those who remained steadfast being killed as witnesses. And the term *immediately* is properly used in reference to this event; for very soon after the apostolic age the ministry began to fall off

from the apostles doctrine to a mixed system of Judaism, philosophy and gospel; and ceremonies began to be multiplied in the churches, by which their true light was obscured and the sun, the gospel began to be darkened, and these departures went on waxing worse, until the Beast was fully formed and arose in his power, and from him the two horned Beast and now the Image &c. Verses 30 & 31, as I understand them, point out the change which will take place in reference to the gospel and gospel church after the witnesses shall have been killed, the *sign of the Son of man will appear in heaven*, that is his being in the gospel church sustaining and delivering it from all the rage of the Beast, will then be openly manifested; as will also his coming with special power in the *clouds of heaven*, or gospel ministry; this will cause the *tribes of the earth to mourn*, when they see the whole mass of antichristian superstition falling before the power of Jesus and his gospel. But the destruction of Jerusalem caused rejoicing rather than mourning among the tribes of the earth. To Titus was decreed a splendid triumph for his conquest of Jerusalem. *And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a {or the} trumpet*, {not a sound of the great trumpet, as though it were the first blowing of it,} but with a more powerful blast of it. Yea, Zechariah says, "The Lord God shall blow the trumpet," as I think, in reference to the same period. Zech.9:14. By the *trumpet* here I understand the gospel trumpet, and by the *angels*, gospel preachers, for the whole passage is in the figurative language of prophecy. Although there may be a reference to the more extended spread of the gospel and with more powerful effect among the Gentiles, and certainly the gathering in the fulness of the Gentiles is implied; yet I am led to the conclusion, that by the *elect* here are intended the same *elect*, mentioned in verse 22, and that the whole of these three verses has special reference to the bringing in of the Jews; and indeed the whole of Israel, as the last grand event in prophecy, preceding the *second coming* of Christ, and the *end of the world*.

The Master having thus pointed out the events relative to the gospel, which were to precede the periods embraced in each of the two questions of the disciples, without giving any direct answer to them, now turns more directly to their enquiries, and in reference to the first, "When shall these things be" - that is; When shall the temple be destroyed; shows them {verses 32-35,} with what certainty they might know its near approach, and that it should take place before that generation was past. And then in verse 36, and on he gives an answer as to the period referred to, in the other

enquiry; namely, that, "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven &c.;" that is, he hereby informs them, that the period of the *end of the world* God has never made a subject of revelation. He has revealed by his servants the prophets the distinct periods of other events, but never this; and further, according to Mark, he informs them, that the Son as sent of his Father is not authorized to reveal it. Thus we see that Mr. Miller and his disciples have altogether gone beyond revelation in their calculations. That I am correct in making this distinct application of the declarations in verses 34 & 36, appears from the demonstrative adjective pronouns here used. Grotius, a learned Greek scholar, says that according to the idiom of the Greek, the two distinct pronouns used in verses 34 & 36, the one translated *these* and the other *that*, point out a plain distinction in the subjects to which they each relate; distinguishing the one as near, the other as more distant. The same distinction is often made in our own language by using of the words *this* and *that*. If our Lord had intended by the *day and hour*, vs.36, the same period as that intended in vs.34, the use of the demonstrative pronoun *ekeinos*, or *that* was improper; the proper mode of expression would have been *but of the day and hour* &c. As there is therefore clearly a distinction pointed out by the mode of expression used in reference to the subjects of these two verses, I think we are warranted in concluding the distinction to be that of the distinct enquiries. The comparison of this latter period; namely, the end of the world, with the days of Noah, corresponds with what we might infer will be the case, from the description given of the Laodicean church state, the seventh and last state of the church militant, {Rev.3:14-17,} and other declarations of Scripture, which, I think, relate to the same. But the comparison here made with the days of Noah, certainly does not correspond with the description given in Luke of the period connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, nor with the account given in history of those times. See Luke 21:25,26. So also the declarations contained in verses 40 & 41, do not hold good in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; for according to the uniform testimony of history all the Jews without exception found in Judea, that did not perish in the war, were taken captive and sold for slaves. But that the distinction pointed out in these verses will be manifested at the second coming of Christ, we may conclude from the description given by Paul of that event {I Thes.4:16 & 17;} namely, that "*we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.*" Hence one will be changed and taken

up and another left. And I think the admonitions given in the remainder of this chapter, refer to the event of Christ second coming, or *the end of the world*. But here I will remark as to that subject. As some speak of the comings of Christ, we might infer, that they think him like some of the importing merchants and factors in our cities; these having business to transact both in Europe and in this country, have frequently to pass from the one country to the other, to attend to it. But those who so represent our Lord, forget his Godhead and omnipresence. His first coming or his *coming in his kingdom* instead of being confined to one instantaneous appearing is like the coming of the day, progressive, now manifested in this degree of longitude then in that, so of our Lord, who will continue to come in the one coming in his kingdom, until the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, is ground to chaff, and the gospel church or his kingdom, represented by the *stone cut out of the mountain without hands*, fills the whole earth. So in reference to his second coming, it has been in effect progressive to every succeeding generation of men, and will be until the dead in Christ are raised and the world burned. That is, when we or others are called from time by death, time things have no more to do with us, and therefore it is the same with us, as though time was ended as to any changes we may know, but the one in the resurrection of our bodies. Hence the admonitions contained in these latter verses of this chapter; also the declaration contained in Rev.22:7, "Behold I come quickly," &c., and other like ones, are as appropriate to us as they will be to any future generation of men on the earth. O that the Lord would give us grace to obey these admonitions of our Lord, and to watch for his coming; that is, to us.

Brother Jewett, having been permitted to return home in safety from my tour, I have thus finished the communication begun abroad; in it I have given what is my understanding of the portion of our Lord's prophecy designated, which you will of course publish, if you publish it, as mine. If you have anything more correct, or better on the subject, I hope, you will publish that also.

Yours with Christian affection,
S. TROTT.
May 26, 1843.

GOSPEL ORDER.

BROTHER JEWETT: - By some mismanagement among the Post-masters, I have not received the Sept., number of the ADVOCATE and MONITOR, but in a recent tour I had an opportunity of seeing it and of noticing the request of brother Ashbrook for your views and mine on the query, Whether one church has a right to disown another church, as a church of Christ, on account of corruption however great.

I am somewhat surprised, that any O.S. brethren should harbor the idea, that a departure from the faith should be no bar to fellowship; or that corruption should be held in estimation as if manifesting a body of persons, to be a church of Christ, equally with truth and disorder, and disorder equally with order. I readily admit, that there is no direction given in the New Testament, for churches dealing with and excluding other churches, as is the case with individual members. But be it also remembered, that the New Testament contains no authority for churches combining, or being bound together with churches in any external union or form, by which any such discipline, or exclusion, or act of dismissal, should be required to produce a separation. Neither do the scriptures justify us in owning the *tares* as wheat, the synagogues of Satan as churches of Christ, error as truth, or contempt of Christ as obedience to Him; nor our recognizing any body of people, not continuing steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, as a gospel church. Such being the fact, relative to New Testament authority on the subject, the opinion of those spoken of by brother Ashbrook, stands at once condemned, as being *antichristian usurpation*, and *not* gospel order; I mean, that it is usurpation, which requires us to fellowship everything brought in by the will of man. I will, however, enlarge a little on this subject.

The Redeemer's interest, as established in the world, is called a *kingdom*, but a kingdom *not of this world*; accordingly we find its manifestation under the ministry of the apostles. The Apostles, as they planted churches, instead of combining them under territorial governments and these again being made subject to a great central, visible power, after the manner of the governments of this world – gathered a little flock at Antioch, one at Ephesus, at Philippi, several in the region of Galatia, called the *churches* of Galatia. Each of these was organized as a distinct church, having its own bishops or elders and deacons; and when addressed, were addressed distinctly as a church, whether on doctrine, order or discipline;

so that in each place, where the gospel standard was planted, the kingdom of Christ appeared only as a *little flock* meeting together for worship, having nothing in its appearance calculated to alarm the fears of the governments of this world, as though it were a power growing up to overturn their authority. It is true, jealousies and opposition were aroused against these lambs of Christ, but not by any just provocation from the Gospel.

When the interest of Christ collectively is spoken of, it is called *the church*, as it is the one body of Christ; but when spoken of as manifested in the world, *the churches*, and *the churches of the saints*, are mentioned; each a little flock by itself having no other bond of union with each other, than that invisible bond of being made to center in Christ, and on being quickened by the *one Spirit*; and having no visible form of union {except the congregating of individuals in church relation,} but the "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and being "called in one hope of their calling." But so soon as Antichrist began to gain power in the churches, the propensity to mould the visible form of the church into a conformity to the kingdoms of this world, was manifested; and we quickly find territorial bishops, assuming a control over all the churches in a certain district, and these again uniting under the government of patriarchs, or of archbishops and a Pope. And when the Reformation took place, the same disposition was manifested, in all the reformed churches, to have their government conformed to the kingdoms of this world; and each sect has to this day its confederacies and combined government over the churches. We can but be struck, in reading history, with the distinction in narrating the state of the Novatians and Donatists, {as those who separated from the corruptions of the early church were called,} from that of the other sects, these are only spoken of by their churches, whilst others are mentioned by their bishoprics, patriarchies, &c. The same peculiarity is observable in the history of the Waldenses. No instance can be produced, wherein the Baptist churches, either during the apostolic period, or after their separation from the corruptions of the churches, until since the reformation, were confederated into any kind of territorial bodies, or under any external form of central government, or oversight. During the former part of the 17th century, the Baptists in England took it into their heads to try to get rid of the peculiar odium and persecutions, which as Baptists they had suffered. To accomplish this they held general meetings to agree on a *one confession of their faith*; these meetings they ultimately molded into constituted associations, by which

under the notion of *advisory councils* they might keep an oversight over the churches and prevent their showing any departure from the *one confession of faith*, lest they should be charged with duplicity in putting it forth, as Mosheim does the Mennonites. And, as an additional preventative against contempt and persecution, they adopted measures, such as the establishment of schools &c., for having an educated ministry. From this move, associations have become general among the Baptists.

If then brother Ashbrook's enquiry has reference to the case of associated churches, whether they as so associated have a right to put from their connection any church, however corrupt, he has applied to a wrong person to solve it. I know of no better source to apply to on this point, than to the same book, in which they find their authority for being combined into associational bodies, which probably may be the epistles of St. Hermes, or St. Simon the Sorcerer, if such epistles exist. As associations grew out of an attempt by the Baptists to avoid that peculiar persecution, to which they as a peculiar people had been subjected; and were an imitation of what existed among some of the reformed churches, I cannot approve of them; though I would bear with them as I find them among my brethren, for my brethren's sake. Although associations as I find them among the Old School, are shorn of their antichristian power, yet there remains the form of a central control in their constitutional compacts; and I can but think their testimony against the concentrated governments, established among the New School in their Boards, &c., would be less liable to be objected to, were they themselves clear of all appearance of sanctioning human confederacies in religion. Were I, therefore, to express an opinion upon this point, it would be, that churches which find themselves unpleasantly confederated with other churches by any constitutional bonds, should at once dissolve their compact and reinstate themselves in that independency, as churches, in which we find the churches in the New Testament, owning no Lord, but Christ, and no religious ties beyond the church, but those of brotherly love and a mutual interest in the *common salvation*; being free *each* church to act for itself, and show out by its doctrine and practice, what in truth it is, *wheat* or *tare*, a church of Christ, or of antichrist; and each church alike free to recognize another body as a gospel church, or an antichristian combination, according as they may judge that they discover the marks of the one or the other.

But if brother Ashbrook has reference to the action of churches as such, independently of any associational control,

then I would say to him, that he must admit that there is a standard given in the New Testament, by which to test a church, whether it be a gospel church, or belong to that opposing power brought to view in the Scriptures; or that there is not. If there be no such standard or pattern given, then is there no alternative left but for us on the one hand to assume the judgment seat and decide according to our own opinions, who belong to Christ and who do not; or on the other hand, to extend undistinguished fellowship toward everything coming under the name of the christian religion, in doctrine, from Socinianism to Predestinarianism; and in order, from the Quaker to the Papist. But if there be such pattern or standard given in the New Testament, what right have we to acknowledge any body of persons as being a gospel church, unless such body possess the characteristics given in the New Testament of a church of Christ? And even if a true church had once worshipped in any place and had been succeeded by a people corrupt in doctrine and practice, would it not be manifest, that the golden candlestick had been removed? And shall we, when the Lord has done this, persist in calling the succeeding corruption truth, the darkness light, and the mixed mass a candlestick of beaten gold?

But on this point, discretionary forbearance is to be used. A church may be bewitched from the simplicity of the Gospel, as were the Galatians, and yet *life* be there; so that they will bear the word of admonition and return from their wanderings. But if they are deaf to the word and throw themselves into the embrace of strangers, or lose their individuality of action, in any of the confederacies of antichristian benevolence, shall we still consider such a church to be "espoused as a *chaste virgin* to Christ?" II Cor.11:2.

But again, if Scripture prophecy be good authority, there is abundant authority for the people and churches of Christ to stand separated from every branch of Antichrist. What means the voice, *Come out of her, my people*, &c., if Christ's people are not to separate themselves from the antichristian interest? Or whence would war arise between the seven headed Beast and the saints, if all are to be blended in one common fellowship? Why the "woman clothed with the sun," fleeing into the wilderness to the place God had prepared for her? And why the two witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, if the true church was not to separate and be a distant interest from those churches, which by corruption had become antichristian? Rev., 11th & 12th chapters. Whence came the present Romish, Greek and Nestorian churches, but from churches originally planted by the apostles, and being what they now are by corruption? If

the churches of Christ have no right to be separate from corrupt churches, then ought Christ's *dove, his undefiled*, still to have been linked in fellowship and union with the *great whore*, who has her name *Mystery, Babylon the Great*, &c. Neither should there have been any distinct revelation of that *Wicked*, whom the Lord shall "consume with the spirit of his mouth," as a distinct interest from the true churches, if the corrupted and uncorrupted were to be mingled together in one common mass. II Thes.2:8. Or why were the disciples and churches of Christ warned of the coming of false prophets and of antichrist, if they were not to beware of them, and not be deceived by them, &c.?

On a little reflection, on the nature of the two religious interests brought to view in the New Testament, I think, brother Ashbrook will be convinced, that they cannot walk together in peace, until righteousness can have fellowship with unrighteousness and light have communion with darkness. See Amos 3:3 & II Cor.6:14.

With the apostolic exhortation, "Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean," &c. {II Cor.6:17,} I conclude.

S.TROTT.
Nov. 8, 1843.

CONCERNING SIN.

BROTHER JEWETT: - In reading certain communications on subjects which have been, for some time past, agitated in Old School periodicals, I have been struck with the diversity of opinion there appears to be on several general, leading principles. Hence the difference about sin, Satan &c. The principles to which I refer, and which it is my design to examine, may be embraced in the following heads: 1st Sin, 2nd Holiness, 3rd Election and Calling, 4th The ground of Christ's glory as a Savior. These subjects would require, fully to illustrate them, the ample pages of a volume, instead of a few columns in a periodical; I shall of course but glance at them in these communications; though I may give a sketch of what I understand the Scriptures to reveal concerning them.

First: Sin. What is sin? Will the brethren allow the Scriptures to answer this enquiry? If so, the decision is made, that "sin is the transgression of the law." I John 3:4. Not to *love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind; and not to love thy neighbor as thyself.*

Matt.22:37-39. The force of law must arise from obligation to obey. This obligation may arise spontaneously from the nature of things, or it may spring from either voluntary or forced subjection, as in different governments. Our obligation to obey God arises naturally from our relations to him as our Creator, and from what he is in himself. Thus God in giving the law from Sinai, declares his right to enforce it upon Israel, as resting on his having brought them out of the land of Egypt, &c. Exod.20:2. And in giving the covenant of circumcision to Abraham, he required subjection to it on the ground of what he is, "the Almighty God." Gen.17:1. So the obligation of Adam and of all his posterity to obey whatever law God was pleased to prescribe, arose from God's having brought them into existence, and is continued, by his still sustaining in existence, as well as from his being what he is. Hence in reference to the existence of sin in the world, it is evident, that to its existence there should be in existence creatures capable of intelligent obedience, having a law given them, founded upon their obligation to obey and prescribing the test of their subjection; "for where no law is, there is no transgression," and "sin is not imputed, when there is no law." See Rom.4:15 & 5:13. God's creating such intellective beings, and giving them a good law with the certain knowledge that they would by transgressing it become sinners, no more makes God the Author of sin or the fountain, whence it flowed, than would his creating such beings with the knowledge that there existed a wicked spirit, his opposite, which would certainly lead them into transgression; nor that Christ's setting up his kingdom in the world with the knowledge, that it would be the occasion of the enemy's sowing tares, makes him the Author of those delusions and persecutions, with which Antichrist has deluged the world and is overflowing the church *even to the neck*.

Many seem to think, that sin could not have gotten into the world by the good creation of God, unless either God created it, or it had a previous self-existence. These suppositions are contradictory to the testimony of Scripture; they imply, that there *may be transgression and sin be imputed, where there is no Law*. This notion of sin's being an existence by itself, though entertained by good and understanding brethren, is a manifest absurdity. Can we suppose the existence of theft or any other crime without supposing the existence of the perpetrator of such crime? This absurdity of supposing, that sin may exist independently of the existence of a sinner, is not confined to the system of Elder Parker; it is involved with equal fulness in the idea, that God created sin, or brought it into existence in his creation of

intelligent beings. If God brought sin into existence, He must have been the first transgressor, as sin is a transgression of the law; an inference they would shudder at. The Fullerite notion of Christ's having made an atonement for sin abstractly, implies its having an existence distinct from the sinner, equally with Elder Parker's views; and therefore shows the two systems to be much nigher akin, than their respective advocates have supposed.

This notion of sin's having an existence *antecedent* to the transgression of Adam, or of the first transgressor, whether angel or man, and its previous existence being necessary to account for the creatures of God becoming transgressors, implies that man was not, and that angels could not have been, voluntary actors in first transgressing; but must have been acted upon; according to one, man was subjected to it by the creating hand of God, according to others, he was acted upon by the self existent spirit of wickedness. If this had been the case, and man in his original transgression, was not in circumstances to choose his course, with a view to the consequences, and to act voluntarily, he could have been no more justly accountable for the act, than would be your flock of sheep for trespassing on your field of grain, being let in by an enemy or driven in by yourself. God in making man a *living soul*, must have given a mind, *active* in all those powers belonging to the soul, such as those of reflecting, judging, choosing and rejoicing. And I must confess, that for myself, whatever others may be able to do, I cannot conceive of man's being thus brought into existence, as a distinct being, finding himself possessed of a mind to choose or reject for himself, and having individual feelings to gratify, without considering him liable, without any influence from without being exerted upon him, to prefer the gratification of his own will and choice even to that of his Maker's will, unless God, who alone is the fountain of holiness, has been pleased to communicate to him such a holy influence, as would lead him to prefer subjection to the will of God, to living to and for himself, as we see manifested in the holy Jesus, when he said to his Father, "Not my will, but thine, be done." Such communication of a principle of holiness, to man, God was under no obligation to make, in addition to having created him an intellectual, upright being. That man was thus liable to choose to live to himself and for himself, rather than live as the creature of God and the subject of his government, is evident from God having put him under the prohibition of a special command. On the other hand, without such prohibition there had been no transgression. The wise man evidently had

so found the thing concerning man's sin, when he said, "Lo, this only have I found that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Eccl.7:29. There is a reference here manifestly made to what is said in Gen.5:1,2, "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God created he them," &c. So here God made *man* upright; but *they have* &c. *God hath made man upright*, of course he did not create in him any bias to sin; and *they sought out many inventions*, consequently it was *their* own act, the act of the male and female, in seeking out and doing what God had not commanded, but what they chose for themselves. So also says the apostle, "As by one man sin entered into the world." Rom.5:12. The advocates of the existence of sin as God's eternal opposite, have tried to make something out of the expression *by one man*, as though sin came into the world from some other source than man's transgression. If, as I contend, it was man's voluntary transgression that entailed sin upon the world of the human family, I know not what more definite expression to convey that idea the apostle could have used. But if sin was infused into the woman by the serpent, and she communicated it to the man as the cause of his transgressing, then it was by *one serpent*, not by *one man*, that sin entered into the world, whether that serpent was a *created* devil, or a *self-existent* devil.

What has been said of man's liability to choose his own course, or according to the wise man, to *seek out inventions*, may with equal propriety be said of angelic spirits, such as were not elected to be *holy*, only that we know not decidedly what particular command they were placed under as a test of their subjection to God, nor what occasion was given them to show a preference for their own choice over a subjection to God's will, or whether for this they needed such an occasion, as was presented to Adam in Eve's having been deceived, which at once tested whether he loved God best, or his own flesh as manifested in Eve. We however know of the angels, that some of them "kept not their first estate," the condition in which God created them, and which of course was that of uprightness; *but left their own habitation*, of course the one which God had especially assigned to them; for they could have had no claim to it, unless God had given it, unless we limit the Omnipresence of God! Hence we discover a choosing for themselves and a disobedience to God's appointment and a consequent entailing upon themselves *chains of darkness*, instead of light; and this is all that is necessary, to show that angels sinned and what angels as well as men are, left to themselves.

But it may be said, that man is represented as being under the reign and power of sin, which does not comport with the idea of his bringing sin into the world by a free and voluntary act of his own. Herein is where I think brethren, losing sight of Scriptural testimony upon the point, have strangely confounded things which are importantly distinct; namely, the introduction of sin into the world, and the infliction of the penalty of a *death in trespasses and sins* upon Adam and his posterity, in consequence of his revolting against the government of God by eating the forbidden fruit. I have already showed, I think conclusively from the testimony of the Scriptures, that "Sin is the transgression of the law," that sin could have no existence, had it not been that God pleased to create rational, or intellectual beings, &c., to prescribe to them a law or command, as a test of subjection. But the creating man and creating him in uprightness, *unswerved*, and prescribing to him, as a test of his subjection, a command that was *holy, just and good*, is one thing, and was an act of God's goodness and holiness; and God's inflicting upon Adam and his posterity in him the penalty, that was annexed to the command, the penalty of death, or total depravity, is another thing, it is an act of God's righteous judgment. So man's standing as he came from the hand of his Creator upright, in a state that was good is one thing; and his having fallen by voluntary transgression, and being justly condemned to a state of depravity, or subjection to the reign and power of sin, is another thing. And thus the scriptures, I think, clearly represent the case, that man's being under the dominion of sin or in a state of depravity, banished from the *tree of life*, was not the act of God's creating goodness, nor of Satan's power to mar God's good creation beyond himself; but was the act of God's just sentence of condemnation for transgression. The apostle speaks of *death's reigning by one man's offence* and of *judgment coming upon all men to condemnation*. What was this condemnation? Certainly not to the state of the *second death* in everlasting *punishment*, for then all men had been in that state; but to a state of death in sin, of subjection to its power.

Thus the Apostle evidently explains it, in the following verse by the use of different words, when he says, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners," thus clearly and plainly showing that it was not by God's creating power, nor by Satan's infusing himself into them, that the *many were made sinners*, but by "one man;" that is, Adam's "disobedience," being the infliction of the penalty of the command. See Rom.5:17-19.

Thus Adam was made, in the day that God created him, *in the likeness of God*; that is, a correct figure of Christ, with his bride in him and as the head of his posterity. If Adam's act of disobedience, in which he represented *the many*, even all his posterity, had not been voluntary, the Law in justice could not have taken cognizance of it, and the many would not have been "made sinners;" neither would it have corresponded to Christ's voluntary act of obedience by which *many*, even all *his* posterity, *were made righteous*.

Yours, &c., S. TROTT.
Dec. 21st, 1843.

CONCERNING HOLINESS.

Whether those of our brethren, who in supporting their different systems, speak so much of the holiness of heaven, as though it afforded an unanswerable argument against the possibility of angels having sinned, do actually believe that there is a certain region, a *mere locality*, within the bounds of God's Creation, which is so *essentially holy* that sin cannot enter its bounds; or whether they only use it as a subterfuge, by which to confound their opponents, I cannot say. But certain I am, that the scriptural representation of Holiness affords no ground for any such argument, and that the idea is equally absurd with the notion, that there is a certain space, a bottomless pit, somewhere of course beyond God's existence, which is essentially a *fountain of evil* and spontaneously producing evil spirits! Such ideas of sin and holiness, arising from mere localities, set aside everything like a moral distinction between them, and make them mere qualities affixed by *fate*. This doctrine transfers the fountain of holiness from God to the mere locality, called heaven; and carried out it would lead to the conclusion, that God is holy *because* he inhabits heaven, and that Satan is sinful *because* he came from the bottomless pit, or hell. Of course there would be no virtue in the one, nor crime in the other.

In seeking after the Scriptural representation of holiness, we must bear in mind, that in our translation of the Bible, different words are used in relation to this subject. Thus, to convey the idea of making or becoming holy, as there is no English verb, *to holify*, the translators had to use the verb *to sanctify*; as in the text, "Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified, are all of one," &c. The idea is, *both he that maketh holy and they who are holy*, &c. "Holy brethren" is the same as *sanctified brethren*, and *saints* are holy or sanctified

persons &c. So in the Old Testament, the Hebrew word *KADESH* in its various formations is translated *holy, holiness, to sanctify, sanctuary, saints* &c.

In the use of these terms in the Scriptures we find them applied to God, the Father, the Son and the Spirit, to angels, to believers, to national Israel, to the priests as such and to their garments, to the tabernacle and temple, and to the vessels and apartments thereof &c. From this diversified use of these terms, we must discover, that they are used in relation to an external and an internal holiness, a ceremonial or typical and a spiritual holiness. Now if any external holiness, which can be attached to places, persons or things, could effectually bar sin, {and it is absurd to speak of internal or spiritual holiness as if belonging to heaven itself, as a locality;} then surely Nadab and Abihu could not have sinned as they did in offering *strange fire before the Lord*. Lev.10:1. They had just been consecrated to the holy priesthood, as Moses had been commanded to *sanctify* them as priests to the Lord, and as God had said he would sanctify them, or make them holy, to the priest's office {Ex.28:41 & 29:44;} they were clothed with the holy garments and had the holy anointing oil upon them; {see Ex.30:25, Lev.8:30 & 10:7;} and they were in the holy place before the ark of the Testimony; yet they there conceived of offering strange fire before the Lord, *and there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them!* What greater holiness could belong to any mere locality, than was concentrated here? The Lord had manifested his presence in it by his glory filling it, when the tabernacle was reared, and again by consuming the sacrifice of Aaron and his sons; Ex.40:34,35 & Lev.9:24. It may be said, that SIN was then already in the world, and not so when the angels are supposed to have sinned. But it has been showed, that wherever created, living intelligences are, if left of God to themselves, they will think and act for themselves with a special reference to their own individualities. Even believers are not always restrained from the acting out their old nature and wounding their own consciences; though *called to be saints* and have formed in them a *new man, created in righteousness and true holiness*.

The primary idea of the Hebrew word, rendered *holy, holiness, &c.*, is to *set apart, to separate* &c.; not that to be holy we must live as isolated beings, only to and for ourselves, but on the contrary, because that, to be holy, since sin has entered into the world, we must be separated from the world and from its spirit and principles. So in things and persons being sanctified, that is externally, they were set apart to be

employed only in the service of God, according to his appointments; and thus ceremonially were taught the doctrine, that to be spiritually holy we must be entirely subject to God's will as the alone standard of true holiness.

Persons *sanctify the Lord*, not in communicating any holiness to him, as He does to us; but in setting him apart in our hearts and by our acts, as the supreme source of all authority; the one object of our love, trust and reverence, as the fountain of all good &c. Thus Nadab and Abihu did not sanctify the Lord, when they offered strange fire, nor Saul when he reserved of the cattle, because they set up their wills, instead of implicitly being subject to God's declared will. Thus Moses and Aaron did not sanctify the Lord in saying, "Must we draw water out of this rock," instead of ascribing to God's goodness and power the flowing of the water. So missionists do not sanctify the Lord, in resorting to their own plans, instead of trusting in the Lord to accomplish his own purpose of grace by his own appointments; and so of Arminians in depending on their own exertions, instead of coming empty to the Lord to receive out of that fulness that is in Him. And men generally do not sanctify Him, in "loving the creature more than the Creator."

As God's will is the standard of our holiness, so he is the pattern of it. Hence the exhortation, "but as he who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy." I Pet.1:15,16. In all the manifestation which God has made of himself in the works of creation, providence and redemption, there is nothing of selfishness in it, nothing which He needed for himself, to increase his glory or happiness; but everything is for the sake of communicating happiness or good to others. Hence the holiness of the Law in requiring, that "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." God being the supreme good and the source of all good, to love the greatest good, the good of the whole, we must love God; and to be like God we must love our neighbor as ourselves and be as desirous of doing him good and only good, as of doing good to ourselves. Thus the law, if man could of himself have obeyed it, though it would have produced perfect harmony and peace in the world, would have been a constant restraint upon man's selfishness and individuality, and of course kept him in bondage. But as already remarked, I cannot think, that anything short of the communication of a distinct principle of holiness from God to angels and to men, could have enabled them so to overcome their individuality of will and desire, as to

lose that individuality of feeling in a desire to live to the good of the whole. But in the glorious purpose of salvation it is provided for, that saints should be holy in heart by their deriving a new life from Christ in the heavenly birth. This life as flowing from Christ as its Head, and not being an individual creation, but being Christ formed in them, and being ONE SPIRIT in all the saints as they are ONE BODY, is essentially holy, or is the love of God instead of individual love. And so far as this love is brought into exercise in us by the indwelling Spirit of truth, we feel our self-love lost in love to God, and our self-gratification lost in the desire to glorify and obey God, and our individuality lost in feeling that WE ARE NOT OUR OWN and in a desire to feel and act as members of one body with our brethren; to live for the cause of Christ and for the good of others, and to esteem others better than ourselves. And were it not for the new creature's being "made subject to vanity," in having still to carry about our old man and its corruptions, we should reflect fully the image of Christ. Thus also the angels are holy, as I understand it, not only from their being "set apart" in election; but also from the love of God or a principle of holiness being communicated to them, by which their standing is confirmed in Christ, as the Head of all principality and power and HEAD OVER ALL THINGS TO THE CHURCH.

This view of holiness is very different from the Hopkinsian doctrine of "disinterested benevolence;" for that by being placed upon law grounds and being made a condition of salvation is absolute selfishness. But this is the Salvation for which the saints pant; and the standing in which the angels delight.

One point more; ceremonial uncleanness are often referred to in the Scriptures, and to cleanse from them was to *sanctify*. This may be thought not to correspond with the view I have taken of holiness. But I think it does; those uncleannesses being naturally loathsome, were well calculated to show how odious self-indulgences in all their various shapes are to God and to the new man of the believer; and as nothing but cleansing could remove the one, so nothing but an application of the blood of Jesus, can give peace to the believer. As frequent as were the occasions for ceremonial ablution or cleansing, more abundant are the occasions the believer has for applying to the blood of Christ. What a blessed privilege, that we have such an efficacious pool ready invoked, whenever faith is at hand to put us in; and such an Advocate we have with the Father in all our straits, whose intercession is all-prevalent, however impotent we may feel ourselves to be.

May the Lord "sanctify us wholly," that both our lives and our consciences may be freed from the pollution of sin.

The other subjects mentioned, are left for a future time.

Yours, &c., S. TROTT.

Dec. 21st, 1843.

CONCERNING ELECTION & CALLING.

BROTHER JEWETT: - The third subject which I proposed examining is that of Election & Calling. I connect these together in my examination, not because there is not a distinction between them; but because that though *election* is the going forth of God in his eternal purpose, and *calling* is a time act, yet the latter is but a making manifest the individuals embraced in the purpose of election, and is that alone by which the objects of God's electing love, can be known by us in time. Thus the two are connected together in the Scriptures, as in II Tim.1:9, "Who hath saved us; and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." Here calling is according to the purpose of God, and is therefore a manifestation of it. So Jude in verse 1, "Sanctified by God the Father, preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." Thus also the *blessing us with all spiritual blessings*, is "according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world;" that is, in Christ Jesus. Eph.1:3,4. Taking the doctrine of election and calling thus in connection, we shall, I think, find them uniting to lead us to the conclusion, that the purpose of God in Election, has to do with both the headships, Christ's and Adam's; that the subjects of it were chosen *in* Christ as a head, and from Adam as a head. But being aware of the ground on which I stand in this discussion, I shall not leave these positions, without bringing forward Scriptural proofs and illustrations, nor perhaps without a passing notice of an opposing sentiment.

The proof that the elect were chosen in Christ, is at hand, "According as he hath chosen us *in him* before the foundation of the world." Eph.1:4. This is not a choosing them *into* Christ, a taking them out of another head to put them into him as their Head. There was no other headship before him, *In all things he has the preeminence*; being he, who *is before all things*, and by *whom all things consist*, as he is "the head of the body, the church." Col.1:17,18. But if in that nature, in which we were created in Adam as rational beings, the elect were put into Christ as a head, either in their whole nature or

their souls only, it is evident that Adam must have been first *viewed* as a head, and that Christ was afterward set up as a head of those chosen from the predestined Adam. And I cannot understand the views of many in any other light, than as involving such a degradation of Christ as a head. Thus Watts, in these lines, "Christ be my first elect, he said, then chose our souls in Christ our head," implies one of two sentiments either of which I am bound to reject as an error; namely, either that the elect were created without souls in Adam, their souls being created in Christ, and of course that the non-elect are without souls; or else, as before observed, the elect must have been first viewed in their relation to Adam and their souls afterwards transferred by election to the headship of Christ. The election in Christ must have reference to that life, in which the saints eternally existed in him; of which they are born, when born again, and by which they are manifested as his seed and the sons of God.

Christ is spoken of as the *elect*, the chosen of God, but certainly not as God, and therefore not as having in him that life which is the light of men, as *bearing them and carrying them all the days of old*, and being *their dwelling place in all generations, before the mountains were brought forth*, &c. Isa.63:9 & Ps.90:1,2. It is in reference to his being manifested in the flesh, to his humanity that he is spoken of as chosen; it is a part of his *being in all things made like unto his brethren*, {Heb.2:14,17,} that is as his brethren. The children were partakers of flesh and blood, "he also himself took part of the same," so as they in their humanity were chosen out of the family of Adam, he in his humanity was "one chosen out of the people." See Ps.89:19, compared with the following verses to 27. In Isa.4:2, when Christ is called God's *elect*, he is called God's *servant*, which shows, as does the whole connection, that he is there spoken of in reference to his manifestation in the flesh. See also in connection, Matt.12:15-21. These texts, I think, are frequently quoted and applied to Christ in reference to his Headship; I have so quoted them, and thought it a correct application, until looking at them in reference to this subject, when I saw my mistake.

The other branch of my position; namely, that the elect were chosen *from* the headship of Adam; that is, out of his posterity, is more opposed by some of our brethren. Elder Parker and others with him contend, that only the elect were created in Adam; of course they suppose, that God in saving a part only of mankind, is only making a distinction between his own good creation and the devil's progeny. They would thus explain away the Sovereignty of God in election. If there had

been this very rational excuse for *hiding these things from the wise and prudent* and for *revealing them unto babes*, it is a wonder our Lord had not assigned this reason instead of resolving it altogether into the sovereign pleasure of God, as he did in saying, "Even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matt.11:25,26. One of the proofs, which they would draw from the Scripture in support of their position, is that Adam was *made in the likeness of God*, or as Paul explains it, "was the figure of him that was to come." Gen.5:1 & Rom.5:14. Hence they say, that as Christ in being set up had only the elect in him, so Adam in being created in his likeness, must have had only the elect created in him. But Christ was set up with his bride in him, in this respect also Adam was a figure of him, being created with his bride in him; therefore by the same rule by which they come to the other conclusion, Eve must have been the church, the Lamb's wife! But this theory of theirs is altogether a new one, that a *figure* or *likeness* must be the very essence of the thing prefigured. Carry this out through all the types of the former dispensation, and where would it lead us? Aaron in officiating in the priest's office was a type or figure of Christ, the blood therefore of bullocks and goats, which the presented must, according to this theory, have been the blood of Christ, the holy place, into which he entered, must have been heaven; and the twelve tribes of Israel, whose names he bore on his breast-plate and on his shoulders, must have been the very people represented by Christ. Such ideas of the figures of Scripture, in which natural and earthly things are made to represent spiritual and heavenly things, are preposterous. Adam truly was created in the likeness or as a figure of Christ. 1st. In being created male and female with Eve in him, as Christ was set up with his church and all its gifts and graces in him. 2nd. In being created with a posterity in him, as Christ eternally existed with the elect in him, in that life, of which they are born, as the sons of God. But whilst Adam was thus a figure of Christ, there is this vast difference between them, the one was of the earth, *earthy*; the other *is the Lord from heaven*. And so of their distinct posterities, *that which is born of the flesh, is flesh*; and *that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*.

Again, Elder Parker and those with him, attempt to prove their position, that only the elect were created in Adam, by God's declaration to the woman, that he would greatly multiply her sorrow and her conception. Though God claims the prerogative to himself alone, to give this multiplied conception, not allowing the *serpent* any part in it, his words being, "I will greatly multiply," &c., yet as some writers on that

side still persist in ascribing that *multiplied conception*, somehow, to the Serpent's influence, though reminded, again and again, that God asserts his own authority in the case, I will propose some queries for their consideration.

First, Did God's original purpose of peopling the earth include in it the existence of all who have lived or shall live upon it; or did it not? If it did not, is it not manifest that he has changed his purpose, and is therefore a changeable Being; and hence that the doctrine of predestination cannot be maintained? If God's eternal purpose did include the existence of all who have lived, was his declaration to the woman anything other, than that of carrying out of that purpose? If God did originally purpose the existence of all mankind, did he not in finishing the work of creation in six days, provide for their being brought into existence in the creation of Adam? If you deny this, is it not incumbent on you to show wherein he made such provision? Or will you say that he left his work unfinished? Again, as we have God's testimony, that Cain, who gave as full evidence, as any have given, of being a seed of the Serpent, came into existence through Adam's intercourse with Eve, and therefore must have been seminally in the loins of Adam, {Gen.4:1,} if then he was not originally created in Adam, must he not have been either an after production of God, or in some way communicated by the Serpent? In either case, is it not evident, that God did not *make of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth*, and that the Apostle, therefore, bore a wrong testimony in Acts 17:26? In a word, brethren, if you admit the truth of the testimony of Scripture, that the heavens and the earth *were finished and all the host of them* in six days, and that *on the seventh day God ended his work*, and in that day *rested from all his work which God created and made* and that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," Gen.2:1-3, and Acts 17:26, must you not give up your notion of the non-elect's not being created in Adam, and of their not being represented by him in his *one offence*?

I now proceed to the proof that the elect are chosen out of the posterity of Adam. And 1st, We are told, that "by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners," and that "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" &c.; further that "by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom.5:12,18,19. *And so death passed, &c.*, is there not a meaning in this word *so*? Is it not equivalent to *in that way*, or by that means; that is, that *by the means of sin's entering by one man, death has passed*

upon all men, &c.? The Apostle is clearly sustained in this by the history of the affair. God said unto Adam, in consequence of his transgression, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." This together with the whole sentence which God passed upon him {Gen.3:17,19,} has been visited upon all the family of man, excepting Enoch and Elijah. Is it not then a plain revelation of Scripture, that the sentence of death, under which all the generations of men have returned to dust, was passed originally upon Adam? And hence, that as the sentence of death, passed through Adam upon all mankind, and death only passes upon them, because *they have sinned*, is it not equally a manifest Scripture doctrine, that all the human family were *made sinners* through Adam's one offence, and therefore were represented by Adam as a head?

Now, if in the face of the above testimony any will persist in denying, that all on whom the sentence of death has passed, and who were therefore viewed as sinners, were represented by Adam as a head; is it not manifest, that they prefer human speculation to God's revelation, seeing that they can show no declaration from God that there was any other head, through whom any part of mankind were made sinners and were sentenced to death? Seeing then, that as far as God's revelation is received as a guide in the matter, it is so conclusively evident, that all who are sinners and who die, came under this condemnation to depravity and death in consequence of their connection with Adam, as a head; and as, from the same revelation, it is so evident, that the elect were chosen to salvation, and therefore were foreknown as sinners; it is clear that the elect are of the posterity of Adam. And further as it is equally evident that some *die in their sins*, and who therefore are not of the elect, but who as above showed must be of Adam's posterity, it is demonstrated, that the elect were chosen *out of Adam's posterity*; that is, that whilst some who were represented by Adam as a head, were chosen to salvation, others thus represented were passed by and left to die in their sins. That the elect were chosen to salvation, and were therefore viewed as sinners, see II Thes.2:13, "Because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation," &c., and I Pet.1:2, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

In saying that God viewed the subjects of his Election as sinners, I do not wish to be understood as asserting, that the creation and fall of Adam and his posterity, was first in the purpose of God. But I say this, that God in *predestinating his*

people to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, in the same eternal purpose, predetermined their existence in an earthly nature, and therefore their creation in an earthly and fallible head, and through that head, their being left to fall and to be brought under the power of sin or depravity, that they might be objects of salvation, and through their salvation be delivered from under the law and be raised to the freedom and all the privileges of sons and heirs of God. Which had the precedence in the purpose *according to which they are saved*, the choice of the individuals who were to be born of God, or the determination to leave Adam and his posterity to become sinners, God has not revealed, and is not important for us to know.

Corresponding with the above proven position, is the uniform revelation of God concerning his election. Thus Christ says to his disciples, John 15:19, "But because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world," &c. If by the world is here to be understood Adam's posterity as such, then of course their being chosen out of it shows, that some of that posterity were not chosen. Or make the *world* here to mean the Jewish nation, or what you please, the disciples being chosen out of this world clearly proves them to have been of it, and some of that world not to be chosen, or not of the elect. Again our Lord, speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, that very people, to whom he said on another occasion, "Behold, your home is left unto you desolate," Matt.23:38, said, "Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the *elect's* sake those days shall be shortened." Matt.24:22. So that there was, or still is, an *elect* to come out of the chaff of that nation, that very chaff which in itself was to be *burned with unquenchable fire*. Matt.3:12. Hence as an *elect* is to come out of that *valley of dry bones*, that nation after being pursued for ages with this *unquenchable fire*, what other conclusion can we come to, than that the elect and the non-elect are, according to the flesh, all of one blood, of one people? Thus the Apostle in Romans, the 9th & 10th chapters, speaking of those Jews who were *going about to establish their own righteousness*, and who were *cast away*, speaks of them as *his brethren*, his *kinsmen according to the flesh*, as the *seed of Abraham* &c., and prays to God for them that they might be saved. Surely the Holy Ghost had never revealed to him anything of that distinction between the elect and non-elect which it is said has been discovered to Elder Parker; namely, that the elect were created of God in Adam, whilst the non-elect are the devil's progeny or were brought into existence through sin; or he

would not so have lamented over the fall of that people. But again Paul instead of wishing to set aside the sovereignty of God in election, delights to hold it forth in its clearest light. He brings forward the strongest possible figure to illustrate it, and to show that the difference between the elect and non-elect, is only what the *purpose of God according to election* has made. He takes the case of Jacob and Esau, children not only of the same parents, but also of the same birth, and shows that the decision of God concerning them was made before the children *had done either good or evil*, and before they were born. Again he brings to view, as illustrating this subject, God's declaration to Moses, saying, "I will have mercy, on whom I will have mercy," &c. So also Rom.11:5-7, where he shows, that the remnant which were saved, was *according to the election of Grace*, not according to God's creation in Adam. And further says, "the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded." Paul thus makes the whole distinction to rest in the sovereignty of God in election; very different his view from the notion, that the distinction consisted in one part's being God's *good creation* and the other the serpent's seed.

If we look at the *Calling* of God, as presented to view in the Scriptures or manifested in experience, we shall find it to be *not according* to our works, but according to his own *purpose and grace* which was given us *in Christ Jesus before the world began*, therefore not in the creating us in Adam in the garden. It also shows that God is *no respecter of persons*, pays no regard to any natural or fleshly distinction. Hence the hope brother Jewett, that you and I have of being called of God; for when we came to see ourselves, we saw no fleshly distinction between us and those who were still indulging in sin, excepting that we felt ourselves more vile and *brutish than any man*; and that we inherited nothing from Adam, but sin and corruption.

As was Abraham called out from his own country and his kindred, {see Heb.11:8, compared with Acts 7:3,} so are the elect all called by grace; instead of being called to cleave to their father Adam's house and his portion, they are called to *forget their own people and their father's house*. Psal.45:10.

In conclusion, it appears evident that, according to the revelation given in the Scriptures, the elect were chosen in Christ, not in Adam; that the election runs through that life which they derive from Christ, and not through that earthly life which was created in Adam. But that, as for the greater display of the glory of God, in multiplying the enjoyments of this life, by its being communicated to many individuated and crested beings, it was his purpose to create those individuals in an

earthly and fallible head Adam; so those individuals {the elect,} were of him *chosen to salvation* out of the mass of individuals, which he in infinite wisdom and goodness {however it may appear to us} purposed should proceed from his creation in Adam. These chosen individuals were from everlasting foreknown as being manifested in time, as members of Christ's body, by being born of that life that was set up in him, the head of it, and were thus loved of God from everlasting and preserved *in Jesus Christ*, not in Adam. Christ's Bride being thus viewed in him, as the *fulness of him*, and as formed in her distinct manifestation out of him – not as she was created in her members in Adam – as being spiritually his body, his flesh and his bones {being thus the antitype of Eve,} was without *any spot in her*, and a *chaste virgin*. See Eph.1:23, 5:30 & I Cor.12:12; also Song 4:7. Thus the priests under the Law, more fully to typify Christ, might marry only a virgin. Lev.21:7,13,14. But the individuals of Adam's posterity who were thus *predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ*, viewed in their relation to Adam, had to be redeemed and justified from the demands of the law, through Christ's being made under the law and a *curse for them*.

I think I have succeeded in showing, that according to Scripture revelation the elect have stood related to two distinct heads; that from the one head, Adam, they have derived nothing but what is common to all mankind; namely, individuality, depravity and death; that from the other head, Christ, they have derived everything, which distinguishes them from others. Until therefore our Western brethren can show us from the same authenticated revelation of God, to the contrary, they surely must be willing to abandon their notion that the distinction between the elect and non-elect, originated or exists in God's creation in Adam, instead of existing in his everlasting love and sovereign purpose according to election in Christ Jesus.

Yours, &c., S. TROTT.
January, 1844.

THE GROUND OF CHRIST'S GLORY.

BROTHER JEWETT: - The 4th and last head, which I mentioned, as a division of those subjects, on which there appears to be an important difference of views between us and some of our Western brethren, is *The ground of Christ's glory*, or *that which constitutes his glory as the Redeemer*.

If I can understand the import of the arguments used by those brethren, they suppose the GLORY, which accrues to the Son of God from the work of redemption, to be altogether such as earthly conquerors derive from their conquests; the more powerful the foe subdued, the greater the glory in conquering him. Thus Elder Parker, in his views of the *Two Seeds*, pg.12, says, "Notice and remember, that, when a king or power makes great preparations for to accomplish a small object, it argues and proves weakness and ignorance; and as this character cannot be attached to the Divine Being, we cannot fall on any better plan to form an idea of the greatness and power of the devil, than to take a view of the Almighty God of heaven and earth exerting his divine properties in the redemption of his people, *for his own glory and the overthrow of Satan and his kingdom.*" After other remarks to the same point, he comes to this declaration: "But just bring our minds to Christ, his servitude in this world, his agonizing pains in the garden, his shameful and awful sufferings, his crucifixion, his resurrection and ascension; not a groan, not a drop of blood in vain. O think of this with the sufferings of saints, and providence of God, from then till now, and ask your common reasons as well as the revelation of God, *has all this and a great deal more been done just to defeat an immaterial spirit or two?* O this would be a contemptible idea of God." From these quotations it is manifest, that he considers the redemption of the elect and the defeat of Satan to be one and the same thing; that is, that their redemption consisted in conquering the devil and delivering them out of his hands. Hence the argument in favor of Satan's greatness, from the greatness of the power and exertions to redeem the elect. Also he makes the *glory of God and the overthrow of Satan and his kingdom*, as intimately connected. Elder Paxton to the same effect says, {W.P. Baptist, No.15, pg.231,} "What! Can we properly appreciate the great power and wisdom of God in his all-conquering Son, for overcoming a mere creature, which he, the Son, must have created in less time than a minute!! I would as soon think of enlarging a giant for overcoming an infant not a week old." Brother Crafton also seems to have imbibed the same idea; for in reply to Elder West's letter to him, {W.P. Baptist, No.16, pg.245,} he says, "And whether Jesus Christ in conquering and destroying the devil and his works, will have the glory and honor of destroying an enemy indeed, or only of subduing a revolted subject, made by and for himself to war with," &c. Again he speaks of the Scriptures, representing in glowing colors *the transcendent glories of the Son of God in delivering his captured people from the*

corrupting influence of the power of darkness and destroying the works of the devil. It appears to me, that those brethren have suffered themselves to be so carried away with the whim of trying to extol the greatness of their *self-existent devil*, as to be led to degrade and carnalize the great and glorious work of redemption into a mere war of conquest between God and Satan, and the glory resulting to God and Christ as being only commensurate with the great prowess of their enemy, Satan. If such be the case, I have certainly hitherto read the Scriptures in ignorance. I have understood the purpose of Christ, in coming into the world to be to *redeem* his people, not from the power of Satan, but from *curse of the law* and from under the law, that they might "receive the adoption of sons."

In my exercises, my convictions were, not that Satan had the power over me, but that I was a transgressor of God's Law and depraved in all my faculties. And if ever I knew the joy of believing in Christ, it was that he had taken the law-place for such poor sinners as me, had magnified the law, brought in an everlasting righteousness, and expiated the guilt of sin by the shedding of his own blood, so as to bring us to God. And surely, if our western brethren would look to the time when Christ first appeared to them the *chiefest among ten thousand*, yea as *altogether lovely*, they will remember that it was on other accounts, that he thus appeared to them, than *merely* as having displayed his power in conquering Satan.

But in coming to the point, as to what is declared in the Scriptures to be the design of Christ's coming into the world, we read in I John 3:8, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil." Again, in Heb.2:14, we read, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him, that had the power of death, that is, the devil," &c. By a first view of these texts, without any reference to other parts of scripture, we might suppose, that the devil had gotten the elect somehow into his power, and that what was necessary for their deliverance was to conquer him, as our western brethren, if I understand them, represent the matter. But when we look at other parts of Scripture, we find that it was under the law of God, that they were holden, and that being transgressors of it in Adam, *the judgment had passed upon them*, in common with others, *in condemnation*; and therefore sin reigned over them and in their mortal bodies, and they were under the sentence of the Law, *dead in* – not to –

trespasses and sins. Hence, to redeem them from under the Law, to bear the curse in their stead, and to become "the end of the Law for righteousness" to them, was what he had to perform, to accomplish their deliverance. And such the Scriptures abundantly represent his work to have been. Thus Christ says, "Even as the Son of man is come, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many," certainly not to the devil, but to the law of God. Matt.20:28. But is there a contradiction between those passages above quoted from I John and Hebrews, and the other parts of the Scriptures? Certainly not. By turning again to I John 3:8, we find the former part of the verse read thus, "He that committeth sin, is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose," &c. Hence we can readily perceive, what John means by *the works of the devil*; namely, sin; and by comparing this with Heb.2:14, we may understand what is intended by destroying *the devil* as having the *power of death*. We cannot suppose with any propriety, either that the Son of God undertook to destroy the existence of the devil, or that the devil ever had personally the power of *death*, that is, the control of it so as to visit it upon whom he pleased and when he pleased; or to release from it at his pleasure. But if we understand this text according to the one in John, that is, the devil here spoken of as personating his works, *sin*, and sin to be represented as his *works*, because he sinned from the beginning; that is, he first transgressed, for sin is a *transgression* of the law; and that he first beguiled the woman to transgress, we shall then find it harmonizing with other Scriptures and the general doctrine of Redemption. Thus sin is represented as having power to bring death, as in Rom.5:21, "That as sin hath reigned unto death," and verse 12, same chapter, "wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world and *death by sin*, and so *death passed upon all men for that all have sinned*." Thus as it is plain, that *death comes by sin*, so it was sin that Christ was manifested to destroy, in reference to his people; that is, in taking it away by the *offering of his body once for all*, Heb.10:4-14, and in *saving his people from their sins*. But from whence did sin derive this power of reigning unto death? Was it a power which the devil independently possessed, and which he of his own will imparted to sin over the human family? Certainly not, for on this principle the devil could kill as fast, as God could create. But as Christ said to Pilate, "Thou couldest have no power against me, except it were given thee from above;" {which he said with all the sins of his people charged to him,} so it might be said to Satan.

The power of sin to *reign unto death* over the whole human family, as was showed in treating of Sin, was given to it of God as a judgment upon man for his transgression, and was but an infliction of the penalty upon Adam, as a public head, annexed to the prohibition; "For in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Gen.2:17. Hence "the sting of death is sin; and *the strength of sin is the law.*" I Cor.15:56. This leads to a very different conclusion from the one, that the object of God's sending his Son into the world, with all its preparatory and attendant circumstances, was to measure power with the devil and conquer him, thereby to redeem the elect. It leads us to the certainty, that it was the immutable Law of God with its incurred curse, which was to be met, satisfied and honored, for the redemption of his people from under it. And certainly his being able to deliver sinners from the curse of God's unchanging law, and raise them above its demands, by a perfected redemption, even to the privilege of being sons and heirs of God, whilst he magnifies and makes honorable the law in all its demands, is a far greater manifestation of Christ's Almighty power to save, than could have been given by his measuring lances with Satan and conquering him. When the devil had the impudence to meet Christ Jesus, face to face, Christ had but to say to him as to his vassal, "Get thee hence, Satan," and the devil quailed before him. But when he came to meet the law with its sword of eternal Justice awakened up, we find him agonizing in the garden under a view of *the cup given him to drink*; yea yielding unto death before it; yea as standing in the law place of his people, Immanuel was weak to resist the demands of the law, and *was crucified through weakness*, II Cor.13:4, *yet he liveth by the power of God*. Having by his death satisfied the sword of Justice, conquered death, removed the curse of the law and redeemed his people from under it, He arose victorious, *was declared to be the Son of God with power*, and manifested as "ABLE TO SAVE TO THE UTTERMOST all that come unto God by him." The parable of the *strong man armed*, Luke 11:21,22, appears from the connection to refer to Satan; and by the figure he is represented, not as a self-existent being, but as a creature, the figure being that of a *man*. He considered himself secure of a dominion over the whole human family, being armed, as he thought, with the penalty of the law holding them in a state of death in sin. This penalty Christ by his death took away; thereby stripped Satan of his imaginary dominion over the elect, and *divided his spoils*. By this we must understand, that the elect and non-elect were in Satan's estimation alike his *spoils*.

Thus in redeeming his people from under the curse of the law, Christ completely destroyed the works of the devil; that is, not only, as before observed, took away sin from his people, but also overturned all the malice and arts of Satan, from his beguiling Eve on to his entering into Judas, to his own confusion, and to the accomplishment of God's glorious purpose of salvation. In this work of redeeming his people from under the law, the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ was fully manifested. No created being could have come into the law place of others and redeemed them, because every creature is bound to obey for himself; God has a sovereign, an unalienable right to his service, from his being his creature. If you are already a bound servant in your own person, it would be absurd to offer your service to your master, as a substitute for the release of a fellow servant. But our Lord, being Jehovah, and therefore dependant on none for his existence and accountable to none, could voluntarily undertake in behalf of others; and by coming into their law-place, *being made under the law*, and taking this legal nature, this humanity, into personal union with his Godhead, could by his obedience magnify the law and take the curse out of the way, and thus take from death its sting and power to hold its captives, and deliver the *lawful captive*.

The *lawful captive*, {Isa.49:24,25,} cannot mean a captive to Satan, he having no legal right to make God's creatures captives. But they having transgressed God's righteous law, God, as the rightful Judge, had an undoubted right to assign them over to captivity under sin or depravity, according to the requisition of his law; and being thus under judgment *to condemnation*, they stand prominent, as the prey of God's *terrible* wrath. He who could thus deliver the *captive from the mighty* and take the prey from *the terrible*, must be GOD ALMIGHTY; and not only must he put forth omnipotent power, but must exercise an infinitude of goodness, of love and humiliation, in coming *under the law* and being *made a curse* for sinners. Thus the true glory of the Son of God, does not consist merely in his having put forth omnipotent power, nor in his destroying an enemy, but in his putting it forth for the salvation of rebel, ruined sinners. How infinitely brighter is this glory, which encircles the brow of our Immanuel, than any which could be reflected by the mere conquest of a contending power! The holiness, the infinite love and goodness, which led Him, who was rich, *to become poor*, who was *in the form of God* and thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*, to make *himself of no reputation* and as a servant to become obedient unto death, that he might save vile sinners from the merited

curse of the law, and raise them to be participants with himself in heavenly and eternal happiness and glory, is that glory which he showed forth as *the Only Begotten of the Father*; that *glory* which he had with the Father before the world was, and with which he is glorified in his risen humanity in seeing of the travail of his soul and bringing his loved, his redeemed, his heaven-born bride home to partake of that during, holy happiness, which is of the Father reserved for her. When we contemplate the Son of God as *crowned with such a glory* as this; how trifling, how insipid appears the attempt to swell the devil to a self-existent, independent power, that Christ might have the glory of trying prowess with him and conquering him!

It appears to me, that these Western brethren in their whole advocacy of the *Two Seed* system, mistake the occasion, or, if you please, the necessity of the putting forth of the power and other attributes of the Godhead in the great work of redemption. For they represent, whether they so intend or not, this most glorious display which God has made of himself, to be from an occasion entirely out of himself, yea to be from a necessity laid upon him by the independent existence of an opposite being, in order to carry out his purpose in spite of the opposition of this enemy. Or if they say, "No; that God foreknew the existence of this enemy, and that he would intrude upon his creation, {which by the by is a positive absurdity, which they have never attempted to meet, that God should actually know what an independent being, who acted of and from himself, would do, when in fact this being could not have willed thus to intrude, until he knew of the existence of an occasion,} still it would leave the purpose, which God purposed in Christ Jesus to have been dependant on the voluntary action of this self-existent and self-acting being! Take which view they please of it; it cannot be made to correspond with the declaration which God made of himself to Moses, when he said, "I AM THAT I AM." Ex.3:14. The Psalmist says, "He that is our God, is the God of salvation." Hence, as to be God, is to exist, to will and to act sovereignly and independently, salvation must be, from the original occasion and purpose of it, with all its provisions unto its ultimate accomplishment, all of God, the result of His infinitely wise and sovereign choice. The occasion was God's goodness in choosing to bring into existence beings, and to raise them to a happiness and glory, in nearness of likeness to and communion with his glorious and holy self, which as mere creatures, however upright they might be, they could never attain, or participate in. The plan embraced those provisions, which are adapted in infinite wisdom to the communication of

the greatest good and happiness; such as the creation of these chosen vessels in a natural head, leaving them to fall in him by transgression and become sinners, that they might be proper subjects of the redemption and thus be raised above the accountability and servitude of the law of their creation, even to the privilege of sons; whilst the evil of their depravity as leading them to will and act for self-gratification, is contrasted with the infinite goodness of God, as manifested in the gracious purpose of the Father, the humiliation and sufferings of the Son for them, and the gracious teachings and indwelling of the Holy Ghost as a Comforter; and whilst from Christ, as their spiritual Head, is communicated to them spiritual life, in which they discern and delight in the *good*, and know and abhor the *evil*.

But what can we who dead in tenements of clay, know of the purpose and plan of God in what he has declared? We do know, that other beings are brought into existence through the putting forth of God's creating power, and by his understanding, and are left to depravity and to consequent banishment from him and to misery. How the goodness of God is to be manifested in their being brought into existence, beyond that of communicating to them the pleasure of existence, we know not. But we do see enough of his goodness in creation and providence, in making the curse, with which he visited the earth for man's sake, a temporal blessing to man, in giving him employment instead of idleness; but more especially as showed in the work of redemption, to know that he is good, infinitely good; and therefore we must know that the existence of the wicked is for the greater good, or they would not be permitted to exist; though we cannot tell *the why and the wherefore*. And here it is our prudence to leave it.

Yours, &c., S. TROTT.
January, 1844.

THE BEASTS AND THEIR IMAGE.

DEAR BROTHER MEREDITH: - Having seen yours addressed to me through the ADVOCATE, on the subject of prophecy, I proceed briefly to notice it, at this time; though I have not your communication by me, my April number not having come to hand.

In reviewing my former letters on the "Beasts and their Image," the first point, on which you suggest a different view, is in reference to the second Beast, the two horned beast. Your idea appears to be, that the established church of England is

that beast, and hence that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of York are the two horns. My opinion was and still is, that this Beast represents the whole body of the Reformed, or Protestant churches, in all their subdivisions, including the church of England, all retaining the rudiments of the first beast, in retaining *infant baptism*, and in having been in themselves, or in those churches from which they came out, in one way or other, established by law. As the Lutheran church in some of the states of Germany, on its first formation; the Presbyterian church in Geneva and since in Scotland, and the branches of the Scottish church being but branches of that establishment; the Episcopal church in England, and the Methodists being but a branch from that, and so on of others. Hence as Luther and Calvin were the two distinguished leaders of the Reformation, I have considered them as intended by the *two horns*. Luther as being the *horn* or leading power of all those churches, which are but reformed branches of the church of Rome, retaining many of the ceremonies and forms as originally established in that church, such as the Lutheran and Episcopalian churches. And Calvin as being the *horn* or leading power of all those churches, which are built upon the principle, that there is no specific and binding form for the order and government of churches in the New Testament, but that these things were left to be changed and molded according to circumstances and the judgments of men; he having first taught this notion of church government, and carried it out in contriving and adopting the Presbyterian form of church government in his church at Geneva. Both of them also aimed to make their churches national establishments.

If I were to conclude, that any particular church was designed by the two horned Beast, I should as soon think the Episcopal church, and its branches to be intended, and Henry the VIIIth the one horn, and John Wesley the other; for if Wesley's church as a distinct horn of this beast has never been established by law, it is evidently aspiring after it in this country, and is manifesting a great deal of worldly wisdom in managing to get a control in civil affairs, wherever opportunity offers. At any rate, this church gives strong evidence of being the legitimate offspring of her *mother*, the church of England, and of her grandmother the church of Rome.

Your suggestion concerning the idea I had advanced, relative to the *life* to be given to the *image of the beast*, that it might refer to an establishment by law in this country, has certainly much weight in it. Such a combination of Church and State would in truth be a beast. And from year to year there are fresh developments, showing that this Image can have life

in our country without any special Law, establishing a union between it and the civil government. We see it in the manner in which the actions of religious bodies are trumpeted forth in the political and miscellaneous papers. The awfully delusive ceremony also of *taking the veil* among the Catholics, is sounded forth with great seeming applause. And the proceedings of Conventions, missionary Meetings, associations, and even the discourses and prayers of individual preachers on special occasions, are taken down and reported for the newspapers; the same as the proceedings of legislative bodies and political meetings, as though they were all of a class. Some occurrences took place recently in the House of Representatives, showing how these things stand in the American Congress.

In the discussions on the Army Appropriation Bill, Sat., March 29th, Mr. Pettit, from Indiana, moved to strike out the Section providing for the pay of chaplains of the Army, on the ground that the Constitution forbids all interference in religion, and that whilst such was the provision of the Constitution, the government was paying annually for religious purposes \$35,341.99, according to a statement from the Secretary of the Treasury; also that it was taking money from one class of persons to pay for the teaching of the religious sentiments of another, &c. But this brought down against him such a storm of denunciations, without one to back him, that he withdrew his amendment. It was denounced as Fanny Wrightism, as the Atheism of France &c. One thanked his god, that there was no chance in an assembly of gentlemen in this enlightened age for the adoption of such a resolution. Again in the discussion of the same Bill, Thurs., April 4th, Mr. Holmes of S. Carolina, the very man who thanked his god in the above case, offered an amendment to the effect, That no officer or private soldier in the Army of the U. S., shall be compelled to attend any public worship when the doctrines of the church to which he may be attached are opposed to such worship. He offered this, he said, on the ground that Catholics had frequently been compelled to attend on the worship of Protestant chaplains, and in some instances had been punished for refusing to attend. Mr. Hale of New Hampshire proposed to amend the amendment by striking out the latter part, so as to forbid absolutely their being compelled to attend religious worship. He assigned for the reason of his amendment the following; that, The Constitution of the U. S. provided that Congress should pass no law respecting the establishment of religion, and believing that Congress had no power to compel anybody to attend any form of religious worship, he was opposed to the latter part of

Mr. Holmes amendment and therefore had proposed to strike it out. That religion {he said} was true and acceptable, which came from the heart; and hence he was opposed to religion being a part of the soldier's drill. The christian religion did not depend on the aid of the sword or of legislation, and he was in consequence, opposed to its being made a part of military discipline. Mr. Hale here, I think, expresses the most correct views of true religion, that I have ever seen as advanced in Congress; it give me therefore peculiar pleasure to notice it, as coming from the state of my nativity. Mr. Hunt of New York, regretted that a proposition had been offered to the House which could serve as a pretext for the exhibition of blasphemy and the ridicule of the christian religion, to which they had been compelled to listen to from the gentleman of Indiana {Mr. Pettit,} whose remarks are not reported any further than that he spoke in opposition to a soldier being compelled to go to church at all. Mr. Hale's amendment was negatived and the proposition of Mr. Holmes rejected; so that the soldiers may still be compelled to attend public worship just where the commanding officer pleases, and that by the sanction of Congress; and religion is made a part of the soldier's drill, in order to make good soldier's according to the usage of the ancients, as expressed by some of the speakers.

Whilst Congress can legislate in this way and sanction such enforcement of religious worship, there is no need of a special law incorporating religion with the government. The same principle may carry them any length to enforcing a particular form of worship. It might have been added, that Mr. Carroll also of New York, took high ground in favor of enforcing religion upon the soldiers.

In reference to brother Meredith's request for my further views on certain prophecies, I would inform him that my present feelings on the subject of prophecy, brought about, probably in some measure, by being disappointed in the calculations made concerning the Turks, are that the fulfillment of every prediction, is in safe, unerring hands; that our speculations on them, or seeking to understand them before hand, any further than God may for wise and gracious purposes be pleased to give his people to understand them, cannot alter the accomplishment, nor profit any one. So far as prophecies which yet are not fully accomplished, in all their predictions, are fulfilled in some parts, or are being fulfilled, we may with propriety compare the events with the predictions, and thus trace the accomplishment as it progresses. Thus we may see the Ten-horned & Two-horned beasts and their Image, standing before us, and things

apparently nearly ready for the accomplishment of the prediction that "no man may be allowed to buy or sell, save he that hath the mark or the name, or the number of the name" of the beast. The causing, "all, both small and great, rich and poor, to receive a mark in their right hands or in their foreheads," is evidently now progressing rapidly before us. Of these things we may with propriety speak; and so of other events as they transpire, we may watch their progress, and examine and speak of them as we discover their conformity to prediction and their place and period in prophecy. But in reference to events and periods which are manifestly yet future, I repeat, that it is safest, and most conformable with that *wisdom which is from above*, to leave them with God, who will accomplish everything in its place and season.

Yours with Christian love,
S.TROTT.

Centreville, Va., May 1, 1844.

CHRIST'S BEING MADE UNDER THE LAW

EXPOSITION OF GALATIANS 4:4 & 5.

BROTHER JEWETT: - I saw in the *ADVOCATE & MONITOR* for June 1844, the request of brother Lowe of Missouri for my views on Gal.4:4 & 5. "When the fulness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." But various circumstances have occurred to prevent my complying with his request till now.

The main points, I presume, of Brother Lowe's enquiry, are in reference to *redeeming them that were under the law*; and as to *the Son of God being made of a woman and made under the law*. But in pursuing these enquiries, others at once arise; namely, whether Paul is here treating of the law given from Sinai, or some other law. And if of the Sinai law, whether the Gentiles were ever under it. The term *law* is used in the Scriptures in other senses than that of denoting the commandments, which God gave from Sinai; but in such cases the term is generally accompanied with some other identifying expressions. The definite expression, *the law*, as found in this text, I believe uniformly refers to the Sinai law. But should any doubt as to this being the law the apostle is speaking of, a little attention to the context will, I think, if they are candid

examiners, convince them of the fact. Beginning with the 3rd chapter, where Paul commences this particular argument, we find him in verses 2 & 5 contrasting the *works of the law* with the *hearing of faith*; here I presume none will dispute his meaning the law which was given by Moses. In verse 10, he asserts, that "as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," and quotes from Deut.27:26, with a little variation of expression, in confirmation of this assertion; thereby showing clearly, that he is here speaking of the law of Moses. He then in verse 13 says, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Thus showing, that, in order to redeem from the curse of the law, He was himself made subject to the curse, of course must have been made subject to, or under the law that cursed, and that law, as proved above, was the Sinai law, or law of Moses. Here then is proof positive, without going further, that the law Christ was made under, was the Sinai law. But Paul goes on further to declare, that the law he is speaking of, was given *four hundred and thirty years after* the promise made to Abraham. What law will this apply to but the Sinai law? Surely I should think then, that this point is established beyond doubt.

And yet an objection is raised, in opposition to this proof, to the idea that the Sinai law is intended; because it has to be admitted that, if that law is intended, it would prove that both Jews and Gentiles are under it; and the expression, *them that are under the law*, would involve, they say, the idea that all of both *Jews and Gentiles* are redeemed. Hence it is supposed that some law, which the elect alone are under, is intended. But the truth is, the Apostle is not here treating of the extent of the redemption, but of *the occasion* of the redemption, that they who were redeemed had been under the law, and that they were redeemed, that they might be delivered both from the curse and servitude of it. And the expression, "*them that were under the law*," is not more general, than Paul uses in that *faithful saying* of his, "That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," I Tim.1:15; nor than the words of our Lord, that, "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke 19:10. So that I think this objection cannot militate against the proof we have showed.

We now pass to the other enquiry; namely, Whether the Gentiles were ever under the Sinai law. As above noticed, the establishing of the fact that the Sinai law is here intended, establishes also the point that the Gentiles are under it; else they had no part in that redemption, which God sent forth his

Son to accomplish. But Paul writing to the brethren both at Ephesus and at Colosse, Gentiles of course included, connects them with himself in saying, "In whom we have redemption through his blood," &c. Eph.1:7, Col.1:14. And in the connection of our subject, chapter 3, verses 13 & 14, he speaks of Christ's being *made a curse for us*, &c., *that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles*; thus showing that the "curse of the law" stood in the way of the Gentiles experiencing the blessing of Abraham. And in chapter 4, verses 6 & 9, he says, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts," &c., "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son," &c. What can the Apostle mean here but to show these Galatian brethren, that they were interested in the redemption just spoken of, as evidenced by their receiving the spirit of sonship or of adoption, and that they ought not, therefore, any longer to consider themselves servants under the law? But as the law was given to national Israel, the difficulty with some is, how the Gentiles could be under it. In the mere letter, as a national covenant, the law was given exclusively to national Israel, and in that covenant form, it had nothing to do with the Gentiles, but to bar them from the worship and privileges which belonged to Israel; it was a separating wall between the two. This *wall of partition* Christ, by his crucifixion, *broke down*, so that the Gentiles now stand on the same footing with the Jews, as to the privilege of having the revelation of God's will published to them; and as to acceptance with him. But under the light of the Gospel, the law is manifested as a spiritual law, emanating from God who is a Spirit, and having a demand upon man as a rational being, having a soul as well as body alike derived from God. Hence it shows, that nothing short of loving God with all the heart, with all the soul and with all the strength, and loving his neighbor as himself, is righteousness before God; and it proclaims that a falling short of this, in any point, is sin, and subjects to "the curse of the law." As our Lord informs us that all *the law and the prophets hang upon this* obligation thus to love God and our neighbor, it is evident this obligation existed before the giving of the law, and therefore was not limited by that *wall of partition*. Indeed the Decalogue is but a transcript of this obligation, illustrating its nature by distinct acts. Hence, "until the law, sin was in the world." As the letter of the law was proclaimed indiscriminately to all Israel; to those that fell in the wilderness, as well as to those that entered the promised land, showing the same standard of national righteousness to the one as to the other, and pronouncing the same thing to be sin in the one case, as in the other; so the law in its

spirituality, is under the Gospel proclaimed alike to Jews and Gentiles, to those that perish, and to those that afterwards believe, as the one standard of righteousness, and that by which is the *knowledge of sin*. Hence Paul says, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." Rom.3:19. According to Paul then, *them who are under the law* include no less than *all the world*.

Paul, in his figure of the *schoolmaster*, and of the *heir being a child* &c., seems to me to refer to that collective body of Christ, in which there is *neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free*, &c. The childhood state of this body, or church, had its existence in the type, in the natural seed of Abraham, having the Messiah in it yet undeveloped. In this state it was in servitude "under the law," differing nothing from a servant; the law as a schoolmaster enforced its instructions by the rod; and *tutors and governors*, the priesthood, were enforcing and expounding the requisitions of the law, and directing the conscience. But since Christ, the object, the *author and finisher of faith*, has come, the church is no longer under a schoolmaster. He has taken the hand-writing of ordinances, the Sinai covenant, *out of the way*, and the church is brought into the liberty of sonship. But in the second place, as the body and members are one, and therefore the travel of the church and of the individual members correspond, so Paul shows by the same figures the experience of the elect in their quickened state; and how, when *faith is come*, or given, they have Redemption through Christ's blood, and receive the Spirit of God's Son. But the elect in their state of unregeneracy, like others, are *aliens*, living as *having no hope and without God in the world*. Eph.2:12. Whatever educational knowledge they may have, they are like Paul *alive without the law*. But when quickened by the Spirit, like Israel when brought out of Egypt, they are put to work under the law, and *differ nothing from a servant*, toiling to obey and to be accepted upon their obedience; but are only learning more of the broadness of the law, of the infinite purity of that God they have to do with, and of the depth of their own pollution and depravity; so that the Law is continually wasting them and their hopes, as Israel was wasted in the wilderness. And like them they frequently murmur saying, "Behold, we die, we perish; we all perish; whosoever comes anything near unto the tabernacle of the Lord shall die." Or thus, "Wherefore have ye made us to come out of Egypt to bring us into this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates; neither is

there any water to drink." Num.17:12,13 & 20:5. Thus, though the law does not *bring* them to Christ, as the translators make the passage read, Gal.3:24, by adding the words *to bring us*; yet it was *unto* or *until* Christ; that is, it held its dominion over them, until they were stripped of all hope, condemned and just ready to be in justice forever banished, and thus made to know themselves to be in that desperate case, as to be just fit objects for the display of God's mercy, and of the power of Jesus to save; and when faith comes, they see that the salvation by Christ is just fitted and adapted to the case of such polluted, ruined, helpless sinners, as they are. By the application of this salvation they find themselves delivered from the law and brought into the relation of sons to God.

But probably, owing to the many speculations which have been set afloat by man's wisdom, brother Lowe may want to know my views concerning Christ's being *made of a woman* and *made under the law*.

First: The expression *made of a woman*, as well as that used by the Angel, {Luke 1:35,} "that holy thing which shall be born of thee," forbids my believing, that the body of Jesus was a super-human or previous existence, which dwindled itself down to pass through Mary in the form of a child. I believe, the child Jesus was born of Mary, the fetus receiving its nourishment and growth from her, the same as any other child is born of its mother. Some have objected, that as Mary was of the same depraved stock with the rest of the human family, if the child Jesus was made of her or received its growth from her, it must have partaken of her depravity. But not so; the depravity of the human family proceeded from Adam, not from Eve, and is therefore communicated by the father, not the mother. Besides, the depravity or sin is not inherent in the mere flesh and bones and blood of the body, that thing which was born of Mary, these in depraved man are *instruments of unrighteousness*, as Paul speaks; but it has its existence in that principle of life, which animates and gives life to *that thing* which is born of the woman; and this principle of life which in ordinary cases is communicated from the man, was, in the case of Jesus, the immediate and uncontaminated production of the Holy Ghost, which came upon her. So then, though Jesus was made of a woman, he was *holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners; not conceived in sin*.

Second: Christ's being *made under the law*, at the same time that he was "made of a woman," shows that he was made a *rational being*, and therefore we have proof in this of the error of another speculation; namely, that what was as a soul to the body of Jesus, was a preexistent being, which was the

beginning {or first} *of the creation of God*, and which had existed from before the foundation of the world, as the Head and Representative of the Church or spiritual body of Christ. Now we know that the law has nothing to do with irrationality; that it was prescribed to man as a rational being, as having a soul or mind, as well as an animated body; Christ therefore in being made under the law, must have been made such a being. His assumption of a mere body could not have constituted him any more under the Law, than he was before. The declaration that he *was made flesh*, which is quoted to support the other notion, evidently means, that he was made man in distinction from his antecedent existence, as "the Word," and having that life in him, which was the life of men, and which he had as the Head of that life; just as the same term is used, "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit." It may be said, that Jesus in his human body existing in union with his preexistent life, rendered him as much a rational being, as though he had had a human soul. Admitting this to be so, {of the correctness of it, however, I have no means of judging;} there is another difficulty, Christ as the Head of his people and fountain of that life, which manifests them as sons of God, was not like Adam, set up under the law, but under that everlasting covenant *ordered in all things and sure*. This life never in the members, and of course never in the Head, for Christ is it, was in a state of servitude under the law, but always in a state of sonship; it is the Spirit of God's Son. Gal.4:6. He therefore, to come into the law place of his people, must be *made of a woman and made under the law*. In conformity with the idea I am contending for, it is written that, in taking upon him the form of a servant, he *was made in the likeness of men*, Phil.2:7; he must of course been made with a soul as well as a body like men. In Rom.8:3, we read of God's sending forth his Son *in the likeness of sinful flesh*. There are other sinful beings, as I believe; namely, the devils; but as the design of the Son of God was not to represent them, "he took not on him the nature of angels;" and sinful flesh is not to be found, except as it exists in personal union with a human soul. Christ therefore, to be in the *likeness of sinful flesh*, must have flesh in union with a human soul. But more clearly, if possible, to the point, we read in Heb.2:17, that "in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren." Now, his brethren exist as perfect men having souls and bodies, besides having the spirit of Christ, the spirit of God's Son, or Christ who is their life in them. The Son of God therefore, to be *in all things made like unto his brethren*, must not only be the Head of spiritual life,

and as their Elder Brother have it in common with them as brethren, but he must also be a complete man having a human soul and body, and therefore human passions, though not swayed by depravity. Being such, he could know what his brethren suffer in mind, as well as body, from being tempted; and having been in like manner tempted, he knows how to *succor them* and have *compassion* on them. And having a human soul, he could know and feel in soul as well as body, the condemnation and curse of the law; and thus feeling it, he said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Matt.26:38.

Christ being thus made fully under the law, and being at the same time one with his people in that life of which he is *the Head*, and they are the *members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones*, he could fully represent them under the law; and being their Elder Brother he could claim the right to redeem according to law; and being at the same time God and having *all the fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in him*, He by his obedience could and did completely cancel the demands of the Law upon his people; and becoming the *end of the law for righteousness* unto them, he removed every barrier, which the law could present, out of the way of their being brought experimentally to a oneness with him, and to participate with him in the privilege of being sons of God and in the glory, which He had with the Father before the world began.

I have thus given my views on those points in this text, which brother Lowe most probably had in view. If there are other points which I have not so particularly noticed, on which he wishes my views more fully, and will signify the same through the ADVOCATE & MONITOR, I will try, if spared, to satisfy him.

S. TROTT.
Sept.6, 1844.

THE PARABLE OF THE WHEAT & THE TARES.

BROTHER JEWETT: - I send you my views of this parable, as found in Matt.13:24-30 & 36-40. It is one among the many which our Lord used, to teach the nature of his kingdom and the events which should be connected therewith. And "without a parable spake he not to the multitude," that the prophecy {Ps.78:2} might be fulfilled. See verses 34 & 35 of this chapter. These parables were designed for the instruction of

his disciples in every age, but to the Jews they were like tongues, for a sign.

This parable he declares is a similitude of *the kingdom of heaven*, saying, "The kingdom of heaven is likened," &c. From the different applications, which have been made of this parable, it seems important to examine the import of the expression "the kingdom of heaven." It is a term repeatedly used by Matthew, and I believe only by him of all the New Testament writers; a corresponding as used by the other evangelists, is the *kingdom of God*. This kingdom of heaven or kingdom of God, evidently relates to the new dispensation which Christ was bringing in. Hence the preaching of John, as well as of our Lord, was, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" that is, it is about to be set up. Matt.3:2 & 4:17. This idea of the setting up of a distinct kingdom by the Messiah, answers to the prophecies going before; as in Dan.2:44, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a Kingdom, which shall never be destroyed," &c. See also Isa.32:2 & Micah 4:7,8. This kingdom of the Messiah, or *kingdom of heaven*, is not of this world; "My kingdom is not of this world." John 18:36. It was to be set up in the world; hence Christ says to his Father, "I pray not, that thou shouldst take them out of the world," &c., and adds, "they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. John 17:15,16. This he says of the subjects of his kingdom. God had set up a kingdom in the fleshly Israel, but that was a kingdom of *this world*; those who were born of the flesh were the subjects of it. Not so of this *kingdom of heaven*; "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." That fleshly kingdom was ultimately given to other people, but this kingdom shall *not be given to other people*. Dan.2:44. In the former kingdom, God ruled over his subjects by external laws, written on tables of stone; in this spiritual kingdom, God reigns in the hearts of the subjects; his Law is written *in their hearts*. Hence Christ says, "the kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation, for behold the kingdom of God is within you." Luke 17:20,21. Hence it must be manifest, that this kingdom of heaven is peculiar in its nature, and therefore what is distinctly said of it, we are not justifiable in applying to any of the kingdoms of this world.

Elder Parker applies this parable to the introduction of sin into the world, making the *good seed* to represent the *elect*, as created in Adam; *the tares*, the non-elect and as such the seed of the serpent. He thus makes the parable a similitude of the world in its natural creation, instead of Messiah's kingdom to be "set up" in the world. And in so

applying it, he makes the similitude rather a riddle, than a parable, as being a representation of things past instead of things to come. Again, others have given an application of this and similar parables to the Jews. But the Jewish dispensation had long been, instead of being about to be manifested, or *being at hand*, when John commenced his ministry. Besides, that dispensation was earthly and carnal, instead of being heavenly and spiritual, as the Scriptures point out the distinct character of the other. But this is confounding the kingdom of Heaven with that which was earthly, and Christ with Moses.

I must therefore, as I said before, understand this parable as having a distinct reference to the Gospel dispensation, or that kingdom which Christ set up in the world. Considering it as having this application, we will notice, First; *The Field*. In the parable it is said, *in his field*, {verse 24.} In the explanation given by Christ we are told *the field is the world*, and the *Son of man* is he who sowed the *good seed*, {verses 37, 38.} So that the Son of man, he who was manifested in the flesh, claims the world as *his field*; that in which he was to accomplish the great work of Redemption and Salvation. Indeed it was *created by him and for him*. Col.1:16. When *the earth* and all the inhabitants thereof were dissolved, *he bore up the pillars thereof*, {Psal.75:3,} and that for the sake of the elect; here they must be born and *born again*, and power was given him *over all flesh*, that he might give eternal life to as many as the Father had *given him*. Into this field he sends forth his laborers; and here he is accomplishing the whole purpose of God in giving occasion and opportunity for the *man of sin*, or the tares to be fully developed and thereby, as by contrast, showing the glory of his religion, the riches of his grace and His power to save.

Second. *The good seed*; these are *the children of the kingdom*. Verse 38. The preached gospel is represented as seed in the parable of the sower, verses 3-8 & 18-23 of the same chapter. Again, Christ represents himself as seed or wheat sown, when he says, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." John 12:24. But in this case our Lord expressly declares, that "the good seed are the *children of the kingdom*;" and so of course we must understand it. And who are more definitely "the children of the kingdom," than the apostles? As seed, when sown, is scattered over the field, so Christ sowed his twelve Apostles in the field of the world, sending them forth into all the world, &c.; and hence he says unto them, "I have chosen you and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit and that your fruit should

remain." John 15:16. And they have been bringing forth fruit unto this day, in the believers and gospel churches which have been growing up from their testimony or gospel. For it is through a belief of the gospel which they testified unto, that persons are brought into the liberty of gospel grace; and it is through a belief in and submission to the order which they established, that gospel churches have grown up.

Third. *The tares*. These are the *children of the wicked*; the translators add the word *one*, "the wicked *one*," hence the word is printed in italics. I know not, that the passage needed that addition from them. I am inclined to believe, that by the *wicked* here is meant the same as by "that wicked," in II Thes.2:8; namely, the *man of sin*, or that antichristian interest, which should grow up in the world. The original word here rendered *tares*, is supposed to mean a plant, which much resembles wheat in appearance until the fruit be formed; and so the words of the parable clearly imply. The seed of this plant when mixed and manufactured with wheat, is said to be hurtful. The tares therefore not only prefigure, but also strikingly represent that hurtful interest, which began to be manifested even in the apostles' days, and which has grown up from another gospel than the gospel of Christ, and is in its branches the product of those "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves as the apostles of Christ." II Cor.11:13. They assume to be believers in Christ and churches of Christ, growing up among them and for a time not distinguished from them, until they begin to bring forth their fruit of opposition to the truth and order of the Gospel. Instead of resting in the truth, in the doctrine of the apostles, they receive and advocate *the doctrines of devils*; having many systems. He, that sowed them, is the *devil*, hence Paul represents those false apostles as Satan's ministers, II Cor.11:15. He instigated those persons to be disciples of Christ, and filled their imaginations with falsehood or false doctrines, and induced them to preach "their dreams" for the doctrine of Christ, and thus multiply disciples to their imaginary gospel. Satan set this interest afoot, as an enemy; thinking by the plausibility of his systems to drown the truth; or to render it and those, who adhere to it, odious, as contrasted with his flattering doctrines, and so to cause the truth to be perverted and put down. He sowed *these tares whilst men slept*. These false systems have generally been disseminated imperceptibly and the churches have slept over them, till they have been awakened by the awful inroads made upon the truth and order professed by the church, and the strong party, formed in the church against that truth and

order, having ripened are sowing their fruits of bitter opposition.

Fourth. The enquiry of the servants, "Wilt thou that we go and gather them up?" and the answer, "Nay, lest whilst ye gather up the tares ye root up also the wheat with them." We are here to bear in mind, that the field is not the church, but the world; and therefore the direction here given interferes not with that discipline, which the New Testament enjoins on the churches, such as to "Put away from among you that wicked person." &c. It may be asked, whether the churches and servants of Christ have ever had power to root up or destroy the antichristian interest in the world. Not to any great extent. They might however had they not been restrained, have applied to the governments under which they lived, to put down these false interests and thus have manifested a persecuting spirit. To guard the disciples of Jesus against indulging in such a spirit, this instruction is here given. It is the nature of tares to supplant and root out the wheat; but the wheat yields to such encroachments upon it, rather than having a tendency to root out other plants that get among it. And herein is manifested the spirit of the Gospel, in distinction from Antichrist, as being of a yielding, and not of a persecuting nature. Where we see men disposed to put down by worldly force those, who differ from them in religion, or to use any other weapons against them than the sword of the Spirit and a faithful gospel testimony, there is not the spirit of Christ; he *came not to destroy men's lives, but to save*. In the second place, this instruction of our Lord may be designed to show the tendency of a persecuting spirit; it knows no stopping place short of entire uniformity. It may begin with *tares*, but it will soon attack the *wheat*. The early professing church began with persecuting the Arians and other like sects, but it soon turned the army of Constantine against the Novatians and Donatists; because they would not fellowship the corruptions of the popular churches, in receiving members and restoring those, who had fallen away on account of persecution. So the recent persecutions in our country raised by popular excitements, have commenced with the Mormons and Catholics; but let O.S. Baptists look for the sequel. When we reflect, that so murderous an excitement could be raised against the Catholics in Philadelphia, and that a grand jury taken from that intelligent community, could be found to *excuse*, in their presentment, such excitement, on the ground that the Catholics had provoked it by contending for equal religious rights with the Protestants in reference to the public schools; and if at the same we consider how odious we, Old School

Baptists are to the popular religionists on account of our opposition to their principles and measures, and also how far the public mind has been already excited against us by the degrading, opprobrious descriptions given of us by the popular party, we shall be satisfied, that not much more will be needed than Benedict, Peck & Co.'s perverted historical account of our religious character, and that generally circulated, to prepare the public mind, throughout the country, for as bloody an excitement to be raised against us, as was raised against the Catholics in Philadelphia.

In the third place; there may be some wheat entwined among the roots or branches of the tares, which may or may not as yet have put forth the blade; this of course would be rooted up with the tares, if they were pulled up in this state. That is, there may be some of the elect yet in the loins of those who are manifested as tares, or there may be yet some of the children of God intermixed with the antichristian professors, without discovering their error, consequently were the one destroyed, the other would be involved in the destruction. But preparatory to the harvest each will be ripened, so that each may be distinguished. Hence the prophetic declaration, "Come out of her, my people." &c. Hence the Lord's time is the only safe time to gather *the tares* to burn. Let us then beware of encouraging the putting forth of any legal or popular force for putting down any religionists as such.

Fifth. *The harvest. This is the end of the world.* Dr. George Campbell, in his translation, has the "conclusion of this state," instead of the *end of the world*; and in his Notes he says, he renders the word, here used, *conclusion*, in distinction from another word which more definitely signifies the *end* or *termination*. At any rate, the general range of prophecy and Scripture declaration, seems to require that, by the expression *in the end of the world* as here used, we should understand rather the concluding period, than the final termination of the world in its present state. For I think, we are clearly taught, that at the final termination, Christ shall come a second time in Person; whereas in this case he only sends "his angels." Besides his Second Coming is to receive his saints to himself, raised and changed into his likeness; and this before the resurrection of the non-elect; but in this case the *angels* are to be sent to *gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, &c.*, which appears to correspond with the destruction of the *man of sin* and the whole Antichristian interest, and which evidently is to take place before the termination of the world. See Rev. from 14th to 19th inclusive.

Sixth. *The reapers.* These are *the angels*. This corresponds with Rev.14:17-20. I see no reason, why we should not understand by the angels, in this case, those spiritual beings, which are *sent forth to minister to them, who shall be heirs of salvation*. Gospel ministers certainly cannot be intended here by the term *angels*; for it is not the province of such to destroy the wicked, or to inflict those judgments upon the antichristian interest which are denounced against it, and which, I think, are here intended. The *furnace* here spoken of, corresponds with the *wine press of the wrath of God*.

As there are repeated instances, mentioned in the Scriptures, of angels being employed in executing the purposes of God in providence, both for good to Christ and his people, and for evil to their enemies; I see not why we should not believe, that God still employs these invisible spirits in accomplishing those special dispensations of his providence, which are manifestly beyond the agency of man. I certainly need not stop to prove, that angels were employed in acts of kindness, as in delivering Peter out of prison and other instances; but the idea of those pure spirits being employed in executing evil, may not be so readily received; I will therefore notice some instances in point, recorded in Scripture. Their being employed in pouring out the *seven vials of the wrath of God*, is fully in point. Rev.15:6-8 & 16th chapter. When our Lord said, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" Matt.26:53, he evidently intended to convey the idea of their being given for the purpose of defending him against those who would take him. It was an *angel of the Lord*, that smote the camp of the Assyrians, II Kings 19:35. It was an angel of the Lord also that smote Herod, Acts 12:23. The angels spoken of, Psal.78:49, being called *evil angels*, may denote the character of those angels sent among the Egyptians, as being such as had not *kept their first estate*, or they may have been called *evil* from their being sent to inflict evil on Egypt, though for good to Israel. In either case it shows the employment of angels in the administration of God's providence. Any person, who can believe that, in either of the above cases, mere human beings were intended by the term angels, must be able to believe more without proof or reason than I can.

Seventh. *Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.* This corresponds with Isa.30:26, "Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the

breach of his people and healeth the stroke of their wound." This I think, has special reference to the restoration of the Jews and their conversion; and also corresponds in idea with Zech.12:8. These texts thus show that the *moon*, the church, is yet in this world to be clothed with the full and perfect light of the gospel, and therefore to *shine forth as the sun*; and so of course will the righteous.

The above are what I conceive to be the leading ideas taught in this parable. And thus understood, it unfolds the nature and origin of those systems of religion, which have accompanied the Gospel and gospel Church thus far, in their spread in the world; and which, whilst they have assumed to be the gospel, and their votaries have claimed to be believers in Christ, they have no real affinity to the Gospel and gospel churches, and are therefore destined to be burned.

Yours, &c., S. TROTT.
December, 1844.

REGULATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES.

BROTHER MEREDITH: - Please to bear with me a little in noticing your communication, in the Advocate for Feb.1845. You may not have had any particular circumstance in view, but may have merely designed to notice a too great neglect of the command of our Lord, laid down in Matt.18; if I had supposed this to be the case, I should not think it necessary to notice your remarks; but your mentioning *ready-to-halt* men, has led me to think you had some special object in view, and that you have rather misapprehended the subject, and therefore that the carrying out your position, in that case, might occasion an *ism*, or *schism*, or *division* too nigh home to yourself to be pleasant.

In the first place; according to the broad application which you give to the precept in the 18th of Matthew, and if the supposition, under which I write, as above noticed, be correct, you are, my brother, culpable yourself. Have you not occasionally access to those brethren, who you suppose have gone to an *extreme of severity*? And have you not neglected to pursue that course toward them which you so correctly point out as the proper one, that is, I mean, the proper one in the cases to which that rule applies?

But the truth is; that rule was never designed to embrace the whole course of church discipline; if it had been, we should not have found other directions given on the subject

in the New Testament; and the holding it in that light by so many, tends evidently to produce a looseness of discipline in many churches in reference to several important subjects. For instance, brother Meredith and myself may be members of the same church, I may broach some new idea upon the resurrection, virtually denying the resurrection of the body, and consequently of Christ's ever having redeemed the bodies of his people, or his being able to preserve the body with the soul and spirit blameless unto his coming. You think it is an important error, you believe the Scriptures plainly teach that the bodies of the saints are to be raised in a glorified state, and that Christ is able and faithful to save, wholly and fully, all that the Father hath given him. But how are you by any course of consistent reasoning to make this error of mine a trespass against yourself? The word is, "If thy brother shall *trespass against thee*." I break none of your bones, by advancing this error, nor bruise your flesh; neither do I take away your liberty to think for yourself or to advocate your own views. And I am certain, that your christian humility would not allow you to assume the ground that you have authority to think for others, and that they are bound just to take your opinion as theirs, and therefore that in thinking for myself, I was transgressing against your authority. How then would you make it a trespass against yourself? You cannot in any way without assuming to yourself that judgment which belongs alone to the church collectively. What then is to be done? Why, you believe it to be a trespass against the faith of the church and the cause of Christ, and as a faithful brother you bring the case directly before the {earthly} *judgment seat* of Christ, the church. The church on examining my views and comparing them with the standard, pronounce them heresy, and admonish me of it; they find me persisting in it, they admonish me again, I still persist, they reject me; that is, exclude me. Thus we find a rule, that meets the case, and that without one individual's undertaking to pass a judgment upon the faith of another member, which Christ has vested only in the Church the right to do. See Titus 3:10, 11. And why, my brother, is this rule to be rejected more than the one in Matthew 18? Christ did not deliver it in person, but delivered it through one of his apostles; it therefore emanated from the same divine authority with the other. If we had no other rules given, for the regulation of the gospel churches, than what Christ delivered in person, we should come very far short of having a full pattern. He did not deliver his apostles a body of rules, and send them forth with their lessons ready learned, for the whole campaign; as our modern, theological students go forth; but

they were as dependent on him from time to time, for a revelation of his will, to meet the various circumstances that occurred, in planting and setting in order the churches, even as we are to understand what they have delivered as his revealed will; so that the words of Christ were equally true in reference to them with all their gifts, as they are in relation to us, that "Without me ye *can do nothing*." John 15:5. Christ commanded his disciples to "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," &c. We find them {Acts 2,} teaching & baptizing, but we find something more, about which nothing is said in the commission; *there were added to them*, that is, to the apostles or church. Now do you not believe, that this adding to the church is equally binding upon the disciples in after ages, as is the teaching and baptizing? So far as the Commission went, it was necessary as authority for them to go forth; and when the Lord gave efficacy to their word, the Holy Ghost was present to guide them as to the next step after baptism. So the rule in the 18th of Matthew was necessary for the disciples in their then state, as it is for the disciples in all ages. Christ therefore then gave it to them. But, it was not till after churches were formed in full gospel order and liberty, that cases could occur directly against the church and cause of Christ; and as they occurred, the apostles were by inspiration empowered to give the necessary rules, and did give them. And if you can tell, why the churches are not under as much obligation to act in obedience to those rules in the cases to which they apply, as they are to observe that in Matthew 18th in its proper place, I would like to know.

As I have supposed the case of a denial of the resurrection, I will remark, that brother Blakeslee in his generally excellent communication in the same number of the ADVOCATE, on the resurrection, has suffered, I think, his modesty to carry him so far as to say that, "While I feel no disposition to charge with heresy or unchristianize any of my brethren who may differ from me on this subject; believing that the faith of some in this matter may be overthrown by some means {doctrinally considered} while the grace of faith still remains unmoved," and quotes II Tim.2:13 perhaps he meant 18. As to unchristianizing, if he means by that the excluding them from the benefits of Christ's atonement, neither individual members, nor the churches have anything to do with it. "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them that are his." We have no means of judging what degree of heresy a person may embrace and yet be a subject of grace. And yet I think it would puzzle

brother Blakeslee to reconcile his above quoted position with I Cor.15:16,17, "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, *your faith is vain*; ye are yet in your sins." With regard to charging with heresy, if brother Blakeslee meant by his remarks on that point simply that he felt no disposition to set himself up individually to denounce as heretics, brethren who might differ with him on this point, I have not so much to object, excepting that I would wish he had expressed himself a little more definitely. But taking the whole of the above quoted sentence together, it is certainly calculated to convey the idea, that in his estimation, a denial of the resurrection of the bodies of men, is not to be accounted a heresy, and therefore not a proper ground for church discipline; but that the subject is to be treated by the churches, as one of those measurably harmless differences of opinion, which may occur without breaking fellowship. If this was the idea Brother Blakeslee intended to convey, and if it is to be the position taken by the O. S. brethren, those who believe in the resurrection of the bodies, I for one, and I think some others, would like to know it. From the view I take of the subject as presented in the New Testament defined as it is, and with the involved consequences of a denial of the resurrection of the dead so fully expressed, if it does not show such denial to be a heresy, I feel prepared to defy anyone to prove any specific sentiments, by the New Testament to be a heresy, excepting an actual denial of the Lord Jesus Christ, or that he has come in the flesh. I may not be able to define why so much more stress is laid upon this error than upon some other errors noticed in the New Testament. But this is another thing. Has the apostolic decision been delivered on the subject, and have they decided that a denial of the *resurrection of the dead* subverts the very foundation of a believer's hope, the resurrection of Christ? Then upon O. S. Baptist principles, the churches are bound to be governed by such decision, whether they understand the whys and wherefores or not. And if they are bound earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints {Jude verse 3,} then certainly that which overthrows *the faith*, which they are thus to contend for, {II Tim.2:18,} is not to be winked at as an indifferent thing. It is true, that for taking this very stand in former discussions on this subject I have had many hard things said of me by O. S. brethren, have been charged with having been in a *pet*, with being too *ensorious*, with aiming to lord it over the faith of others, or as one expressed it, to condemn all who would not hew to my line &c. But so long as I have the apostolic decision so manifestly on my side, I ought to be contented. If the

judgment thus passed upon me is just, I of course would wish to submit, and if it is not just, I stand at the judgment seat of one who can reverse it at his pleasure; and so I would leave it; but still as the blame of harshness and bitterness was principally laid on me at the time in the controversies had, when I see the thing referred to by brethren with censure, as I occasionally do, old nature, like the worm when trod on, will squirm in spite of me. But excuse me, my Brother, for this digression, and I will return to your communication.

To return back to examples and rules of discipline, given in the New Testament, we find in the 15th of Acts, that when certain men which came down from Jerusalem to Antioch, taught the brethren that except they were circumcised &c., that Paul and Barnabas instead of dealing with them according to the 18th of Matthew had public dissensions and disputations with them; and when the matter could not be settled among them, an appeal was made to the apostles. So you know the New and Old School Baptists were once connected together in churches and associations, and when *new measures* were first introduced among us in our Associations, we had to combat them publicly till we had much dissension and disputation, and when we appealed to the apostles; or their writings, and asked them to show us one precept or example for the measures they would force upon us, and they refused to abide by the decisions of the apostles, we were bound by the command of the apostle in the name of his Lord Jesus Christ, as given II Thes.3:6, to withdraw from them, and by the same rule to withdraw from others, who though not having gone into their measures, refused to withdraw from them. And having withdrawn from them, we could no longer recognize them as brethren or as disciples of Christ. In fact they have gone on from step to step, like the first Beast, to show the marks of the *man of sin*, sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. As 1st, The gospel dispensation is the *kingdom of God*, and He of course has the sole and sovereign right of establishing all the rules and regulations concerning it; but they, as God, have assumed the right to set aside some of the regulations made of God; and to establish other rules and regulations, both for the government of churches and for the proclamation of the gospel. 2nd, The gospel is the gospel of God, and of course is of his revelation. But they, as God, have set aside his revealed Truth, pronouncing it not fit to be preached, and his ministers, as not qualified to preach; and have substituted another gospel of their own device and preachers of their own qualifying and calling. 3rd, The Holy Ghost, the Comforter, is sent of the Father in Christ's name;

but they; as God, pretend to dispense with his operations in many things; which are his peculiar prerogative; and to command his presence and influence at their own pleasure in other cases, as in getting up revivals, &c. Now it must be self-evident, that we cannot both be right, we in depending, entirely on the God of heaven to do his own work, and by his own power, and in his own way and time, to accomplish his own purposes; and they, *as God*, claiming to accomplish God's purpose of salvation in their own ways and time. If we are right, they are diametrically wrong, and so of the opposite. Hence we infer, that in truth no man can fellowship both them and us, as the kingdom of Christ, and therefore we cannot fellowship those, who can profess fellowship with the other interest. And herein, my brother, is where I suppose you have misapprehended the subject.

You say, Have we not heard it said, that ready-to-halt men are as bad as, if not worse than, an avowed enemy or arminian? I will not say that you have not heard this said, but to my recollection, I have never heard it said; neither have I ever seen the disposition manifested by my brethren to treat that class of persons in that light. I have heard it said; and have said it, that middle-grounders are worse than the avowed New School. The latter we know where to find, the others we do not; the one class manifests more moral honesty and courage in avowing their sentiments, than the other does in keeping dark. But these are a very different class of persons from those properly denominated ready-to-halt. These ready-to-halt are such to be sure; as are wanting in fortitude to face the enemy, but they have an understanding of and a hankering after the truth; and though they will not come fully into the ranks, they will flow after and generally try to keep in sight of the army; and you will see the soldiers, instead of driving them from them as enemies, occasionally falling back with them in their march and trying to encourage them to persevere and to come into the ranks as *good soldiers* of the Cross. And sometimes they have for a time been deceived with the middle-grounders, thinking them to be of the other class, and have thus been friendly with them, till they have found them out as spies or pilferers.

The middle-grounders are of three classes. 1st, Those who are missionists in the general extent, but do not approve of camp and protracted meeting excitements. 2nd, Those who advocate Bible, temperance and domestic mission societies, but go not to the full length of missionism, and profess to preach sound doctrine. They go just far enough into popular measures and preaching to escape reproach, but not so far as

to be very expensive in money contributions. The 3rd class are principally preachers with certain adherents, that they lead. These, though they may not be theological students, have studied, as their guides in preaching, certain old Baptist and other authors, called sound; hence their preaching passes for sound preaching. They are from circumstances connected with the O. S. Baptists in associations, but manifest by action no wish to be with the O.S. preachers at meetings, associations &c., except merely to attend the association to which they are connected, and then are with their wives, rather than with their brother preachers, and give clear manifestation, that if they could only get a call and comfortable location among the 2nd class of middle-grounders they would gladly shift their connection. Yet, when thrown into company with decided O.S. brethren, they are very friendly and tender, but give you to feel that there is a certain dignity of age, station, &c., which they claim. On the other hand, when they meet with middle-ground preachers, and they seek such meetings, they are very friendly with them, calling them brothers, and telling them that, though they are among the O.S. they do not go with Beebe, and that class in their abuse of others, but wish to be sociable with others; and they take every occasion, where they can do it without reproof; for abusing the SIGNS and the O.S. preachers for their harshness in preaching &c.

Now, Brother Meredith, how is it possible, when we see persons pursuing the above course, and that for years, that we can have any confidence in them or in their heart attachment to O.S. principles? Can we with consistency extend the right hand of fellowship to them, whilst they are showing their attachment to those, who are building up the interests of the *man of sin*, they themselves helping, in trying to destroy the force of our testimony, calling it abuse? Christ says, "He that is not with me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt.12:30. So that he admits of no neutrality, no middle-groundism in his cause. If we are wrong in our Old School stand, others need not wish our fellowship. If we are right, and sustained, as we are, by the New Testament, we cannot without going wrong extend fellowship to those, who are seeking the friendship and welfare of another interest. Paul speaks of certain "false brethren," who were unawares brought in, and who came in; privily to spy out their liberty &c. They dealt very summarily with such, not going to the 18th of Matt. in the case, but not giving place to them by subjection even for an hour. Gal.2:4,5. Why ought we not to follow their example with such characters, when they become manifest? In quoting some of the words from Galatians, chapter 2, I have

placed a comma after the phrase, *who came in*, though our translators put none there, believing it important to show the connection of the word *privily* with the verb *to spy*.

I write this, Brother M., not to raise an argument with you; but if it may be, to induce you to examine the subject again. If I have mistaken your object, I hope what I have written may do no hurt to the cause of truth.

Yours with Christian regards,

S. TROTT.

Centreville, Va., March 6, 1845.

P.S. – Brother Jewett, I do not mean what I have said in reference to Brother Blakeslee’s communication as an attack upon him. But the point which I have touched, I think of great importance, considering the great inroads the non-resurrection sentiment is making among us. I do not think, that I have any right to fellowship it. Yours, &c. - S.T.

SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FROM GALATIANS 3:3.

BROTHER JEWETT: - Your remarks in the March number of the *ADVOCATE* {1845} touching the propensity of many to bring in the aid of human philosophy in the investigation of religious subjects, reminded me of Paul’s appeal to the churches in Galatia. “Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” Gal.3:3. The Apostle evidently had reference to their going back to the works and rites of the law for the perfecting of their salvation; but a little attention to what is implied in a *beginning in the spirit*, will show that it cuts off every consistent idea of being helped on in furtherance either of the knowledge or the experience of salvation, by the flesh in any sense. In the experience of the child of grace, the Spirit begins in him previous to his *beginning in the Spirit*. The Spirit must implant spiritual life, and consequently light before there can be spiritual action or discernment in any child of the earthly Adam. In some instances the effect of this light being shed abroad in the heart, is to lead the person at once so to view God’s eternal power and Godhead, as to lead him to feel his entire guilt and condemnation, and view, as a sinner in having lived without God in the world; and therefore strips him of all creaturely hope; as were the multitude who were pricked in their hearts, on the day of Pentecost, on being convinced that that Jesus whom they had rejected and crucified was the Christ, the long expected Messiah. Others again are at first,

only led to see their need of a better righteousness than they have, to expect acceptance with God. This leads them to fleshly exertions of mind and body to obtain a righteousness. They resort to reading and hearing of preaching, and to obtain a natural understanding of the way of acceptance with God; and to bodily labor, &c., to bring themselves more into conformity to what they think God requires of them. The final result is; that after their utmost exertions of mind and body to become good, they find that they can bring forth no act which the law does not condemn, and which is not turned to corruption and loathing in their sight; and what is more, they find themselves ignorant of God, and utterly unable to comprehend him, or any way of acceptance with him. All appears as a hopeless case with them. "So foolish was I and ignorant, I was as a beast before thee." Psal.73:22. They are now as little children, as dependent to be taught and led, as to be pardoned. But when the Spirit is pleased to give them a view of Christ crucified, as the way of salvation, and that for lost sinners like themselves, then the gospel declarations appear plain to them, and they see the sovereign act of God in giving them an understanding of these things, as much as in laying help on Christ; for such worthless sinners. They adore God for what they now know, as well as for what they hope, of salvation. They are alike cut off from leaning to their own understanding, and from trusting to their own works. Their hope is in God; to him they look with childlike simplicity, to teach them what he would have them to do, to guide them into the truth; and to keep them from falling. These have now *begun in the spirit*; and is it possible that such, after the lessons they have learned of the deceitfulness of their own hearts, of the blindness of their minds, and the entire weakness of the flesh, should again lean to their own understanding, to find out revealed Truth, or to their own arm to get them the victory over sin? O the presumption, folly, and unbelief of poor human nature! How again, and again, will the child of grace try his own strength for relief in the times of temptations and difficulties, till bruised, and wounded by his falls; he is again glad to sink into his own weakness and dependency at the footstool of mercy. And how often does he undertake by the powers of his mind to clear what appears mysterious in the doctrine of the gospel and make it appear consistent with reason; and to bring to light what God has not revealed, to the bringing in of hurtful errors, and the causing of contentions and divisions in the churches! Happy would it be, if such wise ones, could *become fools that they might be wise*. By the term *flesh* in the text under consideration, it will

be seen that I understand the whole natural man, in distinction from the spirit of Christ, in the believer. And so the term is abundantly used in the Scriptures. This is a day of philosophy, of human investigation, and of absurdities, wherein God has made foolish the wisdom of this world. Not only do we see it among the popular religionists, but also among those who, we would hope, are the children of God. Reason has undertaken to investigate the origin of sin, the nature of angels, and the existence of God as Father, Word and Holy Ghost, and alas; what confounding, and what dividing of God into parts they produce by their philosophy and the figures they employ to make a likeness of him. The doctrine of the resurrection also is reasoned away to be no resurrection, but only a disencumbering of a supposed spiritual bodily existence, from these bodies of dust or flesh in which they are thought to dwell, or according to others, it is a clothing of the soul with a new spiritual body. I see by the religious papers, that a new champion for a non-resurrection of the body has come forth, who by his elegance as a writer, and his philosophical acumen is delighting the polite world. From what sketches I have seen of his system, I think he differs not much from Drew on the resurrection. He, in the estimation of his admirers, demonstrates fully the folly of supposing that the identity of the person can in any measure consist in these external bodies with which we are clothed; the philosophical conclusion that the body at no two given periods is the same, owing to its constant changes through the passing off of the particles of matter of which it is composed, and their place being supplied from the food we take, &c., so that if the identity consisted to the body, the person who died in impenitency at fifty years old, could not be punished for the sins he committed in youth, because it would not be the same person. What astonishing discoveries philosophy makes in religion. I am confident there are persons who have not seen me for twenty years, who on seeing me now would instantly recognize me, and yet who make no pretensions to a gift, either for seeing or discerning spirits. Hence there must be some bodily identity by which I should be known. The birth of Isaac, I presume will be admitted to have been from the bodies of Abraham and Sarah; if so, according to this wonderful discovery in philosophy, the promise to Abraham recorded in Gen.15:4, "He that come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir;" was not verified, because those bodies of Abraham and Sarah of which this was spoken, were not the same they had fifteen or twenty years after, when Isaac was born. Besides the peculiar miracle of Isaac's birth is destroyed, by this calculation, for if Abraham

and Sarah were old, their bodies were not, having become new, and young, not by miracle, but by natural principles. Another objection to the resurrection of the body, is that after its death and decomposition, the particles of dust may become scattered and incorporated in other bodies, &c. If the particles of dust could get beyond the reach of God's control this would be a serious objection, but from the belief I have in both the universal and special government of God, over all things he has made, even to the chemical gasses, I cannot apprehend it to be impossible with God. The truth is, the birth of Isaac was presented to Abraham in the promise as an object of faith, and not as matter of philosophical research; and so is the resurrection of the body declared in the Scriptures. So much is this the case in reference to the resurrection, that the apostle fully identifies the faith of the gospel with a belief in the future resurrection of the body; hence he says of Hymeneus and Philetus, not that they had overthrown a part of the faith, or the faith on any particular point, but absolutely, that they *overthrow the faith of some*. II Tim.2:18. And this broad position he establishes in his epistle to the Corinthians by showing that the resurrection of Christ is involved in a denial of the resurrection of the body, and in this also is involved the efficacy of Christ's atonement. I Cor.15:12-18. And with propriety is the doctrine of the resurrection thus made a criterion of gospel faith, seeing that it has been a subject of scorn and mockery from the wise men of this world, from the learned Greeks of Athens, Acts 17:32, down to the present day. Those who by their philosophy would explain away the entire dependence of those things which are matter of revelation, upon the absolute and sovereign will of God, and to make them the results of certain general laws, as is more or less the case with most of the systems of men, are trying to give us a mere natural or fleshly religion for a revealed one. May we not then say to any of our brethren who may be advocating or receiving these systems; Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, having once learned your own weakness and ignorance, and dependence on the teaching of God, are ye now made perfect by the flesh; by putting forth the force of reason and imagination? May we, as also our brethren, be more enabled to sit as humble learners at the feet of Jesus.

Yours in love,
S.TROTT.
April 25, 1845.

DEPRAVITY & SIN.

Questions Regarding Depravity & Sin Addressed.

BROTHER BEEBE: - I see, in the SIGNS & ADVOCATE, for April 1, 1846, that brother Guice proposes certain questions to me concerning some items contained in a former communication of mine. He says he proposes them not for the purpose of entering into controversy. But if he has views differing from mine on the points embraced in his inquiries, why not give them and let them be discussed. Bitter controversy is not desirable, but brotherly discussion may be useful.

His first question relates to the idea which I advanced that our nature is depraved; is depravity itself, an idea which I still full believe. He asks, "Can human nature undergo any change?" Again, "If so, when such change is, or was effected, would the character on whom such change was effected be in possession of human nature?" In answer to these enquiries I reply that it is said, "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Ecc.7:29. I presume that brother Guice will admit, that so far, and so long as man acted in that state of uprightness, he would act uprightly; but that this uprightness was not inherent in him, so as to be the distinctive and established nature of men; but on the contrary, he was liable, being left to himself, to depart from that uprightness in which he was made. His nature then was that of a fallible, dependent creature, liable to depart from his state of rectitude, when left to himself, but at the same time having no bias inherent, no natural leaning to transgression, as the idea of *uprightness* implies. While in this state of uprightness, I presume he was not a subject of wrath. Now, Paul writing to the Ephesian brethren, and including himself with them, or rather, including both Jews and Gentiles, says, "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by *nature* the children of wrath even as others." Eph.2:3. It appears evident to me that they who by *nature are children of wrath*, must be by nature depraved or sinful. Now the inquiry returns, "Was there any change in the nature of man? I know of no other change than this, that from a state of uprightness, without any natural or fixed laws establishing him in that state, he became in consequence of transgression, fixed unalterably

as death does fix, beyond the control of all but God, in trespasses and sins; or, if you please, in *depravity*. "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph.2:1. Now the Apostle calls this subjugation to wrath, *nature*, and so it is nature; for it is nature that everything should produce its like, that the stream should partake of the qualities of its fountain; and hence, the original fountain or head of the whole human family, as such, being established in *trespasses and sins*, or *depravity*, or *alienation from God*, or whatever you may call it, this depravity became the law under which all the human family exists naturally. So David, who, for all we know was brought into existence according to the same law of nature as others, says, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps.51:5.

One remark more on this point. This fixed trait of man, of this natural depravity was established by the God of nature, not in the exercise of his creating power, but in the exercise of his sovereignty as the ruler of the world, in inflicting a righteous penalty for transgression; so says Paul, "As by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." And, "As by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Rom.5:18 & 19. Again; brother Guice, in view of my remark, that in regeneration *there is no change in nature*, asks, "If nature is depraved, would it not be necessary for it to be changed in regeneration?" If the purpose of God in Christ had been to reinstate men in the state in which Adam was created, then instead of being born again, born of the Spirit, there would have been a necessity, and only that, of their natures being changed from its corruptible state to its original upright state and perhaps a being confirmed in uprightness. But such is not the purpose at all. God having *predestinated* his chosen people, *to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto himself*, he has prepared for them an inheritance suiting their relation to him in Christ Jesus, who *is the Lord from heaven*, and not *of the earth, earthy*. Therefore, in order for their being manifested in such relation, and being prepared for the enjoyment of such inheritance, a being born again of the flesh, and upright Adam being formed anew in them, does not meet the case; but they must derive a distinct existence direct from Christ, be born of the Spirit and have Christ, and not Adam, formed in them. It is true, that as it is entrusted to Christ to save his people wholly from his sins, and to *present them faultless before the throne of his glory*, it will be incumbent on him, ultimately to change their bodies from corruption to incorruption, and from natural to spiritual bodies. Yet as it is not the pleasure of God to translate his

children immediately as they are regenerated, to their heavenly glory, but that many of them should for a season remain in the world, as witness of the power of Jesus to save, so as adapted to their existence in the world, and to their worldly relations, he leaves them in possession of their earthly nature unchanged. And thus not only are they capacitated for holding familiar intercourse with the world, but also by the workings of the two natures in them, the Spirit and the flesh, Christ and Adam, they and their brethren may have the clear evidence, that the change they have experienced is not a mere reformation, or change from their natural propensities, but that they have a new and spiritual nature formed in them, distinct from, and in opposition to, their old nature, and therefore that they are born of God.

I now pass to brother Guice's last inquiry, as being intimately connected with the above; namely, "Whether John was not deceived when he said, Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." I John 3:9. Differing some from brother Guice's quotation. John certainly was not deceived. But others I think have been frequently mistaken in their understanding of this text, when they have inferred from it that if a person is born of God he is divested of all depravity and propensity to sin. An idea which is calculated to sink every child of grace who receives it, into despondency. John evidently speaks of that which is born of God, the *new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness*; not of the *old man* which remains *corrupt according to the deceitful lusts*. See Eph.4:22 & 24. But as an illustration of this subject, and of the fact that the *new* creature is made subject to vanity, not willingly; and that this therefore is the creature intended, {Rom.8:20,} I will notice Paul's own experience in the matter. That Paul *was born of God*, and was therefore a *new creature*, I presume brother Guice will admit. Hear his complaint of himself! "For I know that in me, {that is, in my flesh,} dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." What a perfect riddle this must be to a person who believes that nature is changed in regeneration, or that the nature of man is not depraved! Is not sin depravity? And if sin dwelled, made its home in Paul, was he not depraved? But it certainly was not that *I* that would do good that was depraved, not that which was born of God, but the *I* that did that he would not, the sin that dwelled in him,

the flesh, the *me* in whom dwelleth no good thing, that was depraved, and which of course must be his old nature, that which was born of the flesh. He goes on to say, "I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." He concludes this declaration of his experience with saying, "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh, the law of sin." Rom.7:18-25. What was this law that was in his members, in his flesh, this law of sin, but the law of his nature? It was not *the law of God* which he *served with his mind*, nor *the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus*." Rom.8:2. With the mind *I myself serve the law of God*. Is not this as strong as John's assertion, "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not?" And yet Paul says in the next breath, what evidently amounts to this, "But with the flesh I serve the law of sin." Thus making this his act too. So there were two I's, two Pauls in this one person; Paul who was born of God, and Paul or Saul who was born of a Jew. Was not this being brought into *captivity to the law of sin*, this *doing that he would not*, this *not finding how to perform that which is good*, by the *new creature*, the regenerated Paul, a being *made subject to vanity*, to that which is void of good? And Paul's own testimony is, that it was *not willingly* that he was thus subject to the law of sin. As was Paul's experience in the case, so is the experience of all the children of God, if I know anything about it. It is no wonder then that the *whole creation* {in Christ Jesus} including the Apostles who had the first fruits of the Spirit, groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; waiting for the adoption; to wit, the redemption of our body, when they also shall be changed into the likeness of the glorified body of Jesus. See Rom.8:20-23.

I will now return to brother Guice's other inquiry. I having represented the *sin which doth so easily beset us* {Heb.12:1,} as being *unbelief*, he asks, "If the absence of faith is unbelief; and if so, and unbelief is sin, would not God's having created man without faith be equivalent to his being created a sinner?" By *faith*, I presume brother Guice intends that faith which is the gift of God, and by which we receive and rely on Christ crucified as our whole salvation. I am not prepared to say that the absence of this faith is not in some instances intended by the term *unbelief*. But I am prepared to say that if that were the only sense in which unbelief is spoken of in the Scriptures, I could by no means consent to the idea that unbelief is sin. *Sin is the transgression of the law*. The law

did not require of Adam in his original creation to believe in Christ as his righteousness and salvation, but it required him so to love and obey God as not to be a transgressor of the law, and therefore as not to be a subject for salvation, nor for having the righteousness of Christ imputed. Consequently, a want of this faith cannot be a transgression of the law. But there is an unbelief spoken of in the Scriptures which, according to my understanding thereof, is sinful. I will notice some instances. In I John 5:10, we read, "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." Here the faith in Christ which is connected with salvation, is expressed by a believing *on the Son of God*; the other belief is spoken of as simply a *believing God, a believing the record, &c.*, thus making a manifest difference between the two. The same marked difference is observed in John 3:36. Certainly that unbelief, or not believing, which *makes God a liar*, must be sinful. Do any ask how this unbelief can be a transgression of the law? I reply that the law under which Adam was created, evidently required of him to believe whatever declaration God made to him; otherwise, it would not have been sinful in him to disregard God's declarations concerning the tree of knowledge, &c. The declarations which God has made concerning man's condemnation, and concerning his Son &c., are equally the words of him who cannot lie; and disbelieving them must therefore be equally a transgression of the law. Again, we are told that Christ appeared unto the eleven and "upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark 16:14. Their unbelief must, therefore, have been sinful, or I think he would not have upbraided them for it. Their not believing them which had seen him after his resurrection, included an unbelief of his own declarations beforehand made to them, that he should rise on the third day. In Rev.21:8, the *fearful and unbelieving* are ranked with murderers, &c., as having a part in the "lake that burneth with fire and brimstone;" hence they must be one class of sinners who are thus punished, as murderers are another class. The unbelief, on account of which the natural branches were broken off from the good olive tree, and which led the Jews to reject Christ as the Messiah, I think was sin; so, also, I think was the unbelief which prevented those Israelites from entering the promised land, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, a sin. Heb.3:17-19. "The evil heart of *unbelief* in departing from the living God," against which the Apostle cautions his brethren,

{Heb.3:6,} appears to me is sin, and one to which, if my experience is a criterion, I should judge the children of God are very liable. So that I really do not see any just ground for retracting from either of those ideas to which brother Guice objects; and I have given, in answer to his enquiries, *plainly* my reasons for this conclusion, though I have not given them perhaps as concisely as he requested. If he is not satisfied with my views on these points, I should like for him to give his reasons for dissenting, as well as for him to give some more scriptural views.

Yours, &c.
S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., April 15, 1846.

THE BENEDICTION.

BROTHER BEEBE: - There is so much uproar made about introducing discussions, and disputable points into the SIGNS, that I feel a hesitancy at introducing almost any subject, as discussion might grow out of it, unless I am requested to give my views. I had intended writing a remonstrance against the ground taken by several brethren, but your *veto* put a stop to the discussion then going on. I should have taken this text, "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." Phil.2:4. This is applicable both to things spiritual and things temporal. What if we do not want for ourselves either to receive, or give, any of these enlarged views on doctrine and order, or are so well instructed in the things of the kingdom, that we received no edification from the writings of our brethren on these subjects; or have got our opinions fixed and do not wish to be jostled from them, lest we should be charged with changing our views, and consequently of being wiser today than we were yesterday; ought we to wish to bind all the readers and writers of the SIGNS, down to those common place letters that would suit us. There are brethren among us who are solicitous of knowing the truth on every point of doctrine and of apostolic order; and they are glad to obtain light from any of their brethren on these subjects, and therefore wish to see such as have much disputed, discussed. Shall we look so much on our own things as to monopolize the whole of the SIGNS from them. Again, there are brethren, who become convinced that some opinions or some practice or order which has prevailed among us, is not according to the Scriptures, and so feel the importance of the

error, and of a more strict conformity to what God has declared or enjoined that they are not satisfied without calling the attention of their brethren generally to the subject. Shall we because our minds have not been exercised on these points or because their views if sustained would impeach the correctness of the views handed down to us from those going before, on these points, shut them out from a place in the SIGNS; as though that paper was wholly for our gratification, and that it must be put down if anything is admitted that we do not wish agitated, lest our minds might be disturbed. Surely this is not christian liberty. I trust that no one will argue from these premises that the SIGNS should be opened to subjects which manifestly set aside the scriptures as our perfect standard, or do away with the plain testimony thereof; such subjects as have nothing but human reason; or a visionary construction of scriptures to support them. Some of us are apt to look a great deal more at having our minds disturbed by the agitation of points of order or of doctrine on which we have settled down without having examined carefully to know that we have scriptural authority to support them, than we do at the earnest desire of others to be informed for themselves on these points, or to eradicate errors from ourselves as well as to oppose them in the New School. Such will probably say in reference to the points on which brethren Burritt and Janeway have requested my views, away with these points of order from the SIGNS; let us have practical religion. But indeed, I do not know what deserves the name of practicing religion, more than a due observance of those institutions and that order which our Lord has appointed. If we respect not his authority, we give but poor evidence of supreme love to him. For myself, as these brethren have requested my views on these subjects of order, I feel it right I should give them, not knowing how much satisfaction I may be instrumental in imparting to them and others. Those brethren who do not wish their minds disturbed on the points, can, if they please, pass over what I write, there is surely matter enough in the SIGNS besides to pay them for their dollar, and postage. In reference to brother Woodward's request in the SIGNS, for April 1, 1848, concerning Rev.13:11-18, and which brother Beebe handed over to me, I have to say, that as I have had my views twice published on that subject; once in pamphlet, by brother Beebe, and again with some variation in the SIGNS, volume 7, pages 66 & 73, and having no additional light on that subject, I do not think it advisable to occupy the SIGNS with it. I hope brother Woodward will consider this a sufficient excuse for not further complying with his request.

Brother Burritt requests my views on the subject of pronouncing at the close of a meeting, what the Paedobaptists call *the benediction*, but which I, and I supposed, most of our O.S. Baptists consider merely as a *dismissal*, or *salutation*. If brother Burritt has been diffculted only on that point in the order generally observed in our worship, he has escaped much better than I have. Soon after my first entering upon the ministry, my mind was considerably diffculted as to that order which was general among the baptists, in conducting their meetings for worship and preaching; not being able to find apostolic example for it. For some few years, the Scotch, or Waldanian Baptists, as they are called, had attracted some notice, by setting aside the prevailing forms, and professedly observing a strict regard to apostolic example in all the parts of their worship. In most of our cities, little companies had separated from the Regular Baptists, and met together on every first day to break bread, and preach, &c., according to what they considered strict New Testament order. I read some of their writings on the subject and endeavored to test the same by the New Testament. The result was, that I became satisfied, that the order which had obtained among us in the arrangement of singing, praying, and preaching, &c., was a mere assumed form; and among the Waldanians there were some points of order, not regarded by us, which evidently was according to established apostolic order, and there were other points on which they laid much stress, which were mentioned in the New Testament as mere incidental circumstances, and others again, in reference to the ministry of the word, which were important errors. The enquiry which next occupied my mind, was, whether I should continue to observe the formal course among us, or to endeavor to introduce where I worshipped a stricter regard to what appeared as New Testament order. Whilst unsatisfied on this point, and still hesitating, I was convinced from the ill success which attended the Waldanian attempt to reform, that the Lord did not favor it, and come to the conclusion that so far as real corruption was not involved it was better to bear with some departures from apostolic order, than to split off from those whom we believe to be saints of God and grounded in the truth, and to wait till God shall please to cleanse his church from all its impurities in doctrine and order; which, I am impressed with the idea, will not be whilst the church remains in its present wilderness state; that as he suffered Israel in the wilderness to neglect circumcision and some other of his appointments, so of his church, during the reign of antichrist. I did hope when the church, the O.S. Baptists, separated themselves from the

human inventions of the Image of the Beast, as seen in the New School, to the standard of the Scriptures, that they would go on purging themselves at least from all those human devises, which had manifestly been productive of evil. But it seems it is not to be so, as a general thing, among the churches. Those therefore who see the evil must content themselves with purifying themselves from such evils so far as they can, without separating from the fellowship of their brethren, and to exhorting their brethren as occasion may offer to test their systems and practice by the Scriptures of truth. As to the arrangement of the parts to be attended to in the meetings of the church for worship, I am satisfied that this arrangement is left unestablished as a thing indifferent, provided *all things be done decently and in order*. This opinion I have derived from that particular direction which Paul gave to the church at Corinth touching the exercise both of the ordinary and extraordinary gifts. I Cor.14. There is no direction given when or how often they should sing and pray, though both are referred to; nor in reference to preaching or prophesying, excepting that *two or three* might speak, if so many were present having any message given them; and that one was not to continue speaking so long as to exclude the others from an equal opportunity, as is sometimes the case among us. So in reference to the Lord's Supper, the Apostle, in I Cor.11:23-26, has given clearly what is essential in that ordinance. For he *delivered to them, that which he had received of the Lord* concerning it, and surely he must have received of the Lord all that is essential in that ordinance. But there is nothing in what he delivered them, specifying at what hour, nor how often they should observe this ordinance, as *oft as ye do it*, is the specification on this point; nor in what place, only that it was when *the church were come together in one place*. See verses 18 & 20. So that the circumstances of being in an *upper room* and at *night* on which some lay so much stress, are things indifferent. But here I do not mean by it that because such and such things are not forbidden, they are indifferent. For instance, infant sprinkling is not in direct terms forbidden, yet the appointing of believer's baptism to be observed, is itself a prohibition of the substitution of anything else in the place of it, and therefore *not a thing indifferent*. So the appointing of churches as the order by which the disciples are to be associated together in one visible body, and the committing of the administration of all the Lord's appointed order, to the churches severally, is a forbidding of the constitution of other religious bodies, and of such bodies assuming the management of any part of the affairs of the

gospel. But in the arrangement of the parts of worship, the Apostle has enjoined that *all things be done decently and in order*; it is self evident that some arrangement is necessary to different things being done in order, otherwise, singing, praying, speaking, &c., might be going on at the same time; the very confusion which Paul objects to in that church. This arrangement is not specified in the New Testament, and is therefore left as a thing indifferent providing decency and order is observed. Hence I know not that the arrangement which generally prevails among us is not as good as any other would be; excepting that I have sometimes thought that the having always one uniform arrangement, is more likely to sink into a kind of formal thing, than would be the varying of that arrangement according to circumstances. What I have said above has only reference to the order of worship where the church be come together in one place. In reference to preaching to other congregations than when the church is met, there is on such occasions not only no authority for these forms in singing, praying, &c., but apostolic example is uniformly against their use. The order we observe in such appointments for preaching has grown out of infant baptism, whereby the posterity of professors are placed in circumstances to be considered acceptable worshippers. By conforming to this custom we so far sanction this principle. The same in full may be said of the practice of putting forward persons making no pretensions to religion, or for whose pretensions we have no fellowship, to lead in singing. Yet to both of these customs I have conformed rather than to single out from my brethren.

To come to the particular point of order to which brother Burritt refers, the form of dismissing the meeting; if this was considered as an attempt to impart a blessing to the people by any virtue there is in the lifting up of the hands, as our Lord blessed little children brought to him, I should shrink from the attempt too. But I do not, neither do I think our brethren generally, view it in that light. At most it is but a short prayer to God for a parting blessing upon the people. This appears to me a proper subject of prayer, and being offered at the close of the religious exercises in which we have been engaged. I should not consider it an infringement of that *decency and order*, which the Apostle enjoins. But I have rather looked at it as a *parting salutation*, and have considered the examples of the apostles Paul and Peter in closing their epistles, to be good authority. Paul does not call that close, *a blessing*, but a *salutation*. See II Thes.3:17, and other places. As I have thus viewed the subject for many years, I have felt no difficulty in

conforming to that order, generally, though I have considered there was rather an impropriety in giving this salutation, when we were only adjourning for half an hour or so, expecting the same people again to come together and resume the exercises of the day. Paul speaks of *blessing with the spirit*, from his immediately calling it a *giving of thanks*, I conclude he refers to blessing God, rather than blessing the people. I Cor.14:15 & 16. So the *blessing of the bread*; {Matt.26:26,} and the *cup of blessing*, {I Cor.10:16,} as these cases are spoken of as *giving thanks* in Luke 22:19 & I Cor.11:24, I think refer to *blessing* or *thanking* God for them. I have thus given brother Burritt my experience and conclusion on this subject, if the relation shall afford him any satisfaction on the point about which he is diffculted, or any comfort from the consideration that others are constrained to conform to points, about the correctness of which they are not satisfied, I shall not have labored in vain. May I conclude with the salutation?

May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with each of you, and all his saints. Amen.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., July 22, 1846.

EXPERIMENTAL DARKNESS.

BROTHER BEEBE: - I had formed a resolution not to controvert any subject introduced into the SIGNS, unless particularly called out; and although now inclined to notice a remark of yours, I do not consider it as transgressing in reality that resolution, because I think it will not cause much discussion, being experimental rather than doctrinal, and because I presume the remark was made without reflection, rather than being an expression of your experience on that point. Why then notice it and again subject myself to the charge of being censorious, &c., if it is mere mistake? Because as coming from brother Beebe it is calculated evidently to disturb the minds of many whose lot it is to walk much in darkness; for such I think is frequently the lot of God's children, and that distinct from their seeing and feeling the corruptions of their nature, as I shall probably show the Scriptures support me in believing. The remark to which I refer, is in No.8, present volume, page 63. It is this, "But in an experimental view of the travel of the saints, they are subject to much of what *they very improperly call darkness, for what they call darkness is that by which they see the depravity and corruption of their own carnal natures;*

and our Lord instructs us that whatever maketh manifest, is light." What is the believer's light? Reason or judgment is the lamp of the natural mind, it is trimmed by science, and on some points and in some measure it may be trimmed by spiritual knowledge; but, "Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life," and again, "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth in me should not abide in darkness." John 8:12, and 13:46. He is the light to the spiritual mind or new man, not a *lamp*, but the Sun of righteousness. Thus says the Psalmist, "The Lord is my light and my salvation." Psalm 27:1; and the Apostle, "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." II Cor.1:6. As in the natural, so in the spiritual world, darkness is the absence of light. As the light of the natural sun is at times more or less withdrawn, as from its being obscured by clouds on to its entire withdrawal leaving us in perfect night; so I understand the Lord deals with his people. In proportion as the Lord is pleased to shine upon the written or preached word, or to withdraw his shining, and so upon the ordinances or in prayer, or upon our experience, we see and feel the operations of the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, or we mourn his absence. Sometimes he so withdraws his shining from all these points at once that we have darkness, as brother Hatfield says in his communication in the same number of the SIGNS, *that can be felt*. It is the not enjoying of this light that I have always understood christians to have reference to, when they have spoken of being, or walking in darkness, entirely distinct in idea from their seeing and feeling their native corruptions; though both often go together, for Satan frequently takes advantage of the saint's being in darkness as to his evidences, &c., to stir up his corruptions by temptations. Hence the believer often complains of his darkness and of his depravity both together. As to a darkness that can be felt, I think I have experienced it for instance in preaching, I have thought I had my subject before me, would name my text and commence speaking, when all of a sudden a darkness would come over my subject and text so that every ray or idea of what it contained seemed shut out from my mind; I could go on speaking, but when one idea was advanced I did not know what I should have to advance next; and it seemed actually to affect me so that I felt it in my natural vision, I could not with confidence, whilst it lasted, look upon the congregation and when I attempted it, there seemed a blur before my eyes, as

though half blind, or as some have said, a bag was drawn over them. So in experience sometimes so thick darkness seems to cover the word, past experience, and our minds in prayer, that we cannot discover one ray of spiritual comfort or light from any source; and the darkness is so great that we think we can actually feel it, and we do feel it affecting our natural mind and system. Now a person thus under darkness, might as well undertake to command the natural sun to shine and give him light at midnight as to think by any resolution of his mind, or any recalling to mind of past experience that he could dispel this darkness, or even by any experience of faith that he can cause the light to shine upon his distressed mind, until the Lord is pleased to *bring him forth to the light*. As Job says, "He shutteth up a man and there can be no opening." Faith, instead of being able to control the shining of the light, is dependent on its shining for its acting; when the Sun of righteousness shines on the gospel testimony, or on the promise in reference to us, we feel the actings of faith embracing that testimony or promise; not otherwise. The Lord alone can control and prolong the shining of this light, as Joshua his type only ever successfully commanded the sun and moon to stand still. As to scriptural authority for saints walking at times in darkness, I will quote first, Isa. 50:10, "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, and hath no light? Let him trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God." Surely the prophet must have reference to saints; and if they had been walking in their corruptions and sins, instead of encouraging them as he does, he would have reprov'd them; so that was not what is intended by their *walking in darkness*; and their having *no light*, forbids the idea, that what they *called darkness*, was *light*. Neither does he reprove them for this darkness, nor does he encourage them in lieu thereof to encompass themselves with sparks of their own kindling, see verse 11. Instead of occupying space to explain the trusting in the name of the Lord and staying upon his God, I will illustrate it by the text I will quote from Micah, {Mic.7:8-9,} "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me. I will bear the indignation of the Lord, because I have sinned against him, until he plead my cause, and execute judgment for me; he will bring me forth to the light, and I shall behold his righteousness." Thus Micah, though *he sits in darkness*, trusts in the name of the Lord and stays upon his God, that he will again *bring him forth to the light*.

Brother Beebe, now that I have written this, I have some hesitancy as to the propriety of again subjecting myself to the charge of dogmatism by sending it on for publication. But I think I will send it to you and you may do as you think best, publish it or destroy it.

In reference to the paragraph you inserted in the recent number of the SIGNS, page 63, in reference to me, I will say, I know not what opinion my friends have formed of the state of my health, nor what is the purpose of God concerning me; but I know that between nine and ten years ago some of my friends thought I would not live a year then, but since then I have enjoyed better health, than I ever before enjoyed. As the Lord has so far raised me up again as to enable me to attend and fill my appointments for preaching, he may disappoint me and my friends as he did before; though it is not likely from appearances that I shall again enjoy the same degree of health and strength as before. Indeed if the Lord should continue me only in consideration of my usefulness or fruitfulness, I think he must take me away very speedily as a barren branch.

With Christian regards yours,

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., April 29, 1848.

VIEWS OF HEBREWS 8:11.

BROTHER BEEBE: - A brother in Ohio, some three or four months since, requested by letter that I should give through the SIGNS, my views of Heb.8:11, latter part, "For all shall know me from the least to the greatest."

This declaration is embraced in that *new covenant* which God said by the prophet Jeremiah, {Jer.31:31-34,} he would make, in the *days which shall come, with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah*; and which the Apostle quotes in the connection as the *better covenant*, which was established upon better promises, and of which the man Christ Jesus, the Son, is Mediator. See Eph.7:28, and 8:3, 6-8, and I Tim.2:5. Hence from the Apostle's representing this covenant, as that of which Christ is Mediator, it is evident that the *days which should come*, are the days of the Messiah, or the gospel day, and therefore that the house of Israel and of Judah with which it should be made are the spiritual Israel and Judah. Christ with his people in him, being in national Israel and Judah as their substance and their Holy One, the affirmation that it should be made with them, terminates in him and in his

people, as brought out from that type. The making this covenant with them spoken of, is the making it manifest as the distinct covenant or dispensation under which they stand, and through the provisions of which they approach unto God. It is a *new covenant*, in that it is new to them, when manifested, and is manifested only to the *new man*, or to them as born again. It is new, in that it is a new dispensation which was to be set up in the world. Not *new* as established with Christ, nor as the *purpose and grace* or the substance of it were *given* to his people *in him before the world began*.

Among the provisions of this covenant, is this, "And they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother saying; Know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest." Hence the knowledge of the Lord as possessed by spiritual Israel as such, shall not be that rational knowledge such as national Israel learned of their parents and teachers; but it shall be a knowledge not received of men, nor obtained by any natural or fleshly powers of the mind; for, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." I Cor.2:14. How then, say you, Do they know the Lord and the things of the Lord or of the Spirit of God? The answer is provided, "God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." I Cor.2:10. Or as our Lord referring unto the promise made unto Zion or the gospel church, Isa.54:13, says, "They shall be all taught of God." John 6:45. From what we have said, it is manifest that the *all* who shall know the Lord, are the all of spiritual Israel and Judah, and that all of them shall know him, without exception, from the least to the greatest, and that by God's teaching or revelation. Hence he who knows the Lord only as he has learned of men or by the force of his natural reason, has never been manifested as one of the Israel of God. Hence also, surprising as may be the remark, all that the child of grace knows of the Lord and of the things of the Lord, only as he has obtained it from men or by study, is of no spiritual benefit to him.

The enquiry arises whether this revelation is made to the natural reason or mind of man. Not so; for whatever we can comprehend by our natural reason, we can communicate to others of like rational faculties. Hence we could and should *teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying know the Lord*, in contradiction to the express declaration of this new covenant. So the Apostle shows that as no man "knoweth the things of a man {things peculiar to man,} save the spirit of man which is in him; even so the

things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God." And adds, "Now we {we believers} have received, not the spirit of the world {in our regeneration} but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." And these are things which "God hath revealed unto us by his Spirit." See I Cor.2:11 & 12, compared with 9 & 10. Thus we see that in order to know the *things of God*, it is not only necessary that God should reveal them unto us by his Spirit; but that we should also first receive the *Spirit which is of God*, of God as its Father, and of God as he who alone communicates it in regeneration. Thus God has purposed and provided that the spiritual Israel and Judah shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest of them. If we understand by the *least* and *greatest* here, those who are so naturally; the least shall know the Lord; for as human reason has no part either in the communication or reception of this knowledge, neither infancy, idiocy, nor derangement of mind can prevent them from being made to know the Lord. On the other hand, the greatest intellect with the most intensive knowledge of science, and the self-pride consequent thereto cannot prevent any of the elect Israel from being brought to know the Lord; for he will convert them to become as little children, as babes, and to enter the kingdom of God as such, and to account all their wisdom and learning as foolishness in this case. If by the *least* and *greatest* we are to understand such in a spiritual sense; the apostles who were the greatest among the saints and therefore most eminently their minister according to Mat.20:26, evidently knew and preached the doctrine of the Lord; whilst the least lamb in the flock could receive and judge of that doctrine, not by the written creeds, systems or expositions of men, but by the inward teachings of the Spirit of God. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things." I Cor.2:15.

Is it true that God hath said of his spiritual Israel, *They shall all know the Lord, from the least to the greatest*? And is his *shall*, absolute, almighty, and irreversible? How presumptuous then is it, to set up Articles of Faith and other uninspired writings as standards of faith or truth, which christians must come up to in their belief, as though the Holy Ghost would not be faithful to teach the truth to all the elect, or teach all the truth necessary for them; or as though we would bring the teachings of the Lord to our notions of systematic divinity. It may be said that these Articles of Faith, and other standard books are such as we believe were written by persons who had been taught of the Lord; and that they seem necessary to test the pretensions of those who profess to be believers. The latter of these excuses for such standards

would appear plausible, if God had not given us the Scriptures written by inspiration as a standard, and to his people the spirit of judgment in their own experience. As it is, the excuse is vain. The other, that they were written by men who had been taught of the Lord, is very fallacious. If we admit that in truth these writers were all subjects of grace, who does not know, or from reflection might not know how universally prone we are to speculate on, and to bring every thing to the test of reason, which is presented to our minds even as religion, and to mix our own reflections and preconceived ideas with what has been revealed in us? How seldom do we ever hear a person relate his experience who does not mix some of his own thoughts or traditional notions with what the Lord has taught him, and which in themselves are of no avail in giving us an evidence that he is a subject of grace? How difficult it is truly and fully to become fools that we may be wise? What constitutes the difference between the writings of the Bible and the writings of uninspired men, as to infallibility, other than this: That the inspired writers wrote only as they were guided by the Holy Ghost to write, and therefore wrote only what he revealed to them or assured them was the truth; though they {uninspired writers} may write what the Lord has taught them and which therefore in itself is equally true with the Scriptures and supported by them, yet in writing mix more or less of their own thoughts, and conclusions from reason, and perhaps wild speculations with what they write? It is true that the writings of christians may often be useful in counteracting the errors one of another and of others, and may be for edification and comfort as they show the dealings of God with his people, and as the Holy Ghost may thereby lead persons to an understanding of the Scriptures; but when he does this, he gives them a witness of its truth from the Scriptures and their own experience. But whenever we do not read human writings as the Bereans heard Paul preach, "searching the Scriptures whether those things are so;" whenever we read uninspired writings as true because they are so held by persons in whom we have confidence, or when we receive indiscriminately as true the opinions of any man or set of men, because they appear rational, and not because we have the witness from the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures or in our experience of their truth; if we get any truth we are sure to get error mixed with it, and our views become either contradictory, or erroneous in the whole. Hence the dissensions and divisions, I do not say among professors, but among the saints and which we cannot expect to see healed, until they learn more fully not to put

confidence in man as to any part of their salvation, as well as to what they *believe*, as to what they are to *feel and do*.

What the Lord teaches is true, and it is the same truth in all who are taught of him, and when the saints become satisfied to receive as truth only what he teaches them, then, and not till then, shall we have the satisfaction of seeing again the multitude of them that believe of one heart and one soul.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., June 23, 1848.

P.S. BROTHER BEEBE: - As Paul did not think the enquiry of the Athenians, "May we know what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest, is," unworthy of a reply, I presume we may take the same liberty in reference to *certain strange things brought to our ears*, or eyes, in the SIGNS. I will therefore venture to pronounce some queries on two or three points for the consideration and reply of yourself or of some one of your correspondents.

1. In reference to the *believer's mind*. Paul says, Rom.8:7, "The carnal {or fleshly} mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." I ask, Was that mind which "cannot be subject to the law of God," the same which he had reference to, when he said, {chap.7:25,} "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God"? If so, is nature changed in regeneration, is the mind which by nature is earthly and fleshly changed to that which is heavenly and spiritual? If so, I ask, Can that which is heavenly and spiritual be involved in the cares of earth; and could the believer with only a heavenly mind engage himself in the business of the world? If the carnal mind is not changed, what becomes of it when the new birth is experienced, unless it remains as ever in its relation with *the old man*?

2. In reference to believers, sinning and being wretched. Was not David, though not living under the gospel dispensation, a child of God, a believer? Did he not in the case of Bathsheba and Uriah sin against the Lord, as he said he did, II Sam.12:13? Was there no mind in exercise, no reasoning upon the subject in his desires first to deceive Uriah and then to kill him? So in the case of numbering Israel, was there no sin, no mind or reasoning powers involved in it? Did David feel no *wretchedness* or distress, when convicted through Nathan of his sin concerning Uriah, or when concerning numbering Israel he cried out, "Lo, I have sinned and I have done wickedly; but these sheep what have they done," &c.? In the case of Peter, was there no sin in his denying Christ, and in his *cursing and swearing*, no mind in it, no wretchedness when he

went out and wept bitterly? Are not believers subjects of repentance? Does not that repentance produced by godly sorrow imply a sense of having sinned? Does not *godly sorrow* such as produced in the saints at Corinth, {II Cor.7:9-11,} indignation, fear, vehement desire, zeal, revenge, &c., involve wretchedness or distress of mind?

3. Concerning believers, complaining of the depravity and wickedness of their hearts. Is not the spirit of God's Son in the believer a spirit of holiness, and therefore of opposition to sin? Is it not therefore consistent with a believer that he loathe sin, as much in himself as in others? Does not a sense from time to time of God's love and goodness to him make his own sinfulness and depravity appear more loathsome to him? Can he when he speaks of himself, speak of anything but of his poverty, wretchedness, and guilt? May he not with propriety so speak of himself as an illustration of the riches and freeness of that grace which brings pardon to his guilty soul, as well as for the encouragement of others who know the plague of their own hearts? I will in addition propose one or two queries in reference to the 7th chapter of Romans. 1. Is it consistent to suppose that Paul in personating a person as *under the law* would speak of himself, as distinct from sin dwelling in him, as though he had been delivered from his sense of accountability to the law; and of the inward man in distinction from the flesh as though he had been born again? 2. Is it supposable that Paul would declare his own experience under the law and his being slain by it, as in the past tense, as he does from verse 7 to 13 and then turn round and in the following verses represent himself in the present tense still as under the law? I hope the forthcoming exposition may clear up the point embraced in these two latter queries.

S.TROTT.

EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS: NATURAL & CARNAL.

BROTHER BEEBE: - Will you permit me to propose an answer for the consideration of brethren a little differing from yours on page 113 of the SIGNS for Aug.1, 1848 - to the first of Elder Goldsmith's queries on page 115, same number. To your answer to the second query I have no objections.

This first query is, "Is it certain that *natural* and *carnal* are synonymous terms as *used in the Scriptures*? You give an answer according to the import of the two words as found in lexicons, but the query was in reference to the use of the

terms in the Scriptures. There is this difference in this, as in some other cases. Lexicons speak of men and things as they are manifested in the world to the natural eye, or human reason, the Scriptures speak of them by the revelation of God. I understand, and so I presume you do, the term *carnal* in its application to man as designating him as depraved. This is what I understand God as charging him with, when he says, "For that he also is flesh." Gen.6:3. As man universally is *flesh* or *depraved* we cannot contemplate the *natural* man as he exists in the world but as *carnal*. But the term *natural* is not, I think, in the scriptures confined to man as *carnal* or *depraved*. My recent experience on the point is this; in preaching a short time since, I had occasion to quote I Cor.2:14, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, &c.," and in quoting it the idea was presented with considerable force to my mind that the Apostle did not design to convey the idea only, that man in consequence of his fallen state, "receiveth not the things," but, that man as *made a living soul*, being of the earth, earthy, had no faculty, either in his original upright, or present fallen state, capable of *receiving the things of the Spirit of God*, and I so explained the passage. In reviewing the subject since, I have been confirmed in the correctness of that idea, both from the connection of that text, and from the use of the term *natural* in I Cor.15:44-46, where it is evidently used to denote man in his original creation as distinguished by his peculiar formation, faculties, &c., from the *second man who is the Lord from heaven*; without its having any special bearing as to the state of man, either as upright or fallen. Hence whilst the word is here used in relation to man in his original creation, and therefore whilst in his upright state, it is just before, in verse 44, used in relation to the human body as mortal and therefore as subject to the consequences of sin. So that neither uprightness, nor carnality are essential to man as *natural*. If I am correct in these views, the terms *natural* and *carnal* or *flesh* as found in the Scriptures are not strictly synonymous. The difference is about this; the *carnal man* is the *natural man* as he exists in consequence of the disobedience of Adam, a depraved creature; the *natural man*, is the same man, as he exists in his distinct formation and powers as a creature of God, whether in his original upright or present *carnal* state. From what I have said, it will be seen that one expression of mine found in the queries I proposed, published in SIGNS for July 15, 1848, page 106, is according to my present views incorrect. It is this, "Is the *mind* which by *nature* is earthly and *fleshly* &c.?" The mind of man is by nature *earthly* being so formed of God as adapted to man's

earthly residence. But man's mind is *fleshly* or *carnal*, by the *offence of one*, Adam. This makes the idea involved in the query still more formable, for the mind of man in order to become spiritual and heavenly must be changed both from its *carnal* state and its earthly nature. Excuse me, Brother Beebe, for introducing my views in answer to a query addressed to you and differing from yours. I thought perhaps the query was induced by my expressions above referred to, though not meeting them exactly. Besides as the query was introduced, I wished it to receive an answer through the SIGNS, such as the scriptures will fully justify. If you and I have both failed in giving a correct answer, some other brother may be induced to set the thing right.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Aug. 4, 1848.

MATTHEW 24:27, CONSIDERED.

BROTHER BEEBE: - I see in the SIGNS for Sept.1, 1848, a request for my views on Matt.24:27, from a *humble brother* who signs himself, An Inquirer. As the grace of humility is so very rare, and so many of us who would be humble, find ourselves when tried, the reverse; it seems reasonable that when a humble brother is met with, we should pay all due attention to his inquiries. I will therefore seek to comply with his request.

The reading of the text is this, "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." As the coming of the Son of man is here mentioned, it may not be improper to give somewhat fully my views of the coming of Christ as declared in the Scriptures. The Scriptures as I understand them speak of two distinct comings of Christ, in reference to the saints as being in the world. The first was his coming in the flesh or being born in Bethlehem. Embraced in this personal coming, according to the general tenor of promise, and prophecy going before, is the whole of his coming in his kingdom in the world, both in the gathering together of his elect, and in the destruction of his enemies. Thus old Jacob's prophecy, Gen.49:10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be," evidently embraces Christ's coming in the flesh, and his going forth in his gospel, gathering his sheep into his fold. In Psalms

50:1-3, it is said, "The Lord hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined." And that, "Our God shall come and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with my sacrifice." &c. Thus this corresponds with Jacob's prophecy above, in the coming of our God or Shiloh, and in the *gathering of the people unto him*; also with Matt.24:30 & 31, the sending of his angels with the great sound of a trumpet and gathering together his elect, &c. Those who have made a covenant with him by sacrifice are evidently the *elect*; that is, in and through Christ their Head and Representative. In this connection it is said a *fire devoureth before him*, and remember, "A fire goeth before him and burneth up his enemies round about." Psal.97:3, this also in connection with the Lord's reigning. Thus his reigning or having all power given to him in heaven and in earth, or calling to the heavens from above, and his burning up his enemies round about and the gathering together unto him his people or saints, are all connected with his coming in the flesh, for to this end was he born. John 18:37. See also Phil.2:6-11. In Isa.9:6 & 7 it is said of the *child born*, {and by comparing verse 1 & 2 with Matt.4:14-16 it is evident that it is spoken of Christ, as coming in the flesh,} that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." But it is not necessary to multiply quotations to prove a point of which the scriptures are so full. Hence the comings of our Lord in reference to the spread of his gospel, to the destruction of the Jews, and other enemies; or to his dwelling with his saints are but points of his first personal coming; they are not distinct manifestations of himself in person, but only distinct manifestations of his power and of his grace and faithfulness to his people, &c.

That there is to be a second personal coming and appearing of Christ Jesus, is evident from the declaration of the two men in white apparel, unto the disciples, as they were gazing after Jesus as he went into heaven; namely, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1:9-11. This is affirmed of *Jesus*, and therefore of his manhood, and hence can mean nothing less than that he shall again come visibly in that same body in which the disciples had seen him

go up into heaven. Hence it is that I understand the Apostle in saying, "And unto them that look for him shall he appear a second time without sin unto salvation," {Heb.9:23,} to have reference to the coming of Jesus *in like manner as the disciples saw him go into heaven*. A *second time*, clearly refers to a former time in which he appeared and marks a distinct appearing from that first time; and if it is a second appearing it must be a personal manifestation. This *appearing* or coming is to be "without sin unto salvation." In everything connected with Christ's first appearing, sin is in one way or other brought to remembrance; but this salvation without sin must be that ultimate completion of salvation, that entire deliverance from sin and death, which the saints by faith are looking for. Hence also I think I Thes.4:16 & 17, has reference to this same second appearing, or coming in like manner. It reads thus, "For the Lord *himself shall descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Some of our brethren differ from me in their views of Heb.9:28, as also in reference to the 27th verse, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, &c." If I understand them, their view is that the 27th verse has reference to a will or testament; that the *appointment once to die* has reference to the laws and customs of men which require that the testator should be first dead, before his heirs can claim the execution of his will; and the *after judgment* to be the decision of the judge of probates as to the validity of the will. Whilst I would not treat with disrespect those brethren or their opinions, I must say that from the first of my hearing or seeing this idea advanced my mind revolted as it as tending to belittle this portion of Scripture; and still whilst I am conscious of the superiority of those brethren in gifts and judgment, I cannot view the idea otherwise than as degrading, that the eternal God should have appointed his Son unto death, or offered him, merely in conformity to the laws and customs of men concerning testaments, that the testator must first die, before his will is of force, and such must be the conclusion, from such exposition; for notice the comparison. "As it is appointed unto men once to die ... so Christ once offered, &c." But the mischief of such an exposition does not stop here; it sets aside the whole doctrine of the cross of Christ, as Old School Baptists have ever held it; as those brethren themselves hold it. For if we admit that the laws and

customs of men concerning wills, amount to anything like an appointment unto men once to die, what is the sum of it? It is this, that the testator must die to establish his will. He dies according to the general sentence of God by which *death passed upon all men*; there is nothing in his death expiatory, no bearing the sins of his heirs, no redemption in it. Now if the comparison in the text holds good, according to this exposition, Christ's bearing the sins of many amounts to nothing; he only dies to give force or validity to the new testament, and the inheritance comes to the heirs without their being redeemed, or their sins being expiated. Is not this the legitimate conclusion to be drawn from the passage according to the above exposition? But let us examine the text with its connection, to see whether such exposition can be correct. I cannot see anything in the declaration, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment" applicable to the circumstances of wills. There is the appointment by the word of God or by the laws of men that men shall make their wills, or that having made them they shall then die. There is an appointment of God that men shall die because they have sinned, but this has no relation to their wills. The Apostle says nothing about an appointment in the case of a testament; he says, "Where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator," but this is very different from the idea of an appointment in the case. The necessity arises from the nature of things, because whilst the man still lives, his property is his own, and he may alienate it, or decide to make a different disposition of it. Hence some men have lived to make several wills, and others have died without making any, and some without having any property to be inherited after their debts are paid. Again, how is it that the judgment is after the death of the testator? In modern times, wills may be contested, and in that case there is a judgment as to their validity. But in general the judgment goes before, the man's will is the judgment that must stand in reference to the distribution of his property, and this has after his death to be executed; hence he appoints – not judges – but *executors* to his will.

Also, the connection does not favor the idea, any more than the words of the text, that the Apostle in speaking in reference to a will. God has been pleased to show to the heirs of promise, the security to them of the gracious provisions he has made for them in Christ, both by the idea of a covenant, and of a testament; and both ideas are carried out in the scriptures distinctly. The Apostle having in the eight chapter brought to view the superiority of the new covenant over the

old, goes on in this ninth chapter to show that the specifications of the first covenant were but the shadows of the good things, the substance of the new, as in the case of the offerings of the priesthood, and of the tabernacle; and in bringing to view the death and blood of Christ as the substance shadowed forth by the offerings and priesthood of the old covenant, confirms the idea of the old covenant, confirms the idea of the necessity of his death, verses 15 – 20, by reference to a testament, and the necessity of the death of the testator, thus showing that the death of Christ was involved in both figures. He then again resumes the consideration of the specifications of the covenant in reference to the shedding of *blood for remission*, and offerings, &c., showing that he had fully dropped the idea of a testament; for a testament has to do with an inheritance, not with sacrifices and offerings for sin. In verses 25 and 26 he lays down the position, that Christ's offering of himself had not to be repeated like the offerings of the first covenant, "But now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." He then proceeds, verses 27 & 28, to confirm this position by the fact that the penalty of the law does not require that the sinner should repeatedly die, and therefore Christ as the substitute of his people could not be required repeatedly to *offer himself* or die; his language is, And as it is appointed unto men *once* to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was *once* offered, &c., thus showing that Christ's *once* being offered met the appointment of God or the demand of the law that men should once die. But what, say some, has this sentence, "But after this the judgment" to do in this case? A great deal. What is the judgment, but the giving of judgment? And what is that, but the passing of sentence either of justification or of condemnation? Does not the whole scriptural testimony fix the time of judgment after death? Was it not after Christ's death that he was *raised for the justification of his people*? And in reference to himself, though he was first *manifested in the flesh*, yet it was in the *Spirit* that he was *justified*; not by his death, but by the resurrection from the dead was he "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness." I Tim.3:16, Rom.1:4. So in reference to the elect, it is after they have been slain by the law, that judgment passes upon them. Herein is the clear difference between the sentence or penalty of the law and the judgment, and shows that the sentence of the law is not the judgment; the convicted elect sinner is under the teachings of the Spirit convinced that the sentence of death by the law stands justly against him as a transgressor, and is expecting

every moment the judgment in accordance thereunto to be given, and to be banished to eternal darkness; but behold it does not take place, and to his astonishment, instead of *condemnation*, it is *justification*, through the obedience of Christ. So of the world, or those who die in unbelief, Christ's words are, "The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice; and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5:28 & 29. *Damnation* as used in the scriptures is synonymous with *condemnation*, and condemnation is the giving of judgment. If they are raised to this out of their graves it must be after death. If indeed there is no after judgment, in reference to the finally impenitent, no sentence passed upon them other than what is contained in the scriptures, or than the written penalty of the law; there would at least be a very strong argument in favor of their becoming extinct at death. For the penalty of the law is, the sinner shall *die*; and if there is no after sentence corresponding to the spirituality of the soul, the conclusion would be that death would be the end. Following the Apostle's argument through, that "as it is appointed unto men once to die," so Christ was once offered, corresponding with that sentence, and as, "after this the judgment;" so "unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation;" in open confirmation of their faith, and of the judgment passed upon them through him in his resurrection; we see a full harmony in this passage with the connection, and a dignity in it corresponding to the exalted nature of Christ's death as generally revealed in the scriptures.

But to the immediate subject given for consideration. I think I have on a former occasion in writing my views of this 24th chapter of Matthew noticed that the disciples in verse 3, asked their Lord two distinct questions. 1st. "When shall these things be?" that is, the destruction &c., of the temple of which he had just spoken; and 2nd. "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" Some may perhaps suppose, and I know not but that I may have formerly supposed, that the disciples asked concerning two distinct periods in this second question; namely, that of his coming, and that of the end of the world. But not so, for then they would have enquired for the *signs*; that is, the sign of each, instead of connecting both as they did with *one sign*. The coming therefore embraced in this enquiry, is that which is immediately connected with the end of the world, and which of course is that *second personal coming* of Christ which, as has been showed, the scriptures authorize us to look for. The

enquiry is, after the *sign* of this event, or these events connected. Christ in the course of the chapter gives such answers to the two enquiries and such instructions relative thereto as he saw proper. Preceding this 27th verse he forewarns of the coming of *false christs*, &c., in verse 26, he speaks of their calling upon the people to go into the *desert* or the *secret chambers* in order to their manifesting themselves to them as the Christ. He tells his disciples not to believe them; and in the 27th verse he gives them this one leading principle by which all such secret working imposters may be detected; namely, that the true Christ, the Son of man, comes in no such obscure way, "For as the lightning cometh out of the east" {and from its nature} "shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be." His coming personally, or coming in his gospel and the display of his power, is open and public like the light, not obscure like the darkness. As he says, Isaiah 48:16, "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I;" and as he told the high priest, John 18:20; "I spake openly to the world &c." So his religion leads to an open public profession of it; in vain is it sought to be enjoyed in secret. His doctrine is to be proclaimed from the house-tops, not talked of in the chimney-corner, but kept back in public. These are my present views of this text; and it was spoken I think to guard his disciples in all after ages against any of these *secret-chamber* systems, plans or professions of religion; Christ's religion being like his coming, and like a lighted candle designed to give light.

My respects to *Enquirer*, though I think I may doubt his humility from his being ashamed of his name.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Oct.10, 1848.

REMARKS ON ELDER WILLIAMS' LETTER & QUERIES.

BROTHER BEEBE: - It may appear superfluous for me to attempt any reply to brother Williams' letter, after the able answer you have given to his queries, {SIGNS for June 15th.} But, first, I only am responsible for spreading the extract from Elder Dudley's pamphlet before the readers of the SIGNS, to which brother Williams objects; I therefore feel bound to defend it, and this I feel a willingness to do, from being satisfied of the truth of its sentiment. Secondly, there are

apparently certain sentiments intimated in brother Williams' queries and remarks, upon which I feel a wish to reason a little with him. I may have misapprehended his intended meaning, I hope I have, and that he will correct me by answering the enquiries I beg leave to make of him. The queries direct, I do not intend replying to, unless it be, I may offer some remarks to the first.

1st. I would ask brother Williams whether by exhorting the brethren to "be willing to be *little christians*" he intended to exhort them to be satisfied with knowing but *little* of the *doctrine of Christ*, to be ignorant christians? The connecting remarks tend to convey that idea. If so, I would ask him, whether, when he was young and little in experience and in the doctrine, he felt the same humbling sense of his own vileness and insufficiency to any good thing, as now? Or whether as he has grown in the knowledge of Christ, he has become bigger in his own estimation and more self-confident? I know there are other brethren besides brother Williams, who charge those who would know for themselves, what is the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the different parts of the scriptures, instead of being satisfied with what others have said is the gospel doctrine, with aiming to be big and to dig so deep as to get out of sight of others, &c. My understanding of the matter, so far as I do understand, is that every part of gospel doctrine has a relation to Christ, and tends to exalt him; and the more therefore we know of doctrine, in its relation to experience, the more we shall see of the glory of Christ, and the more abased in our own estimation. What kind of a spirit can that be, which would lead us to say, "We know that Christ is the *Savior of sinners*, and that we have pardon through his blood, but we do not wish to trouble ourselves with any further knowledge of him or of his doctrine? Brother Williams, if I have rightly apprehended the import of your remarks, do they not tend to cultivate just such a spirit among the brethren? Bear with me, my brother, in being plain. If a knowledge of doctrine is of so little amount, or perhaps injurious, why are the brethren reprov'd for their "unskillfulness in the word of righteousness," &c. Heb.5:2-14? Why did Paul pray that the love of the brethren "might abound more and more in knowledge and in all judgment," {Phil.1:9,} and that the brethren at Colosse, "might be *filled* with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding," &c. Col.1:9.

2nd. From the general current of brother Williams' queries and remarks I should infer that with him, the "new creature" is a mere change in the *natural man*, in that they

imply that there is nothing in the *new creature* that was not through Adam dead in sins, and needed salvation. This change in the natural man can of course be nothing more than a change of views concerning God and his relation to him, and a consequent change of desires, affections, and pursuits, occasioned by being taught, and receiving the declarations of Scripture. If this be his ground, then he occupies the very position from whence originates all the difference between Old School Baptists and most popular religionists in reference to experience. For although brother Williams may hold in distinction from the Reformers or Campbellites that the natural man cannot arrive at the knowledge of spiritual religion only as he is taught by the Holy Spirit, yet the moment he assumes that no new faculty is imparted to the man, that it is a mere enlightening of his natural or rational faculties to understand spiritual things, he places this knowledge within the scope of human reason; and I have a right to challenge him to show according to the *principles of reason* why a man cannot impart to others, of like rational faculties, any knowledge which he has himself received by the powers of his natural mind. Let me be discipled to this belief that the natural mind is capable of receiving the things of the Spirit of God, and I shall be an advocate for the popular course of religious instruction by Sunday Schools, &c. If this be the ground really occupied by our brother, {which by the way, I still hope is not the case;} he has evidently overlooked the true import of what the Scriptures deny to the natural powers of man. It is not merely that they deny man's capability of teaching, they deny also his capability of *receiving* the knowledge of spiritual things, by the exercise of any natural powers of his mind. See I Cor.1:21. "For after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God," &c. What is *human wisdom*, other than the highest attainments of which the natural mind is capable? Yet by this God is not known, but God has made foolish this wisdom, in things of religion, as is manifest in the religions of the world, and in the experience of the children of God, when all their attained knowledge was turned into ignorance and confusion. Christ thanked his Father that he had "hid these things from the wise and prudent," {Matt.11:25,} from these who have made the highest attainments in knowledge of which the natural mind is capable. But see the full denial of the capability of the natural or Adamic man of receiving the things of the Spirit of God in I Cor.2:14. "But the natural man *receiveth not* the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither *can he know them*, because they are spiritually discerned." The *natural man* embraces all that

belongs to man as he was originally created in Adam. As to the idea that the new birth is a production in the soul of a *spiritual existence* or *life* by immediate creation, instead of the being produced by regeneration from an original creation in Christ as a Head, as brother Williams' queries and remarks do not involve it, I will not now notice.

3rd. In reference to brother Williams' first query; namely, "Did any of the Apostles and Prophets ever write anything about the *bond of union*?" I must take somewhat different ground from you, brother Beebe. I agree with you that not only the Apostles and Prophets, but that all the sacred writers from Moses on, wrote about the union of Christ and his people. In Moses, the substitution of the animal for a sin offering in the place of the Israelite who had sinned; the high priest's bearing on his breast plate and on his shoulders the names of the twelve tribes of Israel when he officiated in his office, and the right of redemption being in one who was near akin, all typified a union of Christ and his people in that great work of redemption. It is true these were only shadows of a real union, but shall we find in the anti-type that to which we look for in the substance, no more reality, than in the shadow? It may be said there was a foreordained union between Christ and the elect; but there was a foreordained union also between the sinning Israelite and the sin offering; hence when the animal was offered and his blood sprinkled, &c., it was as though the sinner himself had suffered the penalty of the law of Moses. But it was the individual's bringing the animal to the priest for sacrifice that made him actually interested in the efficacy of the offering. So if there is only a foreordained union between Christ and his people, it is their believing in him as their sin offering, that makes them actually interested in his death; and therefore according to this view, faith would be the *bond of union*. But as to the term, "*bond of union*," I do not find it in the scriptures; I cannot discover the idea in those texts which you quote, that is as that which binds Christ and his church together in a union. It is an old term consecrated by its use among religionists. And many persons I have no doubt use it from custom, when they mean only the *union* itself. Others again, need and mean the very idea of a bond of union, or that which binds together, in a nominal or acknowledged union, parts which before or otherwise had separate existences. As for instance, those who believe christians to be no other than *reformed Adamites*, or natural persons changed, must have to connect them with Christ, something to bind them to him, and faith as before remarked, according to their view, appears the proper bond. Again, those who hold that the quickening of the

soul with spiritual life, is not the imparting to that soul this life by regeneration from Christ, but actually a distinct creation of this life direct in them, as some of our brethren appear to hold, if I can understand them, of course need also, in order to connect this new creation to Christ, something to bind it to him. And perhaps *love* is as good a bond as they can have. But those of us who hold that Christ himself, as such, is the *quickening spirit*, that the new life, or new creature, or new man, is the spirit of Christ, or is Christ in us, imparted not by a new creation, but in regeneration; as says John, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." I John 5:11,12. And says Peter, "Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." I Pet.1:28. I say those of us who thus believe, do not need any *bond of union*, the union itself is a being *all of one*; it is Christ in us, the hope of glory. Heb.2:11, Col.1:27. Adam and Eve did not need any *bond* of union to make them one flesh, they were already such in their creation. As natural persons, we had a distinct existence in Adam, as such we needed something to constitute us members of the body of Christ; this something is found in the *one spirit*, {"there is one body and one spirit,"} being quickened with that one spirit, the spirit of Christ, we stand manifest as members of the *one body*, knit together by it. This spirit thus animating us individually, is as *joints and bands*, giving individual action in our union with the body, as moved by the same spirit, as is the case with the members of the natural body. And all the nourishment by which this body increaseth manifestively, according to the increase of God, that is according to his purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, is from Christ the Head.

4th. The quotation from Elder Dudley, I will now notice. Whether brother Williams intended to dress the sentiment borrowed from Elder Dudley, in false colors I will not say. I trust he did not; but certainly there is nothing in the quotation, nor in Elder Dudley's pamphlet, neither in any thing I wrote on the subject, which warrants such constructions as he puts upon the extract, by confounding that which is derived from Christ the Quickening Spirit, with that which is derived from Adam, so as to represent the *persons* quickened as not having been dead in sins and as not needing salvation. The terms *Quickened Spirits* as found in the extract, used instead of *Quickening Spirit*, which on reflection, I think I should prefer, might occasion some obscurity in the sentence, were it not

that the connection shows so clearly that by these expressions is intended that spiritual life which is derived from Christ, and is contrasted with the *living souls* which we derive from Adam. As it stands I can see no obscurity in the meaning. But if it is the sentiment conveyed in the quotation, that brother Williams thereby aims to deride, let us look at the Scriptures referred to, and see if the doctrine does not stand on too strong ground to be shaken by anything which men may bring against it, whether scoffs or philosophy. The Scripture to which Elder Dudley referred is found in I Cor.15:45-49. In this passage the two Adams are spoken of and contrasted. And is it not too manifest to be denied by any candid enquirer after truth, that they are presented to view as two Heads, having each a distinct posterity or seed like unto himself, the one *earthy as is the earthy*, the other *heavenly as is the heavenly*? If the first Adam was an actual head having an actual seed; was not the last Adam an actual Head having an actual seed? If the posterity of the first were created and received a being in him, when he was made a living soul, were not the posterity of the last Adam, in like manner created in him, when he was made a *Quickening Spirit*? Again, does not verse 49, "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," clearly show that the same we who bear the image of the heavenly, and are thereby manifested as his seed, also bear the image of the earthy, and are thereby manifested as his seed; first manifested as the seed of the natural, and afterwards as the seed of the spiritual? How are any manifested in the image of the earthy as to his nature, and in his likeness as to his depravity? We are told {Gen.5:3} that Adam, "begat a son in his own *likeness* and after his image." There then is the answer. May we not then safely conclude that the seed of Christ are manifested in his image as spiritual, by being born of the Spirit, and in his likeness as the glorified Jesus, by their resurrection or being born from the dead, according to the two begettings ascribed to their Head, Christ Jesus? He was manifested as the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, when in the flesh. John 1:14. And he was the first born from the dead, Col.1:18, and said to be begotten in his resurrection, Psal.2:7, compared with Acts 13:33. And further, as the saints are brought to view as the *seed* of Christ, Psal.22:30, and Isa.53:10 and as his *children*, {Isa.8:18, compared with Heb.2:13,} will not brother Williams be constrained to acknowledge this comparison between the two Adams and their seeds as holding good? If so, all ground is taken from him to infer that, because we have been quickened by the spirit of Christ and therefore existed in him,

as *his seed* before the foundation of the world, we therefore never existed in Adam, were not dead as his seed in sin, and did not need salvation. Indeed I cannot conceive how he could ever draw such an inference, if he admits that those who have been born of the flesh may actually be born again of the Spirit. As to the new man, the spiritual life of the believer, as Christ is that life, I am free to admit, that it was not created in Adam, did not fall in him, and never needed salvation any more than did Christ personally. But to draw the conclusion from this, that the persons quickened with this life, were never in a lost state needing salvation, is to me strange logic, and stranger divinity.

5th. As to eternal justification, I see not that it is involved in the subject of his queries. Besides, brother Williams probably was not aware that the first complaining among the readers of the SIGNS about doctrinal controversies, arose from our opposing the idea of the saints being justified from eternity, as he has in his communications.

6th. Brother Williams in speaking of the time when the saints first tasted that the Lord was gracious says, "You did not then think of an eternal actual existence with Christ, &c." I have sometimes described the proper act of faith to be an embracing of Jesus Christ as the Savior of lost sinners, such as the individual felt himself to be without any special reference to his own being represented by Christ. I was wrong. A few nights since as I was reflecting on this point, my own experience when faith was first given me came forcibly to my mind. And I recollected that I then saw, that Christ as substituted to endure the penalty of the law due to condemned sinners was so exactly suited to my case that the conclusion was manifested to me that I once had in view when he was provided as a substitute, and therefore that he bore my sins. So that my faith embraced in substance a union with Christ as far back as his death; and I think, I was led to contemplate the provision as made in eternity. And I am now confident, I never could have hoped for salvation from a mere view of him as suffering the penalty due to sinners. For I then viewed my case an aggravated one, as I still do, and myself worse than any other, and therefore without having faith to view him as standing between me personally, and the law, I could not have had confidence to trust in him as my salvation. I think the same in substance must be the experience of all who are brought into liberty. They must view him as suffering in their stead, and therefore in effect view their union with him. They probably did not at the time have a clear view of all the details of that glorious union with Christ as their Head and Husband,

by which he of right stood between them and all the demands of law. If they had, they would since have experienced no growth in the knowledge of Christ. But it is very strange to me that christians should be exhorted to make their first exercise of faith their exclusive standard of the doctrine of Christ, to the overlooking of all the enlargement of their understanding in that doctrine which they have since experienced. I hope brother Williams will reflect on these things and let us know where he stands. I have used plainness; I was not offended at his communication, but I have been impressed with the idea that it called for great plainness of speech. If he is a child of God and minister of Christ, as I hope he is, this will not hurt him; though he and others may be offended at me for it. May he be disposed to leave the a,b,c, of the doctrine of Christ, and go on unto perfection. If I have erred and thereby dealt wrongfully with his communication, may he feel to forgive me.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., July 18, 1849.

REPLY TO BRETHREN: SONSHIP & UNION.

BROTHER BEEBE: - I would not reply to these brethren, and especially so soon after sending you a communication on a similar subject, were it not that they have given so wrong representations of the views of myself and others, on this side of the question, that I cannot for the truth's sake, nor for the sake of my standing among brethren consent to leave the matter here.

Discussions on religious subjects, when conducted in a spirit of enquiry after truth, and of mutual submission to the testimony of the scriptures as the standard, are calculated to be both pleasant and profitable. But when otherwise conducted, they may as well be let alone, any further than as they may be in defense of truth. For these reasons, I am constrained to reply to these brethren, and in so doing, review some of their positions. I desire to do it, as briefly as I consistently can, in candor, and in love of the truth. I esteem these brethren as christians, as Old School Baptists, and on account of my intercourse with them. In my communication, in the 10th number, present volume of the SIGNS, in replying to brother Barton's query concerning the churches being *created in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world*, I took the

ground, that the expressions "created in Christ Jesus," naturally involved the idea that his church was created in his creation, as the Head of his church, and of course, as far back as he stood as her Head. I referred to I Cor.15:45, as sustaining the same idea, and also to Rev.3:14 & Col.1:15 as further justifying the application of the idea of creatureship to our Lord in reference to his headship. It used to be that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word should be established; but it seems it is not so now. These brethren in replying to that communication, do not notice the text, Eph.2:10 {"For we are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus*, &c.,"} although I founded my main arguments on it. The other three scripture passages above named they notice, and how they dispose of them shall now occupy our attention.

They ask, "Do the Scriptures give any information of anything being created before the beginning?" If they mean by *beginning* the beginning of the creation of God; I answer no, for Christ is that beginning. But, if they mean by it, the beginning of time, as in Gen.1:1, I say yes; for in that beginning God created the heavens and the earth, but Christ, being the Beginning of the creation of God, and the First born of every creature, must in this sense have been created or brought into existence before these, and therefore before time. As no other reading has been attempted to be given to these texts, Rev.3:14 & Col.1:15, I still think them good authority as they read. But as they do not satisfy these brethren, I will produce other corresponding texts. In John 1:4, we read, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." This is said of the Word as he in the beginning was with God, and was God. John 1:1. Will any person after candid reflection say of this life that is so particularly spoken of as distinct from the Word, as being described to be *in the Word*, and again as if to prevent mistake, it is said, and the "life was the light of men," not simply that it *was the light*, &c., that it is itself the Word or the essential existence of the Godhead? If not, must they not admit that this life was produced, that is begotten or created existence in the Word, or be driven to the necessity that there are other self-existencies than God, and therefore other gods? If then this life was not a self-existence, then it may properly be termed a creature, as being produced of God. Remember, Christ is that light. Again, in Isaiah 51, the LORD, or Jehovah addressing himself to that personage in the singular number, of whom he calls himself, verse 13, The LORD *thy Maker*, and in verse 15, says, "I am the Lord *thy God*," says in verse 16, "And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens,

and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people." These brethren certainly must admit that this personage of whom the Lord says, that he is his *Maker* and that he *hath covered him in the shadows of his hand*, &c., is not himself the essential self-existent God, in the sense in which he is spoken of; but that he is a creature. This is said of him before the planting of the heavens, &c., and therefore the *beginning* of time. It cannot with any consistency be said that this was spoken merely by a decree of fore-ordination of what should take place in time, because it is expressly said, "I have put my words in thy mouth, &c.," that "I may plant the heavens, &c.," and therefore spoken of as an antecedent work, preparatory to planting the heavens, &c. {I have left it for these brethren to decide for themselves who this personage is, whether Christ personally as the Head of his church, or the church as in him; they amount to the same thing. By a comparison with Isa.49:2, I should think it is Christ personally; but then his church was thus in him. Ps.90:1,2, & 91:1, and Prov.8, as compared with chapter 7.} Other like texts I might quote, but if these can be thrown aside, fifty might be, I therefore forbear.

I next pass to their notice of the two texts, Rev.3:14 & Col.1:15. They say in reference to them, "We desire to give the fairest construction we can, according to the *tenor of truth*." Why not according to the reading of the texts? This *tenor of truth* I presume is the same with the *analogy of faith*, which we have heard so frequently spoken of. Brethren, I would reason with you a little on this point, if it be not taken as presuming in me, considering my inferiority to you, and my being so full of inconsistencies myself. But whatever I may be, I would like to see in my brethren a *going on to perfection*, and not a setting down satisfied that our fathers have provided for us a sufficiency of knowledge, and that their *cisterns* are better to draw from, than the *fountain of living waters*. Brethren, if we consider, that not only the matter of the Scriptures is by *divine inspiration*, but also that an Apostle has said, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual," {I Cor.2:13,} shall we not feel bound to respect each text, and the *words* of it, as resting upon the authority of God; unless the text be an interpolation, or the translation be not a correct representation of the original? Second. Is not this *tenor of truth* or *analogy of faith*, a matured opinion, we, or others, have formed of what, to be consistent as we think, must compose the parts of God's revealed truth? If so, and we further consider that our

knowledge is so imperfect as to lead Paul to say, "If any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing, yet as he ought to know," {I Cor.8:2,} would it not much better consist with that humility which becometh us, to admit the truth of what each portion of Scripture declares in reference to the subject spoken of, and according to its plain import, than to implicate the Holy Ghost with saying what is not so, that our views of the *tenor of truth* may stand?

To return to our subject, we will now notice how this *tenor of truth* works in reference to those texts. First. In reference to Rev.3:14, "The beginning of the creation of God." They quote the text, and without attempting to show that there is any mistake in the reading, or that the word *beginning* does not properly mean beginning, but *beginner*, they try to show that the text does not mean what it says. Their *modus operandi* it is not necessary for me to notice. They next come to Col.1:15, "The First-born of every creature." By quoting the following verses, in which in connection with the 15th verse, Paul is giving such a representation of the Son of God and Redeemer as to show that in his complex person, *He in all things has the pre-eminence*. But they would thereby make the impression that he is not the *first-born* of every creature, and of course that in this particular he has not the pre-eminence over his brethren, and is not like them, though verse 18 says, "That in all things he might have the pre-eminence," and Heb.2:17, reads, "In all things it behooved him to be made like his brethren," in that they are *born of God*, and he not according to these brethren, for if born of God he has a derived existence, and therein is a creature in distinction from the self-existent Godhead. The same course of reasoning would also prove that he is not the First-born from the dead. For if his being God forbids the idea of his having a *created existence* in personal union with his Godhead, he never could have been in the state of the dead, to be *born* from it. They ask in reference to the declaration, "Who is the image of the invisible God," former part of verse 15, "Can a creature be the image of the invisible God?" It seems Adam was created in the *image of God*, {Gen.1:27,} and so is the new man renewed after the image of him that created him. {Col.3:10.} But wishing to answer them more fully on this point, I will ask them, if according to their views the Son as such does not exist as God, and only as God? If so, is he not the invisible God equally with the Father? And third; Can the *invisible God* be an *image* of the invisible God? I say, no; for an *image*, according to the general and natural import of the word, means a visible representation former of some person or idea;

as the image of liberty, &c. I do not believe that the self-existence, as such, of God was ever represented in an image, but all the attributes of God I believe are expressly represented in and through the Son or Christ. And I know not that God has ever been represented or *declared* to men, but by Christ. John 1:18. If God is declared in the works of creation, all things were created by the Son, {Col.1:16,} but then God "made the worlds by him," as Solomon made all the vessels for the temple through Hiram. I Kings 7:14-48. See Heb.1:1-2. So "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." II Cor.5:18,19. Thus we see that God acts through Christ or the Son as an agent, and therefore as the Son, Christ must have an existence distinct from the *invisible God*, though personally one with him. From the notice we have taken of the attempts of these brethren to deny the correctness of the declarations of these several texts, we see the tendency of their attempts to square the Scriptures according to their views of the tenor of truth. And it is evident that the dispute about these texts, is no longer between me and them, but between them and the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost says that Christ, is the beginning of the creation of God, and the First-born of every creature, and that his people were *created in him*, &c.; they, in effect, say it is not so. Hundreds of other texts might be named on which the same dispute would arise; but I will forbear.

I now come to the wrong representations these brethren have given of the views advanced by me and others, on this subject. When I first read their piece I felt so sensibly the injustice of their representations, that I was ready to pronounce the whole a base slander and there leave it. But on a little reflection I concluded that these brethren did not design to slander us; that they honestly, though strangely, had misconstrued our views. One wrong representation is found in this sentence and connection, "Now the *fancied* system of our dear brethren, that this eternal new creation has nothing to do with the soul or body; the soul is not prepared for eternal life by its implantation nor any influence at all to control any of the disordered passions of nature," &c. This contains such a sweeping charge that I hardly know how to get at all its points, without taking it word by word. But let us examine the two, and see which has the advantage in these particulars, the life with which they fancy they have been quickened, or the life with which we fancy we have been quickened; though indeed, I did hope, this being quickened was something more than fancy, both in them and us, as also the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures. They believe

that the Holy Ghost is the quickening power, but that he does not *create little gods* in them; of course it is not a communication of himself, so as to become their life, and that he does not *purify the Adamic nature in whole or in part*, of course neither soul nor body is changed; but he *implants new spiritual life in the soul*; and *this spiritual life is entirely distinct from their natural life*, &c. This life then must be a creature, a distinct existence, created in them by the Holy Ghost. Is it any better to be created in them, than to have been created in Christ Jesus? As the quickening of each individual must be a distinct putting forth of the power of the Holy Ghost, the life in each must be a distinct creature, having no relation to one another, other than of being alike the creatures of the Holy Ghost; and they are creatures of time too. Hence, there is no being the seed of Christ, no actual relation to him as a head, no being of *his bones and his flesh* in their life. If these brethren can make anything different out of the description they have given, I cannot. No wonder they want a *bond of union* to form a body of Christ out of these separately existing branches. There is no analogy to such a body as this in any kind of body God has ever formed. Christ says, "I am the vine, ye are the branches," but they would have his body made up as they make brush brooms to sweep their yards. The life with which we believe the soul is quickened is Christ – *Christ in you the hope of glory*. Col.1:27 & 3:3,4. Christ who is the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; begotten or created in the Word, and his people in him, and thus ever existing in personal union with the Godhead, both from eternity, and as he is manifested in the new birth in the believer, as he says, "As thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." Again, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." John 17:21,23. Thus Christ our life existed as the Head and Husband of his church, before the heavens were planted, or the foundations of the earth laid, in the secret place of the Most High, in the shadow of God's hand, and as one with God, and therefore as God whilst he is the Son of God. Hence when persons are born again, born of the Quickening Spirit, they are manifested as members of Christ's body, as his seed, and through him – the only begotten of the Father, they are *born of God*, and are the *sons of God*. Now if your life dwelling in the soul as a detached lonely creature, can prepare the soul for heaven and exercise an influence over the person, &c., one would think that Christ in the soul and God in Christ, would be quite as likely to produce these effects. You say the soul is not prepared for eternal life by its implantation. Why, it is eternal life in the

soul, {John 3:36, 17:2-4 & I John 5:12,} not a creature of time as you describe, but a life existing from eternity in union with God, and existing to eternity with him. You say the *eternal new creation*, meaning by this epithet the Christ of God, as the Christ, has nothing to do with the souls and bodies of men. Strange he has not, with his people, when they are his sheep that shall never perish, the gift of his Father, and he is their life, their Redeemer, their salvation and their sanctification. But perhaps you have reference in the remarks above noticed to my having spoken of the *new man* in the believer, as a dependent infant, that cannot bring forth its fruits of love, faith, patience, &c., only as the Comforter, the Holy Ghost brings them into exercise. If your life gives you an independency in these things, and strength to love and to exercise faith, patience, &c., at your own pleasure, I have only to say, {I speak in this only for myself,} your experience and mine in this differ significantly. To will and desire is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not, only as an influence independent of me, may graciously bring these fruits into exercise, in a measure, and that but momentarily. But perhaps you meant by this charge, to imply that our belief is not as productive of *good works* in us, as is yours, in you. If so, whilst I positively deny the correctness of the charge, as it relates to the brethren implicated with me, for myself, I am dumb, if a child, I am the vilest, and am still the chief of sinners. Lord save, or I perish, is my cry.

Another wrong representation of my views, and the views of others, is found in their having throughout their communication, spoken of our views, as though we held that Christ as the Head of his church existed personally distinct from God and therefore distinctly as a creature. Where as we have never admitted that as a person he is a creature, but on the contrary, whilst we say that as man he was a creature, and that as Son, or as the Head of his church, or as Mediator, and Christ he is a creature; that is, that the existence in him which constituted him these, was not self-existent, but was brought into existence of God, yet that he took both of these existences into union with himself as God, the latter in eternity, the former in time, thus existing as God, as the Son of God, and the son of man, in one complex person. He thus exists as a distinct person, having distinct personal qualities from the Father and the Holy Ghost, but one with them in the Godhead, thus constituting him a fit and adequate person to be the *one Mediator* between the *one God*, and *men*. And thus in his complex person, whilst he is one with the church, he is one with the Father, whilst he is the husband of the church, he

is her Maker and Lord; and whilst he is the elder brother of his people and joint heir with them, he is their God, and the alone proper and delightful object of their worship. This is the ground I occupy and have occupied, how far the brethren implicated with me, agree with me in all these points is not for me to say. When it is recollected that in the close of the communication to which these brethren have replied, I remarked among other things, in substance, that his being created as the Head of his church no more conflicted with his essential Godhead as God; than his being made flesh did, I think these brethren on reflection will acknowledge they were not warranted from the premises, not from former communications, to give the representation they did of my views, and therefore that the charge is unjust. I am willing to meet these brethren in argument in reference to the proper grounds we each occupy, and if they from the Scriptures can show that they are right, and I wrong, so be it; but I do not like this fending off these blows aimed at an effigy of their own, and christened with my name.

One more remark of theirs I will notice; they say in a parenthesis in reference to our having advocated the doctrine of the church's having been created in Christ as her Head, &c. "Which has caused so much unnecessary talk and writing." Why brethren, if you could be divested of your notions, of making your views of the *tenor of truth* a standard by which to determine the meaning of Scripture, so as to receive as truth just what the Scriptures declare as such; and could give up the idea of a begotten person in the Godhead, which amounts to a begotten God, shape it as you may, and look at the Son of God, self-existent as God, but begotten as the life and head of his people, and they in him, you would see such glory and majesty in the undivided Godhead, such a fullness and excellency in Christ as the Head of his church, and as the one Mediator; such glory and stability in the union of Christ and his church, as having commenced in eternity and not subject to the changes which attend time things; such security in the believers life being *hid with Christ in God*, and such harmony, beauty and fitness in the whole scripture testimony, that you would feel, if you were to hold your peace from declaring these things, as though stones would immediately cry out.

It would be useless to ask to be excused for the length of this communication, but I will ask the brethren to forgive me, and to forgive anything which may appear harsh or incorrect.

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., July 18, 1849.

REPLY TO BRETHREN: THE NEW BIRTH.

PART I

BROTHER BEEBE: - I wish to connect these brethren together in a reply, because in some instances an answer to one, is a reply to another.

1. **BROTHER CLARK on I Cor.15:45** – Brother Clark commences with some remarks relative to the words, *was made*, being a supply, to which I should have no objection, were it not for his saying, "These supplied words are very convenient things, as they can be cashiered or retained, as it suits the fancy or according to the use we wish to make of the passage," thus insinuating that I made such use of these words without due regard to the sense of the text. He seems however not to have found any iniquity in me in the cases referred to, until he had found me using such words to wrest the meaning of the Scriptures, he might have spared himself the trouble, and me the pain, of such an unkind insinuation.

Brother Clark's first argument on the text is to sustain him in denying the correctness of my former assertion, that *to be made* is equivalent to *being created*. I admit what he takes considerable trouble to prove; namely, that the Greek word here used is of very general import, but one of its primary meanings is, *to be made*. I also admit that *to create* in its strict sense differs from *to make*; thus, man can make, but not create. Still these words are frequently used in the Scriptures as of the same import. In Gen.1:26, it reads, "Let us make man," and in verse 27, "So God created man." The same idea is intended to be conveyed in both verses. In verse 31, *made* is used as meaning the same as created. See also Gen.5:1 & 2. What I said was, "To *be made* is equivalent to being *created*." Is it not so? Has brother Clark proved anything else by his many references to the use of the Greek word? Is not the thing made the production of him that made it, and therefore the creature in the common acceptation of the word? Is the thing that is created anything more? But let us come to the text itself. Brother Clark admits that the words, *was made*, in the latter part of the text is a supply; I am glad he does; for otherwise we might have had some more criticism to show they did not mean the same, as do the same words in the former part. As it is, he must admit that the words, *quickeningspirit*, stand in the same grammatical construction with the one verb, *was made*, as do the words – *living soul*. Hence the

was made has the same bearing on the one as on the other. He also admits the former part is a quotation from Gen.2:7, which reads, "And man became a living soul." The Hebrew word here used is of the same general import as the Greek word used by the Apostle, and like it having for one of its primary meanings, *to make*, and *to be made*. The question is, was Adam's becoming a *living soul* the result of his own will, was he self-existent as such? Or was it the result of God's *breathing into his nostrils the breath of life*? If the latter is the case, as I presume all will admit, then Adam in *becoming a living soul* was as much the creature of God as in being formed of the dust of the ground; and the expression, *was made*, is correct in the text I Cor.15:45. And as both parts of the text are in the same grammatical construction; that is, the Apostle makes exactly the same affirmation concerning the last Adam's being a *quickenning spirit*, as he does concerning the first's being a *living soul*, the legitimate conclusion is that the *last Adam was made a quickenning spirit*, and as such is as much the production or creature of God, as was the former in being a *living soul*. And brother Clark's many references to show the various uses of the Greek word amount to nothing.

Brother Clark uses a more plausible argument against the conclusion I have before drawn from this text, in assuming that it only has reference to the resurrection. But his position, "That if therefore it means a creature, Christ was not created until after Adam was, because he is declared to be the *second Adam*," will not stand. In the 47th verse, where the Apostle is not speaking of their being made, but of their distinct natures, he calls the *earthy man* the *first man*, and the Lord from heaven, the *second man*; he might therefore just as well conclude that from the terms *first* and *second* in this verse, that the earthy man existed before the Lord from heaven did, as to infer from the other text that Adam was made first. Paul is not here saying *when* they were made, but *what* they were made; and he uses the terms, *first* and *last*, and *first* and *second*, to designate them one from the other, having reference by these terms, not to the commencement of their existence, but to their manifestations in the world.

Neither will his other position, that the Apostle in this and the following verses had reference only to the resurrection, stand any better; for in that case Adam in being made a *living soul* would be, and only be the contrast to Christ as the resurrection. But not so, for the Apostle had before shown in verse 21 & 22 wherein Adam was the contrast to Christ as the resurrection, "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all

die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here then is the contrast in reference to the resurrection, death is the counterpart to it. Paul having pursued the subject of the resurrection on to verse 44, where making the assertion that, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," he proceeds in verse 45-49 to show whence these different bodies come; namely, "from two distinct Adams or Heads, and draws the contrast between them as such, showing their different natures, the one made a *living soul*, the other a *quickenning spirit*; the one *natural*, the other *spiritual*; the one, of the *earth earthy*, the other, the *Lord from heaven*. He then shows that the distinguishing characteristics of this second Head or Adam are to be carried out even to the bodies of his posterity in the resurrection. This appears to me as the only consistent view of this passage. So that I think brother Clark will have to let my former inference from it still stand, unless he can bring something more weighty against it.

Brother Clark, on this text has passed over the idea of being *made a quickening spirit*, but I will notice it, and notice it in connection with some remarks of his in his preceding communication on this subject. He said, "To quicken is to give life to the dead and this is conceded to be equivalent to regeneration or the new birth." It may be so conceded by many, and I may have so conceded, but I cannot now. I conclude that to quicken is to *restore life* to the dead, and in some instances that it means a reviving of a person who is in a lifeless or stupid state. I understand the word to be used in this last sense in Psal.80:18 & 119:25, and other verses. In the other sense to *quicken the dead*, that it is a restoring to life to that which has died is evident from Paul's declaration, speaking in reference to the resurrection, he says, I Cor.15:36, "Thou fool; that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." Hence according to Paul, a quickening implies a previous dying. Again, I admit that there is a quickening connected with regeneration, and the new birth, but it is as distinct from regeneration, as sowing the seed is from its vegetating. I think there is an analogy between all natural seeds; I will therefore say the sower sows the seed, but he does not quicken it, that is another process; so in a natural birth, and of course so in regeneration. Of all the texts which brother Clark quotes on this subject, there are but three or four which I supposed anybody thought had reference to regeneration. John 6:63 is considered as having that reference; but this I have disputed and still do, on what ground is known. Eph.2:1 & 5, and Col.2:13, have been explained as referring to regeneration. But in Ephesians there

is a *raising* connected with the quickening, just as in John 5:21, and both in Ephesians and Colossians they are said to be *quickened together with him*, that is Christ. It is therefore something in which Christ participated with his people and they with him. Will brethren persist in an opinion which so fully involves the idea, that Christ participates with his people in regeneration. As they were quickened *together with him*, this must imply that they were quickened when he was quickened. Peter tells us when that was, when he says, "For Christ was once offered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." I Pet.3:18. In being offered the just for the unjust, were not the unjust offered with him, and did he in being offered and *put to death in the flesh* leave them in the grave; or were they not quickened together with him, and raised up together, and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus? Not earthly places, not again under the *Sinai* covenant, but in heavenly places, under the provisions and protection of the heavenly covenant which would secure their being preserved and called, as the other could not. Our Lord uses the same figure of seed sown, in reference to his own death and resurrection, as above quoted from I Cor.15:36. He says, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." John 12:24. Here a quickening is evidently implied. When a corn of wheat first vegetates or is quickened and sprouts, is there not in the sprout the germ of all the fruit it will afterwards mature? So Christ in being quickened and raised, brought up with him under the requisitions of the law, all the fruit or people represented by him. Well therefore does the Apostle say in reference to this, *quickened together with him and raised up together*, &c. "That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Jesus Christ." Eph.2:7. That is, the all of the *us* being *quickened* and raised up together with Christ from under the demands of the law, God might in every after age be showing his grace and kindness toward us as born into the world in calling us to the knowledge of salvation, &c. Thus we see there is a harmony and beauty in thus applying these texts in Ephesians and Colossians which cannot be in the other application.

Something more in reference to this *quickening spirit* as illustrated in Christ and in the experience of the believer, for the subject of grace has a fellowship in experience, as well as in fact, in the death and quickening of Jesus Christ. Peter says of Christ, "being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by

the spirit;" but not quickened until after he was put to death, though he evidently had the spirit before, thus showing as in grain sown, death must precede the quickening, and that as in grain there must be a quickening principle not involved in the death. I have before spoken of the quickening as commencing with the first influence of the implanted spirit in regeneration upon the soul, but I was wrong, as brother Thompson says, death must first come before quickening, as illustrated by the seed sown and illustrated in Christ Jesus. Now we see how the *quickening spirit* worked in Christ, for it is to that, which I understand Peter to refer. This spirit, this life constituted him the actual Head of his people, as they were in this life in him. Hence as the Head and Husband of the church, he was involved in the demands of the law against them and must therefore come under the law to meet those demands. Now it was just so far as he was made under the law, and no further, that he died and that was as made flesh or man, {for his soul participated in the sufferings.} Now however perfect were his sufferings, if Christ had only existed in this fleshly relation to his people, and therefore as under the law, I do not know that there could have been any security of his release from death, for the law knows nothing about release. But standing in this spiritual relation to them and under a covenant ordered in all things and sure, established before the law came into existence, which while it involved him in the demands of the law, secured his not being *left alone* and that his *soul* should not be left in hell, nor be suffered as the Holy One to see corruption, this could secure his release. Hence Peter said, "It was not possible he should be holden of it;" that is, death. Acts 2:24-28. Now Peter does not ground this impossibility upon the Godhead of Christ, but upon those promises through David made to him. I hope brethren will not hereby infer that I deny his Godhead. If his being God would admit of his being made under the law, it would, I should think, admit of his being made the Head of his people, and as such under covenant and promise. Hence we find promises made to him. See Psalms 89, and Isaiah 42. These same things were typified by the promises to Abraham and the Sinai law. See Gal.3:16-18. Thus this life was in Christ a *quickening spirit*. So in his people. In its first implantation it brings them experimentally under the law. This life being the *light of men*, it enlightens the soul to see and know the law as spiritual, and thereby to know sin. Hence by it he is slain. Now the soul being in this situation, could reason ever quicken itself, as in the case of grain sown? No, because reason of itself never could comprehend or receive the idea of acceptance with God in any other way than

by the law. For God has "hid these things from the wise and prudent," Matt.11:25; and, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God ... neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." I Cor.2:14. This then establishes this point. Here then this life is manifested as a quickening spirit; it can and does by faith hear the voice of the Son of God, and receive the tidings of salvation through Christ, and thus quickens the soul to newness of hope of acceptance with God. Paul says of the seed sown, "Thou sowest not that body which shall be, &c." I Cor.15:37. So Christ in dying died as a Servant under the law, but in being quickened, he arose as the Son of God and above the law. See Rom.1:4. So the believer is not quickened to the legal life in which he died, but is quickened and raised to a life of justification, to be no more a servant, but a son, and an heir of God. Gal.4:7. Of all seeds in the vegetable kingdom, I know of but one that does not in its sprouting leave the old body dead in the ground. The bean is an exception, in this the sprout brings the old grain up with it on its top. This completes the figure found in the vegetable world of spiritual things. Christ's soul and body were quickened, his soul not left in hell, nor his body to see corruption. So in experience, in the quickening, the whole person is brought forth with the new life in the new birth, into a state of liberty; and the person now exists as standing in a new relation to God as his Father through Christ Jesus; and to the saints as brethren.

The balance of brother Clark's communication, I will leave to stand with the 'thousand and one things' which have been spoken and written for an *effect*. He must know, that in taking my positions in their connection, he can draw from them no such idea as he conveys by the expression, *a created Son of God*. Though by taking detached positions and expressions he might do it, and lead others to do it; just as by taking detached texts I might represent Christ as altogether inferior to the Father. If the scriptures can thus be distorted, no wonder my feeble writings can. I speak thus with plainness because I think the occasion justifies it. The terms *creature*, *created* and *made* are used in the Scriptures in relation to Christ; and I dare not alter their plain meaning and application to please brother Clark or any other brother.

S.TROTT.

P.S. - Brother Beebe, after having mailed my letter, containing the reply to brother Clark, &c., I recollected that I had left myself liable to be charged, from it, with representing the quickening spirit as raising Christ from the dead, &c., that

is, according to the manner in which my communications have of late, been construed, and I see no more convenient way to remedy it than to send you this postscript to be inserted with the reply. Brother Clark it seems, does not understand that my representing wherein both yourself and he had misapprehended my intended meaning concerning the text, "It is the spirit that quickeneth," though my carelessness, implied, of course, an intimation that he had misrepresented my views. Hence, his twice repeated declaration that I had not charged him with misrepresenting my views. I am not now disposed so to charge him, as it would imply a willful misconstruction, but as a fair specimen of the manner in which he has throughout represented my views, I would request of brethren and of him to turn to the 2nd number, present volume of the SIGNS, and read what I say, concerning God's regenerating persons; and then notice his declaration in his letter in number 9, same volume, in which he says of me, that "He says he knows of no authority in the scriptures to believe that it is the province of the Holy Ghost or God to quicken or first regenerate dead sinners?" Those who do thus read the two passages will I think be satisfied, that let me be guarded as I may in expression, I may be wrongly represented. Still I wish to use due precaution. My mind is quite defective, more so than it once was, so that when I have one subject or point anywise intensely in view, I am apt to lose sight too much of other circumstances connected with it. Thus in the above reply to brother Clark, in endeavoring to illustrate how that Christ as the life of his people was the *quickenings spirit*, even in his own case, in that the promise, as that "his soul should not be left in hell, &c.," were made to him as the Head of this life, rather than to his manhood, which was made under the law, and the law strictly knows neither promises or release, I omitted distinctly to say, that he was raised by the power of God in conformity with those promises made to him, though it was implied in referring to them. But to prevent misapprehension, I now say, that Christ was raised from the dead by the power of God; and not only that, but that it was "according to the exceeding greatness of his power," as Paul speaks, Eph.1:19 & 20. So in speaking of regeneration, as a distinct operation from the quickening of the soul, having so recently declared my belief, that it was God who regenerates, I omitted distinctly to repeat it in this case, I therefore now say as then, that it is God who regenerates and none other, though I still doubt the authority for confining the work of regeneration to the Holy Ghost distinctively from the Father and the Word. Again, in speaking of the soul's being quickened from its death

and condemnation under the law, to a state of justification, &c., by faith as an exercise of Christ in us, or of the life which he is, and also of the necessity of a revelation being made to this faith of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, I may have omitted to say by whom this revelation is made. I therefore now say that the idea of a revelation is that it is a direct communication from God, and further that I understand it to be peculiarly the province of the Holy Ghost, to make this first revelation of Christ to faith and all after revelations made to it of God's truth, as being the Comforter and Teacher, and he who shall take of the things of Christ and show them unto his people.

There is one thing more, though it is swelling this postscript unreasonably, I wish to notice. In my remarks on brother Clark's chapter, I used this expression, "Let them receive in heart this third existence of our Lord, &c." When I first saw it as published I was convinced that many brethren would understand me as having reference to an experimental receiving of this truth by faith. As that was not at all my meaning, {I was not speaking of experience, but of theory,} I determined I would embrace the first opportunity to correct it. But in brother Clark's answer it was not noticed in that way, and at the same time there appeared such a determination on his part to force a split, I thought I would let him have what capital he could make from it. But on second thought I have concluded to explain and say that I had no disposition to call in question the genuineness of their faith in Christ; but at the same time I cannot comprehend how in theory they can heartily and truly, {and this is what I meant by the expression *in heart*,} believe two such opposite positions, as that Christ as God is absolutely self-existent, and yet in reference to the same identical existence as God he is the begotten Son of God. Brother Clark says in his last letter, that he was satisfied there would be too many scriptures. Quite too many; they prove that Jesus is God, is the Son of God, and is man. Just my position. Can he now prove that three are only two?

S.T.

April 21, 1850.

REPLY TO BRETHERN: THE NEW BIRTH.

PART II

2. **BROTHER WILLIAMS, ON I PETER 1:23** – Brother Williams says, "Let the brethren read that letter again, {the

Salem Circular,} and they will find many passages of scripture quoted there to prove the doctrine," &c., namely; *that in regeneration the soul is born again and becomes a new creature*. At his suggestion I have read it over again, and I do assure brother Williams that whilst I find several texts quoted which represent the soul as affected in the work of regeneration, I have not found one quoted which declare or imply that the soul distinctly from the person is that which is born again. I however found that they make *convert*, as well as *resurrect* and *quicken* to mean the same thing with *regenerate*. This I do not like to find among us. Ever since my first acquaintance with the Baptists, I have found this difference between the Old Baptists and the popular religionists of every name. The latter were zealous advocates for conversion, and evidently put it in the place of regeneration. But the Old Baptists contended that conversion was not enough; that it would never constitute one a child of God; that they must be *born again*. This is then an old landmark, and I believe a scriptural one, I therefore dislike to see it removed by blending the two together, lest too many get in among us, who under pretence of preaching Old School Baptist doctrine, know and preach in effect nothing but conversion. I think I need to bring but one proof to convince brother Williams that *regeneration* and *conversion* are materially distinct. He I trust will readily admit that the law cannot regenerate or produce the new birth, yet David says, "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." Psa.19:7. If the law cannot regenerate and yet does convert the soul, it is evident that conversion and regeneration are distinct things. How the law does convert the souls of persons regenerated, from their self-righteousness and all their old notions of acceptance with God, is manifest in the believer. Brother Williams appears to discover some contradiction between my remarks relative to brother Thompson's letter and something I had said before. Conversion and regeneration I hold to be two things, besides he does not notice the import of my expression, *born over again* instead of *born again*. And as I discover from the 9th number, that brother Meredith also has misunderstood me on that point, I will try to explain. I have never denied, or at least never intended to deny that the soul was *born again* in common with the person. But this is the point, I have understood brother Williams and others to contend, that the soul alone was included in the new birth; and this birth, I have understood them to represent by the use of other expressions, to be a passing of the soul through a second birth, without any distinct seed from which the birth

proceeds, and that this birth is a change of the soul from a natural soul to a spiritual existence; hence that it is rather a new formation of the soul than a birth. As I have repeatedly given this in substance as my understanding of their views, and as brother Williams has never given any explanation of his views as being different, I presume I am correct. It is this idea that I have opposed, as not being conformable to the Scripture testimony on the point, and as involving other difficulties; and in designating it I have used various expressions, among others I have used the one above referred to, *born over again*, and this, the *soul being born again distinctly from the person*. On the other hand, I have contended that the whole person was embraced in the new birth, and of course included the soul. Brother Williams in one case so understands me and argues against the idea of the body's being included. In another instance he ascribes to me the idea that the *quickenings spirit* only is included in the birth. Brother Williams expresses himself unable to comprehend my meaning. It is probable this may arise in a considerable degree from the imperfect manner in which I have expressed myself. I discover an expression in a quotation he has made from me, which of itself, without regard to the connection, might imply what he ascribes to me. I said, "The quickening spirit is the subject of his second birth." But as a catching of words is so much the order of the day, to be guarded, I should have said, "The quickening spirit is the seed from which his second birth proceeds." I will now try to explain my views on this subject, in contrast with brother Williams. In doing it I will take the text he has given me – I Pet.1:22 & 23. He could not have given me a better one for the subject; though I was surprised at his quoting it in support of his views. In reference to verse 22, "Seeing ye have purified your souls," &c. I cannot see how he would apply it. He certainly cannot consider this purifying the same as being born again; for he will not admit, I think, that persons regenerate themselves; but Peter says, "Seeing ye have purified your souls." Again, as he holds that the soul in being born again is changed from a natural to a spiritual soul, and therefore is "created in righteousness and true holiness," I cannot conceive how it could need any further purifying by the person or be the subject of it. But according to my experience and corresponding views that it remains a natural soul, it needed after its conversion by the law, and after the new birth, much purifying in obeying the gospel truth, unto unfeigned love of the brethren; and still needs more of the same. In coming to the 23rd verse, brother Beebe and others must bear with me if I should use some expressions a little too

undisguised, the shape the discussion has assumed compels me. Brother Williams quotes our Lord's declaration to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again," John 3:7, and adds, "I believe he meant what he said." This I am glad to hear, it is the point to which I do wish to see us all come, to believe that the scriptures mean just what they say, and be satisfied; not when they say *brick* to understand them to mean *mortar*, like the builders of Babel; not when they speak of a *birth* to understand them to mean *conversion* or a *quickenings*, or a *resurrection* only. All these words were at the command of the Holy Ghost, and when he designed to express the distinctive idea conveyed by either of them, he could and I believe did direct to the use of it; or its equivalent in the original. Now what are the distinctive ideas of a birth? Is it not that a child is brought into a state of existence and into new relations? And is there not necessarily involved in this, the idea that this child had a father by whom it was generated, or that a seed was deposited in its proper receptacle, that it was then quickened; and that this quickened child is brought forth into distinct existence, &c.? Our Lord in explaining this subject to Nicodemus, says, verse 6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Does he not here clearly convey the idea that there is a correspondency between the two births; that they are both distinctively births; that the one being of fleshly seed, is flesh; the other being of the spiritual seed is spirit? Having given this explanation, he in verse 7, makes the declaration, "Ye must be born again," and that with a caution to *marvel not* at it. He does not say, *Your souls must be born again*; but, *Ye must be born again*, &c. Does not, my brethren, the word *again* in this connection, convey the idea that the same *persons* who have been born of the *flesh*, must experience a corresponding birth of the spirit? This is what I believe on the point.

Now to come to the text, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, &c." Here I think it evident that Peter is following out the ideas advanced by his Lord as above noticed. Here are the two distinct seeds called *corruptible* and *incorruptible*, which our Lord spoke of as *flesh* and *spirit*. The flesh, I presume no brother will dispute, is the corruptible seed, as descending from Adam a corruptible head. Is not the *spirit* then the *incorruptible* seed? And must it not have an incorruptible head also, or whence the comparison we have noticed? Is not Christ of whom Adam was a figure, and who is spoken of as having a *seed* and who is the *life* and the truth, this Head? How will brother Williams' idea that the new birth consists in a change

of the soul correspond with this text? If it is simply a change of the soul, then there is of course, as in Peter's birth, no seed about it. If brother Williams contends that the old soul is the seed from whence the *new creature* is formed, then as the old soul was corruptible, it could not be an incorruptible seed. So that I cannot conceive how he can make this text harmonize with the views he has advanced, and allow the text to mean what it says. On the other hand, just such an actual and distinct birth, as I believe is brought to view by our Lord, and here by Peter, is what I have been contending for; and that the incorruptible seed from whence this distinct birth proceeds is not Adam in any shape or form you can place him, by conversions and changes, but that it is Christ the quickening spirit. And hence that the new birth is a being born in the image of Christ, as the Son of God, in a state of freedom from the law, and in the relation of sons and heirs of God, &c. But as I have endeavored to illustrate in my reply to brother Clark on the subject of quickening, there is an important distinction between this, and a natural birth, though in each case, the birth partakes of the nature and image of the head of its distinct seed, yet in this case as the quickening is not a quickening of the seed, that being life and a quickening spirit, but of the soul and person, so the birth is a birth of the soul, and whole person, with the spirit of Christ or the life in it, as illustrated in the resurrection of Christ. If only the soul and not the whole person was the subject of this birth, I know not why gospel ordinances were instituted in which the body participates. Nor should I have reason to believe that the body is redeemed, if not a sharer in the new birth, for that which was redeemed was to receive the adoption of sons. Gal.4:4-7. Again, I cannot conceive that the soul could be changed of itself from its nature as a rational soul, and remain a human soul. But by this new birth, from a distinct seed, or in other words the soul having a distinct and heavenly principle of life imparted to it has two existences – a natural and spiritual; and the person exists as the seed of Adam, and the seed of Christ in one person, being subject to the infirmities of the former, but not to the curse, in consequence of the redemption by the latter. Hence he is subject both to earthly and heavenly influences, to earthly and heavenly desires, &c. Once more, as the experience of regeneration and the new birth is not *bodily exercise*, but an exercise of the understanding or mind, the soul is that which is manifestly affected and exercised by it. Hence the scriptures speak of soul exercises in reference to true religion. I hope brother Williams will now be able to

comprehend my views on this subject, though still imperfectly expressed.

One point more in reference to his letter. He speaks of my manifesting a desire to have a little more information, &c. I did; and I proposed certain difficulties that to me appear in the way of his views being correct which I wished him to explain, or in case he found he could not, I hoped he would review the correctness of his positions. But from the manner in which he passed by them, and from the general tone of his last letter, I judge he felt a little cross on the subject. Not that he has said anything directly offensive. For myself, I feel bound if a brother brings to my notice any difficulties apparently involved in views I had advanced to give an explanation, or if I could not, to abandon such views, and to give any other reasonable explanation asked, and I think I have generally manifested a willingness to do it. Therefore seeing these difficulties involved in the position of the Salem Circular, I did not think of giving offence in proposing them to brother Williams to solve, seeing he had endorsed them. In reference to experience in relation to temptations, &c., I am conscious of soul temptations, and soul sins, and I often doubt the genuineness of my experience on account thereof. I therefore candidly wished to know whether his experience was different, corresponding with his views of the soul being changed, and whether he actually was not conscious of any soul sin or temptation. He says he thinks he knows what *sore temptations mean*, but does not hint whether his soul has any participation in them, so that I am as much in the dark on the subject as before.

3. **BROTHER G.M. THOMPSON, SIGNS: NUMBER 8** –

I hope brother Thompson will not be offended at my giving him the last and least share of my reply. I have in my replies to brethren Clark and Williams anticipated much that would have been otherwise due to his communication, to which I beg leave to refer him. Brother Thompson complains of not being able to comprehend my views on the subject of *quickenings, regeneration, &c.* I am extremely sorry that I am not able to make myself more intelligible to him. Whilst I am willing to ascribe much of this defect to my own awkwardness of expression, I think in part that it is ascribable to him, in that he appears not to have caught the first and leading idea for which I contend and without this the balance is thrown into confusion. How I shall make the thing any more plain to him I know not. For of the details of the work of regeneration and of the quickening of the soul, &c., I am as ignorant as I am how the seed that is cast in the ground dies, is quickened, sprouts, &c. I believe these things are so, because they are so revealed

in the Scriptures. Cannot brother Thompson comprehend what it is to be born of the flesh? That it is the production of a distinct natural person, a child, according to the laws of nature. If so, may there not be such a thing as this same person's being born again, born of the spirit, or of a distinct and spiritual seed? May not this new birth be a production in his soul of a spiritual existence as distinct, in its nature, power, and faculties from his natural existence, as are the two seeds, one from the other from whence the two births proceed, and yet it be the same person, having these two natures, the one earthly and capable of attending to earthly things, the other spiritual and capable of knowing and enjoying spiritual things; he having thus both Adam and Christ in him? If brother Thompson can comprehend such an idea, then he may apprehend what I mean. But if he cannot, I of course shall not be able to make myself understood. However for a further illustration of my views of the new birth, and of its effect on the soul, I refer him to what I have said above in reply to brother Williams, and for my views concerning the quickening of the soul, and person, I refer him to my reply to brother Clark. Brother Thompson asks, "If the soul is converted from a state of darkness and enmity to God and his truth, is not its condition changed, or am I to understand brother Trott as conveying the idea that conversion produces no change?" I answer that conversion does not imply a *change of nature*; but it produces a *change of condition*, according to the nature of the conversion. If a drunken man is converted to a sober man there is a change in his condition, but he may remain a natural man. If a person is converted from an erroneous idea to the truth, or from one erroneous idea to another, there is a change in the condition of his mind. So when the soul is converted from its darkness and converted by the law, &c., there is a great change in its condition. He says speaking of the soul, "If it bears precisely the same relation to the body that it did before, wherein consists its conversion?" Does not the sober man bear precisely the same relation to his wife, that he did when he was a drunkard, and yet you can see wherein there is a conversion. Again, brother Thompson says, "If the soul is destitute of faith, &c." I am not disposed to say that the soul of a believer is destitute of faith, because it possesses it, as the existence of spiritual life. But I have no more idea that the soul of its own proper powers can exercise gospel faith, than I have that a natural man can enjoy heaven. The soul is the rational part of man, and it is not the province of rationality to receive the things of the spirit. Faith is a fruit of the spirit. It is not the Adam in us that believes with gospel faith, but the

Christ. Hence, faith is called the *faith of the Son of God*, and the *faith of Jesus Christ*. Gal.2:20 & 3:22. Brother Thompson seems to have difficulty in comprehending how the soul can receive its knowledge of natural things by the senses of the body, and its knowledge of spiritual things by the faith of the new man or the Christ in us. Faith in the Scriptures is frequently described by the same terms as denote the senses of the body, as the *eyes of your understanding*, *ears to hear*, &c., thus showing that to the new man it stands in the place of the senses to the old. I should suppose that brother Thompson would discover this difference between faith and rationality in his every day's experience. Through faith he understands that the worlds were framed by the word of God. {Heb.11:3} How? From revelation, which his faith receives. Do geologists with all their researches understand this? No, they run into skepticism. By faith he knows that the salvation of sinners is wholly in and by Christ Jesus. How? From the revelation of Christ to his faith. Supposing that brother Thompson was placed on a jury in a murder case wherein there was a train of circumstantial evidences from which to make up the verdict; would he sit there expecting a revelation made to his faith whether the man was guilty or not, by which he might *understand* the proper verdict? No, he would exercise his senses and rationality just as any natural rational man, in attending to the testimony and in comparing and weighing it, &c., that he might make up a proper opinion. Again. He knows that the spring has opened. How? By a revelation to his faith? No; by discovering the signs of its opening in the vegetating of the trees, &c. Brother Thompson then arrives at the knowledge of natural things as a natural, rational man, and he understands spiritual things as a spiritual man, by faith. Must he not then exist both as a natural man and as a spiritual man? Let brother Thompson reconcile the above facts, if he can, with the idea that the soul in regeneration is changed from a natural, and therefore from a rational soul, to a spiritual one.

If brethren Clark, Williams & Thompson do not comprehend what are my views on these points, I fear I shall never be able to convey my ideas intelligibly to them. But I hope they will; and whether they and others reject me and my sentiments or not, I do beg that they will not so misrepresent me and my views as brother Clark still persists in doing, even in his letter in the 9th number. If it is not asking too much I would request brethren, that before they make up their minds to read the two communications together.

I remain yours, perplexed, but not in despair, cast down, but not destroyed; and I sometimes feel as though I might almost add, persecuted, but not forsaken.

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., April 26, 1850.

THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE - REV.3:1-5.

PART I

BROTHER BEEBE: - Sister Izor, in her valuable communication in the SIGNS, Aug.15th, has made two requests of me; one in common with others to write our experiences; the other to give my views on Rev.3:1-5. I have been so much from home since August, that I have not had time to attend to private correspondence as I ought. But I will now give such views as I have on the passage in Revelations, and hope next if spared to attempt to the other request.

I understand the seven churches addressed in this, and the preceding chapter to represent the church in its several changes, and periods on from the days of the Apostles, to the coming of Christ to take his church home to himself. I however differ perhaps from most others; in that, I do not consider the mere nominal church or professing world thus represented, but the true visible church, as professing the doctrine and order established in the New Testament. The several states of the church, as thus pointed out, may probably be understood to be as follows: The 1st as representing the apostolic age; the 2nd the period from that age to the establishing of religion by Constantine; the 3rd from that period, including the separating of the church from the nominal or anti-christian interest, until its location in the *wilderness*, or the commencement of the prophesying of the *two witnesses*; the 4th, the state of the church in the wilderness until it had again become corrupted; the 5th or *SARDIS* state of the church, as commencing with the scattering of the church in consequence of its corruptness, in its being driven from the valley's of Piedmont, or to a future period. I have formerly thought that this church state terminated about the time of the church's having again become corrupted through the influence of the *two horned or second Beast*, and the separation of the church as Old School Baptists from the mass of corrupted baptists, and therefore that we were in the Philadelphian church state; but I do not now believe that the church has as yet, that *open door* which is to characterize the Philadelphian state. {Besides the promise

to the Philadelphia church to be kept from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, and try them that dwell upon the earth, cannot belong to the church at the present time any more than in the past ages. For whilst anti-christ still sits as a *queen*, and sees no sorrow, the church is still reviled and persecuted and will continue to be, until the Witnesses are killed. But when they are raised up again, the tables will be turned; then will come the hour of temptation upon anti-christ and the world, from which the church will be exempt, and she will have an open door set before her. Hence I now conclude that the Sardis church state will continue until the raising up of the Witnesses, and then will commence the Philadelphian church state.} We are therefore now in Sardis, and the message of that church belongs to us; *our work is not perfect*. In thus considering the text, I will first notice the particular descriptive character which our Lord assumes in addressing this church; namely, "He that hath the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars."

1st. The seven spirits of God. One important point of difference between me and some of the brethren in the recent controversy, is that I do not believe that the Holy Ghost in his distinctive being, or God as he exists as the Holy Ghost, is intended by the term *spirit* as generally used in the Scriptures, nor even by the term *spirit of God* in every instance; so in this case I cannot think that the essential Holy Ghost is meant by the *seven spirits of God*, for I understand him to be *one*. Neither do I understand them to intend the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ. But I understand by them that universal power given to him as the exalted Head of the church by which he exercises a providential government over all things in heaven and in earth, and which is subordinate to none, but to him who "put all things under him." I Cor.15:27. Hence these seven spirits of God are represented by *seven eyes*, Rev.5:6; see also Zech.3:9, compared with 4:10. Hence also the *four chariots* which Zechariah saw coming out from between two mountains of brass are said to be, "Four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth." Zech.6:1-8. By the *two mountains of brass*, I would understand *predestination* and *election*, or *God's purpose* and *grace*, and by the *chariots coming out from between them*, I suppose the particular providences thereby indicated were subordinate to God's purpose and grace, or God's decrees concerning the world and concerning the elect. As these chariots were bounded by the two mountains of brass, so the all power given to Christ as Head of the church is exercised specifically for giving eternal life to as many as the Father hath

given him. John 17:2. Hence the Apostle's assertion as above quoted, that "He is excepted which did put all things under him." These *seven spirits of God* being represented by *seven eyes* shows the perfect foresight and knowledge by which Christ governs all things and events. Hence the propriety of our Lord's declaring himself as having this important characteristic in reference to this church state, for the encouragement of his church to trust in him amid all the great and important events that have transpired and are still transpiring in the political and religious world, during this period of the church; such as the church's being driven from her retreat in the valleys of Piedmont and another asylum being provided for her by the discovery, settlement, &c., of America; and the rapid strides of the second Beast to power and in putting the mark of the Beast on all whose names are not written in the Lamb's Book of Life, &c.

2nd. Having the *seven stars*. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, chapter 1:20. Those angels have been generally understood to be the pastors of the churches. But angels signify messengers. Hence, I conclude that if those *stars* have reference to the gospel ministers, as probably they have, they relate to them rather as messengers of Christ, and of the churches sent forth to preach the gospel, than as exercising the pastoral office. Hence the propriety of the expression in each case, "Unto the angel of the church ... write, &c.," that is, transmit to him to be delivered to the church; one angel representing all the ministers of that period, as the churches are represented by one church. Thus we find the several messages apply directly to the churches and not to the ministers only, as is evident in this to the church at Sardis and in most of the others, it being addressed to a collection of persons and not an individual. Also at the conclusion of each message it is said, "He that hath an ear let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches." So in fact, in all ages gospel ministers are Christ's messengers to the churches, and whatever treasure he puts into their earthen vessels, it is that they should empty it out to the churches, and I do not think that any of us have a right to keep back any of the treasures committed to us, for fear of being butted by our brethren for bringing forward some ideas which may be to them *new things*. Christ's *having the seven stars*, and *having them in his right hand* - chapter 1:16 - denotes his having both the gifts for the ministry and the ministers at his own disposal, and under his protection and direction; and that all concerning them is ordered with divine skill. He sends his messages by whom he will, and when and where he pleases; and that is,

wherever in his infinite wisdom he, in his walks "in the midst of the golden candlesticks," sees occasion for it. So that the churches may with confidence look to him to supply all their needs, and the ministers, commit themselves to his disposal, provision and direction. And either churches or ministers by looking to any other sources, dishonor him; the one, as their husband; the other, as their master. But let the churches beware of false prophets or messengers, those who come in his name, with messages from others, or run without being sent of him.

3rd. We now come to our Lord's address to this church state, or to the churches of this period.

1st. His complaint against them. "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead;" again verse 2, "For I have not found thy works perfect before God." We have been accustomed to speak so highly of the Waldenses as comprising the true church in its external form, during the dark ages, that it may surprise some that I should consider these charges as having any bearing upon them. But as in individual christians, they generally render themselves needful of chastisement by in some way leaving their first love, before God sends it, so I think of the church, it needed being driven from the valleys of Piedmont and scattered, for its purification from corruptions. The occasion for the churches becoming corrupted in these valleys was very natural. They were in a great measure insulated from other people, knew no other religion than that which they professed, except the Catholic, and that, they held in abhorrence. Parents and children thus living together as a distinct community from generation to generation, alike prejudiced by education against the Catholics, and in favor of their own religion, it is no wonder that they should have sunken into a formal state, and the unregenerated portion, if they did not, many of them, actually got by profession into the churches, yet should exercise a strong influence in their religious affairs. Hence whilst they had a name that they lived they had become dead and formal as a body, and their work therefore of separating themselves from unregenerated professors and formal worship, to the spiritual religion and worship of Christ's gospel, was not fully carried out, and therefore "not perfect before God." Hence being in this state, no wonder that when Calvin and the Geneva church sent their messengers among them, with professions of friendship and sympathy for them, they by their superior advantages of education, and persuasion, should disciple many of this simple people to Calvin's creed and infant sprinkling. Hence the claim set up by the Paedobaptists that the

Waldenses were paedobaptists. Hence *they had a name that they lived*, were members of the true living church, but were as to the great body of them, a dead mass; and their works were not perfect before God, they did not maintain the perfect order of the gospel; did not *go on unto perfection*, but rather into corruption. These complaints against the church in Sardis, are evidently given as the general characteristic of that church state. Hence we shall find these complaints remaining equally good against the church since its being driven from the valleys of Piedmont as before. It is true that those *few* of whom it was said "they shall walk with me in light, &c.," who had known the truth experimentally or spiritually, and were preserved from the general destruction of that people, being driven from their valleys, wandered over the various Protestant countries of Europe, hoping to be protected, as Protestants, particularly Calvinists had appeared to take so much interest in their behalf, but as wherever they went, they were constrained to bear their testimony to the truth, and that to the simple gospel truth as they had received it from the Scriptures, and to believers' baptism; they soon drew down upon them persecution from the Protestants. In England in particular, although persecuted, the members disciplined to the truth and order of the gospel increased, and among these were some learned men, and others who were impatient of persecution and who persuaded the body of these Waldenses, or Lollards, or Baptists, as they were called, to associate together in associations, and to put forth as their united belief a Confession of their faith, as a protection against persecutions; and further took steps to have schools established in order to educate men for the ministry, &c. But in these Articles of Faith, they still professed believers' baptism as the only gospel baptism, how then could this course screen them from persecution? 1st. They had before, in common with the Baptists in Germany, been charged with Arianism and many other monstrous ideas, but now with Calvin adopting the substance of the Nicene Creed, and Calvin's views generally of doctrine, they showed that they were with the Presbyterians in doctrine, and hence were known as Calvinistic Baptists. 2nd. By forming associations they were enabled more fully to show their numbers and increase, and the men of influence they had among them, and thus to show they were not so despicable a class as they had been held to be. 3rd. By establishing schools of learning and taking care to have learned ministers among them; they obviated the charge of ignorance made against them. Hence whilst Mosheim in his Ecclesiastical History speaks with the utmost contempt of what he terms the Ana-

Baptists on the continent, he exempts the Particular Baptists of England from this censure, and speaks of their doctrine and order with commendation and that "their community is ruled by men *eminent for piety and learning.*" Cent. 15th, Sect.3, Part 2D. These Articles of Faith became through their associations a test of fellowship, and were adopted by most of the Baptists in this country as such. I have no doubt that our churches and brethren mostly have held on to these Articles, &c., as necessity safeguards against the introduction of error and carnal professors among them; but experience has undeniably proved that instead of being safeguards they were no other, than *sheeps clothing*, ready made, for *wolves* to put on. This may appear harsh; but where is there the O.S. Baptist who was such thirty or even twenty years ago, who does not remember the annoyance he used to experience at seeing churches, and ministers, coming forward and claiming fellowship and seats in associations, upon the ground of their holding to the Baptist Confession of Faith, when it was known that they were bitterly opposed to those ministers who preached experimentally the doctrine set forth in that same Confession, and were preaching and countenancing a system of doctrine opposite to it. And did the grievance wax worse, until a majority of the churches and associations of the Baptist denomination had become completely leavened with this deception of carrying one Confession of Faith in their letters to the associations, and another into the pulpits, and on their tongues generally; until the Old School Baptists had to come out from this deceptive and dead mass by the skin of their teeth?

Can there then be any doubt as to the Baptist denomination, that *their work was not perfect before God*, and that whilst they had a *name* as the living or visible church of Christ, they were collectively a dead mass?

S.TROTT.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Dec.5, 1850.

THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE - REV.3:1-5.

PART II

BROTHER BEEBE: - In the former Number, I briefly stated the history of the Sardis church state, from the scattering of the Waldenses to the separation of the Old School from the New School Baptists. The enquiry will arise, whether the work of the Old School in separating from the corruptions among the

Baptists, was a *perfect work before God*; and whether they came out altogether a living body? I think not, for we are yet in Sardis, and the complaint still stands against us. The fact is that as Rachel in leaving her father to go with Jacob to Isaac, in the land of promise, took with her the images or gods of her father, so the Old School Baptists have brought out with them customs established by their fathers, such as Confessions of Faith and Associations; and they can make no better plea for them, than Rachel made to hide those she had stolen and which involved in it an acknowledgement of present barrenness. Excuse me for the reference, "For whatever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through faith and comfort of the Scriptures – {not of men's productions} – might have hope." Rom.15:4. Whether these things will have any less evil effect among the Old School in the end, than they had among the Baptists formerly, is difficult to say. But generally it may be assumed that like causes under similar circumstances, will produce like effects. It is true we have no schools among us for educating young men for the ministry, and have as yet made no move toward it. Our associations appear pretty well guarded against any encroachment of power over the churches, but not more so than were the constitutions of the early associations among the Baptists. The fact is, let there be in an association one or two leading brethren, who have obtained the confidence of the churches, and let there be in them, a secret, but governing hankering either for popularity, or for power over the churches and with the advantages of the associational compact, they will lead the churches into bondage before they are aware that their safeguards have been encroached upon; as past experience abundantly shows. As to written Confessions of Faith, they are what they ever have been from the day that Constantine's Council first established one at Nice, until the present moment; a ground for persecuting in one way or other, all who dared honestly to enquire for themselves on the several points embraced, and were thereby led to differ from them, even in expression. But the images or gods were all given up to Jacob before he went up to Bethel, *the house of God*, and hid under an oak in Shechem. So before the visible church will again be truly distinguished as the *house of God*, all these devices of men will be given up, by Rachel, or the *sheep*, as *Rachel* signifies. Rachel also died whilst in travail with her last son. So I think before the raising up again, the two Witnesses, even the Old School Baptist Church in its form and present organization will die. And the Witnesses that are raised will be indeed *a man child*; a *Benoni*, a son of the church's

sorrow in her last persecution, in the killing of the Witnesses; a Benjamin, the son of Jacob's right hand, but left handed men that can sling stones at an hair's breath and not miss. They will rule all nations with a rod of iron, beating down everything that is in opposition to the truth and order of the gospel. See Gen.35:4 & 18, Judges 20:16 & Rev.12:5.

I have showed how that the works of the Waldenses, and of the Baptists were not perfect, and how they were *dead*, &c., and have glanced at the same complaints as standing against the Old School Baptists; but I wish to offer a few more remarks on these points with particular reference to the Old School Baptists.

First: I cannot think our work is perfect before God until we come explicitly to his standard. And this certainly is not, and will not be the case, so long as we adhere to the productions of men, {as are the Articles of Faith,} as a more correct delineation of God's truth, and a more perfect test of truth and error, or discrimination between them, than are the Scriptures, which are God's own revelation on the subject. As to *being dead whilst we have a name to live as the church of Christ*; I have a hope that the great body of the Old School Baptists are not at this time a *dead mass*, but as before remarked I see not why the same causes may not produce the same effects among us, as they produced formerly in the Baptist denomination. We have the same elements of death among us as were among them, for whilst we profess to receive the Scriptures as a perfect standard of truth and order, a great majority perhaps, of us hold to the Confessions of Faith, as a more convenient, if not a more perfect criteria of truth, and to associations, as an order that cannot be dispensed with. Associations are the creatures of men, and are therefore liable to be used of men for any purpose, and molded into any shape. The Confessions of Faith are but a *dead letter* standard, for it is impossible for men to infuse into their productions, that *spirit and life* which are in the *words* of Christ. Hence, natural persons can receive sentimentally all that is contained in them; and children can be educated in the belief of all they contain as easily as they can in the Episcopal Creed or the Westminster Standards; and we, some of us, know what strenuous advocates many persons formerly were for the doctrine of the catechism, who gave no evidence of being anything but natural persons. But it may be asked, Would the Scriptures be any more of a definite standard by which to discriminate between truth and error, and between true and false believers, than are Confessions of Faith? I answer no, not in the mere letter of them; for where is there

the religionist that professes not to believe the Scriptures? *Dead letter* preaching and believing, amounts to nothing, whether the Scriptures or Creeds be the standard. There are a good many of those whom I hope are subjects of grace, that seem to lose sight of the fact that the words which Christ speaks, are spirit and are life, and therefore that the *flesh profiteth nothing* in understanding or receiving the doctrine of Christ. But the flesh does profit a good deal in knowing and understanding the letter of the Scriptures, for it is by our natural powers that we learn to read them, &c. The *spirit* alone *quickeneth* to an understanding of the truth as it is in Jesus. And the spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God, and therefore he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." God never designed that natural persons should know the doctrine of Christ, he has hid these things from the wise and prudent. Hence, I believe that it is the spirit of the word, it is "Christ in you the hope of glory," that is alone the criterion between truth and falsehood in religion, and he alone who is spiritual, is capable of judging of these things. Set up any *dead letter* standard you please, and you make the church accessible to any one who has experienced a conversion; and by *conversion* I do not mean *regeneration*, natural persons can be converted. Hence I cannot think that the works of the church will be perfect before God, till laying aside all other standards she comes to the spiritual standard. But it does appear to me that the tendency of things among us at this time, is the other way. A quotation of texts of Scripture to support a position, both in preaching and in writing, with a mere reference to the sound of the words, without considering the idea intended by the Holy Ghost to be conveyed thereby is too common. The Scriptures may be more readily, and more deceptively perverted by quoting them in false connection; than in any other way.

Second: I come to Christ's words of commendation and promise concerning a few in Sardis.

1st. "Thou hast a few names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments." This expression, *even in Sardis*, shows the church is here described, to be in her lowest state, unless perhaps the Laodicean may be worse. There were those among the Waldenses, who were experimentally established in the truth and order of the gospel, and who therefore could not be persuaded by Calvin's missionaries, nor driven by the severe persecutions of the Papists, to depart therefrom. These

therefore did not corrupt their profession by a departure therefrom, nor defile their garments by an intercourse with the *Mother of Harlots*, or with any of the Protestant daughters. So in reference to the Baptist denomination, there were as has been manifested, even in the church as existing among them, those who did not defile their garments, by the corruptions brought in with the second Beast, but separated themselves therefrom. So also however corrupted the church may become as now existing among the Old School Baptists, there will undoubtedly a few be found at the last who have not defiled their garments; but will endure faithfully the persecutions connected with the killing of the Witnesses.

2nd. "And they shall walk with me in white for they are worthy." Walking does not seem to indicate that resting from their labors in glory which awaits all saints; but rather their travels here in the wilderness. Christ walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, and they walk with him as followers of him. They walk with him in white. It is said of the bride, that; "She should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints;" {Rev.19:8;} and Christ is their righteousness. Hence as the saints walk by faith, they view themselves as *clean and white* before God, how much soever they may see their own pollutions, and the world may esteem them vile. But again it is said of that innumerable multitude which John saw around the throne, "These are they which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Rev.7:14. The washing of the saints from their sins is ascribed to Christ, "Who hath washed us from our sins in his own blood." Rev.1:5. But in the other text, they are said to *have washed their garments*, &c., and this in connection with their having come out of great tribulation, and therefore to their having endured persecution. This is what I think is intended in the expression, "They shall walk with me in white," that they shall be honored with suffering persecution for Christ's sake. There is nothing short of the drawings of God's love, that has so great a tendency, as persecutions for the truth's sake, to lead the saints not only to seek to keep themselves unspotted from the world, but also to adhere more closely to, and more earnestly to contend for the doctrine of the cross, or Christ's special atonement, in distinction from all compositions, and mixtures of men's devising; and therefore to keep their garments or profession free from pollution. Besides, their being persecuted for the truth's sake, shows clearly that they are *virgins*, {Rev.14:4,} and therefore emblematically clad in *white*. Thus, those Waldenses, who

escaped from the valley of Piedmont, and those who succeeded them as Baptists, were severely persecuted by the Protestant States of Europe. So those Old School Baptists that shall be found standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, will have in the end, to suffer persecution.

3rd. "For they are worthy." Yes, even of so great a privilege. But wherein? Not, in themselves more than others; but in the worthiness which Christ has been pleased to put upon them, in enabling them faithfully to follow him.

4th. "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment." John saith, "Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." I John 5:4. Faith then is that by which believers overcome the world. As Watts sings,

"Faith hath an overcoming power,
It triumphs in the dying hour."

It enables the saint to resist the allurements and flatteries of the world, to face its scorn and frowns, and even its persecutions unto death, with triumph. This faith, which is not the result of testimony, nor in any way the exercise of the rational faculties of man, but is spiritual, and is the gift of God, will be tried in those saints who live at the time of the slaying of the Witnesses; and in a measure, in those who live from this time on, as it has been in times past; but it will overcome, and bear the saints triumphantly through.

"The same shall be clothed in white raiment." This may have reference to the saint's ultimate triumph in glory. Though I think it probable that it has special reference to those who shall continue *steadfast in the faith* and out live the killing of the Witnesses, and their being raised again; for then all the reproaches will be cleared away from the faithful in Christ Jesus; they will be generally acknowledged as the church of Christ, whilst Babylon with all its confederacies will sink under the scorn and hatred of the nations of the earth, to rise no more.

5th. "And I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels." *And I will not blot out his name out of the book of life*. Were not similar expressions found in other texts, there would be no difficulty in understanding this declaration as designed to give confidence to Christ's doubting, tempted, persecuted ones, that they will not be disowned of their Lord, notwithstanding all their fears to the contrary, arising from a sense of their own unworthiness, and from seeing so many turn from the truth and order of the gospel, for the sake of shunning persecution. But as in Rev.22:19, we read, "If any

man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.," and in Psal.69:28, concerning some, "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous;" there seems to be a call for some further explanation of this expression, of *blotting out of the book of life*. I have no idea that the Lamb has literally a book which are recorded the names of his people; but as typical Israel were so regularly numbered, and their names and genealogies so particularly recorded and transmitted down in the books of the Old Testament, we are thereby taught the particular knowledge the Lord has of his people, of what kindred soever they may be. Hence the declaration of the Apostle, "The foundation of God standeth sure having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his." II Tim.2:19. Again on the return of the Jews from their captivity, there were among them those who were accounted and named as priests, who could not find their *register* when they came to be reckoned by genealogy, that is their register as being of the sons of Aaron, and were therefore "as polluted put from the priesthood." Ezra 2:61 & 62. And this is the idea intended to be conveyed by the expressions under consideration as I understand them; namely, that among those who have a *name to live*, as being members of the church of Christ in its visible form, but are dead will not when their faith is tried find their *register*, or show that faith which proves their genealogy to be from Christ the great High Priest, and will therefore as polluted, in some way, be severed from the priesthood, or church of Christ. Whereas those who have that overcoming faith which shows their genealogy to be from Christ, will be owned of him, as members of his church, in its triumph over antichrist, and in its triumph over death; or in its being brought out from the *captivity* of each.

Third: I now will notice Christ's exhortations to this church or to his church in this state, as found in the 2nd and 3rd verses.

1st. "Be watchful and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die." This intimates that what we still have among us of a spiritual and living nature are ready to sink into a cold and lifeless formality. May we then be led to watch, that nothing further of dead letter forms be admitted among us in doctrine and worship, and that our churches be not further filled with formal professors. And may our attachment and regard be strengthened toward those things which we have received by faith, and not of men; for those only have life. What we are taught of God *is spirit and is life*;

what we learn from men, however correct it may be in theory, is mere *dead letter* knowledge. Let us then pay more respect to experience, and less to the opinions of men.

2nd. "Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard." Paul says to the Galatians, "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" And again, "Are ye so foolish; having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Gal.3:2 & 3. These enquiries are highly important to be considered by us, in *remembering how we have received and heard*, that we may know for ourselves, whether we received the gospel, on which we hope for salvation, *of man or were taught it by the revelation of Jesus Christ*. That which we have received of the Lord, let us hold fast; that which is after man, is of no value.

"And repent." Certainly not of that which we are to hold fast, for that would be contradictory. But whilst we hold fast that which the Lord has taught us, and was received by faith, and which therefore is life, may we repent of every system and notion of man's devising, these are dead; and dead notions work death in our minds to that which is spiritual and even a persecuting spirit towards those who contend for that which is *spirit and is life*.

We as the professed living church are with propriety called upon to repent. But still we shall not truly repent unless the Lord is pleased to give us repentance. Repentance he will give to some, but whether he will grant it to us generally as a church and people, or whether he will leave us to go on self-confident in our own opinions and ways, until the troubles connected with the killing of the Witnesses come suddenly upon us *like a thief in the night*, is not for me to say. But indications certainly more and more appear to be that the latter will be the case.

But, brethren, May the Lord, if consistent with his will grant repentance both to you and me, and count us worthy to walk with him in white.

Brother Beebe, I have been led in this communication to dwell somewhat on some points which have been heretofore controverted through the SIGNS. I have not done it with any desire to provoke a revival of those controversies, or to give offense, but simply to give what I honestly believe to be a correct exposition of this prophecy. If any brother not satisfied with this, will give a more Scriptural exposition, I shall be glad to see it, and will not reply in controversy.

Yours with kind regards,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax County, Va., Dec.17, 1850.

VALID BAPTISM.

BROTHER WILLIAM L. BEEBE: - A brother in Georgia, {brother Matthews,} requests my views, through the MESSENGER, on the following queries:

1st. What qualifications are requisite to constitute a lawful administrator of the ordinance of baptism?

2nd. Can a person, after having been once so qualified, so act as to disqualify himself?

3rd. If so, is it right to hold a baptism administered by such persons valid?

4th. What course would you advise the Primitive Baptists to pursue in receiving members from the Missionary Baptists, with whom they have declared non-fellowship?

Brother Beebe, as my views are requested on these points, I trust that I shall be permitted to give them irrespective of what may be the views of others. I give them as the views I individually entertain, but claim no infallibility for them, any further than they are sustained by the testimony of the word of God. God's revealed word is infallible, what therefore that sustains as truth is infallible, and what does not sustain, however ancient may be the idea, is error.

In noticing the first query as to what qualifications are necessary to constitute a valid administrator, in order to obtain a Scriptural answer, we must enquire who were the persons and what were their qualifications to whom our Lord the only and Great Head of the church, gave the command to baptize. The testimony of the Scripture is that it was given directly to the Apostles, and there is no account of his having directly so commanded any others. Matt.28:20, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," appears to me clearly to imply that there was to be a succession to them in the application of the commands he had given them. The inquiry next arises, Where are we to look for the apostolic succession? The idea has been very prevalent from a very early period of the church, that this succession is to be found in the ministry. As this idea affords so good a plea for the ministry to assume the authority over the churches such as the apostles exercised by their Lord's appointment, it has been much insisted on by the clergy of all denominations. And a good many Baptist ministers, who would dissent from this full influence drawn from the above idea of succession, still claim the succession to themselves so far as relates to baptism, and

perhaps to preaching. Hence they conclude that they have the independent right to baptize whom they please without the consent of the church; of course if they may act independently of the church in one case, they may in another. And therefore being once ordained to the ministry, they may claim to themselves that having been called of Christ as were the apostles, that is directly, and not through the judgment of the church, they may go on independently of the government of the church, preach what they please, baptize whom they please, &c., and require that the churches should fellowship their acts. But certainly no candid reader of the New Testament can find therein any sanction for ordinary ministers; that is, *pastors and teachers*, claiming to themselves any such independency of the churches; they are called to the work of the ministry through the judgment and fellowship of the church, are of right subject to the discipline of the church, are the servants of the church.

There is another class of Baptists, who, rejecting this notion of ministerial succession, claim that every disciple or baptized believer, is individually a successor of the apostles in all but their peculiar apostolic gifts; that is, this I judge to be their views from the ground they occupy. They claim for each disciple the individual right to baptize whom and when he pleases; and some consistently with that claim, also claim it as their right to preach the gospel merely on the ground of their being disciples. A church upon this principle instead of possessing the harmony of the human body, would be like a body in which every member claimed the right to occupy what station he pleased in the body, and to act from his own impulse, and not in subjection to the will of the whole. This, if I understand the apostle, is the very kind of disorder which he is reprovng, and the opposite to that order which he declares to belong to the gospel church as the body of Christ, in I Cor., 12th chapter throughout.

The inquiry then returns as to wherein the apostolic succession is found. I answer that the apostles as they were found on the day of Pentecost, were the representation not of the gospel ministry only, but of the gospel church with all its gifts, with all its power, and with all its weakness; and were thus the visible embodiment of the gospel church, as were the twelve sons of Jacob, of the twelve tribes of Israel. Hence the repeated reference to the twelve tribes of Israel in connection with a reference to the apostles, as in Matt.19:28; James 1:1; Rev.7:8-10, & 21:12-14. The eleven were commanded by their Lord after his resurrection to tarry in Jerusalem until they were *endued with power from on high*. In the mean time however

they must show a little of that creaturely impatience which has been common to the church in all succeeding ages, without waiting for this *power* as directed, they undertook to manufacture for their company a twelfth apostle out of Matthias. But the Lord instead of being forestalled by them, in his purpose, in his own time and order called Paul to the apostleship. Still when the day of Pentecost was fully come, we find them all with one accord in one place. A company of as poor, helpless creatures, destitute of any kind of worldly influence to sustain or encourage them, as need to be. Such has been the case of the true church in all ages since. But the power of God was so manifested for encouraging them and strengthening their faith in the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that with boldness they preached the gospel of Christ. And as a further manifestation of Christ's presence with them, and of his power over all flesh, multitudes were brought to obey the gospel, and to rejoice in his salvation. Although this baptism of the Holy Ghost was an extraordinary manifestation, in visible form, in the cloven tongues as of fire which sat upon them, as an evidence of their being endued with power from on high to preach the gospel among all nations, yet this same manifestation, as were also the miracles wrought by the Apostles, was for the encouragement and confirmation of the saints in all after ages, in the faith that Christ with his all power in heaven and in earth would be with his church always, even to the end of the world, to sustain her, and to furnish her with gifts adequate for feeding the sheep and lambs of his flock, and for preaching the gospel wherever it is his pleasure to send it.

Again, the three thousand baptized at the time of the Pentecost are said to have been *added*, or as in our version *added unto them*. As the Apostles were not afterwards to remain together, in a visible body, as the churches were to be, but to be scattered in the fulfillment of their ministry, and a visible church now existing at Jerusalem as established in their doctrine, those who afterwards became disciples, were said to be added to the church. Not only this, but we soon find the apostles, directing the church to the exercise of a part at least of that authority, which they themselves had hitherto exercised, in reference to choosing from the church men to take charge of supplying the poor. Acts, 6th chapter. And from then on we find the church participating with the apostles in the exercise of authority, see Acts 13:1-3, compared with 14:26,27, as showing that it was the church and not the prophets and teachers which sent Paul and Barnabas forth through the direction of the Holy Ghost. And in Acts, the 15th

chapter, we find the church connected with the apostles and elders in deciding on the difficulty which had occurred in the church at Antioch. And in no instance except in the cases of Timothy and Titus, whom Paul had sent to certain churches, as his proxies to set things in order whither it was not convenient for himself to be, and who were therefore called evangelists, as were also certain ministers sent forth by the apostles earlier in the history of the church; I say with these exceptions, there is no instance in which the apostles acknowledged the succession of authority to exercise the government and discipline of the church to be vested in any other than the churches. Paul exhorted the Elders of the church at Ephesus, and Peter exhorted the Elders which were among the churches to whom he wrote, but they only directed them in reference to themselves and to feeding the church and flock of God. Acts 20:28, & I Pet.5:1,2. To sum up on this point, Paul tells the church at Corinth, "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." I Cor.3:21-23. Thus making the churches to stand next to Christ. And so again he shows that all the gifts are given to the churches. Eph.4:11,12. Consequently as the apostolic gift was for the churches; when churches were planted and lesser gifts were given, they were in subordination to the churches, in government.

If then the commission to the apostles to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c., is transmitted in succession to the churches, we see that all Missionary, Tract, Sunday School, and kindred societies are cut off from all claims to authority for spreading the gospel from this commission, and those who sanction them are rebels against the kingdom of Christ, and are assuming an authority which belongs of right only to the bride, the Lamb's wife.

But how is the church to preach the gospel and baptize? Evidently through the gifts of pastors and teachers given her for that purpose. Why are these gifts bestowed if the Lord designed every member to perform that for which they are specially given? And why are servants especially given if all the members of the family are alike to serve? These pastors or servants are given as before noticed to the churches, and are therefore to act in subordination to the churches, and not as some assume independent of their fellowship. Hence a man though he may afterward show himself to have been a wolf in sheep's clothing, having administered baptism under the sanction and fellowship of a gospel church, the baptism, notwithstanding his after defection, thus administered is valid.

On the other hand, of course a baptism administered in form, without the authority and fellowship of a gospel church, cannot be gospel baptism. Certainly if our Lord has connected the ministrations of the gospel and its ordinances with the church, we have no right to sanction or own anything as gospel order which is severed from the church.

Our brother's 1st query is above answered; that is, the qualification requisite to constitute a lawful administrator, are that he must have a standing in the fellowship of a gospel church, and officiate in such administration as the authorized servant or minister of a gospel church.

The 2nd query; namely; "Can a person after having been once so qualified, so act as to disqualify himself?" According to the view I have taken of apostolic succession, he can. And does become disqualified for administering Christ's ordinance of baptism, whenever by his own withdrawal, or by the exclusion or suspension of the church he ceases to stand in the fellowship and to minister under the authority of a gospel church.

Consequently in answer to the 3rd query, whenever a person becomes disqualified according to the answer to the 2nd query, or has never had the qualifications noticed in answer to the 1st query, it certainly cannot be right to acknowledge any performance of such person, as gospel baptism, of gospel order.

The 4th query, "What course would you advise the Primitive Baptists to pursue in receiving members from the Missionary Baptists, with whom they have declared non-fellowship?" My advice is, and let it stand for what it is worth, that you should either fellowship the Mission Baptists as standing in gospel order as churches of Christ, or not fellowship them as such. And if you fellowship them, to fellowship the Paedobaptists also; for if we sanction a departure from the New Testament as our *Rule* in one instance, why not in another? When you get beyond the New Testament you are out in open sea without a compass; who then is to say which course is right? If on the other hand you are disposed to maintain the stand of acknowledging nothing as belonging to the gospel kingdom, but what is in accordance with the "pattern showed in the mount," then I would advise you to hold Mission Baptists and other will-worshippers just as the Apostles held all such classes of religionists in their day. If a person who has been among the Mission Baptists applies to be received among you, and if he was baptized by one who at the time of administering the ordinance to him, stood in fellowship with you as a gospel minister, then receive him as

you would any other excluded person, upon the evidence of his repentance. If the applicant for membership was baptized by one who at the time stood excluded from your fellowship, or which is the same thing, from whom you had separated, thereby declaring non-fellowship for him, and you were to receive this applicant as a baptized member, would you not by such reception disannul your declaration of non-fellowship, and in acknowledging the dipping as gospel baptism thereby acknowledge the administrator as a gospel minister, and the bodies with which he is connected as gospel churches? Hence I would advise the treating of the applicant just as though he had never professed religion; if by the relation of his experience he gives you evidence of being a believer, and shows a willingness to honor Christ as the King of Zion, by being baptized according to his own appointed order as delivered in the New Testament, then receive him to baptism and membership, and not without. A form of baptism can be of no avail wherein Christ is not honored; and certainly no one can show that Christ ever authorized any to administer baptism in his name who were disconnected with his visible church. I should think that when a person once found himself connected with a society with which he could no longer for conscience sake walk with as a church of Christ, he would not wish to countenance any of their acts as gospel ordinances.

Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and he sanctions no compromising with the world or with the world's religion by the subjects of his kingdom. He tells us that he "came to send fire on the earth." Again he says, "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay, but rather division." He further shows that the members of the same natural family are to be divided one from the other, even the tender tie of the mother and daughter must have no binding influence on that which relates to his kingdom, they must be at variance where one is the subject of grace and the other not. The daughter in order to show herself a disciple of Christ, must disregard the opinions, prejudices, or wishes of her unregenerated mother on this subject, and hear only Christ; even natural sympathy for her feelings must be laid aside. And a mother must make no compromises of either doctrine or order in order to bring her unregenerated daughter with her into the church. See Luke 12:49-53; Matt.10:34-36. But how many Baptists there are who are unwilling that the doctrine and order of the gospel should be fully insisted for fear of offending their unregenerated children and friends. And some are afraid of rejecting New School baptism, for fear of giving offence. These fleshly feelings should have no place in the church of Christ.

Excuse my having written so lengthily. I feel that the subject is an important one.

With Christian regards yours,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., April 22, 1853.

SOME OBJECTIONS ADDRESSED.

DEAR BROTHER WILLIAM: - Brother Mitchell's letter in the number of the MESSENGER for February 15, 1854, has put me in the notion of saying a few words to him through the MESSENGER; and whilst I am writing I will also offer a few remarks for the consideration of brother Pate.

In reference to brother Mitchell, I was truly sorry to hear from him of the grievous temptations, in addition to his other afflictions, under which he appeared to be laboring at the time he wrote that letter. I know he is in the hands of him who *knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations*; and that though he may have suffered Satan to *have him*, so far in his power for a season, that he may sift him as wheat, yet the Lord will take care that not the least grain shall fall upon the earth. I also know that, "No chastening for the present seemeth joyous, but grievous, nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." But that which I wish particularly to remark upon, is the temptation brother Mitchell seems to be under, that because his own mind is in darkness with regard to the present comforts of religion, and because he cannot clear the clouds which hang over himself, he concludes that he can no longer be instrumental in edifying and comforting others, and therefore he will not try. If brother Mitchell's communications had drawn upon him as much opposition from brethren as mine have upon me, and caused them to say as many hard things of him as they have of me, there might be some ground for him to hesitate about writing for a periodical designed to be in part at least, supported by those who condemn his writings. But it is not so with brother Mitchell; the brethren I think have generally been well pleased with his writings. Or if when he attempts to write on any subject the Lord is pleased so to shut up his mind, so that the subject is dark to him, or that he cannot collect or arrange his thoughts, as I know he can do both, when we attempt to write or attempt to preach, whilst such is the case it may be well to be silent. But brother Mitchell when his health admitted of his

preaching, because at one time his mind was shut up, or because he felt too unworthy to attempt to speak to the people, would not have felt justified in refusing to try to preach any more.

If he is afraid that the circumstance of brethren so frequently calling upon him for his views of texts of Scripture will tend to lift up with pride, this very trial he is now in shows how easy the Lord can lay him low in his own estimation, and keep him humble. So that I hope he will reconsider this matter, and as the Lord shall give him strength and opportunity he will still let the brethren hear from him, and will give them such views as the Lord gives him.

In reference to brother Pate, when he first wrote his objections to an opinion of mine which I had casually dropped, you were good enough to take up the subject and to say all that I thought was necessary in reply. And when he wrote the second time, it was not because I thought brother Pate's remarks not worth replying to, nor that his arguments were not as good as could be produced on that side of the question, that I have not sooner noticed it, but in part because I did not think the subject, in itself considered, of that importance, that I do not know that brother Pate would be made any more *wise unto salvation*, were we to convince him of the correctness of our position, or that we should be made any more thus wise, were he to convince us of the correctness of his. But still there is a principle or two involved in the matter that is of some importance. 1st. Under the gospel, Christ is revealed as the *One Mediator between God and men*, hence he is not only the Head of the church, as his body, but is the immediate Head of all communication between God and his people. The New Testament recognizes no intermediate heads, no semi-mediators, as between Christ and the people, however fashionable they are among the various religionists of our day. The apostles as I was showing when I made the remarks to which brother Pate objects were the immediate representation of the gospel church in its visible form, with its gifts, &c. Hence in order to bring a proper representation of the immediate dependence of the church upon Christ, they were called directly of Christ as are all subjects of grace, not through others being sent to them, and the twelve were directly ordained of him, as apostles. It is true, that one of those he ordained betrayed him and thus fell from his office, and as Peter showed from the Psalms *another* was to take his bishoprick. Now the enquiry is, as well as the point of difference between brother Pate and us, was this substitute to the office of Judas, to be appointed according to the Old

Testament order, by lots and intermediate agents, or according to New Testament order, immediately by Christ as the Head? If the former be considered, as practiced by the eleven in the case of selecting Matthias, as being established gospel order in making an apostle, then I see not why it is not an example to be carried out, and why we may not resort to secondary means for filling the churches with professors, and for supplying the churches with preachers. If the New Testament order was to be observed in this case, then it would have been the place of the disciples to have waited till the Lord should call and ordain for himself an apostle in the place of Judas; and so according to this order it becomes us, instead of manufacturing christians and preachers, to wait on the Lord to bring in the subjects of his grace, and to send forth laborers of his own choosing into the harvest in his own time and way. So that the point is whether grace reigns sovereignly, or whether there is an interposition of secondary means. That is, as the subject appears to me; it may appear differently to brother Pate.

Another principle apparently involved, is whether the principle contended for by the Old School Baptists; namely, that a command of Christ is requisite to sanction our doing anything as a religious act; or whether we are at liberty to do whatever seems to us right in religion regardless of any direct command from Christ. Now we have direct evidence that Christ commanded the disciples to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high; to wait for the promise of the Father, &c. But not one word of testimony that he directed them in the mean time to select one to fill the place of Judas. As Christ was seen of his disciples forty days out of the fifty, which intervened from his resurrection, or from the Passover to the day of Pentecost; and considering the importance of this matter that when he was speaking to them of the things concerning the kingdom of God, that he should not have given directions on this point, or himself to have selected the man, if the place was to be filled out of those who accompanied with them is to me singular. And to me it is evident that he gave no such command, else why did not Peter refer to the command of Christ, instead of preaching them a sermon from the Psalms, in order to induce them to engage in that enterprise? If such an important work as that might be undertaken without any command to them to do it, why may not other things which seem reasonable from prophecy, be undertaken without any direction in the New Testament for it, such as converting the heathen to Christ, &c.?

Brother Pate speaks approvingly of casting lots in this act pertaining to the gospel kingdom. It is true that lots were appointed in certain cases under the Old Testament as an appeal to God's decision, and were consistent with that shadowy dispensation, in which so much of their intercourse with God was through external forms. But even then there was nothing corresponding with this case in selecting an apostle. In the case of deciding which of the goats, which Aaron was to take from the children of Israel, should be for the Lord and which for the scape goat, the case was referred directly and fully to the Lord, and this showed that in the grand anti-typical atonement nothing is left to man's choice, but all is of God's appointment. But in this case of undertaking to appoint one of the Lord's apostles, they go to work themselves and select *two*, out of how many, I know not by the description. Peter speaks of, perhaps *seventy*, and then in effect tells the Lord that he may have one of the two for to supply the place of Judas; and they cast lots upon the two only that he may designate his choice. This does not look to me like submitting the matter entirely to the Lord's choice, but men appeared to have the greater share in making the selection. It looks very much like many transactions of our modern missionary gentry, in pretending by prayer to submit the choice of their missionaries to the Lord, and yet select them themselves, and send them out as the Lord's missionaries or sent ones, as Matthias was represented to be the Lord's *apostle* or *sent one*. In reference to Paul's saying that the Lord was seen of the twelve next after being seen of Cephas, it is perhaps more than we can do, to determine with precision, which of the appearings of our Lord to his disciples he has reference to, but I should judge he had reference to that special appearing which Matthew and Mark both mention. In which the *eleven* according to a previous appointment of Christ, went into Galilee to meet him. And as there is no account of any but the eleven going there to meet him, I think Paul's using the term *twelve* instead of *eleven* was from that same humility which led him to say that he was the last of the apostles, and that he was not meet to be called an apostle, &c., that is he would not assume to himself the province of denying that there were not twelve apostles without him. Yet at other times when his authority was disputed, he was bold to claim the authority of his office, he could say, Am I not an apostle? "Am I not free? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" Again, he could speak of himself as "called to be an apostle." An "apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God" and by the commandment of God, and as ordained to be a preacher and an apostle, and he

affirms the truth of his ordination. The passage in Rev.21:14, it appears to me requires a little more attention than brother Pate gives to it, for he would intimate that the distinction is to be kept up in the New Jerusalem between Jews and Gentiles, and therefore Paul is not one of the definite *twelve apostles of the Lamb*. Now, brother Pate, you must excuse me, but I cannot believe in a distinction of that kind in the church militant or triumphant. And I do believe that Paul, although the apostle of the Gentiles, is as much honored, as having as a *wise master builder, laid the foundation* as any of the apostles. Paul says himself, "For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing."

Thus, brother Pate, I have gone more lengthy into this subject than I had intended, or than perhaps the subject required, were it not for the principles involved in it. It may be that on reviewing the subject you may see that in contending for the dignity of the disciples, you have in some measure, in this case, lost sight of that proper, that whole dignity which belongs to our Lord Jesus Christ.

However, I have given you my reasons for differing from you on this point. If they are satisfactory to you, I shall be pleased, if they are not I have no wish to be offended with you.

Yours with Christian regards,
S. TROTT.

Fairfax C.H., Va., March 6, 1854.

A CALM REPLY.

To a Communication of Elder John Clark, written originally for the SIGNS, but published in the PRIMITIVE BAPTIST, April 30, 1853; with that communication inserted. By S. TROTT.

Preface.

The communication herein replied to, was written with more of moderation than anything I had seen from Elder Clark's pen for a long time, besides containing strong professions of sincerity and honesty. Hence when a copy of the PRIMITIVE containing it, was furnished me, some months since, by the kindness of a brother, I thought should its statements remain uncontradicted, some well-meaning brethren on reading it, might, from the sincerity professed, conclude that I was the

base heretic I am there represented to be. After much hesitancy, arising from an unwillingness to engage further in a publication of this kind, I therefore concluded to write this reply. But it was not simply with a view of answering Elder Clark that I came to this conclusion. Any person accustomed to discussions, knows how difficult it is for a person engaged in an exciting and excited discussion, so to be on his guard as not to use expressions, and even form sentences, that might be construed to convey ideas different from what he intended, or his general declarations would warrant. An uncandid opponent will be sure to catch at such slips, and make the most he can of them to our disadvantage. But even in a more calm discussion, in following the course of argument pursued, we do not always attend to giving all that explanation to our views, which would be requisite for their being clearly understood. It is no wonder then, that in a discussion so diversified, and of a subject so vast, as was that which we had through the SIGNS, some years back, I should at times have *darkened counsel by words without knowledge*. If Job with all his patience, was led by the false charges and misrepresentations of his three former friends, to utter expressions, which subjected him to the reproofs both of Elihu, and of his God; is it any wonder, when subjected to similar uncandor and uncharitableness, when every opportunity was seized to misrepresent my views, and to brand me with heresy, that, irritable and impatient as I am, I should in such cases, utter things which I ought not, and leave the important point of advocating and illustrating truth for the more selfish object of rebutting the attacks of those I had to deal with? Elder Clark has boasted somewhat of having passed through wars before. I have known something of contests before, and of being particularly blamed for them, but I have met with more uncandor and more malignancy in this, that in all I have before been engaged in. I then, probably have, from all these circumstances, left some of my sentiments, and important ones, somewhat obscured and liable to be misunderstood. Hence the important object had in view, in making this reply, has been to give as clear an illustration of what I do believe, on those important points, concerning which I have been charged with heresy, as I could, as well as to sustain them by Scripture testimony.

Elder Clark's communication, together with other of his letters in connection, has given me the opportunity to notice most of the points which have been in dispute; though in replying to his communication according to its order, I have had to notice those points in rather a disjointed manner, and

to intermingle other remarks with them, more than I could wish.

The publishing of this reply, as has been the writing of it, may be somewhat delayed by circumstances. And the publishing of it will be rather an expensive concern, as from the unpopularity attached to my name, among the Baptists, as well as from not having much opportunity to make sale of the work, I shall probably not be able to dispose of it to any great extent. But still with these discouragements, I feel it duty to have it published, that I may leave it with the churches and brethren who have stood with me, and extended fellowship to my preaching; that they may be able to refer to it as a vindication of themselves, from the charge of having sustained one who had preached among them unscriptural sentiments. If this falls into the hands of any of those who have been led to view me as a mischievous person, and a propagator of heresies, I would ask, as the only favor at their hands, that they would candidly examine my views and test them by the Scriptures. If they, according to that standard, find them erroneous, let them reject them; and in doing so, they will be able to show from the Scriptures a good reason for doing so. But if they do not find the Scriptures condemning them, or declaring that which is at variance with them, I pray God that for their own peace, they may not any longer denounce or reject them. And may my brethren be careful to know for themselves that they are holding the truth.

S. TROTT.

Fairfax C.H., VA., Feb.25, 1854.

Before coming to Elder Clark's communication, there are two or three passages, in the letter to the Editor of the PRIMITIVE, introductory to his communication, which I wish to notice. On page 113, of the PRIMITIVE for April 30th, 1853, he says:

"It is an eventful period. Old Arius has arisen from the dead, and we are fighting the battles of the 3rd & 4th centuries over again."

From the many gross misrepresentations, to a direct falsifying of my views, which have been apparent before and which I shall have to notice in this reply, I have been led to reflect on the subject, and not being willing to believe that a man, who has sustained the standing he has among the Baptists, could in his senses, deliberately perpetrate such falsities, I have in charity concluded, that in some way, some one of his *bumps* has been injured, producing some disorder of his brain. In

accordance with this idea, his hallucination has, apparently, led him to think that he is an Athanasius of this age. Of course, in order to attain to the celebrity of his prototype, he must either find, or manufacture an Arius, to contend with; this he thinks he has done. He, in a communication published in the PRIMITIVE, some months previous to the one I am now replying to, quoted some arguments I had used, relative to the Sonship of Christ, to show that his Sonship could not consist in his existence as God, seeing that as a Son, his existence must be derivative, and posterior to that of his Father, who begat him. These arguments he placed parallel with certain of Arius' expressions, thus representing that I had applied those arguments as Arius was supposed to do his expressions; that is, to the original and essential being and person of the Son. Yet, Elder Clark knew that I applied those arguments only to the Sonship of the Son, insisting at the same time, that in his essential existence, he was as truly and equally the unbegotten and self-existing God as was the Father; because *he and the Father are one*; whilst Arius is supposed to have held that the Son no otherwise existed, than as he was begotten of the Father. As Elder Clark, you now have your Arius full in view, in your fancy, if you could only, with the same dexterity, make another Constantine, who, by his imperial edicts and sword would enforce your decrees against me, what glorious fighting you would have. But I must object to engaging with you in anything like the Arian controversy, independently of my doctrinal views. If you claim to belong to a Church that is descendant from the Church in which that controversy was waged; namely, the national establishment of Constantine, we do not belong to the same Church; for I claim for the Church with which I am connected a descent through the Waldenses, from the Churches of the Novatians, which separated from what was called the Catholic Church years before the *Athanasian war*. If it was otherwise, if I could acknowledge a descent from the Catholic Church; as established by Constantine, then I would admit the authority of the decrees of councils and edicts of Emperors, in establishing doctrine and order; as it is, I am not disposed to acknowledge such authority, nor to acknowledge the authority even of the Baptist Churches in doctrine, for they evidently have bowed too much to the decrees of councils, and the opinions of schoolmen. Nothing but the Scriptures will answer me, for authority in religion. I thought those who claimed to be Old School Baptists were with me in this, when we took our stand; but in this I have been greatly disappointed, with regard to many.

Again, on page 114, Elder Clark, though he names no one in this letter, yet he evidently refers to those named in the accompanying communications, says:

"I have preached and written against their doctrine concerning the Son of God, and charged that it is Arianism, and I here repeat it."

In the foregoing paragraph, he speaks of being in readiness to prove us the sentiments with which he charges us; yes, just as he proved me an Arian, in the specimen I gave of his manner of proving it, on a preceding page. In that way of proving things, I could prove from the Scriptures that there is no God; for it stands in Psalms 14:1 & 53:1, if you throw away the connection, "There is no God."

But we will come to the charge which Elder Clark boasts of having made against us. I entreat Elder Clark, and any others who unite with him in these charges, to follow me in the inquiry as to the truth of this charge, with candor. As to what Arius actually believed, I know not; but in speaking of Arianism, I speak of it as described by those who wrote of it. Elder Clark, and others with him, generally will, I presume, admit that Athanasians and *Tri-personalists*, generally, hold that the Son no otherwise exists as God, than as he is the Son of God, or than as he was begotten of the Father; than in his Godhead, therefore, as well as a person in the Godhead he was begotten of the Father; whilst they hold that he is of the same substance co-equal and co-eternal with the Father. They will also, I think, admit that Arius occupied exactly the same *starting ground* with the other party; namely, that the Son no otherwise existed than as he was the Son of God, or begotten of the Father. But here they split in their conclusions from this common position. Arius drew the conclusion, that as the Son only existed in his Sonship, he, from the nature of that relation to the Father, and from the fact that his existence was a begotten existence, must necessarily be posterior in his individual existence to the Father who begat him, and hence was not co-equal and co-eternal with the Father. I must confess, if I had not the Scriptures for my guide, but had to take the same leading position which Athanasius and Arius both occupied, in forming an opinion of the being of the Son of God, that I must take Arius' side of the question, as being far more consistent than the other. But I, and those with me, do not occupy the same, original position with them, at all; hence, I have offered to prove, if any of those accusers would meet me in argument on the point, that they are far more

assimilated to Arianism than we are; but they have never consented to meet me on that point. The position which we occupy, and the ground on which we stand, is, that what God has revealed of himself in the Scriptures, we are safe in receiving as truth; what He has not revealed, it is presumption in mortals, and would be in angels, to attempt to inquire into; that God has revealed himself as three, as the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are *one*; that they are so three, that there are points of distinction by which they are severally declared in the Scripture; and so one, that *to us there is but one God*. Hence, when either of the three is spoken of as God, we understand it to be that one God in all his fullness of attributes and glory. Hence our conclusion is, that if God exists absolutely independent of any one, or of any act by which he is brought into existence, then each of the three must alike so exist as God; and as we find it not declared in the Scriptures that God exists as three distinct persons, or that one of these persons was begotten of the other, and that the third is breathed into existence, we reject the whole, as fabulous. Again; we find the Son of God declared in the Scriptures, and all those characteristics, or attributes of Sonship, so ascribed to him, that we feel bound to believe that he is actually the *Son of God, the only begotten of the Father*. We further find this Son of God so identified with the Word, that we believe that the Son is the Word, in all his fullness of the Godhead. Hence, as we believe the Godhead cannot be changed from its absolutely independent self-existence, so as truly to sustain the relation and characteristics of Sonship, we believe the Word has that in himself, and has had from the *beginning*, which enables him fully to sustain this relation of Sonship, and of being begotten of the Father, without diminishing, or changing the attributes of his essential Godhead, or ceasing to be the *one God*. In reference to what his characteristics of Sonship consist in, I shall have to speak more fully in another place. But I have here summed up, in as definite and clear words as I can, my belief of God, as existing in Trinity, for I do believe in a Trinity, but not in tri-personality; and in the Son of God, as being in his person, truly, both God and the Son of God.

Now, Elder Clark, compare the sentiments I have here avowed as mine, with the Arian sentiment on this point, and see if you can find any similarity between them, taking each in its connection. And if you will look back into the past volumes of the SIGNS, you will find that in substance, these have been my declared views concerning God, and concerning the Son of God, from the first of my writing on the subject. And I cannot

help thinking that after thus investigating the subject, you will have to acknowledge, if you have the candor to do it, that you have slandered, and willfully slandered me, and those with me, in preaching that we are Arians. I now come to Elder Clark's communication. It is headed:

For the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. *To The Churches Of The Saints, And To The Faithful Brethren In Christ.* "As my name will cease to appear among the List of Agents for the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, from the date of the publication of this communication in that paper, it becomes me, and I feel it to be my duty, to present to you my reason for such decision. The first number of the 1st Volume of the SIGNS was issued on the 28th of November, 1832; just two months after the meeting at Black Rock, and the proceedings of that meeting, including the Address and Declaration of Principles, {which latter is preceded by a selected article upon *justification*, in which the date of justification is maintained to be eternal, which of course, includes that view of the subject upon the 'Scriptural sentiments,' set forth in the declaration of principles,} dated 28th Sept., are published in that Number."

It would seem, from Elder Clark's first sentence, that the design of this communication was to assign to the readers of the SIGNS his reasons for no longer allowing his name to stand as Agent for that paper, and to assign to Brother Beebe the pleasant task of publishing his denunciations of his paper. But why so large a portion of his communication was written, with so direct a reference to me, and to my former writings in an article of this kind, he must hereafter reveal, or we must be left to guess.

In the latter paragraph of the above extract, he has included in a parenthesis, a most barefaced piece of sophistry, by which he would impress on his readers the conclusion, as legitimate, that because Brother Beebe, as Editor of the SIGNS, published in the same Number of his paper in which he published the Old School Address, and his declaration of principles, a borrowed article on the subject of eternal justification, the views in that article must therefore be considered, to use his expressions, *Included upon the Scriptural sentiments set forth in the declaration of principles*; and that this sentiment was, therefore, one of the points for which the Old School Baptists contended in their first separation. Yet, he knows that not a word upon that point is to be found in the Old School Address, nor uttered by Brother Beebe in the declarations of principles, which he appended to the SIGNS. Besides, he knows that so far as I am concerned in

this piece of sophistry, that I shortly followed the publication of that article on justification, taken from the *WORLD*, with a communication over the signature of *A Waldensis*, containing objections to the sentiments of that article, and inviting T.J.K., the author of it, to a discussion of the subject. See *SIGNS*, Volume 1, Number 5.

Elder Clark goes on in his communication, thus:

"I became a subscriber for the paper in the beginning, and have continued so to this time; and have now in possession, I think, a copy of every volume that has been published. I did not sign the Black Rock Address, about which so much was said in the *New School Journals*, simply because I was not present at the meeting, but I approved of it then in the main, and do still, with the platform of principles accompanying it."

As there is nothing in the above worthy of a reply, I will give another extract:

"The cognomen of *Old School* was given us, and adopted by us; and the party advocating Benevolent Institutions, &c., were called *New School*. These epithets, *Old* and *New*, were understood by us to be applicable on the one hand to those who adhered to the doctrine and order of the ancient school of Christ, who were seeking for the *old paths*, and were found walking therein; whilst on the other hand, the term *New School* was considered appropriate to all those of the Arminian tribe who were advocating new doctrine and measures, which had their origin in the wisdom of men. That this was the ground we then occupied in our original stand against new schemes and devices in religion will appear abundantly clear to everyone who {though he was not familiar with our stand and proceedings at that date,} will but consult the record of those proceedings and the correspondence of the *SIGNS*, as the following example will show for the present. See Elder Trott's letter on the 17th page, Volume 1, introducing Elder Leland's letter. In the close of his letter he says: 'In these things it will be seen by the letter, Father Leland is with us; that instead of considering *new schemes, improvements*, he considers them *desertion and apostasy*. But the letter will speak for itself.' Now brethren, upon this ground I stood, and still stand."

The distinction here laid down by Elder Clark, between the *Old* and *New School*, is as we understand it at the first, and as we still understand it. Why, if he was so fully with us formerly, has

he now left us and denounced us as heretics? Perhaps the solution of this query will be found in the fact, that we have been found to have different views of the *ancient school of Christ*, and of the *old paths*. As the term *old paths* is quoted from Jeremiah, I have understood those *old paths* to be the paths pointed out in the law and preceding prophets of the Lord. Certainly he did not mean the *paths* marked out by Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, or by any of the false prophets.

So, in reference to the school of Christ, I believe the Scriptures to be the only standard according to which his disciples are taught. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," is the rule by which to determine whether what is presented as doctrine, or practice, has been learned in the school of Christ, or not; whether they are *old* or *new* paths pointed out. Hence the decrees of the Council of Nice are esteemed, as also all that has emanated from men since, as too *new* for us. But it appears that Elder C., and those with him, place great confidence in the decrees of that Council, and the opinions of certain men as pointing out *old paths*. Hence things which are *new* to us, as originating in the *wisdom of men*, are esteemed *old* by them; and things which did not pass current with the Baptists fifty or a hundred years ago, are called *new* by them, however clearly taught by the Apostles. It was in the sense in which I now understand *new paths*, or *new schemes*, that I used the term in reference to Elder Leland's letter. Elder Clark says again:

"But, as still further preliminary to what I have to say in this communication, I beg leave here to introduce an extract from a letter of Elder Trott, on pages 174 & 175 of the First Volume of the SIGNS, which not only clearly expresses my sentiments, but is fully expressive of my feelings in the present undertaking. The extract is this: 'Indeed, I cannot conceive how a person can be brought experimentally to know and love the truth as it is in Jesus, and not so feel his heart bound to that truth, that the setting up of anything in opposition to it, would be like rending his own soul. There is in this truth as it is known and felt by the believers, everything to enlist all the better feelings of the soul. The glory of the Three-one God is involved in it. The sovereignty, glory, wisdom, love and mercy of the Father; the love, faithfulness and power of the Son, and the efficacy and completion of his work; the sovereignty, faithfulness and divine energies of the Holy Ghost, are all so contained in, and connect with the truth of the gospel, that there never has been a system of doctrine contrived by men,

but what has struck directly at one or more of these divine attributes. Again, the believer knows that the whole Godhead as is known as Father, Word and Holy Ghost, is necessary to secure the salvation of the sinner; hence as any of the divine attributes are left out, or thrown into the back ground by any system introduced, he must feel that the foundation of his hope and comfort is struck at; and at the same time he knows that as such system is received and rested upon, so his fellow men are deceived into a confidence in that which will leave them to perish at last; and knowing all this, can the christian refrain from manifesting his abhorrence of such a system, and his opposition to it? That christian must be under the influence of a most dastardly spirit who can turn from such divine glory and excellency as is the *truth as it is in Jesus*, or who can approbate or even wink at any attempt to deface it, and that from the mean desire of thereby securing a little worldly ease and worldly applause.' End of Trott's extract."

I have met with many rebuffs for my former publications in the SIGNS; have heard of brethren groaning over the SIGNS being filled with my long pieces, and been told of brethren who, when they saw my name appended to a communication, did not pretend to read it; together with a great many other things said, and hints thrown out, calculated to dampen all my ardor for writing, and which if I had not felt some of that warm regard for what I believed to be the truth as revealed in the Scriptures, which I spoke of in the above quotation, which Elder Clark was pleased to make from me, and an earnest desire to hold it forth in opposition to those false systems, which for so many ages had prevailed, would have driven me from the SIGNS sooner than they did. But from such opposition, I was at length led to think, that for the prosperity of the SIGNS, and therefore, to spare the feelings of the Editor, I ought to withdraw from its columns. Now, to find Elder Clark hunting up my old writings and making extracts from them, with such declarations of approval, is quite calculated to cheer my drooping spirits; and, were it not that my judgment suggests that I ought not to place too much confidence in approvals coming, I will say, in that way, I might be led to draw the comfortable conclusion, that after all I have had to suffer in mind on this account, my labors in writing had not been altogether unprofitable. Elder Clark goes on to say, in reference to the extract just given from me:

"As the author of this, we might charitably hope, felt the full force of what he wrote; so did I feel in adopting it; and feel it

as applicable in a good measure to *him*; and the conductors of the SIGNS, who have departed from the original ground assumed, as will appear from the following specifications: First, on the doctrine of justification. This as I have shown was viewed in the ancient creed as eternal; and as further appears from the numbers published in the 2nd Volume of the SIGNS, pages 163, 196 & 244, upon *eternal justification*, with the Editorial sanction. But at a later date, Elder Trott introduced his new theory upon the subject, which after pretty full discussion, in which several participated, the subject was dropped, though the Editor, Elder Gilbert Beebe, was carried by the board, and came out a convert to the new theory. This I did not consider a sufficient cause to abandon the SIGNS, and hence continued to patronize them."

Elder Clark speaks of the *conductors* of the SIGNS; I know of but one. He speaks of the remarks in the last quotation he has given from me, as being *applicable* to *me* and to the *conductors* of the SIGNS. He has not said whether in a good or in a bad sense. I will say for myself, that I feel the importance of those remarks now, perhaps as strongly as when I wrote them originally. I find not a sentiment or idea therein that I wish to retract. I may not have the same energy of action as then, but still, with all my discouragements, I have enough, to undertake the publication of this pamphlet in defense of the same truths I there referred to.

Elder Clark has, I think, wrongly charged us with *departing from the original ground assumed*. The ground assumed in our original stand, was, that the Scriptures were a perfect, and the only legitimate rule of faith and practice; and hence the only rule to be governed by in religion. So we professed to belong to the *ancient school of Christ* – of course, being still learners therein, not to have graduated therefrom. Hence, in accordance with that profession, whatever we learn in that school, as being laid down in that perfect rule, we do not hesitate to receive and to advocate as truth, on account of any former opinions of our own, or of other men's being different from it. When Elder Clark can show from the Scriptures that our present views are not sustained thereby, then he may charge us with leaving original ground; this he has not attempted to do in this communication. I, several years since, found to my grief, that some who professed to be of the same *Old School* with us, instead thereof belonged to the *Old School*, which our opponents meant, when they named us *Old School*; that is, what may be termed the school of the *old English Particular divines*, in distinction from the Fullerite

school, which they then called a *new school*. Elder Clark was one.

In reference to being *still learners*, I further say, that those who have learned in the schools and from the writings of men, are not, with few exceptions of independent minds, still learners. The systems of men are soon fathomed and exhausted. Those who have studied the system, of what they call divinity, in the schools, when they graduate, come forth with all the knowledge they ever have of the system they are to preach. It has been said of some preachers, that they were like young wasps; the biggest when they were first hatched. So those who, though not having been educated in the *divinity* school, yet depend mostly on expositors and other human authors, for their doctrinal views and understanding of the Scriptures, are confined in their knowledge of these things to very narrow limits, even to the limits of man's mind. By just reading their favorite authors you will have their whole system, all the doctrine they will ever preach; and it will be all *old*; nothing *new*. The Scriptures are not so, they are an inexhaustible fund of knowledge; we can never reach the bottom of that revelation which God has made of himself and of His salvation. Hence he who obeys the Apostle's injunction to "study to show himself approved of God, {not of men,} a workman that needeth not to be ashamed rightly dividing the word of truth;" that is, who maketh the Scriptures alone his rule and study, depending on God's teaching to understand them, will be *like him*, {as our Lord said,} "who is an householder, which bringeth forth out of his treasure things *new* and *old*."

The sophistry by which Elder Clark attempts to force the notion of *eternal justification* into what he calls our Old School *creed* has been already exposed. He certainly cannot be ignorant of the fact that Editors frequently insert communications in their papers, without holding themselves responsible for the sentiments. He says at a *later date* Elder Trott introduced his *new theory*, &c. This is in keeping with the rest he says on this point; I have already showed, what he might have known, that early in the First Volume of the SIGNS, page 67 {in an article dated Dec.21st, 1832,} I introduced my objections to that sentiment. As to its being a *new theory*, it is entirely a mistake. The idea that the elect were justified in eternity, justified before they were under law at all; for they were actually not under law until they were created under it in Adam, is comparatively a modern idea. Elder Clark must know, if ever he inquired into the subject, that he cannot show either from the Scriptures, or the writings

of men, that this sentiment had ever been advanced more than two hundred, or two hundred and fifty years back. Hence in rejecting it, I was only *asking for the old paths*. If we admit of such union between Christ and his people as taught by the Apostle, such as of *husband and wife*, of the *head and body*, we shall see the inconsistency of such sentiment. What, the wife considered as justified, while her husband stands liable to be arrested and imprisoned for her debts? The body cleared from all liability to the law, whilst its head has to suffer the penalty for transgression? Elder Clark next says:

"Next came the war upon creeds and confessions of faith, which resulted in wiping out the creed of the Warwick Association; and which was succeeded by a controversy between Elder Beebe and the brethren of the Licking Association. But to show how that accorded with first principles, I will give an extract from the letter of Elder Trott from which the foregoing extract was made, page 275, Volume 1st of the SIGNS. 'I know that great exertions are being made to put down all confessions of faith, by those who are afraid to have these principles see the light. I am surprised that any *lover of the word* should join them in the attempt. Let them succeed, and we shall see Unitarians and Trinitarians, Universalists and Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, &c., all united in battle array against the truth. Let us separate ourselves from the whole mixed multitude.' He then advises to drop the *name* 'Philadelphia Confession,' because it has been abused, &c., but continues, 'Let us make an unequivocal declaration of what we believe to be the faith and practice taught in the word of God as we have learned it in the school of Christ.' Comment upon this is unnecessary."

In reference to the quotation which Elder Clark has here given from some of my early writings, I will remark that I recently read some remark made by Melancthon in reply to a charge made against him, of having changed his views on some points. In correspondence thereto, I will say, that I have lived, studied the Scriptures, and met the rebuffs, the cavils, and various complaints against my writings for these twenty years to very little profit, if I had not been corrected of one error, nor learned one new idea. I readily admit there are expressions in that extract which may be taken as conveying ideas which I cannot now approve. But still, that commingling of all sects together in one mass, by no one's insisting on any particular points of doctrine or order, as tests of fellowship, which had been much advocated, I as much disapprove of now

as then. And I as fully approve now, as then, of churches and individuals making a full and candid declaration of what they receive as truth, and of what they reject as error. Elder Clark's next paragraph reads thus:

"Next and last I shall notice is the doctrine of a created Son of God, and its concomitants as briefly touched on in the Circular of the Corresponding Association of this year; and more at large in the Warwick Circular. The avowal of this doctrine – *The life giving spirit of God is a created existence* – was made by Elder Trott in his controversy with the brethren about the Fort Mountain, though it must be admitted that he had on former occasions in letters to Brother Barton and others, and his articles upon the Sonship of Christ, expressed himself in a way which now appears in harmony with that sentiment, 'such as the creatureship of *our Son* in reference to his headship, &c.' "

In reference to the charge of holding *a doctrine of a created Son of God*, I will refer the reader to what I have already written in answer to the charge of Arianism, and to a further reply to this charge in noticing a following repetition of this charge. Elder Clark says an avowal of this doctrine is in these words: *The life giving spirit of God is a created existence*. I would like to know how this is an avowal of the *doctrine of a created Son of God*, unless it can be showed that this life giving spirit is the Son of God. The question asked by the brethren about the Fort Mountain was, "Is the quickening and life giving spirit of God a created existence?" See SIGNS, Vol.17, page 8. To this inquiry I answered, "Yes," and then gave some explanations showing that I intended the *yes* to be confined to the idea of a quickening spirit. But this is in keeping with all the rest of Elder Clark's representations of my views, to leave out the *quickenings* and make me to say the *life giving spirit of God was a created existence*. Elder Clark must well know that I have two or three times given explanations concerning what my design was in answering that inquiry thus in the affirmative. In those explanations I have declared that I knew of no *life giving spirit of God* being revealed in the Scriptures, and therefore I could say nothing about it. But that the Second Adam was said to be made a *quickenings spirit* as the first Adam was made a *living soul*; and if made, then created. See I Cor.15:45. But there seems to be as great a propensity in Elder Clark and his party to make a man an offender for a word as ever existed in the days of Isaiah. It was certainly an unguarded *yes* that I gave in answer. I did

not properly regard the wise man's injunction, to "answer not a fool according to his folly." For if those brethren acted the *fool* in the sense in which I understand the term to be here used, in asking a question about what the wisdom of God has never revealed, I should not have given any sanction to the inquiry. I know nothing of what Elder Clark means by the expression, *the creatureship of our Son*. I, of course, can say nothing about it. Elder Clark next adds:

"I need only add, in reference to the controversy which I had with him through the SIGNS, that after its close in the paper it was continued for a while privately, but with no better success than appeared upon the face of what was published."

I presume by the *him* in this paragraph he has reference to me; if so, this is as deceptive as the rest he has written. The points discussed through the SIGNS were not discussed by private correspondence. He wrote me and proposed a further discussion; I in answer to him accepted the proposition, and urged a calm investigation of the points of difference. The next was, I received from him a most abusive letter in reference to some correspondence I had with Brother Dudley, varying but little from an exact copy of the one I had received from Elder Buck, published in my appeal to the churches of Ketocton. I then dropped correspondence with him. If I am correct, let him publish the correspondence. His next statement is this:

"From all I can gather from what they have written upon this point, and with an ardent desire to know the truth, and not to be found fighting against it, the doctrine is this: That Christ in his person and character as the Son of God, is the first production of divine power, that is the first creature that God made; which is proven as they think by the expressions, 'The beginning of the creation of God,' & 'The first born of every creature,' that consequently as the life and head of his church he is a creature – created in eternity and his people created in him. 'That he is as the Son of God, inferior to the Father, because the Father begat him.' "

As he has divided his sketch of our views into paragraphs, so I take the liberty of noticing this paragraph by itself, especially as it relates wholly to the one subject, the person of our Lord Jesus Christ. Elder Clark professes a good deal of sincerity at the commencement. But I think he only wanted to know so much of the truth of our views as would suit his purpose. So far as it respects myself, he has in this paragraph given a

more truthful description of my views than in any other part of his communication. But it is only divided parts of the truth, and hence is not a correct representation of *the truth*; for if the whole truth is not told, you are not correctly informed concerning it. He will not admit, it seems, that the person of our Lord Jesus Christ is a compound person; hence he will not admit of my believing it, but estimates my views according to his views of the person of Christ. This is as far from giving a correct representation of my views, as it would be in giving a description of my person and age by his own. In contemplating so vast and mysterious a subject as that of *God manifest in the flesh*, our minds are so limited, that what glimpses we get of it, has to be in parts. Hence in discussing the subject of his manhood, in describing that manhood, we should have to represent it in language that would present him to view as a creature of time, if the fact that he was God manifest in the flesh was not kept in view; so of that by which he is the actual *head* and *life* of his people. The part of candor would be to estimate our views of Emanuel as we represented him, as God and man in one person, and so in reference to his being the life of his people, as we have uniformly represented this life as existing in God, and as one with the Word, and not as though we had represented it as something existing as a person by itself. How much soever of candor Elder Clark may have with others, he is far from manifesting any in his treatment of my views.

But to come to the subject of this paragraph, and to give my views, if possible, so as to be understood, I will consider; First, the compound person of the Son of God as presented to view in the Scriptures. I presume that it will be admitted that with God *there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning*; if so, it ought to be admitted that as God is sovereign, independent and self-sufficient in one of His acts and ways, so He must be in all of His acts and ways. Hence if we find the Scriptures at one time ascribe to Christ a oneness with the Father, and the Godhead in its fulness, and at another time a dependence and subordination to another as his Father and his God, surely, if governed by candor and reflection, we must admit that there is in his person some element distinct in its nature from his Godhead, in which he can sustain this subordinate relation; for the Godhead cannot vacillate thus from a state of sovereignty to a state of dependence. In Heb.1:8,9, we find quoted from the 45th Psalm, and addressed personally to the Son, these two different declarations, 1st: "Thy throne O God is forever and ever;" 2nd: "Therefore God even *thy God* hath anointed thee," &c. So Christ sends to his

Disciples this message, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." Again he saith, "I and my Father are one." John 10:30, and in John 14:23, this very same person says, "For my Father is greater than I." Again in Rom.9:5, Christ is declared to be, "Over all, God blessed for ever, Amen." Yet in I Cor.15:24-28, "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the *Son also himself* be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all and in all." Thus in the one text Christ is declared to be over all, God; and in the other to reign by a delegated power, in a kingdom which he must give up *to God, even the Father*, and ultimately *must himself* as the *Son be subject to Him that put all things under Him*. I know that many try to do away with the force of these texts by ascribing this subordination to his mediatorial office; but he does not so speak in the one, neither is it so represented in the other, in both he is personally spoken of. *My Father is greater than I*, personally of course, if language can express it. In the other, *Then shall the Son also himself be subject*. What can be more personal than this in expression? Indeed no person can read the Scriptures with a desire to have their opinions regulated by the testimony of Scripture, without discovering many instances, in which the independent Godhead of Christ is presented to view as equal and one with the Father; and many other instances in which as Son he is represented as sustaining a subordinate relation to the Father. Some may suppose that these cases relate exclusively to his manhood. But even if it was admitted that only in his manhood, he could thus stand in a subordinate to the Father, yet as it is manifest that he personally sustained this subordinate relation, it fully proves the correctness of our position that he exists in a compound person. That the manhood of Christ possessed all the requisites of a distinct person in itself, I admit; but as it was the Word that was made flesh, I must believe that his manhood *only* existed in personal union with the Word, and with the Word with that life in him which is the light of men; so that in the same *person* he is *God*, is the *Son of God* and is *man*. Were it not so, we should have only a human sacrifice to rely upon. If he only suffered as man, then there was no God

in the sacrifice, nor any representation of his people in it. The oneness of his people with him did not consist in his being made flesh, is evident because they were *chosen in him*, and therefore were in him, *before the foundation of the world*. And we have no authority for believing that his manhood existed before he was made of a woman, only as it might be considered as existing seminally in the *seed of the woman* or from Eve. But whatever some of our western brethren may think, I cannot conceive that this seed of the woman can constitute a flesh and blood union of Christ and his people, for the very plain reason that they are of the seed of Adam, and therefore inherit from him depravity, but he being of the seed of the woman only, in his flesh, had no depravity, condemnation coming not through her. But that it was not of him, alone in his manhood that he is represented as sustaining a subordinate relation to the Father, appears from the following, among many texts of Scripture: In John 3:16 & 17, we find Jesus himself testifying that "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, &c.," and adds, "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, &c." Does not this clearly relate to an existence the Son had before he came into the world, as it speaks of his being *sent into the world*? And is there not a subordination here expressed concerning the Son, that he was *given*, was *sent into the world*? Surely there is not that sovereignty and independence in this passive obedience of the Son which belongs to him as God. So in John 6:38 & 39, Jesus says, "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me; And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, &c." Here he speaks of coming down from heaven, and therefore cannot speak of his manhood which was born of Mary, yet he speaks of being *sent*, and therefore in subordination to his Father's will. Again, in verse 51, of the same chapter, he says, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread which I shall give is my flesh, &c." Here he shows that his flesh is the *bread of life*, and that which he *gives for the life of the world*, yet he so identifies it with his person, as to represent it as the *bread which came down from heaven*. But I will not multiply texts, though I might produce many more to the same effect.

Has Elder Clark, and those with him, such an idea of the sovereign and independent Jehovah, as to believe that in His Godhead He can lay aside His sovereignty so as to be subject to be *given* and *sent*, &c.? If they have, I will thank them not to measure my views of God by their standard. I so believe in the unchanging sovereignty of God, that I must believe that

the Word took into personal union with himself which was not God, that in that distinct existence he could be subject to be sent and given by the Father, as he had to be made flesh in order to be subject to the law.

Will Elder Clark now see that my views of the person of Emanuel is, that it is so compounded that he could be a *Son given*, and a *child born*, and yet be the *mighty God*; that he could be the *beginning of the creation of God*, and yet be the I AM THAT I AM. If so he will see that he has fallen short, as far short of giving my views of the *person and character* of Christ as the earth is below the heavens. If he will look back through the SIGNS, he will see that these in substance are the views I have held and published for these many years.

I will now pass to notice the idea of creatureship as applied to Christ in the Scriptures, in distinction from his being *made flesh*. It will, I presume, be admitted that in God's Son being *made of a woman*, the idea of creatureship is ascribed to him in person, and that without derogating from his Godhead or making him a "created God;" strange then, that such a general alarm should be produced at the idea of creatureship being applied to him, as he is the *life of his people*. But surely, if men inspired of God have, without reserve, in giving their testimony of Jesus, attached this idea to him, I think I need not be afraid to do it, though opposed by friends and foes. But I have never represented that as the Son he is inferior to the Father, because God created him, as Elder Clark has stated. I have based his subordination to the Father upon his relation as Son, as well as upon the testimony of Scripture, showing that he sustained such inferior relation. Elder Clark admits that we have such *expressions* as these: "The beginning of the creation of God," & "The first born of every creature," to sustain our views; but he appears not to admit them to be Scripture. They, however, will be found in Rev.3:14 & Col.1:15. How is Christ the beginning of the creation of God, according to the proper import of the words, if he was not in some sense the first of God's creating? And how the *first born of every creature*, if not in some sense a creature? Some, in order to get rid of the idea of creatureship being applied to the Son, have suggested that the terms expressing that idea should be understood in some other sense; that of constitution, or institution, has been suggested. I should not know what sense to make of the sentence, The beginning of the *institution* of God, or of this, the first born of every *constitution*; because I should not know what was meant by the *constitution* or *institution*. So if Christ was instituted the Head and Life of his people instead of created, then Eph.2:10, should read, For we

are his *appointment instituted* in Christ Jesus, &c., and II Cor.5:17, should read, if any man be in Christ Jesus he is a new *institution*. And the new man is after God constituted in righteousness, &c. See Eph.4:24. But unless there is something in the original or in the connection which shows that a different translation would be more correct, I cannot sanction the idea of saying that the Scriptures do not mean what they say. If one may say that this word, and that, and the other are not to be understood according to their legitimate meanings, others may occupy the same ground, and all because the proper meaning does not suit their notions of things; so every man would be at liberty to construe the Scriptures according to his own opinion. Where then, should we have any standard to test the truth of our various opinions? In the case under consideration, not only are the terms *create*, *creature* and *creation* decidedly a correct translation of the original words, but they also give a more definite sense to the texts in which they are used than the substitution of other words would; and what is more, in some instances at least, the connection evidently calls for the very idea conveyed by these words. As in Eph.2:10, the expression, "For we are his workmanship," evidently requires the idea of *create*, or *make*, to follow it, so that I think the text reads correctly. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, &c. Does not the expression, *created in him*, convey the idea of being *created in him as a head*, as the human family were created in Adam as a head? If so, he must have been created in that which constituted his headship. If in his headship he was self-existent, then his posterity as existing in him were self-existent, and therefore could not have been created; but if they were created in him, then he as their existence, as their life was created. So the *new man which after God is created in righteousness*, &c., {Eph.4:24,} can be no other than the *Christ in you the hope of glory*. If then, the new man was created, then Christ as living in the believer was created. Hence, when we take into consideration the compound person of Christ, I can see nothing in the idea of Christ's being the *beginning of the creation of God*, that ought to alarm us.

But as some of my most esteemed brethren do not agree with me on this point, I wish to examine it still further. And first; if Christ as the life of his people, is that spiritual life which lives in them, and that life is communicated to them personally, so that they are born of it, then Christ as their life becomes personally identified with them. And when we consider what God is, a perfect being of himself, a complete whole, a perfect unit, we cannot conceive that He can so

communicate of Himself of His essence, to creatures, so as to be personally identified with them. Hence I conclude that He must have something in Himself distinct from His essence, which He could communicate to creatures so as to make them participants in it. This something, this communicable essence, I conclude is found in that *life* which is declared to have been in the Word. I think by carefully reading the 1st chapter of the Gospel according to John, a person will be convinced that John commences his Gospel with a particular description of the person of Christ. He commences with the declaration that, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God," and that, "All things were made by Him, &c." Now, this being *with God*, which John is so particular to affirm, must imply, unless we consider Him as making so particular an assertion without any meaning, that there was in the Word a distinction from God, while the same time the Word was God. In verse 4 he goes on to tell wherein that distinction was, "In Him was life and the life was the light of men," not that the *Word* was the *light of men*, but the *life* was the *light of men*. Surely this *life* must be something, it must be a distinct existence to have such an affirmation made distinctively of it. This is not all, but he goes on to speak particularly of that Light which is, speaks of it as a person, uses the pronoun *he* and *him* in particular reference to it. See on to the 13th verse. In the 14th verse he returns to speak again of the Word, which we shall have occasion to notice again. This Light which is the life of which John affirms so much, must be an existence of itself. If an existence, it must either exist independently of its own pleasure in the Word, in God and with God, or it must so exist dependently by the will of God. The first of these, I think no one will believe. If then it exists in the Word of God's will, it is as much in its existence there the production, the creature of God's will as the natural light was the production of God's word. So that this was, I believe, *the beginning of the creation of God*; and as it is the life of his people, the light of men, they in that life were thus and then created in him, or brought into existence in the Word, by the will of God.

But then in thus contending for the creatureship of this life that was in the Word, I do not wish to place it upon a footing with those creatures which God has created exterior from Himself, neither am I authorized by the Scriptures to do so, any more than I am authorized to place that "Holy thing" which was born of Mary, on a level with Adam. That Holy thing had he existed only as the Son of God of Mary, would no doubt have existed as a perfect man, but the Scriptures teach that

from his conception he so existed as one or in personal union with the Godhead that he was no other than Emanuel, than the Word made flesh. So of the life that was in the Word, as being that Light which John bare witness to, had evidently personal qualities, so that had he existed separately he would have been a distinct person, but he existed only in the Word. Hence the Word though God, having this life in him possessed such a personal distinction from God, that he could be said to be *with God*, and could sustain the relation of *Mediator between God and men*. And thus whilst in his person he could stand as Mediator between God and men, he in his person was also one with the Father and with the Holy Ghost, as it is written, "These three are one." Thus this created existence which is included in the person of the Son, for the Son is the Word with that life in him, does not make him as the Son a creature any more than the assumption of manhood did. He remains identically the Word and God manifest in the flesh, whilst through the whole of his mediatorial office, he sustains a personal distinction from God, as abundantly testified in the Scriptures.

But as creation is in idea distinct from begetting, the inquiry arises, how is Christ the begotten Son of God? Before proceeding with the inquiry, it will be well to notice what it is to be a son, what its relation is. First: A son, according to the uniform usage of the term, is one who derives his existence as such from another who begat him, and whom he is therefore bound to honor as his father, according to the 5th command, "Honor thy father and thy mother, &c." Second: A begotten son, partakes of the nature of the father; and, Third: In consequence of his being the first or only begotten son, he is entitled to be the heir to his father's honors, relation, and possessions, &c. When Christ is declared to be God, we understand by it, that he is the self-existent, great First Cause of all things, the sovereign Majesty of the universe. When he is declared to be a servant, we understand that he sustained the relation of a servant, was in servitude under the law. Why not then, when he is so often spoken of as a begotten Son, understand that he sustains the relation indicated by those terms, to another as his Father?

In coming to the first characteristic of Sonship, that of being begotten, as manifested in the Son of God, I would remark, that in formerly treating of this subject, whilst I have uniformly contended that the Son of God, was God co-equal with the Father, I have, in speaking of his Sonship, in itself considered, and in opposition to the absurd idea of a begotten God, used expressions which in themselves considered were

perhaps calculated to convey the idea that his Sonship belonged only to that life that was in the Word. This was wrong, though I still maintain that he never could have sustained the relations of a begotten Son, had he only existed as God, because I cannot believe that God who is so emphatically declared to be *one*, could be so divided in his person, as in his Godhead alone, to be both the Father and a Son, the progenitor and the descendant, the bestower and the recipient of an inheritance; neither can I conceive that God can so divest himself of his independent, self-existence, as to exist in a derivative existence; or of his absolute sovereignty as to owe honor to another as his Father. Hence, I consider that life which was in the Word was as the seed of which he was begotten, as it is the seed of which his brethren, the members of his body are begotten. His headship, of a posterity who were to proceed from him, is in that life of which they are born, though in his person he is God. My mistake in speaking of the Sonship of Christ, arose from the want of a clear idea of what is to be understood by his being *begotten*. I had merely taken the term as it stood in the Scriptures without having been particularly led till recently to reflect on its import as spoken in reference to God, and the Son of God.

How Christ is the *begotten Son of God*, may, I conceive, be illustrated by his second begetting as the Son of God; for there are evidently two begettings spoken of in the Scriptures in reference to him. John says, speaking of the Word being *made flesh*, "We beheld {not *shall behold*,} his glory, the glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father, &c." And at the baptism of Jesus, and in his transfiguration on the mount, the voice from heaven was, "This is {not shall be,} my beloved Son, &c." Thus he was declared to be already the begotten Son of God. But the begetting of which I speak as a *second begetting*, was an after event to these. It is named in Psalms 2:7, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." This was spoken prophetically, and therefore though spoken in the present tense, had a future reference. So an inspired Apostle applied it {Acts 13:33,} when he said, "God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." The Apostle makes this begetting to be the same with his being, "The first begotten of the dead." Rev.1:5. It is probable that it is from these texts, that persons have inferred that regeneration and resurrection are the same. Resurrection alone does not alter the standing of a person; if he dies under the law, he will be under it in his resurrection. As Christ died under the law, if there had been

simply a resurrection of him from death, he would still have been under it. But according to Rom.1:4, he was "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." The Son in being *made of a woman, was made under the law*, and having by his death accomplished the object of his humiliation, the redemption of his people, by bearing the curse in their behalf, and thus exhausted the penalty death, as Peter said, "It was not possible that he should be holden of it," and therefore came out from under it in that nature in which he as the Life of his people had died, his own body, and brought out with him from under the law his spiritual body, the church. In being thus raised up, he was of God, in his manifest relation to his church invested with all the prerogatives of an only begotten Son; he was seated at the right hand of the Father, having *all power given to him in heaven and in earth*; was invested with the inheritance of all things, having all things put under his feet, *Him only excepted who did put all things under him*. Thus we see him of God brought into life from the womb of the grave, and invested with all the prerogatives of the Son of God, inheriting all things and sitting upon the throne and exercising all the power of God; Him only being excepted who did put all things under him. He must thus be of the same nature of the Father, and is so recognized in that it is said to him, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c." See Heb.1:8. None but God could sway the sceptre of universal dominion, and yet as a Son it is in submission to the Father that he reigns, and hence the period is to come when he shall deliver up the kingdom unto God, even the Father, and the *Son himself be subject to Him that put all things* under him. I Cor.15:24-28. Thus it appears to me that the terms *only begotten Son of God* are according to their proper import, strictly descriptive of that relation which Christ as Mediator sustains to God. But as this exaltation of Christ was a being *glorified with that glory which he as Son had with the Father before the world was*, {See John 17:1-5,} we may conclude that his relation as Son was the same before the world was. As there was nothing corresponding to a fleshly begetting in bringing forth the Son of God from under the law and its penalty, so we presume there was nothing like it, in his first being brought forth as the only begotten Son of God. If we look back to *the beginning*, we find the Word with that *life in him which was the light of men*. This Light, as we have showed from the connection, is a distinct existence, and that from the nature of things must be a created existence; it is a something that is communicated to men; thus Jesus saith, "I am the light

of the world, he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John 8:12. What is this *light of life*, but that *life which is the light of men*? Now, this *Life*, though a created existence could never be involved in the relation of a servant; being *in the Word, hid in God*, no law could ever reach it, with its demands, but the glory and majesty of God must ever shine forth with, and around it. But still, this life being in the Word imparted to him a distinct and compound personality, as has been noticed. This complex person could not as noticed, be in the station of a servant under the law, without being made under it, in an additional nature, neither could he in his complex person, though in that person he was God, sustain the relation of the absolute God, but was exactly adapted to sustain the relation of a Son, and was therefore set up, and brought forth in the everlasting covenant as the Son of God; and the same *mighty power* of God was manifested in thus bringing him forth as the Son of God and Head of his church and people, and they in him in that *Life* which was embraced in his distinct personality, as was manifested in raising Christ from the dead. See Eph.1:19,20. It is no wonder that John said of him, when he the Word with this life in him as described was made flesh, so that he could be beheld of mortals, "And we beheld *his glory* the glory as of the *only begotten* of the Father, full of grace and truth." Here is the difference between the Word's taking this life into personal union with him, and his being *made flesh*, though both created existences; the life was in him as God, was hid in God, but the manhood was *taken upon him*, the Godhead was veiled in his flesh. Hence the law could not reach his manhood with its demands, without being intercepted by the intervening Godhead; not so with the life. Hence I can conceive how the law could inflict its penalty upon the Word as being the life of his people, in his manhood, whilst it could not touch the life itself. Again, the manhood of Christ, was made of the seed of the woman; but we are not warranted to believe that the life was made of any created substance. The account we have is, that the *new man*, which must be the life, or Christ, in us, was *after God created in righteousness and true holiness*. From the testimony of Scripture, I conclude that the Word as the Son, occupied the same exalted station at the right hand of the Father, having the immediate government in his own hands, before the foundation of the world, as after his exaltation from the dead. Hence the glory which he now has is the same that he had with the Father before the world was; and the Word was with God. Hence it is declared, that "all things were made by him, and without him

was not anything made that was made." Every declaration made of God whether under, or before the law, must have been made by him; for it is written, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." John 1:18. This must therefore embrace every manifestation made of God, to the fathers, and through the law and prophets. Hence he must be the God of Abraham, &c. But here as after his resurrection we see evidences, that whilst all things were put under him, He was excepted who put all things under him; that the Father retained the supremacy on the throne. Thus whilst all things were made by the Word, or Son, yet it is *testified* that "God made the worlds by him," Heb.1:2, and that "*God created all things by Jesus Christ.*" Eph.3:9. And also in the *fullness of time God sent forth His Son*, &c. Thus showing the supremacy of the Father over him as the Son in all things, and his obedience to his Father's will.

Thus we see in Christ all the characteristics of a begotten Son. He is brought forth in that relation to God. Hence he acknowledges the obligation and willingness to honor and obey God as his Father. He says, John 8:49, "I honor my Father, but ye do dishonor me," and he is represented as saying, "I delight to do thy will, O God, yea thy law is within my heart." See Psalms 40:8 & Heb.10:5-9. Again he is of the same nature with the Father; for the *Word was God*, and he was *the express image of God's person*. Again as the only begotten Son he is *appointed heir of all things*, and none others, none of the Angels does God recognize as Sons with Him, excepting that Christ's people are acknowledged as sons in him, and are therefore *joint heirs with him*.

This case of acknowledging one as a begotten Son distinct from the idea of a literal begetting, is not singular in the Scriptures. God directed Moses to say unto Pharaoh, "Israel is my son, even my first born." Ex.4:22. He evidently thus owns Israel as His son, because He had chosen him to be a peculiar people to himself, and had provided for him an inheritance. See Deut.14:1,2. Thus it is said of Abraham that he *offered up his only begotten son*. Heb.11:17. Isaac could have been called *his only begotten*, only in the sense that he only was recognized as his heir.

I have thus given my views of the person, character and relation of the Son of God as definitely as I can; however much Elder Clark, and those with him, may be opposed to these views, I do request him, no longer to so grossly misrepresent them. Let him present what argument against them, he can, but if he has any candor, let those arguments

be against my views as they are. Elder Clark goes on with the catalogue of what he calls our views, thus:

“That God made the worlds by him {by the Son,} as Solomon made the Temple by Hiram, that is as his servant or instrument. That we are not quickened or regenerated by the Spirit of God or the Holy Ghost, and consequently are not the children of God in that sense, else we should be *little gods*. But we are quickened by the infusion of this created spirit, and hence our life is not in God, or God is not the life of the church. That this life is not in the Divinity of Christ, or in him as the essential Word, but in this undefined *existence*, and which life and his people with him died, arose again and ascended to heaven, &c. This condensed formula contains, what I am well satisfied I can prove from the record whenever called to it, as their sentiments upon this vital and fundamental point of doctrine – the character of the Son of God.”

Elder Clark says he is well satisfied he can prove these things as our sentiments. So he can, according to his manner of proving things, by taking a word here, and a word there, from our writings, and patching them together by some additions of his own. But I as confidently deny that I have ever held or advanced one sentiment as he has presented it, in this formula. In some instances at least, I think he must have known that he was entirely misrepresenting me. But I will proceed to notice the several items.

The first is, *That God made the worlds by the Son as Solomon made the Temple by Hiram*, thus far is a correct representation of my language. But the addition, *as his servant or instrument*, is a gratuitous supply by Elder Clark. Any person, anywise acquainted with agencies, knows that the idea of agency is very different from that of servitude. I have, already, in speaking of Christ's sustaining fully the relation of Sonship, referred to in Heb.1:2 & Eph.3:9, as fully sustaining the idea that all things were made by the Son or Word, yet that God made them by him. Thus showing that whilst all things were the Son's and in subjection to him, God as the Father held supremacy on the throne, similar to the case of Joseph and Pharaoh. I referred to the case of Solomon and Hiram, as I have formerly explained, because I considered the building of the temple typical, and because similar expressions are used as in this case, in relation to Solomon and Hiram. That I was not correct in the idea conveyed thereby, of God's supremacy over the Son as such, Elder Clark cannot show,

unless he can show the incorrectness of those two texts above referred to.

His next item is, *That we are not quickened or regenerated by the Spirit of God or the Holy Ghost, and consequently are not the children of God in that sense, else we should be little gods.* I used the term *little gods* in my controversy with Elder Buck, in relation to some position of his, implying that the Godhead was imparted in regeneration, which I stated would constitute the subjects of such regeneration *little gods*. I have never named that as a conclusion to be drawn from the idea of being regenerated by the Holy Ghost. Why Elder Clark so represented it, he knows better than I, though it looks suspicious of some uncandid design. In reference to regeneration by the Holy Ghost, I have said that if regeneration is to be ascribed to either of the Three, exclusively to the Father, to the Word, or to the Holy Ghost, I should suppose it would be ascribed to the Word as the regenerated are represented as the seed of Christ. I have further said, there is no Scriptural authority, or that I knew of none, for supposing that the Holy Ghost was exclusively the agent in regeneration; that he was particularly described as the Comforter, &c., but not as the Regenerator. The truth is, regeneration is ascribed to God in the Scriptures, without designating either the Father, the Word or the Holy Ghost, as in such texts as these: "Born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Again, "For God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, &c." Unless this text may be considered as confining it to the essential Word, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth, &c." This position may appear strange to those who may have been accustomed to hear regeneration ascribed to the Holy Ghost exclusively, without having considered for themselves whether the Scriptures thus ascribe it to him. But if Elder Clark could have refuted my position by the testimony of Scripture, would he have resorted to such misrepresentations to evade it? In reference to Elder Clark's using the words *regeneration* and *quickening* as synonymous; he may view them as synonymous, but he knows that I do not. In candor, therefore, he should not have so used them in speaking of my views. I deny their being synonymous, because both in their common use among men, and in the Scriptures they are used to convey quite different ideas. Generation is used to convey the idea of begetting an individual that had not before existed excepting seminally in its progenitor. So regeneration implies the begetting another and

a spiritual existence in one who already had a fleshly existence; as being *born again* in the experiencing by a person of a new and distinct birth from his former fleshly birth. Therefore the person *born again*, now exists in a new and distinct life from his natural life, *is a new creature*. But quickening conveys the idea of *stirring up, reviving, exciting, &c.*, that which already exists; its strongest idea is that of *reanimating the dead*, as in John 5:21, "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." Adam's begetting *a son in his own likeness*, is a very different idea from that of his raising up or quickening Abel who was dead. So from Elisha's having brought again to life, or *quicken*ing the Shunamite's son, no one would infer that he had begotten a son. When David prays, as he does repeatedly in the 119th Psalm, "Quicken thou me;" none, I presume understands him to be praying to be regenerated. Is it not strange that men, and even christians, will suffer their minds to be so enslaved by certain hackneyed expositions, as not to regard the proper meaning of words, in their explaining of Scripture; but will, to suit certain imbibed notions, divert words from their legitimate meaning, and thus represent that the Scriptures do not mean what they say, and therefore that the Holy Ghost in indicting them, either did not know, or did not regard the meaning of words! No wonder that there is confusion among us, whilst such is the case; for we thereby deprive ourselves of any definite standard of truth. Men cry up the Scriptures, and yet treat them as some of the heathen do their household gods, wherein they displease them, they repudiate them. If the *regeneration* of the Scriptures is nothing more than a *quicken*ing, then both the soul-regenerationists, or rather *soul-quicken*ists, and the Arminians are right on this point; for both represent it as being only a bringing into religious action certain dead or dormant powers of man. The one class say that God only can quicken these dead powers of man; the other, that men can do it of themselves, or that the preacher can do it for them. I know not but the latter class are right, if a quickening of the powers or faculties which the natural man already possesses, is all that constitutes an experience of religion.

But is there not a quickening connected with the new birth? I answer, yes; corresponding spiritually, to that which belongs naturally to the natural birth. Persons knowing anything about it, know that the quickening of the fetus, is a different thing from the conception. So I understand spiritual quickening to be a different thing from regeneration. But in this, and in many other points of comparison between natural

and spiritual things, there is a correspondence, but not a parallel. In the natural world that which is implanted is the subject of the quickening; in reference to the spiritual birth, the receptacle or soul is that which is quickened. Hence while I have uniformly held and contended that regeneration is of God, that God alone implants in the soul or heart that life which is the light of men, or imparts to it that *light of life*; yet I do contend that it is through this *light of the life shining in the heart*, the soul is quickened to any just conceptions of the spirituality of the law, and of that worship which is acceptable to God; and ultimately of those spiritual blessings which come through Christ. Thus the soul is quickened to the knowledge of sin, and to repentance, as also afterwards, to rejoice in the truth and consolations of the gospel. "For the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" and, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Thus while I contend that the soul is not changed from a natural to a spiritual soul, in regeneration, but remains after the new birth, with just the same faculties it had before, and reasons just in the same way, as before; and that without the impartation in generation, of this *life* which is the *light*, without the *new birth*, or being born of a new life, or of *the spirit of God's Son*, the natural man could never know, nor relish spiritual things; yet that when this *light of the* {so it reads in the original, John 8:12,} *life* shines in him, he is made so to see the exceeding broadness and the spirituality of the law, and to know sin by it, that as a rational man; that is, with all his mind, he approves of the justice of his condemnation. So of salvation through Christ; when by faith he beholds it, it is no longer *foolishness unto him*, but with every faculty of soul, he approves of it, as the *wisdom and the power of God*, and he is astonished at himself, that with all his reading of the Scriptures he never saw these things so, before. Yet the moment he is again left to reason upon the subject without the aid of this light, he concludes that because he is such a poor, guilty sinner, there can be no salvation for him; again when the light shines all is right. Brethren, is not this experience, and is it not consonant with Scripture? If so, is it not then manifest, that the soul of itself is not changed to a spiritual soul? And is it not equally manifest that the light of this life, when it shines does *quicken* the faculties of the soul, otherwise dead to spiritual things, to receive and rejoice in the things of the spirit of God? Thus *Christ was made a quickening spirit*; for this life is Christ in you. So in John 6:63, Christ says, "It is the spirit that

quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the *words* that I speak unto you are spirit, and are life." What words does our Lord here refer to? What he says to be sure, was true of most of his words; but there evidently is a reference in this declaration to the discourse he was holding with the people concerning his flesh being the *true bread from heaven*, and that his *flesh was meat indeed and his blood drink indeed*, &c. We find the Jews reasoning on the subject, and saying, *How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* Also some of his Disciples said, *this is a hard saying, who can bear it, that is, understand it?* It evidently was in reply to these murmurings that he said, *It is the spirit that quickeneth*, &c., and further adds, *There are some of you that believe not*, and again, "Therefore said I unto you that no man can come unto me except it were given him of my Father." All this convinces me that he did not in that text break abruptly off from his discourse to teach what regeneration was, but was assigning the reason in those several verses above quoted, why they could not receive or hear his words. First he lets them know that it was not of a literal eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood that he spake, that his *words were spirit and were life*, therefore the flesh profiteth nothing in this matter, whatever it may profit in natural things, no fleshly powers, or powers of the fleshly birth could comprehend him. They must *believe*, in order to believe or to trust in a crucified Jesus for life and acceptance with God, they must have that faith which God giveth. And this faith which is a fruit of the spirit, and belongs to the *new man*, is that, by which, as men we are enabled to trust in a crucified Jesus as the way of salvation. This being by faith on Christ crucified, is the *eating his flesh and drinking his blood* intended. It is this faith view, this *light of life*, that quickens the faculties of our souls to receive and relish the doctrine of Christ crucified, and to esteem his *flesh as meat indeed and his blood as drink indeed*. Thus I understand the spirit here, as contrasted with the flesh, to be Christ the quickening spirit, as contrasted with the fleshly Adam. The natural Adam has no power to quicken itself to the apprehension of spiritual things; but Christ, the spiritual life, can and does quicken the rational powers of the regenerate to receive and rest upon as truth, the doctrine imparted of spiritual things; if my experience does not deceive me.

There is another quickening spoken of in the Scriptures connected with salvation. That is, as they died representatively; or, in Christ's dying, under the sentence of the law, so they were quickened together with him, and raised up together from under the penalty of the law. See Eph.2:5,6

& Col.2:13. And again in experience, being killed by the law, they are again quickened to life, and raised up from under the sentence of the law, through faith in Christ.

I have been lengthy on this subject of quickening, and more so from having had to differ in my views from most of the brethren on this point. Whether or not I have said anything that will convince any one of the correctness of my views; I think I have said enough to show that Elder Clark has done me great injustice in applying what I have formerly said of quickening, to regeneration.

Elder Clark, in connection with the subject of quickening, further gives as my views, that the *life is not in God, is not in the Divinity of Christ, is not in the essential Word, &c.* Yet as in this pamphlet, so in all my discussions heretofore on this subject, I have repeatedly quoted John 1:1-4, and appealed to it as sustaining me in my belief, that there was in the Word who was God, and distinct in its nature from the Godhead, as being *in the Word, that life* which being the *light of men*, must be, that *life* which Christ is to his people, as he is their *light*, and therefore that *life* of theirs which was *hid with Christ in God*. I have also contended that this life being in the Word, must be personally one with the Word, thus constituting the Son who is the Word with this life in him, both personally one with the Father, and personally one with his people as being their life, in a compound person, and thus making him a divinely fit person to stand as the Mediator between God and his people. Now I know that Elder Clark knew that such in substance was my views, and has joined with others, not in trying to show by sound arguments and proofs that they were wrong, but in trying to ridicule the idea of there being in him before the foundation of the world, a nature distinct from the Godhead; yet in this publication he has made these positive assertions to the contrary. When I consider the standing Elder Clark once had among us, I am disposed to look around for some excuse for his representing things so falsely, but really I find none more charitable than the one already hinted at. But of this, I will leave for those to decide, and to reconcile his course with the confidence they are placing in him, who have put him forward as their oracle.

As to the additional remark intermixed with the others; namely, that *God is not the life of the Church*, I will remark that I did not fully know they held that the God-head was the life of the Church, that *God was the life that was hid with Christ in God*. I freely confess that I do not believe it.

Next following the paragraph which we have just noticed, are four or five paragraphs in Elder Clark's

communication which relate wholly to the Editor of the SIGNS; which, of course, do not refer to me; I will therefore pass them over without copying them, or adding any remarks concerning them, as the Editor is fully able to take his own part. The following paragraph to those omitted, is this:

"I will now present in contrast, what I understand to be the Scriptural doctrine upon these points. The most casual observer must have seen that this doctrine in relation to the character of Christ as the Son of God, is a denial of the equality of the Son with the Father, and is allied to the new theory of the life of the church dying and the church dying, rising, and ascending with that life, &c. The former branch of the scheme runs into *Atheism* and the latter into the grossest *Arminianism*, and is a denial of the substitution of Christ *for* or *instead* of his people, which I will show from the SIGNS is contrary to the doctrine formerly contended for by those who are now advocating it. First then, upon the first branch, and upon which I have now but little to say, I take this declaration as a fair statement of the doctrine, 'There is a priority of existence with the Father.' If this be true the Son cannot be *equal* to the Father, and it therefore would be *robbery* in him to claim that equality. Again, if this is true there was a period when the Son did not exist, and of course there could then have been no Father, for that is a relative term and cannot apply to God under such circumstances, and so we are into *Atheism* at once."

This, certainly, is a strange way of presenting in contrast the Scriptural doctrine, &c. I would like to know what Scriptural authority he has for the ideas he has advanced in this paragraph. However, we will notice some of the points he has taken. First he charges, to the representation he has given of our doctrine, a denial of the equality of the Son with the Father. He evidently means that we deny this equality, in any view of the person of the Son, and he bases the charge not upon any Scripture testimony, but upon the authority of the decree of the Nicene Council, for that is the earliest authority he can produce for fixing the *modus* of God's existence as *Three*. According to that the Son no otherwise exists as God, than as he exists as the Son of God, and therefore in his Godhead he is the begotten Son of God, and hence is, if God, upon this principle, a begotten God. But as showed in reply to his charge of Arianism, we reject this whole attempt to fix the *modus* of God's existing as *Three*, or in *trinity*, and we just receive the Scripture testimony that he does exist as *Three*;

and as it is as God that he thus exists, we believe that with the same sovereign and absolute independence, that he exists at all, he exists as Father, as Word, and as Holy Ghost; that the Word is equally self-existent with the Father, and can no more have a begotten existence than the Father, for he is equally the Jehovah; and that the Word with the life in him which is the light of men, in one person, is the Son. Hence he could say, *I and my Father are one*. But as the Son, as I have abundantly showed, his *Father is greater than he*. And I have showed from I Cor.15:24-28, as well as from other portions of Scripture, that in his present exaltation, as the Son of God with power, he is subordinate to the Father, and must ultimately deliver up the kingdom to Him. Elder Clark admits that the term *Father* is a relative term; is not the term *Son* equally so? Several of the relations characteristic of a son I have before noticed. Is it not equally characteristic of the relation of a son that he has descended as such from him whose son he is, or that he is a son by the act of his father? Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee, says God of him, as before noticed in reference to his present exaltation as Son. Does not this imply priority of existence in the Father, to him as Son? If Christ sustains the name and relation of Son, why not the characteristics? Who, without the greatest presumption, dare say he does not, when God claims him as His Son, because he had begotten him, and that on a certain day?

But says Elder Clark, this leads to Atheism; that is, that the Son could only exist as he existed as a Son, so the Father could only exist as he existed as a Father. Elder Clark speaks of *out Heroding Herod*, but with what point I know not; but surely he has here *out Athanasiused Athanasius* himself with all his audacity. Athanasius made only the existence of the Son as God, to depend on the begetting of the Father, thus represented as a begotten and yet self-existent God, being, to use their terms, *unbegottenly begotten*; an absurdity I should think sufficiently large for any sane man to swallow; yet Elder Clark here makes the existence of both Father and Son, *as God*, to depend on the Father's begetting the Son; that is, that the Father in begetting the Son begat himself into existence as God. How else does he make out the charge of *Atheism*? When shall we be done with such absurdities? Not till men will be satisfied with the simplicity of Bible testimony, and not blindly follow the dictations of the *Dragon*. I admit the correctness of Elder Clark's position, that Father and Son are relative terms, and I contend that we are bound to believe, that God in thus making use of these terms, in the revelation of himself, meant

to convey the idea that the relation indicated by these terms, did exist between Him and His Son. And everybody knows what is involved in the relationship of father and son. My contending for this is just the thing laid hold of by Elder Clark as an occasion for spitting his spite against me by representing me as an Arian. Will he condescend to inform us, as these are relative terms, why they are used, if not to show that such relation exists; and will he further tell us why he spoke of them as *relative terms*, if he did not admit of the existence of such relation?

But these relative terms by no means imply that God did not exist antecedent to his being a Father; yea, the very relation implies that the Father had an existence independent of his paternity. Christ said to Mary, "But go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." The language of Christ here, cannot be construed otherwise than as conveying the idea that the relationship which he acknowledges to God as a Father, is mutual, and the same with that of his Disciples, without doing violence to the order and language of the text. Will Elder Clark, or any other disciple of Athanasius say that God had no existence until these *brethren* of Christ existed? It may be said that Christ is the elder brother; but it is also said that he is the *only begotten of the Father*, they therefore as sons, must have been begotten in his being begotten; as Adam's posterity were created in his creation. God has revealed himself by different names, some descriptive of his being, and of his attributes, and some relative. He has declared himself as the "God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, &c." Did he not exist until these men existed?

So of the Son, when we take into consideration the character given of him in the Scriptures, we must believe that he existed as God independently of his Sonship. He is declared as the Mediator, as the Redeemer, as the Messiah or Anointed, as Jesus or Savior, these are all relative terms as well as Son. In reference to his name Redeemer and Savior, the name God is applied to him as such as well as to him as Son, yet I presume Elder Clark would not say that he did not exist as God until he redeemed or saved. The fact is, the assumption of the adherents of the Nicene Creed, that the Godhead of the Father and of the Son depended on the paternity of the one, and the Sonship of the other, is altogether a *begged question*, for which they can produce no direct authority from the Scriptures. If they will assume to be wiser than the Scriptures, I am not required to follow them, but rather to look *for the old*

paths. And they have no right to denounce me as an heretic or schismatic for thus doing. Elder Clark goes on thus:

"Secondly, as to the second branch – Christ the Head and life of the Church. The Scriptures reveal this life as existing in Christ the essential Word – the true God and eternal life. For we read, 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; in him was life, &c.;' that is, *in God was life*. If this life was in his humanity – that in which he suffered and died on the cross, then the church had no life until *he took on him the seed of Abraham*. But we read that, 'As the children were partakers of flesh and blood he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death; that is, the devil, &c.' They were children then anterior to his assumption of human nature – the children that the Father had given him, who were chosen in him before the foundation of the world, and predestinated to the adoption of sons, &c. As early as the existence of Christ which is without date – for, 'from everlasting to everlasting thou art God,' – so early his people existed in him, and had their life not only *hid with him in God, but he was their life*, for when *Christ who was our life* shall appear we shall appear with him in glory. This life the conclave of Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, and all the powers of earth and hell combined besides, could never reach, nor destroy. These had *their hour*, when they came upon him to eat up his flesh, when his soul was made an offering for sin and when he cried out, my soul is troubled – my soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death. Here he suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. Here he bare our sins in his own body on the tree, and suffered for us in the flesh. It was here that the declaration of God by the prophet was accomplished, 'Awake, O sword against my shepherd, against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.' Christ thus entered in with his own precious blood, which is the price of redemption, and in the sacrifice and offering we see the *Priest*, the *Altar* and the *Lamb*. But I cannot now enlarge upon the point without occupying too much space. It is enough to know that in the sufferings and death of Christ in which a full and complete atonement was made for the church; who stood related to him by an eternal and indissoluble tie; his divinity, though in union with his humanity, did not, it could not, either

suffer or die; and that the atonement was vicarious, as Christ stood under the law as the substitute for his people.”

In this lengthy extract, Elder Clark has given us his views as in contrast with ours. There are in it some few expressions that I should object to; not more perhaps than I should formerly have found in his preaching, and as they do not materially affect the subject in dispute, I shall not stop to point them out. The doctrine expressed as far as it goes is good, such as I approve of. The question arises, How can he in expressions advance the same sentiments which I hold and contend for, and yet condemn me for advocating them? So also the question has arisen, How was it that we so long got along and preached together in harmony, each esteeming the other sound? I then preached the same sentiments I do now, and he probably believed as he now does. The answer to these questions, so far as I can form an opinion from what has transpired in our discussions is this. When he and others preached that the people of God were the *children of Christ*, that *from everlasting they existed in him*, that *their life was hid with him in God*, that *he was their life*, we supposed they spake of realities; that they meant what they said; we supposed that those who were his *children* seminally would be manifested as his children in time, by existing personally in that very existence, “that life in which they existed in Him before time, in their being actually born children, born of that life in a second birth. How else could any be known as ever having an existence in Him, but by being personally partakers of that life? And they preached about being born again. On the other hand when we preached in this way they, I presume, thought that we used those expressions from general usage without intending to convey any definite, or at least any adequate meaning by them. Hence, when we came to contend that these several Scriptural expressions had a definite meaning according to their general use, and that we understood such meaning to be conveyed by them, they quarreled with us, and set up the cry against us of *new things*. Hence this dispute has been evidently different from some which have been said to be merely about words; for in this case both had used the same words, but it was the substances about which we differ.

But let us test the point, whether it is so or not. Elder Clark has not directly said it in this communication, but he and those with him have been understood throughout this discussion to contend that the Son of God previous to his incarnation, existed only in his Godhead, and therefore existed

only as God, and *to us there is but one God*; then as nothing but God existed before time, if the elect had then an actual existence in him, they must of course have existed as God, must have been God in their antemundane existence. Elder Clark, do not turn these conclusions off with contempt, for I am so weak minded, and some others perhaps are like me, that I cannot understand how it can otherwise be than, that if nothing but God existed before time, then all that did exist at that period, was God. If you can explain the matter otherwise, do so. But again, if this *life*, this existence of the *children of Christ which God has given him*, is ever communicated to the sons and daughters of men, so as to make them manifest as these children, they must be made personally participants of it, in being born of it; and if it was God in the head, it must be God in the members, in the children, for God changes not; he says, "I am the Lord, I change not." Mal.3:6. What then can they be in the *new man the new creature*, but God manifested in the flesh. But as Elder Buck discarded this idea of his being personally God, as he was a son of God; and as the idea is so inconsistent with all that is revealed of God, or of the experience of the children of God, this surely cannot be the idea. What else then can he mean by his declarations of a *life and existence in Christ, in God*, from everlasting, but that they existed only in the purpose and grace of God; that is, that God had purposed to display his grace toward them, in making them live, and in giving them an existence in union with Christ? But the text reads, "According to his own purpose and grace which *was given us* in Christ Jesus before the world began." But that which is only a purpose to give *life*, is not the *life*; the purpose of God is sure, but the life itself till it is brought into actual being, in the subject of it, is a nonentity. So the existence which is only purposed to be hereafter, is not now, it is not an *actual existence*. Hence as before intimated, there is no reality in the existence in Christ, and the union with Christ, in the life in God, which they preach as being from everlasting. But *Christ is their life*; if then the life did not actually exist, Christ did not actually exist before time, and if not before time, then not till he existed in the flesh, or was conceived of Mary. Where then was there any Mediator, before Jesus was born? Were the Old Testament Saints saved at first by their own intercession, and afterwards by the mediation of Moses? Or were they not saved at all? Here then is Elder Clark's dilemma of denying the existence of anything but the Godhead in the Son of God before time; and I have showed its two horns. He may hang to which of them he pleases; only it will be nothing but candid for him to inform us which horn he

takes, that we may know in future how to understand him, and to meet him in argument. But certainly it must be more consistent with the Scriptures, and sound reason to believe that the *life which is the light of men*, and which was in the Word, was in the beginning a reality, and something which in the nature of its existence was distinct from God, as it is said to be *in the Word, hid in God, &c.*, but never said to be God, or the Word than to take either horn of Elder Clark's dilemma. The Psalmist says, "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place, in all generations; before the mountains were brought forth, &c." If the Psalmist was correct, the people of God must have had, as a people, an existence in the Lord, not as existing in his existence, but as existing in him, as their dwelling place, having a distinction from him, such as is indicated, by the distinction between the inhabitant and his dwelling. Elder Clark again says:

"And here I wish to present another extract from a letter of Elder Trott, page 239, Volume #1, SIGNS, which is well worth the labor of transcribing and republishing. Speaking of some sentiments advanced by Elder Raymond, he says, 'he speaks of substitution as involving a separation between Christ and his people. Do not the Scriptures teach a manifest separation in this respect? Was Christ created with his people in Adam? If so he is but a creature and a branch of a fallen stock. Or was he as the head of his people set up under the law? If so the inheritance coming through Him is but earthly and must fail. On the other hand, Christ being the elder Brother of his people in the everlasting Covenant, it was his province to interpose Himself as their Redeemer that the law might not remain a barrier to their being put in possession of the inheritance bequeathed in the better Testament; hence it is said, *he was made sin*, or rather, *a sin offering, for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him - and being made a curse for us*. II Cor.5:21 & Gal.3:13. If I know anything of the use of words, the doctrine of these texts is the doctrine of substitution; and the word *for* is used, in them, in the sense of *instead of*, *he being made a curse for us*; for what purpose? *To deliver us from the curse of the law*. Did he not then endure that curse which he would deliver his people from? And would they not have suffered the curse, if he had not borne it? What is this, but his bearing it in their *stead*? And what can that be, but substitution? Again, we are told that Christ *laid down his life for the sheep*. Now if he did not lay down his life in the place of the sheep, how will we find an atonement in the death of Christ? And how will we find a

ransom in it? If he laid down his life for us in any other sense than as suffering that punishment which was due to our transgressions then there was no ransom price in the death of Christ; for a ransom is an equivalent rendered for the demand against those to be ransomed, and consequently involves substitution.' The Editorial *endorsement* of this is in the following note: 'The letter of our Brother Trott in reply to Brother Raymond on the subject of substitution is in accordance with our views on the subject.' Thus it appears that what was sound Old School doctrine 20 years ago, is not Old School now! *Then* it was *for* his people, or *in their stead*; now, it is *with them*."

Had Elder Clark been so complaisant as to have transcribed the whole of my letter from which he made the above extract, he would have showed his readers that I at that period contended for the same life union, the same oneness of Christ and his people, as I now do. I will give an extract or two. On page 237, after quoting Heb.2:11, "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of *one*," I go on to say, "And so I believe. I cannot conceive how the spotless Lamb of God could be made to bleed, or bleeding, how his blood could sanctify or cleanse from their sins any of the family of Adam unless such a union previously existed between him and them as made their sins, of right, chargeable to him; and *his suffering of death and enduring of the curse, accounted as done by them*." Again, I say in that letter, "Instead of this oneness being a union of feeling or views, the Scriptures speak of it as a *oneness of life*. Hear the Apostles; 'Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God, when Christ, who is your life shall appear &c.' This life which is *one in the Head and in the body*, was in the only begotten of the Father from the beginning &c." Again on page 238, in speaking of Christ as the antitype of Adam, I say, "He must have been brought forth a perfect Christ, head and body, he and his bride in him. Hence his people were *chosen in him*, {not into him} *before the foundation of the world*; and they were *created in Christ Jesus unto good works*; and as Christ - not as the essential Word, he is the *Beginning of the creation of God*." Now this was then all good doctrine to Elder Clark, and even now he could refer to that letter as something good. But when I advance the same sentiments now, it is *heresy, Arianism*. But I also in that letter noticed the relation of the people of God to Adam, and showed the distinction in their relation to the two Adams, to be the same as that between the two Adams, and that it was in their relation to the earthy Adam, that they were under the law and

needed redemption, and upon this ground I contended then and do so now, for a substitution in the death of Christ. Does this puzzle Elder Clark, more now than it did when he first read that letter, that the elect should suffer the penalty of the law in Christ's suffering it; and yet that he suffered it as a substitute for them as the children of Adam? If it does, how can he reconcile the 38th and 39th verse of Acts, chapter 13? "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." *Forgiveness* and *justification* are as opposite in idea; as are substitution and participation in the death of Christ. Forgiveness presupposes guilt in the person forgiven; on the contrary, justification is a legal clearance from all charge of guilt. How could these meet in the same persons and in reference to the same demands of the same law, except in their distinct relation to the two Heads? In their relation to their natural head, Adam, they were transgressors and needed forgiveness, which comes only through the blood of Christ being shed for them. In Christ their spiritual Head, they had *magnified the law and made it honorable*, and were therefore *made the righteousness of God in him, and justified by him from all things, &c.* So as showed in that letter, in their relation to Adam he was not one with them, he being *holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners*, was the *spotless Lamb of God*, he was therefore substituted as an offering for their sins. But in their spiritual life they were so one with Christ, that he could be held amenable for their transgressions, and the sword of justice be commanded to awake against him; and their life was so in him, that it could be reached but through him. Their life being hid in God, how could they die but as he their life died? Hence as he was so one with them as to be made to bear their sins in his own body, they must have been so one with him, as to have borne the penalty of the law in his bearing it. This is just in accordance with what I then wrote, and preached, and now believe and preach. Hence, if Elder Clark had transcribed that whole letter, he would have saved me the trouble of this explanation; and have saved himself from the charge in this instance, of giving, and that knowingly, a one-sided view of my sentiments, as a just representation of them. For he evidently had the letter before him when he made that extract. Elder Clark now comes forward with an argument, for a rarity, he says:

"If in the death of Christ there was a ransom price, and if a ransom is an equivalent rendered for the demand against those to be ransomed, and the church or sinners died with Christ, &c.; then they aided in the payment of that ransom, and in rendering the equivalent for the demand against them. Nothing is clearer than this, unless to get out of the difficulty, we contend that Christ died for one object, and his people in him for another, which would be a greater absurdity and also inconsistent with the idea that they are one. Talk of *Arminianism!* Why this scheme *out Herods Herod!* Old Arminius, the Wesleys, Adam Clark and all the host of Arminian authors must surrender the palm. For none of them ever contended that the sinner could *do anything in making the atonement!* They gave Christ the honor of that achievement without their cooperation, but that after the atonement was made, the sinner could help along a little by his *effort, prayers, &c.* Perhaps that poet who sung of *mingling his tears with Jesus' blood* might have believed in this theory. It is strange that the passages of Scripture that represent the believers as suffering, dying, as crucified, &c., with Christ, all of which is accomplished under the reign of divine grace in them, should be carried to Calvary and made to apply to his death there. Paul said, *I am* – not, *was* – crucified with Christ, and *I die daily*. The believer is dead to the law by the body of Christ – dead to sin – crucified unto the world, and the world unto him."

I might pass Elder Clark's mares-nest which he has found and chuckles over so much, as he has done with some of my arguments; but I prefer calmly investigating his positions. His conclusions from his position in the argument, are, *Then they aided in the payment of that ransom, &c.* Not so fast, Sir. Let us notice some of the positions of Scripture before we fall before your logic. It is written, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Again, it is written, "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for all have sinned." In this latter text it is declared, *That death passed upon all, for that all have sinned;* yet in the former text it is laid down as an undeniable proposition, that *In Adam all died,* then of course *all* must have sinned in Adam, for all to die in him. How else could they have died in him but by being in him, and therefore being accounted as having transgressed and incurred the penalty death in his transgressing the command. *Even so,* in the same way, *shall all be made alive in Christ,* that is, of course by being in him, their *Life,* when by his

obedience unto death, he exhausted the penalty due his people, and thus conquered it. And they thus conquered it, in his conquering it. If, then all men in the first part of the text were *in Adam*, when he died under the penalty, they must have been *with him*. So if the other all were in Christ, they must have been *with him* in exhausting the penalty of death. Elder Clark will not contend that, because Adam's all were in him, and therefore with him when he transgressed, they aided him in the transgression. If not, his argument falls to the ground, that because Christ's people were *in him*, and therefore *with him* in bearing the curse; yea, even bore the curse in his bearing it, that therefore they aided him personally in bearing it. If Christ is the life of his people, and they are by that, identified as the sons of God, are they not personally one with him as such, being even *his body*, and *members in particular* and the *fullness of him*, &c., did they not then in him the Head, do what he did in making the atonement, and yet he the Head did it alone? If by a member of my head I swallow a pill, did not I do it, and is not my body affected by it? If it is said my hand put the pill to my mouth, what put the bitter pill of the curse to Christ but the transgression of the members of his body? Elder Clark certainly does not hold to an actual union of Christ and his people, such as exist between the head and body, or he could not have formed such an argument. As to the charge of *Arminianism*, when he finds us denying the actual union of Christ and his people, then he may expect to find us secretly, if not openly, looking for something in our Adamic natures, something to be done by us, or in us, that will make us participants of the benefits of Christ's death. And then, and not till then, may he charge us with Arminianism in our doctrine.

Elder Clark's criticism upon Gal.2:20, "I am crucified with Christ, &c.," is as inconsistent as his charge of Arminianism. It is true, Paul there speaks of himself experimentally. But does experience produce a salvation; or is it a being brought experimentally to the knowledge of that salvation which is in Christ Jesus, and which he is? Faith brings nothing into existence, any more than common belief does. It leads us to know spiritual things, to know the truth as it is in Jesus Christ in being crucified was made a *curse for us*. Is repentance a bearing the curse or being *crucified with Christ*? Take the other text which Elder Clark quotes in connection, "I am dead to the law by the body of Christ." Does repentance produce a death *to the law*? Paul speaks of *dying* when *sin revived*, and again speaks of *sins slaying him by the commandment*. Children of God, you know something of Paul's

experience in this, when you was thus slain, lying dead, exposed to the curse of the law, and destitute of all hope of ever becoming any better, or of doing anything to recommend you to the mercy of God, did you feel that you *was dead to the law*, that its demands against you had ceased? Or rather were you not more alive to its demands, so that you could see no way how God could be just and save you from its curse? And was not its demands so personal against you, that you saw that whoever else might be saved, God would be just in assigning you over to everlasting punishment? How then have you since become *dead to the law*? Why as Paul did, not by repentance, faith, or any other exercise, but *by the body of Christ*. God gave you faith to behold his body as slain, and him as being made a curse, to redeem guilty sinners like you from the curse, and all the demands of the law. You may not at the time have inquired, or understood how this could be, but the substance of Christ's actually representing his people on the cross you felt; yea, as personal as the curse had stood against you, now you felt it exhausted and therefore as though you had borne it, in Christ's bearing it; and hence you was from this time so dead to it, that its thunders could no more alarm you. Elder Clark may think as he pleases about our carrying these texts back to Calvary; but rest assured faith will carry the believer directly back there, for all his hope, and all his participation in the benefits of Christ's death; yea, he is made to know that if he was not with Christ there, and his sins personally were not expiated, he cannot be saved. We shall see now who comes the nighest to *Arminianism*, our antagonist or we. If he can tell the people of any other way of being delivered from the curse of the law, short of honoring the law, through Christ's honoring it, and therefore as being crucified with him, the Wesleyans would be as much pleased with his preaching, as they are of late with the preaching of his coadjutor in the war against us, William Gilmore. Elder Clark once more:

"And now dear brethren shall this war about the prepositions *with* and *for*, with the *opinion* of a created life and Head of the church, be allowed to rend asunder and break the peace and fellowship of Zion? If this is to be done well may we take up the lamentation of David. Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Phillistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph."

If Elder Clark has reference in naming these *fors* and *withs* to the doctrine whether the elect were one with Christ, so as their

sins were legally accounted his, and his obedience to the law accounted theirs, or that their sins were charged to him and he made to suffer for them, by an arbitrary substitution of him in their law place, without any legal claim against him, such as was against them in consequence of their union with Adam, then I think the *fors* and *withs* of vast importance, involving no less a consequence, than the purity or violation of God's justice and truth. God said to Adam, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Again he hath said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Hence the sinner must either suffer the penalty in his own person, or be so one with Christ as to suffer it in him, or the truth of God fails. And where is God's justice in making an innocent person a substitute for the guilty, if there is not such a union of the parties as to make them legally one; and if legally and truly one, where he is, they are with him, as being one. Elder Clark seems to have no other idea of the union of Christ and his people, than that of a combination of persons bound together by the ties of love. In that case, to be with him, they would have to be personally with him as man. But that is not the union we speak of. Those who have a conception of a spiritual man in the believer, can conceive of that spiritual existence being Christ in them; and not Adam reformed. Hence they can believe in the idea of having ever been with Christ, and of his Godhead having ever been their *dwelling place*. But with what kind of grace does Elder Clark talk about breaking the peace of Zion. Did we ever make our views a test of fellowship with them, or show a disposition to sever from them, until they drove us from them, by their slanderous misrepresentations of our sentiments, and denunciations of us as heretics, in a way that it would be understood who they meant, though they had not the candor either to name us, or to state truly our sentiments. If the difference were of so trivial importance as Elder Clark here represents it to be, why all this persecution of us in their associations and from their pulpits, preaching us heretics, instead of preaching Christ and him crucified? I presume the point is, he thought we ought to yield our views, however conscientious we might be in holding them, and believing them to be according to the Scriptures, to accommodate ourselves to their feelings. But because we would dare to think and search for ourselves, and preach as we had learned from the Bible, and not from Doctor Gill, no denunciations of us can be too severe. But what will all this avail them? If they should blast my name, it will be but a short triumph; I shall soon be out of their way, and it may I shall be at rest. Besides God has others in the field whom he has nerved, naturally and

spiritually, for engaging in any contest they may meet for the truth's sake. You may enlist in your behalf your Gilmores, your Pitchers and Mansers, but will God own such as advocates for his cause? God will assuredly in the end, vindicate the integrity and honor of his revelation, against all the decrees of councils and systems of men that may be arrayed against us. "*The word,*" says Christ, "*that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.*" John 12:48. Elder Clark's concluding paragraph:

"Well would it have been for those who have been mainly instrumental in introducing these new doctrines and opinions and thereby causing divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine we have learned, if they had observed their own precepts, and followed the wise counsels which they gave in years past. See SIGNS, 1st Volume, page 255, where Elder Trott says: 'I think we have enough to do to face the opposers of the purpose and grace of God as revealed in his sacred word, with an unbroken *front*, without suffering ourselves to be divided into parties, by disputes about our individual peculiar notions concerning certain points. I could also bring forward peculiar notions of my own relative to certain minor points, and most of us could probably do the same, and thus introduce a continued scene of disputes, but what would it profit? If there ever was a time that called for unanimity among the *willing subjects of Zion's King*, and a united firm stand in opposition to the encroachments of will worship and anti-christian delusions, that time is now.' Yes that time is still *now* – as much so as it was 20 years ago. But I will now close. I have no unkind feelings towards any and would cheerfully aid in any way consistent with the truth as it is in Jesus to effect a reconciliation. It has not been my design to try to place any one in a false position or to misrepresent their views. What the *record* shows I am willing to abide by whether that will sustain what I have set down or not, and I want my testimony against these doctrines to go into history in a tangible form, and will cheerfully abide the issue that may ensue from the church of the living God, which is the pillar and ground of the truth."

John Clark.
Nov. 8th, 1852.

Thus closes Elder Clark's communication. He has given in this paragraph another extract from my former writings with his commendation. I think myself that the extract he has made contains wholesome advice. I will not say that I have in all

instances lived up to it. I think in several instances I have erred from it. I am an erring mortal. I need daily forgiveness from God, and forbearance from my brethren. The advice therein contained is as important *now*, as when written, to the *willing subjects of Zion's King*; though the warfare is somewhat changed. Elder Clark, I presume, knows enough of war, to know than when the attack of the enemy is made from a new quarter, it is necessary to change our front. *Then* the combat was with New-Schoolism; *now* it is with *nominalism*, if I may be allowed to coin a word, in distinction from realities, as also with a servile submission to the opinions of certain fathers, and decisions of councils, as opposed to the integrity of the Scriptures as they stand.

What Elder Clark says in conclusion, about *having no unkind feelings*, and about not having *designed to try to place any in a false position*, &c., I leave as it stands. I wish I could believe in the sincerity of his declarations, that his misrepresentations were from an error of judgment, an undesigned misconception of our views; for I would rather think favorably of him than unfavorably. What he has written and said on the point, has, according to his wishes, gone into history. What I have formerly written has been read by some, and what I now write may fall into the hands of some who will, with candor, judge of the correctness or incorrectness of his representations of my views, and of the error or soundness of my views according to the true standard, the Scriptures.

I have thus replied, I think calmly, to Elder Clark's communication. I have used some expressions harsher, than I wish to use towards one, who has a standing as a Baptist preacher, but not harsher than the occasion seemed to me to require.

In conclusion I will say, it cannot be expected but that Elder Clark will reply in some measure to this; indeed I have called on him for a reply to some points; I would request that if he undertakes any further to give my views, he will give them in their connection, candidly as I have declared them. I do not claim for them an exemption from error, and I am willing that they should be candidly examined and tested by the Scriptures, the only standard I admit. In my reply, so far as his attacks on me have brought them to notice, I have given my views on the points of difference between us, in a pretty full, and as far as I was able, in a candid and plain manner. It is not for me to say what course Elder Clark shall pursue toward my views, but I will venture to give it as my opinion that it will in the end be more for his credit, if he will attack my views, to state them honestly, as I have declared

them, then to carefully investigate them, and if he can, by sound argument and the testimony of the Scriptures show them to be heresy; than arbitrarily to denounce them as such, because they differ from certain creeds, and then to give countenance to his denunciations, falsify my views. But God will take care of his truth, and with this I would wish to be satisfied. Though I would desire that, if it is consistent to his will, he would soon make his truth manifest, whether Elder Clark or myself fall before it.

S.TROTT.

THE CALM REPLY: APPENDIX.

CONTAINING SOME REMARKS ON THE EDITORIAL IN "ZION'S PILGRIM," FOR MARCH, 1853, IN RESPONSE TO A LETTER OF ELDER CLARK, PUBLISHED IN THE SAME NUMBER. ALSO, REMARKS ON A LETTER OF ELDER LOUTHAN'S.

The part of Mr. Manser's Editorial which I shall notice, will be found on page 78th, ZION'S PILGRIM for 1853. It is this:

"We do not hesitate, nor fear to declare, that men who from the pulpit or otherwise can treat with ridicule and can pour contempt upon such expressions as a *Triune God, a Three-one God, &c.*, used by the servants of Christ and fully warranted by the Scriptures, are rotten to the core, with all their show of religion and pretended soundness, and are to be shunned by the children of God as enemies to the cross of Christ, and secret emissaries of Satan, though coming in the garb of professed friendship to the cause of truth. The church of the living God from the Apostles' days to the present time have embraced the doctrine of three divine persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, having plain Scripture as support, and being led into it by a blessed and heartfelt experience; while those who have denied and caviled at this, have justly been regarded as lacking that holy unction and anointing which teacheth all things, &c."

Thus this Editor, catching the fire from Elder Clark's letter, which was of a piece with it, goes on with what would appear a *holy zeal* to denounce all who do not receive every expression which he holds sacred. Yet he himself can treat with contempt the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, as King in Zion, by

trampling under foot, what he has acknowledged to be the appointed ordinances of Christ, by publicly approving of extending fellowship to, and communion with those who pervert the ordinances of baptism by substituting sprinkling for immersion, and infants for believers. Yet is he hailed as a brother by Elder Clark, and he with other characters no better, which might be named, are among those I presume whom he terms in his letter to this Editor, *the living in Jerusalem*. But for what has he denounced certain persons as being *rotten at the core*, and as deserving to be *shunned by the children of God*? For ridiculing, as he says, certain names by which those whom he calls the *servants of Christ* choose to designate God. As though the all-wise God did not know by what names to reveal Himself, without men's inventing names for Him. It is this spirit which I wish to point out in this paragraph; a spirit which rejects persons from christian fellowship, because they will not reverence such names as men may invent for God, however *religious and sound* they may otherwise appear to be.

But, who are they to whom Mr. Manser refers? Elder Clark, in his letter to which this is a response, names only myself, but speaks in connection of the Editor of the SIGNS. It is therefore probable Mr. Manser has reference to us, or to others with us. It is possible that some among us may have spoken slightly of the term *Triune* as being too pedantic for plain Old School Baptists, though I have not heard them. But I know that Brother Beebe, as well as myself, have repeatedly declared our belief in the sentiment intended to be conveyed by that name; that is, that God exists as *three and one*. I know of none among us who do not so believe. As to the term in English, the *Three-One* God, I have myself frequently used it for brevity's sake. I have often had occasion to speak of God as existing as Three and yet as being but one, in distinction from the *tri-personal* notion. For whilst I believe that God exists as *three in unity*, I cannot believe that there are *three divine persons* in the Godhead. The legitimate idea conveyed by the term *person*, and especially where the term *persons* in the plural is used, is that of individual beings. Hence *three divine persons*, would be three *divine individuals*, and what would that be but *three Gods*? I believe in the incomprehensibility of God, but I cannot believe in His being an absurdity, and to speak of *three individuals*, as one *being*, is to my apprehension an absurdity.

In his next paragraph, he goes on in the same spirit to unchristianize all who *deny the doctrine of three divine persons in the Godhead*, or *who cavil at it*. As this strikes so directly at me, it becomes me to inquire particularly into the authorities

he gives for this doctrine. I will take his authorities given inversely.

He speaks of the *Church having been led into this doctrine by a blessed and heart-felt experience*. I have read and heard related many experiences, and those of numbers of persons who were tri-personalists, but I have never known one to name this thing as any part of what they were led into the knowledge of, in their experience. I have known of those who have been led in their *experience, to a heartfelt sense* of the Godhead of Christ Jesus, as they had not known it before. But I have not known of any being led to the knowledge of three persons in the Godhead by any such experience as that by which they were led to the knowledge of salvation. So that Mr. Manser, I think, was indulging in the imagination of the poet, when he wrote this. It was just that kind of speculation which many have mistaken for christian experience.

His next point is that the church has *plain Scripture to support this doctrine*. I find plain Scripture for believing that God has revealed himself as *three, as Father, as Word or Son, and as Holy Ghost*, and that these *three are one*, so one that whenever God is named, we are bound to believe it to be that God in His whole person or being, who hath said, "I am the LORD {or Jehovah,} and *there is none else*, no God beside me." Isa.45:5. But plain Scripture to support the idea of *three divine persons* in the Godhead, I have not seen, neither do I think it can be showed. The Son is said to be the *express image of God's person*. Heb.1:1,2. He is such, in that, all that hath *been declared of God* or reflected of Him, has been by the Son. "No man hath seen God at any time, &c." Again, that God who *in time past spake* unto the Father *by the Prophets*, can be no other than he who by the Prophet said, "I even I am the LORD and besides me there is no Savior." But the Son is the only Savior, therefore the Son as God, must be the same with him who *spake by the Prophets*. Hence I cannot think the expression *persons* here has any reference to different persons in the Godhead. But the declaration, the *express image of his person*, conveys to me the idea that God in all His attributes and fullness is represented by the Son, as Christ said to Philip, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Again, it has been supposed that tri-personality in the Godhead, is proved from the distinctive use of the personal pronouns in reference to the Father and Son, &c. But it must be borne in mind, that the Son as he is manifested, is the one Mediator between God and men. Paul says, "A mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one," thus showing that a mediator must be personally distinct from God, as well as from men. Consequently the Son

in order to be a Mediator must possess a personality distinct from God, as God is one of the parties to be mediated between. A distinct personality in the Godhead, unless it made him distinct from God, would not meet the case. Hence says Paul again, "There is *one God* and one Mediator between God and men," – and who is he? God the Son? No, but "the Man Christ Jesus." If the *Life* that was in the *Word from the beginning* does not constitute the Son personally distinct from the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the estimation of others, yet surely if the *Word in being made flesh*, was made a perfect man, then in that manhood he possessed all the qualities of a distinct person; Jesus in Pilates' view was a *person*; then of course the Word or Son possessed in consequence of his assumption of manhood a distinct personality from the Father and Holy Ghost, who were not made flesh. But as the *second man*, or the *man Christ Jesus*, was *the Lord from heaven*, so I believe he actually existed as the one Mediator from before the foundation of the world. But as I have above showed that no personal distinction in the Godhead would capacitate him for acting as Mediator between God and men, he must be personally distinct from God to stand in the relation of one. I think I find the requisite personal distinction in the Word from having in him that life which was the light of men. If that life was the life of Christ's people as I think no candid man can deny after considering what is said of it as the *light* of men, from the 4th to the 13th verse, John, 1st chapter, then he was one with his people, being their life or existence, as he was one with God, being God, and at the same time had a personal distinction from each. He was thus distinct from his people because he was God, and distinct from the Father and the Holy Ghost because he was the life of his people. What a glorious person for a Mediator! One with God and one with his people, therefore securing the glory of the one and blessedness of the other; a Mediator in which both parties meet, and who is the antitype of the mercy seat which covered the Ark and the tables of the Law, and from which God communed with Moses and Israel, so in the Mediator God communes with His people and they behold His face in peace. Elder Clark, and his brother Manser, may pronounce the idea of such a Mediator, *blindness* and heresy; but with all their orthodoxy they cannot present to view a person so suitable to stand as *Mediator between God and men*, as is the man Jesus Christ in his compound person. Hence as we contemplate him as a Mediator, it is no wonder the Scriptures present him to view in all the characteristics of a distinct person; so that we need not undertake to disturb the unity of the Godhead to find a solution of the use of the

personal pronouns as found in the Scriptures from Gen.1:26, and on.

Mr. Manser's first-named authority for three divine persons in the Godhead, and the last in our notice, is *that the church from the Apostles' days to the present time have embraced that doctrine*. If he could have showed us that the Apostles themselves taught this doctrine of three divine persons in the Godhead, there would have been no need of reference to the opinions of the church in after ages. If this doctrine of *three persons* were true, it is un-accountable that the Apostles should not have taught it in direct terms; especially if it be so important a point, that the believing, or not believing it constitutes the distinction between those who have been anointed with the holy unction and those who have not.

However, as Mr. Manser's assertion involves an important point in history, we will examine it. Our appeal will of course be to history for proof on the point. Mosheim's testimony, speaking of the introduction of the Arian controversy, in the early part of the 4th century, is this: "The subject of this fatal controversy which kindled such deplorable divisions throughout the christian world was the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, a doctrine which in the three preceding centuries had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The church, indeed, had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the Father and the Son, and that the Holy Ghost was distinct from both; or, *as we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in the Deity*; but the mutual relation of these persons to each other, and the nature of that distinction that subsists between them are matters that hitherto were neither disputed, nor explained, and *with respect to which the church had, consequently observed a profound silence*. Nothing was dictated to the faith of christians in this matter, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery. Hence it happened that the christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously concerning the distinctions between Father, Son and Holy Ghost; each one following his respective opinions with the utmost liberty." Well would it be the church was brought to that ancient simplicity concerning the *modus* of God's existing as three. Notice that this learned historian, though himself a tri-personalist, does not represent the church at this time, as having adopted the

idea of *three distinct persons* in the Godhead, but the reverse, only that the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost were distinct; that is, they held to a trinity in the Godhead, as myself and others with me have held it. It is true he attempts to define their notions of the distinction existing between the three as corresponding with, to use his words, "As we commonly speak, that three distinct persons exist in Deity." And yet he fully shows that the *christian doctors* {or teachers} *discoursed variously concerning the distinction between Father, Son and Holy Ghost*. That Mosheim in the above extract, meant to convey the idea that the notion of the Three, being a trinity of persons in the Godhead was not a defined or generally received idea is further evident from what he says relative to the Macedonian sect which arose in the latter part of this {the 4th} century. He says, the council assembled by Theodosius {the Emperor} in A.D. 381, "Put a stop by its authority to the growing evil and crushed this rising sect before it had arrived at its full maturity. An 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*." Thus history assures us, that the doctrine of *three persons in one God* was not fixed as the 'orthodox' doctrine until the year 381, fifty years after the great Council of Nice, assembled by the decree of Constantine the Great. If we examine Jones' history of the Waldenses it will be found, that whilst he speaks of the doctrine of a *trinity* being held; that is, that God exists as *three*, yet he in no instance mentions the doctrine of *three persons* in the Godhead, as being held up to the Council of Nice in the year 325. Neither in the *Creed* adopted by that Council, as given by him, from Eusebius, is there any mention of three persons in the Godhead. In some excellent remarks of this historian on the presumption of mortals in attempting to define the *modus* of the Divine existence, or how God exists as *three* and *one*, he even quotes Athanasius as saying upon this point, and as he thinks correctly, "the Father cannot be the Son, nor the Son the Father, and the Holy Ghost is never called by the name of the Son, but is called the spirit of the Father and of the Son. The Holy Trinity is but one divine nature and one God. This is sufficient for the faithful; human knowledge goes no further. The cherubim's veil the rest with their wings." Thus, notwithstanding the presumption of Athanasius and the Council in defining the Trinity in which God exists, *to be three* in the *modus* of their existence, as he that begets, he that is begotten, and he that is breathed forth, they then had not

pried so far under the *wings of the cherubims*, or into that which God has not revealed, as even to see that their own prescribing to men what they must believe, as to how God exists as *three*, would lead others in like presumption to constitute the *three* into three persons in one God. Thus, Mr. Manser's historical assertion that the *doctrine of three persons in the Godhead has been held by the church from the Apostles' days*, and his candor, or intelligence, in making the assertion, are alike dissolved into air by coming in contact with history. But the arrogance of him, and others in making *tri-personality* a test of regeneration, and of fellowship, is more fully developed by the following circumstances: The Novatians separated from what was considered the Catholic or general church, A.D. 251, seventy-four years before the Council of Nice, wherein Athanasius' notion of the Sonship of the Son of God was established as the doctrine of the Catholic church; and a hundred and thirty years before the doctrine of *three persons* was established. The Donatists in Africa in like manner and for like cause had also separated from the Catholic church some years before the Nicene Council. There was no charge against these separatists on account of doctrine. The complaints against them were that they were too rigid in discipline, especially in receiving members, that they had made a great split in the church, and that they would receive none from the Catholic church without re-baptizing them, on account of the corruptions in that church. They thus occupied then the same ground towards the Catholic church that the Old School Baptists do now towards the New School. These, though much persecuted by the Catholic church or the christian Emperors, as Heads of the church, were numerous for one or two centuries, but being ultimately driven from their homes by the Emperor Honorius, were lost sight of, until the Waldenses were discovered in the valleys of Piedmont. These being a people holding a like separation from the Catholic church with the Novatians and Donatists, are supposed to be a continuation of those ancient churches, thus hid from the Dragon and the Beast in the *place which God had prepared for the woman*. So that if the Waldenses be considered the true church in distinction from the Catholic, then the Donatists and Novatians, the only separatists from the Catholic church, from which they could be likely to have descended, must have been the true church, thus separated from the Catholic church before the doctrine of the *eternal generation of the Son, as God*, and that of *three persons in the Godhead*, were brought in and established as the doctrine of that church. Hence we find no mention of these doctrines in the Confessions of Faith

of the Waldenses. Again, as the *Dragon* is said to have given to the *Beast* that *arose out of the sea, his power, his seat, and great authority*, imperial Rome as christian, must have been intended by the Dragon, and not Rome pagan as I formerly thought. The Emperor's presuming to connect the kingdom of Christ with their State government, taking the control of its affairs and enforcing such doctrines and ceremonies as the Council called by their command decided on, and that by cruel persecutions, was certainly a monster deserving the name of Dragon, as the power which arose after him, is called a *Beast* in distinction. The distinction between the two being this, the Dragon based his ecclesiastical powers upon his imperial authority, whilst the Beast assumes an authority over State governments by virtue of his ecclesiastical authority. Rome pagan was nothing but a kingdom of this world, but the Dragon was first seen as a *wonder in heaven*, Rev.12:3; and besides is represented as continuing, as he does in all the religious establishments of every age and country. See Rev.12:17; which cannot with propriety be said of Rome pagan. Thus as Constantine by his imperial authority called the Council of Nice and presided in it, and afterwards enforced its decisions by the sword, whilst he also persecuted the Novatians and Donatists for separating from the Catholic church. And as the Council of Constantinople was called by the Emperor Theodosius, and its decisions, that *there existed three persons in the Godhead*, were enforced by his persecuting edicts; it is therefore evident from history that the doctrine of the *eternal generation of the Son of God*, and that of *tri-personality* in the Godhead had their origin as established doctrines of the church, from the Dragon. Yet strange to tell, these very doctrines having such origin, are made, not only by Mr. Manser and the popular, so-called *evangelical* churches, but also by professed Old School Baptists, as tests of soundness in the faith, and of christian fellowship. And they are still attempted to be enforced in the same spirit from which they originated. That is, demanding arbitrarily implicit faith in them as they have been handed down. Whenever a person manifests a disposition to examine the divine testimony for himself, and declares his dissent from the decisions of those Councils, instead of attempting to explain and prove those points and to clear away the objections the enquirer may bring against them, he is at once denounced as a heretic, or as a disturber of the peace of the churches, by bringing in NEW THINGS.

Here I leave Elder Clark and his brother Manser to pay my respects to Elder Louthan.

In the pamphlet I published entitled, "An appeal to the churches of the Kettocton Association, I had occasion to present Elder Louthan to view, in some of his movements. He afterwards wrote me a lengthy letter on the subject, which I concluded not to answer. Since that, I have understood that he furnished a copy or copies of his letter to some of the Lauck and Clark party, that they have been feasting on its abusive contents, until they are so excited with it, that one of them, a Baptist, has said *Burning is too good for me*. But this is only a letting off a little of the spirit of the Dragon.

In consequence of this, I have thought it best to notice some few sentences of his letter in which our veracities stand in opposition; leaving his abusive expressions and denunciations of me unmolested, for the further enjoyment of those who delight in such things, the first point in his letter I shall notice, is the following. Speaking concerning my notice of his course at the Corresponding Meeting of 1850, in a letter to Brother Dudley, he says:

"Why were you not candid enough to tell all the truth and inform Brother Dudley that Doctor Klipstein had preached his {Dudley's} views on the stand on Friday, and as Louthan preached on Saturday, he felt constrained to notice them and to give Brother Dudley, as the author of them, as they originated with him. Would this have been too much truth to have answered your purpose?"

To this my reply is, that Brother Klipstein, in preaching on Friday, preached his own views, that he knew he was at a meeting and among brethren who in general agreed with him in sentiment, and that he therefore had no just ground to suppose in preaching thus, he would provoke any dispute; that you, previous to that meeting, had been with Elder Buck and among his churches, where you had undoubtedly learned our agreement in most points with Brother Dudley in the views advanced in his Circular, that on Friday night, you and Brother Beebe, with other brethren stayed at brother Leachman's; that you there made your attack upon brother Dudley, and his Circular, and that the whole matter was gone over two or three times that night, brother Beebe meeting your charges, and refuting them, and exculpating Brother Dudley from all blame in having the Circular brought to public notice, assuring you that he was attending the Licking Association at the time, and that it was through his proposition it was brought before the Association, and yet when your charges were once exhausted and refuted, you would fly back and reiterate them,

and again Brother Beebe would drive you from them. Yet the next day when you came to occupy the stand instead of preaching the gospel, you entertained your audience with a repetition of the same charges against Brother Dudley and his Circular from which you had been thrice driven the night before. From all this I was warranted in the conclusion that you came to the Corresponding Meeting determined to make this attack upon Brother Dudley and through him, upon our sentiments, hoping there were some elements among us on which you might operate to generate a division. It was on this account that I represented you as *coming on a mission* for making a division. I have now perhaps given you more truth on the point than you want. But as you have drawn it out, it must stand, and as truth too with those acquainted with the affair. The next portion of Elder Louthan's letter which I shall notice is this:

"Our first meeting was at the Baltimore Association in May, 1850. You urged me to preach the introductory sermon, and after you heard me preach three sermons at that meeting unsolicited on my part you took me by the hand and with tears in your eyes, you observed, Brother Louthan, I wish you to know that I have fellowship for your doctrine, to which I made but little reply, for I then believed your friendship was not worth much."

After several other lines of like stamp with the last, but increasing in vulgarity of abuse, he goes on to say:

"At that meeting you prevailed on me to let you make an appointment for preaching at the City of Washington, and insisted on my attending the Corresponding Meeting."

I appeal to the candid reader, Was there anything uncivil or unchristian-like in my treatment to Elder Louthan at this interview taking his own statement of the matter? Anything calculated to provoke him to make such a rough attack upon our sentiments through his attack on Brother Dudley, at the Corresponding Meeting? He was at the Baltimore Association, rather as a stranger, and as it was my province to invite one to preach the Introductory, I invited him. Knowing that he had a regular standing among the Old School Baptists, I was willing to treat him as a brother, though I presume from what I had seen through the SIGNS, that he had some prejudices against me, and against some of my views. He twice afterwards preached during the meeting, and I was generally pleased with

his preaching; there was nothing particularly objectionable in his doctrine, and he appeared to aim at peace, as he touched on no points, on which we were known to disagree. When I am pleased I am quite as apt to give a token of it as when I am displeased. Elder Louthan is not the first person who has for a time preached in conformity to the known views of those he was among till he gained their confidence. Neither am I the first that has been deceived in a person's preaching. I will relate an anecdote. Our aged brother Abraham Cole, who, while living was a member of the Black Rock Baptist church, and was pretty extensively known as a correct, firm and discerning Old School Baptist, was once traveling out West, and chanced to spend a Sunday in the vicinity of a Presbyterian meeting which he attended, and being pleased with the soundness of the discourse, he concluded the preacher was one taught of God; going up to the preacher to express his approbation, he said to him, "I perceive Sir, you have had a good teacher." Yes, replied the preacher, I studied under a good teacher, but he has *been dead several years*. Poor Brother Cole was taken all aback. So was I, when I heard Elder Louthan's philippic at the Corresponding Meeting. The next portion of Elder Louthan's letter which requires notice reads thus:

"As you know it was after Brother Beebe had preached and placed me as I thought in an improper light before the people, I spoke a few words in reply, in which I stated a large portion of God's word on the subject of regeneration implied a change, that this was their meaning. At that time I looked at you and you shook your head and said I was mistaken. I then quoted the language of Paul who says, it is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. I stated that if that passage did not imply a change I did not know the meaning of language."

There is Elder Louthan's statement, but I still feel confident that the statement I formerly made is correct, although differing so materially from his. It is true that he had labored in his discourse to prove that regeneration was a *change* of the soul. But when he arose to reply to Brother Beebe, after blaming him for attacking his discourse, &c., he remarked, "*Much has been said on the subject of regeneration, What is it? It is a washing {or cleansing,} that is its import in the Scriptures.*" He looked round to me as he spake those words, and as he says, I *shook my head at him*, and said with some

emphasis, and loud, *My brother, you are mistaken*. And as he turned from me he quoted Titus 3:5, as he mentions in the above extract, and probably added, "If this does not imply a change, &c." I feel confident that in this statement I am in substance correct; not only from the recollection I have of the matter, but also from the connecting circumstances. Elder Louthan ought to recollect that when he arose that second time, he was much excited, and hence was not as sensible of what he said as though he had been calm. As to representing regeneration as a *change*, instead of a *washing* or *cleansing*, whichever word be used, if he had so represented it, it would not have so surprised me as to lead me to interrupt him as I did, for I had often heard it so represented, and I do myself believe there is a *change* connected with regeneration, both in the soul and life. In the soul, in that it is quickened from its dormant state to a sense of its relation to God, &c. Here are the two versions of the matter; and here I leave it. If I am incorrect in the statement, it is from a wrong impression made on my mind at the time. The last extract which I shall make from his letter, is this:

"In reference to the charge at the Kettocton Association, it is true I laid down the position that faith was the result of testimony, and you must know my course of argument on that occasion. I spoke of a historical faith and a faith of miracles, as being entirely insufficient to make a man acquainted with Christ as his Savior; that a man in this respect might have all faith so that he could remove mountains, and without charity which could only flow from one who had been made alive from the dead it was nothing. You know that I contended in that sermon that faith was the gift of God and the fruit of the spirit; that I believed it to be one thing for a man to be born again, and another for him to have the evidence, &c."

Elder Louthan has once or twice stated in this extract that *I know this and that*, but I prefer stating for myself what *I know*. I know he is so far honest, as to confess that he laid down the position, *that faith is the result of testimony*. I know that being surprised at such a position from him, my attention was fully aroused to see how he would carry it out, whether he would make faith out a mere natural belief or whether he would give it a turn so as to conform it more to what is generally received by Old School Baptists. I know he went on to sustain his position at some length by a reference to our belief of natural things as being produced by evidence; and that whatever he may have said about historical faith, he said

nothing to show that he meant anything else than what the literal construction of his position implied. I know that at length he made these remarks; "It will be said that *faith is the gift of God*. So it is, *because God gives the evidence by which it is produced.*" Or to that effect. Finding him thus wresting this text to suit his position, I turned to Brother Beebe, who was sitting by the side of me, and said, *If they are going to make a split, I care not how soon they do it, if such Campbellism as this is to be preached and received among them*. After this I paid but little attention while I stayed at the stand to what he said, so that if he mentioned faith's being a *fruit of the spirit*, I know not what he said concerning it. But I think he is a man of sufficient sense to know that if he had quoted either of those texts and left them to stand as he has, in the above quotation from his letter, they would have stood in direct contradiction to his position. What, Faith absolutely the gift of God, and the fruit of the spirit, and yet like common belief, the result of testimony?

I have thus given my statements on the several points on which the veracity of Elder Louthan and myself are in contrast. I would have preferred, could I have been convinced that my impressions concerning his declarations were wrong, to have recalled what I had written; after receiving his letter, I wrote to several brethren who were present at the meetings requesting them to state what were their recollections on the points, but found that neither of them had a sufficiently clear recollection of the matter to state anything decisive, two years having then elapsed; if anything their impressions seemed to favor mine. Hence I must leave the matter as it is, until I can be convinced that I have not made a correct statement. Those who are pleased with the abusive parts of his letter will of course believe his statements correct and mine false. Others will probably conclude that there is some undesigned mistake on the one side, or the other. And this is I would hope a correct view of the subject.

S.TROTT.

THE SEALING OF THE SPIRIT.

BROTHER BEEBE: - As our brother Mitchell has requested, through the MESSENGER, my views on the *sealing* of the Spirit, mentioned in Ephesians 1:13, I will endeavor to comply

with his wishes. The text reads thus, "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."

The idea of a *seal*, or of *sealing*, is that of *confirming*, *ratifying*, or *making safe*. So I understand the expression to be used here, and in other corresponding texts. Hence in the 14th verse it is represented as an earnest of our inheritance. The apostle has, I have no doubt, in this text, infallibly laid down the particular steps or order by which a person is led in experience, into the liberty and privilege of a son of God. 1st. There is *faith*, or a *hearing of the word of truth, the gospel of their salvation*. For the *hearing* here spoken of is only by faith; it is no mere outward hearing that produces trust or hope in Christ. Hence in the next sentence the apostle calls it *believing*. 2nd. A *trusting* in Christ; or a *hoping* in him, as the marginal reading of many Bibles is; and as is a correct rendering of the original word; as is also *trust*. I notice this change of the word from *trust* to *hope*, not because it makes any difference in the sense, but because *hope* is the term more generally used to express this exercise; and because many would confess that they *hoped* in Christ, when they would fear to say that they trusted in him. 3rd. A being *sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise*, as an *earnest* or pledge of our inheritance. But as important a point as this is, in a believer's experience, being designed to confine his hope in Christ of eternal salvation, we very seldom hear it noticed by persons in a relation of their experience, or by preachers in preaching experience. It is true that faith or believing is the more material point at which a person passes from death experimentally to life, he then *hears the voice of the Son of God and lives*. And belief, hope or trust in Christ immediately springs up in the breast. Hence *believing* is spoken of in the Scriptures as the distinguishing characteristic of a saved one. This sealing is, or once was, not essential to salvation, for none of the Old Testament saints enjoined this privilege, but were all their *lifetime subject to bondage*; as I shall have occasion again to notice. But still this *sealing* is too important a point in a believer's exercise to be passed unnoticed in our preaching, or in our examination of ourselves whether *we be in the faith*; because where this seal is, it confirms the genuineness of our faith, and the certainty of our being the children of God.

The first head of enquiry, in meeting brother Mitchell's request, is, In what does this sealing consist? I have been led to believe that this sealing consists in the shedding abroad in

the heart of the believer the spirit of adoption whereby we cry *Abba Father*. I am confirmed in this belief by comparing this text, Eph.1:13 & II Cor.1:22, with Gal.4:6 & Rom.8:15,16. When this spirit is imparted, we view God as a father, and approach him with our wants as a child does its parents, and not as a servant would his master. We can then see how God could provide for us that fulness which is in Christ, notwithstanding our utter unworthiness, that is as a father provides for his children; and whilst we feel humbled under a sense of our vileness, we can look up to God as a loving and gracious Father, and feel a confidence in rejoicing in the consolation and provisions of the gospel. In the experience of some I know that this sealing follows in quick succession after their hoping in Christ, so that it is, as it were, all one exercise; and yet the parts of it are distinguishable on a careful review. We shall see that Christ crucified as the way of salvation, was the first presented to our view by faith, afterwards a sense of God's fatherly love. But with others, I should judge from a relation of their experience, a considerable time elapses, with some longer, and others shorter, between their being brought to view Christ crucified as the way of salvation, with their having a hope of being saved by him; and their receiving the spirit of adoption. They see Christ as the way of salvation, as a full and suitable way, and in spite of all difficulties there is a hope of being saved by him; but it cannot be for me, says the trembling soul, I can do nothing to merit such favor. Of this nature will be their exercises until they are sealed. We can know ourselves, only as the creatures of God, subject to him as a legal sovereign, and dependent on him as such, until we *receive the adoption of children*. If, then, we perform our services because it is our Father's will, without any idea of merit or of earning wages or reward thereby; and if we approach God with our wants, without regard to worthiness, or unworthiness in ourselves, but simply to unburden to him our wants and distresses freely, and as depending wholly on him for help, under a sense of his loving kindness as a Father, and knowing as we of course do, if we have faith, that he can consistently with the holiness of his character, bless us through Christ; there is the witness of having received the adoption of children. Consequently, there is the *seal*; for, "if children then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Rom.8:16.

The second point of inquiry, is, What are we to understand by that *Holy Spirit of promise with which we are sealed*? As the sealing, as showed before, follows believing, the holy spirit here spoken of must be distinct from the spirit

of life communicated in regeneration, although it must be in the spirit; that is, that of which we are born in the new birth, that we are sealed, as "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit;" they are *spiritually discerned*. Hence Paul speaking as I understand it, of this sealing, says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom.8:16. Hence also the Old Testament saints could be born of the Spirit, could have faith, without being sealed with the spirit of adoption. That the saints were not thus sealed, but were *shut up under the law*, until the fullness of time had come, when God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law, I think is clearly showed by the apostle's argument on the subject, in Galatians from chapter 3:19, to chapter 4:6. From what I can understand from the Scriptures, I judge that this *Holy Spirit of promise* is the Holy Ghost in the sense in which it was said he was *not yet given*, because "Jesus was not yet glorified;" {John 7:39,} and in which Christ said to 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." {John 16:7.} And as He says again, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not," &c. John 14:16,17. See I John 3:1, in connection with the above text. I say *in the sense* in which he is thus spoken of, as being *given* and *sent*; for these things cannot refer to his essential being, or his sovereign acting as God. As God, he always was, he *moved upon the face of the waters*, Gen.1:2, moved the prophets to speak and write what it was his pleasure to reveal. II Pet.1:21. It must therefore be that these things are said of him in reference to some special relation to, or manifestation concerning the plan of salvation. If this be so, it shows that it is not his special province in the economy of salvation to regenerate, for persons had been in all ages regenerated previous to its being said; "for the Holy Ghost was not yet given," or *was not yet*; the *given* being a supply.

It is said of Jesus Christ, that he was "declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." Rom.1:4. Peter in giving an explanation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, said, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Again, he said, "Therefore let the house of Israel know

assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts 2:32,33 & 36. Thus it was by the baptism of the Holy Ghost that the exaltation of Jesus as both Lord and Christ, or Messiah, was declared or confirmed, and consequently he was thus declared to be the Son of God with power. So by this same Holy Spirit in being communicated to the believers, it does not make them sons, but seals or confirms them as sons. Hence it is said, Gal.4:6, "And *because ye are sons*, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your heart, crying Abba, Father." It is here called the *Spirit of his Son*, not because it is that life which Christ is to his people, and which is communicated in regeneration, but because it is the *spirit of sonship*, being that by which Christ was declared to be the Son of God, and that by which they are *sealed* as sons. Thus showing that their sonship is in his Sonship, or that they are sons in union with the Son of God, and therefore are *joint heirs with him*.

I have thus brother Mitchell, given you my views fully on the points you requested. I know they are not altogether according to the standards which men have set up. If you find them sustained by the Scriptures, you will no doubt appreciate them as such. If you discover that in whole, or in part, they are not in accordance with the Scripture testimony, I hope you will point out the error. With desires for your health, and for your enjoying the consolations of the gospel.

I subscribe myself your brother in tribulation,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax C.H., Va., August 21, 1854.

SOME VIEWS REGARDING MANASSAH: KING OF JUDAH.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - Having received a letter from brother John S. McColl, of Albdorough, Elgin County, Canada West, dated the 27th November, and requesting my views on II Kings 24:3,4, in view of what is said of Manassah, in II Chron.33:11-18, I will by your permission, answer him through the SIGNS.

Dear Brother McColl: - After thanking you for the kindly expressions of fellowship, contained in your letter toward me and the writers in the SIGNS and MESSENGER, and assuring you that I feel thankful that there are brethren in Canada who agree with the remnant in the United States, in the belief of

the doctrine of Christ being the life of his church and people, and therefore in a life-union of him with them from before the foundation of the world, I will proceed to give you such views as I have, of the text proposed. You will excuse me for answering you through the SIGNS, instead of doing it by private letter. My reason for this course may be thought by some to be indicative of vanity in me. The passage in its connection, no doubt, appears difficult to many besides yourself, and yet since you called my attention to it, it has appeared to be of easy solution, and I therefore thought that my explanation might be beneficial to others, as well as yourself. If I am deceived I hope the error will be corrected.

The passage, II Kings 24:3,4, reads: "Surely at the commandment of the Lord came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manassah, according to all that he did; and also for the innocent blood that he shed, {for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood;} which the Lord would not pardon." It will be seen from the connection, that the judgment which is here spoken of as coming upon Jerusalem and Judah, as a punishment for the abominations which Manassah committed, and which he caused Judah to commit, was inflicted many years after Manassah's death, and even after the good reign of Josiah; thus showing that the Lord did not, and would not, pardon this thing. On the other hand, I think, brother McColl, with you, that the account given in II Chron.33:11-18, of Manassah's penance, &c., shows clearly that his prayer was heard of God, and therefore that he prayed in faith, and was personally forgiven of God. The question then arises, how is this apparent contradiction to be reconciled? It is easily reconciled by considering the difference between the Sinai covenant and the gospel. If Manassah was forgiven and accepted of God, as we think he was, it was through Christ, and not by the provisions of the Sinai covenant. Though Christ in his flesh, lay in embryo in that nation and under that covenant, and was the Holy One of Israel, and thus preserved them from being destroyed as a nation, by all the judgments they brought upon themselves, until the fulness of time come for him to be personally manifested in the flesh; yet he averted none of those judgments from them. And though by his death he redeemed his people from under the law, and took the whole handwriting of ordinances out of the way, yet he averted not the consummation of the full curse of that covenant from falling upon them as a nation. The truth is, Christ's atonement was for individuals of the human family, and has no reference to nations as such. But the abominations which Manassah perpetrated, and led Judah to commit, he

enacted as the king of Judah and therefore as the head and representative of the nation; hence it was a national act, and therefore drew down the judgment upon the nation long after his death. Indeed, God left him to act out the vileness of his nature, in leading the nation to do these abominations, and thus to fill up that measure of their iniquity which should bring upon them the Babylonish captivity, as a punishment for their rebellion against God from the day he brought them out of Egypt, according to II Kings 21:15. And as God said unto Moses, Exod.32:34. The same principle is carried out under the gospel; the believer has evidence of pardon and acceptance with God, yet in this life he is not relieved from those curses entailed on him by Adam's transgression, such as death, thistles and thorns, &c., nor from that depravity under which he groans. So of national judgments, such as wars, pesthences, &c., the believer has to share with others in their infliction. Not only this, but although all the sins and depravity of the believer are covered over by the atonement of Christ, and can never come in judgment against him, yet he will be made to feel, in this life, the consequences from his sins and errors, or the evils they produce. And as Moses said to Israel, {Num.32:23,} "Be sure your sin will find you out;" so with the believer, as he will be made to feel the burden of his sins sooner or later upon his conscience.

You wish, further, that I would give my views concerning the *innocent blood* which Manassah shed. II Kings 21:16 & 24:4. By turning to Deut.19:10, we find that the killing the man-slayer, who slew his neighbor ignorantly, would be shedding *innocent blood*, and also the killing a man from hatred is shedding *innocent blood*. See verse 13. Instead, therefore, of supposing that the innocent blood which Manassah shed was the blood of infants, and that was innocent because of their purity from sin and depravity, as Arminians have said, we are authorized to consider that *as innocent blood*, which was shed without provocation. See also, as a further confirmation of this, I Sam.19:5 & I Kings 2:31. By Manassah's shedding innocent blood, we are therefore to understand his procuring the killing of many without just provocation, and perhaps because they would not go with him into his idolatry. Probably your enquiry embraced the idea of the antitype, whether there is anything there answering to the figure. The blood of Christ was truly *innocent blood*, and that has been shed in spiritual Israel. It had its effect upon the Jewish nation more direct than the blood which Manassah shed, both in filling up the measure of their iniquity, and in the judgment of God which it drew in on them. But this was only

the consummation of the depravity of that people of which the reign of Manassah was only a prelude, and cannot therefore be viewed as the antitype. The depravity thus showed in the type was but a true figure of the depravity which every believer has to acknowledge belongs to, and hangs upon the spiritual seed in their old man; and such are made to feel that it was their sins which caused the Lord of glory to bleed and die. Does not the believer, at times, feel the force of the poet's words?

"Was it for crimes that I had done,
He groaned upon the tree?"

It was Manassah, the king of Judah, that shed innocent blood. It was Christ, the King of Israel, that shed this in Zion. He says, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself," &c. John 10:17,18. Still the sins and depravity of his people's were the occasion of his doing it, they being laid on him. The consequence of the shedding of this innocent blood has followed the church of Christ from that day to this, not calling for vengeance, but calling down mercy and pardon upon all the children of grace; thus illustrating the distinction between the two covenants; between law and grace. In a worldly point of view; that is, in relation to the outward man, and the outward appearance of the church, the shedding of Christ's blood has had an apparent different consequence upon the church. It has drawn down upon her persecutions, and more than Babylonish captivity, occasioning her to be considered as the offscouring of all things unto this day. Not as retributive justice, for Christ took all that out of the way, in expiating our sins, according to the peculiarities of this letter covenant, under which the church lives; but as a natural consequence of the doctrine of the Cross of Christ; such is the enmity of the human heart against God's way of saving sinners by grace. But the wisdom and grace of God are alike manifested in both cases. By permitting the house of Judah to draw upon themselves the Babylonish captivity, and other repeated judgments, it was manifested that the purpose and grace of God in Christ would override all their sins, and the consequence thereof, so as still to preserve the sceptre in Judah until Shiloh came. Thus God's dealings with that people stand as a confirming testimony to the experience of the saints, that this same purpose and grace of God can, and will, bring all the heirs of promise to the knowledge of the truth, and preserve the church as a faithful witness to the truth, notwithstanding all the opposition of their own corruptions,

and the world, and the world's governments array against that truth, until all the ransomed ones are brought in, and all be saved to sin no more.

Thus, my brother, I have given you my views, perhaps not in as explicit language as I might, but I hope you will be able to understand them, and be edified by them, if they are in substance correct, as I think they are, or I would not have given them. If you please, let me hear from you again, publicly or privately, and if you have objections to these views, inform me of them.

Yours in the bonds of the gospel,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Dec.9, 1855.

SOME THOUGHTS ON HEB.11:40.

BROTHER WILLIAM: - I see by number two of the MESSENGER that brother William Fisher of Florida wishes an explanation of the text, Heb.11:40, "God having provided some better thing for us, *that they without us should not be made perfect.*" If I believed with brother Fisher that the prophets and saints of the Old Testament were not born again, not born of a spiritual birth, I should think that this text contained a mystery that never could be explained in accordance with New Testament testimony. For as brother Fisher admits, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" - "he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Not being born again, could Abraham ever enter into heaven? If not they never could be made perfect. The *natural* or *first man is of the earth, earthy*, not heavenly, and therefore never could enjoy anything higher than an earthly paradise. Brother Fisher says they were saved by faith as was Abraham. Abraham have faith? The faith of God's elect, and not have spiritual life, or be born again? For "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh." It is that which is born of the spirit, that is *spirit*. Paul does not include faith in the works of the flesh, but names it as a *fruit of the spirit*. Gal.5:19-23. If I believed that faith was an act of the natural man, I should think our Arminian preachers were correct in telling their hearers that they can believe at any time, and they are bound by the law to believe, and therefore are condemned for not believing. Did not Abraham rejoice to see Christ's day? {John 8:56.} In seeing it, did he not see the *kingdom of God*? See that which is spiritual? How could he

have seen that, if not born again? Did not Abraham and other Old Testament saints worship God in truth? But how could they do it if not spiritual or born again? "God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and in truth." As the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned; and to receive or believe in Christ is to receive the *things of the Spirit of God*, I must believe that Abraham and Abel and others were born again, though brother Fisher thinks it absurd. Thus we are told, John 1:12,13, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name, which were born, not of blood, but of God." Here are two or three things to be noted, 1st, from this text we are showed that to *receive* Christ, is the same as to *believe on his name*. 2nd, that it does not say, *to them gave he power to become the sons of God*, by being born, *not of blood, &c., but of God*. But it simply affirms that he *gave them power*, and afterwards it affirms of them that they *were born of God*; that is that *they had already been born of God*. Hence the difference between them and others in their *receiving him*, or *believing on his name*, whilst the body of the Jews did not receive him. How he gave to these who were thus born of God, *power to become the sons of God*, will be showed in showing how the ancient subjects of faith were *made perfect*; that is, by being redeemed from under the law. Paul explains the whole matter of brother Fisher's inquiry, in chapter 4, of his letter to the Galatians. He commences with saying, "Now I say brethren, that the heir so long as he is a child differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father. Even so we, when we were children were in bondage under the elements of the world," verses 1-3. In noticing the Apostle's position here, we must remember that, "the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith," it is added, "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void," &c. Rom.4:13,14. Hence the Apostle does not mean to represent by the heir in his position, those which are of the law; that is, those who are only the natural seed, and therefore resting only upon the law, but those which *are of faith*. These he calls children. In a word he is speaking not of the Jews nationally, but of the church of believers as it existed previous to the redemption by Christ, when he says, "even so we brethren when we were children were in bondage under the elements of the world;" that is, under the Sinai covenant or

law. Thus showing that although the saints under the Old Testament were believers and heirs, yet they were in bondage under the law, and therefore knew not the privilege of sons, had not the Spirit of adoption. Yet they were children, and of course I judge that they must have been *born children*, and of course *born again*. Paul goes on to show that in the fulness of time God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, and adds, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father; wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son," &c., verses 6,7. Thus we see that though the children of God under the law, *obtained a good report* on the revealed promise of the Seed, the Christ, and rested on that promise for their righteousness, yet they did not *receive the promise*, or that which was promised, or in other words were not actually justified from the law, and could not be until Christ being delivered for their offences, *was raised again for their justification*. Until then the *righteousness of God for the remission of sins that were past*, was not declared, neither was it known how he could be just and the "justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom.3:25,26. Hence the Apostle says, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." That is, we are permitted to witness and to bear testimony to the resurrection of Christ for the justification of all them that have believed or shall believe in Christ. Thus the manifestation of the justification of the Old Testament saints and of the justice of God in their justification was made perfect, as it was not to them while on earth, at least, even if it was to them in heaven, until the everlasting doors were opened and the King of glory, or Christ triumphant, first entered, then they no doubt entered in with him. Hence, Lazarus instead of being represented as being with Christ, is said to have been in *Abraham's bosom*; that is, resting for the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham. Hence also says the Apostle, "The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all, was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing." Heb.9:8. But in chapter tenth, 19th & 20th verses, he speaks of entering into the holiest by a new and living way; that is, *by the blood of Jesus*.

I have very strong objections to brother Fisher's idea that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the new birth. A baptism and a birth are very different things, a birth is a bringing into existence that which had not individually existed before, or a person being brought to exist in a life in which he had not before existed personally. Baptism is a representation of the

burial and resurrection of the same person. That extraordinary communication which occurred on the day of Pentecost is uniformly in the Scriptures called a baptism, never a birth. Besides, it uniformly had an external effect upon those who were subjects of it. Cloven tongues as of fire were seen upon them, and they all spake with tongues, so that persons of different languages could hear their speech as in their own tongue. I know of no authority other than the Quakers for saying that a person has not been baptized of the Holy Ghost unless he has the miraculous power of speaking externally with tongues. Neither do I know of any authority in the Scriptures for saying that believers are born of the Holy Ghost. They are born as the seed of Christ and of the Spirit of Christ, and therefore have the Spirit of Christ, or Christ in them. But no more at present.

Affectionately yours,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., Jan.28, 1856.

VIEWS ON MARK 8:22-26.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I see by the second number of the SIGNS, volume 24, that sister Culver desires my views concerning the blind man's being restored to sight - Mark 8:22-26. I gladly accept the invitation, not that I have any special or very clear views to give on this miracle, but because being so much detained at home, and from my meetings, during this very inclement winter so far, I am glad of anything to draw my mind to the Scriptures and exercise it thereon.

The many instances recorded of our Lord's opening the eyes of the blind and of healing other diseases, were designed as external, visible proofs of his being the long promised Messiah. And these afforded an evidence which the Jews could not wholly overlook. Thence said Nicodemus, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him;" thus speaking not only for himself, but for others also. The different instances in which he opened the eyes of the blind, show the sovereignty of his power in doing it, with or without instrumentalities. In the case of blind Bartimeus, he simply said to him, "Go thy way; they faith hath made thee whole;" and "*immediately* he received his sight." He touched the eyes

of others, and they received sight, Mark 10:46-52 & Matt.20:30-34. In the case of the man blind from his birth, John, chapter 9, Jesus spat upon the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and sent him to the pool of Siloam to wash; and when he had washed he *came seeing*. In the case under consideration, Mark 8, he spit upon the eyes of the blind man and put his hand upon him, and told him to look up, &c. These different methods of restoring sight to the blind, showed, perhaps, more conclusively, that it was by his own divine power that he performed these miracles, than the performing of them all by one method would have done, as it showed that he could open the eyes of the blind in what way he pleased. But as the various maladies, and particularly blindness, which our Lord healed, are referred to in Scripture to show the miserable state of the sinner in regard to spiritual things, so the performance of these external miracles were evidently designed to bring him to view, as the great physician who can heal all the inward maladies of sinners, and as doing it as readily, as freely and as sovereignly to all who look to him for it, as he did to the infirm in body. It is in reference to the opening of the eyes spiritually, as presented to view in the case of this blind man naturally, that I presume sister Culver wishes my views. To that I will now attend.

Verse 22, "And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him." It is not said whether this man was born blind or not. It is not material in this case. It is true that all men are born blind spiritually; but none in a state of nature know that they are thus blind. Until that life which is imparted in regeneration, we, like the Jews, say we see, or, at least, think so; and whilst this is the case, *our sin remaineth*. John 9:41. This man was sensibly blind – so are all those, spiritually, who apply to Christ to give them sight.

Verse 23, "And he took the blind man by the hand and led him out of town." As Bethsaida was one of the places on which our Lord had pronounced a woe, {Matt.11:21,} it may be, therefore, that Christ thus led him out of the town because he would not perform the miracle in the presence of those he had thus given up to their own destruction. At any rate, in the spiritual miracle, he does not open the eyes of the blind in the sight of those he has left to their own delusions; and not often, if ever, in their assemblies. Often, persons whom we hope are subjects of grace, in giving a relation of their experience, mention having been led in their exercises to go up to a front bench or some way in public to be prayed for, thinking thus to

have their eyes opened to behold the Savior; but they and their leaders are disappointed; instead of opening their eyes then, he leads them out in their blindness from these public resorts and from confidence in them and their measures, and in private gives them the touch that opens their eyes; but not till he has *spit* upon them. Note, some of the children of God have had their eyes opened in the assemblies of the saints, and under the regular preaching of the gospel, and during the prayers and conversation of the people of God, but not in those assemblies under whatever name, got together for the purpose of converting sinners. When the eyes of the blind are opened to behold Christ as the way, it is always so done that the doing of it is by the individual ascribed to God only, independent of all human helpers. "And when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought." We know that in performing the literal miracle, this *spitting* on his eyes was not necessary to our Lord's opening them; there must, therefore, have been some other design in doing it; and I know not that the design is found anywhere but in the antitype. To spit upon a person is to cast great contempt upon him. Thus God said concerning Miriam, "If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days?" Num.12:14. And thus the widow, in case her husband's brother refused to take her and raise up seed unto his brother, was commanded to loose his shoe, and spit in his face. Deut.25:9. So, did any ever have their eyes opened until the Lord had first spit on them; or, in other words, had so treated with contempt all their prayers, tears, and other efforts to recommend themselves to his favor, that they were utterly ashamed and abased, and made sensible that they were so ruined by sin, that there was no power in themselves, or in any human being to take this widowed soul, and raise up seed unto his brother, that the Lord must save, or this inheritance is gone forever. "And put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought?" We lay our hands upon a person when we are going to speak to him, to engage his attention. So the Lord is sure to fix the whole attention of a person when he is about to speak peace to him, or to open his eyes; sometimes he does it by his being made to see a light, or hear a voice apparently, as is frequently the case in the experience of colored persons.

Verse 24, "And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees walking." I understand by this expression, simply the idea of an indistinct vision, as though he could see something moving or walking, as we see the motion of a thing before we discern particularly its parts, but could not distinguish its appearance from that of a tree. Many persons, when Christ

touches them, immediately receive sight, to see how God is just in justifying the ungodly, through Christ's atonement; but others again, like this man, have at first only an indistinct view of salvation. Some text is applied to them which they take as a promise of salvation, or their burden is removed and they feel great peace of mind; and in these things they see God moving toward them in salvation, or conclude that he is going to save them, and they feel happy for the time, but at the same time have no distinct view of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, or as suffering in the sinner's stead. As, "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus," without faith in Christ as the way, they have no solid ground for their hope to rest upon. They may be led, while in this comfortable frame, to unite with the church, and get along for a time satisfied with their experience; but when temptations and trials come, as come they will, their good frame is gone, and they are tossed about without knowing about resting by faith in Christ. It is true the Lord, in the meantime, may have touched them again, to behold, through the reading or the preaching of the word, or by an application in some way of the word, Christ is the way, the truth, and the life. And though they believe now in Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, and speak of him as the Lord our righteousness, still, in those times of trial and darkness they will go back to that experience which they told the church; and in that they never can find that which satisfies themselves, or which they think ought to satisfy others, that they have faith in Christ, and therefore go on dissatisfied with their own experience through life unless, as in some cases, they are led to look to their after teachings as that in which they were enabled to believe in Christ. It is true that when the Lord has begun a good work, he will carry it on to the day of Jesus Christ; but my opinion is that where persons have had their eyes only partially opened, it is much better for their future comfort for them to wait, without being hurried into the church, until the Lord is pleased to lay his hands on them again, and give them a clear sight of Christ. Others, on receiving this partial deliverance, are in some way prevented from speaking of it, and are soon left to darkness again; and they now think their case worse than ever, their burdens are gone, and no view of Christ. In their distress they are led to cry unto the Lord. "After that he put his hands again upon his eyes and made him look up; and he was restored, and saw everything clearly." That is, some portion of Scripture suiting his case is so applied to him that he feels it is of God, and through Christ as the way of salvation, and the salvation is

clearly revealed to him, and he rejoices in him as *the Lord his righteousness, as the chiefest among ten thousand, the one altogether lovely.*

Verse 26. "And he sent him away to his house saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town." Our Lord frequently charged those whom he healed not to tell of it, thus fulfilling the prophecy, "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street;" thus illustrating the spirit of the gospel. The religion of Christ does not consist in external parade and show, but is retiring from the pomp and display of the world. There is nothing like boasting, like, Come and see my religion, my zeal for the Lord. When the Lord opens the eyes of any one to see clearly, instead of leading them to go among the popular religionists, or those who make a boast and show of religion, he leads them to look for his despised and afflicted people, and makes them feel that among them is their home.

Such are the views I have to present for the considerations of sister Culver on the portion of Scripture she designated. I leave it for her and others to judge of their correctness.

With brotherly love,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax County, Va., Feb.6, 1856.

VIEWS ON I JOHN 3:15.

DEAR BROTHER: - I see by the MESSENGER for February 1, 1856, that our brother Wm. M. Mitchell, requests my views on I John 3:15. The views I have I readily give. The text reads thus: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer; and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him."

This has been a difficult text to me, as well as to others. The difficulty has arisen, I apprehend, from the idea we have attached to the term *murderer* as used in the text; that is, applying it as the word is commonly used among us as denoting one who had literally killed or caused the death of another. According to this sense of the word, every son and daughter of Adam must have been literal murderers; for the testimony which Paul bears concerning himself and others, {Titus 3:3,} that in times past they were *hateful and hating one another*, applies to all. Hence according to our text, if we give this sense to the word all must be shedders of human blood directly or indirectly. On the other hand, giving this

sense to the word, and not only must we decide according to the text, that every person, without exception who commits self-murder was destitute of eternal life, but also that David had not eternal life abiding in him as he in this sense was evidently a murderer in the case of Uriah.

But I now understand John as drawing throughout this epistle a close and discriminating line of distinction between those who are the sons of God and those who are not, or who are as he calls them, *the children of the devil*. Hence his words are to be understood not as *in the letter* merely, but as *in the spirit*; that is, he is not speaking merely of outward acts, but of the whole character of the two classes, the natural man and the spiritual man, of the children of the devil, and the children of God. The natural man or the unregenerated having nothing but a carnal mind is as stated in Titus 3:3; hateful and hating, is enmity against God, not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Rom.8:7. Hence he is guilty of the whole law, and is therefore a *murderer* in view of the law as spiritual. But the "new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," is in its essence the very spirit of the law; it is love to God and to its neighbor. And "love is the fulfilling of the law;" hence, "Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." But what is it that he who is *born of God*, loves after the *new man*? Is it sin or depravity? No. Is it the flesh with its lusts? No. It is love to God, and therefore love to Christ, and to the image of Christ wherever it is seen; it is love to the *new man* or to the *spirit and its fruits*. Hence the declaration of our Lord to his disciples, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." The law required that we *should love our neighbor*; but this is a new command, it referred to the new man and his affinities, not to the natural man. The children of God will love one another. No one that is born again can see the fruits of the Spirit, or the evidence of the new birth in another without feeling his love drawn out to them and to him in whom he sees them, as a subject of grace. Hence if anyone who professes to belong to the brotherhood of Christ, can see the evidences of faith in another, and hate him for it, hate him as a brother, as Cain did Abel, he is a murderer, he has not eternal life abiding in him, and is therefore still under the law and held by it as a murderer or guilty of the whole law. And no one that is held under the condemnation of the law, or as a murderer, has eternal life abiding in him.

John in the context refers to Cain evidently as illustrating what he was expounding. He says {verse 11,} "For

this is the message that ye have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another." Referring evidently to the *new* command of the Lord. He then adds, "Not as Cain who was of that wicked one and slew his brother; and wherefore slew he him?" Was it for any mere fleshly or worldly advantage or lust? No, but, "because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." Because his brother offered in faith and was accepted, and he did not, and therefore was rejected. Here then we have an illustration of the murderer in our text – verse 15. And here we have a true illustration of the spirit of persecution in all after ages. And no one who can engage in persecution for righteousness sake, "hath eternal life abiding in him." He is a *murderer*. Thus we see that David was not a murderer in John's sense of the word, neither typically nor antitypically. Not typically, because Uriah was not an Israelite, but a Hittite, one of those nations whom God commanded Israel to destroy. And we have no reason to believe that it was for Uriah's faith that he was killed. Yet David's sin in the whole matter was great, yet repentance was given him and his sin forgiven before the Lord, notwithstanding according to the Sinai law he was made to suffer external retaliatory punishment. See II Sam.12:1-14.

I will here remark for the consideration of brethren who may be exercised on the subject, that from the view we have taken of the love which characterizes one who *has passed from death unto life*, it is not consistent with this love, that we should love every member of the church alike. It is a love of the Spirit of Christ, hence if we are influenced by this love in proportion as we discover this spirit in any member, we shall love him, and where we see a worldly spirit, or that which looks like pretence, or self-exaltation in religion we shall dislike it.

Although I have been already more lengthy than would have been necessary simply to give brother Mitchell my views of the text, yet there is one point more in it that I wish to notice. It is the expression, "Hath eternal life *abiding* in him." The idea which appears to be entertained by many of our brethren concerning the eternal life which a believer hath, is that the soul is merely raised from a state of death to the privilege of living eternally. Hence the *new birth* is frequently spoken of as a *resurrection*, and as a *quickenings*, &c., that is, by men. But John represents *eternal life* as something which *abides* in the new born person. If so, must it not be a real existence that dwells in the believer, distinct from anything that dwells in others, and therefore distinct from the human soul. This corresponds with the idea of a birth, which is a

bringing into individual existence, that which had not before existed except seminally in its head or progenitor. This principle of *eternal life* as an incorruptible seed being thus implanted in the soul, it quickens the soul to a sense of its accountability to God and dependence on him, &c. But I will not now enlarge upon it.

I have thus given such views as are given to me of this text. If brother Mitchell thinks them not scriptural, I need not tell him to throw them by, for he will certainly do it. But in that case I think I have a right to insist on his giving his views of the passage.

With Christian regards,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax C.H., Va., Feb.13, 1856.

VIEWS ON MATTHEW 12:43-45.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - A friend and reader of the SIGNS, from Catskill, has, by letter, requested my views on Matt.12:43-45, I therefore send such as I have to you for publication in the SIGNS, if you see fit.

The passage is that declaration of Christ to the Jews, that "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man," &c. There are, no doubt, many young believers, and some old ones too, who, with the friend making this request, have thought the remarks contained in this passage was a description of their own cases. The time was when they had thought their vile affections and corruptions were subdued, and Satan did not worry them; but when for humbling them, or for the trial of their faith, the Lord leaves them to feel the power of their corruptions, and the assaults of the adversary, they have been led to think their case could not be worse, if they had seven devils in them, for they feel the force of their corruptions to be seven fold, and hence they are ready to conclude that they are not what they had hoped they were - subjects of God - but that *their latter state is worse than the first*. But such may rest assured that this text has no reference to their case, no relation to the trials and experience of the children of God; that the whole was designed to show the peculiar state of that generation of the Jews, as the context with the concluding remark in the text shows. Our Lord, in his remarks, refers, as an illustration of the state of that generation, to what appears to have been a generally conceived idea among that people, concerning the operations of evil spirits upon individuals, and

from the positive declaration which he made concerning it, I must conclude that this opinion concerning unclean spirits and their influence over individuals, was a correct one. I admit there are difficulties in the way of our comprehending how distinct existing spirits should have and exercise such influence and power over men. We have been accustomed to ascribe similar influences and effects, when witnessed among us, to disease, to depravity, or some derangement of the faculties or the mind. Human science would reject, as fictitious, such statements, though found in the Scriptures, as are incomprehensible to us. But however much the power of Satan or devils, in this respect, over men, may have been abridged since the resurrection of Christ – when I consider that the statements found in the Scriptures were written by inspiration of God, and written, not as fiction, but as a revelation of truth – I at present feel constrained to believe, from those recorded statements, that there did exist as distinct intelligent beings, such unclean spirits, or devils, as are spoken of, and that they were permitted of God to take possession of individuals, and exercise such power over them as is described. Witness the case of the man among the tombs, Mark 5:1-13; see also, Mark 3:11-12 & 1:23-26; also, Acts 19:12-17. How far the devils may have similar power given them over individuals under the Gospel, or whether any, I pretend not to say; but from the accounts given, I am inclined to believe the devil has power given him to exercise through human beings – witchcraft in our country the same as in the case of the witch of Endor – though the spirits raised at this day, do not, and cannot, speak the truth through their mediums, as did the spirit of Samuel through the witch of Endor.

Having premised this much concerning unclean spirits, let us notice the words of Christ: "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man." This is not a case of the devils being cast out by the finger of God, and forbid any more to enter the man; but of his voluntarily going out of his own accord. Very different this, from a work of grace upon the heart. "He walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none." The expressions used in the following verse, such as, "he taketh to himself seven other spirits," show that it is the unclean spirit here spoken of, as acting individually or personally, and not the man. "Seeking rest and findeth none." That is, he roamed at large, without being permitted of God to enter in and possess any other person; for he was as much dependent on God's absolute sovereignty to enter any one, as was the legion, to enter the swine.

"Then he saith, I will return unto my house, from whence I came out." That is, I will return unto the man I had before possessed. "And when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept and garnished." Being *empty*, shows that the grace or spirit of God had not been communicated to this man, neither had any other evil spirit possessed him. And being freed from the influence of this unclean spirit, the man had reformed his life, from those unclean or corrupt courses to which he had been led, and of course had garnished himself with decent and moral, if not benevolent conduct.

"Then goeth he and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is worse than the first." That is, being now possessed by seven more spirits, and these more wicked than the first, his conduct was worse, as also was his condition.

"Even so shall it be, also, to this wicked generation." That is, like unto the man thus represented, the Jews had been addicted, previous to their captivity, to idolatry, and to a disregard of the law; but after their return from Babylon, and the building of the sacred temple, every vestige of their former idolatry was swept away, they were obedient to the law in its letter; and were garnished with a zealous regard to the worship of the true God. But the generation then on the stage, when our Lord was on earth, adhered more to the traditions of the fathers than to the law of God, and were, therefore, in truth, idolaters; though they shunned the form, they were hypocritical in their worship, were self-righteous, and with it were proud, bigoted, oppressive, persecuting, blasphemous, &c., so that they were filling up the measure of the iniquities of their fathers sevenfold, and about, thereby, to draw upon themselves, in the rejection of Christ, a judgment sevenfold worse than the Babylonish captivity, so that their *last state was worse than the first*, like the possessed man. I will remark, in addition, that there is much in our day resembling the state of that generation and of that possessed man. Many persons speak favorably of revival efforts who do not profess to approve of their systems of religion; they say these conversions tend to moralize the people. But according to Christ's view concerning that generation of the Jews, the state of these persons is likely to become sevenfold worse. These men made converts, or excitement converts, may leave off drunkenness if they have been addicted to it, and profanity, gaming and the like. But, on the other hand, it makes them hypocrites in leading them to profess a religion which they do not possess, their religion being legal. This religion being a

selfish one, it makes them more selfish in their intercourse with men, however liberal they may be in giving to religious purposes, it leads them to have self-righteous opinions of themselves; and self-righteousness always embitters the heart of its possessor against the truth and those who hold it, and enlists them in opposition thereto; so that they become revilers of the truth and of true believers, and are prepared instruments for persecuting the saints, in any form and to any extent, in which persecution may be permitted of God. More might be said on this point, and yet not appear over-drawn to any candid observer of the popular religion of our day. This is so from the nature of things; for where the heart is not changed, and the love of God not imputed, the enmity of the heart toward God and the depravity of nature, remain in their full force, and in the conversion from a man of the world to a religious professor, the individual will act under the influence of his enmity, selfishness, &c., more freely in his religious course than formerly he did in his worldly course, because conscience has more or less restraint upon men of the world to keep them within bounds, but now this man thinks he is doing God service in reviling and seeking to put down the truth, and will satisfy himself in opposing those he gets under his power, and in overreaching and taking the advantage of his neighbor in his dealings, because the more he can gain in this way, the more he can give to religious purposes. Now, my friend, from your enquiry, I presume this is not your case.

S.TROTT.

Fairfax County, Va., June 23, 1856.

BARREN FIG TREE & VIEWS ON ZECH.1:8.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - A sister has requested my views on the parable of the barren fig tree, and another sister has by letter requested my views on Zech.1:8, through the SIGNS, and as I have not much to say on either, I will include my views of both in one communication.

1st. The parable, Luke 13:6-9. "He spake also this parable, A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard," &c. Christ had in the preceding verses, informed those who talked with him that those Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices were not sinners above the other Galileans, and that those eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell, were not sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem, and that excepting they repented they should all

likewise perish. He then spake this parable, as I understand it, as illustrating those remarks. Hence I consider the parable as having a special reference to the Jews both of Galilee and Judea.

"Had a fig tree planted in his vineyard." Israel is often, in the Scriptures, represented as a vineyard, a *fruitful field*, &c., in distinction from the other nations, who were left uncared for, like a wilderness; whilst Israel was fenced in by the provisions of their law and by the providence of God, and cultivated by the teachings of the law and the prophets. Judah or the Jews are represented as a fig tree planted in this vineyard.

"And he came and sought fruit thereon and found none. Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree and find none; cut it down, &c." Said the Lord unto Moses, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Deut.13:18,19. Jesus was that prophet. Christ had sent, his messenger, John, to prepare his way before him with the message, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He afterwards sent forth his disciples, two and two, to the Jews only, with the same message. This then was the fruit he had been seeking for about three years from the commencement of John's ministry. Hence John said unto the Jews, "Bring forth fruit worthy of repentance." Luke 3:8.

"Cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground." From that time our Lord began to foretell the destruction of Jerusalem.

"And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it; and if it bear fruit, well; and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down." This denoted that his ministry and that of his apostles was to be continued among them for another year, and if they repented of their self-righteousness and received the kingdom of heaven, *well*, if not, then their city and nation was left to destruction.

However much Satan, may throw this text at the children of God to worry them, and through his ministers, in their not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God, may apply this parable to the saints, it evidently does not belong to them. As when a fig tree is properly planted and cultivated it is expected that from the resources it has it will produce fruit, so the Jewish nation were required to bring forth the fruit of

obedience to the letter of the law, and therefore to receive that prophet or the Messiah when he came as a condition of their continuing to enjoy the good land which God had given to their fathers. Not so with the children of God; they are not under a conditional covenant. The Lord does not come requiring fruit of them to compensate him for their planting, but he comes to supply all their needs from his own abundant fulness. Hence it is said concerning Ephraim, "Ephraim shall say, What have I to do any more with idols? I have heard him and observed him; I am like a green fir-tree. *From me is thy fruit found.*" Hosea 14:8. So in reference to the fruit of repentance; Christ is exalted as a Prince and a Savior to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. Again, Israel is represented as saying, "But now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay and thou our potter, and we all are the work of thy hand." Isaiah 64:8. Instead then of repining because we have nothing of our own, *no fruit of the ground* which we can bring as an offering to the Lord, let us be thankful and rejoice that we may come and receive of his fulness and trust in his righteousness.

Zech.1:8 - "I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood among the myrtle trees that were in the bottom; and behind him were there red horses, speckled and white." I have to inform sister Ball that I have no special light on this text; I will give her, if they will be of any use to her such general views as I have of it.

1st. Zechariah prophesied after the return of some of the Jews from Babylon and during the building of the second temple. The principal burden of his prophesying seems to have been to encourage the Jews under their difficulties. For this end he referred pretty fully through the types to the building of the antitype of that temple, the Gospel church, by "the man whose name is the Branch" - the antitype of Zerubbabel and Joshua - the Lord Jesus Christ, who is truly a *priest upon his throne*. And here, permit me to add, is the *counsel of peace between them both*; that is, in his having all power in connection with all prevalency of intercession founded upon the sacrifice of himself. Zechariah includes in his prophecy events connected with the type and antitype. Such I think is the prophecy in the text under consideration. By the red horse and his rider I conclude, from what is said in Rev.6:4 of a similar representation, that war is intended. As a white horse and its rider is used to denote the conquests of the gospel of peace, {Rev.19:11 & 6:2,} I conclude that the *red horses, speckled and white*, or as it reads in the margin *bay and white*, intimated that there would be war, and after that unsettled times among or with the Jews, or as Daniel calls it, *troublous*

times, {Dan.9:25,} yet that the temple and wall of the city should be built. My recollection of the history of the times will not admit of my attempting to designate what particular was intended by the *red horse*, and its *rider*. Yet, from what is said in Ezra and Nehemiah, we may learn that though *all the earth* {verse 11,} or the Persian empire, was then still and at rest, yet the Jews experienced troublesome times in their building the temple and walls of Jerusalem from the opposition of those nations occupying the country formerly inhabited by the ten tribes. History also, as well as some of the prophesies of Daniel, inform us that after the time of Nehemiah, under the reign of the Antiochuses or the Grecian empire, the Jews experienced much trouble before they became again established in the enjoyment of their national and religious rights. We learn from the context {verse 10,} that the *war* as well as *peace* horses were sent forth of the Lord. So in chapter 11, we are informed of four chariots, having in one bay horses, in the second white, in the third black, in the fourth grizzled and bay horses, coming out from between two mountains of brass. These mountains may denote God's purpose and grace; or, in other words, his predestination of all things in the government of the world and his special predestination to salvation. These are as immutable as mountains of brass. Here then is war, gospel, famine, {see Rev.6:5 & 6,} and probably pesthence, called the spirits of the heavens, going forth from the Lord. We learn also from verse 16 and 17 of the context, that the Jews were ultimately prosperous and spread abroad.

If we turn to the antitype, the building of the gospel church, we shall find the same ideas holding good; wars and the spreading of the gospel have been connected in all ages. The Roman conquests by war of all the nations around, by which all the earth was brought to sit still and be at rest, at the time of our Savior's being manifested in the flesh, by bringing all those nations under one government, made those nations far more easy of access to the apostles, and therefore favored the spread of the gospel. The succeeding wars of the Romans, by forcing many of the christians into their armies, shielded those thus employed, from the persecutions raging among those remaining at home, and gave them an opportunity they would not otherwise have had, of bearing their testimony to the truth of the gospel of the grace of God, among their fellow soldiers and among the nations whither they were sent. And their testimonies, no doubt, were blessed of God to the accomplishment of good. Hence, no wonder that when Constantine came to the throne, he found the armies filled with christians. The conquest of the Romans by the

Goths, &c., served to shield the true church in some measure from the persecutions of the Catholic church, and to favor their retreat to the wilderness or valleys of Piedmont. As the after war upon the Waldenses and driving them from those valleys scattered them, and therefore led them to disseminate their testimony among the several nations of Europe, our revolutionary war was the instrument by which the religious establishments, existing in several of the provinces, were broken down, and the way prepared for our free enjoyment of that religious liberty, which has since existed among us. The wars among the various kingdoms in Africa, and the selling of their captives into slavery, were the leading instruments of bringing many of the Africans among us, where thousands of them have been made to hear and rejoice in the gospel of Christ. Other instances might be mentioned, but these are sufficient to show how God has caused the *red horse* of war to lead the way for the going forth of the white horse of the gospel, and that the white horse has followed, and though it has been often speckled with opposition and divisions, yet it has held on its way. The gospel, where God has sent it, has had *free course and been glorified*. In Revelation, the 6th chapter, the *white horse*, is put forward, to show that the spread of the gospel or the cause of Christ was the first object in view, in God's predestination, and that many of the wars which should follow would be on religious accounts. We are not, my sister, to infer from these prophesies that the spirit of war and the spirit of the gospel in themselves harmonize. They are as opposite as are earth and heaven. The spirit of the gospel is *love* and *peace*. The spirit of the world is war and contention. This spirit can no more be conquered by the wisdom and devices of men, than the Ethiopian can change his skin. It may be curbed for a time, but on the first occasion it will again break forth in all its rage. In Zech., the 6th chapter, these emblems of war, of famine, of the gospel of peace, and of pesthence, are all alike called the *spirit of the heavens*, not to show that they are alike heavenly any more than the *evil spirit of the Lord* which troubled Saul was the same as the *spirit of the Lord*. I Sam.16:14. But to show that they are all alike sent forth from the Lord, and are under the entire control of his predestinating purpose without the earth's having any share in limiting or enlarging their movements. Says God by Isaiah, "I make peace and create evil; I, the Lord, do all these things." Isaiah 45:7. This is the reason why we Old School Baptists love the doctrine of God's *absolute predestination of all things*, because that according to this doctrine, instead of being left to the gloomy consideration that the evils which are

in the world, any of them, come by chance, or are in anywise controlled by men or Satan, we believe that they are all confined by the predestinating purpose of God as *between two mountains of brass*, and can go forth only where God sends them, and only to accomplish his wise and good purpose; and that wherever they go, the white horse of the gospel, or, in other words, some gracious purpose of God concerning salvation, follows in this train. And this also is the reason why we have no confidence in the missionary operations, believing God will send his gospel just where he has a purpose for it, and that it will accomplish that whereunto he sends it; and that his gospel can go no where but as he sends it; and any spurious gospel which may be sent by men will accomplish no real good.

My sister, without noticing all the particulars in the text, I have written down such views as have been presented to my mind on the general subject. My reflections have, perhaps, been led in a different channel from what you anticipated; I certainly have extended them much beyond what I expected when I commenced; otherwise I should not have included the two texts in the one communication. What I have written, I have written; and I desire it may afford as much satisfaction to you and others in reading, as the contemplation of the subject has afforded pleasure to me. One remark more. When we feel that this predestinating, this God-governing – God of all events, is our Father, the sound of thunder and of the raging tempest, however terrific otherwise, is as music, and the lightning's flash is both grand and beautiful.

Yours, with Christian regards,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax County, Va., Aug.20, 1856.

SOME OBJECTIONS NOTICED.

DEAR BROTHER WILLIAM: - I find by the 13th & 14th number, present volume of the MESSENGER, that brother Purdy has some objections to certain ideas advanced by me in my communication in answer to brother Fisher. His objection seems to be mainly against an idea which I threw out rather as a suggestion, than as a fixed opinion. This suggestion is found in the sentence quoted by him from me. "Thus the manifestation of the justification of the Old Testament saints, and the justice of God in their justification was made perfect, {that is, by Christ's being delivered for their offences, and

raised again for their justification as spoken of before,} as it was not to them while on earth, at least, even if it was to them in heaven, until the everlasting doors were opened, and the King of glory, or Christ triumphant first entered, then they no doubt entered in with him." That is, that the saints which died previous to the ascension of Christ did not enter into that heaven where the saints are with Christ and behold his glory, until he as the Leader and Head of his people first entered in, and was seated on the throne of his glory, then they entered in to be with him, &c. I threw out the idea rather as a suggestion, because it was an idea I had not previously particularly thought of; though when it was presented to my mind, certain texts which I also quoted were brought to my mind as supporting the idea. But the fact that brother Purdy has not been able to bring one text of Scripture in support of the view that the ancient saints enter at death, is sufficient to confirm me that his view is not right, even if I had not plain Scripture to support my idea. For since my mind has been led to the subject it must take something more than traditional assumptions to convince me that the Old Testament saints could at their death enter into the glory of Christ, whilst *Jesus was not yet glorified*. See John 7:39.

But brother Purdy seems also to object to the idea that the Old Testament saints had not the full manifestation of their justification, as they and the New Testament saints have, since Christ was *raised for their justification*. I will offer the few remarks I have to make on this point first.

1st. As this seems to involve the doctrine of *eternal* or antemundane justification, a subject which has been heretofore fully discussed. Besides the doctrine of the union of Christ and his bride or people, which has been more recently discussed, necessarily involves the idea that as Adam's posterity stood and fell in him by virtue of union, so Christ's bride remained under the demands of the law, whilst he, her husband, remained under it, and was justified when he received his clearance on her behalf by his resurrection. So I am not disposed now to discuss these points. I wish only to notice a few texts of Scripture. First, Gal.4:3, which I quoted before. Who does Paul mean by the *we* in verse 3? We national Israel, or we spiritual Israel? Do not his various addresses to those to whom he wrote his Epistles show that he addressed them as brethren in Christ or spiritual Israelites? If so, can brother Purdy explain this passage so as to allow that the believers, the spiritual Israelites were not in bondage under the elements of the world, until the fulness of time was come when God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under

the law? And could they receive the adoption of sons before they were thus redeemed by Christ's coming and death? Or what does Paul mean by what he says in the 4,5 & 7th verses? Again, Rom.3:24-26. What can Paul mean, after saying, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God," by repeating, *To declare* and uniting it by the expression *at this time*, if he would have it understood that in all past time God's righteousness in the remission of sins, was declared through types, as now through the actual death of Christ? Brother Purdy took no notice of these texts as quoted in my communication to which he replied. They certainly stand for something, and their meaning must be definite. If brother Purdy will carefully examine them, I think he will be convinced that the actual death of Christ was important, and vastly important in the redemption of his people from under the law, and as much so in reference to those who lived before his coming in the flesh, as for those who have lived since. Many other texts might be quoted to the same amount, but I will just name two others. Matt.5:17,18, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, until all be fulfilled." What can this mean, if the law and prophets were fulfilled by the types and shadows, or by faith, so that the saints were freed from the law and made perfect? See also Rom.10:4, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." How could Christ become the end of the law for righteousness, {if the law could not be destroyed, nor one jot or tittle pass from it,} without his actually fulfilling it? And if not, how could the Old Testament saints be delivered from it, so as to be no more servants, but sons? Will brother Purdy reflect on these things, and show us if he can that the faith of the ancient saints by looking at the shadow, could see as clearly the end of the law, and the justice of God, in justifying the ungodly, as does the faith of the New Testament saints in looking at the substance, Christ, with *open face* and not through a veil. See II Cor.3:13-18.

But brother Purdy seems to place great stress on the purpose of God going before. As there is so much of this *purposed salvation* afloat among us at this day, and represented to be of equal efficacy and equally complete with actual redemption and salvation, I may perhaps be indulged in

noticing it a little. But I wish first to notice the vast difference between the infinitely omniscient God with whom there can be no future, no past, and finite creatures who are of yesterday. With God, his law was magnified and satisfied from the beginning. But could God impart to finite creatures, or has he ever done it, a faith, that equals his own omniscience? I think not. And I should think brother Purdy, when calmly reflecting on it, would admit that it is the prerogative of Jehovah alone to *declare the end from the beginning*. And yet what short of this, does he ascribe to the faith of the Old Testament saints? If I can understand some parts of his remarks, salvation must be an actual deliverance from the obligations or bondage of the law, as well as from sin, for the strength of sin is the law. I Cor.15:56. God as the sovereign law giver, could suspend the infliction of the curse incurred on his people, until *the fulness of time* by him set had come, then the Son coming forward in that nature which the law could take hold of, that curse fell on him, as having by his eternal relation to his people been placed between them and the law, they being in him. Hence God could *spare them from going down to the pit*, saying, "I have found a ransom," {Job 33:24,} and give them a type of that ransom in the sacrifices of beasts, &c., and give them faith to behold through these that provided ransom, and therefore give them hope of final deliverance. But how he could give them faith to believe, that they were already justified or cleared from the demands of the law, seeing that Christ had not then redeemed them by his death, and seeing that faith is a belief of the truth, I cannot see. Neither can brother Purdy point me to a single shadow, or a single declaration in the Old Testament that points backward to the redemption and deliverance from the law as already accomplished. Hence as faith, genuine faith, can embrace only what God has revealed, it could only believe that they should be delivered from the law and its bondage; not that they were then delivered. Brother Purdy speaks with surprise at the idea of the old Testament saints being born again and not being justified from the law and enjoying all the liberty of sons; but Paul speaks of those who preceded the fullness of time when God sent forth his Son, &c., as being children, and yet as being in *bondage under the elements of the world*. Gal.4:8, already referred to, so that brother Purdy must reconcile this matter with Paul, not with me.

Brother Purdy seems to suppose that to believe in God's having purposed to redeem will have just the same effect in giving liberty, as to believe that he has fulfilled that purpose in sending his Son to redeem. Why then did not the faith of the

old saints look back to the purpose of God as the ground of their hope instead of looking forward to the coming of Christ to redeem them? But that such is not the case, brother Purdy's own experience I think is sufficient to convince him, if he will attend to it. Brother Purdy I presume believes that according to the revealed purpose of God, he being a child of promise, his body is yet to be changed like unto the glorified body of the Son of God when he will be freed from all corruption, earthliness and mortality; and being Christ's and therefore the seed of Abraham, he believes it with the same faith that Abraham had, and as strongly as Abraham could believe that in his *seed should all nations be blessed*. Does his faith in this purpose of God, in this case, enable him to realize the change as already taken place? Or does he like Paul and others still "groan, being burdened with a body of sin and death?" How then can he suppose that faith can bring that which is future and existing only in purpose, into present and actual existence? What is it then? Why brother Purdy believes that this glorious change will take place, therefore does he hope and quietly wait for it. So I have no doubt the Old Testament believers, *hoped and patiently waited* for their redemption and justification from the law. This purposed salvation carried to the extent which some do even denying that the Mediator existed only in purpose, until he was born of Mary, I cannot view as anything else than *cloaked deism*. For if for four thousand years men could approach God, and be accepted, without any existing Mediator through whom to approach and could enjoy perfect deliverance from the demands of the law without being actually redeemed from under it; I see not why others in after ages, might not so approach and be accepted of God without the existence of a Mediator. What is this but open *deism* or infidelity as it is called? But I have a hope that brother Purdy does not carry his *purposed salvation* so far.

But brother Purdy evidently misunderstood me in arguing as though I had represented that the Old Testament saints were not made equal with those living under the gospel, that is in heaven. I said no such thing, and thought no such thing. In the very sentence which he quoted from me I said when the "everlasting doors were lifted up and the king of glory or Christ entered, they no doubt entered with him." Of course fully partook of that justification for which he was raised, and of his spirit as son and of his glory, as much as any who have entered where he is since. So that the text, "They are all one in Christ Jesus," which he quoted has no bearing against my position, but supports it as showing that they were all alike and at the same time redeemed in Christ, and glorified

in him. I now come to brother Purdy's objection to the idea that the Old Testament saints did not enter into that heaven or glory which followed Christ's death, into which the saints who died before, and those who have died since the ascension of Christ, have alike now entered.

1st. I will notice his remarks on the two texts to which I referred in advancing my idea. First, he notices my reference to Psa.24:7-10. Brother Purdy remarks upon this, "Brother Trott has a plurality of doors for the admittance of the old saints. We had cherished the belief that there was but the one way to heaven, &c." I had supposed there was but one way to the Father, and that Christ is that way. But I was speaking of Christ having triumphed over death, &c., entering into his glory, so I understand the Psalmist to have reference. As I only referred to the passage without quoting it, I used the term *opened* instead of *lifted up*, as synonymous. As the Holy Ghost by David spake of *doors* and *gates* in the plural, I still think I was correct in using the language of inspiration on the point. As Christ is the Head of the body, the church; the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all he might have the preeminence, I then thought, and now think he would be the first to be received up into glory; that glory which I understand to be the heaven of the saints. Brother Purdy also notices my reference to the parable of Lazarus. I said, "Hence Lazarus, instead of being represented as being with Christ is said to have been in Abraham's bosom; that is, resting for the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham." Thus it will be seen that I understand the expression as figurative of resting on the promise made to Abraham, waiting its fulfillment in the manifestation of the seed, Christ, if I had not added this explanatory remark, but merely quoted the expression of Christ. I cannot but think the remark of brother Purdy was rather ill aimed, - "Ah! One saint resting in the bosom of another saint," because the language was the language of the Son of God, not mine. The idea of brother Purdy, that Abraham is here mentioned as figurative of the Father and Lazarus of the Son, is not only to me strange, but awful. A man, a figure of the absolute, sovereign, self-existing, and invisible Jehovah! Can there be any other likeness of God, but the Son, who is the *express image of his person*? Did brother Purdy ever consider the second command of the Decalogue of Moses' remarks, Deut.4:12-16, or did he recollect that God is a spirit, or the text, John 1:18. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him?" Then to speak of the Son as being carried by angels to the bosom of the Father, as though he did not

always dwell there, and as though he was raised up and transported by angels. As to Abraham, he is frequently mentioned in the New Testament, as well as in the Old, but never as a type or figure, but always of himself, in that peculiar relation in which God had placed him as being the *Father of all them that believe*, as well as of national Israel. That parable with its closing instruction shows that Abraham as the father of the Jews was there intended. But brother Purdy noticed my reference to those two texts, why not notice the quotation of Heb.9:8, in connection with 10:19,20. There is contained a positive declaration, that "the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing."

Let us notice what this state of glory, or heaven, or the antitypical *holiest of all*, into which the saints enter since the coming of Christ, is described to be in the New Testament. Paul speaks, Phil.1:23, of having a desire to depart and be with Christ. This then was the heaven he had in view. Christ in his prayer to his Father, John 17:24, says, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." He had before said, verse 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was." And still before, he had said, verse 1, "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee." It appears from this that he had this glory with the Father, before the world was in that eternal purpose which God purposed in him. That is as he dwelt in the bosom of the Father, and was *hid in God*, but now the hour is come in which he was to be personally and manifestly glorified, as the Son or Mediator to the admiration of angels and saints. Again, Christ says in John 14:2,3. "In my Father's house are many mansions; if not, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there may ye be also." I do not understand this house as being confined in its mansions to the heavenly glory, but as the typical house or temple had its most holy place, shadowing forth *heaven itself*, into which Christ has entered, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Heb.9:21-26. The language of these texts clearly show, that those whom the Father had given, had not been with him in that *heaven* to which he has now entered; that he had not before entered, with *his own blood*, and had not *prepared a place* for his people, and had not the Mediator been personally glorified. Whatever then may have been the heaven signified by the term *Abraham's bosom*, and by the term

paradise, it is evident that the saints who died previous to the everlasting doors being lift up, and Christ's entering into this heavenly glory, could not have been with Christ to behold his glory, where, according to his prayer, they and other departed saints now are. The paradise, where Christ promised the thief, saying, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise," whatever it imports, I think cannot have been designed to denote this state of heavenly glory, from the meaning of the word as signifying a fruit garden, and from its being first applied to Eden in the Scriptures; besides on the third day, after his crucifixion, Christ said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." John 20:17. In conclusion, if brother Purdy will lay aside imagination and the traditions of men, and search the Scriptures on the subject, he will find that I was not so erroneous as he thought in my reply to brother Fisher. I have been more lengthy on the subject than I could have wished. Indeed the subject simply of the state of the departed saints previous to the resurrection is in itself rather unimportant, but involving as this question does, the glorification of Christ and the enquiry whether his people were glorified with him, and in him; or whether a part of them were glorified before he was, and therefore in themselves independently of his glorification, is a subject of no small importance. I hope you may consider this worthy of a place in the MESSENGER.

With Christian regards, yours,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax C.H., Va., Aug. 22, 1856.

VIEWS ON I PETER 4:17-18.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - In the 16th number {present volume} of the SIGNS, there is a request from brother C. Jackson, of Virginia, for my views of I Pet.4:17 & 18: "*For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God, and if it begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?*" Peter in verse 12, says, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you as though some strange thing happened unto you." In the verses intervening between this and verse 17, he exhorts them in reference to the fiery trial, and in his remarks, he shows that by it he refers to some special persecution about coming upon them, and then in verse 17, informs them that the occasion of this *fiery trial*, is, that the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God.

As Peter substitutes the word *us* for the *house of God*, in the second clause of the verse, and also from the connection, it is evident that from the expression, he meant the church of the saints, or Gospel church. And as Peter was an Apostle of the circumcision, his epistles were originally addressed to the believers among the Jews. Hence by the expression, "Them that obey not the Gospel," he undoubtedly means the unbelieving Jews.

The time is come. This expression evidently refers to some anticipated period. Our Lord had foretold his disciples of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the Jewish nation in their nationality, Matthew, chapter 24, and had limited the time to that generation. This judgment came upon that people and city in A.D. 70. Christ had also told his disciples that before these things, "They should lay their hands on them, and they should be brought before kings," &c. Luke 21:12. The Jews had, from the commencement, persecuted the Christians, so far as they had the power, and had in some instances instigated the Roman governors to persecute them. But in A.D. 64, Nero, the Roman Emperor and tyrant, issued his edict against the Christians, authorizing them everywhere to be put to death. Thus commenced the first general persecution against the Christians, which lasted until Nero's death, A.D. 68. In this persecution, multitudes of Christians were put to death by every species of cruelty. According to Chronologists, Peter wrote this epistle, A.D. 65; therefore, at the very time this severe persecution was about commencing, and this, no doubt, was the *judgment* he directly referred to.

Judgment must begin at the house of God. Why begin there? Because whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth, Heb.12:6. And as he said of the type, so also of the antitype, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." Amos 3:2. Hence, "the slaying must begin at God's sanctuary." Ezek.19:6.

But brother Jackson may be ready to enquire whether God inflicts judgment upon his people? I answer, Yes! "The Lord shall judge the people." Again, "God judgeth the righteous." Psal.7:8,11. "With righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." Psal.98:9. God had, previous to Peter's writing this, judged the church according to the strictness of his righteous law, and had inflicted the entire penalty due for her transgressions, upon her head and husband, Christ, who for this purpose, was made under the law. Again, her husband having, by enduring the curse, satisfied the demand of the law; she, by his resurrection from

the dead, was judged clear from the law, or justified. Rom.4:25. But Peter says, "the time is come that judgment must begin." This, therefore, refers to another judgment, and as the church had already been redeemed and justified from the demands of the law, this judgment could not be upon legal principles, but upon Gospel principles, or in love, as a father judgeth and chasteneth his son for his good.

The church and people of God, have in no age kept up the Gospel standard. They have come short in faith, in the order and discipline of the church, and in practice. In times of outward peace, the churches are apt to become careless in reference to these things; the living members will become lukewarm and too much disposed to conform to the world, and persons destitute of grace are suffered to get in and remain with the church. Hence the importance of the churches being first purged before God inflicts his judgments upon their enemies. In the times of persecution and some other judgments, these judgments will do for the churches what they had failed to do for themselves by a faithful and correct exercise of discipline; the dead members will fall away and go to their proper associates, and thus be in a place to meet the judgments awaiting the enemies of the truth. As in that judgment to which Peter particularly referred, many Jews no doubt had professed Christianity, without a living faith; these, when the Romans persecuted the Christians, would go back to Judaism, and thus become involved in the destruction which awaited that people. And although many christians, by this persecution, were taken from the church, and from their relations to the world; yet, there was no wrath in it to the church, nor to them, for still the Lord preserved a remnant sufficient to proclaim the Gospel, and to bear testimony to the truth. And as to those who suffered death, they were placed in their sufferings, in circumstances to bear a much more efficient testimony to the truth of the Gospel, and to the power of divine grace to sustain them, than they could have borne while living in peace; and besides, they were the sooner released from the world and its troubles, and from the corruptions of nature, and taken to rest.

Besides, these judgments tend to manifest the faith of the children of God. Hence, Peter speaks of these manifold temptations as being for the trial of their faith, chapter 1:6,7. Whilst living in comparative ease many of the children of God hardly know whether they have faith or not; indeed often much doubt having any, and cannot so clearly prove their faith to others; but when the judgments of God are upon them and the church, they are led to look to Christ as their wisdom, their

strength, and their salvation. They now feel that without him they are lost, they can do nothing, they have neither wisdom, nor strength to meet their trials; he is, therefore, their only hope, and they know that he is able to save and keep them. What but faith would lead them thus to cling to Christ, under afflictions, divisions, reproaches, &c., as their last hope and trust? And in remaining steadfast in the doctrine and order of the Gospel, whilst the church is enduring these judgments, whether they be persecutions unto death, or reproaches and defaming, or divisions and a thinning of the members of the church, &c., they give evidence to their brethren of their faith. Again, these judgments often lead the children of God to see and feel the evil of errors, neglect of discipline, and sins which they had before overlooked or paid little attention to.

I now come to the part which brother Jackson wished me particularly to notice: "And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" In reference to the *salvation of the righteous* here spoken of, I will remark that there are two kinds of salvation spoken of in relation to them. There is the salvation from the law and its curse, from sin, death, and the grave, to a state of justification here, and of glorification hereafter. This is wholly through the redemption which Christ accomplished by his death, resurrection, and ascension. Christ is this salvation, it is found wholly in him. There can, therefore, be no scarcity in this salvation, for he is God all sufficient. The Scriptures represent the redemption of Christ of his people, as a complete triumph over the last enemy, death. Hence it is said in reference to his ascension as the Redeemer, Head, and Forerunner of his people, "God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumpet." Psal. 47:5. Again, "Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive." Psal. 68:18. Again, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in. Who is this king of glory? The Lord strong and mighty; the Lord mighty in battle." Psal. 24:7,8. Surely when we consider that Christ's people were quickened together with him, and raised up together, and made to sit together in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, Eph. 2:5,6; and that Christ has so signally triumphed over all he had to encounter in accomplishing their redemption, has *led captivity* itself captive, has subdued everything that could bring into or hold his people in *captivity*, has entered in and taken possession of eternal glory, and been honored as king of glory, as the forerunner and in behalf of his people; we must be convinced that there can be no deficiency in this salvation, that the word *scarcely* cannot be made to apply to it.

Again, the term *righteous* will not apply to the elect as objects of the salvation by Christ's blood. They are made righteous by this salvation; but it is as sinners that they are saved. Christ came into the world to save sinners and only sinners; so that I think brother Jackson will be satisfied this is not the salvation intended in his text.

The other salvation spoken of, is a salvation in providence and grace, a being preserved in existence and from evils, and a being kept from the corruptions that are in the world from errors, from temptations, &c. Understanding this to be the salvation intended by the Apostle in relation to this judgment, it will readily be seen that the righteous were *scarcely saved* during such a severe and lengthy persecution. But a mere remnant at most, of those who belonged to the church at the commencement of the persecution were saved from its ravages; others were added to the church, and many of those met death at the very onset of their profession. John was, perhaps, the only apostle that survived it. So in the persecution of the Donatists in the sixth century, and of the Waldenses in the seventeenth century, in both cases these people were scarcely saved, mere remnants escaped and they scattered. In the repeated judgments of God upon his church since, in suffering errors from time to time, to get in and gain such an ascendancy as to cause divisions, and to compel the lovers of truth to separate from the multitude, mere remnants have been found to have escaped the prevailing corruptions or errors; so that the declaration of Scripture, "A remnant shall be saved," applies not only to national Israel, but also to the visible church down to the present hour. I think, also, if the children of God will reflect on their own individual experience of the judgments of God upon them, in leaving them to encounter sore temptations, and in leaving them to feel something of the power of their own corruptions, they then have been brought to feel how weak was all their resistance, and it has not been till all hope was gone that they should be saved or escape, that the Lord appeared for their deliverance, and like Paul and his companions, when they escaped from the dreaded shipwreck of their profession, it was only on planks or broken pieces of the ship. So that they have known there was no safety in the ship, nor in themselves, nor in any resolutions, nor plans of theirs to weather the storm; and that nothing but the interposing mercy of God saved them. Hence all boasting in their strength, in their resolutions, in their love to holiness, &c., was excluded, and shame and self-abasement followed. Again, bodily and family afflictions, want, embarrassment in business, have been visited upon others as judgments, and

when this has been the case they have been left for a season to darkness and unbelief; and under the influence of these, they have concluded that these adverse providences were evidences against their being children of God, and that they were but the beginning of God's wrath against them for their hypocrisy in professing religion. Even unbelief had evidently got the better of Paul, when he said, "All hope that we should be saved was then taken away." For before he left Jerusalem the Lord had stood by him and said, "Be of good cheer Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." Acts 23:11. But this was forgotten of Paul, when "neither sun, nor stars in many days appeared, and no small tempest lay on them." How many of the children of God have experienced such seasons spiritually, and if Paul could be left thus to unbelief, no wonder their unbelief of nature should prevail, when thus tried, until God is pleased to send some angelic message to them to revive their faith, as he did in Paul's case. Acts 27:23. In fact, this shipwreck of Paul's throughout, is a striking illustration of Peter's declaration in our text, "If the righteous scarcely be saved," &c. But when it is applied to the eternal salvation of the saints, as Arminian preachers frequently apply it, there is a gross degradation of Christ and of the efficacy of his blood, for it would represent Christ, the glorious ark of safety, could be broken in pieces. Amidst all these hair-breath escapes which the children of God meet in this world, and all that despondency of soul which they are left to, so that all *hope is taken away that they shall be saved*, the angel of the Lord stands by them, and as the angel said unto Paul, "Lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee," so Christ, the angel of the covenant says, in his word unto his disciples, "Not an hair of your head shall perish. In your patience possess ye your souls." Luke 21:18,19.

If the righteous thus scarcely be saved, when God visits them with his judgments for their wanderings, and their worldly mindedness, "where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear," when God, laying judgment to the line and righteousness to the plummet, shall visit them for the enmity and rage they have manifested to his people and cause? This question, brother Jackson, I presume, does not wish me to answer. It is enough for us to know that God will deal righteously with them, and will vindicate his own and his people's cause, that where they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, he will give them blood to drink.

Yours in love,
S.TROTT.

Fairfax County, Va., Oct.9, 1856.

VIEWS ON GEN.3:22.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: - I some months since received a letter from brother Duggan, of Louisiana, requesting my views on Gen.3:22, former part: "The man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." I would hereby inform brother Duggan that the reason of my so long neglecting his request, is that I have been so much from home that I have the past fall had but little opportunity for writing.

He requested me to answer his request either through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES or SOUTHERN BAPTIST MESSENGER. I had intended giving my views through the MESSENGER, until recently having seen some numbers of a periodical, called the EARTHEN VESSEL, an English Baptist publication, in which your name, brother Beebe, and mine are mentioned by a New York correspondent, in connection with some gross perversions of our views and some unwarranted assertions, as also in reference to brother Goble, of New York, who is also mentioned. I have no disposition to enter into a discussion with this New York correspondent on the points referred to, nor to occupy your pages with a refutation of his slanders. But as an expression of brother Duggan's text will lead to an expression of our views on the points referred to, I have concluded, with your permission, to give the exposition through the SIGNS, as being more likely to meet the eyes of some of the readers of the EARTHEN VESSEL, than if published in the MESSENGER.

I will just mention, in connection with the above, that I saw in that paper, the EARTHEN VESSEL, a communication from another, and probably an English writer, in which he attempts to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, and to refute the notion of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ Jesus. Whether it was designed as a refutation of this American heresy or not, I cannot say. As to the absurd idea concerning the pre-existence of the soul of Christ, we have no affinity with it. This writer, in explaining the Trinity, asserts that the Three: The Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost - are three distinct persons, or subsistencies, and that these three compose the one God or Jehovah, thus representing the God of the Scriptures as a compound of three distinct subsistencies, or real beings. God has nowhere thus declared himself; saying, *We are the Lord*, or *We are God*, as it should read, if such doctrines were true. But he declares, *I, even I, am the LORD*. Again, *Ye are my witnesses*, saith the Lord, that *I am God* -

not *we are God*. Isaiah 43:11,12. Hence men who say such things as above cannot be God's witnesses, on that point.

But I will pass to a consideration of our text. In the expression, "The man is become as one of us," there is, manifestly, a reference to distinct persons. It is true, Unitarians, as they style themselves, say, that in expressions like this, God conforms himself to the custom of kings, who, to express their dignity, use the plural number in speaking of themselves, as modern editors, and some correspondents, who would assume the dignity of editors, do. But there is in this text a distinction in the persons, in the expression *one of us*, that refutes all that reasoning, showing that when God says *us* he means *us* in the plural. On the other hand, the Trinitarians, as they call themselves, contend that when God uses the plural pronoun, saying, *Let us make man*, &c., he refers to the several persons in the Godhead, and that it expresses a consultation among these distinct persons concerning the making of man. But when we come to consider the expressions of our text, I think we shall find their position as lame as that of the Unitarians. Although the correspondent of the EARTHEN VESSEL, before referred to, seems to make the persons composing the one God but *component parts* of God; yet Trinitarians generally, I believe, hold that each of the persons is God. If they do not, the Scriptures clearly declare that the Father is God, the Word is God and that the Holy Ghost is God. If, then, there is but one God, as the Scriptures fully declare, each of these persons must, if each is God, be that one God. How, then, could it be said, *as one of us*? It should be as us; for if, upon that position, man became as one, he became as each one, or as the three, for each is alike God. Again, although God absolutely, of his own infinite understanding, knows good and evil, yet man in this way never has, nor can know good and evil as God knows it. Man knows good and evil only by experience, and that in contrast; in this sense, it cannot be supposed that God knows it; he cannot experience evil, nor depend on contrast for his knowledge of good and evil. Hence it must be manifest that the one of us must be a person distinct from the Godhead. Such person is found in the Mediator, the Son of God; for, in order to be a proper Mediator between God and his people, he must be a person distinct from each. As such, he is clearly revealed in the Scriptures. His being revealed as the Son of God, reveals his distinct personality from God. The idea of son is that of *a person whose existence is derived from another*. In Heb.1:1,2, we read, "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets;

hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." There are in this text several ideas that call for particular notice in treating on this subject. First: That this person by whom God hath spoken unto us, &c., must be a person distinct from God, who spake by him. Second: That this person cannot be a distinct person in the Godhead, and therefore God equally with the Father. For I am certain that no one of those who contend for distinct personality in the Godhead, would, on a moment's reflection, if the idea could be separated from their notion of personality, admit that God, as such, could be an *heir*, much less would be *appointed heir*. Is not God the sovereign Creator of all things? As such, has he not the absolute right to them and the sovereign control of them? How then, can he be said to inherit them? And from whom could he inherit them? Hence then, his being *appointed heir*, and therefore his sonship and personality must be distinct from his being God. Third: The expression, *By whom he made the worlds*, shows that this *Son* and *Person*, who is thus distinct from God, was concerned in the creation of the worlds, and hence he evidently was the person whom God addressed when he said, *Let us make man*, &c., and of whom he spake in saying, *The man is become as one of us*. I will endeavor to show wherein this personality, and therefore the sonship consists. First: It is manifest that the sonship and therefore personality of Christ does not consist in his manhood or being made flesh, for in his manhood he was made of a woman – made of Mary – and therefore could not in that manhood have been present at the making of the worlds. But as Son, he was present, as God made the worlds by him.

By turning to John chapter 1, we will find clearly revealed a person distinct from God and yet with God in the creation; for he was *in God in the beginning*. "For in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And in verse 4, we are told, that, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." It does not say that he, the Word, was the light, &c.; but distinctively the life was the light of men. And verse 5, "The light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehendeth it not." As the life is the light, whatever is said of the light belongeth to the life. In verses 9 & 10, it is said of this light, "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." It is, therefore, clear from these quotations, that this *life* or *light* by whom the world was made is a person, and as such is distinct from God, from the Word, in whom he the life

or light, was. Christ is identified both with, this *light* as such and as the *life*. In John 8:12, Jesus saith, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the *light of life*;" thus showing that the light which he is, is the *light of life*. Again, in John 12:46, he saith, "I am come a light into the world that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." He thus connects faith with being enlightened by him. In Eph.5:8, the children of God are characterized as children of light. It reads, "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light." Does this not show that being *light* is one with being *born again*? Again, in Col.3:3 & 4, the brethren are told, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear," &c. Christ is here directly declared to be the life of his people; not only so, but the life which he is, evidently is identified with the life that was in the Word; for it is *hid in God*. Once more, the Son is identified with this life; for in John 5:11 & 12, we read, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. Now, it appears to me, that any person who is willing to take the plain declarations of Scripture for his guide, independently of creeds, confessions of faith, and traditions, will be satisfied from these quotations, that the *life* which was in the Word, existed in God from the beginning, was personally distinct from God, for it is the *light of men, was in the world*, is that eternal life which God hath given to his people, and is their life; that it is one with Christ or the Son of God; and that he, this life, was with God in making the worlds, that he made the worlds by him. Here, therefore, I might with propriety rest the conclusion on this part of my text; that the *one of us*, is no other than Christ the Son of God, as he existed in the beginning, in God as the life of his people. But I am aware that if I leave it here, the same old cry of a created Mediator will be reiterated against us. For if this life, which is the *Christ, the Son of the living God*, is a person distinct from God, in whom he was, he cannot, as such, be self-existent; for there is but one Jehovah, one self-existent God. The very idea of sonship clearly implies a derivative existence from another as his Father. There are in the Scriptures an abundance of expressions conveying a similar idea. In Prov.8:22-25, we read, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old." Here, under the idea of wisdom, he is presented to view as distinct in being and person from the Jehovah who possessed him. In verse 23 he says, "I was set

up from everlasting." In verse 24, "When there were no depths *I was brought forth.*" In verse 25, he adds, "Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth." He is declared to be "the only begotten of the Father." In Colossians, chapter 1, he, the Son, is declared to be the "image of the invisible God, the *first born of every creature.*" And in Rev.3:14, he styles himself, "the beginning of the creation of God." If there is any definite meaning in words, these and other declarations of Scripture which might be quoted, clearly show that the Son, as such, has a derivative and subordinate existence. We contend that these characteristics of the Mediator belong only to his sonship as such, and not to his Godhead, that as God he is Jehovah, absolutely self-existent, as one with the Father. The Trinitarian party charge us with representing him only as a creature. Yet they themselves admit that his manhood is a created existence, and do not suppose that this admission in any way destroys his essential Godhead. And if his creatureship as man does not destroy the essential Godhead of his person as Mediator, neither can his derivative existence as the Son and the life of his people make him any less God, as he is one with the Father. Thus, the Scriptures support our views of a trinity of persons in the Mediator. In the first chapter of John, after declaring that the Word was God, and that the life that was in him was the light of men, and that this light, as before showed, was presented to view as a person, the Evangelist goes on to say, not that the light was made flesh, but that the *Word*, and therefore God with the *life* in him *was made flesh*, and "we beheld his glory as the glory of the only begotten of the Father." Thus, whilst he was man and Son, he was the brightness of God's glory and express image of his {God's} person. The Godhead shone forth in him.

The truth is, we do and have contended that Christ is a perfect Mediator between God and his people. In order to be such, it is not enough that he should be entirely impartial between them, but he must be equally identified with each, so as fully to appreciate each case, and be equally interested in each. None could sustain that independent stand to enable him to act with impartiality but he who is the self-existent God. And none could truly appreciate what is due to the justice, the honor and glory of God, but he who is absolutely God. And how could he as truly feel for the welfare and happiness of his people, and impartially advocate their cause, unless he was as completely one with them as he is one with the Father? Now, Christ's being made flesh, would not constitute such oneness with his people, as he has with the Father; for he was only

made in *the likeness of sinful flesh*. Rom.8:3. This manhood was not in itself considered one with theirs. They did not derive their manhood from him, as their natural head, neither did his flesh, like theirs, descend from Adam. It is true, his being made flesh was necessary to his representing his people under the law, and to perfect him as their High Priest through suffering, and to make him a compassionate High Priest, by having been himself tempted. See Heb.5:8,9 & 4:15. And this could only have been in consequence of his previous union with his people.

But in Christ, being the life of his people, we see in this life a oneness – he the Head, and they the Body – he as the antitype of Adam, the Husband, and they his Bride. This life is one in the Head, and in all the members of his Body, as in the Vine and its Branches. The Branch was in the Vine, and one with it from its first existence; though it was not manifest as a Branch, until it shot forth. Its manifestation as a branch, neither constitutes nor destroys its oneness with the vine. It remains the same one vine, with all its branches, that it was before the branches shot forth. So the whole believing Church is but one Christ, the Life that is hid in God; the Life that was in the Word in the beginning. Thus says 1st Corinthians 14:12, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and the members of that one body being many, are one body; so also is Christ." See also verse 27. It is *Christ in* every member the *hope of glory*, that manifests a child of God, a distinct branch of the one vine.

Some persons seem to suppose that by this union of Christ and his people, we mean that the natural man was from the beginning in union with Christ. The natural man was one with the earthly Adam, and remains in union with him under the law, until he is killed by the law; then, when born again, born of the Spirit, or Life, he is born into life and all the blessings of Christ's redemption; and stands manifest as a child of God and one with Christ in that life which is in him, and by which he is quickened.

But to return. We have in Christ, thus a perfect mediator, as being God and being the life of his people, both being actually united in him, and therefore represented by him, as he says in John 17:21, "That they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." Again, "I in them and they in me, that they may be made perfect in one." As this oneness was from the beginning so he was in the beginning as Mediator, as it is said of him, Isaiah 63:9, "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.*" I will now notice the other part of the text. "To know good and evil." The idea has been entertained that man *knew good and evil*, in knowing a state of innocency, and then knowing a state of guilt and transgression. Man's goodness in innocency, was like that of Ephraim and Judah as the *morning cloud and early dew*; there was no real goodness in it, because it was not substantial. The text does not read, "knowing good and evil," as though it was something he had then learned, but "to know," that is, he is now by transgression placed in circumstances *to know good and evil*. This man is to know, as *one of us* – that is, as the Mediator, was to know it. Now the Mediator was made to know by experience what it was to bear sin, and all the consequences of it, such as condemnation and death. And he knew the good of redeeming his people, of conquering death in their behalf, and of entering into his glory as their forerunner. So his people are made to know the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and condemnation and death by the law, and by faith are made to know the superior value and goodness of the righteousness of God, *which is by the faith of Jesus Christ*, and which Christ is to his people, and the good of that inheritance which is spiritual and heavenly, over that earthly inheritance which Adam lost by transgression, &c.

This will give an idea to brother Duggan, of what I understand by the *good and evil* which man knows, as the one of us knows them, or which he knows in common with Christ. We have fellowship with Christ's sufferings under the curse of the law, and participate in the redemption; and are to be with Christ and behold his glory, and are joint heirs with him, &c. The *good* in the text is placed before the *evil*, and it is true we must be somewhat enlightened in the knowledge of God and of his goodness, before we can know the evil of sin.

I have also, in the views above given, supposed that *the man* here represented the elect of God, not that I do not understand that all the human family were created in Adam; but I understand that Adam or *the man* was a figure of Christ in his creation, and thus represents Christ and his church and people; and, in fact, that this was the grand end of his creation. The Lord's portion is his people, &c.

These are the views I have of this subject, and as such I give them, leaving to others to give us better views if they have them, and subscribe myself yours in love,

S. TROTT.
Dec. 26, 1859.

IEWS ON ISAIAH 2:4.

DEAR BRETHREN: - I see in the Messenger for December 1, 1859, a request from sister Jane Luce, for my views on Isaiah 2:4. With your permission I will give such views as I have through your paper. The text reads thus, "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

In verse 1, we are told that this is the *word that Isaiah saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem*. Verse 2, "And it shall come to pass in the *last days*, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains," &c.

The expression *last days* is used in the Scriptures repeatedly to denote the last or gospel dispensation, that is the coming and reign of the Messiah. See Acts 2:17, and context; and Heb.1:2. Hence as that whole dispensation is the establishing of a spiritual worship and the reign of Christ, is a spiritual reign, so this, that was to come to pass is spiritual. The Lord's house is the spiritual house, the gospel church; and the *top of the mountains* in which it shall be established, is no other than the Rock on which the church is built, Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. Hence it is not said to be the *tops of the mountains*, nor the *top of the mountain*, but the *top of the mountains*, and *above the hills*. Christ is above all the mountains and hills of political and ecclesiastical governments, and the *top* of them all, having the entire control of them; for, "All power is given to him in heaven and in earth." As Christ's kingdom which is here spoken of, is not of this world, but is *within you*; that is, internal in its influences and reign. See Luke 17:20,21. So we are not to understand in this 4th verse, that his reign, or religion, was to interfere with nations or civil governments. Christ, on a certain occasion, asks, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke 12:14. One of the early corruptions that crept into the church was that of conforming the church and religion of Jesus Christ, to the national religion of the Jews, and hence the attempts to bring the natural seed of believers into the pales of the church, as also to connect the church with civil governments. Hence also the popular idea among national religionists, and all who receive their ideas, is that such texts as this 4th verse related to the nations of the earth as nations. And because they have not yet seen the

event in that way accomplished among those nations and governments which profess to be christian, they have adopted the idea of a worldly Millennium, when these events will be fulfilled. Hence also the attempts to hurry in the Millennium, by peace societies for abolishing war, &c. Not only are the Protestants filled with such notions, but also the Friends or Quakers, who profess a religion that is altogether spiritual, to the exclusion even of the ordinances of the gospel, have run into the same error. The truth is, the *spirit* of their religion is too much of a *fleshly spirit*. Hence their making their Society or church a fleshly or national church by holding their children under the control of their Society, as much as do the Protestants. Hence their opposition to anything like war, and to oaths, &c., in cases relating to worldly governments.

But the New Testament does not authorize a belief that war will cease among the kingdoms of this world while they continue. Christ said, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews;" thus showing that the order of the kingdoms of this world in relation to wars was not changed by his coming. John 18:36. Again he said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." Matt.10:34. The prophecies in the book of Revelations, in their fulfillment thus far, show clearly that by the *sword* in that declaration, our Lord meant wars and fightings.

Sister Luce will enquire, What is then intended by the prophecy under consideration? I answer, that in the first place it shows that the Judah and Jerusalem intended; that is, the kingdom of David's Son, Christ, was to be extended and established among the Gentiles. Hence the declaration in verse 2, "And all nations shall flow unto it;" and in verse 4, "And he shall judge among the nations." In the second place, it teaches, that this kingdom of the Messiah is not to be established and extended on the principle on which the national kingdom of David was established; that is, not by the *sword* and *spear*, but it is established and extended in the spirit of peace and *good will toward men*. The Lord compares the extending of his kingdom among the nations thus, "And he shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them, as he that swimmeth spreadeth forth his hands to swim," &c. Isaiah 25:11. That is, as the swimmer takes the advantage of the weight of the water, by spreading out his hands, to press himself forward, yet as he passes leaves the water to return to its wonted level and smoothness, so our Lord is establishing his churches in the midst of the nations, whilst he takes of the citizens of those nations to form the subjects of his kingdom,

or the members of his church, he does not overturn, nor interfere with the government or laws of those nations, nor take from them their citizens, but leaves the subjects of his grace as much subject and obedient to the governments under which they live as though they had not been brought into his kingdom. Hence if the government is at war, they are ready to bear their proper share of its burden. Whilst in spreading the gospel or extending the church of Christ, they will use no force of law, nor weapons of war, but simply the peaceful implements of the plough share and pruning hook, or the preaching of the gospel and bearing witness to its truth.

Again, the Lord compares his defending of Jerusalem or the church to *birds flying*. See Isaiah 31:5. Birds flying are different from beasts rushing upon their prey. The latter tread down and crush everything in their way. But birds destroy not the equilibrium of the air, leaving no wake behind them. So the Lord will appear for the defense of his church, his people, and his cause. He will defend them so that *no weapon that is formed against them shall prosper*, no evil shall come upon them. Yet the Lord will not destroy their foes, nor crush the government that may persecute them, until his time comes to take vengeance on them, but he will overrule and so control all their machinations and rage as to cause the *wrath of man to praise him*, and to cause *all things*, which he determines to *work together for good to them that love him*, and the *remainder of wrath he will restrain*. This is carrying out the absolute predestination of God as we hold it. Hence as the Lord is thus a sure defense to his people, and cause, hiding them under the shadow of his wings, they have no occasion to seek protection from laws against those who oppose, nor to take up weapons of war against those who persecute; but if they "smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee on the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also," that is, for righteousness sake, or for thy faith in Christ. But if, as a citizen, we are injured in person or property, we have the same right to seek protection and redress from the laws of our country, as have other citizens, or even to defend ourselves, our family, or property. So in reference to oaths, or the direction *swear not at all*, if in our church relations, we have not sufficient love to, and confidence in one another, to let each other's yea, be yea, without its being confirmed by an oath, it is time such church relations were dissolved. But in dealing with people of the world in worldly transactions, we are dealing with those, who at least, do not want to show any more confidence in us, on account of our religion, than we have in them; and we are

dealing with them on the principle of human laws, which ought not to make any distinction between the disciples of Christ, and other citizens. Hence if in such cases an oath is necessary for confirmation, let us take it unhesitatingly.

I have thus attempted to illustrate what I believe to be the spirit of the text under consideration, without coming directly to the words of it. I will now briefly notice the words, in their order. 1st. "And he shall judge among all nations." The *he* here must refer, for its antecedent, to the *God of Jacob*, named in the preceding verse. As the whole connection of our text shows that Christ is the personage brought to view, it is evident, that Christ is the God who declared himself to Jacob at Bethel, as the LORD GOD of Abraham, &c. See Gen.28:12-15. *And he shall judge the nations* – No; for he *came not*, in the view given of him in our text, to *condemn the world*, but for salvation. Hence it reads, "He shall judge among the nations." That is, he shall judge *his people* that are among the nations, and he shall convict them of sin and just condemnation, and yet shall justify them by his blood. "And shall rebuke many people." There are many, very many people who find a good deal of *condemnation* in their religion. Their religion is *Adam* or the *natural man* reformed. Hence when they can find any reformation in their lives, any religious excitement or zeal in their passions and feelings, they think it is commendable, and expect that God will commend them for it. But there are, and have been, many people who find nothing but *rebukes* to themselves in their religion. Whilst under the law, they found nothing but *rebukes* for their want of conformity to its holy and spiritual requisitions, until they became disheartened from all attempts to be accepted upon the ground of their obedience, and fell helpless and condemned at the feet of mercy. They hoped when faith was given them, to behold Christ as *the way* that they should so live, so walk in obedience, as to feel approved before God and their own consciences. But they have found nothing but rebukes against themselves from that day to this. They have been daily rebuked. They have been rebuked for the coldness of their love and zeal, for giving way to their appetites and passions, for the workings of corruptions within, and their proneness to yield to temptations, for their worldly mindedness, and for the mingling of the flesh or self in all their religious exercises and doings. Why is it so? Because Christ, who is in them, or the *new man* is holy as God is holy, whilst the *old man* is corrupt, and so of course are all its acts; hence the spirit or new man rebukes and abhors all its doings. No wonder that the people who are thus rebuked should be

humbled and abased in their own eyes; and therefore esteem others better than themselves. Hence that instead of wishing to compel others to be conformed to themselves in religion, their great desire and effort should be to be in themselves more conformed to the image of Christ, and more anxious to show forth his salvation. Hence, that they should exchange the implements of destruction, for the implements of production and peace; the implements of war, for the implements of husbandry, which are implements for producing that which is good, to man.

"Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." The kingdom or church of Christ is composed of persons who are of different nations and owe allegiance to different governments; yet as subjects of Christ's kingdom, they are a *peculiar people*, and a distinct and *holy nation*. Although the nations and religions of the world have repeatedly lifted up the sword against this nation, yet it has never lifted up the sword against them. And the subjects of this kingdom have no prejudices against one another because they are of different nations of the earth; but let them meet together, from different nations, and different parts of the earth, and as soon as they have seen in each other, that they are of the spiritual circumcision, they will embrace each other in their affections as brethren, and of the same family. And when the *kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ*, as I think they will at the close of the Philadelphian church state, or after the destruction of the man of sin; then whilst under the influence of the spirit of the gospel, they will no more lift up the sword, nation against nation. But no human effort can bring this about, for the prophecies concerning the Beasts, and their destruction, must first be accomplished.

"Neither shall they learn war any more." Under David, Judah learned war, but under Christ, the spiritual Judah, instead of learning war, learn to love one another, and to act from the principle of love, having the love of God shed abroad in their hearts.

Such are my views of this subject, and as such I give them.

Yours, I hope in love,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., Jan, 2, 1860.

CIRCULAR LETTERS.

RELATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES AND MINISTERS.

Circular Letter: *The Delaware Baptist Association, to the Churches they represent.*

Beloved Brethren: - Having again been permitted through the mercy of God, which *endureth forever*, to meet in our associate relation; and to receive, as tokens of your mutual fellowship, the epistles sent by your messengers; we in turn address you by Letter, praying that *grace and peace* may be multiplied unto you.

As a subject that may be interesting and profitable unto you, we present for your consideration a view of the relation of gospel Churches and Ministers, as we believe is revealed in the word of God, the only correct standard of gospel order.

This relation is therein represented as a household or family relation. The churches, as the bride of Christ, are the mistresses of their respective families. For although the term *bride* is more generally applied to the collective church, or body of Christ, yet as each branch into which the body is divided, is individually spoken of in the New Testament as a distinct church, and as an independent body is entrusted with an administration of the discipline and order of Christ's house, in its own sphere, {see, for instance, Paul's direction to the church at Corinth, concerning the disciplining of its members, I Cor.5:1-13 & II Cor.2:6-10,} each branch may be considered as the bride of Christ, owning Him for her Head and Husband, and as the Father of her children.

The gospel ministers, stand to the respective families or churches with which they are severally connected, in the relation of *servants*, as the term *minister* denotes. The minister of the gospel is primarily the minister or servant of Christ, being by Him entrusted with the ministry, {see I Tim.1:11 & Col.4:17.} Hence says the Apostle, "Let a man so account of us, as the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." I Cor.4:1. Being the servants of Christ, they are of course, especially called by Him, and gifted or qualified for the work assigned them. Hence in all their ministrations they are to be governed by the New Testament; it being the law of Christ, which they are to seek at His mouth, as the *High Priest of our profession*. See Mal.2:7. To Him they must also ultimately account for the manner in which they

have discharged their stewardship. Luke 12:42-48 & I Cor.4:2-5.

But whilst the gospel minister is to act as the servant of Christ, he is also to consider himself as a servant of the church of which he is a member, and which he is appointed to serve; and is therefore to act under her direction in all things committed to her government by her and his Lord. And surely the Lord has not appointed His bride to be subject to the servants, as many will have it, but His servants to be subject to the church. Paul says to the church at Corinth, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus sake." II Cor.4:5.

To the churches it belongs in administering the government of their Lord's house, to set her servants to work, or in other words, to call into public service the gifts bestowed upon them respectively. But in doing this as they are so abundantly cautioned by their Lord to "*beware of false prophets, which come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are raving wolves,*" and to "*try the spirits,*" &c., it becomes them to be very cautious that they set none to work whom the Lord has not sent forth into *His harvest*. And to the churches it belongs to examine the credentials of those who would introduce themselves into the family of the Lord's servants. They are to examine the certificate of their appointment to His service; that is, the gift imparted for the work of the ministry; namely, *aptness to teach*; and their *experimental* call to it, and discovering their Lord's signature, which is nothing less than an *experimental witness* in their own breast, that the messages delivered are from God; then, and not otherwise, to appoint them to their work, as the case may require; either to labor as a pastor in the duties of that office, or as teachers simply, that is as preachers not having a pastoral care. The appointment to be manifested according to the pattern given, namely: *by prayer, and the laying on the hands of the Elders*; as in the case of setting apart Paul and Barnabas to the work whereunto the Holy Ghost had called them. Acts 13:1-3.

We are aware, brethren, that in the above remarks we pass by one practice common in our Baptist churches, namely: that of *licensing* preachers. Upon this point we will propose, for the candid consideration of our brethren, the following queries: 1st. Do we anywhere in the New Testament, find any pattern or direction for licensing preachers? 2nd. Does our Lord anywhere commission any to preach His gospel, whom He does not commission to baptize? We know that we ought to "*lay hands suddenly on no man,*" nor ought we in anyway to

send them out into the world as Christ's ministers, without a thorough trial.

But in the case of *licensing* preachers, this caution is not always sufficiently regarded. Too many churches, in sending out preachers in this way, act under the impression that it is only a licensing of them, and therefore think it not necessary to have the same full evidence of the individual's being called of Christ to this work as in the case of ordination; as though a person being imposed upon the churches and the world as a gospel preacher without having the gospel of Christ *committed, of God, to his trust*, was of much less consequence than his baptizing without being specially called to do it. Another evil arising from the plan of licensing, is that many persons who are fellowshipped by their churches, as having been called of Christ to preach, but whose gifts are not great, or who have not confidence to crowd themselves forward, are left to labor for years under the difficulty of being allowed to obey but one part of their Lord's command. He says to His ministers, "*Go and teach all nations, baptizing them,*" &c., but the churches say to these, "No, you may go and teach, but not baptize."

Again, gospel ministers, whether pastors or others, being servants of the church, and connected with the churches where they severally belong as members of the family, are as much under the watch and care of the church as are the other members. Consequently if it is the duty of each church, as it manifestly is, in maintaining the order and discipline of Christ's house, to know how its members attend upon the institutions of the gospel; and to call those to an account who shall be found treating with neglect, or turning from the gospel and its ordinances, as they professed to receive them; it is equally its duty to see that each minister belonging to the church faithfully discharge the duties of his station; and not only to *know* that he preaches Christ's gospel, but also to know that with fidelity, as providential circumstances permit, he exercises the gift committed to him in the *work of the ministry*. Thus Paul and Barnabas, although specially sent forth by the Holy Ghost to a certain work, yet considered it their duty to account to the church, how they had fulfilled the work assigned to them. Compare Acts 13:2 with 14:26,27. But how different from this is the present state of things among the Baptist churches generally. They leave the preachers which are among them, other than the pastors, to roam at large; and if they abstain from immoral conduct, and from the grosser errors, such as Universalism, or Campbellism, or the like, the churches exercise no more watch over them, either as to the

exercising of their gifts, or to their doctrine, than over those who are not members with them. In consequence of this, among those who profess to have been called by the Lord, to go and preach His gospel, even with the urgent direction to *let the dead bury their dead*, rather than neglect this work; and whose *call* their churches have declared a fellowship for by licensing them, we find *one* engaged in the business of the world, preaching but seldom, if at all; *another* is wandering far and wide, probably more intent to hunt a settlement than to preach the gospel; a *third* we find in a seminary of learning, studying the heathenish writings of the ancient Greeks and Latins to qualify him to preach the gospel of Christ; a *fourth* is traveling as an agent of some society, to collect monies, &c.; a *fifth* has engaged as a missionary, to some mission board, to be subject to their direction, to hold himself accountable to them, and to acknowledge his dependence on them for his reward. Thus we find him a member of two distinct families; one the household of faith, by which he was licensed, the other a household of *human contrivance*. To the latter he cleaves, and owns their government; the other he despises as an inefficient institution for spreading the gospel. We would not have it understood by these expressions that we are opposed to spreading the gospel upon New Testament principles. Perhaps a *sixth* may be found living within the bounds of his church, and engaged as far as circumstances permit, in preaching the gospel to the destitute.

But to return; the duty of the churches to watch over the preachers, as such, which are among them, involves in it their accountability to their Lord, for the employment of those gifts which He has bestowed upon them. For the apostle tells us, Eph.4:11-13, that "He gave some, Apostles," that is, evidently, to some churches, as in the first age of the gospel. "And some Pastors and Teachers," and they were given *for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ*. By the *body of Christ*, in the passage, as appears from what is said in the following verse, we are evidently to understand the whole collective body, of which each church is a branch. Hence though these gifts are given to the individual churches, yet as they are designed for the *edifying of the whole body*, it becomes the duty of the churches, to see, according to circumstances, that they are thus employed. It is true that as each church can only act in a limited sphere, and as each gift can only be employed in a like sphere, a church will feel the propriety of requiring the gifts committed to it, especially in the pastoral office, to be employed for its own edification, so far as in connection with the good of the whole, it is judged

proper. Not that the labors even of the Pastor should be wholly confined within the bounds of his church; much less that the other gifts, in the office of *Teachers*, should be thus confined.

We do think, brethren, that the churches have been too remiss upon this point. They have of late years acted too much upon the principle of *mine* and *thine*, as though the pastor was exclusively for the church to which he belonged, and as though the individual church had no concern in the whole body's being edified. Poor and destitute churches have been left to shift for themselves as well as they could. For that care which the churches ought to have exercised towards the *feeble branches* of the body, and towards destitute neighbors, *human contrivance* has been substituted in the form of Mission Societies; whereas let the churches but discharge their duty towards, and with the gifts entrusted to them, and it will be found that the institutions of the great Head of the Church are perfectly adequate to the edifying of His body, and the accomplishing of His purpose of salvation, without the intervention of human wisdom to guide His affairs.

You will perhaps say, that we do not feel able to support more than one preacher, nor hardly that; and we should not like to insist on a man's leaving his business, and going from home to preach, without being able to secure him a compensation for his time, &c. How was it, brethren, in the early ages of the church? Oh! but, say some, that was a day of miracles; and we cannot now expect preachers to be supported by miracle. Jesus has the same power as then, and the promise that He *will be with His ministers to the end of the world* still holds good. But where have we an instance of the Apostles performing a miracle to procure themselves substance? Paul's *own hands* ministered unto his necessities, when the churches did not communicate to him; and he tells the elders of the church at Ephesus, I have shewed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak. Hence we have here an example for preachers, when the churches fail to minister to their necessities, that they should *labor, working with their hands*, to support themselves while preaching the gospel. See Acts 20:34,35. It is true, the Lord has *ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel*; but He has never appointed that his ministers should wait till they have competent wages secured to them, before they go forth to preach the gospel. And if they have put their hands to the *gospel plough* in a right spirit, they will not be looking back for their gains, before they can move on.

But let not the churches conclude that they are not under obligation to communicate a support to those who

preach the gospel, or to their families. *Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things*, is the direction of Zion's King. Gal.6:6.

An important enquiry arises, how this support is to be communicated; whether as a fixed salary, or otherwise. Much is said in favor of salaries on worldly principles; but we nowhere find this to be the New Testament plan; nor is it congenial with the gospel spirit. It places the preacher and church in opposite scales, as much as are the parties to a mercantile transaction. Indeed this stipulating with a preacher to give him a certain annual sum on condition of his being their preacher, looks too much like a worldly bargain, and places the preacher in circumstances very much like those of a hireling. It deprives the preacher of the sweet consolation of receiving the communications from the church and individuals as a token of love for his work's sake; for they are naturally received as the fulfillment of a contract. Many other evils arising from this plan might be specified, had we room.

On the other hand, by a due regard to the family relation, in which the churches and preachers are connected, the occasion for a stipulated salary for the ministerial support will be excluded. In a family where proper equality reigns, those members of the family who are laboring in the harvest field, or engaged in tending the flocks, will come to a family table, and partake equally free with those who have been concerned in making ready the provisions. So the preachers being called to labor in the *gospel field*, or as *shepherds* to take the oversight of the family in spiritual things, are or ought to be principally engaged in these things; whilst the other members of the family are attending to their worldly avocations, and thereby collecting the *meat that perishes*. Now as these come and freely receive for the supply of their spiritual wants, out of that distribution which the preachers make, as *stewards of the mysteries of God*, is it anything more than a proper equality that the preachers should be allowed to come freely for the supply of their temporal wants to the stock which the others have collected? This is evidently the New Testament view of the subject. See Gal.6:6. "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." And I Cor.9:7 - "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" Again, verse 11 - "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things?"

A correct view of this relation, and a conformity to it in practice, will place the preacher in a happy remove from the two extremes; that of being engaged as a *hireling*, and that of being supported upon the ground of common charity. It will place him at *home* among his brethren.

But you are ready to enquire how this thing is to be come at; and whether your property is all to be thrown into *common stock*? This was the case in the beginning of the gospel church, and that by the voluntary act of the disciples, from an ardent love to the gospel cause, and a sense of the present necessity. Compare Acts 4:32-37 with I Cor.7:26. But the peculiar circumstances of the first church, which called for these great individual sacrifices, having passed away with the increase of disciples and churches, with it passed away, even in the Apostles' days, the practice of *having all things common*. Still, however, a circumstance arose out of this which produced a peculiar demand upon the liberality of the Gentile churches; and Paul speaks of it as an act of just return in these churches; his words are: "and their debtors they are." See Rom.15:26-27. That is, as we understand the Apostle, as the liberality of the saints in Jerusalem, in giving up their individual possessions to the church, enabled the Apostles and the other gifted brethren, to give themselves to the *ministry* of the word; and be supported, without a *miracle* too, by which means the knowledge of salvation was extended to the Gentiles, and Gentile churches were planted; so the after suffering state of these disciples, in consequence of their voluntary poverty, in connection with the oppression of the church at Jerusalem, called for a suitable return of liberality from the Gentile churches, to supply their temporal wants. The Holy Ghost, in handing down the particular description of the management of this collection, contained in Romans, chapter 15; I Cor.16:1-3 & II Cor., chapters 8 & 9 appears to have designed it as a pattern to the churches in after ages, in reference to those demands which the gospel would at all times have upon their liberality, for the support of its preachers and the poor of the church. Taking this collection then as our pattern, we conclude that the preachers are not to be supported by tithing, taxing, or restraint in any way, but by a voluntary and liberal return made for benefits received. We also conclude that no individual is required to throw his possessions into a *common stock*, but to improve them with care and industry. Upon the proceeds, however he will find, and feel too, if he feels aright, that the gospel has a claim, for a due share. *Let every man lay by him in store as God has prospered him*, is the direction: I Cor.16:2. Not that the

preacher *should be eased and they burdened*; but that, whilst he is engaged in feeding the flock with the bread of eternal life, they by a proper distribution of their worldly increase may yield him a supply for his wants; and thus *there may be equality*. For to be placed on an equality, as to the circumstances of temporal support, for himself and family, with the other members of the church, is what the preacher has a right to expect, for services rendered, in the gospel; and with which he ought to be satisfied. If the preachers could feel and exercise that humbleness of heart which is proper to the servants of Jesus, and if the other members of the churches, instead of expending the surplus of their incomes in vain trappings, that their families may make a show in the world, or in adding farm to farm or stock to stock, would freely allow the gospel claim to its share of what God from time to time is pleased to bless them with; many churches, which now think, they cannot give one preacher a support, would find themselves able not only to make their Pastor comfortable, but also to say to other preachers which they may have among them, "go preach the gospel to the destitute around, as the Lord opens a door for you, and the wants of yourself and family in the mean time will be our care." Or if they had no gifts among them save the Pastor, they could contribute something towards the support of those who were laboring with small and poor churches, or in destitute neighborhoods, as did the Philippians to Paul, while laboring in Thessalonica and Corinth, Phil.4:16 & II Cor.11:9.

In a word, when we get back to the proper state of gospel feeling, to be of *one heart and of one soul*, to realize that we are *one body*, animated by *one spirit*, even as we are *called in one hope of our calling*, owning and loving the *one Lord, one faith, and one baptism*; then will vanish all difficulties from the way, in supporting the gospel ministry according to the gospel *pattern and order*, even to any extent to which the Lord may *send forth laborers into His vineyard*.

Brethren, let us, both preachers and churches, strive more to cultivate the spirit of the gospel; and to act more in conformity to that family relation by which we are bound together, and as those who are to give an account, not unto men, but unto our Lord. In proportion as this is the case, we shall find it *good to stand in the ways, and to see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein, for we shall find rest to our souls*. Jer.6:16. Though others may say, *we will not walk therein*, yet we should find our confidence in the Lord's wisdom and power to accomplish His own gracious purposes increasing, according to the plan laid

down by Himself in His word; and of course shall be less disposed to wander after the traditions and inventions of men.

The Lord, we judge from the signs of the times, *will suddenly come to His temple*. But who may abide the day of His coming? How many, alas, will He have to scourge out, for having made His Father's house a house of merchandise? Brethren, may all our loins be girded, and our lights burning, that when He comes, we may welcome His approach with the salutation, "EVEN SO COME, LORD JESUS." Amen.

S.TROTT. Moderator. 1833.

REMARKS ON I JOHN 1:3.

Circular Letter: *The Corresponding Association held with the Mt. Pleasant Church, Fairfax County, Va., to all Old School brethren, churches, associations, corresponding and annual meetings, sendeth Christian salutation.*

Beloved Brethren: - "That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ." I John 1:3. The Apostle in the above text seems to express a desire to cultivate christian fellowship with those to whom he is writing, and to this end declares unto them what he has seen and heard; and as ours is the same desire, we wish in the following address to confine ourselves to what we have seen and heard, believing as we do, that the believers in Christ, in every age and country, were all embraced in the same eternal purpose; were all interested in the same grace which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began; are all watched over by the same kind Providence which brings them to, and preserves them in their natural existence; are all sanctified by the same God and Father, preserved in the same Christ Jesus; called with the same holy calling; the same pangs and sorrows bring them all into their spiritual existence; the same provision is the support of each, while on his pilgrimage; and the same heaven will be their home, when mortal scenes shall end. We can but believe also that the language of one who is in the *light* will be the language of all; and if we would all speak the same things, we must walk in the same light; and if we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another. Here two questions arise for our consideration. 1st. What is light? And secondly, What is fellowship?

In answer to the first of these enquiries, it is not our purpose to enter into an illustration of the various significations with which the term *light* is used in the scriptures, nor to direct you to any *new light* which has sprung up in these modern times; but to ascertain if we can, what is the nature of that light in which the saints are called to walk. And 1st. It is not the light of human reason; for this is often at war with the whole government of God, instead of enjoying fellowship with Him. It is not the light of nature; for this is called in the scriptures a darkness, which will eventually lead those who follow it into interminable woe, unless God call them out of it into His marvelous light. It is no blazing comet beheld by the natural eye; for, "We walk by faith, and not by sight." Nor is it the pillar of fire literally, that was the directory of national Israel through the wilderness into Canaan; but what this pillar of fire was to them figuratively the Lord Jesus Christ is to His church substantially; hence they are required to follow Him; to hear Him, &c. "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." God has given Him for a light of the Gentiles. Isa.42:6. Again, He is said to be the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. John 1:9. And John 3:19, where it is said that men loved darkness rather than light; and concerning Christ it is said: "He was despised and rejected of men." And Christ says of Himself, "I am the Light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." John 8:12. Without multiplying quotations, we think the above sufficient to establish the fact that Christ is the light in which the saints are called to walk. But it may be asked, since Christ has ascended up on high, are we not each at liberty to walk according to our own sense of propriety, and to put our own construction upon His own word, and walk accordingly? We answer, No! There has been too much of this done, hence the lack of fellowship and union among us. This would be like departing from the Lord, and thinking to have peace by walking in the imagination of our own heart. Deut.29:19. What then are we to understand by following Christ, or walking in Him as our light? And where shall we find the substance of what was shadowed forth in the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, that guided Israel after the flesh in their windings through the wilderness? The spiritual Israel experience, both darkness and day, and it is truly a wilderness through which they are called to pass. How important then that we should have a safe Directory, a bright and shining Light to conduct us on our pilgrimage. Well, our strong Deliverer has not left us to grope our way in the dark, but has afforded us a Light whereunto we do well that we take

heed. "Is not my word like as a fire, saith the Lord?" Jer.23:29. And says the psalmist, "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path." Psa.119:105. It is Christ Jesus who shines in this word, that makes it a fire and a light. And as this is evidently a night season with the church, how important that we should give the more earnest heed to this light, and have our eye steadily fixed on Him who is clothed with light, as with a garment. We know that there are many who profess to be the children of God, and profess to be governed by His word, and yet are pursuing different plans and schemes; but we are inclined to believe that by far the greatest part are following some fancy of their own, instead of waiting for the moving of this fiery pillar. The scriptures in themselves are but as a dark body, even to the children of God, only when Christ, who is our light and life shines therein. And whilst, dear brethren, we are wading through this dark night, anxiously watching for the morning, let us be *still*, like our ancient types, when the pillar of fire is not moving before us, that is, let our lips be sealed in silence, and our pens keep their places where nature grew them, rather than advance one sentiment, either in doctrine or practice, much less move therein, if we have not a thus saith the Lord for it. When there exists a diversity of opinion among brethren, touching any one point of doctrine, it is clear that they are not all following the light, in contending each for their peculiar sentiments; and as these things are confined chiefly to the ministry, it only goes to show that the *cloudy* pillar will not do to follow in the night; but when the morning shall again dawn upon the church; when "Zion's watchmen shall see eye to eye;" when the ministers of the gospel who are also called clouds, shall be embodied as one pillar; then may Zion's children follow on; then our peace shall be as a river; and then shall our fellowship be sweet. But to our second enquiry, what is christian fellowship?

This term, as used in the scriptures, and experienced by christians, means something more than formal friendship or kindness. This kind is experienced by the world, and by the various anti-christian societies that are in the world, consequently is nothing more than a fleshly feeling, while the saints are required to "know no man after the flesh," all fleshly attachments and preferences should be laid aside; no creature fondness should be suffered to predominate over that fellowship which is of God. This term is not particularly defined in the scriptures of truth, but according to its application as there used, seems to be somewhat synonymous with love, and is an inevitable consequence of fellowship or communion with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ; "For if we love Him

that beget, we love them also that are begotten of Him." This fellowship with God is brought about alone by being born of God, having our souls washed in the blood of Jesus and made holy, otherwise there could be no communion with Him; for as soon might we expect that light and darkness might have fellowship one with the other, or righteousness and unrighteousness; but being purified we become experimentally connected with Christ, and in Him enjoy communion with God, as did Noah in the big ark, while it rode sturdily upon the bosom of the mighty deep. There is a fellowship that is merely nominal, but like that which exists merely in the flesh, it always fails to produce those delightful effects flowing from a fellowship of kindred spirits - this is to take an individual by the hand and call him brother, for whom we do not feel that endearing relationship, and to whom we are not bound by any fleshly ties. This kind is sometimes expressed towards those who have gone out from us, that it might be made manifest that they were not of us - contrary to the Apostle's injunction, that we have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them. Christian fellowship is a union of soul, and does not exist towards an individual *because* he is called an Old School Baptist, or because he professes to be a believer in Jesus; but because he gives evidence of being born of God, and manifests a conformity in his life to the precepts of the gospel; and in his conversation an unyielding attachment to the doctrine of Jesus, thus bearing His image; and the more christians discover of this in one another, the more closely will they be knit together in the bonds of christian love and union; and where this exists, instead of opposition and persecution from their many enemies, having a tendency to untwist the chains that bind them together, it will but rivet them more firmly; lead them to speak often one to another, and endeavor to comfort and console each other with the rich promises of the gospel; to administer to each other's necessities; and to drive them often to a throne of grace, to tell God their sorrows.

Fellowship with God, and with one another, is what constitutes our happiness here below; but more particularly the former; for by it we have the promise made to us of a rich inheritance beyond the narrow bounds of time, when we shall be fully fitted to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; 'twas this that burst off the prison bonds of Paul and Silas, and lightened up their dark abode; 'twas this that made the burning furnace a pleasant palace for Shadrech, Meschec and Abednego; 'twas this that buoys up our fainting spirits, in our lonely sojournings. But when we meet the children of God

associated together for the worship of their Father, and enjoy the comfortable evidence that He is in the midst; we unite our melodies in praise to His name; we unite our supplications to a throne of grace; we are charmed alike with the gospel proclamation, and we are led to enquire, "From whence doth this union arise?" The answer can be found alone in Him who has made us one; and who has made it our desire to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of our lives; to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in His temple, Psa.27:4.

Our meeting has truly been a season of refreshing to our souls, having enjoyed, as we trust, the presence of our God, and the visits of a goodly number of our brethren. The letters from the churches express peace and love among themselves, and they seem to enjoy an unshaken confidence in God.

Finally, brethren, farewell. "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might."

S.TROTT.
Moderator. 1842.

ON THE REIGN OF CHRIST.

Circular Letter: The Baltimore Association of Old School Baptists, convened with the church at Black Rock, Md., May 18, 19 & 20, to the churches of which she is composed, greeting.

Time like some mighty whirlpool will sooner or later engulf all that floats in its channel. Every returning period tells of many that have already been swallowed up, and we too are hastening to the vortex. But while upon the surface we would indulge another opportunity afforded us of communicating with those we love of the things that make for our peace, as children of the same family, and things whereby one may edify another. Considering the uncertainty and many changing scenes of time, the thousand allurements and great oppositions that are in the world, the wily arts of the Devil with his armed legions, the lust of our flesh with its propensity to evil, and above all the rapid strides and boasting threats of the man of sin, it is thought there is no subject we can contemplate with greater pleasure or profit than that of the *Reign of Christ*. He is that King that Isaiah said should reign in righteousness and whose princes should rule in judgment. The prophets universally ascribe sovereignty to God, and David says, Psa.62:11, "God has spoken once; twice have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God." Christ, not as the

essential God, but as the head of His church and the executor of the Father's will possesses a delegated power, conferred upon Him for a special purpose and for a limited period, and the question as to how far that power extends or what it is made to effect, is one that forever separates between Christ and antichrist, or the children of God and the children of the Devil: the one believing it to be omnipotent, the other that it is limited; the one, that He does His pleasure and none can let Him; the other, that it is dependent for its execution upon the co-operation of His creatures; and while the saints are hailing Him as King of kings and Lord of lords, and rejoicing that there is one possessed of all power that careth for them; the whole antichristian brood are very busy in taking care of their little idol, which they call Jesus, and transporting him from one country to another. Now, in all the little that we may write upon this important subject, we wish to take divine inspiration as our guide, and in order to render the subject intelligible, we will briefly consider it in three branches, namely: Its extent, its nature and its duration. In considering first the extent of the reign of Christ, it is needful that we take into consideration the object for which it is conferred upon Him, in order to ascertain how far it was needful that power should extend. That object is declared in scripture, and that by Himself, to be that He should give eternal life to as many as the Father had given Him. These are in the world, have to do with the things of the world, stand connected with the rest of mankind, and have a frail and evil nature in common with all the human family. It therefore became necessary that Christ, in order to secure to them eternal life, should have unreserved control over all things that stand in the least degree connected with them, as it is written, "As thou hast given Him power over *all* flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given Him." John 17:2. Nor does He simply possess a power in earth and over flesh, but He informed His disciples after His resurrection from the dead that All power was given unto Him in *heaven* and in earth, Mt.28:18; by which we may learn that the eternal power of the Godhead, and whatever power the Prophets and the Psalmist speak of as belonging to God is involved in the mediatorial reign of Christ. Old Testament scriptures are therefore as applicable to define the power of Christ as those of the new, for "it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell." It is not to be expected that we should find in the scriptures an express declaration that the power of Christ embraces this, that, and the other particular thing or occurrence; it is enough that we find evidence of its extending to all things in all worlds. We have already shown that it

embraces heaven and earth, as Peter says, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him. It now remains to show that it extends over hell and the power there. He is regarded by us as the mighty angel that John saw descend with a great chain, and lay hold of the dragon, and bind him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up. The apostles having fulfilled their mission and returned on a certain occasion said, Lord, even the devils are subject to us through Thy name. This power is not only declared but acknowledged, for, said the devils to the seven sons of Sceva, Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye? We might here make a number of other quotations to the same import, but these are deemed sufficient. Here let us ask what comfort or enjoyment could christians feel in view of the storms and tempests that are howling around them, did they not know that in Jesus dwelt a power that rules the raging of the sea and stills its angry waves. What security could they feel in a world of opposition, did they not know that He made the wrath of man to praise Him, and restrained the rest. In short what hope could they have of final blessedness, but in the belief that Jesus holds the keys of hell and death, controls all the angry passions of their natures, and every being, every thing, and every act; whether standing in opposition or needful to be employed for their comfort. So they can unite their voices with, and make up that great multitude, many waters and mighty thunders spoken of in the book of Revelation, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. He reigns over Heaven, earth, and hell. The winds and the seas obey Him. The sparrows in their flight are moved and directed by His care, and not one of the countless hairs that deck our heads can fall or remain unmoved but by His government. His is a power to wound and a power to heal, a power to kill and a power to make alive, this is the King that saves His subjects and destroys their foes.

In the second place we are to consider the nature or character of this reign, and wish it borne in mind that there is no reign but His, for the kingdoms of this world are become "the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ," and Solomon says, Proverbs 8:15,16 - "By me kings reign and princes decree justice. By me princes rule and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." It is also written in the New Testament: There is no power, but of God. The powers that be, are ordained of God. We wish it also borne in mind that He reigns for the exclusive good of his people, His chosen. Isaiah has characterized His reign as a reign in righteousness. Whether we consider Him, then, as dethroning kings, or exalting to sceptres base and

blood thirsty tyrants; whether as sending wars with all the evils that follow in their train, or causing the clarion of peace and good will to men to be blown, still His reign is in righteousness, because so it seems good in His sight. "Righteous art thou, O Lord, and upright are thy judgments," Psalms 119:137. He governs the world by a power which they neither see nor acknowledge, and to describe it fully, would be beyond the capacity of angels. It is to His reign in Zion, where His power is both felt and acknowledged, that we would confine ourselves in treating upon this branch of our subject. It is there that He has laws, or more properly, a law, which is unchanging as His own eternal throne, and extending to all the subjects of His kingdom in all time and eternity too. It needs no fire and fagot, no sword or bayonet to enforce it; it exerts no tyrannical influence, holds to view no terrors; promises no rewards. It is not recorded upon tables of stone or pieces of parchment, and deposited in the archives of some moldering edifice; nor is it subject to abrogation or amendment like the laws of men. This law is the *law of love*. The promptings of this law are recorded in the New Testament; but let this be obliterated, let bonfires be lighted up with the pages of scripture, still the law is in their hearts and will teach them the way that they should go. Whilst then in the precepts and commandments of the New Testament, we have a transcript of the mind and will of God, they furnish us also with an expression of christian desire. They delight to do the will of God; a service called forth by any other law, either looks for a reward or dreads punishment; but this is all performed for the sake of Him who hath loved them and given Himself for them. If a man preaches truth and does not love it, he is no better off than if he had preached error, and he that practices morality and loves iniquity, is no better off than if he practiced iniquity. Self love has a governing influence over us in nature; but here: "the love of Christ constraineth us." But whence this love? Paul in his letter to the Romans informs us that it is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. So that, as Solomon says, If a man should give all the substance of his house for love, it would be utterly contemned. As it exists independent of the creature, so it operates independent of his mind and will. It extends to all the family of God and no further. It is therefore no marvel that christians cannot love those that give no evidence that they love God. But we now pass to the consideration of the third and last branch of our subject, which is, the duration of this reign. While we are utterly unable to find any limit to the extent of His reign, the scriptures justify us in fixing a period to its duration and this is no other than

the full completion of all that work for which His power was conferred upon Him. Viewing Him as Jehovah the scriptures speak of Him as reigning for ever and ever, but in His mediatorial character they figuratively speak of Him as reigning a thousand years. When that thousand years shall expire no man can tell; but certain it is that He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. When He shall have called up the slumbering bodies of His saints from their graves, and thus taken the prey from the mighty, then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power, See I Cor. 15:24; and when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all; verse 28. And now brethren, may we not rejoice in the universal power of Christ, since being controlled by His power no weapon that is formed against us shall prosper and every tongue that shall rise up in judgment against us we shall condemn. May we not confidently look for the complete glorification of all the election of grace since it is His will that they may behold His glory, and all power is His to execute that will. May we not rejoice in the nature of His reign, since, all His works being done in righteousness, all things work together for good to them that love God and are the called according to His purpose. Being by the law of love, we have nothing to dread from our many short comings and repeated wanderings; He heals our backslidings and loves us freely. He holds no threatening judgments over us; nor spurns us from His face.

“The poorer the wretch, the welcomer here.”

Lastly, may we not rejoice in the termination of that reign, since with its end will be the eternal overthrow of the kingdom of antichrist, the complete destruction of all enemies including the last, which is death, and the raising up of His church, both soul and body, to dwell with Him in bliss forever. Finally, brethren, farewell; the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

S.TROTT. 1848.

UNITY OF THE BRETHREN.

Circular Letter: *The Brethren assembled with the Mount Pleasant Church, Fairfax County, VA, August 9,10, 1849, in a Meeting for Correspondence: To the Churches, Associations and Corresponding Meetings, in correspondence with us, send this token of love.*

Beloved Brethren: - Having received and read your communications to us, we would reciprocate the correspondence by addressing our epistle to you in return. The Psalmist says: "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" Ps.133:1. In order to *unity*, they who dwell together, must be brethren, children of the same family, having a common interest. Such is the case with the children of God, when not bewildered; the truth of God, the order of His house as established by the Head, the peace and prosperity of Zion, are with them a common interest, as well as the joys and sorrows of the individual members. But when *strange children* get in among the household of faith, her *sons* become stunted in growth - her *daughters* lose their polish - her *oxen* become weak to labor - her *garners* become impoverished, and there is a breaking in, and going out, thus breeding confusion. These *strange children*, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and whose right hand is a right hand of falsehood, Ps.144:11, are children of the *strange woman*, Prov.7:5. How careful should we be to keep, and to be kept separate, from all religious intercourse with such, that our harmony and unity be not broken, and an interest averse to the interest of Zion be not set up in our midst. We have mentioned the truth of God, as one of the items connected with the *interest of Zion*, and which is of vast importance toward the brethren's dwelling together in unity. By the *truth of God*, we mean that which God has revealed as truth, and which is according to the standard of truth as He hath given it in the Scriptures. When we begin to bring in other standards, or the writings and opinions of men as standards, however eminent they were or may be, they are but the opinions of men, and we shall feel here to indulge in our partialities, as they did in the Church of Corinth, and one will say: I am of Paul, another, I am of Apollos, &c., and this will cause bickerings and divisions and wrestings of the words of Scripture to make them conform to our standards. But, when brethren are agreed to let the *thus saith the Lord*, and as

He has said it, decide all points, our unity in doctrine will then be preserved; as Watts says:

"This is the judge that ends the strife
Where wit and reason fail."

We have named, as another item in the interest of Zion, the order of His house as established by the Head, the one King of Zion. Where a number of heads are acknowledged, unless they form a unity among themselves by deciding by majorities, there will be conflicting orders, and clashings in practice. But where Christ alone is acknowledged as King, and His directions as the order, there will be no confusion, nor contention in the observance of the order of the house. In thus acknowledging Him alone as *King*, we render to Him no more than is His just due, both in reference to His claims on us, and to His claims to qualifications to be Head. This order includes ordinances, discipline, the choosing of officers, and the manner of their officiating, the meeting of the Church, the worship, the business transactions, and the manner of publishing the Gospel abroad. As we value the good of dwelling together in unity, let us therefore, be careful to observe its commands, to confine ourselves to them, and to His directions through Apostolic example for observing them.

We named, as a third item, *The peace and prosperity of Zion*, as belonging to the common interest of the children of Zion. In promoting the peace of Zion, and her prosperity, in the showing forth her salvation, in attracting those who love the Lord, within her borders, and in her being built up in purity and love, it is important that the several members should conduct themselves orderly, meekly and affectionately in the Church, and toward one another; that they see that the discipline of the Church be exercised faithfully and impartially, and that they submit when subject to it, quietly and patiently; that each be found occupying his proper gifts, station, or sphere in the Church; that in the support of the ministry, the relief of the poor, and in meeting other rightful demands for contributing of our temporal goods, none hold back through covetousness, but that each contribute freely as the Lord has prospered them; that the brethren show their love toward one another, by a manifest preference for each other's society, comfort and welfare, and that they be not estranged from these things by indulging in the love of the world, or by being entangled in alliances or pledges, with other societies, whether secret or otherwise; and further, that the brethren conduct themselves honestly, humbly, quietly and blamelessly toward

them that are without, and who may differ with us; and in all their intercourse with men, aiming to be governed by the directions in the New Testament. Brethren, if these things were so, would not the people of the world be again constrained to say, "Behold how these christians love one another!" And, if we were found fearlessly and earnestly contending for and bearing testimony to the faith once delivered to the saints; bearing patiently and quietly, the scoffs, reproaches, indignities and persecutions if they come, incident thereunto, from those who oppose the truth, would not others be made to acknowledge that we are actuated by another spirit than that of the world? And would we not then experience; *How good it is to dwell together in unity?*

Brethren, although the children of God are now somewhat scattered by localities, and perhaps worse, by different standards set up, and consequently different views of doctrine and order entertained, yet, even in this day of darkness, and of the scattering of the flock, our Churches are generally permitted to dwell together in a good degree of unity, and from time to time many of the brethren, from distant parts are permitted to meet together, and sit together, in a good degree of unity. How long we shall be permitted to enjoy these privileges, without for a little season being deprived of them, is known only to Him, who orders *all* events. But come, when it may, whilst it will come in accordance with prophecy, it will come as a just chastisement upon the Church and people of God, for permitting their unity to be so much marred by clinging to the creeds and systems of men as their standards, instead of *taking heed to the more sure word of prophecy*; and in other cases for suffering the peace of Churches to be broken by winking at, and countenancing disorderly walk among the members. It will also come as a needful fire, to purge away all this dross from the Churches. The seven thunders mentioned in Revelation, chapter 10, which are a prelude to the killing of the two Witnesses, are apparently sounding. Whether the *seven thunders* designate seven particularly astounding events, or whether they denote seven years duration of such events or rather, whether as is frequently the sense of the number seven in the Scriptures, it is here used to denote that *full* shaking of the governments of the world, necessary so to concentrate the powers and branches of antichrist, as to enable them to accomplish the killing of the Witnesses, we will not say. But, as before said, we think we hear the sound of the thunders, and hear the voice from Heaven, saying, *Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not*, in that such dark

obscurity hangs over every event which transpires, as that all the expectations and calculations made on the particular event, are disappointed. It is not improbable that some of these thunders, before they cease, may burst over the head of our government, and shake it to its foundation.

But, Brethren, let what will come, and come when it may; God grant that we may be found standing in our lots, being neither traitors nor cowards towards the cause of our Lord and His truth, but enduring hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. And may God, by His grace, so keep us from all corruption in doctrine, or in walk, that the enemy may have no evil thing to say of us justly

Our meeting has been pleasant; your ministering brethren came to us bringing the precious gospel of the grace of God in its fulness; our congregations have been large and quite attentive.

The Bethlehem Church having invited our next Meeting to be held with them, we have appointed to meet with them, to commence on Thursday, before the 2nd Lord's Day in August, 1850. We continue our cordial invitation to Churches, Corresponding Meetings and Associations, to meet with us by their Letters and Messengers, at that time and place.

S.TROTT.
Moderator. 1849.

THE LORD THY GOD WHICH TEACHETH THEE TO PROFIT.

Circular Letter: Of the Baltimore Old School Baptist Association to the churches of which she is composed.

Beloved Brethren: - As an expression of fellowship, we again address you in our Associational Circular. On this occasion we have selected as our subject the address to the Israel of God contained in Isaiah 48:17-19. "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go. O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments," &c. We understand spiritual Israel to be here particularly addressed. In the first verse of chapter 48 God addresses the house of Jacob, which art called by the name of Israel, &c., which swear by the name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth, nor in righteousness, &c., thus showing that national, and not the

true Israel are there addressed. Hence their idolatry and obstinacy, &c., are spoken of.

In verse 12th, and onward, the Lord addresses *Jacob and Israel His called*. Paul says, "But unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." I Cor.1:24. So that being *called* is distinctive in believers or the true Israel. Hence these are the people we think are addressed in the verses we have selected as our subject. In directing your attention to this subject, we will notice.

First. The person speaking, who being Israel's Redeemer, can be no other than the Messiah. Hence whilst He declares Himself to be the Lord, or Jehovah, *their God* {verse 17} as He is in truth the self-existing God, and whilst He claims the prerogatives of God, saying in verse 13, "Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens," &c; He in verse 16 saith, "And now the Lord God and His Spirit hath sent *me*;" thus showing that whilst He is Jehovah, God, He also exists in a relation personally distinct from the Lord God and His Spirit; and is the Messenger of God.

Secondly. The characters under which He speaks. - 1st. *The Lord thy Redeemer.* He is the Jehovah, whilst He is also *thy God, thy Near Kinsman*, who stood of course in this relation to thee, before thy thralldom; whose right therefore it was to redeem thee and who was not like Ruth's kinsman afraid of marrying His own *inheritance* in doing it; but who has accomplished thy redemption from all bondage and from all iniquity, by the sacrifice of Himself; and who is to thee, and for thee, all that righteousness which the law requires; who indeed gave Himself for thee, that He might in justice, be manifested as thy Lord and thy Husband. - 2nd. "The Holy One of Israel." He is to His people all that holiness in which they will shine through eternity, was to them all that holiness in which they stood before God from before the foundation of the world, as His body, His bride; being loved in Him, and in Him predestinated to the adoption of children. His blood is their purification from all pollution, and He in them is the principle of personal holiness and of love to God.

Thirdly, What He says. 1st. He says, "I am the Lord thy God, which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldest go." - As before noticed, Christ is truly the self-existing God, whilst He is He who was sent of the Father; and being God in Christ, He is as such peculiarly the object of His people's worship, trust, and love; is their God; whilst as such He is to all others the *unknown God*. As the *Root and*

offspring of David, He was given a Leader and Commander to the people. As such He *teaches* His people to *profit*. He by implanting His spirit in them, gives them spiritual discernment, gives them ears to hear, and hearts to understand, and when He speaks the word, whether He speaks through others, through the written word, or in visions of the night, they know it, and rejoice in it as the truth, whilst all other teaching but deludes. All that He teaches is good, and He teaches them all that is good or profitable for them to know, whether in relation to doctrine or practice. Let us then beware of other teaching. Which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go. As the Leader of His people, He goeth before them, and draws them with cords of a man, with bands of love. John 10:4 & Hosea 11:4. When He thus draws, they willingly run after Him. He does not lead His people to places of worldly rest and ease, but to the experience of tribulations and trials, to temptations and darkness, and thereby to the knowledge of the plague of their own hearts. He does not lead them to partake much of the applause, honors, &c, of the world, but to receive its reproaches and persecutions. He leads them to know the law, but He also leads them out from it, to the enjoyment of the privilege of sons of God. He leads them to death, but He will also lead them to participate in the joys of the resurrection. He leads them about through the way of the wilderness, but it is by a right way that they might go to a city of habitation. Ex.13:18 & Ps.107:7. He has gone before leading them in the way of patience, meekness, uprightness, holiness and self-denial. Both by precept and example He leads them into the ordinances in which they should go, and out from the traditions, and commandments of men. Where the footsteps of Jesus are seen going before, there is the right way. Where they are not found, there let His people not go.

2nd. He says, "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments," &c. All our Lord's instructions whether in relation to faith, or to acts of obedience, are with authority, hence they are here with propriety called commandments. So the Evangelist speaking of Christ's instructions to His disciples as recorded in Matthew, Chapter 10, says, chapter 11:1 - "And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding His disciples, He departed thence to teach, and to preach in their cities." His instructions came to the Jews as the preaching of men does to the world, but to those to whom He has given ears to hear and hearts to understand, they come as commands. But it may be asked: Do any of the people of God neglect to hearken to the instructions of Christ after having once received His commands with joy? We answer, the church,

the visible Israel of God, evidently has done it in two ways. First, she has neglected to adhere to the instructions received; and secondly, she has been much disposed, instead of hearkening to hear what He commands, to listen to the suggestions and commands of men. Thus, the churches of Galatia, instead of adhering to the gospel testimony, which they had no doubt once received with joy, proclaiming them *justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses*, were disposed again to return to the law. And so the church went on listening to the suggestions of reason, and the teachings of Satan's ministers, until the *man of sin* came full robed into power; and the bride the Lamb's wife had to retire from the pomp, the splendor and persecution of an established religion, to the wilderness, to find a lodging place. Still with all this evidence of the evil consequences of not hearkening to the commands of her Lord, the church has been too much disposed to hearken to the reasonings and commandments of men, even to this day. Hence instead of her peace flowing as a river, divisions and contentions prevail, instead of her true righteousness rolling on to view she is covering herself too much with *linsey-woolsey* or the flimsy stuff of human doings. We also think that individual believers have not as they ought, hearkened to the commands of the Lord, though times have been when His word was all precious to them, and they wanted nothing else for their comfort and directory. But enticers from without and from within have succeeded in turning away their ears from hearkening to His commands, and led them off from the simplicity of the word. Hence they have been bewildered and confused with the traditions and systems of men, have been contending for things that are not according to the word, or have found themselves walking in paths of disorder and disobedience, and to aggravate the wretchedness that has resulted, instead of the regular flow of peace and righteousness, Satan has charged these disorders home upon them, as evidences that they are not christians.

Then had thy peace been as a river and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea. We do not, brethren, understand by this complaint, that God has been disappointed, or His purpose at all frustrated by the disobedience of His church and people. On the contrary this very oppression and diminishing of His church is abundantly pointed out in prophesy; and these very trials of His people, are fully anticipated in the Scriptures. But we understand that it was designed to set forth on the one hand, the direct tendency of a faithful hearkening to the commands of the Lord in all things

pertaining to religion; namely, unity of faith and consequent peace. On the other hand, the evil consequences of seeking guidance and instruction in religion from any other source. *Then had thy peace been as a river.* A river flows on in a constant current, bearing down and overcoming every obstacle to its progress. Such would have been the peace of the church had they uniformly been disposed undeviatingly to have hearkened to the commands of the Lord, and suffered no opinions of men to usurp the place of His instructions. Not its external peace with the world, for in this sense Christ *came not to send peace, but a sword*, {Mt.10:34,} but peace within, a oneness of mind and heart. *And thy righteousness as the waves of the sea.* The sea is in constant motion, and its waves or swells are therefore constantly rolling on in regular succession. So would their righteousness have been constantly rolling on to view, that is, *The Lord their righteousness*, in all their preaching, in all their conversation, in all their approaches to God. *Thy seed also had been as the sand and the offspring of thy bowels as the gravel thereof.* Instead of multitudes of the children of God having been led off with the various sects that separated from the Apostles' doctrine and order, and multitudes more being deterred from making a profession, by the divisions among the professed disciples of Christ, there would have been but one doctrine, one order, one professed church of Christ, and all the children of God should *have been borne upon her sides, dandled upon her knees; and sucked and been satisfied with the breasts of her consolations.* See Isa.66:11 & 12. And who will say that in that case her seed would not have been manifested to be numerous as the sand of the sea?

His name should not have been cut off, nor destroyed from before me. Instead of the expression as it stands in the text, *should not have been cut off, &c.*, in the margins of some Bibles we read, *Shall not be cut off, &c.* This we think is the correct reading of the text because it corresponds with the declaration of our Lord - "Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Mt.16:18. It also corresponds with what is said in the next verse, "Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the ends of the earth, say ye, The Lord hath redeemed His servant Jacob." So that instead of Jacob or Israel's being *cut off* for his rebellion, he is yet to be redeemed and come forth from *Babylon*, or from all the *confusion* occasioned by the *man of sin*. How rich and free the grace and mercy of our God!

Now, brethren, we see and we lament that there are discords among the O.S. Baptists. Whilst instead of *hearkening to the Lord's commandments*, we say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ*, and suffer opinions, whether our own or of other men, to govern us, can we expect our *peace to flow like a river*? Opinions of men always have, and always will conflict one with another. If then we were to stop all means of public correspondence, whilst each is swayed by opinion, can we *be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment*? Methods were resorted to in the earlier ages of the church, for supplying the place of the remedy pointed out in our text, to produce unity of faith and practice in the church. Councils were called, Creeds and Confessions of Faith were formed, ceremonies and forms were agreed upon, and the observance of these was attempted to be enforced by laws and persecutions; but all would not do. Do you ask why? We answer, that all of the children of Zion are to some extent taught of the Lord, and are led more or less to wait on Him for further teaching, and so far as He reveals to their faith His doctrine or order, or any point thereof, all the fetters and chains which men may forge will not bind their consciences to prevent their testifying to that which they know is truth, nor against what they know is error. Could we give up all contending for opinions, if we have occasion to mention them, mention them only as opinions, as it is written, *The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream*, and contend only for what we have been taught of God to know is truth, then would contentions cease among us; for the Spirit of truth cannot give different views on the same subject to different persons; though He may give more extended views of scripture to one than another. It may be asked, How are we to distinguish what is taught us of the Lord, from what is merely made up opinion? We answer, there are certain things which every child of grace so knows to be the truth, that neither the sophistry, nor wrath of man can lead him to deny them. He knows that he did not attain this knowledge of them from men, nor from books, except, it may be, instrumentally, and that he did not reason himself into it. He was taught it internally; there was an enlightening of the mind to see, to taste and feel that it was truth and that the Scriptures bore testimony to it. And since the first revelation of Christ to him as the way, he has in like manner had his understanding enlarged in the knowledge of the Scriptures on particular points. There is an exercise of faith in the thing, a knowing that it is God's truth. When he states these things and points to the Scriptures which he has seen as so clearly sustaining their truth, he does it with

confidence, feeling that he is girt about with truth. But it is not enough to have an internal impression, there must be an opening of the Scriptures to view as sustaining it. If there were with us more of a waiting to *hear what God the Lord will say*, and of hearkening to His commandments, then might we look for unity and peace. It is not however probable, that we shall altogether be divested of our attachment to human opinions, whilst the church remains encompassed by Babylon. But if we cannot agree in opinions, let us try to *love as brethren*, to be *courteous*, and not to give place to anger and bitterness, nor to a wresting and distorting of each other's views, that we may put down by prejudices what we cannot confute by argument. And let us remember for our comfort that amidst all the confusion, Jesus will in His own good time show Himself as walking upon the waves, and will hush all to peace.

S.TROTT. 1850.

THE LORD SHALL COMFORT ZION.

Circular Letter & Corresponding Letter.

The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association, to the several churches of which she is composed, send Christian salutation.

Beloved Brethren: - As an expression of our fellowship, we again address you in our associational circular, and on this occasion we have selected as the theme or subject of our address, the following declaration made in the scriptures concerning Zion: "The Lord shall comfort Zion." Isa.51:3.

In this passage we find four things which demand the attention of the redeemed of the Lord. First: Zion, which is to be comforted. Second: Zion's Comforter. Third: The absolute character of the promise. Fourth: The Comfort promised. May the Lord by His Spirit guide both writer and reader into the experimental enjoyment of the subject under consideration.

First: Zion, or the city of David, see I Kings 8:1, is frequently used in the scriptures as a type of the church of Christ, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all; and we regard it as a very beautiful and instructing figure: first, from the meaning of the word *Zion*, which signifies a *monument raised up*. The church of Christ is truly a monument raised up and founded on the eternal purpose of God, based on His unchanging love, secured against all evil by His omnipotence. Every individual believer is a monument of grace, seen and read of all men. The whole church forms a

monument which shall remain resplendent in glory when all the glories of this world, yea, when the creation itself shall no longer exist. But, some will say, the word Zion, means a *heap of stones* - rough, unpolished, useless. Do they come from nature's quarry? Are they not made living stones and polished by divine grace? They are raised up as the spiritual seed of Abraham, and built upon the foundation which God hath laid. Each stone, whether great or small occupies the place which was from eternity assigned it, by the great Architect, who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. But again, Zion is emblematic of the church in being the object of God's peculiar love. See Psa.87:2 - "The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob," and even so hath He loved the church; yea, "He loved the people." Deut.33:3. And He so loved them that He gave His Son to die for them. I John 4:10. And although the Lord's tender mercy is over all His works, so as to supply all His creatures with food and raiment; yet His love for His church is peculiarly manifested in providing for them in an everlasting covenant, spiritual food and raiment in the Person and righteousness of His dearly beloved and only begotten Son. Zion is the object of God's choice. Psa.132:13 - "The Lord hath chosen Zion." So hath He chosen the church in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world. Eph.1:4. Zion is well garrisoned: "Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof; Mark well her bulwarks." Psa.48:12. So also is the church. Her walls are Salvation, and her gates Praise. The Lord will be a wall of fire round about her. God, with all His wisdom, power, love, mercy, longsuffering and goodness is for her; who can be against her? She has watchmen upon her walls, to warn her of danger, and they have a trumpet on which to blow *a certain sound*, that her inhabitants may prepare for battle.

Second: Let us notice Zion's Comforter. And this is the Lord: He is God the Father; for all her comfort, all her joy, and all her hope springs from the heart of Jehovah, the Father, and descend to her through the Son, whom He declares to be: "Lord, to the glory of the Father." For in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. All spiritual blessings were given to the church in Him, and of His fulness they all receive their strength, light, hope, joy and peace. These are all in Him in their fulness; and for the use of thirsting souls, to whom they are applied by the Spirit who is expressly called the Comforter. John 14:15-17. Because His covenant engagements are to give the church a knowledge and enjoyment of her most gracious Lord and Master.

Third: We will now glance at the absolute promise of God: "The Lord shall comfort Zion." All the promises of God in Christ Jesus are yea, and in Him, Amen. That is, they are sure and certain, irrevocable and irrevocable to all the promised seed of Abraham. And the nature and attributes of Jehovah confirm the same. For if Jehovah, the Father hath given comfort, the Son received the same, and the Spirit engaged to communicate it to the hearts of the elect. Jehovah being unchangeable in His nature, is consequently immutable in these wonderful acts, whereby the comfort of the church is secured. Not dependent on any contingency or uncertainty: for God has so arranged from even the most trying circumstances of their lives. If the comfort of Zion depended on her deserts, she would indeed be comfortless; or if it depended on her improvement of anything committed to her care, she would be destitute; for she feels daily and hourly that she can only stand as she is held up, and only use what is given to her; for the Spirit of God works in her both to will and to do of His own good pleasure.

Fourth: We will now offer a few remarks on the comfort, and the manner in which the Lord applies it to Zion. It is by His word, by the ministry, and by the direct agency of the Holy Ghost. 1. The Lord comforts His people by His word when it quickens them, as it did David, Psa.119:50, and when through patience and comfort thereof they have hope. Rom.15:4. Seeing themselves, in the early stage of their conversion, and in their daily falls into sin, to be altogether helpless, they imagine themselves to be in a hopeless state, until by the word, they see the foundation of hope to be not in themselves, but in Jesus Christ the Lord. 2. He comforts them by the ministry, when a full and free salvation is proclaimed, as in Isaiah 40:11 - "He shall feed His flock like a Shepherd," &c, and when His ministers have been led into trouble, and comforted, expressly that they might be enabled to comfort those who are in any tribulation, with the same comfort wherewith they themselves are comforted of God. II Cor.1:3,4. But neither the word, nor the ministry, valuable as they are, can afford any comfort, only as instruments in the hands of God, by His Spirit. Now all the comfort of Zion's citizens consists in relying *entirely* on Christ in every emergency, and in all trying circumstances. 3. The Holy Ghost becomes a Comforter in testifying of Christ, and by leading the soul to Him. Are any suffering under a sense of indwelling corruptions; He leads them to Jesus for sanctification. Are they naked; He leads them to Jesus for the mantle of His righteousness. Are they hungry; He leads them to Jesus for the bread of life. Are

they weak; He teaches them to rely wholly upon that strength which is made perfect in their weakness.

Fear not then, ye drooping, doubting and desponding saints; for *Christ is All*. The Father hath given you all. The Holy Ghost is engaged to bring you to Him; and thus the Lord *shall* comfort Zion, and all her children shall rejoice. Yet a little while, and the Lord God shall wipe away all tears from their faces, and lead them to fountains of delight, to cast their crowns at His feet, and praise Him forever and ever, even so, amen, and amen.

Corresponding Letter.

Dear Brethren: - Agreeably to our last year's appointment, we have been indulged of our Heavenly Father with the privilege of once more meeting together; and considering our ingratitude and many short comings, of which each church, and each individual member among us will plead guilty, and stand convicted. We are amazed at the goodness of God in granting us privileges so inestimable. Yet, we enquire on the other hand, if while we were dead in sins, God so loved us as to give His Son to die for us, will He not also with Him freely give us all things? Cold, ungrateful, and indifferent as we are, we do feel an assurance that we hold and love the truth as it is in Jesus. For our attachment to what we understand to be the doctrine and order of the gospel, and our opposition to the innovations and inventions of men, we have not only to endure the persecutions of men made religionists, but to resist the popular current of the world. All this we could well bear and even rejoice in knowing as we do that it is a part of the saint's inheritance on earth; but the Lord seems to have in a measure withdrawn His presence from us, and because of this we mourn. Many of the churches in our connection, have, from the ravages of death and other causes dwindled down to a mere moiety, while some have entirely disbanded, and we are in a great measure dependent for ministerial gifts, on other associations. The evidences of the power of divine grace are few and far between, and our harps are hung upon the willows; but amidst the raging storm, to whom shall we look so confidently as to Him "who rides upon the stormy sky, and thunders when He please." Perhaps these things may be to prove our steadfastness in the stand we have taken; or it may be that the Lord is about finishing His work in this part of the land, and that the gospel, like the sun, arose in the East, and is traveling on to the West, leaving us to repose in its evening

shade. Let the purpose of our God be what it may, we desire to still contend for His truth, submit patiently to all His will, and live upon the assurance that all things work together for good to them that love God, and are the called according to His purpose.

Our meeting, which is drawing to a close, has been one of unusual comfort and christian enjoyment. Your messengers and ministers who have come to us have brought us the pleasing intelligence that you are enabled in some good degree to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. The preaching that we have had has been of Christ, and His salvation, without a jarring note.

Our next Association will be held, the Lord willing, with the church at Harford, Harford County, Md., to commence on the Thursday preceding the third Sunday in May, 1852, at 10 o'clock, a.m., when and where we hope to receive a continuance of your correspondence.

S.TROTT.
Moderator. 1851.

GOD'S GRACE.

Corresponding Letter: The Corresponding Association of Old School Baptists held with the church at Occoquan, Prince Wm. Co., VA., August 7, 8 & 9th, 1851, to all Old School brethren, churches and associations in correspondence with us, sendeth Christian salutation.

Beloved Brethren: - In the providence of God we are once more permitted to meet on the shores of time, and according to a long established custom, we send you this our annual epistle; in which we would offer a few remarks upon the subject of *God's Grace*.

This is a theme upon which ministers have declaimed, sages mused, and poets sung, in ages that are past, and yet the tale remains untold, and is one of the few subjects upon which repetition is not irksome; its sound is still charming, its effects still transporting to the children of God. Near six thousand years ago in the land of Asia, now wrapped in heathenish night, and under the influence of blind idolatry, appeared a solitary individual making an offering to God, expressive of his faith in the doctrine of salvation by grace, and incurring at once the approbation of his God, and the enmity of his brother, who offered the result of his own labor. Four thousand years subsequent was seen and heard in the

same country, a meek, quiet, unassuming individual, bearing indubitable testimony of having been sent of God, yea of being God Himself made manifest in the flesh, proclaiming to the world in a voice so loud that the sound has even reached us of the Nineteenth Century, that there is no Salvation but by grace; yet there are found multitudes who like their ancient brother Cain, think to obtain salvation by their own works. It is true, they talk about grace, about obtaining it, and losing it, obtaining it by good works, and forfeiting it either by bad, or by neglecting to attend to those things which are reputed good. But brethren, we have not so learned Christ, we have not been taught to regard this grace as a commodity which may be obtained at a price, or upon conditions, but as the act of a Sovereign God having mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and hardening whom He will. The qualifying or distinguishing terms: Free, sovereign, &c., are not found in the Scriptures, are deemed wholly superfluous and unnecessary, because all the acts of God, whether of a gracious or other character are sovereign and free. Sovereign, because His will is the standard of His own acts; and all that He does is right, because so it seemed good in His sight. Free, because He requires nothing of His creatures as a return for what He does for them; and because an act ceases to be gracious when it ceases to be free. Salvation is either of works or of grace, for there is no affinity between the two. If it be of works, it is no more of grace; if of grace, it is no more of works, and the question is settled in the scriptures, and in the experience of the children of God, that salvation is of grace. In a state of nature they have no evidences of being interested in the favor of God, but what are common to the rest of mankind. They are fed and clothed, protected and defended in Providence, and so are the rest of mankind, the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea. The raven and the lion both seek their meat from God; but they are no less interested in this grace because they are ignorant of it; nor do they partake of it any more freely because they know it. Prior to regeneration, they ascribe all their destiny to their own skillful or unskillful management {as the case may be} of their own affairs; but after regeneration, they say, as Paul said, "By the grace of God I am what I am." And what was he? An apostle, a minister of the gospel, a persecuted and afflicted saint, a prisoner in bonds, enduring the buffeting of Satan, in perils, by land and in perils by sea, in perils among false brethren, and carrying about continually a body of death that made him wretched, &c., and yet the grace of God had made him what he was. Every act of God expressive of kindness or favor is an

act of grace; and every act performed upon or in relation to His chosen people is an act of this kind. All the provisions necessary to their eternal salvation were made in Christ, while they were yet in a state of nonentity, yea, from all eternity. For their sakes the foundations of the earth were laid; light and darkness, life and death, evil and good, angels, men and devils, and all things present, past and to come, are so many expressions of God's grace to His people. And they are assured, through the apostle Paul, that no creature shall be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus. What though they fell in Adam, and became dead in trespasses and sins? It was in full view of this state that God loved them with a perfect love, and made for them all that rich provision of grace of which we read in the Scriptures. What though when born they go astray from the womb, and run into all the excesses of riot and debauchery to which their depraved natures incline them? God's grace is commended to them in that while they were yet sinners Christ died for them. What though being dead they are unable to know or appreciate His kindness towards them? God's grace has made provision for their being quickened into life; but not through the means of a preached gospel as some suppose, for to admit this would be to deny that any were quickened until about eighteen hundred years ago when the gospel first began to be preached; or that any have been quickened since only where the gospel has been preached. To us such an idea savors more of the language of Ashdod or Arminianism than of being a mere different form of expression, to express the same idea with those who contend that the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead *shall* hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear *shall* live. What though being quickened they are left to feel themselves exposed to wrath under the sentence of God's violated law and borne down by a weight of guilt sufficient to sink a world to hell? There is in store for them, as the fruit of God's grace, a righteousness which shall hide all their shame, a sacrifice that shall atone for all their sins, and a victim that their faith shall behold, enduring all the wrath that was due to them. What though in the christian pilgrimage they meet with sore temptations and dire afflictions? My grace, saith God, shall be sufficient for them. They shall glory in infirmity, and in weakness shall be made strong. Affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground. Job 5:6; but these are sent in loving kindness and tender mercy, for God has promised to be with them in six, and not to forsake them in the seventh. When His providence seems to frown and bear strong marks of displeasure, yet while He

chastens He loves, and works all things together for good to them who are the called according to His purpose. That grace therefore which ordained the plan of salvation for God's elect, shall be their companion and comfort through this vale of tears; their support in death, and it has in store for them in heaven an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and cannot fade away. May we not then joyfully sing,

"O to grace how great a debtor!"

Our meeting, whilst it has been one of peace and pleasant intercourse together, has been one well calculated to lead us to mourn over the desolations of Zion; but few churches united in the correspondence this year, and messengers from but one association, were in attendance with us. Whilst we mourn before God the causes of the thinness of our meeting in reference to brethren, we would not repine; we sometimes feel that if our brethren abroad knew us as we know ourselves they would not care to associate with us. And when we contemplate God's dispensation in this affair, instead of repining we have ground for great thankfulness to Him that He is still granting us the privilege of meeting together in peace, of receiving epistles of love from a few sister churches, which are indeed little flocks, surrounded by wolves, and having nothing to hope for, but from God's rich grace in Christ, and His protecting care; and from two or three associations. Though we have but little to commend us to the favorable notice of our brethren abroad, yet we feel a desire for a continuance, and even extension of the correspondence of churches, corresponding meetings and associations who are united with us, in the glorious doctrine of salvation by the grace of God, and in that order marked out in the New Testament. And would therefore say again; Brethren visit us with your letters of christian affection, and your messengers, at our next meeting to be held with the Frying-pan Church, Fairfax Co., VA., to commence on the Thursday before the 2nd Lord's day in August, 1852, at 11 o'clock, A.M.

S.TROTT. 1851.

SAVED BY THE LORD.

Corresponding Letter: *The Fryingpan Old School Baptist Church and the churches and brethren uniting with her in a meeting for correspondence, - To the churches and Associations corresponding with us together, with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and walk in truth: Send brotherly greetings.*

Beloved Brethren: - In addressing to you this our letter of correspondence, we would call your attention to the declaration found in Deut.33 - part of verse 29, as a theme of contemplation. "Happy art thou O, Israel: who is like unto thee, O, people, saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency."

Moses having in the preceding part of the chapter pronounced prophetically a blessing upon each tribe severally, then addresses Israel collectively, first as *Jeshurun*, and in the text above quoted as *Israel*.

"*Happy art thou O, Israel.*" Israel is here addressed as singular, as one whilst she is spoken of as a people. Wherein was this unity found but in him to whom this name Israel was given, and from whom as his posterity they inherited it, together with the blessing therein implied? This was evidently the case with national Israel, and can be no less so with spiritual Israel the antitype. At the time Jacob received this name he was in very straightened circumstances. He had just received word that his brother Esau was coming to meet him, and four hundred men with him; he knew Esau's enmity against him, he no doubt felt conscious of the provocation he had given him. He therefore feared that himself, his wives and children and all that he had would fall a prey to Esau's vengeance. After making certain arrangements, and having sent all over the brook, "Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day, and when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh, and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh, And he said I will not let thee go except thou bless me. And he said, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." Gen.32:24 - 28. This has all undoubtedly a typical reference to the spiritual Israel, but we cannot now go into a full illustration of it, lest it swell our letter to too

great a length. We will remark that Jacob's posterity were all involved in his sin toward Esau, and in the threatened vengeance, and in his prevailing to clear away his sin before God, and to have Esau's enmity subdued, his posterity, those already born, as well as those that should be born after, participated in the same blessing. Hence the name *Israel* was attached to them, and so recognized of God. Exod.4:22 - "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn." Now brethren, would we not insult your feelings, were we to ask you whether as spiritual Israelites, you in your own persons, as *princes have power with God and with men*? How then have you prevailed, and have been manifested as Israelites? National Israel as we have seen thus prevailed in an eternal sense and obtained the name Israel through and in their immediate head Jacob. Have we not a Head, a Jacob through whom as Israelites we have power with God and with men? Jacob was so named from the circumstance of his hand's taking hold of Esau's heel. Esau as from his names, Esau and Edom, as well as from his being the first born and being disappointed of the blessing was evidently typical of national Israel as manifested under the Sinai covenant. Had not Christ hold of the heel of national Israel, in all the manifestation or birth of that people from the promise to Abraham to give him a seed on through the giving of the law with all its ceremonies and forms? That is, was not all, designed to prefigure the coming of the Messiah, and to introduce Him to the view of faith as well as to prepare the way for His manifestation in the flesh? Thus we see His hand hold of Esau's heel in the declaration to Abraham, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," as well as in His being the substance of all the sacrifices of the law. Again Jacob was distinguished as the *elect* of God. See Rom.9:10, 13. So Christ is declared as the *elect* of God. See Isa.42:1 & 65:9. But the posterity of Jacob were elected in him to be participants in the blessing of Isaac, and that whilst Jacob was yet in the womb, and therefore it must be as they existed in him, and hence it was said to Rebekah: "Two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels" which could only immediately have taken place in the birth of Esau and Jacob. Gen.25:23. So the children of God are said to have been *chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world*. See Eph.1:4. If before the *foundation of the world*, of course when He only, as their life existed in God, before sin existed and therefore before He could be manifested or declared in the world. And if then chosen *in Him*, it must have been, that according to the type, they were chosen in His election, and

must have existed in Him and were a distinct *manner of people* in time to proceed from Him. Brethren, is it not in Christ and in Him only, that you find your Israel, your *power with God and with men*? Is it not alone through His atonement, and intercession that you have confidence to approach God with your supplications, and hope for acceptance with Him? Is it not *Christ in you the hope of glory. Christ living in you* {Col.1:27, Gal.2:20} that gives you the victory over the old man and over the allurements and opposition of men? Or is it from some new strength that you have obtained of your own? In other words, Is that *faith which is the victory* &c. a faith of your own, or is it not the *faith of the Son of God*? See Gal.2:16, 20. Happy indeed art thou, O, Israel; thy life being one with the Son of God. I John 5:12. Christ being thy life, thy salvation and righteousness, no curse can now reach thee, nor any plague come nigh thy dwelling in a spiritual sense. The blessing of God rests upon thy head and therefore upon His body and upon each member thereof. Thy very afflictions are blessings, and not in disguise neither, but often seen openly as such.

"Who is like thee, O, people saved by the Lord?" Truly in all times, the spiritual Israel, the members and body of Christ, have been singular, a different manner of people from others, in their salvation. Saved by the Lord, by Jehovah as it is in the original. As He is, as His name signifies, self-existent, He is all that He is, absolutely of Himself, therefore in the manifestation of Himself in His power, in His grace, or in His holiness, or in His love and mercy, He cannot be controlled, influenced, nor helped by any other, nor governed in the manifestations of any of His attributes, but by His own purpose and His purpose and design, must be like Himself eternal. Hence His people in being brought to know His salvation, are brought off from every idea of conditions. Their repentance instead of being viewed by them as a condition, is in itself a turning with loathing from every doing and exercise, yea from their whole Adamic nature, with all its works and faculties, as being depraved and rendering them unworthy of the favor of God. Instead of viewing their faith as a means of their salvation it gives them to see their salvation as already complete in Christ Jesus, that He is that salvation, {Isa.62:11} so that we might as well talk of faith's being the means of Christ's existence, as of its being the means of salvation. As we are saved by Jehovah, Christ must be, and is Jehovah, existing of Himself, and not of another. If the life which *is the light of men, was in Him in the beginning*, He was still the Word and the *Word was God*. If He is the only begotten Son, He is in the bosom of the Father, He and the Father are one. John 1:18 & 10:30. Hence the life of

believers is hid with Christ in God. If Christ is in His people, the hope of glory liveth in them. Col.1:27, Gal.2:20. God, even the Father is in them there, "I in them, and thou in me." John 17:23. If that as the Mediator, He might make that offering to law and justice which was required for the redemption of His people. He partook with them of *flesh and blood*, He was still, *God manifest in the flesh*. Contemplate the salvation of Israel as you may as completed in Christ or as existing experimentally in the believer, his hope of glory, it is by the Lord; it was His purpose, it is all His work, all that was necessary for accomplishing it, He provided in Himself, and communicates it with Himself as the life, to His people, as His body. Hence the *church* of which He is Head is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Eph.1:22, 23. Who then is like thee, O, people? Who is there of all the shades of religion in the world that do not manifest their opposition to Thy salvation? "The shield of thy help." That is, Jehovah is the shield &c. Israel by his relation to Adam was ruined, condemned and helpless. But God laid help upon one that is mighty, exalted one chosen out of the people. Psal.89:19. By David in this connection, we are evidently to understand the antitype of David, He who was David's Lord and Son, Jesus Christ as we have showed is mighty as the Jehovah, and He is called the Mighty God, Isa.9:6. Help was laid on Him, in that He was appointed the Surety of the better testament, a Mediator between God and men, and the High Priest of our profession. Israelites are made to know by experience that all their help must come from Him. As He said to His disciples "Without me ye can do nothing;" {John 15:5} and that they can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth them. Phil 4:13. And Christ says, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

A shield is an armour of defense. Christ as the helper of His people was assaulted with the wrath of the law, it met Him at His birth and pursued Him to His tomb. He was assaulted by all the rage of Satan. Nothing short of the Godhead could have sustained Him under the assaults and enabled Him to triumph over them, and to bring His body the church out with Him unharmed from the contest. The help itself, the salvation of Israel is assaulted by many enemies, external and internal, but Jehovah shields it. "He that keepeth Israel, &c., Psal.121:4,5. "And who is the sword of thy excellency." The word here rendered excellency, signifies exalted, or exaltation. In the passage already quoted, Psal.89:19 where David is spoken of as the type of Christ, it is written: "I have exalted one chosen out of the people." David was chosen from among his brethren and exalted to the throne of Israel. So Christ is manifested as

one with His brethren. Thus, it is written: "For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren." Heb.2:11. And thus Christ said to Mary; "Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." John 20:17. Here He fully acknowledges a brotherhood with His disciples, as having with them one common Father, and one God. Not only this, but it is also written that: "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death, &c." Heb.2:14. In the foregoing verses He had both acknowledged them as brethren and as children, and thus claims a father and a brother's right to redeem them. And that the law might recognize His right to redeem, and accept of satisfaction at His hands He came into the law place of the children by taking part of the flesh and blood of which they partook and in which they had sinned. He thus humbled Himself to come under the law, both as God {Phil.2:6,7} and as the Son. Hence it is written: "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered." Heb.5:8. His humiliation thus was the ground of His exaltation as spoken of in the text above quoted from Psal.89. See Eph. 4:9 & 10, and Phil.2:6 - 10. As the condemnation of Christ to death lawfully, could only be by His standing in that relation to His people as their life, by which the law could hold Him as one with them and their sins as the sins of His body and members, and hence could inflict the penalty on Him. If their sins were not thus considered as His, how could David when speaking of Christ in Psal.40 represent Him in verse 12, as saying "Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head, &c." Christ individually had no sin.

If then Christ is so one with His people, He the life and head, and they the body and members in particular, {I Cor.12:12-27}, that their sins were His, did not Paul rightly say "I am crucified with Christ"? Gal.2:20. If crucified together, were they not raised up together? Hear what Paul testifies: "But God who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, {by grace ye are saved;} and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Eph.2:4-6. Notice that this quickening, this raising &c., is not only together with Christ, but it is *in Christ Jesus*, it must therefore have been in His being quickened, in His being raised; and therefore as one with Him. And who is it that has the presumption to call in question a truth so divinely

testified to by an inspired Apostle? In the exaltation or excellency of Israel; the Lord is the sword of this excellency. By this sword, by the power of His self-existent Godhead, Christ cut His way through the curse of the law, through death and the grave to the exaltation of His people. This sword was stronger than the flaming sword placed at the east of Eden. Jesus by His death vanquished that. The religion of Christ is a living and experimental religion; it is not to be supposed that Christ as the head and life of His people hath ascended to glory with the purpose of leaving His body or a single member of His body behind. The head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you. I Cor.12:21. As every member of a body is quickened by the same life which animates the head, so every member of Christ's body must be quickened with that life which animates Him as the head, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His," and they must be born of the seed of Abraham, of Israel, or they are not Israelites. Again the saints must be kept and their bodies raised spiritual bodies before they can participate individually in the glory, the exaltation of Christ. But when we consider that Jehovah Himself is the sword by which this excellency, this high exaltation is achieved, who can doubt its accomplishment, whatever obstacles we see in the way, whether within us or without?

Brethren, this is the salvation in which we believe, and to which we would bear our testimony. It meets with opposition and false representations even from some who once professedly walked in fellowship with us. But we rejoice to know and to testify that this is the God we worship, the Saviour we adore, the Mediator in whom we trust. Even Him of whom John testifies that , "This is the true God and eternal life." I John 5:20. Therefore though reviled and reproached, we would rejoice in the consolations of our trust.

Our meeting which is drawing to a close has been truly refreshing and comforting to us, we have been highly grateful at receiving a goodly number of corresponding messengers from our sister associations, ministers and other brethren. The preaching that we have had has been of Christ and His salvation and in opposition to all the attempts of men to save themselves; so that we have been made to think the language of Moses to Israel applies to us. "Happy art thou O Israel, who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help and the sword of thine excellency."

To our sister Associations we would say, we desire a continuance of your correspondence by minutes and messengers. Our next association will be held by appointment,

the Lord willing, with the church at Mt. Pleasant Fairfax Co. Va.
on Thursday before the second Lord's Day in August 1853.

S.TROTT.
Moderator. 1852.

THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT MADE FOR SIN.

Circular Letter: The Corresponding Association of Old School Baptists, held with the church at Mount Pleasant, to her brethren scattered abroad sends greeting.

Dear Brethren: - It is under peculiar and trying circumstances that we address you in this our annual epistle. Peculiar because hitherto we have been permitted to regard all who wear the cognomen of *Old School* as being partakers of our joys and sorrows and although not particularly connected in our correspondence, we felt that their God was our God, and their Christ our Christ. Trying because, we have seen such a disposition for strife manifested by many, and to set up new and unheard of tests of fellowship, so that instead of feeling assured as formerly that we have the prayers and sympathies of many with whom we have been in habit of associating as brethren, some have withdrawn themselves from us, who, if they read our epistles at all, read them for criticism and not for edification. And why this strife? Or whence these estranged feelings? It is difficult for us to believe that the principles of the religion of Christ or the fruits of the spirit are productive of such results, we must therefore look to a departure from those principles and to the depraved nature of man, to find an origin for such a state of things. We are all doubtless striving for the faith of the gospel, but are we according to the apostles admonition striving together? And not rather about a difference of *opinion* upon extraneous matters that do not effect the principles of the faith of the gospel? The limits of a circular forbid that we should notice all the points upon which a difference of opinion exists, nor do we think it necessary; but we would call your attention to the Nature of that Atonement or Sacrifice which has been made for Sin. In doing which we will try to divest ourselves of all preconceived *opinions* and utterly disregarding the views or opinions of others, take the scriptures as the man of our counsel, as the lamp to our feet and the light of our path. Whilst we have but little hope of being able to reconcile conflicting views upon this subject, we

pray you brethren to hear us patiently and weigh well the scriptural evidence we bring in support of our views, before you judge us harshly or decide that we are heretics. We are perhaps all agreed that the sacrifice upon which sinners alone can have any hope of acceptance with God, is that of His own Son, this at any rate is the position we occupy, and as we do not intend to advance a single idea unsustained by the scriptures of truth we will before we proceed further, introduce some scripture proof relative to this point.

In Romans 5:10, it is recorded: "We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son." Rom.8:3 - "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh" and 8:32 - "He that spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all." Gal.4:4 - "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son made of a woman, &c. I John 4:9 - "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him," see 10th verse also. The point being fully established, we next proceed to enquire what constitutes the Son of God? Was it the human nature in which He appeared, the Deity and humanity combined, or was it a real existence as the first born among many brethren. If the human nature alone, then as a matter of course there was no such thing as the Son of God until He was thus curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth, see Psa.139:15. If it be the deity and humanity united, then there was no Son until this union took place. And do the scriptures authorize us to believe that 4000 years of time should roll away and that Abel, Noah, Lot, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Gideon, Barak, Sampson and all the long train of patriarchs and prophets should live and die without any real Redeemer, but such as existed merely in the design and purpose of God. No, but on the contrary we hear Christ declare: "Before Abraham was, I am." We cannot therefore think it was the seed of Abraham which He took upon Him, but rather, He that took the seed of Abraham was the Son of God. This conclusion we find sustained by scriptures both of the old and new testament, not only as being before Abraham, but before all things, and by whom all things consist. When four men were seen walking in the fiery furnace, it was said that the form of the fourth was like the Son of God; and how we ask, could there be a likeness of that which had no existence? In Proverbs 8:23 {where it is generally admitted that the writer, under the name of Wisdom is personating Christ,} it is said - "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or

ever the earth was &c., read to verse 30. Again, in Proverbs 30:4 hear the words of Agur: "Who hath ascended up into heaven or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in His fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is His name, and what is His Son's name, if thou canst tell?" Job exclaims in the depth of affliction as though it were the only comfort he had: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." In John 6:62, Jesus asks, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before," and also in Eph.4:9 & 10 - "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things." In the John 17:5, Jesus asks to be glorified with that glory which He had with the Father before the world was. Therefore it seems clear that in ascending up where He was before, He was going to return to some position that He occupied with the Father, not only before He was born in Bethlehem, but before the world began. Again, if He had no existence prior to His incarnation we are at a loss to know how it was that the saints were blessed and chosen in Him before the foundation of the world. Now brethren we think from these and other considerations we might notice, we are fully warranted in contending for the doctrine, that the Son of God existed before time began, and that therefore neither His humanity, nor deity and humanity united constituted Him such. The essence of sonship we cannot attempt to define any further than to say that He was and is a spiritual head of a spiritual family. But some may be ready to enquire, How long has He existed as such? To which enquiry we can only reply in the language of the same divine authority by which we have established the positions already taken, and we wish it borne in mind that we are not treating of His self existence as Jehovah, but of Him as the only begotten Son. And whilst we acknowledge ourselves utterly unable to trace His existence as such to any point, the scriptures everywhere speak of that existence as posterior to the existence of His Godhead. In Proverbs 8, already referred to, He is represented as having been set up from everlasting. In John 1:1, it is written: "In the beginning was the Word." In Col.1:15, He is said to be the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; verse 17 - "He is before all things," 18 - "who is the beginning." And in Rev.3:14, He styles Himself - "The Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." And we acknowledge ourselves unable to see any difference in the language last quoted, which are the words of

Christ Himself, and an expression found in the Signs of the Times, much caviled at, that "He is the first production of Divine Power."

Nor does it become cavilers to dispute the doctrine that Christ, as the Son of God, is the production of God, until they can show that these scriptures do not mean what they say, and discard the idea that His Sonship consists in His humanity which is to all intents and purposes a creature; for He was *made of a woman*. He is spoken of frequently as the begotten of God, the sent of God, the messenger of God, and as coming to do not His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him. When He comes He is manifest as the Mighty God, though veiled in humanity, because it pleased the Father that in Him all fulness should dwell, and His humanity no more constituted Him the Son of God than it did God Himself. Then why was He clothed with humanity? Because the children are partakers of flesh and blood, therefore He took part of the same, and we may add, for the same reason that Moses put a veil upon his face when he came down from the top of Sinai. Moses had been upon the mountain and talked with God, and his face in consequence shone with such a glory that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold him. Christ proceeded forth and came from God, yea has His dwelling in the bosom of the Father. If then it was necessary that the mediator of the administration of condemnation should veil his face, how much more that the mediator of the administration of righteousness which exceedeth in glory should veil Himself. This He has done, hence says Paul, "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh." Here His flesh is expressly called a veil, and was not therefore that which constituted Him the Christ. He comes at the appointed time and this is the manner of His appearing, clothed with humanity and embodying the whole of Deity. At the appointed time He was delivered up and dies. Forsaken of the Father, insulted by devils, and denied by friends, is yet borne testimony to so strongly by the Father, who hides the sun and rends the rocks, that the amazed centurion cries, "This is the Son of God!"

Now we ask, is not such a sacrifice of infinitely more value than that which is merely human? If the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

"So great, so vast a sacrifice,
May well our hopes revive;
If God's own Son thus bleeds and dies,
The sinner sure may live."

If this brethren be the doctrine of the Bible it should not be withheld because some do not *believe* it, nor because they refuse to worship this Son of God, though God has said "Let all the angels of God worship Him," and those who would convince us that we are in error must bring some scripture proof rather than to say falsely, that this is Arianism, new things, heresy, idolatry, &c.

This sacrifice we do not regard as being only the substitution of one person or thing for another; but as the sacrifice of the head for the body, which is His church, and the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Nor do we imagine that although the *Son* of God was delivered up and put to death, that He for one moment ceased to be; but that in Him at His death was fulfilled the word of the Lord by the prophet Isaiah, 54:7,9 - "For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee," &c., and that though passing in connection with the body through the vale of terrors, He was the same vital head, and when He arose, it was with His body completely justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses.

Our present meeting has been one of peculiar interest evincing as it has done, how christians can dwell together in unity. We have none of Hagar's mocking children among us, and although a much larger number than usual of our brethren have been together, they seemed to be one of heart and one soul. Our ministering brethren have come to us in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ, and their preaching has been a full exhibition of the glories of our Redeemer in the full and complete salvation of His elect. We feel thankful to God and those of our sister associations who have thought enough of us to send us their minutes and messengers, and desire to reciprocate their kindness. Our next meeting is appointed to be held with the church at Upper Broad Run, to commence on the Thursday before the second Lord's Day in August 1854, when and where we hope to great you again and enjoy another season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.

S.TROTT.1853.

THE NEW BIRTH: EXPERIMENTALLY CONSIDERED.

Circular Letter: *The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association, to the several churches therein represented, send love in the Lord.*

Beloved Brethren: - In addressing to you this token of our particular relationship and regard to you, we would call your attention to the subject of the *new birth*. This doctrine in all by-gone ages has been almost as distinguishing a mark of the Regular Baptists, as is baptism. Although the multitude bearing the name of Baptists have dwindled down the idea of a second birth to a mere wordy phantom, a change which an individual can procure, if not accomplish for himself by his efforts, and others claiming to be Regular or Old School Baptists, have substituted for it, imaginations of the human mind, having no direct resemblance to the idea of a birth, the scripture testimony still is: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And the necessity for it remains as strong as in past ages, for still it remains true, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." We do not contemplate entering into, in this letter, an elaborate argument in support of the doctrine of an actual *new birth*, but would content ourselves with giving you a brief view of what it is, as illustrated in the scriptures. For this end, we beg leave to call your attention to the births of Ishmael and Isaac. Perhaps it may be thought that the birth of Jacob and Esau are similar in their figurative application to the above, but the scriptures do not so represent them. Jacob and Esau are brought to view as illustrating the sovereignty of God in election from among the posterity of Adam. See Rom., chap.9-12. Hence they were both of the same birth, and therefore alike after the flesh. As their mothers were allegorical of the two covenants, so they represented in their births the children of the two covenants. But the things of the new covenant are spiritual, or things of the spirit of God, and therefore are only known by the spiritual man. {See I Cor.2:12-15.} Hence Ishmael is said to have been born after the flesh, and Isaac in distinction from him, is said to have been by promise; and the promises of God we know do not run through Adam, but through Christ Jesus. See Gal.4:22,23 & Rom.9:7-9. So that whilst Ishmael represents the natural seed of Abraham, or fleshly birth, Isaac represents

the spiritual seed, or the spiritual birth; and Christ is that spiritual seed, and the believer is of the seed of Abraham as he is Christ's. See Gal.3:15 & 29. Not that we do not suppose that Isaac was a fleshly man in his birth; but we believe that his birth had those peculiar characteristics connected with it which made it a fit allegory of the spiritual birth in distinction from the fleshly. Hence in further confirmation of this view, we have taken of the birth's of Isaac and Ishmael. Whilst the scriptures represent the birth of Ishmael as being altogether without faith, being the result of human reasoning or contrivance, and fleshly actings, they represent that in the birth of Isaac all fleshly powers were previously dead, and that it was only through faith that Sarah received strength to conceive seed &c., Heb.11:11, and faith is not a fruit of the flesh, but of the Spirit.

Having thus far, as we think fully established the position that the birth of Isaac was a figure of the spiritual birth, in distinction from the birth of the flesh, we will proceed to illustrate the new birth by it.

1. We will remark that this birth in the figure had its particular seed, that faith was connected with its conception, and therefore points to that incorruptible seed which Peter declares the saints to be born of, by the word of God. I Pet.1:23. It was the promise of God that secured the birth of Isaac, so it is the word of God or His declared promise, or purpose and grace that secures the spiritual birth of all the elect; and as before noticed, all the promises of God are in Christ Jesus, so the purpose and grace of God which secures the salvation of all who are saved is in Him, excluding all our Adamic powers from any part in accomplishing it. Christ is the substance, the grand whole of all the revelation of God, of all the promises, the grace and purpose of God; as we have Christ we have the promises and grace of God. And He is the life and therefore the embodiment of His church; hence they are saved according to God's purpose and grace given in Him, See II Tim.1:9. We might go on to notice the effect of the conception of this incorruptible seed, how it produces faith in God, quickens the man to a sense of his relations, and accountability to God, of the spirituality and broadness of the law, and of the sin in his acts, thoughts, and nature; of the distress occasioned thereby; of the darkness that covers the whole operation within, hiding all excepting certain external effects from the individual view, so that he is a mystery to himself, and can tell no more why he is thus, than he can tell of the wind whence it cometh or whither it goeth. We might show that whilst the soul is thus quickened to such a deep

sense of the law or of sin as being against God, that it still evidently is not changed from a natural to a spiritual soul, and therefore it cannot receive the things of the Spirit, or the things freely given us of God, but entirely looks to the deeds of the law as the way of acceptance with God. But we forbear, and come to the birth. We are told that Sarah bear to Abraham a son at the set time of which God had spoken to him; and that Abraham called the name of his son whom Sarah bear to him, Isaac; also that Sarah said on the occasion. "God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me." And she further said, "Who would have said unto Abraham that Sarah would have given children suck &c." Gen.21:1-7. The name Isaac signifies laughter, as Sarah says, God has made me to laugh. Laughter is an expression of sudden, but transient and light joy. The name Isaac therefore and Sarah's being said to laugh, is strikingly expressive of that joy which is experienced when a person is first born again, or brought by faith to behold the light of the Sun of Righteousness into liberty. It is all joy and excitement at beholding the way of pardon and acceptance with God. But as it is a general, but rather superficial view which the child of grace has at this time of the way of salvation, and not that full understanding which he has afterwards when taught of Christ as the way, his joy is easily and quickly turned again to sorrow and grief, and his light is obscured soon by clouds and darkness. Still with the very first burst of joy, there is a feeling in the individual that it is God and no other that hath made me to laugh. There is also a feeling as with Sarah, that all who hear shall laugh, and he is therefore anxious for the moment to impart the good news to others, some under the idea of publishing it to all, and therefore as having a kind of preaching excitement. As Isaac retained his name of laughter through life, so the believer in his after pilgrimage has his times of this transient excitable joy. {Note: There is much of humility and astonishment connected with this laughing. Who would have said that Sarah should give suck, &c. So says the new born child of grace, who would have thought that ever I should have found pardon, that all my distress which I have suffered on account of my sins should have been but preparing me to know and rejoice in salvation by Christ; that such a vile sinner should have been an object of God's love.} But brethren, let us not stop merely to laugh with Sarah, let us inquire what has transpired to occasion it. It was not that any change had taken place in Ishmael, he had not been transformed to be the son of the free woman, or of Sarah; he remained to be the son of Hagar, and subject to bondage with his mother. But it was that a new

and distinct existence had come to light in the family, that Sarah had a son of her own, and that as she was a free woman so her son was free born. As she represented the children, or child of the new covenant; the spiritual man, for there is one spirit, and the Lord {Christ} is that Spirit; and it is Christ in all the saints, their life, and the hope of glory. Thus we have the new birth in a figure before us. That which was born of the flesh, the whole natural man, soul and body, remains fleshly and under bondage, after the new birth as before. It remains subject to notions of legality and bondage, and therefore subject to be continually annoyed with doubts and fears. It remains subject to all that depravity and all those afflictions, and diseases, and that death which was entailed upon man by the transgression of the natural Adam. It is true that in reference to the believer, the whole curse has been removed by the atonement of Christ from all these evils of sin; but they in themselves remain to disturb his peace and hopes, only when faith is in exercise, then he can view and rejoice in the whole as blessings. But there is a new existence, spiritual in its nature, that opens its eyes from the first, not to behold the light of the natural sun, but to delight in the shining of the Sun of Righteousness; not to behold the alternate blaze and thick darkness of Mt. Sinai, but to rejoice in the light of life; not to cry and fret, and to labor and toil for that which is not bread, and which satisfieth not, but to behold and feast upon the rich supply of the bread of life, the bread which came down from heaven ready prepared at his hands. It is true that faith when looking through the natural senses as it sometimes does, takes a view of natural things; but instead of seeing the curse written upon them, views engraven on all, from the blaze of the sun to the glimmering of the glow-worm, the glorious truth, that God is love. But it is not by the fleshly senses that this spiritual child, this new man sees or judges of anything, it is by faith; faith is to it what the senses are to the natural man. Hence when faith is not in exercise and we look at, and attempt to judge of things by our senses and the faculties of our souls, much of clouds and darkness obscure our vision, and much that appears threatening and injurious hovers over us. But all that faith looks upon is light and peace, with no darkness to obscure, nor any threatenings to create fear; that which is most gloomy to sense, is light to faith. It beholds God in all, and God as He is manifested in Christ Jesus.

Hence as the two, the Ishmael and the Isaac in the believer, are so different in their birth, look at and judge of things so differently, and are so different in their pursuits; the one being earthy and clinging to earthly things, the other

being heavenly and soaring towards heaven, and that which is heavenly, it is no wonder that there is a continued warfare going on in the breast of the believer; making him feel that whilst he would fly heavenward, he is still confined to the earth, that when he would do good, he is full of evil. But leaving this point with much that might be said on it, we pass in the next place to notice the weaning time, and the events connected with it. We are told that the child grew and was weaned; and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned. Also that "Sarah saw the son of Hagar mocking," and she said to Abraham, "Cast out this bondwoman and her son, &c." Gen.21:5-12. Milk is a light food prepared in the order of nature to suit the tender stomach of the young infant. It is sought after by the infant as a balm for all its little ills and griefs. But it is necessary for the relief of the mother, that she may obey the mandate of God, to be fruitful and multiply, and that her children may be proper and healthy; as well as for the child, that it should be fitted to fill its station in the world, that it should be weaned from the breast and learn to live on stronger food. So for the spiritual Isaac's, the children of God; they at first live on such food only as they look to their mother - the church for, that which has a good deal of animal sympathy, and creaturely doing in it. They look to their frames and feelings and to the discharge of what they call duty, for their nourishment and growth as well as for the healing of their woes. This is all light food, it is momentary in its effects, it may occasion them to laugh, but there is nothing solid like the feast we have to speak of. They are continually changing either up or down. Hence the importance of being weaned from the breast and of being fed with meat. But some even in the apostles' days did not get weaned. Paul complains of the Corinthians that he had fed them with milk and not with meat, for hitherto they were not able to bear it; and adds, "neither yet are ye now able." This he says to show that they were yet carnal, and that he could not speak to them as spiritual, but as carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I Cor.3:1-3. In like manner he complains of the Hebrews, that instead of being teachers, they needed to be taught first principles, to be fed with milk; and adds, "For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe." Heb.5:12-14. It would appear that many also among us are in the same condition, not weaned from the breast. Hence, the cry for what they call practical preaching, and the fondness for hearing and reading of first experiences to the exclusion of doctrine, &c. It would seem that the complaint against Ephraim, that "he is an unwise son, for he should not stay long

in the breaking forth of children," applied to them. {See Hosea 13:13., with the words in *italics* omitted.} As for the mother, so for the churches, it is necessary if they would have proper and healthy children, and have them grow up to a vigorous manhood, to see that they are weaned from milk, and fed through the ministry with sound doctrine, such as the scriptures and the whole experiences of the children of God correspond with. Isaiah asks: "Whom shall He teach knowledge? and whom shall He make to understand doctrine?" And he himself answers the inquiries thus: "Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts." Isa.25:9. The enquiry is, not whom shall men, but whom shall *He*, that is, the Lord, mentioned in verse 5. So that according to this scripture the Lord leaves them who hang on to the breast, to continue in a puppy state.

But when are they weaned? The natural child as was Isaac is generally weaned at a certain period; not so with the spiritual Isaacs, with them there is no fixed time. They have to do, not with time, but with spiritual things. Some begin their weaning and feasting on doctrine almost as soon as they are born, whilst all have more or less of the weaning process to experience through life. How about the feast? At feasts it is usual to have a rich supply of choice provisions, accompanied with wine. Such is the doctrine of Christ. It is true persons may speculate on this doctrine, and may discuss and argue it in a carnal spirit, and produce only coldness. But when any one is led to seek of God - His teachings in the revelation He has made of Himself in Christ Jesus, and enabled by faith to receive any part of that glorious truth, he finds in it a feast of fat things. How can it be otherwise? There is not only the fullness of Christ's atonement, the purpose and grace of God in Christ Jesus, but God in all His attributes, as He could not be known in all the works of creation and providence, couched in it. Hence, even the angels desire to look into these things. And the love of God, as wine on the lees well refined, flows through the whole of it, to cheer, to invigorate and to strengthen the child of grace to bear all the fatigues and trials of the way, and to support him under them. As he is led to feast on this glorious doctrine, he is weaned from the light food of frames, excitements, and creaturely discharge of duties. Not only this, but also as he is thus weaned from creaturely dependencies, he with Sarah sees the son of the bond-woman, the fleshly nature mocking. He sees how it has mocked him, disappointing him in all his fleshly expectations for solid, lasting comfort, and spiritual enjoyment, how much soever they may have made him laugh at the time; and even when the rich feast of gospel

grace is spread before him, the flesh mocks him, by suggesting to him that those consolations are not for him; that he, a poor sinful wretch as he is, can have no claim to those consolations, that it would be presumptuous for him to trust in the absolute promises of God, unless he could find something in himself more worthy of God's favor, and the like. But God has confirmed the declaration of Sarah, "Cast out this bond-woman and her son; for the son of this bond-woman shall not be heir with my son, with Isaac." Not only is it decreed that flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God, but also we find that whenever we are led to God for consolations we have to cast out everything fleshly, in feelings and in action, and to depend alone on the mercy of God in Christ for acceptance, and we receive the blessings as coming alone through that channel.

Brethren, we have thus given you what we understand to be some of the outlines of the new birth, and of its effects as illustrated in the birth of Isaac. In conclusion let us say, brethren, that in this season of commotions, religious and political, separate and combined, shaking the heavens and the earth of the mere human mind, we need some stronger food to support and steady us than we can draw from excited feelings, human reasonings, or even acts of obedience. May we follow the example of David. He says, "Surely, I have behaved and quieted myself as a child that is weaned of its mother. My soul is even as a weaned child." How this is, he shows by saying, "Let Israel hope in the Lord from henceforth and forever." Psa.131:2, 3. Again we find him quieting himself thus: "Why art thou cast down O my soul? And why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise Him who is the health of my countenance and my God." Psa.42:11. Brethren, farewell.

S.TROTT.
Moderator.1855.

BROTHERLY LOVE AND UNITY.

Circular Letter & Corresponding Letter: *The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association, in session with the Church at Black Rock, Baltimore County, Md., May 14th, 15th & 16th, 1856, to the several Churches of which she is composed, sends love in the Lord.*

Beloved Brethren: - As an expression of fellowship, we again address you this our annual Circular, and on this occasion we

have selected as our theme, the subject of Brotherly Love and Unity. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." - Psa.133:1.

First. The character and relationship of brethren; and secondly, the manner of their living together in unity. In the Scriptures, the words *brother* or *brethren* are used in a variety of senses. Some are so called in a proper sense, as by immediate descent, the children of the same parent or parents, according to the flesh, and some by affinity, kindred or nation, and also by common participation of our human nature, in which all men are brethren. But the saints of God are all brethren in a spiritual sense, by the grace of God, they all having God as their Father, and Christ as their Elder Brother. In this sense we were brethren in eternity, as the members of Christ's body. "Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned as when as yet there was none of them." Psa.139:16. Christ's incarnation is another proof of this brotherhood. "I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." Psa.22:22. Again, "Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praises unto thee." Heb.2:12. "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Heb.2:17. "For whom He {God} did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He {Christ} might be the first born among many brethren." Rom.8:29. "But go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and unto your Father; and to my God, and your God." John20:17. His death is a strong proof of His love to His brethren. He was delivered for their offenses, and raised again for their justification. And He received gifts for men, to quicken whom He will. {See John 5:21.} And He said, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory," &c. John 17:24. "And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph.2:1. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." Gal.4:6. In this way they are brought to view as brethren. Not like national Israel, under a covenant of works; but as the spiritual Israel, in the covenant of grace. National Israel was a separate people, and not reckoned among the nations, and in that sense they dwell alone. For Moses said, "If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence; for

wherein shall it be known here, that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us, so shall we be separated from the nations around about us." The brethren are separated from the world, for they are not of the world, as Christ was not of the world. Not that they chose Christ. No. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you out of the world;" therefore the world knoweth you not, because it knew Him {Christ} not. "For they neither know me nor my Father." So in dwelling together they are one body. "My dove, my undefiled is but one." Christ is the head, and they, the brethren, are His body, and members in particular; members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. Christ is the living Stone, as the Foundation, and the brethren are lively stones, to compose the spiritual house, the holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ. They, the brethren, dwell together in love. "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love. Beloved, if God so loved us we ought also to love one another. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as He is, so are we in the world. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" I John 4:7,8,19,20. "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth."

Another evidence of thus dwelling together in unity, is that we endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. "There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph.4:3-6. So the life which the brethren live is a life by the faith of the Son of God, who has loved them and given Himself for them. As they are living members of Christ's living body, the church, so they have bowels of sympathy; if a brother is in bonds, as being bound with him, and with such as suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body. Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Make not a man an offender for a word, nor lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gates; nor turn aside the just for a thing of nought. Isa.29:21.

Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye, which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted. Let nothing be

done through strife or vain glory; but in lowliness of mind, let each esteem the other better than himself.

As evidence of the unity of the brethren, they all have the same prospect in view, and are heirs alike to an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that cannot fade away; which is reserved in heaven for them, and they are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. I Pet.1:4,5. When we all shall have come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Eph.4:13. "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father." Mt.13:43. And then shall they enjoy the presence of their God, and sing praises to Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, who is the light of the city forever. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it; and the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there shall be no night there. And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie, but they which are written in the Lambs book of life. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!" May grace, mercy and peace be with you all.

Corresponding Letter.

Dear Brethren: - By the indulgence of our Heavenly Father, we have been favored with another opportunity of meeting together, and have been favored by the visits of brethren from Maine to North Carolina, and from the Atlantic coast to the prairies of the West, all speaking the same things, and exhibiting a united and common interest in the things of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Why this interest, and why this unanimity of sentiment among those who were born in different climes, raised up under different circumstances, and subject to different influences? The answer can only be, that they have one common Teacher, who teacheth as never man taught; whose school is subject to no locality other than the hearts of His pupils. When thus assembled and thus united, may we not confidently call both upon the interested and the curious to come and behold our order? Or say to them, in the language of David: "Walk about Zion, go round about her; mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generation following." O, how delightful to contemplate that, exposed as we are continually to the

envenomed shafts of the world, and the fiery darts of the wicked, that God has enclosed us in the invincible walls and bulwarks of salvation!

As it was only Him that dwelt in the bush, that preserved the bush from burning; only Him that walked in the midst of the heated furnace that kept the smell of fire from the garments of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego: so it is only by His appearing as a wall of fire round about Jerusalem, and the Glory in the midst, that Zion has ever been and still is preserved as a monument of the praise and glory of God's grace.

Our next Association will be held {the Lord willing} with the church at Harford, commencing on Wednesday before the 3rd Sunday in May, 1857, when and where we hope to meet a goodly number of your messengers.

S.TROTT.
Moderator.1856.

PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH.

Circular Letter: The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association met with the Church at Black Rock, May 19th, 20th & 21st, 1858, to the Churches connected therewith.

Beloved Brethren: - Permit us to address you on this occasion on the Present State of the Church of Christ. That the Church is at this time surrounded with darkness in a peculiar manner, is generally admitted. It is like the plague of darkness of Egypt, a darkness that may be felt. It is a wintry state of the Church. The sun occasionally shines, but its shining has not that warming, enlivening and cheering influence upon the plants as at other times it has had, and it is soon obscured by cold bleak clouds. There are clouds rising from the mists of this world, from the various agitations in the world at this time, politically and otherwise, which much darken the hemisphere of the Church and saints, and produce a corresponding chilliness. There is not that liveliness in our love to the brethren, nor to the truth and ordinances of the Gospel, nor that engagedness in religious exercises, and in religious conversation, and meditations, as have at other times been felt. As in night and wintry seasons beasts of prey crowd round the settlements of men, to raven; so it is with the Church at this time. There are those around the saints and among them, that would persuade to scare the sheep from their fenced folds

to ramble with them in the wild rages of human wisdom, and to repose with them with them in their dens that they may prey upon them, and no doubt they have bewitched some of the sheep. There are others again who would persuade the children of God, that they ought not to follow or receive the light which God has given to their continual guide - the Scriptures and blessed teachings of the Spirit - but to be guided in their belief and practice by the mixture of light and shade which is found in the writings of eminent men of past ages; and as these are various, so as they are followed they produce different views and dissensions among the saints. Again, Satan takes the advantage of this darkness, to assault the saints with temptations. It is an old complaint with the children of God that,

"Temptations every where annoy,
And sins and snares my peace destroy."

How it may be with the brethren generally at this time we know not, but some are peculiarly tried with temptations. Satan so stirs up their passions, appetites, &c., that they think it is altogether themselves. And indeed it is their own vile nature that thus shows itself; and what is a worse annoyance to them, the old man when left to act itself loves as much as ever it did, the indulgence of itself in its corruptions, and hence under this wildness and darkness, or in other words not having the spiritual man in lively exercise, we are led on under the influence of our corruptions, till we are on the very brink of acting them out, and were it not for the faithfulness of God who has promised that with the temptations He will make a way for our escape, we should plunge into actual sin. Though the escape is brought about, we know that it is not of ourselves, but that the sin is ours, though we were not left to carry it out; then arises the trying doubts, whether, if we loved God and His cause and believed the declarations of His word, &c., we could be led on thus contrary to His word and to the exposing of His cause to reproach. We are sometimes thus tossed upon the billows of temptations, until like Jonah, we become exceedingly displeased, and angry, and pray the Lord to *take away our life*, thinking it *better for us to die than to live*; yea, with Job, our souls, those souls which others tell us are made heavenly in regeneration, *choose strangling and death rather than life*. Again, as in wintry seasons, clouds have heretofore at times gathered over the Church, but at this time they appear to be gathering thicker than ever, as though preparing to burst in a storm upon us. The *Young Men's*

Christian Associations which are organized in most of our towns, and united throughout the country in a general convention, appear as very innocent combinations at first sight; but when we consider that they are composed of persons of different denominations and likewise of those who are not professors, all united together for promoting religion, though they appear like the little cloud which Elijah's servant saw rising out of the sea, yet there is evidently in them the elements of a great rain, tending as they are to promote a matured, combined and concentrated effort in their religious enterprise. Again, these *union* prayer meetings which are said to have originated from these young men's associations, are tending still more fully to concentrate and combine all the sects of Protestantism in a grand effort to bring the country and the government under the control of their religious influence, and thus enable them to dictate to the government, and to silence opposition to their plans and measures. Indeed the unprecedented and wonderful effects of these union prayer meetings, in making converts, looks more like *making fire come down from heaven in the sight of men*, and of consummating the power of the Protestant Beast, than anything that has appeared yet. How soon it will be consummated is not our province to say.

But, brethren, it is with the Church now as it was with Israel during the plague of darkness in Egypt. *All the children of Israel had light in their dwellings*. So we think the churches of the saints have at this time as clear light in the great truths of the Gospel as in any former period; and it is more distinguishable from every false system than formerly as it makes manifest the darkness without, by being so contrasted with it. The ministers of Christ, although frequently on account of the wintry darkness when going to their appointments, feel more as though they were on some worldly concern than to deliver a message of peace, yet are enabled generally to preach the gospel with much clearness, to feel while preaching the vast weight of their subject, the precious fulness and freeness of the gospel of salvation, and the importance of contending earnestly for the faith, and of preaching Christ as the only way of salvation. Private members are as well established in the truth, and have as clear a discerning spirit to distinguish between truth and error when preached, as at any former period; and whilst complaining of many doubts, fears and temptations, are as well established in the truth that their whole salvation is in Christ Jesus as in any former period, and manifest as much anxiety to know the Scriptures, and to be in all things conformed to them.

The enquiry is frequently made, what can be the reason of the Church's being in this dark wintry state, and whether it is not owing to the unfaithfulness of the Church that this has come upon her? The inquiry is also made whether the Church cannot adopt some course, whether some measures cannot be taken to bring the Church back to more sunny seasons, and whether individuals by proper efforts, by prayer, &c., cannot deliver themselves from their coldness? Some few have urged the making certain exertions to relieve the Church and saints from this unpleasant situation. Brethren, does not the same God reign in the heavenly kingdom as in the earthly? Does He not reign as supremely in the one as in the other? Does not the declaration of the Lord, "I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things" apply as fully to the spiritual world and its government as to the natural? Try your powers, brethren, in mid-winter to clear away the storm clouds, to avert the long, dark cold nights and to bring the sun back to its summer solstice, and if ye can do this, then may ye hope by your efforts to hasten on again the period when in reference to the Church ye may sing, "For lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land," and not till then. We know, brethren, that all this coldness and darkness and the corruptions, that cause us to doubt and fret, and are the materials for Satan's temptations to act upon, are in us. We cannot say with our Lord, "The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me." No, the evil is all in us, and when we rightly feel, we take all the shame and blame to ourselves. But can we shake off to overcome these evils of ourselves? No, the more we feel the evil of these corruptions and coldness, we feel the more our entire impotency to relieve ourselves from them, we cry for God to interpose His grace or we must fall under them. It is true, that amid the severest colds and storms of winter, if God in His providence provide us with shelter, with food and clothing we may keep from perishing, so under all these dark and wintry seasons spiritually, God's grace will be sufficient for His people to secure that *their faith fail not*. He will *keep them by His power through faith unto salvation*, though He may leave them, for more humbling of themselves, and for the trying their faith, to fall into the mire.

The people of God, are likened to sheep. Sheep are feeble, defenseless creatures of themselves, very simple in providing for their defense against their enemies, or in providing for, and protecting themselves and their young from

perishing in the wintry storms. They need the constant care of a shepherd to provide food and shelter for them, and to protect them by keeping them embosomed, or by watching over them, or they will wander off, get scattered and devoured. The people of God are equally as dependent upon the care of their Shepherd. But David personating Christ in His body, the Church, says, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me besides the still waters. He restoreth my soul, &c." So that even the souls of the children, get off at times from the simplicity of gospel truth and order and need to be restored by the great Shepherd. This does not look like the souls of saints have been changed into heavenly souls.

As to the reason why the church is in this dark and wintry state; we would say, it is not that the Shepherd is unfaithful to His charge; not because He has not power to preserve His sheep in perfect peace, and to keep them in the constant enjoyment of light; nor because they are left to their own care; but because He has seen it best for the church to be in this state. In a word, because it is so written, and the Scriptures must be fulfilled. The present dark and cold state of the church, will no doubt be more for the glory of God, more for a manifestation of the power and exceeding riches of His grace; more fully to display to the admiration of saints and angels, the divine efficacy of the blood of Jesus to cleanse from all sin, and that perfect fulness there is in Him to present the vilest sinner without spot or blemish before the throne of God, than would the church's being kept in the constant exercise of that faith and love and zeal such as characterized the lives of Peter, John and Paul. Because now it appears so manifest that it is all of grace that they are saved and kept, all of Christ in which they will appear with acceptance before God, and shine in glory.

Let us then, Brethren, amidst all the darkness around, rejoice in the power and faithful care of our Shepherd and may we be found walking as children of light.

S.TROTT.1858.

THE END.