BX 5949 .A1 S3
Stone, John Seely, 1795-
1882.
The mysteries opened

THE

MYSTERIES OPENED;

OR,

SCRIPTURAL VIEWS OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM CERTAIN THEORIES CONCERNING

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION

AND THE

REAL PRESENCE.

BY THE

REV. JOHN S. STONE, D.D.,

RECTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH, BROOKLYN.

NEW-YORK:

HARPER & BROTHERS, 82 CLIFF-STREET.

1844.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1844, by
HARPER & BROTHERS,
In the Clerk's Office of the Southern District of New-York.

PREFACE.

In the following work, the wish, which, at the outset, was sincerely felt, to abstain from controversy, and to look at the subject as it lies in its own elements and in its own light, has been but partially realized. Truth stands opposite to Error; and, to make their contrast seen and felt, it is often necessary to present *both*. To this the author of the present treatise has been almost resistlessly led by the force of circumstances; and it will be readily perceived that the very considerations which induced him to present what he conscientiously believes to be erroneous views of the subjects which he has treated, bound him, at the same time, to present them, not in his own, but in the language of their advocates. He has, however, endeavoured to quote fairly, and has honestly sought to put the theories of the authors whom he has quoted in such a light as they themselves must acknowledge to be just; and, having done so, he has busied himself with the theories, not with the men who hold them. Against their views he may have spoken strongly, but against them he has said nothing. He is glad to concede to them what he is desirous may be conceded to himself—full honesty and sincerity in the views embraced, and a hearty solicitude to promote the best interests of the everlasting Gospel, and the universal Church of Christ. He can feel no pleasure in supporting even what he believes to be vital truth, by so poor a prop as the at-

tempt to excite prejudice against those who embrace even what he believes to be dangerous error. Nor has he any desire that the views which he has presented should stand any farther than they stand on the basis of *Truth*, as revealed in the Word of God, recognised in the standards of our Church, and illustrated by its own inward light.

The author has quoted the writers to whom he refers only so far as was necessary to develop their peculiar views of the points under examination. This object effected, he has not attempted to follow them through any extended train of reasoning, illustration, or reference to authorities. There is, consequently, a sense in which the present work is not controversial. It does not pretend to be a special answer to any other work, nor a full review of any other treatise. It is rather an independent exposition of the nature of the Christian sacraments; referring for authority mainly to the Scriptures, and showing subordinately the harmony between the Scriptures and our own ecclesiastical standards.

The reasons which have influenced him in bringing his cause for trial before the sole tribunal of the Scriptures, are two.

1. In the first place, while he has been desirous of writing something not wholly unworthy the attention of the more learned, his chief desire has been to present truths, of the highest importance, to that far greater class of minds which have the power of thinking justly, but which ordinarily have little leisure for following learned research beyond the Bible, and the most accessible helps to its interpretation. In a word, he has written, not so much for the learned divines as

for the intelligent laity of the Church; while his humble hope is, that both will find in what he has written something worthy of their serious consideration. To have made the work larger, by a full quotation and examination of authorities, had been easy, and perhaps, to the one class, useful; but the work has already reached a size not at first intended, and needing, for the other class, curtailment rather than addition.

2. But, in the second place, he has been strongly influenced in the course which he has taken by the increasing prevalence of views which, to his apprehension, threaten the dislodgment of the Bible from its true place of importance in the settlement of all questions involving the purity and the vital interests of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We see coming into distinct shape among us the notions that Christ has left himself perpetually Incarnate, through the Sacraments, in the living Body of the Visible Church; and that He now dispenses the gifts of the Holy Spirit, not by imparting them directly to the *individual*, who privately studies or publicly hears the truths of the Word, or who, independently of all outward ordinances, seeks those gifts in secret and believing prayer, but by having, *once for all*, deposited those gifts in the hands of His Apostles alone, to be by them *handed* down through successors, and by successors, through Sacraments, to the Body of the Church. Now these are notions which can never be plausibly sustained but by aids extraneous to the Scriptures themselves; in other words, by later *Tradition*. It is impossible to find adequate support for such views in the Word of God. They are in conflict with that Divine standard. They must virtually ap-

peal from it to another Rule. It is evident, therefore, that just so far as such notions prevail, the Scriptures must be sinking in the practical esteem both of clergy and of laity; while Tradition simultaneously rises to the rank of virtually Supreme Judge and Arbiter in all the most important questions which can affect the purity of the Church and the Gospel, or the destinies of Christ's kingdom on earth. On the theory which the above notions involve, the ministry of the Church holds a prerogative, which, as our nature is constituted, can never be safe in human hands; which has ever proved the means of the most crushing Spiritual Despotism; and which must always force its upholders into greater and greater departures from the simplicity of the Gospel, into the corruptions of error.

It is nothing else than the secret power of this theory which is now driving so large a portion of the English Church, and which may soon be seen driving a corresponding portion of our own, into the startling doctrine of "*Development*," a doctrine which rests on the acknowledged silence, and even repugnancy of the Scriptures, and of *primitive* Tradition, in regard to certain matters both of faith and of practice, notoriously and undeniably prevalent in the middle and later ages of the Church; and which, so far as it is found within our Protestant Episcopal Communion, is confessedly derived from those modern Romish theorists, De Maistre and Möhler, and was invented by them in defense of the monstrous errors of the Papal Supremacy, the Worship of Saints and Angels, of Images and the Virgin Mary, Indulgences, Purgatory, and Transubstantiation itself.

This doctrine, or theory, or philosophy of "*Develop-*

ment," consists in maintaining that Christianity is a *progressive* system; that it existed at first in an imperfect *germ* only; that it has innate tendencies to growth, to gradual self-development; and that hence, those doctrines and practices of Mediæval Christianity, of which the Bible and *primitive* antiquity know nothing, or which they know only to condemn, are but the *results* of this tendency to self-development. They are but the *germ* expanded into the *tree*.

Upon the frightful tendency of this theory to put arguments into the mouth of the infidel, who contends that Christianity has, in this process of development, not only reached its full growth, but also passed beyond into a state of senility and decay—and upon its equally frightful tendency in favor of Idolatry, Polytheism, Pantheism, and even practical Atheism, it is not necessary to dwell. It is enough for present purposes to say, that the natural inference from the doctrine is, that there never has been either Error or Corruption in the Church catholic; that these are the faults of heretics and schismatics alone; that the Mediæval Church was more perfect than the primitive; and that Rome, since the Council of Trent, is more perfect than she was even before the 4th of the Lateran.

The notions to which reference was just made, as already gaining currency among us, of Christ's perpetuated Incarnation of himself through the Sacraments in the living Body of the Visible Church, and of the deposite of the gifts of the Spirit, once for all, in the hands of the priesthood, to be dispensed by their authoritative act alone, can no more be maintained on the ground of Scripture and of *primitive* antiquity than

the worst errors and corruptions of the Mediæval Church. A far later Tradition is indispensable to their support. Hence the tendency so perceptible to magnify the authority of the later *fathers*, as they are called; to make citations from their writings, and to revive among us the credit of their names. The system on which this support of doctrines and practices rests, carries within it, indeed, a tendency to self-development. It is ceaselessly pushing itself, and forcing its supporters farther and farther upon the grounds of Tradition; and, with every step in its movement, is more and more effectually losing sight of the only true and tenable ground of Scripture. Every year that this movement is followed, will the study of the Bible be diminished, and that of the authors of the Middle Age be increased. Nor need we be surprised to find ourselves, at no distant day, verging close upon a period when the Bible will indeed be known in name, but in little more than name, as a book which the subtle philosophy of *development* has learned to construe into at least a *toleration* of its progressively monstrous conceptions.

In the midst of such a tendency, new at least to us, and yet already sufficiently perceptible, the resort to the Bible alone, as umpire in the great questions which have been examined, was even peculiarly proper. Authority and *primitive* tradition are good and valuable in their appropriate places and for their appropriate ends. But wo, wo to the Church of our affections, should she ever allow a fondness for the authority and traditions of later ages to allure her by degrees away from her past reverence for the Bible alone as her rule of faith. She will be drawn thereby into mists

and darkness through which her passage will be as perilous as would that of a noble ship across an ocean abounding every where in rocks and quicksands, and under fogs so perpetually dense that neither sun nor moon, nor yet the guiding polar star, could even once be seen.

As yet our perils are new, and there may be something even alluring in the undefinedness and excitements of the solemn future before us. There certainly is much that is attractive to the human heart and imagination in the awful prerogatives with which it is now sought to reinvest the ministerial character; and in a religion which, arraying itself in the imposing forms of a dim antiquity, professes to come to us with a sort of infallible guide to salvation, requiring little more of its recipients than profound reverence, implicit obedience, and unquestioning submission to the prerogatives, the prescriptions, and the persons of its authorized dispensers. Nevertheless, in these very circumstances opens the great deep of our perils; and the forces which, in combination with the attractions just named, are pushing us into the abyss, are the ever restless evils of an age prone to excitement and tossed with change.

Let it not be supposed, from the remarks just made, that the author is of the number of those who love to "speak evil of dignities." *Office*, even in civil government, is a sacred thing. Its authority has source and sanction in God. Much more is this true in ecclesiastical government. Those who, in higher and lower degree, hold commissions from Christ, hold specially sacred things; things which may never, with impunity, be treated with other than the most reverently re-

spectful regard. Personal vices, indeed, can never be justly shielded by the sanctity of office; but, so far as Christ's ministers hold their commissions in clean hands, even their persons are naturally regarded with somewhat of the respect which is due to their office itself. But, the more sacred is office, the more sacredly should it be guarded against all *stretch* of prerogative, and against all *assumption* of power; especially when prerogative and power put on the impressive habiliments of spiritual attributes, and stand in the awful interspace between God and man. *Then*, to stretch prerogative and to assume power is, either arrogantly or with mistaken aim, to *abuse* office to the worst of purposes; and since men, when provoked by abuses, are often blind to real differences, such a course is sometimes to invite invasion even of what is in itself sacred. It is to step beyond the line which, with a midway limit, divides that awful interspace whereon are transacted the concerns of the soul and of eternity. It is to get nearer to God than to man, not in holiness, but in the attempt to wield influences which are never safe but in God's hands. Left in His hands, these influences are, indeed, as the gentle rain and dew, which distill only to fertilize. But, seized by the hand of man, they are as the thunderbolt, which man can not restrain, let loose to do the work of terror and of death.

O for the spirit of uncommon wisdom and of uncommon grace, poured out upon us from on High, to keep us safe from our various and thickening perils; that we may still live on, abiding quietly by the light which shineth from the Word, and standing simple in

PART I.

THE DESIGN AND RELATION OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

THE DESIGN AND RELATION OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY. THE RESULT, THE AGENT, AND THE INSTRUMENT OF THE NEW BIRTH.

Every actual Sinner must be the Subject of this Change, or he can not be saved. The Holy Spirit the sole Agent of the Change. Divine Truth the sole Instrument Page 17

CHAPTER II.

PREACHING THE RIGHT HAND OF THE SPIRIT IN WIELDING THE SWORD OF THE WORD.

In the New Testament, the main Stress in the Work of saving Men is laid on Preaching, whether we look, 1. at Christ's own Ministry; or, 2. at His various Commissions to the Twelve: or, 3. at their Action under those Commissions; or, 4. at the Language of the New Testament Writers when speaking of Preaching and the Sacraments, whether separately or in connection 32

CHAPTER III.

COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS.

The History of the Church corroborates the View given in Chap. II. 1. In Apostolic Times. Bishop Beveridge examined. 2. In the Middle Ages. Preaching then neglected and the Sacraments exalted. 3. During the Period of the Reformation. Archbishop Grindal and Queen Elizabeth. Hooker. The Power of Preaching not in Man, but in God. This View of Preaching discredits not the Sacraments. The true relative Position and Effects of Preaching and the Sacraments assigned. 1. Preaching, or its Equivalent, the Means of our Renewal. 2. Baptism our Introduction into the Church. 3. Preaching and the Lord's Supper, joint Means of our Christian Edification 52

PART II.

THE NATURE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

BAPTISM.

CHAPTER IV.

NATURE OF BAPTISM.

1. Erroneous View stated. 2. Rests on a more fundamental Error touching original Righteousness and original Sin. 3. This latter Error stated and examined, in the Light of Scripture and of our Articles. 4. This fundamental Error being Refuted, the Theory of Baptismal Regeneration, which is Built on it, falls. 5. No moral Change of our Nature effected in Baptism. Testimony of the Church Catechism 81

CHAPTER V.

NATURE OF BAPTISM CONTINUED.

Consideration of Suggestions arising from the last Chapter. 1. Though there be no Change of Nature in Baptism, yet may not the *Seed* of the new Birth be then implanted? Examination of this Point. Scriptural *Examples* of "Sanctification from the Womb:" Samuel, Jeremiah, St. Paul, Timothy, John the Baptist. Scriptural *Language* touching the Gift of the Holy Ghost. This Language connects not the Gift with *Baptism*. The ordinary Gift goes *before* Baptism in Adults. True meaning of this Language ascertained 105

CHAPTER VI.

NATURE OF BAPTISM CONTINUED.

Consideration of Suggestions pursued. 2. Did not God at first *create* the Soul without *any* Means; and can He not, therefore, *new*-create it without the *particular* Means of Divine Truth; and, consequently, in Infant Baptism? The Difference between Creation and the new Creation pointed out; the Latter shown to require the Instrumentality of Truth. 3. Does not a Denial of the Doctrine of Baptismal Regen-

eration land us either in the Heresy that Infants are born without Sin; or in the gloomy Dogma, that no Infants dying in Infancy can be saved? Article on original Sin examined. The Objection considered and answered. Difference between original and actual Sin. State of those who die in Infancy. Argument against Baptismal Regeneration concluded . . . . . Page 139

CHAPTER VII.

NATURE OF BAPTISM CONTINUED.

The Scriptural Doctrine of Baptism asserted and illustrated. False Canon of Interpretation exposed, and the true one indicated. Examination of Passages usually cited in Favor of the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. Their true Sense elicited. The true Nature of Baptism stated. 1. A *Badge* of our Christian Profession. 2. A *Symbol* of our Regeneration. 3. An *Initiatory* Rite. 4. A *Covenanting* and *Sealing* Ordinance. Coincidence of these Views with our Articles. 5. A *moral Monument* to the Origin and the Truth of Christianity. These Views all that is essential to the Beauty, Value, and Efficacy of this Sacrament. These Views compared with the Language of our Liturgy and Offices. Conclusion 173

PART III.

THE NATURE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. Erroneous View stated. The Doctrine of the Real Presence. 2. Examination of Scripture Passages supposed to favor the Doctrine. The *Seed* of this Doctrine planted in that of Baptismal Regeneration. Examination of John, vi. False Canon of Interpretation again exposed. The Chapter refers not to Sacramental eating and drinking. I Cor., x., 16, examined. Does not contain the Doctrine of the Real Presence. Examination of the Instituting Words of Christ. False Interpretation exposed. Idiom of Christ's *spoken* Language. Traced in the Old and in the New Testament. He taught not the Doctrine of the Real Presence 251

CHAPTER IX.

NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER CONTINUED.

Remarks on the Theory of the Real Presence. 1. This Theory rests on the Notion that Salvation depends on receiving the real Body and Blood of Christ into our Bodies and Souls. This Notion shown to be *unreasonable* as well as unscriptural. Mediæval Origin of the Doctrine of the Real Presence. 2. This Doctrine teaches that the Pardon of post-baptismal Sins is *conveyed* in the Lord's Supper only. The Falsehood and the Danger of this Teaching exposed. 3. The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in this Sacrament, as now taught, is *impossible*. Examination of Answers to this Objection. 4. The Doctrine of the Real Presence is a *prolific* Error. It is the Parent of, (1.) the Notion of a *Sacrifice* in the Eucharist; (2.) the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; (3.) the Traffic in Masses; and, (4.) the Worship of the Host. The Connection between the Parent Error and its Offspring traced and demonstrated. Concluding Remarks 300

CHAPTER X.

NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER CONTINUED.

The true Scriptural View of this Sacrament. 1. A Divinely obligatory MEMORIAL of the Death of Christ as a Sacrifice for Sin. The Scriptural Idea of a *Mystery*. Language of our Communion Office. Reasons for the MEMORIAL. Not Christ in the Memorial, but a Memorial *of* Christ. 2. Faith's MIRROR of the Sacrifice on the Cross. Not a *mere* Memorial. Office of Faith in View of this Mirror of the Cross. *How* Faith receives the Body and Blood of Christ then as at no other Time. Language of our Catechism and Communion Office on this Point examined. Does not teach the Doctrine of the Real Presence. *Believing* in Christ the only Reception of Him *possible*. 3. A *Means of Grace*. False and True Idea of this Means. Language of Catechism. Preaching and this Sacrament are Means of Grace on the same *Principle*, but not with the same *Extent*. 4. A Test of our *Obedience* to Christ. Scriptural Claim to this Obedience. 5. A visible *Badge* of our Discipleship, and one of the Church's Means of Discipline. True Value of this View. 6. A moral Monument to the Origin and Truth of Christianity. Language of our Articles coincident with the foregoing Views. Conclusion. Sum of the Treatise. Office of the Bible. Grand SYMBOLIC MYSTERY of Christ, His Church, and His Word. The History of the Church must be the unfolding of this MYSTERY . . . 344

our allegiance to the Gospel and the Faith, which that Word reveals!

Whether the work which is herewith offered has been dictated by any portion of such a Spirit of Wisdom; whether it carries with it aught of such a Spirit of Grace; or whether it is to be made tributary in any degree to the promotion of such blessed results, these are questions which must be referred for answer, not to the too often blinded judgment of authorship, but to the good providence of Him unto whose disposal the work is committed, who standeth in the midst of His golden candlesticks, and who holdeth in His right hand not only the stars of His ministry, but also the feebler lights thereof, which *seek* to gather and cast forth their beams from Christ.

Brooklyn, December 23d, 1843.

THE

MYSTERIES OPENED.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

ON THE RESULT, THE AGENT, AND THE INSTRUMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN'S NEW BIRTH.

1 Peter, i., 22, 23: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

This passage teaches several important things, which ought to be well weighed at the present time. We live in a period when that branch of the Church to which we belong, whether planted in the Old World or in the New, is deeply affected, not only by passing political events of an external character, but also by a tendency within itself to re-examine and discuss anew the great principles and doctrines of the Protestant Reformation.

My object in the ensuing treatise will be, not to enter with the fierceness of the common polemic into this re-examination and renewed discussion, but to treat directly, and, as far as possible, practically, some of these fundamental truths, which are widely discussed and strongly agitated among us. To be well grounded in the rudiments of our religion, it is not necessary that we be taught them amid the din of excited controversy, or that they be held in the spirit of hot disputation. I shall, indeed, refer occasionally

to human writings; but my chief resort in what I am to say will be to the sacred Scriptures themselves.

I. The passage prefixed to this chapter goes to the very root of all practical religion in man. "Unfeigned love for the brethren," or, literally, a "love *without hypocrisy*," "fervent love for one another out of a *pure heart*," this is religion in its fairest, most perfect development on earth. Were all that claims to be religion really imbued with this spirit, Truth would have a safer, as well as a warmer home than she now has in this lower world. Pure, holy, Christian love furnishes no soil for the roots of Error: nor does it ever baptize Truth in the waters of strife.

Such love is the great result at which God aims in all his spiritual discipline of his creatures. And when this result is fully reached, the soul is ripe for heaven; whether this result be reached in early childhood, in years of ripeness, or in declining age. Holy love is religion itself, not the process by which religion is attained. It is most unfeigned and most fervent when the heart is most pure and the soul most sanctified. Faithful Christians, while obeying the truth through the Spirit, "purify their souls unto unfeigned love of the brethren:" the process is sustained, till, sooner or later, they "love one another with a pure heart fervently:" and the more exact they are "in obeying the truth," the more rapid, as well as eminent, do their attainments become in this unfeigned and fervent, this holy and heavenly LOVE.

Since, then, this love is the grand result at which God aims in all his spiritual discipline of his people, and since this love is itself dependent for growth on growing purity of soul, it follows that the purifying of the soul is, in the highest sense, necessary to our enjoyment of eternal life. Without this purifying there can be no salvation. Sin defiles, and reason confirms what God hath taught, that nothing defiled can enter heaven. "There shall in nowise

enter therein any thing that defileth, or that worketh abomination, or a lie."—Rev., xxi., 27. The soul of every man guilty of actual sin must be purified, or it must spend its eternity out of heaven. In other words, as every man is by nature sinful, and, if he live, "commits many actual transgressions," his moral character must be radically changed; must pass what the passage before us calls a "being born again—of incorruptible seed;" or what Christ terms a being "born of water and of the Spirit;" of water, which *represents*, and of the Spirit, which *effects* this inward renewing of the mind: and being thus regenerate, the soul must grow in its new life; must advance in sanctification; must gain strength and stature, proportion and beauty, in all the graces of a pure and spotless nature. As the body has its birth, growth, and beautifying, so must the soul have. In its natural state, which is always a state of sin, it lies in the blood and darkness of its corruption, with merely capabilities for spiritual life. If it reach the period of moral action, then, before it can actually *live* in holiness, it must be *born* of the Spirit. Its moral character must be changed and made new. It must come to the light of a Divine life. It must be washed from the blood of its sinfulness and of its sins; and then, "as a new-born babe" in this its better life, it must "desire the sincere milk of the Word, that it may grow thereby," grow strong and lofty, well-shaped and beauteous, in all the purities of a new and heavenly character. This must be, not because man says so, but because God says so, and because he speaks but the decision of his own plain, divine-eyed reason. Even *we* can see that it must be so. The soul in its sins can not live a *holy*, therefore not a *heavenly*, life. Call its change by what name we please; "repentance and faith"—"regeneration"—"the new birth"—"the renewing of the mind"—a "new creation"—a "passing from death unto life"—a "quickening from a death in trespasses and sins"—a putting "on of the

wedding garment"—the "making of a new heart and a new spirit:" call its change by what name we will, it alters not the case; it must *be* changed, or it can never live with God in heaven. If all the teachers on earth were to teach otherwise, this would not *make* it otherwise. The necessity for this change lies in the nature of things, and the character of the immutable God and of his eternal truth must be altered before this necessity can cease to exist.

Nor is this change, thus necessary, merely superficial. The defilement of sin is not like an unclean garment, which may at any time be thrown aside, and exchanged for clean apparel. It is rather like impurities in the *blood*, or a disease in the *bones*, or an inflammation in the *heart*, which must be cured by strong, inworking medicine. The defilement of sin is in the very soul itself. The soul itself, therefore, and not its mere outward dress, or habits, must be the subject of this necessary change; must be purified and made whole of its inward diseases.

This work of purifying the soul is, of all others, most important to every individual man, since upon this depend all the results of practical religion in this life, and that holy love which is the essential element of eternal life itself. It must never be forgotten that this "unfeigned love of the brethren," this "loving one another with a pure heart fervently," which all real Christians obtain while "purifying their souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit," is identical in nature and in origin with that pure and fervent affection wherewith they love God, and are fitted to be forever happy in His love.

II. I have said that this purity of soul, this holy and fervent love out of a pure heart, is religion itself, not the process by which religion is attained. The passage before us, however, touches this process, as well as the result to which it leads. And, before we enter into the midst of our coming subject, it is of great importance that we should

have clear ideas of that process, as well as a full experience of this result, inasmuch as the ease with which we reach any given end depends on the clearness with which we see our way. The remainder of this chapter, therefore, will be devoted to a brief tracing of the way, as indicated in the passage before us, by which the Christian is brought to that purity of nature, and to that perfectness of love, so indispensable, as we have seen, to his salvation.

"Seeing that ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever," or, rather, "by the Word of the living and ever-enduring God."

Two things concerning the way of purifying the soul unto unfeigned love are here specified: the *Agent* and the *Instrument* which He uses; in other words, the *Spirit* and the *Word* of God.

1. The Agent, then, in the Christian's new birth, is the Spirit of God. Christians "purify their souls in obeying the truth through *the Spirit*." They are "born again of that incorruptible seed" which He alone can implant. He is the true and *only* efficient cause of their spiritual change.

On this point the Bible leaves no doubt. When religious teachers speak of other things as "sources of Divine grace,"* they mean, or ought to mean, the *channel* through which that grace flows, and not the *fountain* from which it springs; the visible means put into our hands, and not the viewless First Cause that operates through them. Of such causes there is but *one*, and that one the *Spirit of God*. Our new birth is from Him, his power, his influence. Man does not renew and sanctify himself. By nature he is opposed, not merely indifferent, but hostile, to the change.

* Tracts for the Times, N. Y. ed., vol. i., p. 6.

Left wholly to himself, to his *own will*, he would always die unchanged. "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other." — Gal., v., 17. With this repugnance to a change so peculiar as that required in Scripture, nothing but the Holy Spirit ever will, or can, give us a new and holy nature.

On this point, I repeat, the Bible suffers us not to doubt. It tells us, emphatically, that those who "believe in the name" of Christ, all true Christians, "are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of *God*."—John, i., 13. It assures us of the absolute necessity, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, of being "born of *the Spirit*."—John, iii., 5. It is the glory of the Christian dispensation that, while John baptized with *water*, Christ was to "baptize with the *Holy Ghost*." — Matt., iii., 11. He specially promised to send this Divine Agent to "convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." — John, xvi., 8. One of the most cheering prophecies of the Old Testament is that in which God promised to "pour out his Spirit upon all flesh." — Joel, ii., 28. Among the most cheering facts recorded in the New, are those which show that this promise has been, and is to be, literally fulfilled (Acts, ii., 1–18); while the saddest records on the sacred page are those in which the perishing are described as having "resisted the Holy Ghost" (Acts, vii., 51); and the most solemn warnings found there are those which warn men "not to grieve," "not to quench" that heavenly Agent.—Eph., iv., 30. 1 Thess., v., 19.

This point, then, is clear. To the follower of the Bible no shadow of doubt rests upon it. The Holy Spirit is, in the first instance, the only Renewer, and, through life, the only Sanctifier of the soul. Were it possible for the real child of God to deny this, even he would be a living proof of the truth which he denied. He would carry within,

however unseen and unacknowledged by himself, signatures in light, which nothing but the hand of that Holy One could have written, of his "new name." Such a denial, however, can never be made. Merely nominal Christians may make it, but not those who are so in heart as well as in name.

And yet, though this Spirit be the only Renewer and Purifier of the soul, He acts not on merely passive substances. He acts by inclining living spirits to action. He infuses not holiness by quantity into a motionless soul, as men pour clean water into a standing vessel. He puts the soul in motion toward the attainment of holiness, as a skilful master teaches his pupil how to acquire useful knowledge. Hence the peculiarity of the language of the passage on which I am remarking: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit." The Christians thus addressed purified their own souls through the Spirit, even as the Philippians were exhorted to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling;" for the reason that "it was God who wrought in them both to will and to do of His good pleasure."—Phil., ii., 12, 13. The Spirit wrought the work of their purification, yet the purified were themselves alive and in action under his influences; insomuch that, in one sense, they purified themselves. The Spirit wrought by inclining them to work. The soul becomes holy by thinking of holiness, longing for holiness, and laboring for holiness; but it is the Spirit of God that *moves* it to think, to long, and to labor.

Thus far, then, the way of the new birth is plain. The Agent in this divine change stands clearly revealed—the Holy Spirit of God.

2. But there is another step in this way. The *Agent* in the case works not without an *instrument*. The *Spirit* of God does his work by "the *Word* of God;" and He does it by inclining and enabling the soul to "*obey the*

truth" of that Word. "Ye have purified your souls in *obeying the truth* through the Spirit;" "being born again, of incorruptible seed, by *the Word of God*." It is "in obeying the truth" that the soul is purified, and divine love generated. The Spirit brings the soul to obey the truth; and, in obeying it, purifies its affections, and excites the exercises of holy love. *Truth* is the great instrument in the Spirit's renewing and sanctifying work. "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy Word is truth." — John, xvii., 17. "The sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God."— Eph., vi., 17. "Let the Word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom."—Col., iii., 16.

These passages show not only that Truth is the instrument with which the Spirit works, but also what and where that truth is. It is not mathematical truth, nor philosophical truth, nor physical truth, but truth *revealed, divine, spiritual.* It is that Holy Word which tells us the whole truth about God's character, the whole truth about man's condition, the whole truth about the way of salvation, the whole truth about our religious duties, the whole truth about all that it concerns us to know as candidates for a happy eternity. In short, as Christ is the central Sun of this whole system, and has called himself "*the Truth*," as well as "the Way and the Life," so the truth which the Spirit uses in His work of renewing and purifying the soul is that which makes truly and adequately known the character, offices, and work of this Divine Savior, together with the love, the homage, the whole duty which we owe him. And when the Spirit works in the soul the power and the disposition to *obey* this truth, it is but the same thing with working in it repentance for sin, faith in Christ, submission of the whole heart to him, and life-long love and service in his cause. It is the assigned office of the Spirit to glorify Christ, by exhibiting and applying to our minds the powerful truths of the Gospel. "He shall glorify me, for He

shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."—John, xvi., 14. And when men pervert the Gospel, they are termed "*false teachers*"—"by reason of whom the Way of *Truth* is evil spoken of."—2 Pet., ii., 1, 2.

The truth, then, which the Spirit uses as His instrument in renewing and purifying the soul, is the Gospel; all that body of spiritual light, which, centring in Christ, shines out from Christ; all that constitutes the "shining in our hearts of the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor., iv., 6); all that shows us what God is, and what we are; what Christ is, and what is our need of him; what He has done to save us, and what we must do to be saved.

How the Spirit uses this truth in renewing and purifying the soul is a different question, and one which I purpose hereafter to examine. For the present, I am concerned simply with *the fact* that, strictly speaking, this truth is the instrument, and the *only* instrument, employed in his work. I say, the only instrument, because the Church, her ministry, her Sabbaths, her worship, and her sacraments, are not, *in strictness*, instruments. They are so only as they hold *the* instrument in their hands. They are but the scabbard in which is sheathed that heaven-tempered "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," the truth of the Gospel. Unsheath—not for use, but to cast away—that sword; withdraw, so as to lose, this truth; or even, in *any* way, virtually deprive her of the Word of God, and the Church, her ministry, her Sabbaths, her worship, and her sacraments, would be lifeless things. They could exert no renewing and purifying power over the soul. In vain would you then go to them for life and cleansing. You might as well go for knowledge to a book, the covers of which inclosed only *blank leaves*, without the imprint of a syllable or a letter. Except as channels through which the Spirit pours God's truth upon the mind, the external

things of the Church are powerless for spiritual good. Take this truth out of them, and they could make no more impression on the soul than could a man's naked hand, or a literal sword of steel. The soul can not feel *them;* it can feel only the *truth*, when it comes through them.

In this strict and only proper sense, truth is *necessarily* the only instrument in our renewal and purification. So far as He uses an instrument, no agent can work on the soul for good without truth. Truth and Error are really the only instruments which the soul can feel.

When one free spirit manifests itself to another so as to move or affect it, the power with which it acts is evidently that of Truth only, or that of Error. Truth and Error stand to such a spirit in the stead of physical force to brute bodies. Free spirits are separate and distinct beings, and can actuate one another only by intelligible moral forces. They have no physical impact, like material things. They strike not; they wield no force of sinews; but, moving in their separateness, and charged with the power of Truth only, or that of Error, they pour into each other's conscious bosoms the electricity of mutual thought; till each becomes roused to all the vast emotions, activities, and free shaping of its nature, of which they are capable. This is their peculiar, their high prerogative and power with each other.

Keep both Truth and Error from a human soul, and how still and stagnant it lies! But, tell it a great truth truthfully, or whisper in its ear some glozing falsehood, and how quickly and mightily it moves and acts! Every thing that makes the soul feel, or affects her nature, is but Truth or Error, in some of their numberless forms. Goodness, love, beauty, and all other right things, which the soul feels so keenly, what are they but the *truth* of character, actions, and objects to the eternal fitness of things in God? And wickedness, injustice, deformity, and all other wrong things, to which the soul is so sensitive, what are *they* but the *false-*

hood of character, actions, and objects to that same eternal fitness? In what shape soever Truth comes, upon reaching the soul it makes that soul *feel* and *act;* and thus fashions her nature. The same is true of Error, only with a contrary effect. I repeat, then, so far as he uses an instrument, no agent can act on the soul for good without Truth. That agent must have Truth. Without this, in matters of religion, the soul can not understand what God is, what sin is, what holiness is, what duty is, what the way of salvation is, what heaven is, or what is the meaning of *any* thing religious. And, until it *understand* what these and kindred things are, ay, and feel them too, it can not repent, can not believe, can not exercise Divine love, can not perform a single holy act, can not become a renewed and purified being. Even the Spirit of God (with reverence is it spoken) can not *make* the soul understand and feel these things, except through the medium of Truth. If it have not *written* truth as its instrument, it must, by direct *inspiration*, supply its equivalent, and by an inward miracle, teach the soul to *understand*, and enable it to *feel* the truth, which it brings. Otherwise, its renewing and purifying work must remain undone. But this inward miracle, though possible with *God*, yet He has not encouraged *us* to expect. He has given us His revealed and written Truth; this Truth He has put into the hands of His Spirit; and with this His Spirit works in renewing and purifying the soul. Under an economy of means, this is a *necessary* instrument in His work. With this *only*, as resident in His Church, and actually using an instrument, He enlightens, quickens, changes, purifies, strengthens, comforts, and perfects the soul into a likeness to His own blessed self.

Conscience has sometimes been called a Divine light, and the voice of God in the soul of man; as though this could stand in the stead of revealed, or otherwise communicated truth. But this is false philosophy. Conscience

would, more properly, be called the eye of the soul, with which it sees truth; or the ear of the soul, with which it hears the voice of God; or, more properly still, the sensibility of the soul, with which it feels the power of His Word. Strictly speaking, however, conscience is but the mind itself, seeing and judging, approving or condemning its own acts; and Truth—revealed in the written Word, or radiating from the works of God, or shining in the actions of men, or miraculously communicated by the Spirit—is the light which the mind uses in thus seeing and judging, approving or condemning, its own acts. Truth is the light in which the soul was formed to live. Truth is a universal language, which she can every where be taught to *understand*. Truth is a spiritual weapon, which always makes her *feel*, whenever it is brought so as to reach her susceptibilities. And, as already intimated, the office of the Spirit is to pour the light of truth around the soul, and to heal her diseased eye, that she may see it; to speak the *meaning* of truth to the mind, and to unstop its closed ear, that it may hear its meaning; or, to bring the weapon of truth home to the heart, and to take off the iron mail of prejudice, that the sensibilities may feel its piercing. In the plain terms of the passage on which these remarks are made, the office of the Spirit is to bring the soul to "*obey the truth*," that, "in obeying," it may be "purified unto unfeigned love of the brethren," and every other form of holiness. The soul *obeys* truth when it perceives, feels, and submits to it; when it bows to its authority, loves its sway, and joyfully gives it governance over the thoughts and feelings, principles and purposes, motives and conduct of the mind; and truth, thus made effectual by the Spirit, thus reverenced, loved, and followed, touches every faculty of the soul, mixes remedially in all its action, brings it right with God, and right with man, works off its impurities, excites love, and brings back to man the lost tempers of heaven.

It may, indeed, be asked, *How* does the Holy Spirit, in the process just unfolded, open the blinded eye of the soul, that it may be conscious of the presence of Truth as a spiritual light; or unstop its deafened ear, that it may hear the meaning of that truth when presented; or soften its hardened heart, that it may feel the power of that truth when urged? Is not here a work upon the soul which the Spirit must perform *before* it can use the instrument of truth in carrying on its *farther* work? And must it not, therefore, do this previous work *without* an instrument?

This is inquiring deeply, but not, I apprehend, beyond the power of answer. I see not that this first act must be performed *without* an instrument, but, rather, that an instrument is actually used in performing it; yea, that this instrument is the very Truth itself, which is afterward to be still farther employed. To bring an illustration, I would say, Truth is the *couching*-instrument, which the Spirit uses in removing the film from the *eye* of the soul, that it may be conscious of the *light* of Truth. Truth is the *point* which the Spirit uses in piercing the dulness of her *ear*, that it may hear the *meaning* of Truth. And Truth is the *fire* which the Spirit applies in melting the hardness of her *heart*, that it may feel the *power* of Truth. Evidently, the Divine Agent *may*, and, for aught that appears to the contrary, *must* use the instrument of Truth in this, his *first* act, as well as in any and in every *farther* operation. The essence of Truth is spiritual. *Divine* Truth is what the Spirit *utters*. *What* He speaks is to be *understood*. And *when* He speaks, He *makes the deaf* to *hear*, as well as the *hearing* to *understand*. "*Speak*, Lord, for thy servant *heareth*," was the language of the listening young Samuel.—1 Sam., iii., 9, 10. "When they *heard* this, they were *pricked* in their heart," was the experience of the three thousand to whom Peter preached the Gospel on the day of Pentecost,

and whose *hard hearts* the Spirit pierced *by* what they *heard*.—Acts, ii., 37.

I have thought it desirable to dwell the longer on this point, because it has an important bearing on what I am hereafter to say on the subjects of preaching and the sacraments. The application of what has been said to those subjects I shall not at present anticipate. I will only add, in this place, that the relation which has been indicated between the truth of God's Word and the Holy Spirit on the one hand, and the soul of man on the other, is most important. It shows us why the Church is more gloriously successful in one place, or at one time, than another, in saving the souls of men. It is because, in such places and at such times, she has more holy truth, with a less mixture of error, than at others, in her preaching and sacraments, in her doctrines and worship. If truth be the only instrument with which the Spirit renews and purifies the soul, then *all* truth, so far as Revelation has made it known, is important, and not a ray of its light may be safely or guiltlessly turned aside from the eye of the mind. The Church which has Truth in her standards, yet that truth corrupted with Error, or covered under a pall of darkness, can hope for little, if any success in saving men. Where truth is latent, or error mostly visible, the soul can receive little or nothing but damage. *Error* is the instrument which the Spirit of Evil uses in deforming and destroying the soul; in polluting it, and filling it with hatred of God. Where there is *no* holy truth, the soul lies dead in her blood and uncleanness. But where such truth prevails, where it is free from mixtures of error, and is simply and adequately exhibited in the ministry and services of the Church, there true conversions abound, and the souls of a great multitude are seen, washed from the guilt of their transgressions, made alive to God, and clothed in the garments of beautiful holiness.

Let us bear in mind, then, the points which have now

been reviewed. The soul of every man guilty of actual sin must be morally changed and purified, or it can never be happy with God. The Holy Spirit is the only Agent by which this change can be effected. And Divine truth is the sole instrument which He uses in this work. And let us never forget that, in speaking of Divine truth, the Spirit of God, and the soul of man, we are not speaking of blocks and brutes, but of living and life-giving things; and that, therefore, the whole subject devolves on us the duties of prayer and watchfulness, of labor and study, of thought and effort, to see that these living and life-giving things be not kept apart. It is only by keeping the truth, the Spirit, and the soul in close companionship, that we can expect the blessed result of renewed and purified natures. Indolence and indifference here are as deeply mischievous, and, in one sense, as deeply criminal, as dislike and opposition. Though God is always first in action in the great work which we have considered, yet we should always labor as though first action belonged to us; and though He will ever be found to have wrought all our good in us, yet we should always work as though there were a sense in which all things depend on ourselves.

CHAPTER II.

PREACHING THE RIGHT HAND OF THE SPIRIT IN WIELDING THE SWORD OF THE WORD.

1 Pet., i., 23: "Being born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

It has been shown, in the previous chapter, that the new birth, of which mention is here made, is indispensably necessary to the salvation of every man as a moral agent; that the only efficient cause of this change is the Holy Spirit; and that the only instrument which this Divine Agent can employ in this work is holy truth. This truth is called, in the passage prefixed to the present chapter, "The Word of God, that liveth and abideth forever;" or, as it should, perhaps, have been rendered, "The Word of the living and ever-abiding God." In another place it is called "The Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God," in reference to the use which this Divine Agent makes of it in slaying the sins of the heart, and in conquering the hostility of the world.

If the question were here asked, With what visible hand does the Spirit most efficaciously wield this Sword of the Word, this instrument of heavenly temper? I presume all enlightened Christians would answer, With the hand of an authorized ministry of living men. This ministry unquestionably stands in the awfully honorable place of the seen hand, with which the Spirit of God generally grasps and wields the sword of Divine truth. And this hand is kindly and wisely chosen. It is better than would have been the hand of angels. Man, spiritually taught to know *himself*,

knows also, by analogy, his *fellow* man, and can approach him without inspiring that overwhelming awe with which he would be struck by the ministry of more mysterious natures. The ministry of living men has always been in use under every dispensation of the Church, and is especially characteristic of it under its Christian name. It is this ministry which now appears, visibly, in filling the Sabbaths, the worship, the preaching, and the Sacraments of the Church with a kind of life and motion. Take this ministry away, and all these channels would be empty, or filled with nothing but motionless truth. Take this ministry away, and the Spirit would have no commissioned, visible, and vital hand in bringing God's truth into action through its appointed channels.

But when we come to ask another question, Was this visible ministry appointed to bring truth into operation mainly through the administration of the Sacraments, or mainly through the preaching of the Gospel? we do not find the same harmony of opinion. In speaking of these visible channels, through which the instrument of truth is brought into contact with the mind by the efficacious power of the Spirit, there are some who teach "that the *Sacraments*, not *preaching*, are the sources of Divine grace;"* that "the great work" which Christians at first "did every Lord's Day," was "to administer and receive Christ's mystical Body and Blood;"† and that "this is the great means, appointed by our blessed Redeemer, whereby to communicate himself and all the merits of His most precious death and passion to us, for the pardon of all our sins, and for the purifying of our consciences from dead works, to serve the living God."‡ But to others, this sounds more like the extreme of a human theory than the teaching of the Word of God. To their apprehension, this Word makes the preach-

* Tracts for the Times, N. Y. ed., vol. i., p. 6.

† Bishop Beveridge, quoted by the Tracts, p. 175. ‡ Ibid., p. 189, 190

ing of the Gospel, rather than the administration of the Sacraments, the very right-hand of the Spirit in wielding the sword of Truth for the salvation of men.

To ascertain which of these important views is the more correct, let us go "to the law and to the testimony."

I. What, then, is the language of the New Testament in speaking of the Sacraments as included in the commission of Christ's ministers?

1. As to the Sacrament of Baptism, we find it instituted, enjoined, and practiced; but, to all appearance, it is thus presented as an ordinance which was to *follow* the preaching of the Gospel, and the conversion thereby of the souls of men to the faith of Christ. "Preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." —Mark, xvi., 15, 16. Here, evidently, is the divinely indicated order in the work of the ministry: 1, preaching the Gospel; 2, its effect, conversion unto faith; 3, the outward expression of this effect, Baptism. And this order the first ministers of Christ appear to have uniformly followed. Hence, when "Philip went down to the city of Samaria and *preached Christ* unto them," it is said, "When they *believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were *baptized*, both men and women." — Acts, viii., 5, 12. Hence, in the case of the eunuch, the same evangelist first "opened his mouth and began at the same Scripture" which had been read, "and *preached* unto him Jesus:" then he demanded and obtained of him a profession of his *faith* in Christ, and finally he "*baptized* him."—Acts, viii., 35, 37, 38. Hence, too, when Peter first carried the Gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles, he began with "*preaching* peace by Jesus Christ," assuring them that "through his name, whosoever *believeth* on Him shall receive remission of sins;" and when his *preaching* had been blessed to their conversion, he inquired, "Can any man forbid water, that these

should not be *baptized*, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we ?" Then "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."—Acts, x., passim. Hence Lydia of Thyatira *first* heard Paul and Timothy preach the Gospel; *then* "the Lord opened her heart to attend to the things which were spoken," and, *finally*, being a true convert, "she was baptized."—Acts, xvi., 14, 15. Hence, Paul and Silas, singing praises unto God at the midnight hour in their prison, when the anxious jailer of Philippi came in with the inquiry, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved ?" replied, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house." Then "spake they unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house;" and "believing in God with all his house," "he was baptized, he and all his straightway."—Acts, xvi., 30–34. Hence, when Peter had preached his first sermon, and when the multitude, who "were pricked in their heart, said unto him and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do ?" he answered, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." "Then they that gladly received his Word, were baptized, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls."—Acts, ii., 37, 38, 41. And hence, when Saul of Tarsus had seen a vision of his persecuted Lord, he must needs go to Damascus, and listen to the preaching of Annanias, before, in the waters of Baptism, he visibly sealed the faith, to which he had been converted, and thus openly consecrated himself to the service of Jesus of Nazareth.—Acts, xxii., 10–16.

In the New Testament are many other references to the practice of Baptism,* but nothing, so far as I am aware which can affect the view here taken—that it is an ordi-

* See, among other passages, the following, as most important: John, iii., 26; iv., 1, 2. Acts, viii., 12. Rom., vi., 3, 4. 1 Cor., xii., 13. Gal., iii., 27. Eph., iv., 5. Tit., iii., 4, 5. Heb., vi., 2. 1 Peter, iii., 21.

nance designed to *follow* the preaching of the Gospel, and the conversion thereby of the souls of men to the faith of Christ.

It must, indeed, be observed that these remarks apply to the baptism of *adults*. That of *infants* is rather an ecclesiastical usage than an express Divine precept: a usage, indeed, supported by just inference from the Bible, and by early Christian practice; still, as I conceive, not affecting the view which I have taken of the original design and place of Baptism. Infants are incapable of receiving a preached Gospel, of repenting and of believing in Christ. To them, baptism is a token that they are the seed of a believing people; it admits them into the Visible Church; seals to them, conditionally, the promises of God; places them for education amid the outward privileges and means of grace; represents to them what they need, the renewing and cleansing influences of the Spirit; and binds them, upon opening accountability, to seek those influences and to become what their baptism teaches they should become, dead unto sin and alive unto righteousness. Hence, when they "come to years of discretion," the Church still "calls upon them to hear sermons," the Gospel preached, and "chiefly provides that they should learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and all *other* things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."* And hence, when effectually brought to this knowledge and faith, they are called on openly to ratify and confirm what was done in their name in baptism, before they can be regularly received to a participation of the higher Sacrament of the Church.† The *principle* in question, therefore, remains unaffected. The preaching of the Gospel, or some equivalent inculcation of its truths, in riper years, is as much needed in their case as it is in the case of the great body of unbaptized adults in the world, to whom

* Off. Infant Baptism. † Conf. Off. and Rub. in Catech.

Christ's ministers are commissioned to carry the Gospel. In either case, the preaching of the Gospel, or some equivalent, seems the necessary channel through which the quickening influences of the Spirit flow; and in *both* cases baptism has mainly the same signification and effect, as an ordinance admitting to membership in the Church, sealing the promises of God, and binding to obedience of life. Even in infant baptism the ministry of the Word holds *priority*, not in point of *time*, but in point of *efficacy*, as that channel through which the Spirit first pours quickening and renewing truth upon the intelligent and conscious soul, and thus brings it to a fitness openly and intelligently to confess Christ before men. In the view of the Church, whatever may be the effect of infant baptism, it is evidently not that of a first means of that great moral change through which every conscious transgressor must pass in order to salvation.

2. Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper less is said in the New Testament than of baptism. Three of the writers of the Gospels record the facts of its first institution, and of its being enjoined on the disciples as a memorial of Christ, and as a sacred symbol of his atoning sacrifice. — Matt., xxvi.; Mark, xiv.; and Luke, xxii. The Apostle Paul records the special revelation to him of the same facts.— 1 Cor., xi., 23–26. He also sharply reproves the Corinthians for their shocking abuse of this sacrament, and gives them suitable instructions for its decent observance in future. — 1 Cor., xi., 17–34. Moreover, he thus defines the act of receiving this sacrament: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?—1 Cor., x., 16. And he shows the utter inconsistency of "drinking the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, and of being partakers of the Lord's Table and of the table of devils."—1 Cor., x., 21. In

addition to this, there are three incidental allusions to the observance of this sacrament during the times of the apostles; one, in the case of Christ and the two disciples at Emmaus, if that can be called an instance of its observance; another in the case of the three thousand converted under the preaching of Peter; and another in the case of Paul and the Church at Troas, in connection with the death and recovery of Eutychus.

This, so far as I can collect, is the whole of what is said of this sacrament in the New Testament; enough to evince the Divine origin, high obligation, and vast importance of the Lord's Supper; and to prove that, by the early Christians, it was an ordinance regularly, or, at least, frequently observed; and yet going mainly to show that this ordinance, in its leading design, is *Love's* memorial of the death of Christ; that the bread and wine in the Eucharist are symbols, ministerially set apart, of Christ's body and blood as a sacrifice for sin; and that to abuse this ordinance in a profane way, or without discerning by faith the Lord's body which it symbolizes, is to eat and drink not with a blessing, but unto condemnation.

This is not the place for entering fully into an examination of the sense of these important passages. Such an examination belongs to a future stage in the discussion. For the present, therefore, I content myself with saying that, rightly understood, they do not suggest the idea that either Christ or his apostles relied on this sacrament for the *conveyance* of that pardon which was purchased by his death, or that they relied on this sacrament mainly for giving *effect* to his wondrous work of atonement by sacrifice. On the contrary, understood in their true sense, they are full of meaning to this effect: that its Institutor, and his first ministers, considered it an ordinance in which true Christians only are to commune happily together in love, and profitably together by faith, upon the consecrated *symbols* of their

Savior's body and blood; that, having *previously*, by "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," become participants in the pardon of sin, and in the hope of eternal life, as revealed in the Gospel, such Christians come together at the Lord's Supper to *express* their love for Christ, and their faith in Him; and, in the exercise of these graces, to be refreshed and strengthened in the new life mightily; feeding in spirit on "the True Bread which came down from heaven."

II. Having thus seen what is said of the sacraments, let us now see what is said of the preaching of the Gospel as the great work of the ministry.

1. It would seem, then, that there is something of meaning in the fact that Christ himself is called, by emphasis, "*the Word.*" Why was this, but to intimate that truth *uttered*, *spoken*, by himself and by his ministry, is the great means by which, through the efficacious influences of His Spirit, He designs to give effect to His redeeming work in saving lost men?

2. Illustrative of this, we have the fact that His own ministry was eminently a ministry of preaching the Gospel. It was by this, blessed by the influences of His Spirit, that He prepared His disciples to understand and receive the offering of Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. In this act of sacrifice, indeed, lies the burden of his Gospel; and yet in this act itself He spent a few hours only; while, in preparing the disciples for it, by the preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom, He consumed years. From the time of His entrance on His ministry, "Jesus began to *preach* and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."—Matt., iv., 17. And it was as true of the whole sphere of His ministry as it was of the particular place mentioned, that "Jesus went about all *Galilee*, teaching in their synagogues, and *preaching* the Gospel of the kingdom."—Matt., iv., 23. When he "departed" from one

place, it was "to teach and to preach in their cities."—Matt., xi., 1. To His disciples He said, "Let us go into the next towns, that I may *preach* there also; for therefore came I forth."—Mark, i., 38. And when He came into the synagogue at Nazareth, and made His hearers "wonder at the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth," it was by simply commenting on that beautiful prophecy of Isaiah concerning himself: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me *to preach the Gospel* to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the broken hearted; to *preach* deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised; to *preach* the acceptable year of the Lord."—Luke, iv., 18, 19.

3. As a farther illustration, we have the fact that the twelve were chosen to be with him "from the *beginning*," in order that, by listening to his preaching, and witnessing His miracles and His passion, they might, when endowed with the Spirit, be qualified to become themselves *preachers* of the Gospel, which they had been taught. Hence He says to them, "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, He shall testify of me; *and ye* also shall *bear witness*, because *ye have been with me from the beginning*."—John, xv., 26, 27. The season which they spent with Him was the period of their theological education; of their acquisition of knowledge, and their investment with the Spirit, in order to their successful *witnessing* for Christ in their future preaching of His Gospel.

4. As a still farther illustration, we have the fact that the various commissions which the apostles received from Christ were chiefly commissions to preach the Gospel. Thus ran the high mandates under which they went forth.

First, Jesus "ordained twelve that they might be with

him, and that he might send them forth *to preach*, and to have power to heal sickness, and to cast out devils."—Mark, iii., 14, 15. Luke, vi., 13. Here, evidently, their chief work was *preaching*. *Miracles* could have been but an occasional incident on their way.

Their second commission, however, was still more emphatic. "Go ye to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and, as ye go, *preach*, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand."—Matt., x., 7. "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye on the house tops."—Matt., x., 27. "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that city shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city."—Matt., x., 14, 15. In this, as in the first commission, was included the temporary power of working miracles. But, as in the former case, it could have been but an incident by the way. Their main business must have been the "preaching of the kingdom."—Luke, ix., 2.

Nor was this feature removed from its place of primacy in their *third* and great commission from Christ; conferred after His resurrection, when He may be supposed to have given it its most evangelical type. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."—Matt., xxviii., 18–20. Or, as it is elsewhere given: "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the Gospel to every creature*. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned."—Mark, xvi., 15, 16. To this their last, their finished commission, it is immediately added, by way of historical comment, "And

they went forth, and *preached every where;* the Lord working with them, and confirming *the Word* with signs following."—Mark, xvi., 20.

5. This comment leads to the mention of still another illustrative fact—that, after their Master had given their commission its widest scope and most divine fullness; after He had dropped from his ascending form the broad mantle of his own authority upon their office, they, with their coadjutors, immediately gave themselves to the execution of their commission in the preaching of the Gospel. To this, emphatically, Peter and John, Stephen and Philip, Paul and Barnabas, Apollos—"mighty in the Scriptures"—and the multitude dispersed by early persecution, devoted their powers: "Rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name, they *daily*, in the Temple and in every house, ceased not to *teach and preach Jesus Christ.*"—Acts, v., 41, 42. Yea, "They went *every where*, *preaching the Word.*"—Acts, viii., 4.

While thus engaged, the incidents which happened to them, and the manner in which they met those incidents, showed the estimate in which they held their office, and the interpretation which they put on their commission. Scarcely had they entered on their work, when they were thrown into prison for their boldness *in preaching* Christ. But the Angel of the Lord, having opened their prison door, said unto them, "Go, stand and speak in the Temple to the people all the words of this life." They went, and spake! Immediately, however, they were dragged before the council, and asked, "Did we not straightly command you that ye should not teach in this name? And, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine." But to this their heroic reply was, "We ought to obey God rather than men;" and with that they instantly began to preach Jesus, in the very audience of their persecutors. And when they had been beaten for so doing, "they departed from the presence

of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name. And daily, in the Temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."—Acts, v., passim.

Again: when the apostles found lesser duties too engrossing upon their time, they appointed subordinate ministers for such things, saying, "We will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the Word."—Acts, vi., 4.

And again: when the multitude, "unable to resist the wisdom and the Spirit, by which he spake" in his preaching, had "stoned Stephen," and thus began to roll the first wave of general persecution over the Infant Church, "those that were scattered abroad went every where *preaching the Word*."—Acts, viii., 4.

In all these incidents, who does not see that the great burden of the labors of all his first ministers was, what we should naturally expect from the tenor of their commission, not the administration of the Lord's Supper, but the preaching of "Jesus Christ, and him crucified?" The body of their history is, in fact, found in the following brief record: "And they, when they had testified and preached the Word of the Lord, returned to Jerusalem, and preached the Gospel in many villages of the Samaritans."—Acts, viii., 25. That "the breaking of bread," or celebration of the Lord's Supper, was very frequent in the first Christian assemblies, it is needless to deny.—Acts, ii., 42. But there can be no doubt that the main course of their ministry lay thus: the preaching of the Gospel with a view to the all-essential result of bringing men to "repentance toward God, and to faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" and when they were thus gathered into Christian assemblies, then the drawing close of the bonds of brotherly love and of holy union, by frequently communing together over the hallowed memorials of that crucified Master to whom they had given

their faith, and whom they were determined to serve, though in the face of persecution and death. By the *ministry of the Word*, they were brought to the Savior. By the *communion of saints*, they were cheered and encouraged to constancy amid the kindling fires of persecution.

6. But, besides all these *facts* in illustration of the present point, we have various passages, both from Christ and from his apostles, which materially increase the light hitherto collected.

(1.) Thus, announcing the permanent work of his ministers, and foretelling even the end of the world, Christ says, "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come."—Matt., xxiv., 14. Other things, besides this preaching of the Gospel, were to be done during this long period, and things of great importance, too; but, in thus condensing the entire history of the Church into a single sentence, this, it seems, was so much the most important of all, as to be the only thing worthy of introduction into such a summary.

(2.) So, too, after his resurrection, and the giving of his final commission, in explaining to his disciples Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, and in "opening their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures," He said unto them, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behooved Christ to suffer*, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be *preached in his name* among all nations."—Luke, xxiv., 44–47. *Suffering*, as a sacrifice for sin, was the great fact in *his* labors; *giving it effect* through the Spirit, by preaching in his name repentance and remission of sins, was to be the great work of his *ministers*. To this end, they were "endued with power from on high," Luke, xxiv., 49; and to make them *skilful* in their work, "their understandings were opened, that they might understand the Scriptures," and thus know

how to preach the Savior, whom those Scriptures revealed. And yet, the theory of some would have Christ to say, in substance, while thus setting forth his chief act, and the corresponding work of his ministers: "Offering the *first* sacrifice for sin in the death on the cross has been *my* great work: *continuing* this sacrifice, in the sacrament of the altar, is to be *yours*." It is enough to say, Christ did not *so* interpret his own meaning. *His* interpretation runs thus: "*My* propitiatory suffering for sin is the most vital fact in the Gospel system. *Your* main labor will be *the preaching* of this fact, and of its dependent system, for the conversion and salvation of sinners."

(3.) But, to pass from the view which Christ thus gave of this point to that which his apostles took, I notice, first, the address of the Apostle Paul to the elders of the Church of Ephesus assembled at Miletus. This was a peculiarly solemn occasion; lying near the close of the apostle's labors, and improved to the affecting purpose of showing that he had "made full proof of his ministry; that no one could charge upon him the death of a single soul; and that the skirts of his office had been washed clean from the blood of all." On such an occasion, what does he say? Take a few of many pregnant expressions. "I kept back nothing that was profitable, but have showed you and taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things which shall befall me there, save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me; neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and *the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God*. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I

have gone *preaching the kingdom of God*, shall see my face no more. Wherefore, I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men; for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God."—Acts. xx., 20–27. This is a specimen of his whole address, in which there is not one word about his ever having administered a single sacrament. And yet, he, as well as others, had administered the sacraments on proper occasions. But the truth is, he had been so mainly occupied throughout his ministry with its great ordained labor, that now, when standing almost at the foot of Christ's judgment seat, and amid the most affecting anticipations of his final account, he could only pour out his thoughts on what had so long and so thoroughly possessed and occupied them, "*the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God!*"

(4.) Nor is his demonstration to the Romans of the necessity of preaching less in point. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved. How, then, shall they call on Him, in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in Him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a *preacher?* And how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that *preach the Gospel* of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!" "So, then, *faith* cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the *Word of God.*"—Rom., x., 13–15, and 17.

How different is this from the theory, that whosoever, not in mortal sin, shall partake of the sacrifice of the altar, with faith to believe that Christ's body is there, shall be saved. The apostle's is a more evangelic scheme. "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, in the faith necessary to such a calling, shall be saved." To this prayer of *faith* a knowledge of Christ is of course necessary; and to this knowledge the preaching of the Gospel, or some equiv-

alent inculcation of the Word of God, is essential. Here is not a word of the necessity of the sacraments to salvation. The sacraments are necessary "where they may be had," and for the end designed in them, but not essentially and absolutely necessary to salvation. But, so far as the Gospel is concerned, *faith in Christ*, derived through the Word of God, *is* essentially and absolutely necessary to salvation. Hence the pre-eminent importance which attaches itself to *the ministry of the Word*.

(5.) To the same effect is the teaching of this distinguished apostle to the Corinthians: "To wit: that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto *us* the *Word* of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us. We pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God; for He hath made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."—2 Cor., v., 19–21. This is one of the happiest summaries on record of the true Gospel of our redemption; one of the best statements to be found of the true character of the ministry; and one of the most felicitous specimens to be met with of the manner in which this ministry should be exercised. According to this, the *Gospel* is, "God in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself; not imputing their trespasses unto them:" the *ministry;* "ambassadors for Christ," charged with "the Word of reconciliation," the terms of pardon and life: the manner of *exercising* this ministry; urging God's beseeching call, and praying men, "for Christ's sake, to be reconciled to him," as the most effectual way of bringing them to realize, amid the tenderness of repentance and the actings of faith, this vital truth; that God "hath made Him, who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." Precious Gospel! a reconciling God in Christ. Solemn ministry! am-

bassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech by us. Touching discharge of our high function! pleading with men, for Christ's sake, to be reconciled to Him, against whom they have rebelled, but who yet seeks to cover them, through faith in the Crucified, with the rich robe of His own perfect righteousness. Would that all who bear the name were ministers in the full spirit of this charming passage!

(6.) Nor is His language to the Corinthians in another place less in point. "Though ye have *ten thousand instructors* in Christ, yet have ye not *many fathers;* for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through *the Gospel.*"—1 Cor., iv., 15. Here the whole order, work, and result of the ministry are given in brief but significant summary. "*In Christ Jesus*," who giveth the Spirit, and whom the Spirit glorifieth, *Paul*, the living preacher, "*had begotten*" to their new birth the Corinthian disciples, "*through the Gospel*," as the divinely appointed instrument of their renewal, and conversion "from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God."

(7.) But perhaps the most remarkable language on this point is that addressed to the Corinthians in another place, as illustrating both the necessity and the power of preaching, when considered as the right hand of the Spirit in wielding the Sword of the Word. "Christ sent me not to *baptize*, but to *preach the Gospel.*" That is, administering the sacraments is not the *main* thing for which I am sent. *This* is the preaching of the Gospel. "Not with wisdom of words, lest the Cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the Cross is, to them that perish, foolishness: but unto us, which are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to naught the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that, in the

wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom. But we preach Christ crucified; unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness: but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren; how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble *call you.* But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen; yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; that no flesh should glory in His presence. But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who, of God, is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. That, according as it is written, He that glorifieth, let him glory in the Lord."—1 Cor., i., 17–31.

Now, be it remembered, the whole of this magnificent passage is spoken of the *preaching* of the Cross, in distinction from the administration of the sacraments, or at least of one of them; and is therefore as strictly as possible to our purpose. This preaching the apostle styles, in different parts of the passage, "the foolishness of preaching;" "the foolish things of the world;" "the weak things of the world;" nay, by one of the most startling of figures, he terms it "the foolishness of God," and "the weakness of God," in reference to the estimate put upon it by the self-conceited philosophers of ancient times.

I have ventured, with Macknight, to change one expression in the commonly received version. I refer to the words "*are called,*" in the 26th verse. These are want-

ing in the original; and in filling the blank, it is absolutely required by the scope of the writer to substitute the words "*call you.*" "Ye see *your calling*, brethren; how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, *call you*," or have been employed in *your calling*. God hath not employed men of learning, men of office, and men of rank, in calling you; but rather the unlearned, the obscure, and the untitled, like Peter, and James, and John; and He has done this for the very purpose of "staining the pride of all glory" in man; of showing that the preaching of the Cross does not depend for success on human learning, office, or nobility; but on the power of God as it resides in the mighty doctrine.

Thus rendered, the whole passage is still more pertinent to my purpose; and, did the limits which I have assigned myself allow, I should delight in putting the whole into ample paraphrase. Perhaps, however, it is well that my limits forbid this; for nothing, surely, can make the general sense of the apostle more plain; and nothing can add to the weight of his strong and ponderous meaning. I will simply add, therefore, that I have given it *entire*, because it can not be broken without weakening its force, in demonstrating the pre-eminent honor which God has put upon the ordinance of preaching, and the reverential estimate in which He would have us hold it, as what I must repeatedly term, *the right hand of His Spirit in wielding the Sword of His Word for the salvation of men.*

There are other passages of equal pertinency, from this, and from other apostles, to the same point. But they are too numerous for citation and comment, and would merely add *numerically* to the illustrations already given.* I

* See, among other passages, the following: 1 Cor., ii., 1–7; ix., 16; xv., 1, 2. 2 Cor., iv., 1–7. Gal., i., 6–9. Eph., vi., 19, 20. Phil., i., 14–19. Col., i., 24–29. 1 Thess., ii., 4–13. 2 Thess., iii., 1. 1 Tim., ii., 6, 7. 2 Tim., i., 11; ii., 15; iii., 16, 17; iv., 1–5. Tit., i., 9–11. James, i., 21–25. 1 Pet., i., 22–25. Rev., xiv., 6.

close, therefore, with a remark or two on what has been said.

The principal results, then, which have now been reached are these two: that the sacraments were intended, not for the instrumental origination of the new life in the soul, and the conveyance of pardon or justifying grace, but for administration to those who, through the preaching of the Gospel made effectual by the Spirit, have previously been brought to repentance and faith in Christ; or who, if *infants*, are in baptism placed amid the means of their subsequent renewal unto righteousness and true holiness; but, that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ crucified, in season and out of season, in the face of persecution and death, with boldness and fidelity, in love and long suffering, was the one mighty labor to which the first ministers of Christ were devoted, and in which they wore out their lives for the conversion and salvation of their fellow-men.

Since, therefore, the character and objects of the ministry have not since changed, it is evident that the teaching which is becoming so prevalent among us, "That the sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine grace," is unscriptural, and can not be held consistently with the Bible. In saying, moreover, that this teaching involves a serious error, we detract not from the value of the sacraments themselves, nor from that profound reverence and affection with which they should ever be regarded as the ordinances of Christ. On this point I purpose to speak more particularly at a future stage of the discussion.

For the present, let us bless God for the Gospel which He has sent us, and for that ministry of living men in the *preaching* of that Gospel through which the Holy Spirit seeks to bring the power of Divine truth into action within our minds. In this preaching, now as of old, holy influences meet men. Let us beware how we resist them, or even trifle with them amid the dallying of procrastination.

Sacred, though viewless, realities are about us. God, Father, Son, and Spirit, is seeking the salvation of our souls. And eternal life or everlasting death must be the issue of the effort which He is making, and of the manner in which we are affected by that effort. Let us not "receive this grace of God in vain," but so yield to it that "the preaching of the Cross" may prove to us neither "a stumbling block" nor "foolishness," but "the power of God and the wisdom of God," to the salvation of our souls.

CHAPTER III.

COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF PREACHING AND THE SACRAMENTS.

Mark, xvi., 15, 16: "Preach the Gospel to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

Luke, xxii., 19: "This do in remembrance of me."

These passages show that the instructions which Christ gave his ministers bound them to do two things: to preach His Gospel, and to administer His sacraments. The implication is, not that they were to do nothing else, but that these they must do, whatever else was either done or left undone.

I have already remarked, in substance, that the most vital fact included in the Gospel is, the Sacrifice, which Christ perfected on the Cross, as an atonement for sin. This was that sublime consummation, without which He had left the bosom of the Father in vain. "It *behooved* Christ to suffer." Teaching *alone* would not have redeemed a world. The cup, which the Father gave the Son to drink, *could not* pass away. It was necessary that he should exhaust it, or leave His design of mercy unaccomplished.

Now, to this work of atonement by sacrifice both the Christian sacraments have an admitted reference. In the *former*, we are represented as "baptized into His death."—Rom., vi., 3. That is, baptism emblematizes the death of Christ, in so far as it teaches, in emblem, what Christ's sacrifice demands of us—"a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness." Baptism represents what the death of Christ requires should be wrought *in* the sinner.

In the *latter* sacrament, we are represented as having "the communion of the body and blood of Christ."—1 Cor., x., 16. The Lord's Supper, in the fullest sense, symbolizes the sacrifice of atonement. It teaches, in symbol, that "without the shedding of blood is no remission." The Lord's Supper represents what Christ, in His death, has graciously and actually done *for* the sinner.

Thus far all rightly instructed Christians agree. Difference arises on another point. Did Christ intend to give *effect* to his work of atonement, to communicate the benefits of His passion, to generate the principle of a new and holy life in the soul, and to bring us to the actual enjoyment of pardon, justification, adoption, by the gift of His Spirit in the use of *the sacraments*, or by the influences of His Spirit through *the preaching of the Gospel ?*

In discussing this important point, I have thus far been led to the view, which sees, not in the sacraments, but in the preaching of the Gospel, the very right hand of the Spirit in wielding the Sword of Truth ; not because such is the view taken by multitudes of learned as well as pious divines of the Church, but because such appears to be the view given by the Bible itself. I have shown that, in the New Testament, the only part of the Bible which furnishes testimony on this point, the main stress, in the work of saving men, is laid on

preaching: whether we look at Christ's own ministry, at His various commissions to the Twelve, at their action under those commissions, or at the language of the New Testament writers when speaking of the sacraments and of preaching, whether separately or in connection. As Christ's great though not solitary act was the making of an atonement for sin, so the great though not exclusive work of his ministers was to be, and actually became, the proclamation of that atonement, the "preaching of the Cross"—the preaching of "Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." The ministry itself is termed, by the Apostle Paul, "the ministry of reconciliation;" and then the trust committed to this ministry is termed by him "the *Word* of reconciliation," not the *sacrament* of reconciliation. Ministers themselves are denominated "*ambassadors* for Christ," not offerers of *sacrifice* at His altar; and their work is described as consisting, not in "making the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ," but in "praying men, in Christ's stead, as though God did beseech us *by* them, to be reconciled to Him."

I. But, if such be the true place of the Divine ordinance of preaching, as assigned in the Bible, may we not expect, when we come to trace the history of the Church, to find a correspondence between this view and the facts of the case? I reply, undoubtedly; nor will our expectation be disappointed. After the effusion of the Spirit on the Church, we find that, wherever the ordinance of preaching was most abundantly and faithfully used, there were exhibited most of the results of repentance and faith, of an effectual taking hold of that eternal life, which is in Christ Jesus. To speak first of apostolic times:

1. Such were the effects of Philip's labors, when he "went down to the city of Samaria, and *preached Christ*

unto them." "They believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, and were baptized, both men and women."—Acts, viii., 5, 12. Such, too, were the effects of Peter's preaching in the house of Cornelius, where the first *Gentile* congregation were "present before God, to *hear* all things commanded of God." "While Peter yet *spake*, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that *heard the Word*."—Acts, x., 33, 44. And such, more remarkably, were the effects of Peter's first sermon to a congregation of *Jews*. The Holy Ghost having been silently given while Peter preached the Word, "there were the same day added" to the disciples "about three thousand souls."—Acts, ii., 41.

Similar facts are continually recurring in the sacred records. Thus, immediately after the apostles had decided, "It is not reason that we should leave the *Word of God*, and serve tables;" and had taken the resolution, "We will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of *the Word*;" we find that "*the Word of God increased*, and the number of the disciples *multiplied* in Jerusalem *greatly*, and a *great company* of the priests were obedient to the faith."—Acts, vi., 2, 4, 7. Thus, too, when, "by the space of two years," Paul had been preaching the Gospel in Ephesus, "so that all they that dwelt in Asia *heard the Word of the Lord Jesus*, both Jews and Greeks;" when the evil spirits had refused to be adjured by that "Jesus whom Paul *preached*," and when the "many that believed came and confessed and showed their deeds;" and the "many, also, of them which used curious arts, brought their books together and burned them before all," to the value of "fifty thousand pieces of silver;" we have the strikingly illustrative comment of the sacred historian, "So mightily grew the *Word of God* and prevailed!"—Acts, xix., 1–20, passim.

2. All the passages, thus far cited, in reference to the ordinance of preaching, speak of it, more or less directly, as the great instrument used by the Spirit in bringing men to repentance and faith; in generating in the soul the principle of a new and spiritual life. And it is remarkable that, when speaking of this glorious, this designed result of all Christ's labors and sufferings, as practically developed, the Scriptures never once allude to the sacraments as the instrument which was used. It is true that Bishop Beveridge, in his "Sermon on Frequent Communion," has attempted to show that this sacrament was at first administered *daily*, or, at least, *every Lord's Day*. But, in both points, he has strained his proofs beyond what they are able to bear. As his argument leads us to the Scriptures, it may not be amiss to follow its principal steps. It rests on three passages; one from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and two from the book of the Acts.

(1.) To the Corinthians, the apostle gives the instituting words of Christ, as specially revealed to him, and among them, the expression, "This do, *as oft as* ye drink it, in remembrance of me."—1 Cor., xi., 25. Now, from this, it is argued, that it was Christ's "meaning and pleasure that they should *often* do it, *so* often as they met together to perform their public devotions to Him, if it was possible; or, at least, upon the Lord's Day;"* as if Christ had said, "This do (as ye are *often* to drink it) in remembrance of me." It is needless, even to an English scholar, to say, that this is a mistake of the force of language. Our Savior's words bear no more than this: that, "*as often as*" (ὁσάκις), or whenever, his disciples partook of His Supper, they should do so *in memory of Him*. Whether this should be once a day, or once a

* Bishop Beveridge, quoted in the "Tracts for the Times," New-York ed., vol. i., p. 176.

week, or once a month, is a question which they leave wholly untouched; unless, indeed, as the word "*drink*" is not, in the original, followed by the pronoun "*it*," we take the passages thus: "This do, *as oft as ye drink*, in remembrance of me." Then, in truth, we should have the communion with sufficient frequency, as often as the Christian slaked his thirst; and, what is more, every man his own administrator of the mystery! Again:

(2.) In the book of the Acts, after recording the case of the three thousand, it is said, "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and *in breaking of bread* and in prayers." It is also added that, "continuing *daily* in the Temple, and breaking bread from house to house, they did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart."—Acts, ii., 42, 46. From this it is argued that, "As they continued *daily* in the Temple, at the hours of prayer, to perform their solemn devotions there, so they *daily* received the Holy Sacrament, and ate this spiritual food 'with gladness and singleness of heart:' this being, indeed, the chief part of their devotions, whensoever they could meet together to perform them."* Here, it is obvious, the premises are too narrow for the conclusion which they are forced to support. It must be remembered that the Jews, who hated and had just crucified their Messiah, were still masters of their own Temple, and kept up there the daily service of their own worship. It is, therefore, somewhat doubtful whether they would allow *persecuted* Christians to come there daily at the hour of that worship and celebrate what must have been to them the *odious* sacrament of the death of Christ, side by side with the revered rites of their own dispensation. But, besides this, the text does not say, nor imply, that they *broke bread* daily. It says, indeed, that they went daily

* Bishop Beveridge, quoted in the Tracts, N. Y. ed., vol. i., p. 175.

to *the Temple:* but this means no more than that, though the Jewish dispensation was *ecclesiastically* at an end, yet, as the Temple worship was still *outwardly* maintained, so the disciples, being themselves Jews, still continued, as their Master had done, to frequent that worship, though for the simple purpose of joining in its ancient, and, as yet, undisplaced forms. As to the Lord's Supper, the text says, they "continued *steadfastly* in the breaking of bread:" but then, *steadfastness* implies not any particular degree of *frequency*. They might have been sufficiently *steadfast* in the custom, though it had been but of *monthly* occurrence. What is said of "breaking bread from house to house," and of "eating their meat with gladness and singleness of heart," carries no reference to the *frequency* of the sacrament in the *former* clause, if it carry any reference to the sacrament *at all;* while the *latter* unquestionably refers to the *ordinary meals* of the first Christians. To make "eating their meat" here refer to the *sacrament*, is to introduce a new and strange kind of transubstantiation. It is to change the elements, not into the body and blood of Christ, but into men's *ordinary food;* for the word rendered "meat" (τροφῆς), means the common and nutritious aliment of our bodies. In truth, the whole force of both these clauses is evidently this: that, as the first Christians were led, by stress of circumstances, to "have all things common, to sell their possessions and goods, and part them to all, as every man had need," so they socially and generously lived together, taking their food sometimes in one house, and sometimes in another, and sharing their common bounties, not with the dissocial, thankless, and selfish spirit of those who hoard for themselves, and grudge what they have hoarded, but with the joyful and single hearts of men who live not unto themselves, but unto the Lord.

(3.) And, again, in the same book it is said, "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together *to break bread*, Paul preached unto them (ready to depart on the morrow), and continued his speech until midnight."—Acts, xx., 7. From this it is argued thus: "It is true, St. Paul, being to go away next day, he took that opportunity, when they were met together for that end" (the breaking of bread), "to give them a sermon. But that was not the end of their meeting together at that time. They did not come to hear a sermon, though St. Paul himself was to preach; but they came together to administer and receive Christ's mystical body and blood; which plainly shows that this was the great work they did *every* Lord's Day."* But this, certainly, is quite too sudden and too long a leap from premises to conclusion. The fact that they came together on that particular Lord's Day to break bread, no more proves that they did so *every* Lord's Day, than the fact that some of our parishes meet for communion once *a month* proves that they meet for that purpose once *a week*. On the contrary, so far as the remark in the text proves any thing, it proves that, as that *particular* day was mentioned as *communion* day, there were *other* Sundays on which there was *no* communion. Had the apostle said, "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, as they were wont to do *every* Lord's Day," the proof of the point had been complete. But, as he adds no such interpreting clause, he in fact leaves the question of *frequency* in this sacrament still untouched. Gravely to argue, therefore, from such premises, that the giving and receiving of the Lord's Supper was the great business of *every* Lord's Day; and to imply that *preaching* was but

* Bishop Beveridge, quoted in the "Tracts for the Times," N. Y. ed., vol. i., p. 175.

a sort of incident by the way, the occasional parting address of a journeying apostle, is not only to disregard the main current of Scripture testimony, but to strain a particular text for proof till it *breaks*, and leaves the conclusion at an unapproachable distance from the premises.

It will be remembered that I am not opposing frequent communions. On the contrary, I incline to the opinion that, in the apostles' times, they were both more frequent and *more simple* than they are in our days and in our Church. Possibly they did occur every Lord's Day; and, certainly, they were very simple ceremonies. They were called, not, in the imposing phrase of later periods, "the Holy Sacrament of the altar;" but, in the language of men who had learned of a sublimely simple Teacher, "*the breaking of bread.*" They doubtless approached vastly nearer in *simplicity* than they did in *frequency*, to an ordinary meal. And this, in connection with the possible fact that they were somewhat frequent, accounts readily for the gross abuse into which the still sensual Corinthians so early carried the Christian's feast, by turning it into an occasion of common and profane excess. In the undiscerning state of their minds, they slid easily from so simple a ceremony into the actual excesses of commom eating and drinking. What I have been endeavoring to show, however, is this: that it is impossible to decide, either from the language of Scripture, or from apostolic practice, *how* frequent their seasons of communion were; whether daily, weekly, semi-monthly, or monthly, or whether there were *any* statedly recurring periods for the administration of this Christian ordinance. And it is now to my purpose to add that, however frequent their seasons of communion were, this does not in the least detract from the proofs which have been given that

preaching the Gospel, not administering the sacraments, was the main labor of the apostles' ministry, and the great instrument, in the hands of the Spirit, for generating the new life in the soul, and thus rendering effectual to salvation the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

3. But it is time to trace this comparison into the history of later periods. Look, then, at the experience of the Church in the Middle Ages; that protracted period, when she made almost *every* thing of the sacraments, and comparatively little of preaching. What was her condition then? It was one of deep, and almost universal spiritual death. The two simple sacraments, instituted by her Divine Head, had become extremely artificial and awfully corrupted. To these had been added five others, fashioned out of most abused and perverted things. And this whole cluster of corrupted and multiplied sacraments had come to be regarded with most superstitious awe; as though, by a miraculous charm, they imparted saving grace, new life, and holiness, to all who, not being in mortal sin, received them. Meanwhile, *the Scriptures* were locked up in dead languages, and almost unknown to the people, and even to the lower orders of the clergy. Oral tradition was virtually their *law;* and its *executor* the spiritual despotism of the hierarchy. The Ritual of the Church was excessively cumbrous, and religion was supposed to consist so wholly in a strict observance of its forms, and to have so little to do with private virtues of character, that it was an easy thing to acquire the reputation of being remarkably *religious*, while, to the knowledge of all, a man was scandalously *immoral.*

It is impossible, in few words, to picture the whole extent and aggravation of that spiritual death which then reigned over the heritage of Christ, and which had seized so deeply on both people and clergy.

I inquire not now whether the disuse of preaching led to this multiplication and abuse of the sacraments, or whether this multiplication and abuse of the sacraments led to the disuse of preaching; or whether some other causes had come in to corrupt the Church, and to produce both the one and the other of the results noticed. It is enough to know the simple fact that, when sacraments were most numerous and most frequent, when they were regarded with most awe, and trusted with most confidence, then there were least preaching and most ignorance, darkest superstition and deepest corruption. From whatever cause, the Scriptures and the preaching of the Cross were removed from their place; and, being removed, there was no instrument, in the use of which the Spirit of Christ and the Father could restore to its pristine glory the fallen and decayed body of the Redeemer.

4. This view is confirmed by following history a little farther still. For, at the Reformation, when a large portion of the Church was awakened from the sleep of ages, the work had its very beginning in the secret study of the Holy Scriptures by the Monk of Erfurt, and in the public preaching of the Gospel, thus again brought to the knowledge and experience of its ministers. In the progress of the work, the Holy Scriptures were unlocked from the dead languages of antiquity, and given to the people in their living mother tongues; and the ministers of the Word "blew the trumpet" boldly and long in the ears of the sleepers, awakening multitudes to life, and nerving millions to action, in defense of the Gospel. The new soldiers of Jesus Christ brought from their sacred armory the long unused, and rusted, but still heaven-tempered weapons of *Truth*, burnished them anew, trained themselves to their use,

and skilfully wielded them in the work for which they were designed. Then it again "pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believed." Then "the preaching of the Cross" was again made "the power of God." Once more "the foolishness of God" was shown to be "wiser than men, and the weakness of God to be stronger than men."

Of the facts now noticed, that, during the Middle Ages, preaching had been, if not unknown, at least almost unused; and that, at the Reformation, it came again into eager requisition, there is no lack of illustration. Perhaps as strong a one as can be given—all the stronger for being of Protestant origin—is found in this, that even Elizabeth, the patron queen of the English Reformation, still retained so much of the prejudices of earlier times, that she set herself openly against what were then termed "*prophesyings*," or meetings of the clergy for preaching several days together. Against good Archbishop Grindal, the father and favorer of those meetings, she was deeply incensed, and intimated to him personally her royal pleasure that "the number of preachers should be abridged," and "all learned conferences among the ministers of the Church utterly subverted." In his written reply,* the bold bishop declared, against the face of majesty, that her "speeches had exceedingly dismayed and discomforted him." Like a true man of God, in nothing daunted by the voice of power, stood he up for his Master, and fearlessly said to the (in this matter) misguided queen, "God forbid, madam, that you should open your ears to any of their wicked persuasions, or in any way diminish the preaching of the Gospel." "Where it is thought

* Grindal's Letter to the Queen, in Fuller's History of the Church, London, 1837, p. 7 to 18. Its title there is, "The most remarkable Letter of Archbishop Grindal, in Defense of Prophecies and Church Jurisdiction."

that the reading of godly Homilies, set forth by public authority, may suffice, the reading of Homilies hath his commodities, but it is nothing comparable to the office of preaching. The godly preacher is learned in the Gospel, *who can apply his speech to the diversity of times, places, and hearers*, which can not be done in Homilies." "I am *enforced*, with all humility, yet plainly, to profess that *I can not*, with safe conscience, and without the offense of the majesty of God, give mine assent to the suppressing of the said exercises; much less can I send out any injunction for the utter and universal subversion of the same. I say with Paul, 'I have no power to destroy, but only to edify;' and with the same apostle, 'I can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.'"

How exactly is this conceived in the spirit of the apostles at Jerusalem, who, when "straitly threatened to speak henceforth to no man in the name" of Christ, replied, "Whether it be *right* in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts, iv., 19, 20); and who, when farther questioned for their fidelity, responded in the calm heroism of those memorable words, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts, v., 29); and then proceeded, in the very face of their persecutors, to preach that sacred name, which Jewish prejudice would fain have buried in enduring oblivion! The Queen of England, indeed, did not wish to put the name of Jesus under a ban: farthest from it; but she had been so little accustomed to a fearless, stirring, and frequent preaching of his Gospel, that she disliked this feature in the Reformation; a dislike for which her brave archbishop reproved her, with a manly and God-fearing honesty

worthy of the first days of Christianity, and the best apostles of Christ.*

This comparative view might be followed much farther, and made much fuller. But the limits assigned to the discussion have, in this part, been already reached. Enough, I trust, has been said to show that the preaching of the Gospel of Christ is, and ever should have been, the great work of *all* his ministers ;† and

* The following extract from Hooker, who had Jewel for his patron and Grindal for his contemporary, will show in what esteem preaching was held, not only by that great man himself, but also by multitudes besides, whom the Reformation had awakened from that slumber of ages, during which the pulpit had been so nearly silent. The extract shows that preaching had risen into such extravagant repute as even to require a caution lest it should bring into disuse the public *reading* of the Scriptures in the churches :

"So worthy a part of Divine service we should greatly wrong, if we did not esteem *preaching* as the blessed ordinance of God; sermons as keys to the kingdom of heaven, as wings to the soul, as spurs to the good affections of man, unto the sound and healthy as food, as physic unto diseased minds. Wherefore, how highly soever it may please them with words to extol sermons, they shall not herein offend us. We seek not to derogate from any thing which they can justly esteem, but our desire is to uphold the just estimation of that from which, it seemeth unto us, they derogate more than becometh them. That which offendeth us is, first, the great disgrace which they offer unto our custom of *bare reading of the Word of God*, and to His gracious Spirit, the principal virtue whereof thereby manifesting itself for the endless good of men's souls, even the virtue which it hath to convert, to edify, to save souls ; this they mightily strive to obscure : and, secondly, the shifts wherewith they maintain their opinion of sermons; whereunto, while they labor to *appropriate* the saving power of the Holy Ghost, they separate from all apparent hope of life and salvation thousands whom the goodness of Almighty God doth not exclude."—*Eccl. Pol.*, book v., § 22, London, 1825, p. 461.

That preaching rose into such repute, was proof of the mighty power which it exerted. That it was carried by some to such a height of regard as to be considered as enjoying the exclusive appropriation of the power of the Spirit in saving the souls of men, was but its almost necessary recoil, for a season, from a state of extreme depression to one of extreme exaltation.

† I cannot help inserting in this note a sentiment which I have just found in examining the manuscripts of the late Bishop Griswold :

"The apostles would 'give themselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of *the Word*.' How different the conduct of those dignitaries of the Church, in some parts of the world, who, when they have reached the *apos-*

that it is not without reason that their high commission sends them, first, to "do the work of *evangelists*;" and, second, to administer the sacraments of the Church.

II. And yet, it is not to be inferred that the efficacy of preaching lies peculiarly in *human* power; and that *man* is to be extolled for success in this work. The true view of this point has already been given. The whole efficacy of ordinances, whether in preaching or in the sacraments, resides in the accompanying influences of the Holy Spirit, sealing upon the mind the meaning and the power of Divine truth. To make the sacraments the main channels of grace, is as much to exalt *human* power as to make preaching the main channel. The truth is, human power is nothing in *either*. In the ministry of the Gospel, the *man* is put out of view behind the commission which he bears, and the truths which he presents. "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus, the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake."—2 Cor., iv., 5. "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath," indeed, "shined in the hearts" of all his true ministers, "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor., iv., 6); and hath thus qualified them for the great work of preaching his Gospel, teaching them "to renounce the things of dishonesty; not walking in craftiness, nor handling *the Word of God* deceitfully; but, by manifestation of *the truth*, commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."—2 Cor., iv., 2. But, then, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of *God*, and not of *us*."

tleship, and when they ought to be the 'servants of *all*,' instead of giving themselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the Word, neglect *both*; employing chaplains to *pray* for them, and settling curates to *preach!* Well might Jewel say, 'A *bishop* should *die preaching!*'"

—2 Cor., iv., 7. Christ's ministers are no more than *earthen vessels*, which derive their whole importance from the preciousness of the treasure which they contain; and this treasure has been put in such frail receivers for the very purpose of making it thereby the more manifest that the whole excellency of the power, felt in preaching the Gospel, is of *God*, and not of *us*. I remember reading somewhere the words of an English preacher, on occasion of ordaining a young brother to the ministry. They were to this effect: "Your work will be to preach, not yourself, but Jesus Christ; and in presenting him to your people, you must be like a man holding up to view a picture so large as wholly to conceal himself. Your great effort must be to let *Christ alone* appear in all your ministrations. In holding up his picture, you must not let so much as your little finger be seen by your audience." Exactly in this spirit are the words of the apostle: "Who then is *Paul*, and who is *Apollos*, but ministers (servants), by whom ye believed even as *the Lord* gave to every man? I have planted; Apollos watered; but *God* gave the increase. So, then, neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but *God*, that giveth the increase." —1 Cor., iii., 5, 7.

Nor yet is it to be inferred, from what has been said, that those who hold this view of preaching, do in any way *make light of the sacraments*, or consider them of small value or efficacy. This inference would do great injustice to my argument. He that would detract from the true solemnity and preciousness of the sacraments, betrays either a sad ignorance of their nature and object, or a wicked hostility to the interests of Christ's religion. The true ground of regret is, not that *too much* has been made of the sacraments; but that they have been wrongly understood, and, therefore, wrongly

used. The value of a faithful preaching of the Gospel may be extolled, not too highly, but too exclusively. Men may err on this side as well as on the other; and in this error, the Church has had, if not an equally protracted and disastrous, yet a truly sore and sad experience. When ministers rely too exclusively on preaching for the fruit of their labors, we have seen a strong tendency to the multiplication of human artifices and management for the purpose of giving to their ministry instant and enlarged effect; and perhaps an equally strong tendency to the puffing up of the vanity and pride of the human heart amid the apparent evidences of ministerial success; with a proneness among hearers to run after popular men and popular measures, rather than to seek for the power of Christ, the Spirit of God, and the simplicity of Truth, in the appointed services of his Church. As, in relying on sacraments to the neglect of preaching, there is a tendency to multiply, corrupt, and abuse those sacraments by human additions and conceits; so, in relying on preaching, to the neglect of sacraments, there is an opposite tendency to multiply, vary, and misdirect human artifices and popular measures, with the view of giving that preaching greater effect. On either hand, experience has taught the Church an expensive, indeed, but still valuable lesson; and, in the light thus afforded, the true question in the argument before us is, not which shall be excluded, preaching or the sacraments, but what are the true place and importance of each? Before closing, then, this branch of the subject, in order to enter on the next great inquiry, that concerning the *nature* of the sacraments, let us pursue this question a little farther.

III. What, then, are the true place and importance of that Divine ordinance which we have in the preaching of the Gospel?

1. The citations from the New Testament which have been made, make it sufficiently plain that this ordinance finds its principal place and importance in its character as the great instrument, in the hand of the Spirit, for the conversion of men from sin to holiness; for instructing, convincing, awakening, and renewing them; for bringing them to true repentance and a living faith, to fervent love and holy obedience; for leading them intelligently and unreservedly to Christ as the only Savior; and thus for bringing them to the entrance, and conducting them through the gate, which open into the way of life eternal.

To this its high office the ordinance is fitted on the principle already stated, that Truth is the utterance, the breath of the Spirit. It is the very converse of the Spirit of God with the mind of man. God puts Himself into the Truth, and thus, to the measure of the mind's capacities, makes Himself *understood*, *comprehended*, and *felt*. Now, preaching deals with Truth, and is Christ's ordinance for dealing with it most effectually. The chief office of the ministry lies in "rightly dividing *the Word of Truth*," and it is thus that the servant of Christ "shows himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed" (2 Tim., ii., 15); an "able minister of the New Testament; not of the *letter*" merely, "but of the *Spirit*" (2 Cor., iii., 6); a "Scribe," well "instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," and "bringing forth out of his treasures things new and old."—Matt., xiii., 52. Divine truth is both the instrument with which the Spirit quickens the soul, and the light through which the soul sees God and all eternal things; and he who best knows how to *divide* this truth, to separate it into its several offices, and to point the arrows of its power with greatest wisdom and skill, is the *ablest* minister of the New Testament, and the *best* instructed

scribe in the kingdom. He will be the means of convincing most men of sin, and of bringing most to the Savior.

That such is the momentous office of preaching, there can, I think, be no doubt in the mind of him who, with unprejudiced care, studies the oracles of Truth on this point. From those oracles, and the confirming ways of God, comes a voice to this effect, loud, clear, and not to be misunderstood.

2. But, though this is the *principal*, yet it is not the *only* office of preaching. It is, still farther, one of the necessary, and even a principal means of "building up Christians in their most holy faith," *after* they have been brought to Christ at the entrance of the way of life.

Such Christians are taught of Christ to look to God's Word of Truth for sanctification. "Sanctify them by thy Truth: thy Word is Truth."—John, xvii., 17. They are also enjoined by an apostle, "as new-born babes, to desire the sincere milk of *the Word*, that they may *grow* thereby" (1 Pet., ii., 2); to "let *the Word* of Christ dwell in them *richly* in all wisdom" (Col., iii., 16); to "be swift to *hear*," and to "receive, with meekness, that *ingrafted Word*, which is to *save their souls*." — James, i., 19, 21. In reference to the different strength of the doctrines preached, as adapted to the different progress of Christians in their new life, the apostle fed some "with *milk*," and others "with *meat*" (1 Cor., iii., 1–3); the former, as being "yet *carnal*," the latter as having become "*spiritual*;" the one, as retaining still something of low and gross views of the Gospel and of Christian character, the other as having reached a high degree of knowledge, purity, and perfectness in the heavenly life; the one, as being disposed to "envy, strife, and divisions," the other as seeing deeply

into the generousness, love, and union which should pervade the living body of Christ. All these results, too, came through the various degrees of thoroughness with which those early Christians had received "the things which were freely given to them of God; which things also" the apostles "*spake*, not in the words which *man's* wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual."—1 Cor., ii., 12, 13. To the *Hebrew* Christians, some of whom had probably been scribes and doctors in their law, and who had been under Christian instruction long enough to have become preachers of the Gospel, and yet were still "dull of hearing," the apostle writes thus: "For when, for the time ye *ought* to be teachers, ye have need that one teach *you again* which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of *milk*, and not of *strong meat*. For every one that useth *milk* is unskilful in *the Word* of righteousness, for he is a *babe*. But *strong meat* belongeth to them that are of *full age;* to those who, by reason of *use*, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil."—Heb., v., 12–14. What Divine skill does all this evince in so "*dividing the Word of Truth*" as to build up true Christians from one degree of perfectness to another, in the Divine life; from the babe to the man of full age; from the carnal to the spiritual; from the dull of hearing, to those who, by reason of *use*, have their moral senses exercised to discern both good and evil! And how remarkable that, in all this work of building up Christians in their most holy faith, *the Word*, *the Word*, is the only instrument mentioned, as wielded by the Spirit, in the hand of a living ministry!

3. There is a farther office still to the ordinance of preaching. It is that of a means by which, mainly, *Error* is to be banished from among the people of God,

and the Church preserved in the purity of her heaven-taught doctrines. Hence, the preachers of the Gospel are required to "hold fast the *faithful Word*, as they have been *taught*, that they may be able by *sound doctrine* both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."—Tit., i., 9. And though it is not exclusively, yet it is most distinguishingly, the work of the ministry to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints;" seeing there are ever those who "creep in unawares—turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ."—Jude, 3, 4. To this work of banishing Error from the Church, her ministers are now ordained, as an important part of their sacred office; and it is a work which they may and must do in various ways. They must preach against error from the pulpit and from the press; at one time, in "doctrine which shall drop as the rain, and in speech, which shall distill as the dew" (Deut., xxxii., 2); and at another, in that strenuous argumentation which shall mightily confound falsehood, and in that vigorous and keen, yet calm and dignified controversy, which shall effectually sift the sophistry and expose the lurking-places of error; now in the uttered homily, by which they may most quickeningly "commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God;" and now in the imprinted volume, from which, "though dead," the man of Christ may "yet speak," and preach the Gospel of His saving truth to generations long to come; that they, too, the yet unborn, may walk in truth, and be not led away of falsehood.

In a word, to sum up this whole point, it is by the preaching of his Gospel, in all varying ways, that Christ, through the Spirit, seeks to illumine the darkened mind, and to renew the wicked heart of "the natural man;" to lay the foundations of holy character deep, and strong,

and broad, in the understanding and in the affections; to build up, and garnish with heavenly graces, the structure of individual holiness, for which those foundations are laid; to "chase away erroneous and strange doctrines" from the Church of God; to keep truth victorious, and to multiply the bright and blessed conquests of Christ's spiritual kingdom. The preaching of the Gospel is emphatically that "greater light" which Christ has hung in the firmament of his Church; and according as that light shines brightly or dimly, from a cloudless or an enclouded sky, this Church will walk as in the day, or stumble as in darkness.

IV. But, if such be the rank held by the ordinance of *preaching*, what, in this comparison, are the true place and importance of the *sacraments?* The inquiry now is not into their nature, but into their moral effect on their recipients.

1. As to *baptism*, its moral effect on the mind of *infants* is, doubtless, not *immediate*, but *prospective*. It brings them into the visible Church, and into external covenant with God. It seals, or certifies to them the truth of those Divine promises, which are to the people of God, "and to their children."—Acts, ii., 39. It gives them thus a right to all the outward privileges of their relation. It surrounds them with the breath of prayer, and with the thoughtful solicitudes of believing and watchful Christians. It puts them to *school*, where Christ is master, and the Spirit, monitor; the Bible, text-book; and worship, exercise; Christians, companions; and their way, charity; that thus their earliest faculties and first opening reason may be educated for heaven, and, if possible, get light and power from God before they contract more than original darkness and corruption from the world. Upon all this, too, it brings God's covenanted blessing, in order to throw a brighter hope, and gather

a more cheering encouragement into the prospects for eternity of the seed of God's people. But in all this, great and unspeakable as is the benefit, the moral effect of baptism on the soul is necessarily *prospective;* and such are the perils of this world, even to the children of Christians, that the whole priceless good may be lost.

But on the mind of *adults*, if they come to it with the requisite previous preparation of the heart—true repentance and a lively faith—the moral effect of baptism may be said to be *immediate*. And yet, this effect does not come as from a sacred charm, or from the Spirit indwelling with the water; but rather, to use the language of our article, to such "faith is confirmed, and grace increased, *by virtue of prayer to God*."—Art. xxvii. Coming with hearts renewed, and minds prepared, and souls longing for fuller blessings, they feel that it is good thus publicly to seal themselves Christ's, and thus openly to take the plighted shield of God, to keep them in their future conflict with the world. Putting, therefore, their hearts into the ascending prayer of the Church, they realize the descending grace of the Spirit, and go forth from the solemn covenanting strong in the faith, resolved in their purposes, and refreshed as if by heavenly dews on their whole nature.

2. As to the *Lord's Supper*, in *its* moral effect on the soul, this, to true Christians, and with the influences of the Spirit filling and energizing all, is doubtless a very eminent *means of grace*. Neither the Bible, indeed, nor our Church, teaches Christians to bring their sins after baptism to this sacrament for remission. On the contrary, both teach them to come with clean hands and pure hearts, and sins forgiven through faith in Christ; that, thus prepared for the table of their Lord, they may receive the real blessings which await them there. And these blessings are, growth in true *love*, *union*, *pu-*

rity, and all perfectness of Christian character. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, when the Church is kept pure by a faithful preaching of Christ crucified—the full and uncorrupt Gospel—and when her ministrations are blessed with the influences of the overshadowing and life-giving Spirit, is an ordinance in which the Christian comes into closest communion with his Savior, and feels his *love* for him kindling into its intensest glow; in which, too, he comes into holiest communion with his *fellow*-Christians, of all ages and nations, and feels himself most inseparably knit to them in "the communion of saints," in the *union* of the great mystical body of Christ; and in which he realizes a peculiar strengthening and refreshing of his soul in all her Divine and heavenly graces of faith and courage, humility and purity, deadness to the world, and desires after heaven. Through the divinely ordained symbol of the sacrifice on the cross, faith feeds on all the benefits of Christ's passion, enters into the depths of that union which subsists between each member of the Body and its Head, and draws a happy immortality from the Fountain of Life.

I think it proper to repeat, that what I have here said of the two sacraments refers not to their nature, but to their effect, as means, in the formation and growth of Christian character. What these sacraments are in themselves, or, rather, in the intention of their Institutor, is a question reserved for future consideration.

From the present comparative view, we have seen what are the place and importance, respectively, of the Divine ordinances both of preaching and of the sacraments; neither interfering with the other, but both helping sinful man from the world into the Church, and from the Church up to heaven. Their relation stands thus:

The preaching of the Gospel is ordained to bring men, intelligently and by their own personal experience, to Christ, by repentance and faith, love and an obedient surrender of themselves to His service. Baptism is appointed to introduce them into the Visible Church, in *infancy* if they are the children of believing parents, and in *riper years* if they have been converted from among the unbelieving. And then, for the nourishment, growth, and perfecting of their religious life, the preaching of the Gospel, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are designed *jointly* to take up the office of means, and to go hand in hand in the common work of edifying the characters of those who are truly renewed, and of ripening them for the glories of their eternal fellowship with the saints in the immediate presence of God.

An obvious reflection, suggested by what has been said, is this: While we seek, by the light of the Bible, to ascertain and assign the true relation of the various Christian ordinances to their great and common end, the salvation of men, we should carefully regard them all as originating in the same Divine authority; and therefore, on one common ground, entitled to our obedient and affectionate regard. Let each, then, that of preaching and that of the sacraments, be duly reverenced, and neither be put down for the sake of exalting the other into solitary eminence and single consideration. Either extreme ends in danger. Dark superstition, with its misty imaginings and its debasing corruptions, lies at the one, and at the other that cold contempt, which human reason, vanity, and pride cast on all outward though Divine symbols of our most holy faith. It is at the *mean* between these extremes that all things are united in their due proportion and harmony. It is at this *mean* that life enters into all ordinances, and that the light of reason and the superior light of

revelation *blend* in showing the beauty of the whole body of Christ's institutions, and in commending the whole to the approval of our understandings, to the love of our hearts, and to the reverence of our faith.

Nor will it be useless to suggest once more, that every thing which has been said about the revealed Word of God, as that body of eternal truth which has been given to us; or about the preaching of the Gospel, as the great work of the ministry; or about the sacraments of Christ, as the hallowed symbols of His religion, has had reference to something higher, more vital and more divine than any, or than all, of these things—to the necessary power and teachings of the Holy Spirit—of that Divine Agent, which, using Truth as His single instrument, seeks thereby the renewal, sanctification, and perfection of all the children of God; and which, if He use the preaching of the Gospel as His *right* hand in wielding the *Sword* of the Word for the slaying of sin and error, and for conquering the enmity of the world, does also use the sacraments as His *left* hand in holding over the Church a broad and consecrated *shield* of protection, and in putting to the lips of our souls a full and refreshing cup of consolation. It is at our worst peril that we, either theoretically or practically, lose sight of this Sacred Agent, the Spirit of the Father and the Son, amid that branching yet united system of channels, through which he makes His ordinary approaches to our understandings and our hearts; seeking thus to reach our invisible souls through our bodily senses, and through those audible and visible means, of preaching and the sacraments, in which those senses are met. To lose sight of this Spirit, and to think only, or *mainly*, of the Truth, its ministry, or its symbols, is as unreasonable as it would be to forget that the body carries *a soul;* if not as dangerous as it

would be to pay to a graven image the honor due unto God.

Let the Divine Spirit, the sacred Illuminator and Comforter of the soul, be ever held in clear view amid the surrounding institutes of the Church, and always regarded as the only efficient agent in our renewal and sanctification; acting alone through all sensible channels, and using Truth, men, and ordinances in doing His own proper work. So shall we be in least danger either of misplacing, or of disproportionately valuing outward things; and most certain of finding the whole body of the Church filled with Christ and with His life-giving power to the salvation of our souls.

PART II.

THE NATURE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

BAPTISM.

PART II.

CHAPTER IV.

THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

John, iii., 5: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

I HAVE already shown that the great end which God seeks in all his gracious acts toward man, is the renewal and sanctification of the soul; that this change is the work of the Holy Spirit; that the sole instrument which He uses in this work is Divine Truth; and that the constituted channels through which He ordinarily brings this truth into action on the mind are, preaching and the sacraments. I have also attempted to assign the true place and relative importance of preaching and the sacraments as connected with this work of the Spirit in the use of truth.

In what the ordinance of preaching consists it is not now necessary to inquire; because, in understanding it, there is no great difficulty; and because the discussions lately revived in the Church, though they decidedly depreciate the value of this ordinance, are yet more largely devoted to the *nature of the sacraments*, and to an undue exaltation of them, as, in their language, "the sources of Divine grace." Into this nature, therefore, it is more important to inquire; and upon this inquiry it is my purpose now to enter. In what do the sacraments consist, or in what consist their true design and value? This is the inquiry now before us, and in prosecuting it, we need the guidance of the Spirit both

for writer and for reader; a guidance which will never be withheld from the true prayer of faith.

The sacraments which Christ has instituted are *Baptism* and *the Lord's Supper*. Baptism, like the Laver in the ancient Temple, is an ordinance which stands at the *entrance* of the Church, the symbol of our needed purification from sin. The Lord's Supper, like the mercy-seat, or place of typical atonement in the Holy of Holies, is an institution which occupies the *inner recess*, the symbol of Christ's great sacrifice for sin. Baptism is administered to *infants* in sign of the purifying which they *need;* and to *adults* in sign of the cleansing which they profess to *have received;* and to both as that by which they are admitted to membership in the Church. The Lord's Supper is, or ought to be, administered to those only who, having been baptized, give evidence, in their riper years, that they indeed *are* what their baptism *represents*, the truly penitent and believing disciples of the Lord Jesus, his renewed and obedient followers.

I inquire, first, into the nature of *baptism*, not, of course, into its *material* and *sensible* part, but into its *religious* nature and design. What is *God's* act, and what the *soul's* experience in this ordinance?

I. The answer to this question, as given by those who have revived the present discussion, whether in England or in this country, may be put down in the following terms, selected from a multitude of others, equally significant and strong:

"Baptism containeth the remission of sins," and "hath the *germ* of spiritual life."* "This exposition" (that which makes John, i., 12, 13, refer to baptism as the instrument of the birth there mentioned) "is founded on the very notion

* Dr. Pusey's Sermon before the University of Oxford, N. Y. ed., p. 5. The following references on the subject of baptism are all to the New-York editions of Dr. Pusey's Sermon, and of the "Tracts for the Times," vol. ii. part i.

that *the partaking of the incarnation*, and the Christian relation of *sonship to God*, is imparted through baptism, and *is not imparted without it*."* Baptism is "that mystery whereby we are made *partakers of the incarnation*," being "baptized into one body," the body of our Incarnate Lord."† "The pardon of sins is the direct provision in baptism." "Baptism gives life."‡ "Herein are we justified, or both accounted and *made* righteous;" "have a new principle of life imparted to us; since, having been made members of Christ, we have a portion of His life or of Him, who is our life."§ "In baptism two very different *causes* are combined: the one, God himself; the other, a creature" (water) "which He hath thought fit to hallow to this end."‖ "Faith and repentance are the conditions on which God gives it. Water, sanctified by our Lord's baptism, is the womb of our new birth."¶ In baptism, "the old man is laid aside, the new taken; he entereth a sinner, he ariseth justified."** "Regeneration is the 'being born again of water and the Spirit,' or, by God's Spirit moving again on the face of the waters; sanctifying them for our cleansing, and cleansing us thereby."†† One of the chief writers on this subject calls baptism "this miracle."‡‡ The baptized, by way of expressing the reality of this miracle, used to be called "Christophori, Theophori," Christbearers, Godbearers.§§ And, finally, "That oneness with Him in His Son," which is alleged to be wrought through the sacraments, is called "the perfection of eternal bliss, where will, thought, affections, shall be one, because we shall be, by *communication of His Divine nature*, one."‖‖

* Tracts, vol. ii., p. 31.
† Ibid., vol. ii., p. 44.
‡ Dr. Pusey's Sermon, p. 6.
§ Tracts, vol. ii., p. 24.
‖ Ibid., vol. ii., p. 26.
¶ Ibid., vol. ii., p. 43.
** Ibid., vol. ii., p. 47.
†† Ibid., vol. ii., p. 47, 48.
‡‡ Ibid., vol. ii., p. 68.
§§ Ibid., vol. ii., p. 44.
‖‖ Dr. Pusey's Sermons, p. 8. The following passages also contain the substance of the theory:

I would not force these expressions into a meaning not intended, and yet it is desirable to throw them somewhat more into summary, that the theory of baptism which they really teach may be seen at a glance. According to this theory, then, it is plain,

That in baptism, the Holy Spirit, taking residence in the water, is communicated to the unconscious infant; that thus He makes the baptized a partaker of the incarnation, as He at first made Christ to be incarnate in our nature; that, being "baptized into one body," means not, as usually understood, initiated into the Church as the body of Christ, but "baptized into the body of our *incarnate* Lord," as explanatory of the phrase, "made partakers of the *incarnation*;"

"The view, then, here held of baptism is, that we be ingrafted into Christ, and thereby receive a principle of life, afterward to be developed and enlarged by fuller influxes of His grace; so that neither is baptism looked upon as an infusion of grace distinct from the incorporation into Christ; nor is that incorporation conceived of as separate from its attendant blessings."—*Tracts*, vol. ii., p. 24, 25.

"No change of heart or of the affections, no repentance, however radical, no faith, no life, no love can come up to the idea of this 'birth from above;' it takes them all in, and comprehends them all, but itself is more than all; it is not only the creation of a new heart, new affections, new desires, and, *as it were*, a new birth, but is an *actual* birth from above, or from God, a gift coming down from God and given to faith, through baptism; yet not the work *of* faith, but the operation *of* 'water and the Holy Spirit;' the Holy Spirit giving us a new life in the fountain opened by Him, and we being born therein *of* Him, even as our blessed and incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb."—*Tracts*, vol. ii., p. 43.

"Our new birth" is "itself the gift of God," "illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery from which it flows, *the incarnation of our Redeemer*."—*Ibid.*

"Baptismal regeneration, as *connected with the incarnation of our blessed Lord*, gives a depth to our Christian existence, an actualness to our union with Christ, a reality to our sonship to God, an interest in the presence of our Lord's glorified body at God's right hand, a joyousness amid the subduing of the flesh, an overwhelmingness to the dignity conferred on human nature, a solemnity to the communion of saints, who are the fullness of Him who filleth all in all, a *substantiality* to the indwelling of Christ, that to those who retain this truth, the school which abandoned it must needs appear to have sold its birthright."—*Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 16.

that, in consequence of this literal ingrafting into Christ, baptism gives life, the germ, the principle of spiritual life, a portion of Him who is our life ; and that, being thus efficacious, it is both *justifying* and *sanctifying*, both the *accounting* and the *making* of us righteous. In short, by "this miracle," "this communication of the Divine nature," we lay aside the *old* man and take the *new;* we enter the water sinful flesh, and rise from it as from an "overwhelming mystery," "Christophori, Theophori."

Such is the theory : the Holy Spirit imparted to the water ; in that water meeting the infant, and imparting to it Christ ; and then, as it leaves the font, presenting it justified in the twofold sense of being both accounted and *made* righteous, the subject of a virtually miraculous communication of the Divine nature.

This is baptismal regeneration, as drawn from the statements of a master of the doctrine, in distinction, he says, from the system which "the moderns have formed ;" and between which and "the exposition of the ancient Church," he declares "the difference is *radical, essential.*"* This is what he terms the "overwhelming mystery,"† and of this it is that he says, "It relates to no insulated point, no by or incidental question which may be laid aside, or assumed without affecting the rest. It lies, as is confessed, at the root of the whole system, as *some* say, a deadening doctrine ; as *the old Church* found it, full of life ;‡ but, in either case, it is the point from which the two opposite systems that divide the Church diverge."§

I believe that all acquainted with the subject will admit that the difference between the two systems *is* radical and essential ; and many, no doubt, will feel constrained to say

* Tracts, vol. ii., p. 47. † Ibid., vol. ii., p. 44.

‡ Did "the old Church" grow more vital the longer she hugged this doctrine to her bosom? Alas! she gathered from it but the vitality of death!

§ Tracts, vol. ii., p. 38

that the theory here stated is not only unsustained by the sense of Scripture, but fraught with an absurdity as great as that of transubstantiation itself.

The advocates of this doctrine warn us against asking, "How can these things be?" They call all such "Nicodemus questions;" they urge us to *believe* that we may understand; and they caution us against turning certain Scriptures into *figures*, lest we thereby justify heretics in turning all other vital truths into the emptiness of mere tropes. Nevertheless, as their theory is itself an attempt to interpret the Scriptures, and enters rather boldly into their "Exposition," we must even attempt the same thing. We must not be deterred from studying the Scriptures, and that, more deeply than just to look upon them with *the eye* and believe. We must seek to discover their real meaning; and our object in doing so should be, not to avoid finding figures in the Bible; but, where we do find them, to ascertain the true sense which they carry.

1. The view of baptism, then, which I have presented, rests for its corner-stone on this idea, that, in order to regeneration and spiritual life, the baptized must be not merely renewed and made holy by repentance, faith, and obedience, but something higher and more miraculous than this—made "partakers of the incarnation:" that the office of the Holy Spirit is, to work in the baptized, by the water which it fills, a participation of Christ's whole nature; "an illimitable, incomprehensible mystery," analogous to that in which He made Christ incarnate in the womb of the Virgin, when He brought the Divine nature into union with the human, and imparted to the latter the life of the former. The theory understands the phrases, "born of God," "born of the Spirit," as, in the strictest sense, literal; that, as infants are born not only *by*, but *of* their parents, of their substance, so are Christians born *of* God, *of* the Spirit; not only by His operation, but literally *of* Him. Its main point, however,

seems to be, that the baptized participate in the incarnation; that they are, "not by any *figure*, or *likeness*, but *actually*, sons of God, because He, in Whom and *of* Whom they are made, is, not by any figure or likeness, but actually, the Son of God;" that they are "parts of the Second Adam, as they were by nature of the first."*

But, though this is the corner-stone of the system, yet the system itself, with its corner-stone, rests on something still lower down. The doctrine seeks its support in something still farther back; and this something is a correlative notion of what at first constituted *original righteousness*, and of what still constitutes *original sin*. In order that the theory of Baptismal Regeneration, as just stated, may not look too like a new conceit, related to nothing in earlier Divine disclosures, its advocates go back to the creation and fall of man, and impose on those great facts a character correspondent with their own view of the means of man's recovery from sin, and of his restoration to his primeval privilege. Their view of these points is briefly this.

2. Original *righteousness* consisted, not in "*actual inherent holiness*" (the image of God), but in a "*supernatural clothing*," "*over and above* nature;"† and this, "agreeably with the view of justification already taken, is nothing less than the inward presence either of the Divine Word, or of the Holy Ghost."‡ Consequently, original *sin* consists, not

* Tracts, vol. ii., p. 44.

† "Christ clothes us with something over and above nature, which Adam forfeited."—*Newman on Justification*, *London*, 1838, p. 180.

Dr. Pusey shadows forth the same idea in his Treatise on Baptism: "We are first *clothed* upon by Him, and when we have been thus clothed, the blessing is pronounced upon 'him that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked.' Our shame, which we contracted in Adam's fall, is *first* hidden, and our garment of immortality and righteousness *more* than *restored*, by being made members of Christ; and *then* we are bidden, 'Buy of me white raiment that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear.'"—[*Tract* 67, p. 91.]

‡ Newman on Justification, p. 180.

To show how distinct this alleged original, or justifying righteousness,

in the loss of "actual inherent holiness," or the image of God, but in the deprivation or forfeiture of this supernatural clothing, this extra endowment of Divinity. In other words, God at first created, not a mere perfect man—a man in the Divine image, because of a moral and rational nature, and perfect in his kind; but a perfect man with a Divine *addition* to his perfection; a literal Theophorus—a created being with an endowment uncreated. And then, by the fall, man not only lost his "actual inherent holiness," but also forfeited his *supernatural investment;* in which forfeiture—not in the loss of holiness—consists original sin.

lost at the fall and regained under the Gospel, is from any thing *in* man or *of* man, as the result of God's agency, I give a few other extracts.

"Justifying righteousness consists in the coming and presence of the Holy Ghost within us"—p. 153.

"It is not any mere quality of mind, whether faith or holiness"—p. 154, 155.

"Justification" (and, of course, the righteousness in which it consists) "is not a mere change of state in us, or a liberty, privilege, or (as it may be called) citizenship; but a something lodged within us"—p. 157.

"The righteousness, on which we are called righteous, though *within* us, as it must be, if it is to separate us from the world, yet is not *of* us, nor *in* us, nor any quality or act of our minds, not faith, not renovation, not obedience, not any thing cognizable by man, but a certain *Divine* gift, in which all these qualifications are included"—p. 159.

"The Divine Presence vouchsafed to us, besides being that of the Holy Trinity, is specially said to be the presence of *Christ;* which would seem to imply that '*The Word made flesh*' is, in some mysterious manner, bestowed upon us"—p. 164. This is said in explanation of "the Gift of Righteousness."

"Christ is our Righteousness, by dwelling in us by the Spirit. He justifies us by entering into us; He continues to justify us by remaining in us. *This* is really and truly our justification, not faith, not holiness, not a mere imputation; but, through God's mercy, the very presence of Christ"—p. 167.

"Christians are justified by the communication of an inward, most sacred, and most mysterious gift. From the very time of baptism they are temples of the Holy Ghost."—*Ibid.*

The difference between Old and New Testament saints in the matter of justification is said to be this: that the former were *not*, while the latter *were*, "partakers in the body and blood of *the Incarnate Son*"—p. 225. In short, the lectures abound in traces of the above train of thought.

Now from this un-Bible-like notion (to fashion a word for the place), from this apparent forethought, which is yet an afterthought, from this seeming parent, which is yet an offspring, the theory of baptismal regeneration now in view, appears naturally to follow. The added supernatural investment which, by the theory, was forfeited at the fall, is, by the power of the Holy Ghost in baptism, graciously restored; and thus the baptized becomes, as at first, *more* than man, "a partaker in the incarnation, a literal Theophorus," "not by any figure, or *likeness*, but *actually*, a Son of God;" "a part of the Second Adam."

(1.) From this, it is evident that, in pursuing the present argument, the first step is, to show the baselessness of the foregoing theory of original righteousness and original sin. To do this fully would require a volume; but for the present much less must suffice.

What foundation, then, has that theory? Scripturally, none at all. It is a pure figment. The Bible contains an account of the creation and endowment of no such being as the theory supposes. "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." "So God created man in his own image."—Gen., i., 26, 27. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."—Gen., ii., 7. This is the whole of the simply sublime account which the Bible gives of the origin of our race; an event, in view of which God pronounced His whole created Work, not only "good" as He saw it before, but "*very* good" now that one in His own image stood up to understand, admire, and enjoy the magnificent whole.

But where, in this account, do we find the original of the idea, that man was not only created in the image of God, but also gifted with an additional supernatural investment, "the inward presence of the Divine Word, or of the Holy Ghost?" We find, indeed, that as to his rational and mor-

al part, he was not *formed*, but "*created*;" brought into being by that mysterious energy which speaks existence out of non-existence; and that, as to his material and corruptible part, he was—not created—but "*formed*," fashioned out of already existing materials, "the dust of the ground."* We find, also, that after his lifeless body had been thus fashioned, God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" and that thus the *created* and the *formed* taking union, "man became a living soul," a simply perfect man, new from his Maker's hand, and bright in his Maker's image. But in all this we find no place for an additional supernatural investment. The only point at which this can be supposed to have been given, is that closing act, in which God breathed into the yet unbreathing nostrils the literal and common breath of life. To suppose, however, that at the same moment, and in the same act, He inspired the supernatural grace, "the inward presence of the Divine Word, or of the Holy Ghost," would be to indulge a gratuitous and baseless assumption. Such a notion, however it might live in the imagining of the theorist, liveth not in the sober Word of God. So far as Scriptural testimony goes, this theory of original righteousness and, of course, of original sin, is, I repeat, without foundation. It *is* a pure figment. It can not but be seen that, if the notion of baptismal regeneration, as it has been stated, had never been entertained, this figment would never have been conceived. A sane, sober student of the ancient Bible, mindless of modern theories, would never have dreamed of such a thing.

(2.) Besides, the whole idea, when imbodied into consistency, savors not only of the improbable, but also of the *impossible*. It supposes that God created a perfect man, who was yet *more* than man. To illustrate this, it must be re-

* The difference here indicated between "*created*" and "*formed*" is, by some, supposed to be implied in the different meanings of the two Hebrew words, בָּרָא, and עָשָׂה.

membered that, according to the theory of baptismal regeneration under this system, the baptized become "partakers of the incarnation," "parts of the Second Adam;" existing in the same intimate and mysterious union with the nature of Christ, which was effected between the human and the Divine, when He was made incarnate by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin; and that the *original* counterpart to this restored mystery in man is found in that supernatural investment, which was added to his nature at creation. To make the latter idea consistent, therefore, this supernatural investment, or original righteousness, must be, not the mere presence of God *among* his children, but that same intimate and mysterious union of the Divine Word with their natures by the power of the Holy Ghost, which is alleged to be restoringly effected in baptism. And this seems to be the true idea as entertained by the advocates of the system. I repeat, then, this supposes that God created a perfect man, who was yet *more* than man; which is really the figment of an *impossibility*. God may be in man by *an image*, *a likeness* of Himself; but *not* by an actual impartation of Himself, of His substance. His moral and rational *attributes* are communicable, in the sense of being *imitable;* but his nature itself is *in*-communicable. In this sense, He neither "*will*," nor *can*, "give His glory to another." The heavens, it is said, may be *imaged* in a dew-drop: certainly; but they can not *be* in a dew-drop, with their very substance. So God may be *imaged* in the *soul;* He may have His *likeness* there: but He can not *be* in the soul by a literal impartation and commingling of Himself with its substance. I do not deny the possibility of a miraculous union of the human nature with the Divine. This union has been *once* effected in the mysterious person of our glorious "Immanuel." But I do deny its possibility consistently with its subject's continuing *a mere man*. Such a union can not be effected without rendering every

Christian *literally a true Christ;* and thus rendering the work of atonement practically needless: a consequence which, in truth, would seem to follow from this whole system. But no such consequence flows from the true statement of this subject. Originally, man was created, simply and perfectly, *man;* in the *likeness* of God, in so far as he was of a moral and rational nature, and perfectly holy. He was not a being compounded of this perfect man, and an *added* supernatural investment with the Divine nature. And by the fall, he lost, not what had never been given, but what he had received—his holiness, his likeness to God; his original righteousness, in the true Scriptural sense of the term.

(3.) After this view, it may seem needless to add, that such a union as is here denied, would evidently have been a strange departure from the whole analogy of God's creating work. When He created the inferior orders of being, He formed them, as we are told, each "after his kind," and perfect in his kind; dependent on many other things, and yet perfectly distinct from all other things. So, when He created angels, or superior orders, those "sons of God," those "morning stars" that "sang together and shouted for joy" when the "corner stone" of the world was laid; we have not the slightest intimation that He created them otherwise than "after *their* kind," and perfect in their kind; *mere* angels; dependent on God, indeed, and yet *not* God, nor any *part* of Him, but perfectly distinct beings. It is unreasonable, therefore, to suppose that man was an anomaly, an exception to this evidently general, and otherwise universal rule of creation. *He* also was created "after his kind," and perfect in his kind; *mere* man; dependent on God, and yet not God, nor any *part* of God, but a perfectly distinct being; conformed in every respect to all our conceptions of distinct *genus* and *species*.

(4.) Moreover, if it were possible and rational to origi-

nate a being such as the theory makes the first man, how mightily would this embarrass the already profoundly difficult question of the origin of evil in our world! For what purpose could his added supernatural investment, if possible, have been given to man, when withheld from angels, except to keep man from such a fall as that into which angels had plunged? And where was the *inward* Deity when the subtle tempter glozed in the ear of the primal mother that artful falsehood, "Eat, and ye shall *not* die; but be as gods, knowing good and evil?" Supposing man so singularly endowed, of what use was then the awful gift? On the Scriptural ground that man was *simply* man, made strong to stand, yet left free to fall, we can conceive of the *mode*, though we may not of the *reason*, of the origin of evil in our world. But on the ground of this theory, the question loses us in utter darkness; yea, amid the awfulness of a reluctant, yet unavoidable arraignment of God! The difficulties of unquestionable Scripture on this point are sufficiently great. But those of this theory are infinitely greater; and we come with increased satisfaction to the conclusion that the Bible is an utter stranger to the idea of original righteousness and original sin, which has now been examined.

(5.) This theory derives as little support from the Scriptural account of the *fall* as it does from that of the *creation* of man.

The account of the *creation* in the second chapter of Genesis closes with the remark, that "they were both naked, and not ashamed." That of the *fall* in the third chapter concludes with this: "The eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked. And they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons."—Gen, ii., 25; iii., 7. And after the sad catastrophe, when they had "hid themselves among the trees of the garden," and when Adam "heard the voice of the Lord," calling, "Where art thou?" he replied, "I heard thy voice in the garden, and

I was *afraid*, because I was naked."—Gen., iii., 8–10. Now it is undeniable that the nakedness here mentioned in the second chapter, and that discovered in the third, are *identical*. If the *former* were *bodily*, so was the *latter;* and if the *latter* were *spiritual*, so was the *former*. And yet, with plain reference to these primeval scenes, and by way of supporting the theory of original righteousness and original *sin*, one of its advocates, in part conjecturally, and in part positively, argues thus: "Whereas we have gained, under the Gospel, what we lost in Adam, and justification is a reversing of our forfeiture, and a robe of righteousness is what Christ gives, *perchance a robe is what Adam lost.*" "Of this he was stripped, by sinning, as of a covering, and shrank from the sight of himself."* This, it must be

* Newman on Justification, p. 179. The whole sentence stands thus: "Whereas we have gained under the Gospel what we lost in Adam, and justification is a reversing of our forfeiture, and a robe of righteousness is what Christ gives, perchance a robe is what Adam lost. If so, what is told us of what he lost will explain what it is we gain. Now the peculiar gift which Adam lost is told us in the Book of Genesis; and it certainly seems to have been a supernatural clothing. He was stripped of it by sinning, as of a covering, and shrank from the sight of himself."

It may be well to add the following extracts from the same work, as farther illustrations of the view here given of original righteousness and original sin:

"The Catholic fathers, as Bishop Bull has collected their testimony, teach that the principle of sanctity in Adam, to which was attached the gift of immortality, was something *distinct from* and *above* his human nature. That nature, indeed, did look toward such a perfection, but could not in itself reach it. *Without* this heavenly possession, man was not able to keep the law according to the covenant of life, but *with* it he could serve God acceptably, and gain the reward set before him"—p. 182.

"Whatever else Adam had by creation, this seems to have been one main gift, or, rather, that in which all others were included, the presence of God, the Holy Ghost in him," &c. "This was his clothing; this he lost by disobedience; this Christ has regained for us"—p. 183.

"It is an angelic glory, which good spirits honor, which devils tremble at, and which we are bound reverently to cherish, with a careful abstinence from sin, and with the sacrifice of good works. Well, then, may prophets and apostles exult in it as the great gift of Divine Mercy, as the rich gar-

remembered, is spoken, not of our loss of *holiness*, or the image of God, and of our *recovery* of that holiness, or likeness to Him; but of an alleged forfeiture and restitution of something "*over and above nature*," of a supernatural investment; in the possession of which consisted original righteousness, and in the forfeiture of which stood original sin, in the sense contended for by the theory. Let us see what this will make of the account of the fall.

Upon his disobedience, according to the theory, Adam found himself "stripped, as of a covering," not of "actual inherent holiness," but of the "something over and above nature," wherewith God had clothed his soul; and being thus stripped, he discovered his nakedness, "and shrank from the sight of himself." The nakedness which he discovered, and which made him "*afraid*," was, it seems, not *bodily*, but *spiritual;* it was his fallen *humanity* left without the robe of *divnity*, as that which had constituted his original righteousness. But, as was this *discovered* nakedness *after* the fall, such also was the *un*discovered nakedness *before* the fall. The certainty of this is indisputable. *Before* the fall, "they were naked, and not ashamed;" *after* it, "they *knew* they were naked, and were afraid." Of the *identity* of the nakedness in these two scenes, common sense knows no doubt. Thus, then, we have it. Man was equally, and in the same sense, naked both *before* and *after* the fall. If this nakedness were *spiritual*, consisting in the absence of the alleged Divine robe, original righteousness, then have we man, *forfeiting*, at the fall, a righteousness which he never *posssessed*, "*stripped*" of a robe in which God had never *clothed* him. But if his nakedness were *bodily*, consisting in the absence

ment of salvation, and the enjeweled robe of righteousness, &c., as 'Christ in us,' and 'upon us,' and around us, as if it were a light streaming from our hearts, pervading the whole man, *inwrapping and hiding the lineaments and members of our fallen nature*, circling round us, and returning inward to the centre from which it issues"—p. 184.

of literal clothing (and who doubts that this is the true sense?), then again is the theory convicted of a gratuitous and baseless assumption, while engaged in the solemn work of attempting to interpret the oracles of God; turning the actually *literal* into the *figurative*, whenever it suits its purpose, as easily as, for the same reason, it can turn the truly *figurative* into the *literal*. The nakedness for which holy innocence cared not, but which made conscious guilt afraid, and seek an artificial covering, is here, by a mere fiction in theology converted into the stripping of Adam's inner man of its Divine robe, its supernatural investment! The mere statement of the absurdity is its best refutation.

(6.) After what has thus been said, we shall expect to find *the Articles* of our Church as much a stranger to this theory as are the Scriptures themselves. And such is the case. Turn to the standards and read.

"*Original sin* standeth, not in the following of *Adam* (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk), but it is *the fault and corruption* of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from *original righteousness*, and is, of his own nature, inclined to evil; so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit." "And this *infection of nature* doth remain; yea, in them that are regenerated."*

This article is, indeed, directed against the Pelagians by name, but it is not, therefore, the less fatal to the theory which I am examining. Original righteousness and original sin, as mentioned in this article, are moral opposites. Its actual definition of the one is, therefore, a virtual definition of the other. How, then, does the article define original sin, the state in which man is very far gone from its opposite, original righteousness? Does it say that this sin stands in the loss of a supernatural investment, of a mysterious Divine gift infused into man? No; but that it consists in the loss

* See Art. ix.

of man's own holiness; it "standeth in the fault and corruption of *our nature*" *itself;* it is "an infection of nature which remains even in the regenerate." Such being its definition of original *sin*, the direct *opposite* is its definition of original *righteousness*. For the two states—either of them being defined—mutually define each other. As, therefore, "original *sin* standeth in the *fault* and *corruption*, or *infection* of our *nature*" *itself*, "inclining us to *evil*," so original *righteousness* stood in the *faultlessness* and *purity*, or *soundness* of our *nature itself*, inclining the first man to *good;* and *this* original righteousness is but another name for that perfect holiness, that image and likeness of God, in which man was at first created. Thus, the theory and the article are *at war!* Let us draw distinctly into view the points in the conflict.

The *theory* says, Original *Righteousness* stood, not in "*actual*, *inherent holiness*," or *the likeness of God;* but in an *added supernatural investment*. The *article* says, It stood, *not* in this added supernatural investment, *but* in "actual, inherent holiness," or the likeness of God. The *theory* proclaims, Original *sin* standeth, not in "the fault and corruption of *our nature*," but in the forfeiture of an original Divine gift *superadded* to nature. The *article* proclaims, It standeth, *not* in the forfeiture of this additional gift, but in the very fault and corruption of our nature itself. So openly and fatally do the two clash!

This, however, is not the whole of the conflict. If, according to the *theory*, original sin stand in the alleged forfeiture, then, when the forfeit is recovered in Baptism, original sin *no longer remains*. By the theory, original sin and the gift in Baptism are opposites. Where the one is the other is *not*. But the article teaches that original sin *does* remain, "even in them that are regenerated." It remains identical with that lingering "infection of nature," the deep power of which renders our sanctification *progres-*

sive ; the often slow, and the too often interrupted movement of our lives. That there is such a thing as this progressive sanctification, the advocates of the theory admit, though they miscall it "progressive *justification.*" But the theory itself *denies* what the article *affirms*, that original sin itself *remains after baptism.* In truth, the theory is at irreconcilable war both with the standards of the Church, and with the Bible, on which those standards are planted. There is *no* such original righteousness, nor any such original sin, as is here feigned. While the theory admits what we understand by the image of God, or his likeness in man (an admission, however, which is rather tacit than much talked of), it *adds* to the Bible doctrine its own peculiarities, which are yet not *mere* additions, but in truth irreconcilable differences ; nay, virtual contradictions !

I have dwelt thus long on this notion of original righteousness and original sin, because it is really the imaginary foundation, on which the theory of baptismal regeneration now in view seeks to rest itself; and because, to demonstrate that this foundation *is* imaginary, is at the same time to demonstrate that the theory, which seeks to rest on it, is *unscriptural.* This theory has *no other* foundation. It is bound to a baseless idea of original righteousness and original sin ; and, with the unsettling of this idea, *it falls.* As there was no such supernatural gift as that alleged to have been forfeited at the fall, so there is no such supernatural grace to be restored in baptism. This holds true, however you may fashion, and vary, and modify the notion of that supernatural gift, so long as you keep it distinct and different from that original holiness, the image of God, in which man was created. And the moment you bring it down so as to make it no longer a Divine thing *added to* the mere perfect man, but identical with his perfection, his original holiness, the *likeness* of God in him, that moment you come upon a different foundation, and the whole system of

Biblical Theology receives a different shaping. The moment you cease modifying the notion which I have examined, and adopt the idea that original righteousness was indeed nothing else than "actual inherent holiness," the *moral likeness of God* in man, that moment you step from a foundation of fiction to a foundation of fact; you leave the imaginary for the real; you leave that fountain-Error, whose dark stream flows on in a religion of miracle in sacraments, and of superstition in ceremonies; and come to the spring-head of Truth, whose living waters descend to us in a religion of Bible doctrine in the understanding, and of Bible holiness in the heart.

The simple, yet grand truth on this point is, that man was created "in the *image* of God," without any *additional* supernatural investment; "in the *likeness* of God," without any added *impartation* of God. By creation he was a truly and a merely perfect man. By the fall, his nature became *changed* from perfect to imperfect, from holy to sinful, from the likeness of God to a loss of that likeness. And now, what Christ seeks, in coming into the world, surrounded with the lights of revelation and the teachings of the Spirit, is to restore man to the state from which he is fallen; to *change* his nature, with a reverse movement, from imperfect to perfect, from sinful to holy, from the loss to the repossession of *likeness* to God. We do not need a mysterious reinvestiture with the *Divine* nature, but a Scriptural restoration to the perfection of our *own* nature. We need, *not* a virtually miraculous *addition*, but a spiritual, though intelligible *change;* a change inscrutable in its *mode*, but most intelligible in its *effects;* wrought by the Spirit of God in the secrecy of His goings, yet distinctly cognizable by us in the results of His workings: still, a *mere* change, and not an *addition*. This change is all that we can have; and it is *enough*, as well as all that is *possible*. As the issue of our *literal* resurrection will be to "fashion our vile *bodies* into

a *likeness* to Christ's glorious body;" so the issue of this *spiritual* resurrection is, to refashion our fallen *souls* into a *likeness* to his more glorious Godhead. What more than this can we have? What more than this can we desire?

II. The way being thus opened, I advance toward the direct subject of this part of the treatise, the true nature of baptism.

1. The first consideration which I submit, after what has been said, is this. The notion of original righteousness and original sin, which has been examined, as the foundation of a correlative theory of baptismal regeneration, having been shown to be unscriptural, a mere figment of the imagination, we are left, not only *at liberty*, but *under obligation*, to interpret John, iii., 5, and other passages on the subject of baptism, into a correspondence with that *other* great system of Biblical Theology, which the advocates for the one examined pronounce to be "*radically* and *essentially* different" from theirs. Having shown their notion of original righteousness and sin to be without foundation, I conceive we are not at liberty to reject *that notion*, and yet cling to its *correlative theory* of baptismal regeneration. We are bound, as consistent interpreters of the Bible, to reject *both* or *neither;* for they are tied inseparably together, and together they both stand or fall. Next to the abstract being of a God, all doctrinal theology *originates* in the account which the Bible gives of the creation and fall of man. Hence, *of necessity*, the theory of baptismal regeneration, which has been mentioned, pushes itself back to that spring of doctrines, and feels among the great facts, that lie gushing there, for some opening to which it may trace up its own stream: it goes back to that beginning of systems, and feels among those great foundation-stones for some basis on which it may rest its own theory. And the very fact that, in thus going back, it has found a spring-head, of which the Bible knows nothing; that it has discovered a foundation-

stone, which lies, not among the hills that circle Eden, the cradle of *theology* as well as of *man*, but in the land of dreams, as it spreads somewhere beyond; the very fact that this theory, in thus going back, has traced itself to fiction, and based itself on error, proves that, in itself, it is but a figment of error. The true system of Biblical Theology, in thus carrying itself back to its origin, *can* make *no* mistake in finding its true spring-head, its real corner-stone. To suppose the possibility of such a mistake is to suppose as great an absurdity as that, in tracing the sacred *Jordan* to its source, you might find it in the fabled mountain, which is said to pour down the infant *Ganges* toward the scene of his awful deification! As great an absurdity as that, in seeking for the corner-stone of God's holy Temple, you might find it under the gorgeous Pagoda that houses the hideous Juggernauth! The spiritual affinities of truth are with the true; those of error only are with the false.

Is it not true, then, that the notion of original righteousness and sin to which this theory of baptismal regeneration traces itself back *is* a fictitious and unreal thing? Is it not true that not only our article, but the *Bible*, *God's Word*, knows nothing of such notion; and that this notion is not only a *stranger*, but a *foreigner*, and a *foe*, to the simple, though sublime truths of Revelation? If these things are too palpable to be hidden from the open eye, then we claim the right, ay, and feel *the bond*, to set aside from our faith, not only this notion itself, but also its legitimate correlative, *baptismal regeneration*, as here understood. They both belong to the same system, a system of covering, obscuring, and corrupting *additions* to the true system of the Bible; they belong to a system which is "*radically and essentially different*" from this of the Bible, not so much by *denying* as by overlaying, crushing, and killing it with its ponderous masses of addition. The whole, therefore, must be heaved

off together, or this system will find no relief; its free activities will be perpetually laboring under a mountain.

2. The next consideration which I submit, in approaching the true idea of the nature of baptism, is this: As the great end which Christ seeks in his work of redemption is, not a Divine *addition to* our nature, but a Scriptural *change of* our nature; not a *participation in* the whole *nature* of Christ, "body, soul, and Divinity," but a being morally "conformed to *the image* of Christ," in all holy and spiritual perfectness; so, whatever *else* may be *God's act* and the *soul's experience* in baptism, it *can not be* the working and undergoing of this *great needed change*. This is undeniable. For, in the case of all *adults*, this change is required *in order to* baptism (see Acts, viii., 37; also the Church Catechism on Sacraments), and if they have not this change *before* baptism, they receive this sacrament "*unworthily*," and so, in the language of our article, "purchase to themselves," not a blessing, but "damnation." — Article xxv. While, in the case of *infants*, this change *can not* be wrought. It is a change, the steps in which are, "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" leading us out into the life of holy *love* and holy *obedience*, with every *other* affection of a sanctified nature. We can have no other idea than this of the change required in us. But how can we *repent of sin* till we understand and feel *what sin is*, and that *we* are its perpetrators? Or how can we *believe*, till we know and approve that *in which* we are to believe, or Him *in whom* we are to repose our faith? And how can we feel *holy love*, or render *holy obedience*, or exercise any *other* affection of a holy nature, till the springs of these things are reopened within us? All this is clearly impossible, and therefore it is that *this* change, whatever else may be wrought in *infant* baptism, *can not be* wrought.

This point is not presented *magisterially*. *The Church*, in her Catechism, that system of rudiments with which she

imbues the opening minds of her children, *has so decided.* Having stated that "repentance, whereby they forsake sin, and faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the promises of God," are "required" as prerequisites in those who come to baptism, she asks, "Why, then, are *infants* baptized, when, by reason of their tender age, they *can not* perform them;" *can not* feel the repentance, nor exercise the faith, which are required? And her answer is, "Because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." Their natural guardians answer for them; and this lays them, with increased solemnity, under a blessed obligation to do what is required the moment they become *capable* of it. Of it, in *infancy*, they are *not* capable. This decision of the Church is based, undeniably, in the very reason and nature of things. In the baptized infant, the mind takes no cognizance of what is sacramentally passing. It is utterly incapable of understanding what is done for it, or of comprehending a single truth uttered over it. And it is impossible to conceive that the moral nature, or character of the soul, should be *changed*, or in any way remedially affected, except as, in accordance with the principle laid down in the first chapter, it is put intelligently in *motion;* made to *act*, to think, to understand, to feel, to repent, to believe, to pray, to strive, to love, to hope, or, in some way, put forth its powers in the apprehension of those *truths* in which the Spirit comes, and which bring to view God and the realities of the spiritual world. This point, then, needs no farther argument. The *great change* required in every actual sinner, in order to salvation, *can not* be wrought in baptism, whatever else be passing there.

We should now be prepared for entering on an examination of the principal texts that relate to the sacrament of baptism, were it not that, having dealt thus far with the great principles of the case, without turning aside to notice

objections, or matters incidental to the subject, it may be well to spend some time, before proceeding to such an examination, in disposing of some suggestions arising from what has been said. But for this we shall require the time and space of subsequent chapters. Here, therefore, the present is closed. With our views of original righteousness and sin clearly defined and well settled, with the two great and essentially diverse systems of theology, to which different theories on those points have given rise, distinctly before our minds, and with principles to guide us in looking into the Scriptures for the true idea of baptism, we may well feel that we have enough for present thought and digestion. It is of infinite importance that we feel the *practical* relations of what has been advanced. If it all terminated in mere speculation; if the views which have been discussed could have no influence on our real characters, and on our daily religion; on the character of the Church, and on the progress of the Gospel, I would not spend a breath in giving my thoughts vent. But it is not so. The very reason why I have said so much, and spoken so earnestly, is, because the topics which have occupied our thoughts are most vital in their influence, and affect most vitally the whole state and destiny of our religion, whether in the individual or in the mass. These topics, indeed, lie remote from every-day thought; but they send down their influences upon us with an ever-living energy. They are like the sources of a great stream, which lie among distant, and, perhaps, to many, inaccessible mountains; but whose waters reach us for all that, either to delight and bless us, or to overwhelm and sweep us away. According to the views which we adopt of these topics, the Gospel and the Church will prove to us full, either of simple beauty and perennial life, or of turgid splendor and unsaving show.

CHAPTER II.

THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

John, iii., 5: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

BEFORE proceeding to a direct examination of this and other texts on the subject of baptism, I have promised to consider certain suggestions which may arise out of what was said in the last chapter. We there saw that the two correlative ideas of man's fall and recovery, which make these facts consist in the forfeiture and restoration of a mysterious something of and from God, "over and above nature," or added *to* that perfect nature which was created in the image of God, are unscriptural, based on mischievous error, and lead to a great system of theology, which is full of miracle in sacraments, and of superstition in ceremonies. We also saw that the true view of these points, as given in the Bible, is, that our fall and recovery consist in the loss and restoration of the very image of God wherein we were created; in a *change* of our nature *itself*, first from holiness to sin, and then, with a reverse movement, from sin to holiness; and that this view leads to another great and "radically different" system of theology, a religion of Bible doctrine in the understanding, and of Bible holiness in the heart. And, finally, we saw that the *change* now required in us, in order to a recovery of the lost image of God, is one which *is* not wrought in the baptism of *adults*, and which, whatever else is transacted there, *can not* be wrought in the baptism of *infants*.

I. The first suggestion, then, which may arise from these views is this. Although that great change which every

actual sinner needs, can not be *fully* wrought on unconscious and unthinking infancy, yet may not the *principle*, the *seed* of this change, the *germ*, as it were, of the new life, be then implanted in baptism; to be afterward developed and brought into growth when the infant becomes capable of understanding and feeling truth, and of exercising intelligently repentance and faith?

1. In order to answer this suggestion, I must inquire, in turn, What is *meant* by this *principle*, this *seed*, this *germ*, of which so much is said? Are we to understand by it the substance of the Divine nature, so communicated in baptism as to become incorporate with the substance of the soul, though only in future years of intelligence to be developed? If so, what is this but the very theory already examined, and shown to be unscriptural; the theory which supposes that a Divine *addition* to our nature is what we have forfeited, and that this *addition*, therefore, is what we are to regain? The very terms, *principle*, *seed*, *germ*, used in this connection, run into that unscriptural theology, and are calculated to lead astray from the theology of the Bible. What is such a principle, or germ, when implanted? Nothing more nor less than the literal Divine nature itself. And what must it become by future development and growth, if we may suppose such a thing as that the Divine nature is *susceptible* of development and growth? Nothing more nor less than itself enlarged. A *seed*, when it grows, a *germ*, when it germinates, produces, not a different substance, but simply its unfolded self, the full-grown plant, which, perfect in all its parts, lay in wondrous miniature within the yet ungerminating seed. In like manner, this Divine seed, or germ, supposed to be implanted at baptism, of and from God, must become, by subsequent development, not *a renewed human mind*, but simply its own unfolding self, the fuller expanding of that mysterious Divine embryo. Hence, the unscriptural theology adverted to, when speaking of justifi-

cation as given in baptism, calls it, among other names, "Christ in us" (not *changing* our sinful natures, and making them holy, but), "as if it were a light streaming from our hearts, pervading the whole man, *inwrapping* and *hiding* the lineaments and members of our fallen nature, circling round us and returning inward to the centre from which it issues."* And hence, the terms principle, seed, germ, are so frequently used in that theology, when making the *higher* sacrament of the Eucharist consist mainly in developing the mystery implanted at baptism, by communicating to the recipient the body and blood of Christ, inseparably united, as these are held to be, with His soul and Divinity.†

But if this seed or germ be not an actual impartation of the Divine nature, is it a mysterious something *intermediate* between the Divine nature and the human, and the cause of a sanctifying *change* in the latter; a something *in* the soul, yet not *of* the soul? If so, how is this to be put into subsequent *action?* Do you say by religious instruction, by the influences of the Spirit in the future use of

* Newman on Justification, p. 184.

† See Dr. Pusey's Sermon, passim; also on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 216, 238, 239, 253.

It is true that these writers speak much of this gift, though originally neither a *part* of us, nor a *change* in us, yet as "*tending* to become part of us;" as "first *hiding* our deformity, and then *removing* it" (Newman on Just., p. 197); as "casting out, or absorbing into itself our natural mortality, and death, and corruption" (Dr. Pusey's Sermon, p. 7); and as finally "recreating the Spirit in us to newness of life, and making us 'partakers of the Divine nature.'"—Sermon, p. 9. But here are both the absurdity and the perniciousness of their system. The Spirit of God, through the truth of God, may *change* our natures into a likeness to the Divine. But how can that which is no part of us tend to *become* a part of us? How can our clothing, to use Mr. Newman's idea, become our flesh? Besides, to speak of a Divine gift, which, at one time, is said to be increased by fuller influxes of itself (Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, N. Y. ed., p. 24), and, at another, is supposed to conform or absorb us into the Divine nature, is to introduce into theology a confused mystery, at once the spring of perplexities and the parent of superstitions.

truth? But how can this be? By the use of truth in riper years, the Spirit *may* affect, move, and change the soul itself. But how can it animate and put in growth an intermediate principle, which is neither the soul itself, nor yet an impartation of the Divine nature?

If you say that this principle is the germ of new and holy affections in the soul, this must mean either the germ of new and holy affections *added to* those which are original, or the germ of a *renewal* of these original affections themselves. If it mean the *former*, it is evidently false; for the work of the Spirit, whether at baptism or subsequently, does not consist in *adding* even the *germ* of new affections to those which belong *originally* to the soul; but in *changing* these original ones themselves, that *they* may become new or holy. And if it mean this *latter*, then it implies the *commencement* of that very change, which, as we have seen, our Church in her Catechism, and reason in her sanctions, pronounce impossible in infancy; because the steps in this change are that repentance and that faith which infants, "by reason of their tender age, *can not* perform." I say, it implies the *commencement* of this change; for the *germ* of a change, if you pass from the *cause* which produces it, *can be nothing but the change itself begun.* And if this change may be *begun*, so also may it be *completed*, in infancy; so far, at least, as the repentance and faith are concerned; and thus we should have, what our Catechism, speaking in the clear tones of reason, pronounces impossible in infancy, repentance, without knowing what is to be repented of; and faith, without knowing what is to be believed!

There is, then, to the terms principle, seed, germ, of life, no sense intermediate between that of an *addition* and *incorporation* of the Divine nature *to and with* the human, and that of *a change* of our nature itself by the agency of the Holy Spirit; a change, through repentance and faith, from sin to holiness; a change, which must be wrought by the Spirit

in the use of Truth; a change, which can be wrought in those years *only* of opening intelligence and accountability, that lie forward on the course of life at a greater or less remove from the moment of infant dedication to God. And to invest those terms with *this* idea is, of course, to abandon that modified form of the theory of baptismal regeneration, designed to be presented by the suggestion now under consideration.

2. But, clinging still to the form of the suggestion, some may ask, Is the renovation of our nature in infancy literally impossible? Have we not at least some *examples* of not only its possibility, but its actual realization? Was not Samuel made holy from a child? Was not Jeremiah "sanctified from the womb?" Did it not "please God" to make the Apostle Paul, even "from his mother's womb," a "separated," or holy child? Was not Timothy an instance of this early sanctification? And, more specially still, was it not prophesied that John the Baptist should "be *filled* with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb?"

(1.) To these inquiries I answer, first, the examples adduced do not strictly affect the case before us. Neither Samuel nor Jeremiah, neither Paul nor John the Baptist, was *baptized* in infancy. Like other Jewish children, they were "circumcised the eighth day;" but this does not prove either that infants may be *renewed*, or that their renovation takes place in *baptism*.

(2.) But, not to stand on this, I answer, second, the Scriptural idea of being "sanctified from the womb" is not that implied in the inquiries just made, touching the possible renewal of our nature in infancy. But it is that in which so many things among the Hebrews were made *relatively* holy; as the *persons* of prophets, priests, and kings; the Sabbath and the Temple; the instruments and vessels of the Sanctuary; and even houses, fields, and animals.—Lev., xxvii., 14, ad fin. *This* sanctification, according to one of

the most common senses of the Hebrew term, consisted in being *separated, set apart, devoted*, from common to sacred uses; from our *own* use to *God's;* as when a priest was set apart and consecrated to his office; or a farm, to the support of God's ministry and worship.

Now it was in *this* sense that Samuel was set apart and devoted to the Lord even before he was conceived (1 Sam., i., 10, 11); that Jeremiah was "sanctified before he came forth of the womb" (Jer., i., 5); and that Paul was "separated" unto the apostleship "from his mother's womb" (Gal., i., 15); in all which there was nothing implied but a *relative, official* devotement to the great future calling of their lives. As to their *inward, real* sanctification, *Samuel*, we may well believe, received *his* while spending his young, but intelligent years in the Temple, hearing the truths of God from aged Eli, when "the *Word* of the Lord was *precious*," because "in those days there was no open vision;" and while living there amid the lights of a freshly-dawning revelation, as they streamed around his own opening, but well-instructed mind.—1 Sam., iii., 1–14. Jeremiah possibly and probably received *his* when "the Lord put forth his hand and touched his mouth, and said, 'Behold, I have put my *words* into thy mouth;'" thus, while furnishing him with his *messages* as "a prophet unto the nations," curing him also of his just expressed childish fears, and giving him the heart of a true man of God, and of a courageous servant of the Lord.—Jer., i., 5–9. And Paul doubtless received *his* when Jesus met the persecutor on his wrathful embassy to Damascus, threw back the curtain of *common* light which had concealed his form, shone out in all the dazzling brightness of "the Sun of Righteousness," and talked with the stricken man in those mighty words which, rendered quickening by the Spirit, made him *feel* that it was "hard to kick against the pricks."—Acts., xxvi., 12–18.

The case of Timothy has in it nothing even unusual.

Being a semi-Gentile, with a Greek father and a Jewish mother, the latter of whom believed in Christ, *he* may have been baptized in infancy; though this is far from probable. But, be this as it may, the secret of *his* early piety is clearly revealed. His "mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois," being women of "unfeigned faith," had, as the apostle intimates, "from a child taught him those Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus"—2 Tim., iii., 14, 15; comp. 2 Tim., i., 5. Thus, as is often the case, God by his Spirit *early* "sanctified him through the Truth."

The case of John the Baptist *seems* to be more in point; for, though not himself baptized, but brought into the ancient Church by the seal of *circumcision*, yet there was a foregoing promise to his *father* that he should "be *filled* with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb."—Luke, i., 15. But the pertinency of this case is, I apprehend, *only* seeming; for, when we consider the force existing in the use of language, which, among the Hebrews, had made the phrase "separated, or sanctified from the womb," simply expressive of this idea, "designated, or set apart, by God, to some sacred office or special work;" and when we remember that the father of John was of the priestly line, and that John himself, being *born* a priest, was still farther designated in the high counsels of God to an office which made him greater than the greatest of the ancient prophets, the office of immediate herald to the Son of God, it will appear but reasonable to attribute the increased strength of the expression "filled with the Holy Ghost" to the semi-miraculous character of his conception, to the superior dignity of the station to which he was separated, and to the fact that he was to be, at a very early period, *inspired* in that sense in which all *other* prophets were inspired. Taking this as the true force of the expression, we know very well that such *inspiration* had no connection with the *renewing and sancti-*

fying influences of the Holy Spirit in his *ordinary* work of changing the heart from sin to holiness, except as they both proceeded from the same agent. Doubtless *John* was separated, "or sanctified from the womb," to his singularly high office, in the same sense in which Samuel, Jeremiah, and Paul were to theirs; though possibly, earlier and more amply than they, *inspired* as the great heralding prophet of the Messiah. But the work which made him, like all other saints, renewed and holy in heart, fashioned into the renewed image of God within him, was, we may well believe, wrought in the ordinary way, amid the early teachings of the sanctuary, and the faithful instructions and prayers of his holy parents: blessed, as such means usually are, by the quickening and hallowing influences of the Spirit. This, too, accounts for the difference of language which we find between the prophecy *before his conception*, that he should "be *filled* with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb;" and the historical remark *after his circumcision*, that "the child grew and *waxed* strong in spirit."—Luke, i., 80. The former was evidently spoken of his prophetic inspiration, which was to be at once *full*, incapable of *waxing* or increase; the latter was as evidently said of the result of God's blessing on the early religious training which he doubtless received, and which was capable of being *increasingly* effectual.

That I have given the true meaning of the prophecy, that the infant John should "be filled with the Holy Ghost," &c., receives confirmation from the language immediately applied to his parents, as compared with that applied to the twelve on the day of Pentecost. Of his mother, when receiving the visit of Mary, it is said, "And Elizabeth was *filled with the Holy Ghost*" (Luke, i., 41); as a proof of which, she instantly fell into the sublime utterances of *prophecy*. And of his father, when, at the circumcision of the child, his mysteriously bound "tongue was loosed," it

is said, " Zacharias was *filled with the Holy Ghost*" (Luke, i., 67) ; as a proof of which, *he* also was forthwith rapt away into the loftiness of the *prophet's* song. Compare now what was said of the Twelve on the day of Pentecost. When " suddenly there came from heaven a sound as of a rushing, mighty wind," and when " cloven tongues like as of fire appeared and sat on each of them," it is added, "And they were all *filled with the Holy Ghost;*" in proof of which, they, too, immediately " began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."—Acts, ii., 2–4. The phraseology is in all the cases identical, and evidently expressive of the one idea of being " *set apart*" to the execution of a sacred *office*, and *filled* with the impulses of a Divine *inspiration*. And this inspiration, though generally felt by such as were also true saints, was yet sometimes felt by wicked men, and therefore had no connection, save in its source, with the quickening and sanctifying influences of the Spirit, in His ordinary work in the heart. John was thus set apart and filled as the greatest of prophets *for life;* Zacharias and Elizabeth, as the prophets of a grand yet transient occasion ; and the Twelve, as both the chief evangelists and prophets of the then opening Christian dispensation.

It may, indeed, be inquired, If John's gift were like that of Zacharias and Elizabeth, or like that of the Twelve, as the language in which it is expressed would seem to indicate, why did he not, like them, in *proof* of his gift, fall at once into the utterances of prophecy, or into the use of tongues ? I answer, for *two* reasons. 1. The prophet-*child* is not the prophet-*man*. Though we were to allow, therefore, that his full inspiration came *very early*, yet we should not look for very early exercises of the gift. To a great extent, God, even in His *extraordinary* bestowments, observes *ordinary* rules. The favored *child*, while others wondered in their hearts what lay within him, must still *remain* a child, and repress his awful gift, till retirement and

manhood had given him natural and customary authority over his cotemporaries. 2. But it is not certain that inspiration was bestowed so early as the inquiry supposes. The language used, when rightly understood, fixes not *the date* of the gift. From the analogy of persons "separated or sanctified from the womb," it is evident that the individuals thus signalized were exceptions from ordinary cases, that they were to be *born* for an end, *special to themselves*, in connection with the Divine purposes of grace; and that this end was to furnish the great pursuit and business of their lives. The phrases, "*separated, sanctified, filled with the Holy Ghost, from the womb*," may therefore mean no more than that God thus early signified a *special* Divine purpose in *the birth* of the individuals thus distinguished, without tying Himself *to time*, in the actual bestowment of their miraculous endowments. It was "*from the womb*" that their special designation to one great purpose was *made known*. The actual impulses of inspiration or of other gifts *may* have been, and doubtless *were*, bestowed only *as occasion demanded their exercise*. Facts in the *other* cases bear out this view: why, then, should they not weigh in judging of the case of *John?* His case evidently belongs to their class. It is a class which comprehends but a few individuals named in the Bible. In their general characteristics, their cases conform to common rules, and they should therefore be all judged by the rules which are common to them all. *John's* special designation to his peculiarly high and honored destiny was, like that of the others of his class, made known, or intimated, "*even from the womb*," and from the first he was probably a remarkable child; but we have no constraining reason for supposing that the *fullness* of the promised inspiration came upon him till near the time when Christ himself, after His *own* period of withdrawment from the world and quiet abiding the arrival of the customary term of authorized manhood, was preparing to come forth

before that world, the glorious Teacher, and Messiah of the nations.

Such being the circumstances which mark the case of John, I can not repress my surprise that some commentators cite it as a proof that, for the purpose of *changing our sinful nature*, the Holy Ghost may be communicated to the infant, even while in its mother's womb: thus, in fact, giving it its *second* birth before it has received its first! The truth is, if this case has been studied rightly and under right teaching, it has nothing to do with the point now before us. It is as irrelevant thereto as were those of Samuel and Jeremiah, Paul and Timothy; and the inference urged on us by these, the strongest of all cases on record, is, that the Bible, so far as it teaches by *example*, teaches nothing of the renewing and sanctifying work of the Spirit, as wrought in infancy, and as dissevered from that instrumentality, which is found in the light and power of Divine Truth.

3. Still, the advocates of the suggestion under consideration may press a farther inquiry. Does not the Bible teach, if not by *example*, yet in *doctrine*, that that work may be done *without* this instrumentality, and, therefore, in infancy? This will lead me to an examination of a class of passages which it is desirable rightly to understand in connection with this subject. Much of that theology which is shadowed in the suggestion before us is traceable to what the Bible says of "the gift of the Holy Ghost," of Christ being *in the Christian*, in short, of God *dwelling in the heart* of every true believer.

Before enumerating any of the passages in which this leading idea occurs, it is proper to set aside all those in which the gift of the Spirit implies simply extraordinary inspiration, or other miraculous endowment. These belong not to our subject, because they have no connection with the renovating change of our sinful nature. If, therefore, I

occasionally refer to some of them, it will not be for the purpose of disproving such a connection, but for that of preparing for a right understanding of those which properly belong to the subject; in which the gift of the Spirit means unquestionably an *ordinary* gift; and in which union with Christ and participation in a Divine nature imply the common privilege of all true Christians.

Scattered through the Bible, then, are numerous texts, in which all the persons in the Godhead are represented as being, or dwelling in the children of God; or in which these children are represented as in union with God in all his persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and this indwelling, or union, must in all these cases be considered as the peculiar *gift of the Spirit.* The following are the most prominent of these passages:

"Thus saith the High and Lofty One, I *dwell with him* that is of a contrite and humble Spirit."—Isa., lvii., 15. "Ye are the temples of the living God, as God hath said, I will *dwell in them*, and *walk in them*."—2 Cor., vi., 16. "Precious promises, that by these ye might be *partakers of the Divine nature*."—2 Pet., i., 4.

"Abide in me, and I *in you*."—John, xv., 4. "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have *put on Christ*."—Gal., iii., 27. "Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is *in you*, except ye be reprobates?" —2 Cor., xiii., 5. "This mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ *in you*, the hope of glory."—Col., i., 27. "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again, until Christ be *formed in you*, I desire to be present with you," &c.—Gal., iv., 19, 20.

"This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him *should receive*." — John, vii., 39. "The Spirit of Truth—He dwelleth with you, and shall be *in you*."—John, xiv., 17. "Know ye not that your body is the temple of

the Holy Ghost, which is *in you?*"—1 Cor., vi., 19. "Be *filled* with the Spirit."—Eph., v., 18.

Now the great theme of these and similar passages is, *the gift* of the Holy Spirit, whereby, as Christians, we have all that is meant by the indwelling of God, Father, Son, and Spirit, in all His true children. And the question which they present is this: What is their import? They certainly mean something very serious and vitally important. What *is* their meaning? What is the *inresidence* of which they speak?

In seeking an answer to this inquiry, it is obvious that, however differently in different phrases the idea may be expressed, it is, in all cases, *one and the same thing*. If we suppose it possible that the gift may be communicated to *infants*, still, it will not be conceived of as one thing in *them*, and another in *adults;* nor as one thing *before* baptism, and another *after* baptism. It must be, in all cases and at all times, *one and the same*. With this remark, I proceed to the inquiry, What is the meaning of the passages cited? What is the inresidence of which they speak?

(1.) In the first place, I reply, that whatever they may mean, they do not connect the gift of the Spirit with *baptism* as its instrument. There is, indeed, one passage which I have *not* yet recited, and one of those which I *have*, that *seem* to connect this gift with baptism; but the connection, I apprehend, is *only* seeming.

(*a.*) The former of these two passages is a part of the address of Peter to his countrymen on the day of Pentecost; that day of wondrous effusion on the Church of the amazing gifts of the Spirit, in miracle and inspiration. When those to whom the bold apostle had been preaching the Gospel "in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, were pricked in their heart," and began to cry out, "What shall we do?" Peter replied, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and

ye shall receive *the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" — Acts, ii., 38.

Now to understand what is meant by the gift promised in this case, it is necessary to mark, what is too often overlooked in explaining this gift, the order of events, as here recorded. Peter, then, had been preaching to them the Gospel of "Jesus Christ, and him crucified." This preaching was unquestionably accompanied by the silent, convincing, and quickening influences of the Holy Spirit in His *ordinary* gifts of grace. As a consequence of this, and while the preacher was yet speaking, "they were pricked in their hearts:" they felt the first deep and secret movements of a new life, and were constrained to inquire, "What shall we do?" To this inquiry the preacher replied, "Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." This direction they forthwith obeyed. Under the *silent* influences of the Spirit, accompanying the spoken Word, their hearts were already pierced with a sense of their heinous sins, and already convinced that He whom they had crucified was none other than their own true Christ. They *did*, therefore, repent; they *did* believe in the name of Jesus Christ; and in this faith they were then *baptized*, in seal of the promise of forgiven sin. Hence it is added, "They that *gladly received his Word* were *baptized*." Why did they gladly receive it? Because the Spirit inclined their hearts. And why were they baptized? Because, being moved by the Spirit, they felt that true repentance and faith in Christ, which, as we learn from the case of Philip and the Eunuch (Acts, viii., 37), were indispensable prerequisites to their baptism.

We are now ready for the inquiry, If they were already under the influence of the Spirit, what means the *added* promise, that, upon being baptized, "they should receive *the gift of the Holy Ghost?* I answer, it means that they

also should become sharers in those amazing endowments, with which they had just seen the apostles miraculously invested. The *ordinary* grace of the Spirit is ever silent and unfelt; that is, it links itself with the truth, and so enters the mind in the unnoticed form of the mind's own operations. This grace they had already effectually received, though as yet they stopped not to reflect on its workings. *Now* they were to receive something remarkable — their share in the *miraculous* endowments of the Spirit. Hence, as the ground of his promise, the apostle refers to the prophecy of Joel, which had already begun to be fulfilled amid the opening marvels of the Pentecost; and adds, "The promise is unto *you*, and to your *children*, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call." The promise was to them first; *they*, therefore, might well expect to be among the earliest sharers in its most august fulfillment.—Comp. Joel, ii., 28–32, with Acts, ii., 17–21, and 39.

This prophecy by Joel was unquestionably, in its main features, a prediction of the *extraordinary* gifts of the Holy Ghost as actually shed upon the Church at this Pentecostal season; for it is so quoted and applied by the inspired apostle himself. It may, indeed, be urged that it predicted the *ordinary* as well as the *extraordinary* influences of the Spirit; that it is a special promise to the Christian Church of the abiding influences of the Spirit in measures before unknown; that it is, in fact, the charter by which this Church now holds her permanent endowment, in all its fullness and richness, of the never-departing presence of the Illuminator, Sanctifier, and Comforter. And this view I am by no means disposed to controvert. What I contend for is this: that the *ordinary* influences which it promises were actually shed on those whom Peter was addressing, *before* they were baptized. *Without* those previous ordinary influences, they *could not* have had, what we are sure they

felt, in order to their baptism, "*repentance* toward God, and *faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" and, therefore, the *additional* "gift of the Holy Ghost," which Peter assured them should, on that occasion, *follow* their baptism, may well be understood of those *miraculous* endowments which also Joel predicted, and for which that Pentecost was so memorable. The *ordinary* grace, as we see, was not, either by the prophecy, or by its fulfillment, tied to *baptism* as its effect; for it unquestionably *preceded* that ordinance. The *extraordinary* gift was, on *this* occasion, promised by the apostle as a bestowment, which should *follow*, though even this was not promised to follow as the *effect* of, baptism.

Thus, by looking carefully at this passage, we see that it yields no support to the theory which teaches that the *ordinary* gift of the Spirit, and the consequent in-residence of God with his children as their common privilege, are communicated *in baptism*. Here, unquestionably, they were communicated *before* baptism.

(*b.*) The latter of the two passages to which I have referred is a part of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians; and what I have just said will help us to its true sense.

After having spoken of the *Law*, as "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith," by the operation of which law, and its accompanying influences, those whom he addressed had become "the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ," he adds, "As many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on Christ*." —Gal., iii., 24–27. The meaning of this whole passage is plainly this. The law having been, of course through the preaching of the Gospel and the accompanying influences of the Spirit, the means of bringing the Galatians to Christ for justification by faith, they had, *in this faith*, been baptized into Christ, or into his name. More fully expressed, they had been baptized into the one great name, *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;* or with a profession of true

faith in the Trinity; and the result of their *previous* blessed change had been, that they had become, as the apostle styles them, "the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." As the result of that change, a change professed and sealed at their baptism, they had "*put on Christ;*" or, as the same apostle expresses the idea in another epistle, they had become "*conformed to the image*" of Christ.—Rom., viii., 29. The advocates of baptismal regeneration, as that term is here understood, argue from this passage, that the Galatians had "put on Christ" by a *literal* incorporation of His incarnate nature with their own, effected by the Spirit and the water *at and in baptism.* But taking, as we have done, the whole passage in its connection, it not only gives no support to this strange dogma, but furnishes no proof of *any* spiritual change effected *at and in* baptism as its instrument. "*Putting on Christ*" means, being made *like* Christ; having the same "*mind* which was also in Him" (Phil., ii., 5); being "conformed to His *image;*" made "children of God *by faith* in Him;" and this was effected by the Holy Ghost, *using the law and its accompanying influences* in bringing the Galatians *to Christ for justification by faith*, and in thus making them God's believing children. "*As many of you,*" says the apostle, "as have been baptized into Christ, have *put on Christ.*" As a general thing, those of them who had been brought to baptism, were thus brought because they had previously been truly converted and conformed to their Savior. In some things they might have been backsliders from their original soundness and constancy in the faith; but, on the whole, they were true Christians. Such was the power of persecution and opposition at that time raging against Christ, that few indeed could be brought to confess their faith in Him, unless they had been previously and thoroughly penetrated with the power of His Gospel, and, in strongly encouraging measures, conformed to his image. This, evidently, is the full meaning of the passage; and it

is a weighty and a precious meaning: it comes up fully to the dignity of the connected discourse: it has in it no frigidness, but is warm with all the vital meaning of the Gospel.

If, then, these passages, which at first sight *seem* to connect the gift of the Spirit, and the consequent indwelling of God, with baptism, do, on closer examination, virtually disprove such connection, much more strongly must all the other passages, which I have cited, tend the same way; for they carry not the remotest allusion to baptism.

(2.) In the next place, to the inquiry, What is the true meaning of those passages? I reply that, be it what it may, not only the passages just examined, but *the main teaching of the New Testament*, show that the *ordinary grace of the Spirit*, that which quickens the dead in trespasses and sins, brings them to repentance and faith in Christ, and fills them with the indwelling of God, is uniformly exerted *before* baptism.

This, I apprehend, was conclusively shown in a previous chapter.* We there saw that the uniform order, in the work of the ministry and its fruits, was, 1. Preaching the Gospel; 2. Conversion to Christ by repentance and faith; 3. Baptism. This last, we know, was not administered to adults but on evidence, or profession of *foregoing* repentance and faith; and these graces, these spiritual passages in the inner life of the soul, constitute the elements of our great change from sin to holiness. Unless, therefore, one be bold enough to say that this change may be wrought *without* the agency of the Holy Spirit, he must admit that this agency and its result *preceded* baptism.

In *one* instance, we find that both the ordinary and the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit *preceded* baptism. It was that of Peter's preaching in the house of Cornelius. "While Peter yet spake these words," says the inspired historian,

* Chapter ii., on Preaching, p. 34, 35.

"*the Holy Ghost fell* on all them which heard the Word." —Acts, x., 44. In this gift we know were included both the ordinary and the extraordinary: the *ordinary*, because its recipients were straightway *baptized;* which could not have been but on evidence of that repentance and faith which come through the influences of the Spirit: the *extraordinary*, because, *before* their baptism, they "were heard to *speak with tongues*," or in languages taught by immediate inspiration, as at the Pentecost.

In two other instances, we find that the *ordinary* and silent, the quickening and renewing grace of the Spirit, *preceded* baptism; while his *extraordinary* and sensible, his special and miraculous gifts, *followed* that ordinance.

(*a.*) The *one* of these instances occurs in the account of Philip's ministry at Samaria. The Holy Spirit having *first*, by his quickening grace, blessed the preaching of the evangelist in the conversion of the Samaritans to the true faith, they were then *baptized*. Here was the *ordinary* gift *before* baptism. *After* their baptism, two of the apostles went down and "laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." That this was the *extraordinary* gift, we know, because Simon Magus, "*seeing* that the Holy Ghost was given, offered money," in the impious hope of purchasing the power to convey so splendid a "gift of God," and of thereby winning for himself higher fortune or fame than he had yet acquired by his sorceries.—Acts, viii., 4–20.

(*b.*) The *other* of these instances occurs in the account of Paul's preaching at Ephesus, when he had passed thither "through the upper coasts." He found there "about twelve" believing disciples, and said, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?"* Their reply, as we have it translated, was, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." They had only been

* Literally translated, "Did ye receive the Holy Ghost, having believed?"

baptized by the herald, John. Being now, therefore, "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," "Paul laid his hands on them; and the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied."—Acts, xix., 1–7. Here the extraordinary gift was bestowed *after* baptism, as the *ordinary* grace had evidently been *before*. I say evidently, because, though hitherto unbaptized in the name of Christ, they were yet *believing disciples* (Acts, xix., 2); and their faith was "the gift of God" by the Spirit.—Eph., ii., 8.

What, then, some may ask in surprise, what is meant by their own declaration, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost?" Let us endeavor to ascertain.

Their history, as connected with this transaction, seems to have been briefly this. Soon after receiving from John that baptism, which we find required repentance and faith in Jesus as then at hand, they had retired from Jerusalem to Ephesus, that distant corner of the Lesser Asia; probably in pursuit of the objects of their calling; and there, remote, secluded, and engrossed by their toils, had never, till this meeting with the apostle, heard whether the Holy Ghost, in his promised wonderful effusion, had yet come upon the Church.

That this is the true import of their language, we shall, I think, be satisfied on closer inspection. It can not, then, by any but a superficial reader, be supposed that they, who had been baptized by John, the *inspired* herald of Christ, had literally never heard of the existence of the Holy Ghost. What, persons who were themselves Jews, who were doubtless acquainted with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in all their promises both of the Messiah and of the Spirit, and yet actually ignorant of the *existence* of that Spirit? Was not their great master, who *taught*, as well as baptized them, himself a partaker of the Holy Ghost, in his

fullness both of ordinary and of extraordinary gifts? And being so, would he tell his pupils nothing of his Divine inspirer? Was he not wont, as Jesus passed by, at the opening of his ministry, not only to point to him with this very finger of the Gospel: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (John, i., 29); but also to say to his disciples, "I indeed baptize you with *water unto* repentance; but he shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost*, and with fire?" Is not this language of John an admitted prophecy of the Pentecostal wonder; and did it not probably lead his disciples to look out for what then happened? Is not this specimen of John's teaching the foundation of what Paul said to these very disciples at Ephesus: "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance," or *unto* repentance; "saying unto the people that they should *believe* on Him, who should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus?"—Acts, xix., 4. And is it possible, after this view of John's manner of teaching, to suppose that these disciples, even though far and long removed from Jerusalem, had literally never before heard of the Holy Ghost? No. Nor do their words, rightly rendered, import any such thing. They are similar in meaning to the words of the other John in his Gospel, when interpreting the language of his Savior about "*Rivers of living Water.*" "This spake he of the *Spirit*, which they that believe on him *should* receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified."—John, vii., 39. In this passage, as it stands in our translation, the word "*given*" is an *addition*. It is not in the original. The expression is, "*The Holy Ghost was not yet.*" Nor are the two passages similar in *meaning* only; but, so far as the point of comparison goes, in *phraseology* also. With the simple difference between past and present time, the main words are the same. *Literally* rendered, the phrase

in the Gospel is, "for not yet *the Holy Ghost was*;"* while that in the passage before us stands in the *original* thus: "*Whether the Holy Ghost is.*"† And the true force of the passages is this. In his Gospel, the Evangelist says, "As yet, the Holy Ghost *was not*;" historically interpreted, "was not yet *given*;" not yet Pentecostally poured forth on the Church. In the dialogue at Ephesus, the disciples say, "We have not heard whether the Holy Ghost *is*;" in like manner interpreted, "We have not heard whether He has yet been shed forth in his promised gifts of power."

It is not true, therefore, that these disciples knew not of the existence of the Holy Spirit. They were, however imperfectly, still really the subjects of his renewing grace. He had made them, under the Baptist's teaching, believing disciples, with that repentance and faith in Christ which, as we have seen, their Master taught. But, ever since they left his early ministry, they had been far away at Ephesus; and so, had never enjoyed an *opportunity* of being baptized in the name of Christ, nor even heard of the glorious effusion of the Holy Spirit, which had taken place at the Pentecost; much less, been sharers in its wonders. It was not John, who first baptized them, but Jesus, in whose name they were now baptized, that gave forth the marvels of that awful day: not their *first*, therefore, but their *second* baptism, which was immediately followed by *their* being made sharers in its rich and *special* gifts. Such is evidently the true force of the passage; and thus understood, it is one of those which show that, at first, the phrases, "Gift of the Holy Ghost," "The Holy Ghost came," "The Holy Ghost fell," &c., were used to designate his strictly extraordinary endowments, in miracle and in inspiration.

With the *extraordinary* gift of the Spirit, however, my argument, as I have already remarked, has no concern. It

* *οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον.*—John, vii., 39.
† *οὐδὲ εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν.*—Acts, xix., 2.

is busied wholly with his *ordinary* grace; that by which He renews and sanctifies the sinful soul, and makes it a partaker of the indwelling of God, as the common privilege of his children. *This*, as we have seen, in one of the remarks which I have offered, is, by none of the strong passages first cited, connected with baptism; while, as we have seen in the other of those remarks, numerous equally strong passages either impliedly or expressly *disconnect* it from baptism. The urgent inference, thus far, would be, that, with the Bible as our authority, we have no reason for saying or supposing that it is *ever* connected with baptism.

4. Having thus disconnected this whole class of passages from baptism, or, rather, shown that they have no *such* connection as is claimed, let us now proceed to a point not yet touched, the true meaning of the Scriptures quoted.

(1.) They all speak, then, of the simple gift of the Holy Ghost, without saying any thing of *the mode*, or *means*, by which this gift is bestowed. To illustrate this point, therefore, I refer to another class of texts, which give a view of this mode or means. I regard this as a legitimate resort; for even indirect statements of doctrine, explanatory of others, may be as valuable for proof as the direct ones which they explain.

(*a.*) The Apostle Paul, then, speaks of "the new man" as being "renewed *in knowledge* after the image of Him that created him."—Col., iii., 10. Here, the new man, or the soul restored to the image of God, is the *result;* renewal, the *process;* the Holy Spirit, the implied *agent;* and *knowledge*, the *means* employed in the Divine work before us. It is true, the expression "*in* knowledge" might be rendered "*unto* knowledge," making this one of the *results* of renewal. But it is also true that it may, with strict propriety, be rendered "*by* knowledge," making it the *means;* and this rendering is confirmed by what the same apostle says elsewhere, "In Christ Jesus, I have begotten you *through*

the Gospel."—1 Cor., iv., 15. Here are summarily involved the very same things: the new man; his renewal, or new birth; the implied agency of the Spirit; and the instrumentality of *knowledge*, called, in this place, "*the Gospel.*" This, then, unfolds the whole work before us. The gift of the Spirit, which results in that "new man" wherein *dwelleth God*, whether as the Father, or as Christ, or as the Holy Ghost, is communicated through, or by, the *Gospel*, by means of *knowledge* or of *Divine Truth*. On this point there can, it seems to me, be no possible doubt. The very new man, or new life, claimed as the gift of the Spirit in baptism alone, is the result of his influences through the preaching of the Gospel, or some equivalent inculcation of Divine Truth.

(*b.*) Even the Old Testament prophets took this view. Says Jeremiah, speaking of the "new Covenant," or gracious relation between God and his people, and uttering the very words of God, "I will put *my law* in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people."—Jer., xxxi., 33. This relation between God and his people is identical with his *dwelling in them*, as the gift of his Spirit, and He produces this relation by putting *his law* in their inward parts, and by writing it in their hearts. The *law* here evidently means a *knowledge* of God and his will. The writing it *in their hearts* is the work of the *Spirit*, giving inward effect to the truth: and the resulting relation between God and his people is all they need or can have of Him, save the sacred peace, the holy delight, the Divine communings which follow on that relation.

(*c.*) A *part* of this subject, the process and agent of our renewal, is strikingly exhibited by the apostle to the Corinthians: "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord."—2 Cor., iii., 18. What is "the glory of the Lord," here said to be mir-

rored to our "open face" or unveiled minds? If we look back upon the apostle's discourse, we find it to be his *revealed* glory, or the glory of his *character, purposes, and works of grace*, as made known *in the Bible*. The Jews, when Moses and the Old Testament were read, saw not this glory. "Their minds were *blinded*." There was "a *veil* upon their *heart*." This veil consisted partly in their own prejudices, and partly in the typical, shadowy character of their law and dispensation. But "in *Christ* this veil is done away." By his coming, light is poured on the page of Revelation, and the perversions of Jewish prejudice are swept away. Now, therefore, we can look upon the mirror of the Word "with open face," that is, without a veil; and, beholding there the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, by the quickening and enlightening power of his Spirit. Here we have the full gift of the Spirit, *changing* our sinful natures into the renewed image of God through that Word of truth, in which He has mirrored his *best* glories to our view; especially that "light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," whereby He "shines in our hearts," and makes us truly "light in the Lord."—2 Cor., iv., 6.

(*d.*) Again: by one of the most persuasive arguments ever urged, our blessed Savior teaches us that the gift of the Spirit is to be sought and obtained in *prayer*. "If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask *him?*"—Luke, xi., 13. But prayer for the Spirit implies *a knowledge* of God, and of his way of salvation; in opening which, and leading us along it, the Spirit is concerned. Prayer for the Spirit is the sighing of a heart that is feeling after a God *revealed;* not the asking of a mind that gropes for a God *unknown*. And though this prayer generally goes up from hearts that are already renewed, and "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination

to the Lord," yet, doubtless, when God, by his Word and providence, has set the heart of one before unchanged longing for himself, the utterance of its longings will draw down the unspeakable gift of the Spirit in its fullness, even though no other outward rite be witness to *the prayer*, and it be uttered alone amid the silence of the soul.

(*e.*) Farther: our Savior teaches that "*manifesting himself*" to the Christian, and *dwelling* with him, are identical in meaning; and that this high favor is vouchsafed to the heart of *love*—to him that *knows and obeys the truth.* "Lord, *how* is it that thou wilt *manifest thyself* unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered, 'If a man *love* me, he will *keep my words*, and my Father will *love* him, and we will come unto him, and make our *abode* with him.'"—John, xiv., 22, 23. Here is an inquiry into *the mode* of the Divine manifestation, or indwelling; and the answer to the querist's "HOW?" is, "by *mutual love* between the Christian and God, leading to *a keeping of the words* of Christ, or obedience to his truth." He who thus keeps his Savior's *words* because he *loves* him, shall know that he in turn *is loved* of the Father; while, in the secret of this mutual love, and in the path of this intelligent obedience, he shall realize that both the Father and the Son are with him of a truth, dwelling in him, and manifesting themselves to him as they do not to the world. This passage not only explains the *mode* of the Divine manifestation, but still farther intimates in what this manifestation itself *consists:* in *mutual love*, and the *evidence* which this love and its fruits do furnish of that *gracious and happy relation* which subsists between the true Christian and God; a relation which is sealed in Christ, and witnessed by the Spirit, wherever the heart, in the exercise of true repentance and living faith, yields itself to God, though it be but in its first secret consentings to His blessed covenant of life. And this inward sealing and witnessing would doubtless stand good forever, though its sub-

ject were never to enjoy the desired opportunity of publicly *imbodying* that covenant in the appropriate solemnities of the Church.

(*f.*) And, once more: the great Apostle to the Gentiles spreads out this whole subject into still more ample expression. "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might *by His Spirit* in the *inner man;* that *Christ* may *dwell in* your hearts by *faith;* that ye, being rooted and grounded *in love*, may be able to comprehend, with *all saints*, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge; that ye might be *filled with all the fullness of God.*"—Eph., iii., 14–19.

This passage gathers all the particulars of our subject into a single sentence. Here is the great "gift of the Spirit," in all its depth and power, working "according to the riches of God's glory in the *inner man;*" here, too, is "Christ, *dwelling* in the Christian's *heart;*" here, in short, is the Christian "*filled* with all the fullness of *God:*" and all this, in less or greater measure, the common privilege of "*all* the saints"—of "the whole family in heaven and earth"—of all the children of God who have gone from the olden dispensation,* as well as of those who are gathering thither

* Mr. Newman contends that there is a great difference between the Old and the New Testament saints in regard to what is conveyed in this gift of the Spirit: that the latter *have* it, but the former had it *not.* "Whatever they were," he writes, "however high in God's favor, however influenced by God's secret aids, they could not be partakers of that which did not as yet exist, the body and blood of the Incarnate Son." They had a sort of piety, he allows, "the fruit, too, of Divine assistance." Still, it was "but the poor effort after that righteousness which it never could really reach, and which He (Christ) is. Its services" "did not tend to the perfection, which they testified."—"They could not rise out of their feeble selves, and claim to be His works, not man's."

He puts a corresponding difference between Jewish and Christian *sacra-*

from the new. This, then, is not the extraordinary gift of which I have spoken. It is, questionless, the ordinary grace; the common heritage of *all* God's faithful people. It is, therefore, in the strictest sense, pertinent to the subject of our inquiry.

Does this passage, then, say aught of the *means* by which this gift is obtained, or of the *medium* through which it is received, or of the *exercises* in which it is realized and enjoyed? Certainly it does. And *what* does it say? That the gift is a supernatural investment, of and from God, over and above nature? That it is neither renovation nor any of its fruits, but a mysterious endowment distinct from them, superior to them, and inclusive of them all? And that it is miraculously communicated in baptism, and as miraculously increased in the Eucharist? Not a word of all this, or of aught cognate with it in theology. It speaks, indeed, of the *inward strengthenings* of the Spirit, of the *indwelling of Christ*, and of the accompanying *fullness* of the Father. But, then, this great gift is, in the first place, sought in answer to *prayer;* it is received, when it comes, by *faith;* and it is enjoyed, when realized, by that *holy love* which delights to comprehend what it may of the breadth, and length, and depth, and height of that love wherewith Christ hath loved us; however, at present, this love may overpass our power of knowledge. In all this, too, we have simply the "*new man*," changed into the *recovered image of God*, and putting forth his renovated powers in *faith*, *comprehension*, *knowledge*, and *love*, in the pleasing effort to realize the manifested love, and presence, and inworking of God,

ments. "The Church, before His coming, offered to him material elements, 'which perish in the using,' but now He has sent *His Spirit*, to fill them with *himself*, and to make them *living* and *availing sacrifices* to the Father," &c.—*Newman on Justification*, p. 225–6.

And if the gift of the Spirit consisted in such impartations as those in which he believes, he is right in his theology on this point; but if not, he is perniciously wrong.

his Father, his Savior, and his Sanctifier. It is simply renovation and its fruits; God, in all his persons and perfections, dwelling in the heart *by faith; faith* proving itself "the *substance* of things *hoped* for, and the *evidence* of things *not seen;*" *faith* bringing into manifestation before the mind the Spirit, and all the bright, but viewless realities of the spiritual world.

All this high gift of the Spirit may doubtless be enjoyed *most richly* in the services of God's house, especially in that sacred act, in which Christians commune and covenant together with their bodily absent though spiritually present Savior, over the consecrated symbols of his body and blood, his death and passion; but, then, it is a gift which may come *before* any outward sacrament, and which may abide with the Christian strengtheningly and satisfyingly, though all outward rites be *denied* him.

(2.) This course of illustration from particular texts might be carried farther, but such farther illustration can hardly be necessary. I pass, therefore, to the last step in this somewhat prolonged examination. What *is* this gift itself of the Spirit? What *is* this indwelling of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the hearts of his people? Is it, as is claimed, an actual impartation from and of God, the actual, spriritual substance, the very Divine nature itself, especially of the incarnate Son, miraculously communicated and mysteriously lodged within us, yet no part of us; commingled with our nature, shining from and around the heart, and tending to absorb the human into the Divine? Evidently, nothing is farther than this from the teaching of the Word of God, even in these, the strongest of its expressions, which I have quoted, and to prepare for the true sense of which I have passed through so long a course of remark. This true sense has already been partially unfolded in what has been said. But, to give it fuller statement, the gift of the Holy Ghost in his *ordinary* grace, and the consequent

indwelling of God in the soul, plainly include and consist, 1. In the *renewing* work of the Spirit, wrought upon the heart, or upon our rational and moral nature, through the truth; and, 2. In that *sacred and happy fellowship* which ensues between the renewed man and that God who has so mightily renewed him. This *renewing work* involves the solemn enactment of the covenant of grace between God and the soul; and this enactment first takes place amid those withdrawn scenes, in that silence and secrecy of the thoughts, where the Reconciler and the reconciled have their first meeting of peace. No eye but the inner one of the penitent and the approving one of the Omniscient looks upon it, or knows aught of it, till it comes out in the light of a holy life, and in the beneficence of godly actions, or till it is brought forth, for sealing and for witnessing, in the face of the Church, and under the seals of her sacraments. And then, *the indwelling of God* which follows, is but the "*fellowship*" of the renewed soul "with the Father, with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John, i., 3), and with "the Holy Spirit" (2 Cor., xiii., 14); maintained through *faith*, enjoyed in *love*, and perfected with the growing perfection of the *Divine likeness* within. This indwelling is the direct opposite to that state of the wicked which the Psalmist describes when he says, "*God is not in all his thoughts.*"—Ps., x., 4. God *is* in all the thoughts of his *renewed child*, at least, so far as the lingering conflict with sin allows him to act according to the tendencies of his renewed mind. In these thoughts he delights to hold converse with God, especially as manifested amid the wonders of his redemption in Christ Jesus. In this holy and blessed fellowship, his *faith* lifts its eye, and realizes the presence of his Redeemer, Renewer, and Sanctifier; his *love* opens its heart, and grasps all that it can of the incomprehensible fullness of the love of Christ for him; his *hope* goes up and takes in *all* of the fullness of God as his eternal portion; his *thoughts* range

through the vastness of their theme, and bring home growing knowledge of the infinitely perfect and blessed One; and thus, under the teachings of the Spirit through the truth, and most rapidly when privileged to walk in the way of God's own appointments in his Church, his whole soul becomes more and more *full of God*, of a renewed likeness to Him, of blessed thoughts of Him, and of a divine enjoyment of Him.

In the phrase of the quoted texts which I am explaining, "The high and lofty One *dwells with* him who is of a contrite and humble spirit;" and the end of his dwelling there is, to "revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones;" by his sweet influences, the lowly to exalt, and the bruised to heal. True Christians are his "*Temples*," and He "dwells and walks *in them*." They have worshiping and adoring thoughts of Him, and keep up in their hearts sacrifices of prayer and praise, which render their souls fitter temples to Him than even his awful palace in the Olden Church. And, then, his "exceeding great and precious promises," received by faith, make them "*partakers of the Divine nature;*" not, indeed, of the substance of God, *the* Divine nature itself, but of "a Divine nature,"* a nature *like* God's, the Divine "image and likeness" recovered.

Specially doth *Christ* "*abide in them*." A precious Savior, He "dwells in their hearts *by faith*." By faith, their hearts sweetly entertain this friend and brother of their souls. By faith, they "*put on Christ*," with all the fruits of believing, till they stand "conformed to his image," dressed both in a robe of righteousness, which He has externally wrought for them, and in a garment of holiness, which they have inwardly caught from among his shining graces. He is, moreover, "*in them*, the hope of glory." Their inmost thoughts, affections, and desires, do so entertain Him, that

* Θείας φύσεως, without the article.

they can not doubt of ultimately sharing with Him the glory to which He is already exalted. And, finally, He is "*formed in them*," in the beautiful likeness which they bear to Him; in that *image of himself* within them, which He sees gradually shaping and brightening toward perfection; and in the growth of which, He anticipates, with a fullness of divine satisfaction, the time when they will be "presented faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy."

And, lastly, as the source and agent of all these glorious things, they have "*received the Spirit*" which Christ promised. This Divine quickener, clothing himself in the *light*, and making himself the *power*, of *revealed truth*, has renewed their souls, made them "new creatures in Christ Jesus," and brought them to that spiritual mind in which such inward visions of God are possible, and such satisfying fellowship with the Father and the Son, not only possible, but *actual*. He has made even their "*bodies* his temples;" their *thoughts* of Him, and their *communion* with Him, bring Him within the very walls of this little tabernacle, the flesh, by putting all *bodily* appetites, affections, and faculties under his sacred control, and making them all instruments in his heavenly work. In short, both in soul and in body, they know what it is, in this its true sense, to "be *filled* with the Spirit."

Such, in the sober light of the Scriptures, are that gift of the Spirit, and that indwelling of God in the hearts of his people, about which we have been inquiring. This, in its fullness, is all that we need to make us holy; all that we need to make us happy; *all that we can have* to make us glorious.

To return, then, to the suggestion which has given rise to what has been said in this chapter: it seems, from all the texts and classes of texts which have been examined that, whatever may be meant by the terms *principle*, *seed*, or

germ of the new life, we have no ground for supposing that it is implanted in the infant at his baptism, but, rather, that it has, both as to *time* and as to *instrument*, a different origin.

One reason why this process has not its beginning in *baptism* is, as we have seen, that, as the gift of the Spirit, it begins in that *change* of our nature, in that "repentance and faith," which "infants, by reason of their tender age, *can not* perform" or feel. And another reason which may be assigned is, that the theory which lays the beginning of this work in baptism, puts the Bible out of its true place, or tends to substitute, for its great office in the hands of the Spirit, *an unreal efficiency of sacraments*, whose inevitable fruits are, *growing* error in doctrine, and *growing* superstition in practice. If the new life, or its germ, may be miraculously* communicated by one sacrament to *unconscious infancy*, it may, of course, be miraculously developed by another sacrament in even *unreflecting manhood*. Thus, the office of the Scriptures of truth is practically superseded. The ministry need not preach those Scriptures, nor need the people "search" them; the former to teach, nor the latter to learn, how "they testify of Christ." The work of both parties is mainly summed up in *sacraments*, and their spiritual life is both given and nourished in those supposed awfully *efficient* mysteries. It is needless to say that this disuse of the Scriptures and of preaching, and this almost solitary exaltation and magnifying of the sacraments, are facts with which the history of the Church has been but too sadly familiar.

How discordant is the system which engenders and brings forth these facts, from that which stands out, unconcealable, on the pages of Inspiration! "The Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword,

* The writers to whom I have referred on this subject repeatedly speak of baptism as a "*miracle*," and of both the sacraments as partaking of the *miraculous* in their effects.

piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."—Heb., iv., 12. "*The law* of the Lord is perfect, *converting the soul*." "The commandment of the Lord is pure, *enlightening the eyes*."—Ps., xix., 7, 8. "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of *thy Law*."—Ps., cxix., 18. "Sanctify them through thy *Truth:* thy *Word* is Truth."—John, xvii., 17. How all these, and a thousand similar texts, exalt the Bible!

Indeed, for what purpose was this blessed volume inspired and sent, but to be *a moral light*, through which the Holy Spirit may come and manifest himself, and make all other spiritual realities manifest to our minds? *an atmosphere of truth*, in which He may become *spiritually perceptible*, and with which He may breathe on the conscious and intelligent soul, as it lies diseased and defiled in its sins, His quickening and purifying power? It is no more evident that, without *natural* light, we should see no natural *objects*, than it is that, without this *spiritual* light, we should have no perception of *spiritual* objects; and so should remain utterly unaffected both by the Spirit himself and by the spiritual world.* It is through this holy light that God "*shines into our hearts*, and gives us"—not his actual substance in the whole person of his incarnate Son, but—"the

* It will be admitted that we *must* have this body of spiritual light. If we do not have it practically before the people, spread over our ecclesiastical firmament, in *Divine writings*, we *must* have it before their eyes in the vague expanse of *unwritten Tradition*. But, in this latter form, it is a light unavoidably filled and darkened by so many clouds, an atmosphere inevitably pervaded and poisoned by so many miasms, that God, foreseeing what would happen, saw fit to give it to us in the form of His own fixed, and incorruptible, and lively Oracles. To these, therefore, we must go for the only clear light in which we can see spiritual things, for the only pure atmosphere in which we can breathe the spiritual life. *Original* Tradition has been and is incurably darkened and poisoned; and *we* certainly neither look for, nor can accept, any *new* inspiration, unless it come accompanied with its attesting miracles, as in the days of Christ and his apostles.

light of the *knowledge* of his own *glory* in the face of Jesus Christ."—2 Cor., iv., 6. And so, "beholding this glory, as in a glass" which reflects its best brightness, "we are"—not supernaturally endowed with an *addition* from his nature, but—"*changed* into the same image"—into a *likeness* to Himself; and this blessed *change*, by His continual shining, and our continual beholding, is carried on, "from glory to glory," in the ever-brightening *resemblance*, "as by the Spirit of the Lord."—2 Cor., iii., 18.

Having thus disposed of one of the suggestions arising out of the previous chapter, others remain to engage our attention in the next.

CHAPTER VI.

THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

John, iii., 5: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

I AM still unprepared to enter on a direct examination of this and other important texts on the subject of the first Christian Sacrament. In approaching such an examination, much time has been required in clearing the way, by setting aside those loose interpretations of Scripture, which stand, like buttresses, around the edifice of an imposing but false system of theology. In doing this, I have not felt bound to enter into a critical examination of every text which may have been pressed into the support of that system, as it touches the point of baptismal regeneration and justification; but have thought it enough so to classify and illustrate those texts, or the most important of them, as to show the entire unsoundness of the views which they are so confidently brought to defend.

With this part of the subject, however, I have not yet done. Still farther suggestions present themselves from what was said in the first chapter on Baptism; and the consideration of them must detain us yet a little longer from what I conceive to be the true doctrine of the Bible on this subject.

II. The next suggestion, then, which I apprehend, from what has been said, is this: Did not God, at first, without *any* intermediate means, create the soul in holiness, or in His own image? and can He not now new-create it unto holiness, or His renewed image, without the particular intermediate means of Divine Truth? And, therefore, though this new creation be not *by* baptism as its instrument, yet may it not be *at* baptism as its time, and in the infant as its subject?

It is unfortunate for the argument intended to be involved in this suggestion, that the conclusion which it seeks does not follow from the premises with which it starts. To create a soul originally, and to new-create it subsequently, are very different processes. In what the former consists we know not. To us it is in all respects unfathomable. Into the literally creative act we can not enter. We may, indeed, rationally decide in what it does *not* consist. It does not consist in separating a particle of the Divine substance from God, and lodging it temporarily in a body of flesh: for then this particle might be reabsorbed into God; become again, what, in truth, it had never ceased to be, identical with Him; and thus leave God the solitary intelligence, the only being in the universe. This would be but the emanative philosophy of the Heathen; the old Oriental Pantheism. Thus far, then, as believers in the Bible, we may go. The creation of the soul did not consist in such an act. But when we come to ask, In what, then, did it consist? we can only say, this is an inquiry pushed to a point on which, in this world, we must remain profoundly ignorant. Its unsearchable Author alone can penetrate and comprehend

the process. But in what the latter of the two acts consists we know. It is true that we can not, in all respects, comprehend the new creation of the soul. In the movements of the renewing Spirit, the heavenly "wind bloweth where it listeth; and we can not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth." Nevertheless, we can "hear the sound thereof;" we can perceive its direction and its effects; we can comprehend something of the process carried on in our inner man; and we can understand all the results of this in our own renewed character. In some respects, therefore, we know in what this process consists. We know that it is a totally different act from that of original creation. True, the apostle calls it "a new creation" (Gal., vi., 15); and there are great propriety and beauty in the figure. Still, it *is* a figure, and *but* a figure; heavy though it be, like all other Scriptural figures, with deep and important meaning. It is a moral, not a physical, an alterative, not an originating act. It consists, not in originating a soul into separate nature and life, but in actuating the nature of a living soul, already originated and become sinful; in so actuating it as to effect a moral *change* of its nature and character, of its tempers and tastes, its inclinations and purposes, its inward and its outward habits and actions. Now this is a process which we can comprehend. How it begins with God and is sustained by Him, we know not; but we know how it begins and is sustained in us; even with memory, reflection, thought, feeling, purpose, action, in the great work of repentance, faith, love, and obedience.

Creation consists in originating the power, or faculty, of remembering, reflecting, thinking, feeling, purposing, and acting; the *new creation* consists in putting this power, or faculty, after it has become disordered and diseased, into its appropriate and its healthful activities. Of the former, we can know nothing; of the latter we know much.

The two processes, then, being thus radically dissimilar,

it by no means follows that, because God at first created the soul in holiness, without any intermediate means, therefore he can new-create a sinful soul unto holiness without the particular intermediate means of His own Divine Truth. On the contrary, the difference between the two may be such as, even with the Infinite, to require in the latter not only some intermediate means, but the special intermediate means of divine Truth, although, in the former, no means at all were employed. I am constrained to believe that such is the fact; and that, therefore, since the fall, God has furnished us with His Word, and with His ministry for preaching that Word. He has given to us His own Truth, because it was necessary in doing within us His own work.

In expressing this belief, however, I wish it observed, that I do not say God can not renew a sinful soul without *the Bible*. This would be deciding, more positively than a reasonable man should dare decide, the case of those literally innumerable multitudes who never had, as well as of those countless myriads who now have not the Bible. What I suggest, as the basis of my belief, is the inquiry whether God can, consistently with the nature which He himself has constituted in man, renew a sinful soul without such truth as the Bible *contains?* By a special revelation, He may communicate such truth to any one capable of understanding it, and thus effect His work of "renewing the soul through knowledge after the image of Him that created him," without the *written* form of that truth in the Bible. This admission, however, makes nothing for the advocates of baptismal regeneration; for they do not contend for such a special revelation. Infants in baptism could neither apply nor comprehend it. It does, however, make something for what I have advanced. Every man, if he have not this truth by a revelation special to himself, that he may know God and spiritual things, and participate in the new life of the soul, must now, according to the view here taken, have

it as already revealed in the Bible ; either perused for himself, or in some way proclaimed or taught in his hearing. And for this purpose, it has been made providentially accessible. Before the fall, God talked with Adam face to face. But since that sad catastrophe, though He can do, and sometimes has done, the same thing, yet He is ordinarily withdrawn from such familiarity of intercourse with men. The awful privilege befits not a race of defiled and condemned criminals. Still, as a token of His yet living mercy ; yea, as an instrument by which this mercy may reach us in our guilt and ruin, He has graciously left us a substitute for that high fellowship, by communicating to us His written Truth, full of the knowledge of himself, and divinely fitted both for use by His Spirit, and for entrance into our own minds. And now, without this truth, addressed to our reason and understanding, and flooding the world with a knowledge of himself, it may well be doubted whether He can reach the soul with his renewing and saving grace. To say that He can, is to say that He can save all the heathen without sending them either the Bible, or any equivalent for it in special revelation ; that He can impart his grace to the soul while it lies in perfect ignorance of Himself and of all divine things. This is a high theme ; and it behooves us to touch it with reverence. But, touching it thus, is it presumption to say, that God, by His own dealings, shows that He is self-bound to His own divine Truth, actually made known, actually understood and felt, as His instrument in the hand of the Spirit for quickening a voluntarily sinful soul to the new and spiritual life ; and that therefore renovation, or what is the same thing, the gift of the new life to the actual sinner, never takes place till the infant becomes capable of understanding and feeling those simple forms of Divine Truth, which make known God and the soul, the Spirit and the Savior ? Let us see what light we can obtain on this subject from the spiritual world.

We have no evidence, then, either from the principles of philosophy, or from the testimony of revelation, that spirit affects spirit by impact of their substances. It is not by such touches that they stir the powers, or modify the shape, or affect the nature, each of the other. They doubtless have other modes of action. And yet, of other modes we can not conceive, except as they involve the use of truth. I speak of good spirits only: to those which are evil, error is as necessary as truth is to others. We know that the Holy Spirit, in the use of the Bible, as revealed truth, can not reach our souls while in the body, except through the senses of seeing and hearing. Suppose, then, the body laid aside, or, what is the same thing, not used in the intercourse: how, in this case, does the Spirit reach the soul in the use of truth? I say, in the use of truth, because truth exists independently of the body, and even of recorded revelation; and God uses it in holding intercourse with disimbodied spirits. But how? Of course, by presenting it to the seeing, or the hearing, or what may be termed the inward sense, of the soul; that inward sense, without which truth were valueless in a world of spirits. Hence the Bible represents angels as speaking and listening to each other, and God as speaking and listening to them; while they, in their turn, speak and listen to Him. This is not mere empty imagery. It carries silent proof that fleshless spirits, like God and angels, or our own unbodied souls, have an inward, spiritual sense, in the use of which they communicate and receive knowledge or truth. This knowledge and that inward sense, truth known and made known, are grand media of happy and beneficial intercourse between all pure spirits.

The same thing held true when the body, though not laid aside, was yet unused in the intercourse of revelation between God and man, at least in those cases in which there was no vision to the outward eye, and no voice to the out-

ward ear. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But how were they moved? Was it by a sensible impulse leaving them to speak whatever might come up amid the fervors of the unusual excitement? No: but doubtless by the suggestion of thoughts pregnant with the truth to be made known; that these thoughts might be either uttered for use, or recorded for permanency. In other words, by truth and the sense which received it; truth known and made known, through that receptive faculty, without which there could have been no revealing intercourse between God and man.

Here, then, is one great established mode of intercommunication between spiritual beings, and it is a mode which apparently meets all their wants and all their capabilities. For with truth understood and felt, with truth as a light shining every where around them, all possible objects and influences become perceptible and influential; while, without truth, all is but the darkness, and motionlessness, and powerlessness of the moral world. If there could be a spirit without truth, or without the faculty of receiving truth, it would be necessarily cut off from all happy and profitable intercourse with other spirits, whether they were its superiors or its equals. But there are no such spirits. Mutual exchange of thought and of truth, with the feelings and sympathies which follow in the exchange of such Divine wealth, this constitutes the peculiar, the established intercourse of the whole world of spirits, imbodied or disimbodied; and the mighty power involved in the thoughts and the truths, in the feelings and the sympathies, which circulate in such an intercourse, constitute a necessary element, if not the whole body, of the influence which one good spirit exerts over another, or which one good spirit exerts over another that is evil.

The only question, then, which can arise on the point is this: Is there not, may there not be, some other mode of

intercourse and of influence between spirits, and therefore between God and the soul, whether bodily senses are used or not used?

I do not expect, definitively and forever, to settle the controversy on this point; because men will dispute about it so long as they can demand, what others may not be able to give, a demonstration that no other mode is possible. And yet, this controversy ought to be capable of settlement by a reasonable amount of moral probability. Is there not, then, the strongest moral probability, from what has been said, that all the feelings and sympathies, and all the consequent influences with each other which can arise in a right intercourse of spirits, have and must have their ground in some of the numberless forms, combinations, and relations of truth; of truth perceived, understood, and felt? Truth, when used in such intercourse, is addressed to the reason, the understanding, and the conscience, or moral sense. If, then, there be an intercourse, in which truth is not used, it must be one in which reason, understanding, and conscience remain without exercise; for truth is the only food which enters in by these mouths of the soul. It follows, therefore, that if there be any other possible mode of intercourse or communication between God and pure spirits in general, or between God and our own souls in particular, it must consist in this: that without truth communicated, and independently of any inward sensibility to truth, or perception of it, God, in some unknown manner, impresses Himself, his simple, naked essence upon the unreasoning and unconscious soul; enstamping it with his image, as the seal leaves its likeness on the yielding wax; or quickening it with his life, as the dove broodingly infuses animation into the unconscious egg. This, however, is an hypothesis which the mind shrinks from admitting, and will not admit, till an unreasoning credulity has usurped the place of an intelligent faith.

No reasonable man will reject a doctrine merely because

it involves a mystery. Many things are mysterious, and yet true. Such a man, if he reject it at all, will reject the theory of baptismal regeneration, as now generally understood, for two reasons: 1. Because he finds no adequate testimony to it, either in the Bible or from experience; and, 2. Because it involves the immense difficulty, not to say absurdity, of supposing that the soul may receive a communication, impartation, or impressiom from God, while utterly ignorant of His existence, and utterly incapable, as in infancy, of the removal of its ignorance. It is not mere mystery, here, which staggers faith; it is the absence of Scripture proof in support of the theory, and the inward pressure of the huge difficulty inherent in the theory itself. With nothing in the shape of adequate proof to bind faith down to the theory, this inward pressure forces her off, and leaves the theory to what must prove its ultimate fate—explosion.

To some the foregoing discussion may appear abstruse, and be passed over as remote from the easy run of thought. And yet, abstruse though it be, it makes some things plain. It throws light on the reason of this great fact, that, in His intercourse with His intelligent, yet sinful creatures, God uses, and has furnished for our use, the exhaustless riches of His Truth. He is Truth; infinite in the treasures and in the comprehension of it; and He has made us, though finite, yet capable, in reason and understanding, of receiving Him in and through His Truth. Therefore hath He given us the Truth, and Himself in it, and the eternal world through its shining. All this is plain and certain; and if any other mode of intercourse between God and man *be* possible, without involving the same principle of truth and its intelligent reception, still, the fearful and perilous darkness which meets us as we attempt to seek for it, constrains the belief that it is a mode which has never been followed by even Him, "whose judgments are unsearchable," and "whose footsteps are not known."

To others, again, the views which have been advanced may seem to ascribe too much, in the work of our renewal, to the power of "influential motives:" to be "substituting Gospel motives for the Gospel itself;" the tendency of truths to excite love, for "the love of Christ constraining us;" and the persuasiveness of man's preaching for the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power."* And, undoubtedly, there is a system which tends to "put Christ out of Christianity, and the Holy Spirit out of the Holy Scriptures;" and, having done so, to fall down and worship, not the vacated Bible, but an idol of its own, *called* Truth. Against such a system and its tendencies we may well lift a loud voice of warning. But what has this to do with a view which makes God all in all, Christ the whole hope of his people, and the Holy Spirit the one Agent, every where at work in the renewal and sanctification of the saints? This view, indeed, makes truth a necessary medium of manifestation, and a necessary instrument of operation in that renewing and sanctifying work; still, effectual only because it is "the sword of the Spirit;" only because it is "the Word of God," and full of God in His Word.

Here, as well as elsewhere, there are two extremes to be avoided. The one is, casting God out of His Word, and then making speculations, and theories, and supposed truths omnipotent. The other is, divorcing Truth, and putting her away from God, and then making Him a Being who works not only amid the darkness of constant mystery, but also amid the prodigies of ceaseless superstition. It is needless to say both these extremes must be avoided. We must leave God and His truth where they naturally are—always together—one and inseparable. In no other way shall we know either of them unto profit. Truth manifesting God, and God manifest through the Truth; Truth testifying for

* Tract 67. Pusey on Baptism, p. 77.

God, and God convincing by the Truth; Truth shining round all divine things, and God making all divine things savingly perceptible; this is the eternal union and co-operation of the Infinite with the Light in which he dwelleth. The true idea of "Gospel motives" is this—God moving in the Gospel; and this is "the love of Christ truly constraining us;" Christ constraining us by the love which his Word makes known; while the true "demonstration of the Spirit and of power" lies here, the Spirit demonstrating the power of that "preaching which is *not* with enticing words of man's wisdom."—1 Cor., ii., 4.

And, finally, to others it may appear that, according to the idea of baptism which has been shadowed forth, every infant is left, through his early years, a solitary thing; a creature of God, yet cut off from intercourse with Him; under the operation of His law, yet incapable of renewing by His grace; in short, thrown on a cold world, and left to bud and blossom amid nothing but its frosts.

With reasons for the condition of infancy as a fact we have nothing to do. Why God has seen fit to bring the human creature into life, the heir to an inheritance which may hereafter equal that of an angel in intellectual and moral wealth and happiness, and yet actually knowing less at its birth, and less able to care for itself, than the youngling of the dumb beast of burden, we know not, and need not inquire. The reason of the order is His, and to Himself is perfectly satisfying. Yet, this much we may say of it: though infancy be incapable of comprehending the truths of God, of performing any religious act toward him, or of being renewed unto repentance and faith as the opening of the new and spiritual life, yet is it not left in uncared-for coldness and solitude. However unconscious of God's regards, we know that in Christ He regards the infant with the deepest and tenderest solicitude. The intense interest, and the sacred delight with which the loving mother watch-

es her first-born, catches the first gleam of its opening intelligence and moral sensibility, and seeks to nurse the young spirit up for sweet and blessed intercourse with herself—these are but faint and feeble things compared with that still more intense interest, that still more sacred delight with which a God of love watches the infancy of every human being, sees its nature unfold, and seeks to draw its young affections to himself. Yea, the anxieties, cares, and sleepless love of the *Christian* parent for his offspring are actually but a part of that beautiful and beneficent system which God hath ordained, and under which he is preparing to place the infancy of every human being, in order that its first possible impressions may be holy, and its first possible knowledge sanctifying; or, if not actually so, yet harmonious with the holy and the sanctifying influences which are living round its young spirit. Let this suffice. Infancy is not uncared for of God. He watches over it long before it can be conscious of His watching, and long before it can requite His care with either gratitude or neglect.

III. I advance now to another suggestion which may arise from what was said in the first chapter on baptism.

If, then, we deny that infants may receive the gift of a new and spiritual life, in the sanctifying waters of baptism, does not this throw us either upon the gloomy dogma, that all infants, dying in infancy, are lost; or upon that loose heresy which holds that they are saved, because born without sin? If infants are sinful, then, it may be urged, all who die in infancy must either be previously renewed, and have the gift of a spiritual life, or be lost. Or, if they are saved, though not thus previously gifted with new and spiritual life, it must be because they are born without sin. Upon the one part or the other of this alternative it may be said we are unavoidably cast, by the view of baptism which has been indicated; a view which forces us either to hug

the chilling belief that all who die in infancy are lost, or to part from that belief only to join the rank heresy, that they are born without sin.

To this suggestion I reply, Whether those who die in infancy be saved or lost, is not strictly our question. It belongs to God, and He will settle it in equity. It need not, therefore, influence us in what is our proper business, seeking and believing the truth. As to the tendencies, however, of the views which I have stated, I will endeavor to show that they do not land us in either of the deep heresies just named.

I begin, then, by declaring, with the Bible, that we are "shapen in iniquity," and "conceived in sin" (Ps., li., 5); and by professing, with our article, that "in every person born into this world," original sin "deserveth God's wrath and damnation."—Art. ix. And thus clear of one of the heresies named, it only remains to be seen whether the view of baptism now advocated runs into the other.

If this consequence *does* follow, it must be on one or the other of these two grounds: that all who die in infancy must be lost, either because original sin, their only sinfulness, "deserves God's wrath and damnation;" or because they can not be renewed unto repentance and faith, and have the gift of the new and spiritual life. Does it follow on either of these grounds?

Before I answer this question directly, I must pause a moment to inquire what the language of our article means, when it declares that, "in every person born into this world, original sin deserves God's wrath and damnation?" Does it mean that the infant itself deserves God's wrath and damnation for being born subject to this "infection of nature?" God forbid! The distinction between the infant and the "infection" which is "*in*" him; or that between the infant, as an involuntary subject of this infection, and the adult, as a voluntary agent in the actual sin, which is its issue, may

be called a nice one; nevertheless, it is a true and an essential distinction. Both the infection itself, and the agent, when voluntary in giving it issue, deserve God's wrath and damnation. But the mere involuntary, unconscious subject of that infection, not having reached the age at which its issue becomes possible, does not, strictly speaking, deserve such retribution. Original sin, to use the language of the Article, is "*an infection*." It is a taint, a poison, whatever may be understood by such terms, and in this character, God hates and condemns it. The primary disobedience of Adam himself, and all its consequences both of involuntary sinfulness in the infant, and of voluntary sin in the adult, are objects of utter dislike to God, and against them He warreth ever. But, though thus "angry with the wicked every day," yet on the mere unsinning infant (unsinning, though sinful) He looks with a father's love and compassion. The deep sin of Adam, and its deep effect on the nature of every one born into this world, these are justly the objects of "God's wrath and damnation;" but not the new-born babe, involuntarily become the subject of the awful infection. If he live to be *capable* and *guilty* of giving this infection its issue in actual sin, he, too, falls under the never-changing wrath of God; but till then, whatever other relation he may bear to his Maker, he bears not that of the *actual transgressor*. With this explanatory remark, I pass to the first branch of the inquiry which has been stated.

1. Does the future perdition of the dying infant follow from the fact that *original* sin deserves God's wrath? No! for *actual* sin deserves the same, even in the true penitent, and *after it has been freely forgiven*. Nay, in the highest *saint* who, in heaven, has become *sinless*, even in *him*, his past actual sins deserve God's wrath, and will deserve it forever. For if sin ceases to deserve punishment because it has been forgiven, then hath forgiveness the power of changing guilt into innocence, and sin into holiness! No,

all sin, original or actual, forgiven or unforgiven, alike deserves God's displeasure, and will deserve it through eternity. Hence it is that, though Christ has paid our ransom, or endured a substitute for our penalty, yet our salvation is still all of grace. Although, therefore, original sin does deserve God's wrath, yet it does not follow, from the view now taken of baptism, that those who die in infancy must be lost. If a way have been opened, this sin may be forgiven; and thus, so far as *forgiveness* can contribute to the result, they may be saved.

Has not a way to its forgiveness, then, been opened? The limits which I have assigned to my argument will not allow me to go fully into the evangelic scheme as it touches this interesting point. It must be sufficient to glance at the view of it given in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, from the 12th to the 21st verse. Whatever else that important and somewhat difficult Scripture may contain, it contains at least these things: that Adam was a type of Christ, in the extraordinary sense of the latter's being set over against the former at all points, or in all moral relations to our race; that, as Adam brought sin and death upon all, so Christ brings righteousness and life to all; that, as Adam, by one act of trangression, brought condemnation, so Christ, from many acts of transgression, brings justification; and that, while the evils of Adam's sin are unconditional, absolute, the benefits of Christ's righteousness are conditional, contingent. By his sin, Adam actually, positively brought death, temporal and spiritual, upon all men. By His righteousness, Christ brings life, spiritual and eternal, conditionally, under terms, to all men.

Let us see how this bears on the question before us. In the case of those who die in infancy, with original sin only affecting their natures, Christ, it would seem, stands to them for good, over against Adam for evil. As they are brought under the condemnation of original sin through Adam, so

they receive remission of it through Christ. And the condition—(involuntarily enjoyed, indeed, on their part, but voluntarily secured to them on God's)—the condition on which they receive this remission is, that they have committed no actual sin. Being taken away from the ordinary conditions of the Gospel, they need no other. For if, in receiving this grant of remission, their relation to *Christ* be involuntary, so, in becoming subject to the sin forgiven, was their relation to *Adam* involuntary. Is it not reasonable, therefore, that, on the condition named, Christ, the greater, should remove what Adam, the less, entailed? To make the principle here involved general: as the first Adam brought the condemnation of original sin upon the whole race, so the second Adam brings the remission of that sin upon the whole race, on condition that original sin never issues in actual sin. When, therefore, God is pleased to remove infants by death, before they have committed actual sin, He secures to them, in his own way, the benefits of this condition. For Christ's sake, He delivers them from the wrath and condemnation which original sin deserves. As Christ "tasted death for every man" (Heb., ii., 9), and as God removes these infants before they can comprehend what their Redeemer hath done for them, and before they have committed any actual sin, so, it may be believed, He extends to them the benefits of His death and passion, without imposing any other condition than that solitary one which He has himself secured to them—freedom from actual sin. It is thus the great law of the Church under the Gospel, that while, in the case of those who live to commit actual sin, the death of Christ can be rendered effectual only by being applied in the exercises of faith and repentance, or of that inward renewing which is the work of the Spirit in the use of Truth; in the case of all who die in infancy, and without actual sin, the death of Christ itself is effectual, *without being so applied.* As they have not be-

come *voluntary* in following the first Adam's sin, so need they not be *voluntary* in relying on the second Adam's righteousness.

Had it not been for Christ, the whole race had perished. But since He "hath tasted death for every man," they only perish who, to the fact of *original* sin, as an infection from our common head, add the guilt of *actual* sin, as the intelligent and voluntary issue of their own minds; and who, thus guilty and defiled, never become renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost unto repentance, faith, and holiness; but, on the contrary, either by an *actual volition*, or by cherishing tempers which would *prompt* such an act, reject the offer of pardon and life through the Savior, and thus seal, beyond reversal, the sentence of their own condemnation.

This view of the effects of Christ's death and sacrifice accounts for the fact that so little is said in the Bible of those who die in infancy. Toward infancy and childhood, as states of life, the Bible is full of the tenderest regard. The language of Christ to those who would have kept the little children from him may be taken as the best expression of that regard in summary; while it shows that, between original sin in infancy, and actual sin in subsequent years, there is a broad and important difference. But the case of those *who die in infancy* the Bible leaves in almost unbroken silence. The comforted mourning of the penitent David over his dead child, "I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me" (2 Sam., xii., 23), is the plainest and loudest, if not the only word ever uttered to break that silence. The slaughtered babes of Bethlehem have, by some, been called *martyrs* for Christ; and yet it is remarkable that the evangelist says not a word of their state by nature, or of their future condition. So far as what the Bible says may have a direction toward this subject (the future state of those who die in infancy), it opens glimpses

into something bright and blessed. But, in the remarkable silence which it generally observes, it plainly intimates that this is a case to which the ordinary conditions of the Gospel do not apply; that, as "what the law says, it says to them that are under the law," so, what the Bible any where says, it says to them that are under the Bible, and can understand its elementary and fundamental teachings; that dying infants, not belonging to this class, are in God's hands; and that, as He sees good to take them away from the ordinary lot of sinful men, so He probably takes them to that bosom of mercy, to that freeness of pardon for Christ's sake, to which the actual transgressor can be admitted in no other way than that fully prescribed in the Gospel.

On the whole, then, we may confidently conclude that, although original sin, as it is expressed in the Article, "deserves God's wrath and damnation," yet those who die in infancy are not, *for this reason*, lost, but, on the contrary, may be saved; the way to a free remission being open in this case as well as in others. To pass, then, to the second branch of the inquiry:

2. Does it follow that those who die in infancy must be lost, because they are incapable of that renewal unto repentance and faith, obedience and holiness, which is effected by the Spirit in the use of Truth?

It is needless to repeat here, that no one guilty of *actual* sin can be saved without such a renewal. The heart that has once understandingly, voluntarily, deliberately conceived sin against God, can never know peace with Him till it has been not only pardoned, but also reconciled, renewed, and cleansed of the defilement which that accountable act infused. It is enough to say, this is not the case now in view. The dying infant is not guilty of *actual* sin.

In reference to this case, then, I reply, If dying infants need any previous change of nature in order to their happi-

ness with God, it can not be such a change as is required of those who have become capable and guilty of *actual* sin. For this latter change takes its very first steps in repentance and faith; and it is evident that, whatever else they may need, dying infants need no such change as this.

They need not *repentance*, for they have never committed a sin of which they ought to repent. Some strange theorists, indeed, have taught that we ought to repent of Adam's sin—of his personal and first act of transgression. But this, even when applied to the case of adults, would almost universally be set down as false theology. We may mourn, with the deepest grief of which a smitten spirit is capable, over

> "Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our wo;"

and yet, this grief would not be repentance, in the theological or Scriptural sense of the term. In this sense, we neither need, nor can, repent of any but our own, personal, voluntary acts. I can not repent of Adam's sin, any more than I can repent of the sin of Judas. And if this be true even of adults, much more than this is true of infants. Dying in infancy, they need no repentance, whether of Adam's sin, or of their own. From Adam, indeed, they have inherited "an infection of nature," termed original sin; but into actual sin, as the fatal consequence of this, they have never, by their own volition, fallen. They, therefore, need no repentance. They *have* nothing, they have *done* nothing of which they should or can repent.

Nor, again, do they need *faith*. For faith, as it stands related to the offered pardon of sin, is that act which the soul performs when the Holy Spirit has "*convinced* it of sin," especially the *actual* sin of unbelief; and has thus shown it the need of a Savior.—John, xvi., 8, 9. Faith, as a general act of reliance on God, and on what He hath tes-

tified in His Word, may indeed have a wider scope than this, though not a different nature; but, as the act which looks to Christ the Savior, and receives through Him a free forgiveness, it can have no other place than that which I have named, the look of the soul to Christ, when the Spirit has convinced it of actual sin. But dying infants have no actual sin, especially not that of unbelief, of which the Spirit should, or can, convince them. They need no faith, therefore, either as the hand by which pardon is received, or as a step in that change through which purification comes. For, of *original* sin they can not be convinced, any more than I can be justly convicted of the sin of my neighbor; nor need they be convinced of it, any more than a miserable youth, infected with a hereditary disease, which is sure to break out if he lives, needs to be convicted of that sin of his parent in which his disease originated; while, as we have seen, faith in this connection is that act which apprehends Christ as a Savior from the *guilt* of *actual* sin; at the same time opening a channel through which the heart becomes purified from the *defilement* of that sin. Dying infants, therefore, having nothing of either *this* guilt or *this* defilement, have no more need of *faith* than of *repentance*.

But repentance and faith are the main steps in that change which every *actual* sinner must have in order to his salvation. As dying infants, then, need not take these *steps*, so neither do they need the *change* in which they *are* steps. Consequently, so far as this point is concerned, they may, *without* this change, be saved. Whatever else may be necessary to their salvation, such a change is not necessary.

Thus, the theory of baptism which I have shadowed forth, lands not its advocate in the cold and horrid dogma that all who die in infancy must be lost. On the contrary, it leads to bright and blessed views of their future lot;

views full of the sunlight of hope, and rich with the blessedness of anticipated glory, to all whom God, in His chastening goodness, is pleased to beckon away ere the stain of actual sin has rested on their spirits. If they can not *have*, neither do they *need*, that specifically renewing and sanctifying change which God demands of all others. If they do not live to receive that gift of a renewed mind which Christ came to bestow, neither do they live to feel that voluntary breaking out of the disease of sin, the workings of which Christ came to destroy. Through Christ's sacrifice the fact of *original* sin is, it may be believed, forgiven them; through God's intervention, the stain of *actual* sin is not contracted. The pains of temporal death come upon them, not in punishment of *voluntary guilt*, but as that only part of the original penalty which follows *involuntary infection*. In them, *Adam* still *dies* for his first offense. In them, *Christ* now *lives*, through his satisfying obedience. The first Adam plunged them into the peril of original sin. The second Adam travailed for them in bloody pain, and delivered them out of their peril. The former left them to a state of misery, as the inevitable consequence of introducing sin into the world. The latter wins them to a life of blessedness, as part of his promised reward for becoming *a sacrifice* for sin.

The only objection of which I can conceive, that may be urged against the view thus given, is, that although dying infants, in order to their salvation, need not, previously to their death, the *specific* change effected in repentance and faith, yet they need some other change which shall take out the infection of original sin; and this change is the mystery in baptism. Even this objection, however, may, I think, be effectually removed, or shown to be utterly groundless.

(1.) If, in the mystery of baptism, the infection of *original* sin be *taken out*, then those baptized infants who sur-

vive to "years of discretion" may reasonably be expected to live without *actual* sin. The effect of the fall being once remedied, God surely would not, after such an infinite expenditure in furnishing and applying the remedy, suffer the fall and its effect to be straightway repeated; as would be the case if such infants were to commit actual sin after baptism. *Their* sin, in such a case, would be literally "after the similitude of Adam's transgression:" it would be literally falling from a sinless condition. But what is the state of facts here? Do those who survive their baptism till "years of discretion," live without actual sin? Universal experience concurs with the Word of God in testifying that they do not. On reaching years of moral action, they invariably sin; and thereby show in action how perfectly true it is, as expressed in doctrine: "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not."—Eccl., vii., 20.

What, then, says the language of our Article to the point? Does it teach that the infection of original sin *is* taken away in baptism? Directly the reverse. It declares that "this infection remaineth, yea, in them that are regenerated." This remaining of the infection, too, is at once a reason why, if we survive to years of moral action, we invariably sin after baptism; and a proof that, in thus sinning, we do "*not* sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression," by falling from a sinless condition, but after the similitude of the unbaptized around us, by giving voluntary issue to the lingering infection within us.

2. Again: if baptism be the necessary mystery which is infallibly to take out this infection, and thus leave the soul of the dying infant, before the seal of death is set, pure from all stain, as its only capacity for heaven, then what becomes of the myriads of those infants who die without baptism, not only in heathen, but even in Christian lands? And how is it that the theory of baptismal regeneration,

so careful of the infants of Christian parents, is so cruel to the dying babes of those who are not Christians? Many of the advocates of that theory *do* not, and all of them, if they consistently carried out their principle, *would* not, hesitate to avow their belief, that the mystery of baptism is so absolutely necessary to the salvation of dying infants, *that none who die without it can be saved.* And so the theory, which thinks to save a few, consigns infinite myriads of dying infants to perdition.

The simple truth is, the mystery of baptism is *not* the specific for the removal of original sin, which these theorists suppose it to be. This mystery does not take out that "infection of our nature." It is not thus necessary to the salvation of the dying infant. Overpowering probabilities, yea, high moral certainties, cluster around the position, that the obliteration of original sin, as a lingering "infection of nature," its obliteration before the hour of death, is not necessary to salvation.

Let me be understood. I assert not that the complete sanctification of our nature from *actual* sin in this life is *impossible.* That is a question which, in this discussion, I need not moot. What I mean is, that the obliteration of *original* sin before death is not *necessary* to the salvation either of the dying infant, or of the dying man of years.

This is evident from the fact that the best Christians actually carry this infection, and more or less of its fruits, to the very hour of death. That they do, is the burden of the concurrent testimony of the Bible, of our Article, and of experience; three unimpeachable witnesses. The Bible declares, "There is not a *just* man upon earth, who sinneth not;" and experience says the same thing. This is the state of facts. Whatever becomes of the question of the *possible* complete sanctification of the soul from *actual* sin in this life, the fact comes to this: that, in some of its forms, it clings to all living men, even to the "just." But

the presence of *actual* sin, in any of its forms, though but in the most occult movements of the will, is full proof of the co-presence of *original* sin. The *actual* would not live an instant but for the coexistence of the *original*. The infection of original sin, therefore, not only "remains," as the Article asserts, but remains *till death*, even in the most deeply-experienced and truly ripened Christian. Hence, at their dying hour, the mourning of so many over the remains within them of the fruits of this deep-fixed infection. Hence they are, at that hour, driven to Christ alone as their ground of hope, and cleave to him in death with a fondness of love, and an energy of faith, and a thoroughness of self-renunciation unknown in life.

If, as the objection supposes, this infection of original sin *must* be taken out before death, in order to render salvation possible, then, even these true Christians, notwithstanding all the wonders of redemption and grace which have been wrought for and in them, can not be saved. From their Savior, in all the earnestness and sweet agony of their last love for him, and of their last faith in his sacrifice, they must part and perish!—a result, of course, which contradicts the whole testimony of the Bible.

There is, then, no weight in the objection. It is not necessary to salvation that the obliteration of original sin should take place before death. Perhaps this previous obliteration is not *possible*, though on this point reasonable men will not dogmatize; but *perhaps* it is not possible. Perhaps the high mysteries of our last change on earth, and the still higher mysteries which await us when we come to "see God as he is" (1 John, iii., 2), are necessary finally to take out the deep infection which our nature has received, and to present it again perfect in the image of its Creator. Perhaps such a final extinction of original sin is to be the summing up of the whole mystery of our redemption. Before the fall, God and man met face to face. Then,

to look upon God was to be *like* him. But the fall ensued, and, in displeasure, God withdrew from sight, and from all familiarity of intercourse with men. That loss of the vision of God was not only the effect, but also an aggravation of their unlikeness to him. And yet they were not left hopeless in their double loss. God at length, and in measured progress, made himself again manifest; not, indeed, as at first, "face to face," but in *promise*, in *prophecy*, in *type*, in *ritual*, "*in the flesh*," "*in Christ*;" still partly hidden, and yet in part, O how gloriously revealed! And now, through this graciously renewed, though still partial manifestation of himself, through the wondrous sacrifice on the cross for the free pardon of our sins, and through the blessed work of the Spirit in the incipient and progressive sanctification of our souls, he prepares as many as resist him not, as grieve him not, for a reintroduction to his *unveiled* presence, and for a final and complete obliteration of all unlikeness to him; and to be thus, through Christ and by the Spirit, reintroduced to his presence, will be to become again perfect in his image.

But, whether this vision of God be a *necessary* summing up of the mystery of our redemption or not, it is often, perhaps always, the *actual* summing up of that mystery. The work of redemption, in its effect within us, frequently, perhaps uniformly, has its completion, its last finishing touches, in the power of that first look of the soul upon the unveiled glory of God to which John refers in the expression above quoted; and if this be either necessary or sufficient to obliterate *original* sin from the soul of the aged saint, much more is it sufficient for this effect in that infant spirit who, before committing *actual* sin, returns to Him "who gave it" —a soul redeemed by Christ, and presented to the Father, for its first sin-extinguishing look upon the glorious God.

It is but reasonable to believe that such a soul, removed in infancy from the sin, the corruption, and the evil influ-

ence with which this world is filled, and which are early as well as powerful stimulants to all that is evil within us, may feel that first sanctifying look with a vastly more penetrating power than that realized by the Christian, who, after having become defiled with *actual* sin, is here privileged to "behold," indeed, but only "as in a glass, the glory of the Lord;" and is thus really, though gradually, "changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord." If this mere *reflection* of God upon the eye of faith, an eye directed and steadied by the Spirit, and yet beholding only His "manifestation in the flesh," be thus efficient in gradually removing from the soul the stains of *actual* sin and guilt, much more shall that *direct vision* of God, vouchsafed, through Christ, to the sinful, yet unsinning infant spirit, be efficient in at once extinguishing that "infection of nature" which, however fatal in its activities and developments, lies yet the mere inactive, undeveloped principle of evil.

I do not intend, by any thing just said, that the sin, the corruption, and the evil influences with which the world is filled, are the tempters which originally lead our *naturally sinless* hearts, by the power of evil example, into the ways of wickedness. This would be a heresy worse even than that condemned in our 9th article. I mean that, as the deep infection of original sin is in our nature, and *sure* to act when carried to years of accountability, so the sin, corruption, and evil influences which fill the world, may prove to that deep inward infection like impure air to the seeds of already latent disease in the body; developing it, if not into earlier, yet into more virulent and fatal growth; and that the soul of the infant, being removed by the early act of God from this morally polluted world, to a world of purer airs, may feel its first sanctifying look upon God as He stands face to face with the absorbed beholder, more penetratingly and more effectually than the glimpses of faith in this life can be

felt by the Christian, who only sees the Divine glory "as in a glass," and even there, but "through a glass *darkly*."

The whole apparent force of the third suggestion, that which has led to this part of the discussion, arises from an ambiguous use of the term *sinful*. If infants be *sinful*, it is asked, Must they not be changed, and have a new life imparted to them before death, in order to their salvation? What has already been said in reply to this shows the necessity of distinguishing carefully between being *sinful* and being *sinners;* or between *original* sin and *actual* sin.

What constitutes the precise ultimate, or specific difference between the two, we know not, and probably never shall know, till we come to read that difference by the light which shineth in heaven. Still, there are some things which show that they are different, and that their difference is important. Thus, we know that, in *original* sin, the new-born babe is not strictly *guilty;* he is not guilty by a *voluntary* consent to the infection: while in *actual* sin, the adult *is* guilty; guilty by a voluntary consent and indulgence in the act. So, also, in estimating *original* sin, we see that the *infection alone* "deserves God's wrath and damnation;" while in estimating *actual* sin, we see that "the wrath of God abideth" both on *the act* and on *the agent*. Now these circumstances show that the two things are really different; and yet they show us not in what the difference consists. They are no parts of that difference, but only consequences of it. The difference itself *may* be something analogous to that between a seed and its plant; the former of which never produces the latter without the concurrence of certain conditions; while the latter, when produced, contains within itself multiplied repetitions or reproductions of the former. Or this difference may be something analogous to that between a poison, and the disease of the body which it generates; the former sure to result in the latter; and yet the latter characteristically distinct from the former. But, whatever this difference be,

there can be no doubt that, were it once exposed to observation, it would more clearly than ever manifest the reason why those who die in infancy are saved, notwithstanding they carry, from their brief passage through a corrupt stock, the infection of *original*, though not the guilt of *actual* sin, into the presence of Him who is infinite in holiness.

I have said the difference between original and actual sin may be somewhat analogous to that between *poison* and the disease which it generates. The Article, so often mentioned, seems to suggest this possible analogy, when it defines original sin to be "an *infection* of nature." Infection is "that which taints, *poisons*, or corrupts, by communication from one to another." Perhaps, therefore, by dwelling a moment on this suggested analogy, the light which we have on this point may become a little lighter.

Poison, then, we know, when lodged in the body and before it has begun to *act*, must in some way be *expelled*, or it will generate a dangerous *disease*, sensibly felt and visibly manifested. But after it has begun to act, it can no longer *be* expelled, except with its effects: it must therefore have an *antidote*, *neutralizer*, *remedy*, or the disease which it has generated will inevitably kill. So, *original sin*, as a poison in the soul, "an infection of nature," before it has begun to act, must be *expelled*, or it will dangerously disease the soul, the life, the whole man, inner and outer. But after it has begun to act, it can no longer be expelled, except with the last of its effects; it must therefore have an *antidote*, *neutralizer*, *remedy*, or it will prove inevitably and eternally fatal.

Now we know, still farther, that poison, and the disease which it generates, are not one and the same thing. Hence it is that they admit of entirely different treatment, before and after the generating action. If, therefore, there be any thing in the suggested analogy, original and actual sin are not one and the same thing; whence it is that they *receive*,

as well as admit of, very dissimilar treatment before and after the period of moral accountability. In the dying infant, the moral poison is *expelled* in God's own way: first, its action is *prevented* by the suspending stroke of death; and then itself is taken wholly out by the energy of a direct vision of the perfect God, graciously vouchsafed for the sake of Him who "hath tasted death for every man." But in the adult, this process becomes impossible: disease has set in; and it must now be *healed* (unless it be suffered to become fatal) by its appointed *remedy*, the mercy of God in Christ, applied and made effectual by the Holy Spirit in the use of Truth, in the renewing and sanctifying change of repentance and faith, and with the present fruits of love, obedience and holiness.

These remarks, though of course an inadequate illustration of the difference between original and actual sin, are still enough to show that they *are* different; and that this difference detects the fallacy couched in the suggestion which has been considered. The infant, who sleeps in early death, and the adult, who sleeps in Jesus after a life of accountability, are both *sinful*, but not both *actual sinners;* and they are both saved by God's mercy through Christ, but *by a totally different application of that mercy.*

At the same time, these remarks give increased strength to the conclusion, that there is no weight in the special objection which I have been considering. It is a mistake of the very genius of the Gospel to suppose that, in order to salvation, we must, before the hour of death, be purified from the infection of original sin. This would be virtually to demand that the image of God should be, not only in the process of a renewed formation within the soul, but brought to its last finishing touch, in the present life. This would be more than multitudes, if not more than any, of even the eminent servants of Christ attain, while yet in the flesh. Christ, indeed, came "to destroy sin, the work of the dev-

il ;" and ultimately he will effect his object, till not a sherd of the broken image of evil remain in any one of his disciples. But, allowing it to be *possible*, still, it is not *necessary* that the last stroke in this work should be struck this side the grave. Christ's main purpose, so far as it falls within the present life, is to bring men within the reach and embrace of mercy; to open before them the door of the kingdom of heaven ; and to set them in the way which passes through its entrance. As illustrative of this point, it seems to me that the whole view which the Bible gives of the fall and recovery of mankind may be thus briefly stated.

By his first disobedience, Adam opened and spread the broad roll of a flying curse over the whole race of man. His act, which was one of rebellion, cut the race off from God ; and, thus cut off, the whole fell into a state of moral separation from Him: a state, which rendered it certain that every individual would, on reaching years of moral action, commit *actual* sin. That state of the race, including this attendant certainty, constitutes *original* sin. It is a state over which " God's wrath and damnation" rest; and, at the same time, one which includes every individual of the race, from Adam to the last of his stock. Thus much of the *fall.*

In the *recovery*, Christ, the second Adam, by his obedience unto death, brought in a blessing, which, in the possibilities of its application, is coextensive with the primal curse. He threw the reach and embrace of mercy around the entire race. He " tasted death for every man." He opened the door of the kingdom of heaven to all mankind. He made eternal life *possible* to the whole race, from Adam to the last of his stock. And thus much of the *recovery.*

According to this view, *the infancy of every human being* appears to be a conditon actually embraced within the mercy of God in Christ Jesus ; and if God call the infant away while in that condition, or before *actual* sin, it will be difficult

to deny that He calls it to Himself and to salvation, the work of extinguishing the infection of original sin being complete in the first vision of his glorious face.

But, if the life of the human being reach to years of moral action, to actual sin, the individual enters a state not covered by the *first* application of mercy. He passes from that general condition of the *race*, into a state of *personal* liability for voluntary acts ; and before he can *again* pass within the embrace of mercy, he must, *personally and for himself*, have "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;" his sin must be slain by that Spirit, whose sword is the Word of God; and his soul must be renewed by that Holy One, whose sanctifyings are through the truth. This is the *full* Gospel-method of salvation. This is what the Bible says to them that are under the Bible. And all who thus come to Christ, making voluntary covenant with him, and continuing faithful to the end, are *saved ;* not because in this life they necessarily become perfect, or free from the infection of original sin, but because they are in Him who *is* perfect, and who will ultimately perfect *them*, when, after the blessed trials, and the loving discipline, and the glorious progress of time, he brings them to the full vision of God, and presents them, *at last*, "faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy."

It is evident that this is not a gospel, nor a view of the Gospel, which encourages indolence in the Divine life, or allows men to rest satisfied with mere half-way attainments in grace. It puts every renewed heart to panting after perfection ; it sets every foot which has been turned to God's testimonies boldly and determinedly on the race *toward* perfection ; and it throws unwonted terrors on the way of him who, having thus started, carelessly suffers a pause in his progress, or a rest to his pantings after perfection. Still, it is a gospel, or a view of the Gospel, which sheds not only *hope*, but "the *full assurance* of hope," on the way of him

who, having been renewed by the Spirit unto repentance and faith in Christ, thus sets forth and thus perseveres on the Christian course, even though, amid the weaknesses of nature, and the intensities of the conflict with evil, he come to the goal of death with something still of remaining sin within him. He has the beginnings of the "life hid with Christ in God;" and he knows, to his deep joy, that when he comes to see *Him*, he shall be *fully* "*like* Him; because he shall *see Him as He is*."

But what are the results of this view of the Gospel as applied to the case which has been passing before us? Evidently these: all the countless myriads who have died, and who are yet to die, *in infancy*, whether in Christian or in heathen lands, in all ages and in all nations, probably *have* entered, or *will* enter, heaven—the trophies of God's redeeming mercy in Christ. The heathen are thus shown to be, in all probability, Christ's "*inheritance*" not only by purchase, but also, to no small extent, by "*possession*;" and when we come to listen to infant choirs around the throne of God, we may see not only how literally, but also how *largely* true were the Savior's words: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." In short, to pass from those who die in infancy to those who survive till "years of discretion"—that great mass of responsible human beings to whom the Bible is addressed, and with whose case it is mainly concerned—they only perish (fearfully great, doubtless, will their number be) who voluntarily reject Christ and grieve from their hearts the Spirit of Life; or who, in lands unevangelized, and in dark corners not reached by the Gospel, *voluntarily* and *perseveringly* do violence to the law within them, and cherish those tempers which would "crucify afresh the Son of God," were he revealed to them, and "do despite unto the Spirit of Grace," were he to strive intelligently with their hearts.

To this view it is hardly necessary to append a notice of

what the Bible says in such passages as these: "Without *faith* it is impossible to please God."—Heb., xi., 6. "He that *believeth* not shall be damned."—Mark, xvi., 16. These passages touch not the case either of those who die in infancy, or of those who never hear of Christ. They are but specimens of what the Bible says to them that are under the Bible, and can understand the Bible. While, therefore, *of* such they are solemnly true, *to* such they are manifestly limited.

To sum up what has been said in answer to the third suggestion, is it not plain that, in rejecting the now commonly-received theory of baptismal regeneration, under all those modifications which leave it still itself, we are not landed either in the error of the Pelagians, or in the chilling dogma that salvation is impossible to dying infants? We may retain the doctrine of Original Sin, as we must heartily and steadfastly retain it, in all the strength of the language used in our 9th Article; while yet we rejoicingly believe that *all* who die in infancy are saved: because, over against the first Adam, who brought the race under condemnation, stands Christ the second Adam, who, on appropriate conditions, has brought in pardon for all; because those who die in infancy *need* not, what they can not have, the specific change which is effected in repentance and faith; and because they do not *need*, what in like manner they can not have, even that vague mystery in baptism which, it is claimed, obliterates the infection of original sin. This is an infection, which we are justified by the Bible, by the Church, and by experience, in saying, remains to trouble and vex even the ripening Christian, till he comes, after his dying hour, to look full upon the glories of God, and to feel the last pulse of "the old Adam" cease amid the finally full beatings of the new and heavenly Life.

In the somewhat prolonged discussion on the nature of baptism which has extended through the last three chap-

ters, it has, I think, been demonstrated, at least with reasonable certainty, 1. That the theory of baptismal regeneration which makes baptism a sort of miracle, a mystery, in which the Holy Spirit imparts to the infant Jesus Christ in his very incarnate nature, as the seed or principle of a new life, is without any support in the Bible: 2. That, short of this, there is nothing on which we can rest till we come to that *moral* change of our nature which is effected by the Holy Spirit in the use of Divine truth: 3. That *this* change, having for its principal steps repentance and faith, is one which our Church, in her Catechism, pronounces impossible in infancy: 4. And, finally, that a rejection of the above theory of baptismal regeneration, in its various modified forms, is perfectly consistent with the language of our 9th Article, while at the same time it leads to bright and blessed views of the future state of one of the most interesting portions of the human race—dying infants.

The views, indeed, thus far presented on this subject may not appear, to *all* minds, free from difficulty; nor would it be reasonable to look for such a result to any discussion on the same subject. It is, perhaps, impossible to frame a system of theology which, on *all* points, especially on one so controverted as this, shall be thus free from difficulty. The most sanguine theologian, I apprehend, never dreamed of presenting a view of this point which should labor under no difficulty at all. The most that can be hoped for is, to find that point of view which makes Scripture most harmonious with itself, and which leaves the fewest and the least difficulties in the way of a clear and settled faith. Were theology, at *all* points, free of difficulty, it would not be of a piece with all the rest of God's sciences. At least, the mind which could so penetrate all its depths as to throw the light of demonstration every where, would thereby give proof that it had taken *one* step, if no more, in advance of even the inspired men themselves of olden times.

I am now ready to take up the principal texts on the subject of Baptism, and to see what light they cast on the *nature* of this sacrament.

CHAPTER VII.

THE NATURE OF BAPTISM.

John, iii., 5: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

In what I have thus far said, whether on the subject of preaching, or on that of baptism, I have been mainly intent on these three points: 1. That our renovation unto a new and spiritual life is the great work of the Holy Spirit, wrought on the intelligent mind in the use of Divine truth; 2. That this work can not be wrought in the baptism of infants, because, as our Church herself teaches, the mind, at that tender age, is not capable of the repentance and faith which the work involves; and, 3. That the alleged mystery of baptism, which consists in an actual communication to us of the Divine nature, especially as manifest in the Incarnate Son; a communication effected by the Holy Spirit in and of the sanctified and sanctifying waters of baptism, and characterizing the theory of baptismal regeneration as now currently taught, is, in all its modifications, unsanctioned by Scripture, and in itself morally impossible, on the principles of the nature in which God has constituted, and upon which He deals with man.

The view of the new birth which I have begun to shadow forth is clearly taught in the following passage; with a remark upon which, by way of bringing the subject to mind, I will introduce what I have yet to say.

"Of his own will *begat* He us *with the Word of Truth*, that we should be a kind of *first-fruits* of his creatures" (James, i., 18); or, literally, "He *who willed* hath begotten us by the Word of Truth."* Nothing can be clearer than this as to the fact which it asserts. God, putting His *will* into, or with, "the Word of Truth," His own true Word, had "*begotten*" the early Christians, and made them "first-fruits of his crea-

* Βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς λόγῳ ἀληθείας; not ἐγέννησεν, as in 1 Cor., iv., 15, and elsewhere. The two words, however, are of similar significancy, and of equal extent of meaning.

Dr. Pusey, indeed, attempts to show that "baptism is spoken of as *the source* of our spiritual birth as no other cause is, save *God*;" because the same *preposition* is used when speaking of the *Water*, as when speaking of the *Spirit*, or of *God*: γεννηθῇ Ἐξ ὕδατος, Ἐκ Πνεύματος, Ἐκ Θεοῦ; while, in speaking of "the Word of Truth" as the "more *remote* instrument" of that birth, a different preposition is used: ΔΙΑ λόγου, ΔΙΑ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, &c. But the criticism, I apprehend, is unsound. The expressions, ἐκ πνεύματος, ἐκ Θεοῦ, denote the *sole agent* of the new birth; as these, διὰ λόγου, διὰ του εὐαγγελίου, denote the *sole instrument* of the work. Why, then, it will be asked, is it said that we must be born, ἐξ ὕδατος, if the Word of Truth be the *sole*, instead of only the more *remote*, instrument of the work? I answer, because, *water* being the appointed and significant *symbol* of the Spirit's cleansing influences, we are *symbolically* born *of* water, as we are *really* born *of* the Spirit, or by His agency. To say that *water* is really *a source* of the new birth conjointly with *the Spirit*, because the same preposition is used of both, is to say that water is, not a more immediate *instrument*, but a joint *agent* with the Spirit; or that we are born *of* water in the same sense in which we are born *of* the Spirit; and thus, on the theory of Dr. P., that the "new creature in Christ" is composed jointly of the two elements, water and the Spirit. The truth is, water is neither *an agent* nor *an instrument*, but it is the *symbol* of the agent, or, rather, of His cleansing influences; and, *therefore*, the same preposition is used in speaking of it as is used in speaking of that of which it *is* the symbol.

It is needless to add, that in the passage in James there is *no* preposition governing λόγῳ ἀληθείας. It is what grammarians call "the dative of the *instrument*."

The passage, 1 Pet., i., 23, is exactly equivalent to that from Jam., i., 18: "Being born again, οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς, ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτης, διὰ λόγου ζῶντος Θεοῦ:" the "Incorruptible Seed" referring to the Holy Spirit as the sole *agent*, and "the Word of the living God" to Divine Truth as the sole *instrument*. [For the criticism to which this note refers, see Pusey on Bap., Tr. 67, p. 25, 26, N. Y. ed.]

tures." If this be not the work of our new *birth*, of our being begotten to the new and spiritual life by the sole instrumentality of *the Word of Truth*, then it is impossible to find that work described or asserted in the Bible, as the result of *any* agency, or of *any* instrumentality.

With a similar meaning, James goes on to exhort those whom he addressed to "receive with meekness the *ingrafted Word*, which was able *to save their souls*."—James, i., 21. The *figure* here is changed, but not the *significancy*. The Word ingrafted, the Truth implanted by the Holy Spirit, is the instrument of the new birth. Farther along the *figure* is again changed, though the same *significancy* remains; with this difference, perhaps, that what is said of the Word as "a glass," the mirror of a "perfect Law," and of him who "looketh into" it, as "like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass," has a broader application; reaching not only to him who, for the first time, looks into the mirror of the Word with a spiritual perception, belief, and love of the truth, but also to him who, having entered on the way of life, "continueth therein," consulting often the same Divine Mirror, which first, through the Spirit, brought him to a knowledge of the Savior; and even extending to him who, having the Mirror of Truth, *looks into it*, but, upon "beholding himself, goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was."—James, i., 22–25.

The whole passage shows us the true place and position of the Word of God, His Divine Truth, both in its relations to Him who uses it as his sole instrument in our regeneration, and in its aspect upon us, in whom it is made to effect His blessed work.

Here, then, it will be asked, If there be no such thing as an actual impartation to us of the very Divine nature, that awful mystery in baptism, or as the alleged

gift involved in some one of the various modifications of this theory; and if the Spirit *always* performs his quickening and renewing work in the intelligent use of Divine Truth, and, therefore, always in the mind after it has become capable of understanding at least the simple and sovereign elements of that Truth; then, what is left, as the nature of baptism? What is God's act, and what the soul's experience in this primary Christian ordinance?

To this inquiry I now proceed to seek for such an answer as may be consonant with the intent and meaning of those precious Scriptures of Truth which God hath given us—the richest treasury of all accessible Divine knowledge.

I. And, in the first place, I invite attention to what I must consider the false Canon of Interpretation,* which has been applied to the text, John, iii., 5, by way of furnishing *a key* to unlock the meaning of all other passages on the subject of baptism. In fashioning and using this key, the awful mystery of baptismal regeneration, as it has been stated, is first virtually assumed; then this text is cited as a passage which teaches that mystery; and, finally, with the key thus fashioned, the meaning of numberless other passages is unlocked, some of which, in-

* Says Dr. Pusey, "The words of our Lord, 'Birth *from above* of water and the Spirit,' are *a key to other Scripture;* they are in themselves a high revelation, not to be closed up when we come to read other Scripture, and their fullness restrained within themselves (as if, like the heretics of old, we looked upon different portions of Scripture as the work of another God), but flowing over into other parts, and imparting to them the light which they contain concentrated within them."—(*On Bapt., Tract* 67, p. 44, N. Y.)

Again: speaking of certain early writers, he says, "Not only did they understand the words, 'water and the Spirit' of baptism, but they regarded them as *a sort of key* to the rest of Holy Scripture which any way bore on the same subjects."—(*Idem*, p. 31.)

And again: "This was the general interpretation of the ancient Church: those who quote the text of baptism go not about to *prove* its reference to it; they *assume* it, *see* it," &c.—(*Idem*, p. 46.)

deed, allude to baptism, though others of them carry no allusion to this ordinance.

The same false Canon of Interpretation is applied in settling the meaning of Scripture on the subject of the Lord's Supper. What Christ says, in John, vi., of "eating His *flesh* and drinking His *blood*," is assumed to be spoken of *actually* eating and drinking His flesh and blood in that sacrament; and then all other Scripture on the subject is forced to take, whether it naturally will or not, the meaning thus arbitrarily assumed.

It is not asserted that a single text may never become a key to the sense of all other texts on the same subject. The falseness of the canon in question arises not from the single circumstance of arguing from the meaning of *one* text to that of *others*. This is sometimes admissible. When a single text announces a doctrine, in itself salutary and reasonable, or not absurd and impossible, and announces it in terms, about which there can be no difference of opinion, in terms which can not possibly or reasonably be understood but in *one* sense, then that text *is* a key to all others on the same subject, *provided these others reasonably admit of* MORE *than one sense*, or of a sense harmonious with that of the key. If, indeed, these other texts themselves admit of but *one* possible or reasonable sense, and this a flat contradiction to the meaning of the first, *then* the authority of the book in which they are found is annihilated; for two portions of God's Truth never *may*, never *can* flatly contradict each other.*

* To illustrate the principle advanced. In Deuteronomy, vi., 4, it is said, "יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֶחָד;" literally, "Jehovah, our God, is *one* Jehovah." Now this can not be understood but in one sense. This one sense is good, vitally important, and agreeable to pure reason. This, therefore, is a key-text; and all others in the Bible on the same subject must be explained into harmony with this. When, therefore, we find a multitude of other texts which speak of this Jehovah as Father, as Son, and as Holy

But when a meaning is arbitrarily imposed on a text which admits of a different sense, and may *reasonably* be understood otherwise, especially when the assumed meaning involves a doctrine which is, if not pernicious, yet useless, and if not absurd, yet loaded with infinite embarrassment; and when, with the meaning thus fixed, men approach as with the key of infallibility, to explain all other passages touching the same subject, albeit these others *reasonably* admit of a different meaning, expecting the moment their key is applied they will all fly open at its touch, and receive a flood of light into their previous darkness; then, unquestionably, they adopt a false canon of interpretation; and the common sense of the reflecting world turns Protestant against the violence thus done to all sound laws of hermeneutics.

Now this is done in explaining, or, rather, fixing, the sense of the text, John, iii., 5. True, a somewhat imposing effort is made to give color to the meaning put upon the passage; but, after all, it amounts but to an *assumption* of a meaning, and then goes on to a virtual forcing of the meaning thus assumed upon all other texts on the subject of baptism. The meaning itself, as assumed, is thus expressed: "This is our new birth, an *actual* birth of God, of water and the Spirit, as we are *actually* born of our natural parents;"* or, differently, thus: "This regeneration is the being born of water

Ghost, as these do not contradict the key-text, and as they, too, carry a reasonable and vitally important sense, they must be explained into a harmony with that text; as thus: in the *one* Jehovah there are Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and these being *three* in *person*, are *one* in *substance*. The essential, indestructible, and indivisible *unity* of Jehovah consists in a mysterious but blessed *trinity* of persons. If, however, there were a single text in the Bible which said, "Jehovah, our God, is *two* Jehovahs," it would destroy the whole authority of the Bible as an alleged revelation. It would make the Bible a flatly self-contradicting book.

* Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 24.

and the Spirit," or "by God's Spirit again moving on the face of the waters, and sanctifying them for our cleansing, and cleansing us thereby;"* or, more fully, thus: "This birth from above is an *actual* birth from God, a gift coming down from God, and given to faith through baptism; yet not the work *of* faith, but the operation '*of* water and the Holy Spirit;' 'the Holy Spirit giving us a new life in the fountain opened by Him; and we being born therein *of* Him, even as our blessed and incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb:' 'the gift of God, illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery from which it flows, the incarnation of our Redeemer.'"†

Such being the meaning put upon the text, the *principal* reasons assigned for it are two: 1. That it is therein said we must be born *from above* (*ἄνωθεν*),‡ and "*of* water and the Spirit," as, in our ordinary birth, we are born *of* our natural parents; and, 2. That such is the meaning put on the passage by a long catalogue of ancient writers and liturgies.§

Now of these reasons, the *former* is simply a naked assumption. The very thing to be ascertained is, what is the meaning of the expressions "*born again*," and born "of water and the Spirit?" To say, therefore, that they carry the meaning assigned them, is but to *assume* a meaning without reason. The *latter*, however,

* Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 47, 48. † Idem, p. 43.

‡ Nicodemus, however, as it appears, did not understand *ἄνωθεν* in this sense, as a spiritual birth *from above*. He supposed our Savior to imply that "a man must enter *a second time* into his mother's womb, and be born." This shows that the sense of *ἄνωθεν* (or, rather, of its synonym in Hebrew-Chaldaic, as the dialect probably used in this interview with Christ), was that of *denuò*, anew, or a *second time*, and not that of *desuper*, from above. It is true that, on the whole, Nicodemus misunderstood Christ; and yet his very misunderstanding of the general meaning of the Savior *shows the sense of the word ἄνωθεν, at least in this particular place.*

§ Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p 24 to 48, passim.

of the two *alleged* reasons certainly *does* show that the sense assigned actually has been put upon the passage, and that it has the authority of many and grave names; but it does *not* show that this is *necessarily* the *true* sense. No one deserving the Christian name denies that we must "be born again of water and the Spirit." Nor are many disposed to deny that the *birth of water*, spoken of in the text, means *baptism*. But, then, multitudes, the authority of whose names is, perhaps, as weighty as that of any, at least since the times of the *apostolic* fathers, *do* deny that the expression "*born of the Spirit*" bears the meaning here assigned to it. They *do* deny, too, that *the effect* which this meaning involves follows *baptism* as its source or cause. This is the very question to be determined. If, therefore, the meaning "assumed" for this expression, and "*seen*" in it, though not "*proved*" of it, be a *wrong* meaning, then it matters not how many writers, or how many liturgies, have been concerned in thus *assuming* and *seeing* what they attempt not "to *prove*." There *have* been ages, *not very modern*, when both individual writers, and scattered churches using liturgies, were prone to incorporate *some errors* among the mass of truths which they doubtless held; and, under *such* circumstances, *a wrong* meaning of the text, though "assumed" and "seen" ten thousand times, does not thereby become the *right* meaning.

Notwithstanding, then, these *alleged* reasons for the meaning assigned to the text, it is, in fact, an arbitrarily-assumed meaning. *Abstractly*, it might be a *right*, or it might be a *wrong* meaning. But *practically*, whether it *be* right or wrong, is the very question to be decided; it must be decided according to just laws of interpretation; and these laws oblige us to look at any meaning proposed before we adopt it as the *true*.

Let us, then, look at the meaning proposed in the

present case. It comes briefly to *this:* that in baptism the infant is born of "sanctifying" water and of the Holy Ghost, even as Christ was born of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin; insomuch that, by "an illimitable and incomprehensible mystery," it thereby becomes "a partaker in the incarnation." Now, it is fearlessly asserted that this is neither a *salutary* nor a *reasonable* sense of the words. The reason which God has given to every man, and the history which God has written of every age of his Church, justify the assertion. It is a sense which nourishes a mischievously superstitious regard for, and use of, both the Christian ordinances; and is, at the same time, a sense which supposes such a moral impossibility as burdens the Scriptures with an intolerable load of difficulties. Moreover, it is *not* a *necessary* sense of the words; not the *only* sense which they will bear; not an actually *undisputed* sense; not a sense which *resistlessly* shuts out another and a better meaning. Fearlessly, therefore, is it asserted, that the process by which this sense is reached involves *a false canon of interpretation.* It is forcing on a text which may have another and a better meaning, a sense which carries in it the *seed* of that monster-absurdity and impossibility, *Transubstantiation;* and then boldly claiming that the sense so assumed shall be received as *an infallible key* for opening the meaning of all other texts on the subject of baptism. Nothing more need be said to show that such a process of interpretation is *fundamentally wrong;* and that if, in any case, it ever reach the truth, it must be by *accident*, and not by following a safe or luminous guide.

The true Canon of Interpretation for settling the meaning of a disputed text (which, for the very reason that it *is* disputed, must admit of another sense than any arbitrarily assumed for it) is the direct opposite

to that just exposed. It consists in first "searching the Scriptures" for the analogy of faith or doctrine on the subject involved, and then, by this analogy, explaining the particular passage in question. In all cases where the sense of a particular passage is doubtful, it is certainly *right* that it should yield to the general analogy of Scripture, and certainly *wrong* that the whole analogy of Scripture should be forced to yield to it.

I have, then, already shown, at length, that the meaning which we have seen imposed on this text is part of a great system of theology, which necessarily pushes itself back to the fall of man, and discovers there an idea of original righteousness and original sin wholly unknown, and altogether opposed, both to the Bible and to our Articles; and that, therefore, we are not only *justified* in rejecting, but *bound* to reject, not only that false notion of original righteousness and original sin, but also its inseparably associated error of baptismal regeneration itself. We are not at liberty, as consistent theologians, to reject that false notion of original righteousness and original sin, and yet retain this twin-born theory of baptismal regeneration. If we *can not* hold the *former*, we *must not* cling to the *latter*. The texts which relate to baptism, we not only *may*, but *must*, interpret into harmony with that other great system of theology which necessarily comes in as antagonist with that which we have rejected.

Through a somewhat extended examination of texts which have, or are alleged to have, a connection with the subject of baptism, we have already passed. Upon an examination of others, more important, we are now to enter.

1. I begin with the account of the baptism of Christ (Matt., iii., 13–16), because our Church, in her baptis-

mal office, says that God, "by the baptism of His well-beloved Son in the River Jordan, did sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin;" and because of the peculiar view which the advocates of baptismul regeneration take of this baptism of Him who was the Institutor of the ordinance into the nature of which we are inquiring. By the language of our Church, "did *sanctify* water to the *mystical* washing away of sin," I understand, according to the usual sense of the word "*sanctify*" when applied to *external* things, "did *separate* and *set apart* that element to be a *seal* of the pardon of sin on the terms of the Gospel, and a *symbol* of purification from sin by the influences of the Spirit." But the advocates for the theory of baptismal regeneration, as here understood, give a very different significancy to these words of our ritual, and a very different effect to the baptism of Christ, on which they are founded. They suggest that the design of His baptism may have been "to fulfill all righteousness" by cleansing the sinful nature, in the likeness of which He had come, and to impart to it, as a whole, the righteousness which He should afterward communicate, one by one, to those who came to the baptism which He had thus consecrated." They say that the early Christians "doubted not that the very element had, by its contact with Him, in this His condescension, received a degree of sanctity and fitness to be a vehicle of spiritual gifts;" and that "His baptism received the gifts which were bestowed upon *ours*, and was to us the pledge and first channel of those gifts."*

Now all this is mere theory; a theory which one has a right to construct if he choose, but still *mere* theory. Having fashioned the idea of the "opus operatum" in baptism, of the gift of the Holy Spirit in the water, and

* Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 221, 224, 225.

the mystery of incorporation into the body of the Incarnate Son, it is easy to impose it, by way of *addition*, upon any text that mentions baptism. But to *add* a sense *to* a text is not to *find* that sense *in* a text; and this were enough to say, even if the sense added were intelligible and good. It is more than is needed, when that sense is scarcely the one or the other. What may be meant by the baptism of Christ "cleansing that *sinful* nature in the (*sinless*) likeness of which He had come," or by its "imparting to our nature, *as a whole*, that righteousness which he should afterward communicate, *one by one*, to those who came to the baptism which he had thus consecrated," or by "the very elements receiving a degree of sanctity and fitness to become a vehicle of spiritual gifts," because a portion of the Jordan once came in "contact with Him," it is, I confess, difficult to conceive; although it is easy to see that the sense, so darkly shadowed forth, can not minister much to any thing but superstition in using the sensible things of religion. This sense may minister to a deep and trembling awe in view of a supposed "overwhelming mystery," but it can not impart to the ordinance of baptism the efficacy which it ascribes. It is enough to say of it, it is a sense *not* found in the account which the evangelist gives of the baptism of Christ. What that baptism actually was, I leave to be seen in the simple phrase in which the Bible expresses it.

2. I pass to another passage, which deserves a brief notice here, not because it has any thing to do with baptism, but because such a reference in it is boldly asserted by the advocates of baptismal regeneration.* I refer to the 12th and 13th verses of the first chapter of the Gospel according to John. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of

* Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 31.

God, even to them that *believe* on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Here, because it is said that those who "received Christ," or "believed on His name," were "*born of God*," it is assumed that they were thus born *in and of the waters of baptism;* and that their birth consisted in an impartation of the Divine substance, or nature, in and of those waters. But, in the first place, this would make against *infant* baptism; for, in the evangelist, the birth is predicated of those only who *believed* on Christ, and *infants* can not so believe. In the second place, however, the meaning given to the passage is again mere *assumption*. There is no reason for supposing that baptism is here implied or understood as a *source*, jointly with God, of the birth declared. The evangelist had just been speaking of the rejection of Christ by his "own countrymen" (*οἱ ἴδιοι*), through their unbelief; they "received Him not," or believed not on Him. To these He immediately opposes those "who received him by *believing* on His name." Of these He says, "They were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man;" this work was of no human agency, "*but of God;*" and to these he says, Christ "gave power," or the privilege, "to become the sons of God." All this certainly *does* prove that the new birth, one of the principal steps in which I have all along observed to be *faith*, is a Divine work, wrought by the sole agency of God's Spirit. But to *assume* that this work is wrought in baptism, and that it is the birth *of* water, as being, with the Spirit, its joint *source*, is but to force a sense upon Scripture, whether it will take it or not. It is, after all, but to add strength to a human theory by the prop of mere human weakness. The passage is heavy with importance; but its importance weighs wholly against the theory into a support of

which it is pressed. It shows that the birth from God involves the exercise of *faith* in its subject; and that the Bible impliedly separates it from its symbol in baptism.

3. The next passage which I take up is found in 1 Cor., xii., 13: "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." At first sight, this seems to teach that the Holy Spirit, in the baptism by *water*, does bring us into spiritual union with Christ. But I suggest whether, on closer examination, this may not prove a groundless inference. There is nothing in this connection to show that baptism by *water* is here intended; but, on the contrary, much to prove that the reference is to that inward work of the Spirit, of which the *water* in baptism is but the divinely-appointed *symbol*.

That there is a baptism *without* water can not be denied. "I, indeed, baptize you *with water* unto repentance," said the herald John, "but He that cometh after me," &c., "shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."—Matt., iii., 11. Literally was this fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when *fire*, not *water*, was the symbol of the marvel which the Spirit wrought.* And, substantially, is it

* This expression, "*He* shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with *fire*," throws light on the meaning of the phrase, "born of *water* and of the Spirit." No one, I think, will deny that the "*fiery* cloven tongues," which marked the baptism with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, fulfilling thus the words which the Baptist spake of Christ (Matt., iii., 11), were *a symbol* of the Spirit's influences in endowing the apostles with the miraculous power of speaking various languages. If, then, to be "baptized with *fire*" is to receive *a symbol* of *one* class of the Spirit's influences, it follows clearly that to be baptized "with *water*" is to receive *a symbol* of *another* class of the Spirit's influences. Nor will it follow that, because the *miraculous* gift *accompanied* its appropriate symbol, therefore the *ordinary* gift must also accompany the symbol in which *it* is represented. For it is *essential* to the *proof* of a miracle, that the symbol, or token, which evidences it to *be* a miracle, should be *simultaneous* with that of which it *is* an evidence. No such necessity as this ties the symbol of *water* to the *ordinary* influences of the Spirit which it represents. Or, if men will insist that *baptism itself*, as well as the gift of tongues, is a miracle, let them *prove* it such (as this thing ever *must* be proved) by showing the miraculous *effect*, and the *symbol* which demonstrates it, to be *inseparably simultaneous*.

ever fulfilled when the same Divine Agent brings the soul, by repentance and faith, to Christ, and to newness of heart and life. There is an inward work on the soul—a work of power and love, of quickening and life-warm energy, of transforming, yet of ordinary grace—which is *called* a baptism, doubtless because the baptism by *water* is its appointed *symbol*. This inward work of the Spirit, whenever effected through the Word of God, and the holy light which this Word sheds around the mind, may, with truth and force, be *called* a *baptism*. The figurative use of this word has been carried even farther than this, by the highest and best authority, that of the Divine Savior himself. "I have a *baptism* to be baptized with," said Christ, in view of his bloody cross.—Luke, xii., 50. "Are ye able to be baptized with the *baptism* that I am baptized with?" (Matt., xx., 22) was his inquiry of the disciples whose ambitious mother would have them to be distinguished in their Master's kingdom; little dreaming that *martyrdom* would be the first and brightest crown awarded in this life to the foremost subjects of *such* a King.

With our minds thus familiar, then, with this beautifully and forcibly *figurative* use of the *word* baptism, let us look at the passage just cited from Corinthians. It occurs in the apostle's discourse on the subject of that essential, intimate, close, spiritual union which exists between *all Christians*, whether "Jew or Gentile, bond or free," and *Christ* their Divine Head; a union which *always* characterizes the true spiritual body of Christ, and which, therefore, *ought* always to characterize what is visible of that body in the Church. Speaking of the various gifts by which this body was then distinguished, by way of preparing for that most divine discourse which follows in the next chapter, about *charity*, or holy love, as the "very bond of perfectness," which is to tie the members of Christ in heaven, when *faith* and *hope* shall have gone out in *sight* and in *fruition*, the apostle says,

using one of his customary striking *figures*, "For, as the (human) body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is *Christ*. For, by *one Spirit* we are all baptized into *one body*, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit."—1 Cor., xii., 12, 13.

Now, *the whole* of this is *figurative* speech; that is, the *literal* human body—animated, of course, by the living human soul—is used as a strong figure of the *mystical* body of Christ, filled with that Holy Spirit by whom its members are cemented into indissoluble union. Hence, doubtless, the baptism spoken of is that inward baptism of the Holy Ghost, which has its appointed *symbol*, indeed, in the baptism by *water*, but which, as we have so often seen, has no connection with it as its operated result. The true force of the passage may be thus expressed in paraphrase: "By one Divine Spirit, all real Christians, of whatever nation or name, are closely united as members in that one spiritual body, of which Christ is the Head; and this work of the Spirit may be called a *baptism*, because it has its appointed *symbol* in that primary Christian ordinance."

The whole of the passage is so incontestably a strong, bold *figure of speech*, that it would evidently be as great a violence to language to quote it as explanatory of the nature of infant baptism by *water*, as it would be to quote what Christ said of his coming bloody baptism on the Cross, as though it had been spoken of his past literal baptism in the Jordan. Even, however, if we were to admit that the *literal* baptism could have been intended in this very heart of an enclosing figure, it would still remain for inquiry, What is the actual work of the Spirit in connection with that literal baptism? To this inquiry, however, I am not yet ready to attend. For the present I must proceed with this examination of passages.

4. I take up next, for a few remarks, what is found in the Epistle to the Ephesians, v., 25–27 : "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it *with the washing of water* by the Word; that He might present it to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy, and without blemish."

The author of the celebrated treatise on baptism so often quoted observes, "As it is a melancholy mark of our times, that a portion of 'the world' has already begun to shrink from this comparison between the relations of marriage and those of Christ to His Church, so it is, undoubtedly, not unconnected with it, but a part of the same state of feeling which depreciates baptism, thus connected by St. Paul with it."* After this, he endeavors to show, and cites various post-Nicene writers as favoring his view, that baptism is that mysterious fountain of cleansing and sanctification to the Church from which she is at once presented to Christ "wholly cleansed;" that, however there may be an "ulterior purity," to which the Church, "in her triumphant state," is to be advanced, still, "the end of the cleansing" (in baptism) "is, that she might abide sanctified, spotless, unblemished," being, in this sacrament, "once wholly cleansed;"† and that the instrumentality of "*the Word*," as mentioned in this passage, is immediately connected with "the washing of water;" being the power of Christ in the baptismal *formula*, and not in the truths of Revelation, written and preached.‡

But what a violence upon language is this! The whole force of this passage may be thus expressed: "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that, having cleansed it emblematically, by the *washing of water*, He might, progressively and really,

* Tract 67, p. 152. † Tract 67, p. 154, 155. ‡ Tract 67, p. 160.

sanctify it *by the Word;* and that thus, in her future glorified state, He might at last present it to Himself, spotless and unwrinkled, holy and without blemish." Where, in all this, is the idea of Christ's presenting to Himself the Church spotless from the very bath of baptism? Not to be found. Besides, the instrumentality which the apostle here assigns to "*the Word*" is evidently the same with that which Christ Himself assigns to it in his last prayer, when he says, "Sanctify them by thy truth: *thy Word** is truth."—John, xvii., 17. "The washing of water" is evidently referred to as the baptismal emblem of what Christ really effects by his Spirit, through the subsequent instrumentality of *his Word.* Hence, the really instrumental character of "the Word" is so plainly indicated by the peculiar form of the expression, "*with* the washing of water *by* the Word:"† "*with* the washing of water" emblematically representing, "*by* the Word" instrumentally effecting the divinely-cleansing process. In infancy, baptism first *symbolizes*, and then, through subsequent life, the Spirit, in the use of the *Word* of Truth, *effects*, carries forward, and finally perfects the inward sanctification of the soul; and thus, each individual being made holy, the whole Church, as one body, shall at length, in her glorified state, be presented by Christ to Himself, as his spotless and divinely-adorned bride, to spend with Him an eternity of perfect blessedness. This futurity of the Church's spotlessness will become more evident by studying the verses which immediately follow.

"So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. (He that loveth his wife loveth himself;) for no man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it,

* The difference between *ῥῆμα*, in the apostle's phrase, and *λόγος* in that of Christ, is unessential, as any scholar will be convinced who examines Dr. Pusey's most unsatisfactory criticism and references, on the 160th p. of the N. Y. ed. of his Tract on Baptism.

† *τῷ λουτρῳ τοῦ ὕδατος, ἐν ῥήματι*; the last word having the *preposition* prefixed; the first being without the preposition.

even as the Lord the Church. For we are *members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.* 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh.' This is *a great mystery*, but I speak concerning *Christ and the Church.*" —Eph., v., 28–32.

In a note to what the author of the afore-named treatise on baptism says when explaining the previous verses, he adds, among other things, the following, in reference to these latter and connected verses:

"The words belong to human marriage as a type; but as to the antitype, they designate that which marriage also designates, the relation of Christ to his Church. Marriage is a mystery, as shadowing out *that union*, as having been, in the first instance, a hidden prophecy of it, and now being an image and reflection of it." "Marriage is a *mystery*, as portraying the union of the Church with Christ; is *not* a *sacrament*, as not *conveying* it."*

In other words, according to this theory, the sacraments *do* convey union with Christ. Marriage does *not* convey this union, and therefore is not a sacrament. What this author means by union with Christ, we have already seen. He means a "participation in the incarnation;" or (as he says when treating of the Lord's Supper), the flesh and blood of Christ "commingled and co-united with the bodies and souls" of Christians, "and preserving both for incorruption."† This union is held to be conveyed and sustained by the sacraments, and by *them only.* Hence this author speaks of them as "the means whereby he (Christ) originally unites her (the Church) to himself, or still nourishes, and cherish-

* Tract 67, p. 154.

† Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Lord's Supper, N. Y., p. 9. Had the author, in the passage here referred to, been speaking of the preservation of natural flesh from corruption by the intermixture with it of what is antiseptic, he could not have used stronger terms.

es, and maintains her in that union."* Hence he quotes Chrysostom as saying, "In baptism, we are incorporate into Christ, and made flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone."† And hence he says that "the *partaking of the incarnation*," &c., "is *imparted* through baptism, and is *not* imparted *without it*."‡

From these quotations, it is easy to gather the interpretation which the author suggests, but does not develop, of the latter passage cited from the fifth of Ephesians. In conformity with his explication of the verses immediately preceding, it would run thus: Marriage is a type of the union between Christ and his Church. As, therefore, by the mystery of marriage, the "twain become one flesh," so, by the mystery of baptism, Christ and the Church become "one flesh;" each individual member being made therein "a partaker of the incarnation;" and all, by the "commingling and co-uniting of his flesh and blood with their bodies and souls," being made "members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." Marriage is the shadow; the substance lies in this "great mystery" "concerning Christ and the Church."

But does this passage really convey such an idea of the union between Christ and his Church? A moment's examination will show that it does not. It is no more than reasonable that we should judge of the nature of that union of which marriage appears to be in some sense a type, or shadow, by looking at the nature of the relation which is constituted in marriage itself. In the language of the Homilies, "If *sacraments* had not a certain *similitude* of those things whereof they *be* sacraments, they should be *no sacraments at all*."§ The same is true of *types*. If they have not a certain *similitude* of those things of which they *are* types, they are *no types at all*. What, then, is the similitude between *marriage* as a type, and *the union of Christ*

* Tract 67, p. 216. † Tract 67, p. 159. ‡ Tract 67, p. 31.
§ Homily of Com. Pr. and Sac. (N. Y., 1815), p. 296.

and the Church as the antitype? A brief answer to this question will serve to throw light on a point which certain writers are fond of wrapping in the darkness of profound mystery.

The relation, then, between the husband and his wife is that of a union based on *covenant*, on a mutual engagement to fidelity each to the other. The first transpiring of this mutual contract, or the first entering into it, is called *the betrothment*, or *espousals*. Its final solemnization according to constituted form is termed *the marriage*. And those who enter into this state are regarded by the Word of God *as one;* that is, as *united* in a *covenant*, which supposes common *sympathies*, which creates a common *interest*, and which, when religiously understood and fulfilled, looks forward to a common *destiny*. Behold, *here*, the similitude of the type to the antitype; of marriage to the union between Christ and the Church! This *latter* relation, also, is that of a union based on *covenant;* on a mutual engagement to fidelity between the contracting parties. This sacred union has its day of *espousals* in *the present life*. The *marriage*, to which it looks forward, is to be celebrated, in solemn and royal state, on *the morning of the greatest day of days*. And the parties who here enter into this holy state of covenant are regarded by the Bible as already *one;* that is, as *united* in a bond which supposes a common *love*, which creates a common *interest*, and which, spiritually understood and discharged, looks forward to a common *destiny*.

Let us see how this matter lies in the record. The *covenant*, then, between the Lord and His Church, under the old dispensation, is termed a "*marriage*."—Ezek., xvi., 8; and Jer., iii., 14. In his character as "Maker and Redeemer," the Lord styles himself the "*husband*" of His ancient people.—Isa., liv., 5. *The time* when He entered into covenant with that people in particular is called the time of their "*espousals*."—Jer., ii., 2. Moreover, the *covenant*,

which then *united* the Church to her head, was the same with that which *still* unites them. The only difference is, that it has passed into a new and better economy, under which *Christ*, the way of salvation through Him, and the nature and extent of His promises, are more fully revealed; and thus "life and immortality more distinctly brought to light." And, furthermore, this Divine relation, this holy union, here based on *covenant* signed and sealed, is to be brought forth for final and glorious solemnization on the illustrious morning of the resurrection. Hence, the Apostle Paul, evidently referring forward to that great day, says to the Corinthians, "I *have* espoused you unto *one husband*, that I *may* present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."—2 Cor., xi., 2. Hence, also, John, in the visions of the Apocalypse, when he "heard a great voice of much people in heaven," caught, among others, these words: "The *marriage* of the Lamb is come; and *his wife* hath made herself ready."—Rev., xix., 7. And hence, "The New Jerusalem," or the Church in heaven, is styled "*the bride*, the Lamb's *wife*."—Rev., xxi., 9.

Bringing now the light which has been gathered, so that it may shine on the passage last cited from the fifth of Ephesians, it is evident that this passage, without pretending, however, to follow its exact order, may be thus paraphrased:

"Under the covenant of grace, Christians '*are members* of *Christ's body*,' the Church, and may, therefore, be termed '*His flesh and His bones*.' In this holy union, Christ '*loves* the Church;' He 'nourisheth and cherisheth' it, as His now graciously *espoused*, and hereafter to be royally *affianced* and *glorified bride*. Of this Divine union, the sacred relation of *husband and wife* is a kind of type, or symbol, and was so ordained from the beginning. 'Husbands, therefore, are religiously bound to love their wives as their own selves (he that loveth his wife does in fact love himself;

since the covenant between them makes them in so many important respects *one*): for no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it even as the Lord loveth and cherisheth the Church.' So let husbands love and cherish their wives. For it is written, on the first pages of Revelation, 'For this cause,' that is, on account of the nature of marriage, as a type of Christ's *covenant relation* to the Church, 'For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined to his wife; and they two shall be one flesh.'—Gen., ii., 24. 'This is a *great mystery;* but I speak it of *Christ* and *the Church.*' Marriage, as a covenant relation, is *significant* as well as sacred; pointing to Christ and the Church; designed to be auxiliary to this higher covenant; and, therefore, binding to the same holy love, which this higher covenant demands."

The plain meaning of all this seems to be, that *marriage* is a Divine institution. It is the basis of the family relation. The family itself is a divine arrangement, designed to be preparatory to the Church. Every truly religious family is a little church. Its office is to train up God's children for *individual* membership in His *greater* Church on earth; even as the office of *this* is to train them more perfectly for their *collective* character, as "*the bride*," the Church in heaven, which is, on the morning of the great day of days, to be presented to Christ, arrayed in divinely-effulgent glories, for the enjoyment with Him of eternal blessedness and honor.

Such is the "great mystery" of marriage, as related to Christ and the Church. The Church, it is true, hath her *sacraments;* and they are a sort of *holy marriage ring; signs* of the *union*, and *pledges* of the *love* between her members and her Head. But this union itself is, in other words, a *covenant relation;* and, as such, it involves no "participating in the incarnation." The phrase, "We are members

of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones," means, "We are members of that Church, which is *called* His body;" and, as every *natural* body has flesh and bones, so, carrying out the strong figure, we, as members of His "*mystical* body," the Church, may be *called* "His flesh and His bones." The language of the apostle, understood as some authors are fond of understanding it, would make Christians in a *double*, and even *treble* sense, members; in other words, members of Christ's *body*, and also members of "His *flesh*, and members of His *bones*." It is needless to dwell on such an unnatural straining of words. They import no more than this: that, adopting the lively phraseology of symbol, or of figure, individual Christians may be called "the flesh and bones of that body" of Christ, which is—The Church.

This whole passage, then, in Ephesians v., from the 25th to the 32d verse, makes nothing in favor of the theory of baptismal regeneration, in the sense maintained by its modern advocates; but is replete and luminous with teaching of a very different character. It makes "the washing of water" the emblem, and "the Word" of truth the instrument, of that renewing and sanctifying process which, realized here in every true Christian, shows how "*the bride*, the Lamb's *wife*," is now "making herself ready" for that august occasion on which Christ is to "present her to Himself, a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but holy and without blemish." And it shows the momentous relation which, in the Divine intention, *marriage* has to all this, as an institution designed to minister to the whole heavenly result; and, therefore, binding to all that holiness of affection which this result is eternally to unfold.

5. I go, next, to the passage which occurs in the first Epistle of Peter, 3d chapter and 21st verse: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not

the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Here, as in the last passage, the baptism by *water* is undoubtedly the idea which the apostle had in his mind when making this reference to Noah and those saved with him in the ark.

The present is a passage of some difficulty, and its precise meaning is not easily settled. Nevertheless, its main sense is, I think, apparent. It does not mean, then, that the waters of the flood were *themselves* a type of the waters in baptism. This meaning were full of incongruity. The waters of the flood were not *saving*, but *destroying*. They could not, therefore, typify even the *symbol* of our salvation. The idea is, that the whole circumstance of Noah's being saved by passing in the ark "through the waters" (*δι' ὕδατος*), is a type of something which baptism, rightly understood, does for us "*through the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" Nor, again, does the passage mean that what is thus effected for us by baptism, is effected by the *waters* of that ordinance; for the apostle expressly guards against such a supposition when he says, that the thing in baptism to which he refers is, not "the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." In other words, it is, not the *water* in baptism, but that inward work of the Spirit, in repentance and faith, which baptism *symbolizes*, and which enables us, in all good sincerity and honesty of conscience, to answer the questions propounded at baptism. And, finally, I think it may be made evident that the something from which baptism, thus understood, saves us, is not the present deep pollution and the future eternal punishment of our sins, but the present afflicting terror, and the future abiding dominion of that same *temporal death*, from which Noah was saved in the ark. This is rendered highly probable by the addition which the apostle

makes when he says, that this inward significancy of baptism saves us "by" or through "*the resurrection of Jesus Christ.*" That is, as Jesus Christ rose from the dead the third day, so *the faith in Him* which is professed or sealed at baptism, when, with "a good conscience toward God," we answer the "questioning" (ἐπερώτημα) which is then made, assures us that *we* also shall rise from the dead at the last day, and thus that death shall not hold over us more than a brief dominion.

This interpretation is, moreover, strongly confirmed by two other texts. The one of these is found in connection with a passage in the sixth of Romans, to which I shall soon have occasion more largely to refer. "Now if we be *dead* with Christ, we *believe* that we shall also *live* with Him: knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him."—Rom., vi., 8, 9. This was spoken after what the apostle had said about being "*baptized* into Jesus Christ," and about being "*buried with Him* by baptism into death." Without anticipating what I have to say of these expressions, I may remark, that their connection with the succeeding passage (that now under consideration) makes it evident that the sense of *this* passage is as follows: "If, as we *profess* at *adult* baptism, or as baptism in *infancy* signifies we *should* become, we be really '*dead with Christ*,' really penitent for sin, thoroughly determined to renounce it, and inwardly deadened to its power, 'we *believe* we shall also *live* with Him;' shall continue to cherish, and cultivate, and enjoy the spiritual life which our repentance and faith imply, or to which baptism in *infancy* binds us; and not only so, but shall ultimately rise, like Christ, from the dead, and live with him forever more. 'As death hath no more dominion over *Him*,' so shall it have no more over *us*, either in the tyranny of sin in this life, or in the abiding power of the grave over us, when this life shall have ended." It is prob-

able that, at baptism, the early converts to Christ professed their *faith* in the great doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, *based on the* FACT *of the resurrection of Christ.*

And this probability is increased by the other of the two texts just mentioned. It occurs in the apostle's great argument for the resurrection of *the body*, in the fifteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and is in these words: "Else, what shall they do who are *baptized for the dead*, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?"—1 Cor., xv., 29, 30. This is, in some respects, one of the most difficult texts in the New Testament. But the best criticisms and helps to interpretation to which I have found access, render it highly probable, if not certain, that its sense is this: "If our dead bodies rise not at all, then why, at baptism, profess we our *belief* in their resurrection from the dead? Why are we baptized in the belief of such a resurrection? And why, through constancy in this faith, do we every hour jeopard our lives amid the persecutions which are thus brought upon us?" This sense agrees with the whole scope of the apostle's argument in that noble chapter, and it goes far to render certain the position that, originally, one of the things professed at the baptism of the early Christians was their steadfast faith in the resurrection of *the body*, grounded on the fact of Christ's own resurrection. It was this fact which all the apostles most vigorously asserted and testified. It was their testimony to this fact which brought on them the persecuting hate of the Jews; and it was their preaching of this fact, with the truth which it involved in the possibility of the resurrection of the human body, that provoked against them the burning scorn of the Greek. Doubtless, therefore, it was this fact itself, and the faith which it supported in the resurrection of their own bodies, which the first Christians, at their baptism, most steadfastly professed, and persevered

in professing in the face of all the peril in which it involved them.

Let us now take the light which comes from these texts, and spread it over the passage from the Epistle of Peter. Thus spread, it plainly manifests the following meaning: The baptism, which is the antitype (*ἀντίτυπον*) of Noah's being saved in the ark from present temporal death amid the devouring waters of the Deluge; the baptism, which consists, not in the mere "putting away of the filth of the flesh, but" in "the answer" which "a good conscience toward God" makes to the questioning customary at that ordinance; *this* baptism, or baptism *thus* understood, assures us that *we* also shall be saved from the future dominion of the grave, as certainly as *our Savior Christ was raised up* from the power of the sepulchre. In the light which one apostle thus reflects from Christ upon a brother apostle, the passage from the latter may, with strict justice to the original, be thus paraphrased: "Noah and his family were carried in the ark through the whelming waters of the flood, and thus saved from present temporal death. The *antitype* to this, I mean baptism, not, however, the mere putting away of the filth of the flesh, but what this material washing signifies, in the answer of a good conscience toward God, given as the result of the inward baptism of the Spirit, now saves us also; or assures us, as God's pledge, the seal of His promise and His oath, that our bodies shall hereafter be raised from the grave, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, or by the same power which raised Him from the dead."

So little support does this apostle give to the idea that baptism is the fountain and source of that new life which saves us from sin and eternal death, and that in it is wrapped the unutterable mystery which makes the baptized infant "a partaker in the incarnation."

6. I pass now to the text to which, a moment since, I referred, in the Epistle to the Romans. "Know ye not, that

so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?"—Rom., vi., 3. Here, it may be asked, Is not baptism said to bring us "*into Christ?*" and does not this constitute that reverend mystery, that "participating in the incarnation," that transmuting of "the sinful flesh into the body of Christ," which has been ascribed to this ordinance? Is it not said, too, that by this baptism we "are baptized *into His death?*" And does not this show that, in baptism, our sinful nature is put to death through the power of Christ, into whom we are thus actually ingrafted? To this I answer, if such *does* appear to be the teaching of the passage, appearances here, as elsewhere, may prove deceitful. Taking the language as it stands by itself, is not the way to penetrate its meaning. To reach this, we must look at its connection with the apostle's argument.

He had, then, been just setting forth the great doctrine of justification by faith, and, having done so, comes, in this part of his epistle, to a vindication of the doctrine from objection; especially from the objection that it has an *Antinomian* tendency, or a tendency to bring the moral law into disrepute as a rule of life, on the ground that, being freely justified by *faith*, we need not be strict in *obedience*. "What shall we say, then?" he inquires, anticipating the language of an objector: "Shall we continue in *sin*, that *grace* may abound? God forbid! How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death?* Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that *like* as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so *we* also should walk in newness of life. For, as we have been planted together in the *likeness* of his *death*, we *shall* be also in the likeness of his *resurrection:* knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin."—Rom., vi., 1–7.

Now, without attempting a labored criticism of this passage, the materials for which, however, are abundant, it is enough to say, that the scope of the apostle's argument fully justifies the following paraphrase. v. 1. "Because, where sin abounds, there grace much more abounds; shall we go on in sin that God may have the glory of this superabounding grace? v. 2. Let no such inference be drawn from the doctrine of justification by faith, or the free gift of our salvation in Christ Jesus. How shall we, who, by that inward renewing which a justifying faith implies, have died to sin, continue to live in the commission of it? v. 3. *Know ye not, that so many of us as have been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, have, in that baptism, sealed a covenant which binds us continually to die* UNTO *sin, even as Christ once died* FOR *sin?* v. 4. This is the solemn import of our baptism. We are there, in a most significant symbol, and in a most stringent covenanting, buried with Christ into death; the deep significancy and obligation of our baptism being this; that, as Christ was raised up from the dead by His glorious Father, even so we, through the power of the Spirit, should habitually walk in the newness of a holy life. v. 5. This is the true import of the baptismal act, and if we be true Christians, we *shall* live conformably to this import. If we have been planted with Christ in a *likeness* to His death, we shall be also in a *likeness* to His resurrection. 'As He died and rose again, so shall we, who are baptized, *die* from sin and rise again unto righteousness; continually *mortifying* all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living.' v. 6. In our inward renewal, professed and sealed in baptism, our old man is crucified with Christ for the very purpose, that henceforth we should not serve sin. v. 7. For he who has thus died to sin is Christ's free man, and no longer a slave to sin."

Thus, by opening a little more fully the apostle's argument, we see that his words in the third verse involve no

such sense as the theory of baptismal regeneration, in its various modifications, implies. His argument is briefly this. The abounding of grace in the free pardon of sin by Jesus Christ neither encourages nor tolerates sin, because, in accepting by faith that covenant of grace, which is sealed in baptism, we come under the most solemn obligations to abstain from all sin; while, at the same time, if we are not *hypocrites*, we have that inward principle of the new life, which the Spirit quickens in us through the truth, and which ultimately works the utter death of all sin in our natures. So far, therefore, as his language in the third verse is concerned, there is no need of seeking for any thing *more*, or for any thing *else*, than the idea intimated in the paraphrase, that, "as many as are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, are baptized either as adults, with a *profession*, or as infants, in *symbol*, of that inward renewing, which makes us dead *unto* sin, even as Christ once died *for* sin."

To a similar purpose the argument is continued in the subsequent verses; but it is needless farther to follow its reasonings. The passage, so far as it has been examined, is one among others, which show the significant and symbolizing nature of Christian baptism.

7. In the Epistle to the Colossians (ii., 10–13) is another passage, which involves the same general sense with that just examined. "Ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; *buried with Him in baptism*; wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with Him; having forgiven you all trespasses."

After what has been said, the sense of all this is beauti-

fully apparent without any lengthened comment. V. 10. "All true Christians make up together the complete body, of which Christ is the Divine Head." V. 11. In Him they have the true circumcision, "that of the heart," which is effected by "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," even "by the circumcision of Christ;" *i. e.*, the circumcision which Christ requires. V. 12. All this is most strikingly represented in their *baptism*, wherein they are *symbolically* (for *literally* they *can not* be) "buried and raised with Christ." And their death unto sin, and their rising to a new life, as here *symbolized*, are *effected* "through their *belief* of that mighty working of God, which raised up Christ from the dead." V. 13. "And thus it is that, having been once dead in sin, in the uncircumcised carnality of their nature, God hath quickened them together with Christ, and freely forgiven them all their trespasses."

This passage, besides implying the *symbolical* nature of baptism, distinctly favors the doctrine that, under the Gospel, *baptism* holds the same place as a *seal* of the covenant of grace, with *circumcision* under the Law.

But in all this there is nothing favorable to that view of baptism in infancy which ascribes to its instrumentality, or, rather, to it as a *source*, "the death unto sin and the new life unto righteousness," which are mentioned. These effects are here ascribed rather to that "*faith*" which is ever the act of the conscious and intelligent mind of riper years.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians (ii., 1–8), this whole Divine process of "quickening us together with Christ," and of "raising us up together with him to the new and heavenly life," is described without the least allusion to *baptism*, though not without a very distinct reference again to *faith*, in its place and exercise as the Christian's act under the renovating influence. "By grace are ye saved," not of *baptism*, but "through *faith*." Thus these eight verses strongly confirm the view taken both of the passage in

Romans, vi., 3, and of that in Colossians, ii., 10–13, viz., that the object in *those* passages of the mention of baptism in connection with this spiritual death and resurrection is to show that, in that sacred ordinance, this Divine operation, though not wrought *in* baptism, is yet *at* baptism *professed* and *symbolized.*

8. I approach now a text of great importance, which has, however, as a little examination will show, been unwarrantably pressed into the service of the theory of baptismal regeneration. It is the celebrated passage in the Epistle of Paul to Titus: "The washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost."—Tit., iii., 5.

It is admitted at once that the former part of the expression, "The washing of regeneration," means *baptism;* but, at the same time, it is contended that the latter part, "The renewing of the Holy Ghost," means no more than just what it *expresses;* "*Renovation*, effected by the Holy Spirit;" including, of course, *all its fruits, or effects.* It does not mean what is claimed for the mystery of baptism, that awful gift which, it is said, "is not to be *confounded with* renovation or a change of heart;" nor *restrained* to any other of *the fruits* of that gift; but is "illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery from which it flows, the incarnation of our Redeemer."* It is simply and solely, what the apostle *says* it is, "*Renovation* by the Spirit," with *all* the fruits which it bears. More especially is it maintained that it does not, as is claimed, *tie* "the renewing by the Holy Ghost," as a special effect, *to* "the washing of regeneration," as, jointly with the Spirit, its *source* and *cause*,† making the two simultaneous in that

* Dr. Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 43.

† *Idem*, p. 25, 26. This last reference, indeed—like that to page 43—is to that part of the Tract on Baptism in which the author treats of John, iii., 5. But, then, he considers that passage and this, Tit., iii., 5, as identical in sense; and, therefore, what he affirms as the sense of the one, he affirms also as the sense of the other.

baptismal "fountain," wherein we are said to be "born *of* the Holy Ghost, even as our blessed and incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb."* The words of the apostle neither make the change overpass renovation and its fruits, nor do they teach that this change is wrought at one and the same moment with "the washing of regeneration." To assume both, or either of these, is but to *force* a meaning where the Bible expresses none; and thus to *make* Scripture for ourselves, where we can not find it to our wish.

"The washing of regeneration," which *symbolizes*, and "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," which *effects* "the great and necessary work of our change from sin to holiness;" *this* is a paraphrase which evidently exhausts the meaning of the passage; leaving the question as to the *time* when this change takes place, a point *wholly untouched*.

It is, indeed, more than probable that, in those early days, when the Word preached was so generally accompanied with wonderful power, and when those who preached it were guided with more than ordinary wisdom in judging of the hearts and characters of men, the washing of water and the renewing of the Spirit were generally, in point of time, *near* each other. Thus, to name a single instance: after Philip had preached Christ to the eunuch, with evidence of the Holy Ghost accompanying the Word;†

* Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 43.

† That the Holy Ghost actually *accompanied*, and *still* accompanies the Word preached, there can be no doubt. "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of *the Spirit* and of power."—1 Cor., ii., 4. And this was to show that the "*faith*" of the early Christians did "not stand in the wisdom of *men*, but in the power of *God*"—v. 5. So *Peter*, when *writing* to the Christians to whom *Paul* had *preached*, says (speaking of Paul undoubtedly, and his companions in labor), They "have preached the Gospel unto you, *with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven*:" literally, "*have evangelized you with the Holy Ghost;*" *εὐανγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.*—1 Pet., i., 12. This demonstration of the Spirit, accompanying the preaching of the Word, was,

and after he had demanded and received from the renovated Ethiop a profession of his heartfelt faith in Jesus, as the Son of God, he at once baptized him.—Acts, viii., 26–38. The evidence of his renewal was satisfying. The apostle needed not to wait, as in these days of feebler power, and dimmer wisdom in the ministers of Christ, it is generally deemed expedient to wait, for professions to prove their sincerity, for character to test its permanency, or for feelings either to settle into principles, or to evanish in forgetfulness, before deciding the great question whether he should or should not be baptized. There was enough in all the circumstances of the case to settle that question at once; and, therefore, at once was the sealing ordinance administered. And there can be little doubt that it was this state of things which led to the *occasional*—by no means the *constant*—mention of the inward work of the Spirit, and of its symbolizing, sealing rite, in close connection of language. This, however, proves not that the baptismal waters were, with the Holy Spirit, the joint "*source*" and "*cause*" of the soul's renewal; or that the two were, in point of *time*, *simultaneously* effected. On the contrary, there are, I apprehend, in all such cases, attendant circumstances sufficient to show not only that, *in point of time*, they were actually *separated*, but also that, *in point of order*, that inward change *preceded* its outward symbol and seal. Let us see if this be not the case with the passage before us (Titus, iii., 5).

What says the context? Read this part of Paul's letter to his "son Titus after the common faith." "Put them

no doubt, sometimes for the communication of miraculous gifts. Yet, unless we suppose that *all* to whom *Paul preached*, and to whom *Peter wrote*, were miraculously endowed, we must allow that it was generally for the ordinary work of their renewal and sanctification. This, however, is only adding to the cumulative evidence already given, that the gift of the Spirit was—not in *baptism*, but—through the Truth of God, understood and felt, received and obeyed.

(the Cretians) in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work, to speak evil of no man, to be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness unto all men." Do you ask, What is your *encouragement* for preaching such things to those "Cretians," whom "one of their own prophets"* has represented as

"Always liars, evil beasts, slow-bellies?"

I reply, even this: "*We ourselves*," I, Paul, who speak, thou, Titus, whom I address, and other preachers like us, were once as unpromising subjects as these very "Cretians:" myself, especially, having been "the chief of sinners." "*We ourselves*," I say, "were once foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But" —see, oh, see what the mighty Gospel, which you are to preach to your "Cretians," has, by the power of the Holy Ghost, effected even in *us;* for, "after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared (not by works of righteousness which *we* have done, but according to his *mercy*), He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that, being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Thus encouraged, then, by what has been wrought in *ourselves*, be not backward in calling your "Cretians" to the entire holiness which I have enjoined. What I have said "is a faithful saying;" my injunction is in full accord with the spirit of the Gospel; "and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have *believed* in God might be careful to maintain good works."—Titus, iii., 1–8.

Here we see that the change of which the apostle speaks

* Supposed to be Epimenides, born at Gnossus, in Crete; a poet, reputed a prophet, and the auther of a work on oracles, now lost.

was nothing more nor less than *his own conversion*, and that of Titus and other preachers; a change which we know, in the case of Paul at least, *preceded* baptism, and was simply his being "turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God," by the mighty working of the Holy Ghost, accompanying the pungent preaching of Jesus himself, and of his servant Ananias, and operating through days of an intense struggle in *prayer*, which began in that heart-surrendering petition, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" It was no miracle, or mystery, wrought on *unconscious* infancy, but an intelligible renewal, wrought by most reasonable and adequate causes, and in years of most intelligent and ripened rebellion against God.*

* It is surely extravagant, and utterly without reason, to say, as our opposing theorists *do* say, that the conversion of St. Paul, and his endowment with the gift of the Holy Spirit, both for *ordinary* and for *extraordinary* grace, did not take place till the moment, and in the act of his *baptism*. In the account of the whole transaction, as recorded in the ninth and twenty-second chapters of the Acts, his baptism was preceded by every circumstance which could characterize a true conversion, and the bestowment of *all* the gifts of the Spirit. For instance, there were his arrest on his way to Damascus by the out-shining of the Sun of Righteousness; the short, but searching sermon of Jesus, evidently carried, by the subduing power of the Spirit, to the soul of the stricken man; that cry of a most submissive heart, uttered in the true spirit of faith, and of a most repentant consciousness of his awful sins, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" his overpowering, and even blinding sense of the manifested glory of Christ; his three days' struggle in *prayer and fasting* at Damascus; the Christian instruction of Ananias, accompanied by the laying on of his hands, and instructing him unto *baptism*, as the first *outward* element and duty of Christ's religion; Paul's receipt of the miraculous gift of inspiration in being "filled with the Holy Ghost," and the restoration of suspended sight to his darkened eyes, in token of the marvelous gift which had just been "shed on him so abundantly." *All* these circumstances transpired, not *when*, or *after*, but *before he was* "*baptized*, and washed away his sins, having called on the name of the Lord"—*i. e.*, before he received that baptismal washing which was to him at once the sign of the full renewal, and the seal of the free forgiveness which he had received. Who, then, in the face of all this, shall say that Paul was not converted and endowed with the gifts of the Holy Ghost till the time and in the mystery of his baptism? If an army of post-Nicene and Mediæval writers were to concur in the assertion, that could not alter the

So utterly groundless is the assumption which takes the naked words, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," and then uses them as a proof that, in *infant* baptism, the two things are tied together in the relation of *source* and *issue*, *cause* and *effect;* and not only so, but as a proof that this result is as awful a miracle as that which was wrought when the Holy Ghost made the Son of God incarnate in our nature! And yet, next to John, iii., 5, this is the *principal* text cited to prove these, and all associated, though modified views of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration as applied to the case of infants!

9. Having thus examined all the texts on the subject of baptism which I think it necessary to examine, whether of those which are *alleged* to refer, or of those which unquestionably *do* refer to this subject, I take up, at last, the great "*key-text*" itself, as it has been termed, under which I have so long been writing. I have reserved it for this place, because it is, in itself, the most important text on the subject before us, and because, in obedience to that just canon of interpretation which I have adopted, I think it ought not, as a text of *disputed*, if not of doubtful meaning, and as, in a strong sense, the hinging point in this discussion, to be interpreted till we have looked abroad through the Bible, and especially through the New Testament, for the best and fullest light which can be collected upon the point proposed for illustration—the nature of Christian baptism. And yet, though standing at the focus of all this light, I shall endeavor, as far as possible, to place this important passage in its own light, to examine it by its own shining, and see whether, fairly viewed, it does not give forth to others the same light which it receives from them.

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born

testimony of incontestable facts. [For the views referred to in the above note, see Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 174–176, N. Y. ed.]

of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—John, iii., 5.

1. In seeking, then, for the meaning of these words, I shall not avail myself of the interpretation which would cut the knot of difficulty instead of untying it, by asserting that there is here no mention of *literal* baptism. With the advocates of baptismal regeneration I have no controversy on this point. I admit, and, if necessary, would contend, that by the birth of water *literal* baptism is intended. Yet I urge, in the first place, that our Savior does not say here, and can not be made to say, that the birth of *water* and the birth of *the Spirit* must be effected, and are effected, at one and the same instant. This is one of the points which, under the false canon of interpretation formerly noticed, is ever silently, but without reason, *assumed*. Taking it for granted that the *water* spoken of means the water of *baptism*, the supporters of that canon also take it for granted, as something which *necessarily* follows, that the birth of *the Spirit* is simultaneous *with* it, and effected *by* it. It needs but a moment's thought to see that this assumption is wholly groundless. Christ says, on another occasion, "He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be saved" (Mark, xvi., 16); while Peter, on the day of Pentecost, in answer to the inquiry of the Jews, "What shall we do?" replies, "*Repent* and be *baptized*, every one of you."—Acts, ii., 38. Now, faith and repentance are essential movements in the work of the Spirit; we can do neither the one nor the other without his gift. What our Savior and his apostle say, therefore, on those two occasions, amounts precisely to this: "*Seek ye the gift of the Spirit*, in order to faith and repentance, and then *be baptized*;" and we may as reasonably assume from this that we must, at one and the same instant, "*believe* and be baptized," "*repent* and be baptized," and that faith and repentance are produced by baptism's being, jointly with the Spirit, their *source* and *cause*, as we may

assume from what Christ says in John, iii., 5, that we must be born of *water* and born of the *Spirit* at one and the same instant, and that the latter birth is effected by the former as *its* joint *source* and *cause*. The *order* of statement is indeed changed. Faith and repentance, as included *in* the gift of the Spirit, are named *before* baptism, while in the text the gift of the Spirit, as *including* faith and repentance, is named *after* baptism; and yet the *things* named in both cases are *themselves* the *same*. We may, it is true, say that the gift of the Spirit includes *more* than faith and repentance, even the *power* to believe and to repent. Still, this is but saying that the *power* itself, like the faith and repentance which spring from it, is made by Christ and his apostle an *antecedent* to baptism. *This*, however, is, in other words, as effectually as by the former inference to overthrow the theory that the *power* here intended (which may, peradventure, be what the theorists mean by the *seed*, the *germ*, the *principle* of the new life) is the mysterious and awful gift of the Spirit *in and of the baptismal waters*. If we say that faith and repentance, as included *in* the gift of the Spirit, are and must be communicated in and of baptism, *then*, so far as it affects the case of *infants*, we contradict *the Church*, which says that *these* are things which "infants, by reason of their tender age, *can not* perform." And if we say that the gift of the Spirit includes *more* than faith and repentance, even the *power* to believe and repent, while yet we insist that this power is and must be communicated in and of *baptism*, *then* we contradict *Christ* and his apostle, who put faith and repentance, flowing *out* of that power, as *antecedents* to the baptism of *adults*. Either way we overthrow the theory by showing the *actual* if not the *necessary* separation, in point of *time*, between the birth by water and the birth by the Spirit.

Whether the *power* to believe and repent can be given to the *infant* in baptism, to be kept for exercise in riper years, or to be lost by post-baptismal sins, is, in fact, a question identical with that so largely discussed when considering the suggestions arising out of the first chapter on baptism. Its farther discussion, therefore, need not here be renewed. It may, indeed, be said, that by nature, and in our worst estate through sin, we all have *a power* to believe and repent; that what we want is only the *will* to *exercise* that power; and that therefore the office of the Spirit in infant baptism consists in giving us a *new and* "*good will;*" and then, in riper years, "working with us when we *have* that good will." This, however, is only shifting the difficulty to a new *term*, although it shows more clearly than ever the moral impossibility that the office of the Spirit should be performed on unconscious *infancy*. If there be any thing that requires the concurrence of our *conscious volition*, it is a *change* of the *will* from evil to good. *How* this change is produced by the Spirit, even in the use of Truth, we may never be able fully to fathom. But these two things, I think, we may know: 1. The office of the Spirit consists in a *change* of the will from evil to *good*, and not in imparting a literally *new* will. The *Christian* is not a being who has *two separate* wills, the one *evil* and the other *good*. He *has*, and *can* have, like other men, but *one* power, or faculty of willing, though that *one* faculty may be so strongly solicited and drawn contrary ways by contrary inducements, as almost to make him feel, at times, as though he had two separate wills. And yet he *has* not, and *can not* have; and the office of the Divine Spirit with him consists in simply *changing* his naturally *evil* will to a will graciously *good;* and then continually "working with him" that this *good* will may, on the whole, be governor of his inner man, de-

spite the numberless solicitations to evil which he feels. 2. A *change* of the will can not be effected without the *concurrence* or an *exercise* of the will. This is a *conscious* act, and, therefore, can not be performed in *un*conscious infancy. The will *changes* only as it sees *reasons* for change. I say not that the will of the infant is incapable of *action*. It evidently *does* act under the promptings of bodily appetite and bodily pain. But upon *moral* and *spiritual truths and objects* it *is* incapable of action, because Reason is not yet so developed as to be able to comprehend them. *How early* Reason may become so far developed as to *be* able to comprehend at least the simple and sovereign elements of these things, in order that, through them, the Spirit may effect a *change* of the natural will, it is not for me to say. I only suggest that there is a period, longer or shorter, in the infancy or childhood of every human being, during which God is pleased to leave both the reason and the will incapable of being *exercised* upon the truths and objects of the spiritual world, and, therefore, the will itself incapable of being *changed* and made a *new* and *good* will. This view, therefore, strengthens the conclusion formerly reached, that, on the principles of that nature in which God has constituted man, the office of the Spirit can not be performed on the *un*reasoning, *un*thinking, *un*conscious infant.

2. But, to leave this momentary digression, and to return upon the text, I urge, in the second place, that in these words our Savior does not say that, in baptism, "God, by His Spirit, moves again on the face of the waters, sanctifies them for our cleansing; and cleanses us thereby." This is another of the points quietly but groundlessly assumed under the false canon of interpretation to which I have adverted. If we may assume *such* mysteries as *implied* when not a word is

said of them in the text which we may happen to be interpreting, then we may assume any thing we please; and so, again, if we can not *find*, may at least *make* as much Scripture to our purpose as we need.

I do not forget, in this connection, what our Church says in her baptismal office: that God, "by the baptism of his well-beloved Son Jesus Christ in the River Jordan, did *sanctify* water to the *mystical* washing away of sin." I have already briefly alluded to this expression; but it may not be amiss to notice it again. What meaneth our Church, then, by this language? What *can* she mean, but that, according to the established use and sense of the word "*sanctify*," when applied to *external* things, God, by that great act, did *separate* and *set apart*, not *all* waters, but the *element* of water, to the religious use there designated; or, as our Church expresses it, "to the *mystical* washing away of sin?" But, mark what she says: "the *mystical*," not the *efficient;* the *typical*, not the *actual;* the *symbolizing*, not the *operated* "washing away of sin." In other words, by the baptism of Christ, God designated water to be perpetually a mystical *seal* of the *pardon* of sin, and a mystical *symbol* of *purification* from sin. This is *all* that the sense of the words "sanctify" and "mystical" requires; and it is, undoubtedly, the true meaning of what our Church says. Whether it *be*, however, or be *not*, and whatever her meaning *may* be, it can never justify any one in assuming, for Christ's words in the text, the meaning put upon them, that "God, by His Spirit, moves again on the face of the waters, sanctifies them for our cleansing, and cleanses us thereby." If we may assume this, when the Divine speaker says nothing of the kind, then, I repeat, we may assume any thing not impossible or absurd; and so, if we can not *draw* our creed *from* the Bible, may at least *force* our creed *upon* the Bible.

3. Again: passing from the birth of *water* to that of the *Spirit*, and leaving the point of *time* for the present out of the question, I urge, in the third place, that when Christ says we must be "born of the Spirit," He does not say that this is not only "a gift of God," but also as "illimitable and incomprehensible as that great mystery from which it flows, the incarnation of our Redeemer;" nor does He say that "the Holy Spirit gives us a new life in the fountain opened by Him, we being born therein *of* Him, even as our blessed and incarnate Lord was, according to the flesh, born *of* Him in the Virgin's womb." This is still *another* point most gratuitously *assumed* under the false canon of interpretation which I have named. What matters it how many ancient writers say that the birth of the Spirit consists in such a mystery? Does their assertion prove that these simple words of Christ carry so absurd a sense? Suppose that one of them *does* say that, in the baptism by water, "*the sinful flesh is changed into the body of Christ*,"* does this prove that *Christ* put this actual *seed* of transubstantiation into *baptism*, that He might ripen the *fruit* of it in *the Lord's Supper*? I pray, where must this strange system of interpreting Christ have its end, but in a monster-body of false divinity, practically overlaying, and in effect crushing out the life of that beautiful and shapely body of Truth which He once informed with *His* Spirit and made quickening to *our* souls?

When Nicodemus, misapprehending Christ's meaning about being "born again," and supposing, from the force of the word employed, that it implied the necessity of a man's being *literally* born *a second time*, inquired, "How can these things be?" Christ reproved him; not, however, because Nicodemus doubted the possibility of so absurd an operation, but because, being "a master in

* Leo, quoted by Dr. Pusey on Baptism, Tract 67, p. 46.

Israel," a *teacher* of God's people, he did not know better than to suppose the acknowledged Divine Teacher before him intended so monstrous an idea. Had the thought which Nicodemus conceived been truly Christ's meaning, his question had been a sensible one, and Christ would have answered it, not in a reproving, but in an explanatory way. And yet the operation, ascribed by this false canon of interpretation to baptism by water, is as incredible as that to which Nicodemus supposed our Savior to refer; and if the mystery of the new birth of the Spirit consist in what is here assumed for it, we may reasonably ask the "Nicodemus question," "How can these things be?" and our question would deserve, not a reproof, but an explanation such as hath never yet been given by either the Great Master himself' or any of his subordinate teachers. But if that new birth consist in no such thing as that assumed, *then* the question, by taking such a meaning for granted, would be impertinent, and they who asked it might well be reproved, as masters in God's Christian Israel, for supposing that our Divine teacher's weighty words meant so impossible a process!

4. Throwing away, then, all these groundlessly-assumed meanings of Christ's words, let us, with humble minds, endeavor to ascertain, so far as we may, what is their true sense.

"The kingdom of God" mentioned in John, iii., 5, has *two* conditions: the one in *time*, the other in *eternity;* the one on *earth*, the other in *heaven;* the one *preparatory*, the other *final;* the one for *probation*, the other for *rewards*. To these two conditions of the kingdom, *baptism* and *renewal*, the *symbolical* regeneration and the *real*, bear analogous relations. Without *baptism* we can not enter the kingdom on *earth*, without *renewal* we can not enter the kingdom in *heaven*. This, I apprehend, will

be regarded as a statement fully sustained by the general teachings of the Bible.

Now, with this general view, the particular words of Christ in the text exactly agree. Understanding "the kingdom of God" to be there spoken of in its *comprehension*, or as including both its earthly or temporal, and its heavenly or eternal state, it is abundantly evident that Christ means to say, "the birth of water," or *baptism*, is necessary as our act or privilege of entering "the kingdom" *here*, while "the birth of the Spirit," or *inward renewing*, is necessary as our meetness or preparation for enjoying "the kingdom" *hereafter*. With this, too, the language of our Church accords when it represents the water in baptism as "an *outward* and *visible sign*," while it recognizes "the death unto sin and the new birth unto righteousness" as "*the inward* and *spiritual grace*," or "*things signified*."

It may, indeed, be inquired, What, then, does our Church mean when she says of a sacrament, in general, that it is not only an "outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace," but also "*a means* whereby we *receive* the same?" or when she says of *baptism* in particular, "we are *hereby made* the children of grace?" To this question, however, a satisfactory reply will, I apprehend, be attended with no difficulty.

Why are we required to be "born of water," or baptized? Because it is Christ's ordained mode of becoming members of His Church or kingdom on earth. And why are we required to be "born of the Spirit," or renewed unto holiness? Because, in every one capable and guilty of actual sin, it is that "without which no man can see the Lord," or be happy with Him in heaven. These points are clear. But why are we required to enter the Church *here* in order to our entering heaven *hereafter*? This is the point on which we now seek

light. I answer, then, because whatever God, in his unfathomable goodness and abundant power, may be pleased to do in saving men by His Spirit and His Truth, in places where His Church is not *known*, or not fully and regularly *organized*, still His Church was and is intended to be that great Divine *system* of means and instruments, in the use of which He *ordinarily* holds present intercourse with men's minds, reaches their hearts, renews, sanctifies, and edifies them "unto the perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." His *ordinary* way now is, not to make us, in infancy, partakers of an unutterable mystery, that we may thus become members of His Church (all Scripture is opposed to this view), but to take us, in infancy, as members of His Church, that we may, with our first opening susceptibilities and powers, find ourselves in holy associations and under holy influences, and thus realize the best means, opportunities, and incitements for seeking and obtaining the knowledge, love, and obedience of God and His Word; for becoming "renewed in the Spirit of our minds," and thus for ripening unto His heavenly kingdom. His first act, now, is, not to perform a miracle on our unconscious infancy, that He may thus make us members of His Church, and yet leave us morally sure to fall into the awful aggravations of *post-baptismal sin*, but to adopt us in infancy, into His family as His graciously, though undeservedly privileged *children*, that He may the better discipline us for our *actual* sins, bring us to "repentance toward God, and to faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," and thus make us finally holy *as* He is holy, and perfect *as* He is perfect. His way is to enter us very early into His *school*, though perfectly ignorant and defiled in our ignorance, that He may the more successfully teach us of His ways and "make us wise unto salvation,"

through that "meekly-received" and inwardly "ingrafted Word," by which His Spirit instructs us unto Christ, and which, thus used and received, "is able to save our souls." *Such*, manifestly, is the great office and place of His Church on earth, in all her divinely-appointed means and influences. Inasmuch, then, as it is by *baptism* that we *enter* this Church, and *without* baptism *can not* enter it, it may, with no little propriety and force, be said that not only is baptism "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual *grace*," but also "*a means* whereby we *receive* the same," being "*thereby made children of grace*," brought into the family and school of a most gracious God, and surrounded with all His most gracious provisions and influences for securing, what is yet *unsecured*, our souls' renewal, sanctification, and eternal blessedness.

This view fully satisfies the language of our Church in her Catechism. It shows what she means when she says that water in baptism is "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace;" and that baptism itself is "*a* means," not *the* means, as though there were no other, but *a* means, *one* of a great *system* of means, "whereby we *receive*" the grace so signified. But whether this be her precise meaning or not, I would humbly trust there is evidence that it *is* the *general* teaching of the Word of God, and in accordance with the *particular* teaching of Christ in the text.

Having said thus much, then, by way of collecting the general sense of Scripture on the subject of baptism, and of eliciting the particular meaning of the text, I venture to give the following paraphrase of these important words as expressive of their true and full import:

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of *water*, which in baptism mystically *symbolizes*, and of

the Spirit, which, in reality, efficiently *works*, the needed renewal and sanctification of his nature, he can not ordinarily be saved. Without the birth of water he can not enter *the Church*, as the earthly state of my kingdom, my constituted family and school for his spiritual training and discipleship; and without the birth of the Spirit, he can not enter *heaven*, as that future and final perfection of my kingdom for which that spiritual training and discipleship are designed to fit him."

Touching, now, the point of *time*, as involved in the text, *the conclusion* is undeniable, that, in what Christ says, *He does not tie the birth of the Spirit unto the birth of water*. He does not make the two simultaneous, or wrought at one and the same instant. He places the one as a Divine *symbol* of the other. He indicates the *ceremonial* as an introduction to the way which ordinarily leads to the *spiritual*. He ordains *baptism* as the gate of entrance into His kingdom on earth; and he reveals *the Spirit's work* of renewing and sanctifying grace as that without which no actual sinner can possibly enter His kingdom in heaven. But he leaves the *time* when the *symbol* shall be followed by the thing *symbolized* to be decided by that which alone can decide the question of every man's salvation, the movements of God's Spirit and truth, of His grace and providence, on the minds of those multitudes to whom His Church and His Gospel come.

In accordance with this view, and in confirmation of it, we can not fail to remark that, as a symbol of the Spirit's renewing and sanctifying work through the instrumentality of God's quickening and purifying truth, *water* is the most appropriate and beautiful element that could have been named. How it gives new life and strength to the fainting, dying pilgrim of the Desert! How it cleanses the dust and filth from the body of him

who has grown unclean through exposure or neglect! And in both these effects, how beautifully and appropriately does it teach in symbol the life-giving and purifying power of the Spirit upon the soul that is dead in sin, and defiled with both its guilt and its corruption!

To the same effect, we can not fail to notice the fact that the text says nothing of the proper *subjects* of baptism. It leaves the *seal* of the covenant under the *Gospel*, as it came in from under the *law*, to be applied generally to the *infant* seed of God's people, and yet, when occasion requires it, to those *adults* who have not received it in infancy; and, leaving these things thus, goes at once to its great teaching about the Divine symbol and its substance, as needed in opening the entrance, and in training us on the way which leads to heaven and to God. In this teaching it addresses an *adult*, and is evidently designed to present its *main*, its *fundamental* truth to the consideration of those capable of understanding it. In its *chief* import, it is but another instance of what the Bible says to those who are under the Bible, and who may be savingly affected, if by nothing more, by its simple and sovereign elements of truth.

There are many other passages in the New Testament which refer to baptism. But their reference to it is indirect or incidental; while there is nothing in them from which we can derive aid in determining the true nature of this Christian ordinance. They, of course, all fall in and harmonize with that view of baptism which, by a just application of the principles of interpretation, may most conclusively be shown to imbody the true sense of those main texts which have now been examined. It will not be necessary, therefore, farther to continue an examination which has already gone to a length not at first intended.

It is time to gather up some results from what has

been said by way of *a summary* enumeration of what is included in the true nature of baptism. The whole discussion, indeed, has thus far been devoted *chiefly* to what I have deemed *erroneous* views of the subject. Still, no one can have followed me through this discussion without seeing that, in setting those views aside, others, like rays from an uncovered light, have all along been silently beaming forth from those Scriptures of Truth from which the obscurings of a false sense have been successively withdrawn.

1. In the first place, then, as an institution of Christ, and as an act of God, baptism is *a badge of our Christian profession.*

It is not thus characterized by any particular text, but this character follows from the nature of the case, and especially from the fact (which for the present I assume) that, under Christ, *baptism* takes the place of *circumcision* as a *seal* of the covenant of grace. Circumcision, we know, was the peculiar visible badge and mark of God's ancient people, distinguishing them from all others, and stringently holding them to fidelity to Him who had graciously taken them to be his chosen race. As the *new form* of this seal, then, baptism has the same force. It marks the Christian people of God as distinct and separate from the world, and most bindingly holds them to fidelity to Him whose glorious name they wear, and to whom they belong by solemn covenant. Under these blessed obligations, baptized *infants* may be considered as properly placed. As of old, in the case of circumcision, baptism is the seal, not of their originally and intelligently covenanting with God, but of His gracious and holy covenant with *them.* He has most condescendingly and lovingly bound Himself to *them* on the conditions of the Gospel; and to these conditions, with all that they involve, of holy faithfulness

and obedience, He holds them in most sacred bonds. He does not ask them whether they *can* or *will consent* to these bonds: He puts them under their binding, as one of the most precious favors which he could confer. That He has a *right* thus to put them under bonds to Himself, and to treat them according to their fidelity, or want of fidelity, to their obligations, none can doubt. But this is a low view. He is most good and loving in laying these bonds on them: infinitely more so than the kindly wise parent who hedges about the path of a wayward child to prevent him, *if possible*, from plunging into irrecoverable ruin.

Nor are these bonds one of the greatest of blessings to the Christian alone as an *individual*. They are *designed* to be one of the best of safeguards to *the Church* also as *a body*. As affording ground for whatever is needed of salutary, maternal discipline upon those who walk unworthily of their vocation, they are intended to be to the Church as *a whole*, like the *wall* to the *vineyard*, her security against destruction from the ravages of unholy principle and of ungodly example. Those who walk thus unworthily, having been brought into the Church by her *baptism*, may be cast out, or reformed by her *discipline*. God hath given her this power for the common good of all.

2. In the second place, as an institution of Christ, and as revealing the mind of God, baptism is *a symbol of our regeneration*.

This is not a contested point, any more than the corresponding one in the Lord's Supper, that the consecrated elements of bread and wine are symbols of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ. It is admitted, in both cases, that the outward parts *are* symbols of the *inward*; the *material*, of the *spiritual*. The controversy, so far as baptism is concerned, therefore, turns not on *this*, but on *another* point, whether the symbol is also, jointly with the Spirit, the *source* and *cause* of regeneration in the sense of an actual

impartation even to infants of a new and spiritual life ; of a communication to the recipient of the very Divine substance, or nature. This point, however, I have already examined at sufficient length. It is not necessary, therefore, to touch it now ; nor will it be necessary to dwell long on the *uncontested* point, that baptism *is* a *symbol* of the true regeneration.

This is implied in several of the texts which have been examined, particularly in those principal ones which speak of our being "born of water and the Spirit," and of our being "saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Whatever else may be disputed here, this, at least, will be admitted by all, that the birth of water is a *symbol* of that of the Spirit, and that the washing of regeneration is a *symbol* of the renewing of the Holy Ghost.

On these and similar texts it must be that our Church, in her office of baptism, takes her stand when she says that "Baptism doth *represent* unto us our profession, which is, to follow the example of our Savior, Christ, and to be made like unto Him : that, as he died and rose again for us, so should we who are baptized die from *sin*, and rise again unto righteousness." It can *represent* this only in its character as a *symbol* of so important a change. The *Catechism*, too, expressly says, that baptism is "an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace."

In its character as a *symbol* of regeneration, baptism seems originally to have represented *two* great facts, with the truths which these facts involve : 1. The fact of our *spiritual resurrection* in this life ; "the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost ;" involving the truths that, by nature, we are "dead in trespasses and sins," and that, therefore, we *must* be "born again" to a new and spiritual life. As a symbol of *this* change, baptism is called "the *washing* of regeneration." 2. The fact of our *literal resurrection* from the grave

to that new state of glory which is to succeed, involving the truths that Christ died and rose again, and that, as the certain fruits of His death and resurrection, all true Christians shall literally follow him in both, and in the glory which is to ensue. As a symbol of *this* change, baptism represents our passing from the death of *the body* to that future life of blessedness with Christ, which he himself calls "*The regeneration* when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory."—Matt., xix., 28. We have already seen reasons for believing that the early Christians, at their baptism, professed and sealed their faith in the fact of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and in the doctrine of the future resurrection of their own bodies. Of *this* resurrection, therefore, as well as of the *other*, baptism may still be considered the symbol; the *teaching* representation. In this sense, it is full of important meaning and power. The truths which it "holds forth," when received by a living *faith* into minds renewed by the Spirit, do operate mightily to the strengthening of hope, courage, and constancy, in meeting, sustaining, and overcoming all those conflicts, trials, and persecutions to which, for Christ's sake, we may in this life be exposed.

3. In the third place, as an institution of Christ, and as an ordinance through which God continually brings Himself into action among His people, baptism is an *initiatory* rite.

Hereby, God brings us into his Church, and makes us "*children*" in His family on earth; "*members of Christ's*" body in this world, and "*heirs of his kingdom*" in the next. His benign intention in this is to gather around us, at the earliest possible period of opening reason, understanding and conscience, every possible advantage and favoring influence for deciding the great question for eternity, whether we are also to be children of His family in *heaven;* members of Christ's *glorified* body in the world to come; and inheritors by *actual possession*, as well as heirs by con-

ditional promise, of His *everlasting* kingdom? To this view allusion was made in explaining the text (John, iii., 5); it expresses all that need be understood by the second answer in our Catechism; and it is implied in the last great command and promise of the Savior to His disciples—"Go ye and *teach* all nations," or make *disciples* of them; enter them into my *school;* "*baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Matt., xxviii., 19. "He that believeth and is *baptized*, shall be saved."—Mark, xvi., 16. In the case of *infants*, baptism is the first known act of God in drawing them within the circle of His future gracious influences; and in the case of *adults*, the whole testimony of the New Testament touching this point shows, as we have seen, that the first thing, after their renewing by the Spirit, was their initiation into the Church by baptism; upon which *sometimes* followed the *extraordinary* gift of the Spirit; while *always* followed those graciously nurturing and ripening influences, needed to perfect them for "the general assembly and Church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven."

In order to entrance into the Church on earth, it surely is not necessary, as the theory which has been opposed assumes, that a "miracle" be wrought in an outward ordinance, giving us beforehand the very thing, ay, and *more* than the very thing, for which we enter that dispensation of means. Nor is it at all certain that those who, by baptism, enter the Church on earth, will, in fact, by inward renewal and sanctification, enter the Church in heaven. God, as our gracious Father, has many "*children*" in His family on earth who prove *disobedient*, and so become the subjects of His just judgment. There are many "*members of Christ*" in this world who resemble the unfruitful, because the *dead* branches of a vine, and who will, therefore, be cut off and cast into the burning prepared for them. And there are many "*heirs of the kingdom of heaven*" who, through a re-

fusal to comply with the *conditions* of their heirship, will be *disinherited*, and banished forever from among the true sons of God. All this comports not only with the suggestions of observation, but also with the language of Scripture. Still, as a general fact, I doubt not it will be found that, among those who enter heaven at last, after having once become *actual sinners*, the great mass will be of those who have entered the Church by baptism, either in infancy or in "riper years;" and who have thus come within that circle of His gracious influences, which God has prescribed for our salvation.

The question, I know, is sometimes asked, "Supposing the case of two children in the same neighborhood, of similar families, of equal capacities, and surrounded by the same means of religious instruction; the one, however, *baptized* into the Church, and the other *unbaptized:* would the former be any more likely, as a matter of fact, to be saved than the *latter;* or any more likely to be brought to that repentance, faith, and holiness, which are necessary to salvation?" This question, however, does not present the true point for consideration. We might, indeed, answer such a question *affirmatively*, and, doing so, find ourselves ultimately sustained by facts. But suppose we were to answer it *negatively*, and even admit that *possibly* the *baptized* child might become "a *reprobate* and a *castaway*," while the *unbaptized* was brought to Christ, and made finally an ornament of His Church on earth, and an inheritor of glory in heaven; still, this would not touch the real point in the case. The grand question is, Whence *come* the means of religious instruction which the two children receive, and receive with such possibly different effect? Come they not from God through His *Church?* Would they have ever been accessible to the unbaptized, had not God organized His Church, and given it His Word and ordinances, and laid on men the work of dispensing them as His stewards?

What had ever been known of these things but for "the Church of the living God?" And where had the Church been but for that *baptism*, through which, as by an open door, God is continually entering us, in order to keep up the intended succession of teachers and hearers of the Truth, and the designed perpetuity of the knowledge and worship of Himself? Say not, He *might* have done all this *without* a church and *without* baptism. He has not *chosen* to do so, and, therefore, it is to us the same as though to do so had been *impossible*. *Practically*, then, the true state of the case is this: There had been no Divine Truth, no Divine influences, no means of grace, no Christian instruction, *without the Church;* there had been no Church *without baptism*, as that gate of entrance, by which the Divine succession of means and instruments is perpetuated; and thus, with truth it may be said, that, without that baptism, in despite of whose solemn obligations the reprobate and castaway child goes on in sin, the healings of the Spirit of life had never reached and saved the unbaptized; while, at the same time, even *his* salvation, though *begun* before outward ordinances, is yet *ordinarily* to be carried forward and perfected under the gracious means to which *adult* baptism introduces its subject.

Here, then, we reach one of the strongest views possible of the importance of baptism in general, and of *infant* baptism in particular. Can we, at too early a period, be brought within that gracious circle, which, if it do not circumscribe, is yet most fully and vitally pervaded by the influences and mercies of God for the salvation of our souls? Does not God, as a matter of fact, show His regard for the seal of His covenant, as affixed in infant baptism? Can we tell *at how early a period* the moral susceptibilities, reason, understanding, and conscience, may possibly develop themselves? Can we, then, at too early a period, find ourselves, upon this opening of our natures, with the seal of God's

covenant upon us, our young minds looking up and seeing the God of that covenant in every shining of His truth, and feeling Him in all the down-pouring rays of His influence, through every possible channel which conducts from Him, the infinite, to us, the finite? This, however, leads to another view of the nature of baptism.

4. In the fourth place, then, as an institution of Christ, and as a rite in which God first presents Himself in action among His people, baptism is *a covenanting and sealing* ordinance.

Infants, it is true, are not capable of intelligently and voluntarily entering into covenant with God, or of receiving, understandingly and cordially, the forgiveness of sin; but they *are* capable of being *taken* into covenant with God, and of being admitted into a state which is endowed with the *sealed promise* of forgiveness, on the annexed terms of the Gospel.

Of this we have sufficient proof in the case of *Jewish* children under the old dispensation. They were all circumcised "the eighth day," and by that act assumed within the relations constituted by God's covenant with His ancient people. The act was that of God's covenanting with *them*, and taking *them* within the relations of His covenant. Among His people *as a whole*, children were included *by name;* and thus the conditional privileges of the covenant were thrown around *the entire nation.* "Ye stand this day, *all of you*, before the Lord *your God*," "all the men of Israel, *your little ones*, your wives," &c., "that thou shouldst enter *into covenant* with the Lord thy God, and *into His oath*, which the Lord thy God *maketh with thee* this day."—Deut., xxix., 10-12. It was a covenant, then, even *an oath*, which God *made with them* and their "*little ones.*" He asked them not whether they could comprehend, or would fulfill it; but He *took them* into it; He *made with them* His covenant and His oath; He sovereignly, yet graciously, bound himself

to them, and them to Him, on assigned conditions; and the benefits of the act followed or failed according as those conditions *were*, or were *not*, fulfilled.

These *conditions*, under the old dispensation, were included in this expression: "Thou shalt *return* unto the Lord thy God, and shalt *obey* His voice, thou and thy *children*, with *all thine heart*, and with *all thy soul*."—Deut., xxx., 2. They were conditions which necessarily involved *faith and repentance;* since *without these* it had been impossible to *return* to God, and to *obey His voice* with all the *heart and soul.*

Again, *the blessings* which, on these conditions, God promised to them, were partly *temporal* and partly *spiritual.* "*Then*," that is, on the prescribed conditions, "the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and He will multiply thee above thy fathers." Thus far *the temporal.* "And the Lord thy God will circumcise *thy heart*, and the heart of *thy seed*, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that *thou mayest live*."—Deut., xxx., 3–6. And thus far the *spiritual.* On the conditions prescribed, He pledged himself with an oath to give them rich *temporal* favors, but far richer spiritual blessings, even the true circumcision of the *heart*, with the *love of God*, and *life forevermore.* And these He pledged not only to *them*, but also to their "*seed*" or *posterity* after them; of course, on their becoming *capable* of *loving* Him, as well as of being placed under His covenant. On condition of *obedience* to His voice, He promised to work in them *love* for himself; and on condition of a *return* to Him, He promised to give them *life* with himself.

It is worthy of remark here, that even the *temporal* favors which God promised on these conditions *seem* designed to lead the thoughts into the *spiritual*, which were to follow. Why did He promise to bring them, not into some

heathen land of which they had never heard, and which, therefore, they had never *lost*, but "into the land which *their fathers* had once *possessed?*" Why but to intimate that the spiritual blessings, *love for God* and *life with God*, were man's *primitive state*, lost by *the fall*, and to be restored *by grace?* And why did He promise, in that land of their forefathers, to "*multiply* them *above* their fathers?" Why, but to intimate that *heaven*, once regained with love for God and life with God, should constitute an *eternal* portion, never more to be forfeited, and infinitely richer than even that primitive perfection and bliss on earth, from which the great forefather fell?

And again: of the covenant, which thus conditionally promised these blessings, both temporal and spiritual, the rite of *circumcision* was the ancient *seal*. Hence St. Paul says of "Abraham, the father of the faithful," "He received the sign of circumcision, *a seal* of the righteousness of the faith, which he had, yet being uncircumcised."—Rom., iv., 11. Mark the order here indicated. It is not said that Abraham's *faith* was prior to God's *covenant* with him; but prior to his receiving the *seal* of the covenant, "the seal of the righteousness of faith;" the seal of his justification with God. And this is the order as fixed by the transactions themselves. 1. God made a covenant with Abraham, even before the latter had *expressed* any faith in the former.—Gen., xii., 1–3. 2. Abraham *obeyed* God by "departing" from Haran, "as the Lord had spoken unto him;" thus for the first time *expressing* his *faith* in God.—Gen., xii., 4. 3. Twenty-four years after, God *confirmed* his covenant unto Abraham and *his seed*, and annexed to it *the seal* of circumcision, as "*a token* of the covenant betwixt them." Then it was, and not till then, that Abraham and his family received the seal of that covenant under which, for four-and-twenty years, he had been living.—Gen., xvii., *passim;* particularly 1, 7, 11, 23, 24.

From this brief sketch of the covenant under the old dispensation, I come now to its correspondences under the *new*.

Under the Gospel, then, the *covenant itself* remains *unchanged*. This is proved by what the apostle writes, Gal., iii., 17: "This I say, the covenant, that was confirmed before of God *in Christ*, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, can not disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." Why was this covenant said to have been confirmed *in Christ* so long before Christ came in the flesh? Why, but to intimate that God's covenant of grace is *one;* and that it really had *Christ* for its surety *before* as well as *after* "the fullness of time," the period of His advent?

Unchanged remain the *conditions* also of the covenant. True, they are now more distinctly expressed, as "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." —Acts, xx., 21. But they are not *different* conditions. What is *expressed* now was *implied* then, in *returning* to God and *obeying* His voice; returning to Him in *repentance*, and in *faith* obeying His voice; as a God who even then held intercourse with them through a surety, whose *name*, however faintly traced, has now but more clearly shone out, "the Sun of Righteousness," "the Lamb of God," "the Christ" with all anointings!

Unchanged, moreover, are the *blessings* which, on these conditions, the covenant promises. It is true that *less* is now said of the *temporal*, and *more* of the *spiritual*. The Gospel talks *out*, and *at large*, of the forgiveness of sin; of justification by faith; of peace with God; of the grace of the Spirit; of the love of Christ which passeth knowledge; of the richness of the glory of His inheritance in the saints; and of eternal life, as a kingdom, and a crown, and an inheritance, which shall never fade away. Still, amid all this profuse display of the Divine treasures revealed and in

store for us, the Gospel does not utterly forget to say, that the "godliness" which is required of us, "hath promise of the life that *now is*," as well as "of that which *is to come*." —1 Tim., iv., 8.

Once more, *the seal* of the covenant remains unchanged; so far, at least, as its *significancy* and *effect* are concerned. Its *form* is indeed *new;* the *bloody* rite of circumcision being exchanged for the *un*bloody washing of baptism. *Still*, it *signifies* the same thing now as of old; the circumcision of the *heart*, the renewing of the mind; and it *binds to* the same thing; fidelity to God, lifelong constancy in his service. This change in the mere *form* of the seal is indicated with sufficient clearness in the passage already examined from the Epistle to the Colossians (ii., 11, 12). For, although the phrases there, "circumcised with the circumcision made without hands," and "the circumcision of Christ," or which Christ requires, doubtless refer to the inward work of the Spirit, yet the figurative expression which immediately follows, "buried with him in *baptism*," shows at least this; that the spiritual circumcision now has its symbol in the baptismal *water*, instead of the baptismal *blood;* and, therefore, that as the *literal circumcision* was the seal of the covenant under the *old* dispensation, so now, with a change of *form*, the *literal baptism* is the seal of the same covenant under the *new;* so that, in truth, baptism may now be called "the circumcision of Christ," or the Christian circumcision.

Finally, then, to complete the chain of correspondences, the *subjects* of the covenant remain unchanged: they are still the people of God, and their *little ones*. As a *nation*, indeed, the Jews have been cut off from the root of "the good olive tree," and the Gentiles "grafted in." But then, as *individuals*, even the Jews have not been cast off, that they should *necessarily* perish. The only change, in this respect, which has been made, is rather an *enlargement* of

the field around which the inclosure of the covenant is thrown. Christ did not cut off the Jew from the hope of final salvation; but only from *exclusive* possession and enjoyment of the *means* of that salvation. When His cross came down, it fell on the old wall of separation between Jew and Gentile, and made a great breach; through which the Church, and covenant, and promises, and offers of God and His Gospel, passed out from their former narrow confinement, and went forth with stately goings to compass the whole earth for Christ as His well-purchased inheritance. I repeat, then, even *the subjects* of the covenant remain still unchanged. They are still the people of God, and their *little ones*. These latter are surely as capable of being *taken* into covenant with God *now*, as they were of *old*. The act does not consist, it never *did* consist, in their voluntarily and intelligently making a covenant *with God;* but in His sovereignly yet graciously *assuming them* within the embrace of His covenant, and pledging to them all His blessings, on the conditions of that covenant. He does not *now*, any more than of *old*, ask infants whether they *can* comprehend, or *will* comply with, His act; but He mercifully takes them within the sacred inclosure, and there does what belongs to Him toward training them, with opening accountability, for himself and for heaven. They are, therefore, still included within the covenant of grace. They *are* capable of being made subjects of the promise that, upon future repentance and faith, God will forgive them all sin, and bestow on them the blessings of everlasting life! They *are* capable of being placed, in their earliest infancy, within the circle of His mercies; that peculiar circle, where His mercies live most *vitally*, and fill all means with their best power. *Infants*, indeed, are not, in the *New* Testament, as in the *Old*, *specifically* mentioned among the subjects of the covenanting rite. Neither are *adults* thus distinguished from infants. And the silence

has, in both cases, the best of reasons. *The subjects* of the seal were *well known*. That seal had *always* been applied to *infants*, as well as to *adults*. And now, the mere change in the *form* of the seal, while the *significancy* and *effect* of it, with all else about the covenant, remained *un*changed, did not render it necessary, one might well say, did not render it *proper*, either to *change*, or to specify *anew*, the subjects to whom it was to be applied. At first, when the Gospel began to be preached, the seal would *naturally* be applied *to adults*, because these *only* could at first be the subjects of Christ's *teachings*. But afterward, when *households* grew up in the Christian Church, and whole households were baptized *together*, then, past all doubt, the covenant gathered its subjects as of old; and fixed its seal on the infant *seed* of God's people, as well as on those *adults* who might be gathered in from the world. Confirmatory of the truth of this view, Ecclesiastical History has ever been one long-lived commentary.

Baptism, then, *is* a *covenanting* and *sealing* ordinance. But what is *meant* by this covenanting and sealing in baptism? This is a point of deep importance, for here the advocates of the theory of baptismal regeneration begin to develop most distinctly the genius of their theory. Baptism, say they, *conveys* remission of sin. This is a vital error. The difference between *conveying* and *sealing* is *essential*. For though this difference were at first but a *point*, yet it is a point of *divergency*, and, therefore, *infinite* in importance; inasmuch as the two systems which start from it, according as they take the one or the other of the divergent lines, become at length separated by a difference which is heaven-wide! *Sealing* is a sign used in *conveyancing;* yet, *conveyance* and *sealing* are not *one and the same thing*. *Conveyance*, in the present case, is the gracious act of Him who really imparts, and actually communicates, Divine blessings. *Sealing* is "*a token*," "*a sign*," "*a pledge*," which He

vouchsafes, and by which He *certifies* us of His truth, and fidelity to His *promises*, and to the *conditions* on which those promises rest. *The blessings are not conveyed by the seal.* They *were* not under the *old* dispensation. They *are* not under the *new*. They never *are* conveyed till the *conditions* on which they are promised are *met*. They are *signified;* they are *sealed;* they are *pledged;* and of their *certainty*, so far as *God* is concerned, we are *assured*, and thus encouraged and invited to diligence and fidelity, on *our* part, in meeting the conditions on which they are *signified*, *sealed*, and *pledged*. In accordance with this, our Catechism, in defining a sacrament, says, it "is an *outward* and *visible sign* of an inward and spiritual grace;" and that, as before explained, it is not only "*a* means," one of a grand *system* of means, "whereby we receive the same," but also "*a pledge* to assure us thereof." But, then, to say that the *blessings* of the covenant are *conveyed* by the *seal* of the covenant, is to begin building, on a foundation of *error*, a structure of superstition, a religion of trembling homage to *outward signs*, which will, in all probability, leave the soul famished for lack of the *inward substance*.

What, then, it will be asked, if the pardon of sin is not *conveyed* by baptism, are we to understand by these texts? "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*."—Acts, ii., 38. "Arise and be baptized; and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord."—Acts, xxii., 16. Or, what is meant by the Article in the Nicene Creed, as grounded on these texts: "I acknowledge one baptism *for the remission of sins?*" In reaching the answer to these questions, I remark that, in the *former* of the two texts, Peter does not say to the Jews, "Be *baptized* for the remission of sins;" but "be baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ*, for the remission of sins;" neither in the *latter* does Ananias say to Paul, "*Wash* away thy sins *by* baptism;" but "be baptized,

and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord;" or, rather, "having previously called on His name," having called in faith on the name of Jesus Christ. The difference between the two forms of expression is *material*. "Remission of sin" is really *the gift of God* to them that *believe on the name of Jesus Christ;* and this, in all such passages as those just recited, is always implied and to be understood. It is "the blood of Jesus Christ" that "cleanses," or "washes away," "all sin." *Faith*, "calling on the name of the Lord" Jesus Christ, is the actual requisite on which the remission of sin is *conveyed*; and baptism, as we have seen, is but the *seal* of the covenant, the promise, the oath, that the grant *shall* be, and actually *is* made, when the specified *condition* is met, and not before. Peter directed the Jews to "be baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ*, for the remission of sins;" that is, to be baptized "*in token*," or as "*a pledge*" from God, that remission is granted to that *faith in Christ*, which in baptism is professed or promised. And Paul was exhorted to "be baptized, and *to wash away his sins*, having first called *on the name of the Lord;*" in other words, he was exhorted to receive the appointed *seal* of that remission which was really conveyed when he believed on the name of Christ.

In explaining such texts, we should never forget what baptism implies. It implies either a profession by *adults*, or a promise for *infants*, of *faith in Christ*. This is the least that can be meant by baptism's being "*in the name* of Christ," or "*calling on the name*" of Christ. It is a rite which points to the *true* and *only* fountain of cleansing, "the blood of Jesus." It seals in our favor the assurance that, in Christ, "we have redemption through His blood; the forgiveness of sin."—Eph., i., 7. When, therefore, in the Creed, as founded on such texts, we "acknowledge one baptism *for the remission of sins*," the true meaning is, *not* that baptism actually *conveys* that remission, but that it seals

to us *the covenant*, in which *God* engages to convey it on the conditions annexed. The Article may be thus expressed: "I acknowledge one baptism as a symbol of purification from sin, and as a seal of the *promise* of remission on those terms of the Gospel, which are, 'repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.'"

This explanation applies to an expression in *the Office for Confirmation*, as well as to this Article in the Creed, and the texts on which it is founded. In behalf of the candidates, we thank God, as "having vouchsafed to regenerate them by water and the Holy Ghost," and as "having *given unto them forgiveness of all their sins*." This latter clause, it is true, might be explained on another ground, viz., that the candidates, "being now come to years of discretion," and having been instructed in all the "things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health," are to be regarded, in the judgment of charity, as having realized in their own experience what was "promised for them in baptism;" as *actually having* that "repentance toward God, and that faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," to which, under the seal of baptism, remission was annexed; and, therefore, as *actually having now* the remission itself, which was *then* only put under the seal of a *promise*. And this explanation imbodies a most important truth. Still, the language in the confirmation office couples "*the forgiveness of sin*" so closely with "regeneration *by water and the Holy Ghost*," as to leave a high probability that the Church, in this one of her offices, regards the regeneration and the forgiveness as *going together*. Taking the passage on this ground, then, it is only necessary to remark that, if I have shown from the Bible that the regeneration is *symbolical*, and not *actual*, I have, at the same time, and by the same reasons, shown that the *remission*, as connected with the regeneration, is *conditional*, and not *conveyed*. I am willing that this explanation of the term *remission*, as

connected with *baptism*, should stand or fall with the argument on that of *regeneration*, as expressive of *the nature* of baptism.

The view which has now been taken of baptism as *a covenanting* and *sealing* ordinance, can not be too well considered, nor too well understood. For, according as we view baptism either in the *one* light or in the *other*, either as actually *conveying*, or only as *sealing* the conditional *promise* to convey the pardon of sin; either we verge upon that system of theology which makes men virtually worship the sacraments, while yet they live at ease in what are termed "*venial sins*," because they are taught that they can, at any time, obtain a valid pardon through its priestly dispenser; or we adopt that "radically and essentially different" system of doctrine which, while it makes us reverence the ordinances of God because they *are* his ordinances, and because they are full of unspeakably precious meaning and value, still works in us an *utter loathing* of *all* sin, because it is *offensive to God*, and *grievous to that blessed Savior*, through whose bloody stripes we profess to be healed, and by faith in whom we have received "pardon and peace."

All the views of baptism thus far given, as *a badge* of our Christian profession, as *a symbol* of regeneration, as an *initiatory* ordinance, and as a *covenanting and sealing* act, are expressly and fully sustained by our Article on this subject. Read it attentively:

"Baptism is not only a *sign* of profession, or a *mark* of difference whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a *sign of regeneration*, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are *grafted into the Church*; the *promises* of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly *signed and sealed*; *faith* is confirmed, and *grace* increased, by virtue of prayer to God. The baptism of *young children* is in any

wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable to the institution of Christ."*

The body of this Article is spoken of *adult* baptism, though much of its language will apply to that of *infants* also. It goes the full length of all the views which I have advocated. Especially does it make baptism, on the great point which has detained us so long, not a *conveyance* of forgiveness, but *a sign and seal* of the *promise* of forgiveness. And when it says, "*Faith* is *confirmed* and *grace increased* by virtue of *prayer to God*," it sweeps away at a stroke the whole fabric of the "opus operatum" which has been so ingeniously and toilfully built up, and so industriously and superstitiously filled with the alleged miracle-working power of the sanctifying water. "*Faith*," says the Article, "is *confirmed ;*" of course, in those who already *have* a faith which *may be* confirmed: "and grace *increased ;*" that is, in those who already *have* grace which *can be* increased: but, then, even this confirmation and increase of *previously generated* graces is not produced by any marvel connected with the symbolizing *waters*, but simply "by *virtue of prayer to God !*" How evidently was this Article framed as a flat contradiction of that theory of baptismal regeneration to which I have so often adverted!

5. But there is one view of baptism which is not given in this Article, but which is yet of some importance. I will therefore add a brief sketch of it to what has already been said. I observe, then, that, as an institution of Christ, baptism imbodies the *evidence of a moral monument* to the identity of the Church, and to the truth of the Christian revelation, through all ages; evidence that could not have been counterfeited, and that can not be set aside.

The principle here involved is indicated in what St. Paul says of the Lord's Supper, as a similar moral monument: "As often as ye do eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye

* Art. xxvii.

do show the Lord's *death* till He come."—1 Cor., xi., 26. A similar assertion may be made of baptism: "As often as ye do baptize in the name of Christ, ye *do show* the Lord's *resurrection* till He come."

Here, then, is a grand moral monument, testifying to a fundamental *fact* in Christianity, and to all the glorious truths which that fact carries with it. This monument must have been set up in the very age when that fact transpired, and those truths were revealed; set up for the alleged purpose, too, of their commemoration: for it could not have been subsequently and fraudulently erected and established under this character in the reverent memory and universal observance of the Church, any more than we could now, in the year 1844, without contradiction and detection, begin to consecrate in a nation's devout memory and universal observance, the falsely-alleged fact, that the 22d of February, 1732, was the birth-day of a man who formerly rescued these United States from the bondage of slavery to the lordly Turk. *Baptism*, therefore, *is* such a monument as I have described. It does imbody an evidence to the identity of the Church, and to the truth of the Christian revelation, which could not have been counterfeited, and which can not be set aside. More unchangeably enduring than the Pyramids on the plains of Egypt, this monument, like the solemn sister at its side, stands to testify to all the generations which have succeeded, or which are to succeed, of the age in which it was set up, of the great Master by whose order it was reared, and of the eternal truths to which it has been dedicated, and with which it has been inscribed!

This view of the two grand monuments of Christianity is most fully and ably given in that master-piece of brief but resistless moral demonstration, "Leslie's Short Method with the Deist," with a reference to which, I close this part

of the views which have been given of the nature of baptism.

I have shown that this ordinance of Christ is *a badge* of Christian profession; a *symbol* of regeneration; a rite of *initiation;* a *covenanting* and *sealing* act; and an *evidence* to the identity of the Church and the truths of Christianity, uncounterfeit and indestructible, from generation to generation. And in doing this, I have shown that the ordinance, thus viewed, is at least all that our Church makes it in her chief standard of doctrine; and that, therefore, the Church being our guide, we may reject that theory of baptismal regeneration which has all along been in view, without leaving this prime Christian ordinance stripped of its solemnity and importance—a mere soulless, lifeless *form* of what *Christ* intended should be instinct with mysterious and awful power. In fact, the view which our Church takes of baptism, while it is simple and Scriptural, is, for that very reason, essential to its true beauty, value, and efficacy. To burden it with the thick covering which the theory of baptismal regeneration throws around it, however reverend and awful the robes in which it was thus designed it should be dressed, is but to disfigure Divine beauty, simplicity, and life, with what, in fact, robs them of much, if not all, of the salutary power which they were intended to exert. Disencumbered, and left as Christ left it, and as our Church finds it in the Bible, baptism commends itself to the Christian's warmest regards and most reverential affection, as every way worthy of its Divine Institutor, and of the Divine end which, in its institution, He contemplated.

I must not, however, entirely close this examination of the all-important subject of baptism without one farther reference to the language in which it is spoken of by our Church.

It will, of course, be asked, Does not our Church call baptism, not only "*a sign* of regeneration," but also regen-

eration itself? Does she not, in her office for infant baptism, thank God "that it hath pleased Him to *regenerate* the infant" just baptized "with His *Holy Spirit?*" And does she not, in evident allusion to this baptismal act, declare, in her Office for Confirmation, that God hath "vouchsafed to *regenerate*" the candidates "by *water and the Holy Ghost?*" And is not all this a proof that she really holds the doctrine of baptismal regeneration in all its breadth and length? Does it not show that she really ties the birth of the Spirit to the washing of water?

To this questioning, then, I reply, The language here used by our Church, if taken by itself, or without reference to the Bible, would, without doubt, be difficult of reconciliation with the views already advanced. In truth, whatever view we take of this language, such a reconciliation is not altogether easy, if we expect thereby to satisfy the queries of every mind. To explain to the satisfaction of *all*, what others of more leisure and ability have failed so to explain, I certainly do not expect in the little which my remaining limits will allow me to add. And yet, it may fearlessly be said, our Church *can not* mean by this language that the Holy Spirit in baptism regenerates the infant in the sense of working in him that great moral change from the old death in sin to the new life of holiness, in which faith and repentance are essential parts. If she meant this, she would stand up a house divided against itself, and sure to fall. She can, therefore, mean no more than that the Holy Spirit effects for the infant in baptism that of which in baptism it is *capable*. *What this is*, different minds differently decide, even while rejecting the theory of baptismal regeneration, as it has been stated.

Perhaps the best thing which, in a few words, I can do, will be to give what the author of one of our standard works on infant baptism says, in explaining what the infant is capable of receiving from the Holy Spirit.

"There are some operations of the Holy Spirit, as working actual faith, repentance, &c., in the heart, of which an infant, indeed, is not capable. But when God does apply the pardon of *original* guilt, does transfer a person out of the state of nature into the state of grace and of the Christian covenant, does unite him as a member into the mystical body of Christ, and accept him for His child; these things and these *promises* are spoken of in Scripture as done, sealed, and applied to the person by *the Spirit*. Now of these latter an infant is capable."*

This view, understood as the author probably intended, accords well with that which I have already given. In *substance* it amounts to this: "That in infancy we are capable of having the pardon of *original* guilt applied, at least in this sense, that the *promise* of its forgiveness through Jesus Christ is then *sealed;* of being transferred from that state of nature, in which we are *out of covenant*, to that state of grace, in which we are *in* covenant with God; of being united to that mystical body of Christ which is His Church; and of being thus, for our future discipline and training, adopted as children of God." Of all this we doubtless *are* capable in infancy; all this, too, may with justice be said to be done for us by the Holy Spirit in baptism; and in *this* sense, we, who were baptized in infancy, may be said to have been *regenerated* by the *Holy Spirit* in that ordinance. Understood in this sense, there can be no objection to the term. The Church has sanctioned its use, and at least one text in the Bible justifies us in considering baptism a *symbolical* regeneration (Tit., iii., 5); a regeneration effected by the Holy Spirit in applying to the infant all the benefits of the covenant of grace of which, at that tender age, he is *capable*.

But whether or not this be, to all minds, a perfectly satis-

* "A Conference between two Men about Infant Baptism." By Wm. Wall, author of "The History of Infant Baptism."

fying explanation of the language of our Church, as it has been quoted, in one thing we may be well settled: the justness and necessity of that great law of interpretation, so vitally important to us as *Protestant* Episcopalians, which I find in the writings of the late venerable Bishop Griswold; that, in cases of apparent conflict, "the *Prayer Book* must be explained into an agreement with the *Bible*, and not the Bible into an agreement with the Prayer Book." If the two *appear* to differ, much more, if they really *do* differ, the *human* must bow to the *Divine*. It were *impious* to force the *Divine* to do obeisance to the *human*. And that the theory of baptismal regeneration, as I have exhibited it from the writings of its now most popular, if not its actually greatest masters, does, not only *apparently*, but *actually* and *irreconcilably*, differ from the true sense of Scripture, is a position which has, I humbly conceive, been sufficiently demonstrated.

That great names and many, in times long past, and in times now current, may be arrayed against the view which has now been taken of baptism, I am well aware. But if I have succeeded in showing that the Word of the living God and the general teaching of our Church are in favor of this view, then I may justly feel well sheltered under names more mighty and more hallowed, if not more numerous, than all that can be brought for a different teaching, whether from the dim days of Mediæval antiquity, or from these days of strange tendency toward a Mediæval theology.

To say that the difference between the two views which have been taken of baptism is *important*, would be weak speech. It is *fundamental;* involving the vital interests of the kingdom of Christ, and auguring, as the one theory or the other shall prevail, either the return of a dun eclipse to the Sun of truth and life; or the shining on to a still more perfect day of that glorious light of the Gospel which the best fathers of the English and American Protestant Episcopal churches

have held forth ever since the time of the blessed Reformation. It is in the view taken of *baptism* that the seed was planted which, in the Middle Ages, produced the fruit of that giant error, in later times named *Transubstantiation;* the poison of which, it may *well* be feared, hath made her who tasted it sick unto death. And it will be in *our* views of baptism, if we are indeed destined to so sad a retrogression, that *we* shall *replant* the same seed of error, and reproduce the same fruits of death!

PART III.

THE NATURE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

PART III.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1 Cor., xi., 23–26: "23. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: 24. And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, 'Take, eat: *this is my body*, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.' 25. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' 26. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

From our deliberate and prolonged survey of the most ancient of what I have termed the two great Christian monuments, those significant memorials of himself which Christ hath builded within the ample inclosure of His Church, I come now to a view of its younger but more solemn sister, rearing itself evermore from amid the sad shades of Gethsemane and of Calvary, and yet gathering most of its sublime impressiveness from the light which breaks around its summit, the light of eternal life. While *baptism* is built on the broad *fact* of our *own* "death in trespasses and sins," and on the coextensively broad *truth*, that we need a quickening and a rising to the new life of holiness; and while, from such a base, it towers upward till lost in the glories of our *bodily* resurrection from the dead as first-fruits of the great Forerunner's victory over the grave; *the Lord's Supper* is built on the mighty *fact* of the *death of Christ* as a sacrifice for sin, and on the equally mighty *truth*, that in Him alone "we have redemption through His

blood, the forgiveness of sin;" and rising from such a base, it points away till its pinnacle is lost in the profound upward depths of that light which it pierceth before the throne of God and the Lamb, the light of the soul's blessed life forevermore.

Viewed thus as to their *significancy*, these moral monuments of Christianity are *vital* things. He to whom they point, and whom they commemorate, still liveth in them by the *facts* which they symbolize, and by the *truths* which they *imbody*. Beautiful things are they in their significancy, but blessed things in their vitality. Enough to justify this, I think, we have already seen in the view which has been taken of *baptism*. Enough to justify it, I think, we *shall* see in the view which is now to be taken of the *Lord's Supper*. Whatever I may be obliged to strip from this sacred ordinance, I trust God will keep me from that rudeness of hand which would either touch its essential life or disfigure its originally Divine beauty.

In what I have already said on the relation which the ordinance of preaching, and the sacraments in general, bear to the renewing and sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, and even in what I have so largely added on the subject of baptism, so much has necessarily been spoken of the Lord's Supper itself, the principles which, like a foundation, underlay the whole structure of sacramentary theology, have been so fully canvassed, and so much light is consequently thrown forward upon the subject of my present inquiry, that it will not be necessary to enter, at so great length as would otherwise have been required, upon the question touching *the nature* of this sacrament. In what I have to say I shall first exhibit what I consider the great *seminal error*, as it manifests itself in that view of the Lord's Supper which is now gaining currency among us; second, examine those

passages of Scripture on which this view is rested; third, place this view in the light of reason and of experience; and, fourth, educe from the Bible, and from the language of our Church, the true idea of the nature of this great Christian ordinance.

I. First, then, in order to exhibit the great *seminal error* to which I refer, I quote the following language from works now become but too well known.

It is said that there is "a real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament;"* that "the body and blood of Christ are sacramentally *united* to the bread and wine, so that Christ is truly given to the faithful;" "His flesh together with the bread, and His blood together with the wine:"† that the "*hands*" of the officiating minister "*convey* the sacrifice," "our *Savior's* sacrifice," that *on* which the Lord's Supper is a "holy feast;"‡ that "every faithful communicant may be as certainly assured that he receives the Lord's body as if he knew that the bread is substantially turned into it;"§ that "the nature of this mystery is such, that when we receive the bread and wine, we also, together with them, receive at the same time the body and blood of Christ, which, in the celebration of the holy Eucharist, are as truly *given* as they are *represented*;"‖ in short, "that there is a true, real, spiritual presence of Christ at the Holy Supper; more real than if we could, with Thomas, feel Him with our hands or thrust our hands into His side;" and that though "this is bestowed *upon* faith and received *by* faith," yet faith does but "open our eyes to see what is really there," and "that it *is* there *independently* of our faith."¶ The *presence* is in-

* Tracts for the Times, N. Y., vol. i., p. 192.
† Ibid., vol. i., p. 199.
‡ Ibid., vol. i., p. 23.
§ Ibid., vol. i., p. 205.
‖ Ibid., vol. i., p. 214
¶ Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, N. Y. ed., p. 86.

deed *spiritual*, not *visible;* and our *eating* is *spiritual*, not *carnal:* still, *that presence* is not the mere *omnipresence* of infinite *Spirit*, realized by faith, but the *real presence* of Christ's very *body and blood*, "*independent* of faith;" and *our eating* is not mere faith in the sacrifice of Christ, as offered on the cross, and as *represented* in the Eucharist, but a real reception of the true body and blood of Christ, as united with the bread and wine, and as actually *conveyed* by the *hands* of the officiator.

To leave no doubt that the doctrine which I am engaged in exhibiting is all that has now been stated, I add a few quotations from one of the latest works on the subject.

In that work it is laid down, "that the Eternal Word so took our flesh into Himself as to impart to it His own inherent life; so, then, we partaking of it" (the flesh which Christ assumed), "that life is transmitted on to us also, and not to our *souls only*, but to our *bodies also*, since we become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, and He, who is wholly life, is *imparted to us wholly.*"* Again: "For now, according both to the declaration of our Lord and our faith, *it is truly flesh and truly blood.* And these, *received into us*, cause that we are in Christ and Christ in us."† To the same effect, "Having received into ourselves, *bodily and spiritually*, Him who is by nature and truly the Son," "we, becoming partakers of the nature which is above all, are glorified."‡ Again, speaking of the effect of the sacrament on "*the sinner*," as the author had been speaking of its effect on the saint, he says, "To him its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer's *very broken body;* it is *His blood which was shed for the remission of his sins.* In the words of the ancient Church, he '*drinks his ransom;*' he *eateth*

* Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist, N. Y., 1843, p. 7.
† Idem, p. 8. ‡ Idem, p. 9.

that, '*the very body and blood of the Lord, the only sacrifice for sin;*' God 'poureth out' for him *yet* 'the most precious blood of His only Begotten;' they 'are fed from the cross of the Lord, because they eat His body and blood.' 'He,' says St. Ambrose, 'is the bread of life. Whoso, then, eateth life, can not die. How should he die whose food is life? How perish, who hath a living substance?'"*

To add more on this point is really unnecessary; and yet a few more sentences I will add, as showing how this *seminal error* is beginning to grow. The author, alluding to that priestly act of Christ by which the natural bread and wine become *changed* into His body and blood, speaks of His "words as *the form* which *consecrates* the sacramental elements into His body and blood."† Consequently, those who are now priests under Christ, when they *repeat that form*, although they do not *transubstantiate* the elements into the body and blood of Christ, yet come so near that alleged miracle that they *consecrate* the elements into that body and blood. And thus it happens, according to this doctrine, "that His flesh and blood in the sacrament shall give life, not only because they *are* the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Word, who is life, but also because they are *the very* flesh and blood which were given and shed for the life of the world."‡ Yea; "For that, *so* are we members of Him, not by *love* only, but in *very deed;* mingled with that flesh, *mingled with Him*, that we might become in a manner *one substance with Him*, the one body and one flesh of Christ; and He, the Eternal Son and God the Word in us, *commingled* and *co-united* with us, with our *bodies* as with our *souls*, preserving both for incorruption;" "descending to our nature, subject to cor-

* Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist, N. Y., 1843, p. 9.
† Idem, p. 10. ‡ Idem, p. 10.

ruption and to change, and raising it to Its own excellences, and, by *commingling it with Itself*, all but removing it from the conditions of created nature."*

Now all this is certainly plain *language*, though it asserts a *doctrine* which is *not* plain. So far as such a subject can be stripped of ambiguity in expression, it is so here. However incomprehensible the thing intended, the thing itself is not left for doubtful conjecture. The real presence of *the body and blood* of Christ *in* the elements, as distinguished from what would be understood by the presence of *Christ at* the sacrament, is unequivocally affirmed; even the presence of *that very flesh and blood* which were given and shed for the life of the world. The change of the natural elements of bread and wine into *more than symbols*, into *actual vehicles*, of that very flesh and blood, is distinctly taught. The *conveyance* of that very flesh and blood by *the hands* of the officiator, and *the reception* of them by the communicant, *together with* their symbols, are expressly asserted. And the miraculous result of the Christian's being made literally a partaker in the nature, the substance of Christ incarnate, so that there is a mutual commingling and co-uniting of His Divine nature with the Christian and of the Christian with His Divine nature, is undisguisedly developed. In all this it is considered as essential to a true and perfect sacrament, that the very body and blood of Christ, which are the things signified, should be present *with* the bread and wine, which are the conveying *signs* of that body and

* Pusey's Sermon on the Eucharist, N. Y., 1843, p. 9. Many of the foregoing quotations from Dr. Pusey's Sermon are in fact *his* quotations from the post-Nicene fathers, but he adopts them as expressive of his own views; and that, too, without abating any thing from their *literal* force, in consideration of the fact that, with those fathers, they may have been sometimes but *strong figures*, intended, with however ill a judgment, to garnish and commend a true and salutary meaning.

blood; and that they should *be* conveyed by the *hands* of the officiator, and received into the *body* as well as soul of the communicant, at *the same time*, and *together with* those signs. If the language which I have quoted do not express the whole of the foregoing complex and amazing idea, then words for its expression can not be framed. How all this is *possible*, the authors quoted do not attempt to inquire; but leave it as that deep, profound, and awful mystery which invests and is involved in this sacrament, and which gives it its claim to our deep, profound, and awful reverence.

II. I pass now, in the second place, to an examination of those passages of Scripture on which the foregoing doctrine of this sacrament is rested. In doing so, I approach a topic which demands our most serious attention. The seed of the great error which is here so largely developed is, as we have seen, planted in the false view taken of *baptism*. But it has already grown so much, and gained such vigor, as to call for solemn heedgiving "to the law and to the testimony." We must know, as we value our soul's eternal weal, whether, in very deed, the Word of God actually teaches the doctrine which we thus see and hear inculcated.

1. I go at once to the key-text from which this doctrine is drawn. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him."—John, vi., 53–56.

I say this is the key-text on this subject, not because it is that which *should* govern the doctrine of the Eucharist, but because it is confessedly that which *has*

given shape to the doctrine as just exhibited. The *true* summary of the nature of this sacrament is found in the instituting words of Christ, and these words are found in the passage which I have placed at the head of this discourse, and its parallels in the Gospels. For this reason, and in obedience to the canon of interpretation which I have adopted, I shall reserve this true summary for examination when I shall have collected all the light possible from other portions of Scripture ; I might more correctly say, when these other portions shall have dissipated by their own light all the darkness which has been spread over them.

I repeat, then, the key-text to the doctrine of the Eucharist, as I have exhibited it, is the passage just cited from the sixth chapter of the Gospel according to John. Adopting here (as in the case of John, iii., 5, *on baptism*) *the false* canon of interpretation formerly exposed, the advocates of this doctrine every where *assume* that these words of Christ were spoken of *the sacrament of His Supper ;* and not only so, but also spoken *literally*, and to be literally *understood.* And then, with their key thus fashioned, they go to *the instituting words of Christ themselves*, and insist on it that they must be understood as teaching the same doctrine.

The very first inquiry to be made, then, is, Were the words quoted from the sixth of John spoken of *sacramental* eating and drinking ? Was Christ there, in fact, discoursing of the nature of the Lord's Supper ? It may seem bold to ask such a question, after its affirmative has been so confidently assumed and reiterated, and used as a point which all the world must concede, and about which there could be no question. And yet one is constrained to ask the question, because this assumption is clearly groundless. It takes for granted what can not be granted—what, I trust, it will be shown,

ought not to be granted. We who live *after* the institution of the Lord's Supper have no right to assume that the words which have been quoted, as they stand by themselves, however much they may *sound like* the language in which we have been accustomed to hear this sacrament stated, were actually spoken of it, and are intended to express its nature and effect. Every principle of sound interpretation obliges us to go back to the *occasion* on which they were uttered, and to *the chapter* in which they are found; and to gather thence their *true*, their *intended* import. Back to that occasion, then, and to that chapter, I go; and I trust it is with the spirit of teachableness to learn what the great Master would have all his disciples know.

The first thing discovered, on thus going back, is the simple, but important fact, that the discourse of Christ in John, vi., was delivered more than a year before the institution of His Supper, and some time before he had even begun to hint to his disciples the great truth, that He was to suffer on the cross, a sacrifice for sin. In His school they had not yet advanced so far as this centre-truth of His Gospel. They were yet wholly ignorant of the manner in which He was to effect the work of their redemption. *They*, therefore, *could not* have understood Him, in what He said, to speak of *sacramental* eating and drinking. In his discourse, as we shall soon see, He was, it is true, teaching them that fundamental principle of evangelic truth, the necessity of *faith* in Him as their Savior; but of the peculiar aspect under which He was finally to present Himself to their faith in the Holy Supper, as a Savior *crucified*, he said nothing. There was not in his words even a *dim shadowing* of that aspect to their minds. His speech was perfectly general, even more so than that of his forerunner, the Baptist, when he pointed out Christ to the people, in those mem-

orable words, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!"—John, i., 29. The *Lamb* of God, they might easily understand, meant *a sacrifice* for sin; and beholding Him truly was to look upon Him with the eye of *faith*. If, then, Christ's words, in the passage before us, may be assumed as spoken of the sacrament of the Supper, with equal, and even with greater justice, may those of His chosen preparatory preacher be assumed as spoken of the same ordinance; for they both teach the same thing; moreover, in the language of John there is a distinct foreshadowing of sacrifice, while in that of Christ, not even the shadow of the cross is seen. The truth is, *neither* was spoken of that ordinance, but only of Him who came to be our Divine Savior, and of whose sacrifice that ordinance has *since* become a Divine symbol.

But, in order to be fully satisfied that these words of Christ do not refer to *sacramental* eating and drinking, we must go more at large into the occasion on which, and into the discourse in which, they were uttered. In doing this, we shall see, not only that they are a strong *figure*, but also that the figurative *dress* in which Christ chose to clothe His thoughts was suggested by something very different from the then future institution of His Supper. Our Savior, we know, was wont to seize on *passing*, or on *well-known* and *familiar* incidents and objects, that by them He might the more impressively illustrate, and that from them He might the more easily lead the thoughts of His hearers to contemplate and apprehend, the glorious truths which He taught. Hence the peculiarly interesting dress in which so many of his discourses and parables appear. Hence, especially, that most striking dress in which this discourse in the sixth of John appears.

To give a few instances in which the above remark

is illustrated. When Jesus had cursed the barren fig-tree, and when the disciples marveled that it so soon withered away, he seized on their remark, and on the excited attention which it evinced, to direct their thoughts to the necessity and power of *faith*, and to the still more marvelous things which, *through* faith, they should be enabled to accomplish.—Matt., xxi., 18–22. So, when He wished to correct the false inference of the Jews, that the greatest *sufferers* in this life were the greatest *sinners*, and to impress on their minds the truth that *repentance* is equally necessary for *all*, he seized on the incident which they related to Him, of Pilate's massacre of some Galileans, while engaged in their sacrifices; and on the well-known incident of the fatal fall of the Tower in Siloam on eighteen of the citizens of Jerusalem, assuring them that their reasonings from such events were false, and that, unless *they* repented, they would even more seriously perish.—Luke, xiii., 1–5. In Matthew, xvi., 5–12, having just fed more than four thousand with seven loaves and a few fishes, he improves both that miracle and the one recorded in John, vi., for the purpose of putting his disciples on their guard against the *false leaven of Pharisaic doctrine.* In Matthew, xv., 1–20, the Scribes and Pharisees come and complain of his disciples for breaking the *traditions* by eating with unwashen hands. He at once takes up the fact, and goes on, in a severe discourse, to show them the difference between mere outward uncleanness and that *inward* defilement of which they were themselves the subjects. In Luke, xiv., 1–24, when a chief Pharisee invited him to dine, and "He marked how some chose out the chief rooms," or *seats*, at the feast, He seized on the incident, and out of it wove the dress of *two parables*, full of important instruction. But the instance *most strongly and exactly in point* is that

which is recorded in John, iv., 5–25, and which occurred at *Jacob's Well*, near Samaria, when the woman came out to *draw water*. Here the starting of the discourse from *the incident before Him*, the *figurative dress* which His discourse drew from that incident, the *nature of the great truth* which He taught, and *the manner* in which He led the conversation from one change to another, till He had brought His hearer to the full knowledge of *Himself* as the *true Messiah*, and of those *waters of eternal life* which He giveth, and of which he that *drinketh* shall be forever satisfied—are all in full keeping and harmony with the origin, progress, and character of the discourse in the sixth of John, which I am now to examine.

This chapter opens with an account of His miraculous feeding of the five thousand with five barley loaves and two small fishes. The sight of this miracle prompted the multitude, who were its witnesses, to a forcible attempt "to make him a king." But he withdrew from the attempt, first, "into a mountain himself alone," and, afterward (when his disciples had launched upon "the sea toward Capernaum"), into that sublime triumph over the elements, in which, as it were, he trode the roaring waves into that lowly acknowledgment of His Godhead, their unopposing silence! The next day, however, the eluded multitude followed, "seeking for Jesus." "And when they had found him," and had questioned him as to the manner of his passage thither, then it was that He gave them the memorable reply which opens at once the ensuing discourse, and puts into our hands the clew that is to guide us through its succeeding changes: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because *ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.*" This is the very generating point of the whole *figure* in which he pro-

ceeds to clothe his speech. "Labor not," he immediately adds, "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for *that meat* which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man shall give you; for him hath God the Father sealed." His very first words were *a figure* drawn from His own allusion to their feeding on the five barley loaves and two small fishes; and His very next furnish the *meaning* of the figure, and give us, not only *a clew* through the changes of His discourse, but also *a key* to unlock its deepest teachings. "What shall we do," they again inquire, "that we *might* work the works of God?" Mark His answer: "*This* is the work of God, that ye *believe* on Him whom He hath sent." Himself, as the Sent of God, to achieve the great work, and to unfold the grand truths of man's redemption; *this* was *the meat* for which they were to labor: *faith* in Him as "the way, the truth, and the life;" *this* was their *sole receiving* of the meat so furnished; and the *figure*, in which He *called* it meat, was suggested by what had passed so recently before their eyes.

With this clew and key, both to the *changes* and to the *teachings* of this discourse, let us now advance, following our Divine Teacher to its close. Having proposed to the multitude the *true meat*, and called on them to receive it by *faith* in Him as the Sent of God, they asked Him, "What sign showest thou, then, that we may *see and believe* thee? What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, 'He gave them bread from heaven to eat.'" To this unreasonable demand of *a sign* such as might challenge their faith, when Christ was daily giving signs which awed dumb nature herself into most profound changes in obedience to His will; and to their disparaging comparison of Him with Moses, as though the latter alone had challenged faith by his miracles, Christ

replied, "Moses gave you not *that* bread from heaven" of which I have spoken, "but my *Father* giveth you *the true* bread from heaven. For *the Bread of God* is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." Here we have the *first* change in the discourse; and we see clearly its *object*, and how naturally it followed, both from the opening allusion to the feeding of the five thousand, and from the allusion here made to the manna. They were willing to make a temporal king of one who could so easily feed and support conquering *armies;* but to His character as their *spiritual* Messiah, their Savior *from sin*, they were blind. They wanted nothing of such a deliverer, and were indisposed to listen to His deep and saving teachings. He, however, understood their temper, and proceeded to manage it with His usual consummate skill. He gently checked their disposition to wander from the point which He had in view, and drew them back to Himself, and to those deep truths concerning Himself as the true Savior which He wished to inculcate. At first, He had proposed to give them—not "*the meat that perisheth*," like the barley loaves and fishes—but "*the meat that endureth unto everlasting life.*" And when they turn disparagingly from Him to their own Moses, and talk of his having "given *bread from heaven*" to their forefathers, He seizes on the hint, and gives a change, not to the real *drift*, but to the figurative *dress* of His discourse, calculated and intended to draw them still nearer to Himself, and to the glorious truth which He was seeking to bring into their minds. "Moses, indeed, gave you *manna* from heaven, yet not the *true bread* which you need. *This* my *Father* giveth you for the salvation of your souls. *The Bread of God* is *He* which cometh down from heaven and *giveth life* unto the world." Still, He utters not *the whole* of the truth

which filled his thoughts. He tells them, indeed, of One that cometh down from heaven to save the world; but He tells them not yet whom He means by that wondrous One; His object being first to *stimulate*, and then to *satisfy* inquiry.

His design prospered. "Lord," said they, "evermore give *us* this bread." Their curiosity was excited. They knew that the miraculous supply which they had recently received could nourish them but for the day. They would, therefore, fain know something of a bread that *could give life*. Here, then, comes *the second* change in Christ's discourse, and with it the full truth which He would teach, followed by a still fuller explanation of its meaning. He saw that they had yet false conceptions of the bread which He offered, and of the life which it was to give. To their eager petition, therefore, "Lord, evermore give *us* this bread," He at once, and without disguise, replied, "*I* am the *Bread of Life*. He that *cometh* to me shall never hunger, and he that *believeth* on me shall never thirst." The *figurative dress* of the discourse is here changed from the summary expression, "*Bread of God* that *giveth life*," to the more condensed summary, "Bread of Life;" and the dress, thus changed, Christ wrappeth still more *closely* and *exclusively* around *Himself;* that, if possible, there may be no farther mistake of His meaning. "*I*," says He, "am *the Bread of Life*." And yet His meaning *itself* is *not* changed. He is still but presenting Himself *under this figure* as the only Savior of lost men, the only Deliverer from the curse of *sin*. Hence it is that, with the *same meaning*, though in a somewhat *altered dress*, he gives the *same explanation*, though in a somewhat *fuller form*, of that necessary act by which sinners are to *receive and realize Him as their Savior*. He says not merely, as before, "This is the work of God, that ye *believe on*

Him whom He hath sent;" but, more largely, and with a stricter reference to Himself, "He that *cometh* to *me* shall never hunger, and he that *believeth* on *me* shall never thirst." In other words, the great truth wrapped up in this figurative discourse, as thus far taught and explained, amounts simply to this: "I am the bread of life; the true and only Savior from sin; the true and only author and giver of eternal life; *come unto me* and *believe on me*, and you shall, in this very act of coming and believing, receive this bread to your salvation; you shall hunger no more and thirst no more, but be forever satisfied with the fullness of everlasting bliss."

See, now, how all this grows into distinctness in what immediately follows of the discourse. "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen me and *believe not*." I know well the blindness of the Jewish mind, which shuts the true Savior from its vision, and, therefore, earnest as I am to teach you the truth, I know ye will not *all* receive it. Nevertheless, "All that the *Father giveth me* shall *come to me;* and him *that cometh to me* I will *in no wise cast out*. 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, that, of all which He hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day. This *also* is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which *seeth* the Son, and *believeth* on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Here, I say, the great meaning and its explanation are seen *growing* into distinctness and fullness. Here is *Jesus*, the *true* and *only Savior*, knowing who are his own, and *promising* never to cast them out. Here, too, is *faith*, "*coming to*" Jesus in the inner movement of the soul; *faith*, "*seeing the Son*," with a spiritual discernment of his true character; *faith*, in short, receiving him as that

great act by which the benefits of his salvation are realized and secured. And here, finally, is *the life* in which the glorious work of redemption ends—not the life which is supposed to spring from a miraculous commingling and co-uniting of Christ's incarnate body and blood with the very substance of the body and soul of the Christian; but that life which, actually having its root in *faith*, bides on through the grave, and, on the morning of the resurrection, springs up into a plant of immortality, reanimates the glorious body which the power of Christ has gathered from its sleeping dust, and, thus perfect, flourishes and is blessed forever with Him, who has proved both its "Author and its Finisher."

But let us pass on through the discourse. "The Jews murmured at Jesus, because he said, 'I am the bread which *came down from heaven*.' Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it, then, that He saith, *I came down from heaven?*" To this cavil the patient Teacher replied, "Murmur not among yourselves. No man can *come to me*, except the Father, which hath sent me, *draw him;* and *him* will I raise up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, '*And they shall be all taught of God*.' Every man, therefore, that hath *heard* and hath *learned* of the Father, *cometh unto me*. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God; he hath seen the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that *believeth* on me hath everlasting life. I am that *bread of life*. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am *the living bread*, which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever. And the bread that I will give is *my flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world."

Here we have *the third* change in the figurative dress, which Christ chose for his thought in this discourse. After

repeating, with a slight variation, the previous form of the figure by calling Himself not only "the bread of life," but also "the living bread," He adds, that this "bread, which He will give for the life of the world, is *His flesh*." Nevertheless, this is but another new form of the figure. When, after first pointing somewhat obscurely to Himself as "*the meat*, which endureth unto everlasting life" (drawing His figure from the miracle of feeding the multitude), he changed His speech by distinctly calling Himself "the bread of life," "the bread of God which giveth life;" it was but a change of the figure from one *form* to another; a change very naturally suggested by the reference which had been made to the manna. So also here: when, after calling Himself again "the bread of life," "the living bread," He again changes his speech, and says that this bread "*is His flesh*," it is but another change in the *form* of the figure. It is not a change from the *figurative* style of speech to the *literal*. It is rather a recurrence from the incidentally suggested figure of "*the bread*," to that first adopted when he bade the multitude "labor for *the meat* which endureth unto everlasting life." And the object of the change evidently was, as before, to wrap the figurative dress of His discourse still more closely and exclusively around *Himself*, that the murmuring cavilers might have no excuse for again attempting to evade the point of His teachings by flying off either to Moses and the manna, or to Joseph and the reputed human origin of Jesus.

But though the figurative dress of His discourse was again changed, yet the great truth which it covered remained still *unchanged*. He was still but presenting Himself, though more and more prominently, as the only Savior, who had come down from heaven to open the way, and to bring the offer of salvation to a lost world; while, on the *manner* in which *we* are to become *partakers* of this salvation, the portion of his discourse now before us pours a flood of new

and brilliant light. He had before explained that to receive *the meat* which the Son of Man would give, or to eat *the bread* which in Him came down from heaven, consists in "*believing*" on Him, in "*coming*" to Him by *faith*, or in "*seeing*" Him with this spiritual eye. He now separates this act of receiving Christ still more effectually from that idea of a mysterious commingling of natures, to which I have adverted. Seeing the multitude disposed to cavil at his words, and to reject his claims, He addressed to them the important language which I have quoted, "No man can *come* to me except the Father, which hath sent me, *draw* him." "It is written in the prophets, 'They shall be *all taught of God*.' Every man, therefore, that hath *heard* and hath *learned* of the Father, *cometh* unto me." The Father "*draws*" to the Son by the instrumentality of "*teaching*," and they who spiritually "*hear*" this teaching, and thus effectually "*learn*" what is taught, "*come*" unto Christ, "*believe*" on Him, *receive* the imperishable "*meat* which the Son of Man giveth," *eat* "the bread which cometh down from heaven," yea, eat the "*flesh* which he giveth for the life of the world." All these are but varying expressions of one unvarying idea, that of receiving Christ as a Savior, or of becoming partakers of the salvation which He brings; and the *faith*, by which we thus receive Him, or become partakers of his salvation, is generated amid the intelligible *teachings* of God, and in the process of intelligently "*hearing*," and, in a docile and obedient spirit, "*learning*" the truths which we are taught concerning Him.

Thus far, then, the character and meaning of this great discourse of Christ are plain. Both his position and his design are evidently seen. He was contending with a Divine wisdom and skill, which nothing could resist but that against which he was contending—the carnal blindness and the obstinate prejudice of his Jewish hearers; and his whole object in the contest was, to make them comprehend these

essential and vital truths: that *He* was their true Messiah and only Savior; and that *faith in Him* was the only way in which they could become partakers of his salvation. The *former* of these truths (according as he was wont, so long before the closing act in his Divine drama justified him in removing all covering from his speech), the *former* of these truths he expressed in *figures*. The *latter* he taught mostly in *plain language*. Hence it is that, throughout the discourse up to this point, the *figurative* and the *literal* alternate, and that in most palpably distinguishable forms. When speaking of *Himself* as the partially manifested, yet still not fully revealed, God in Christ, the long-expected Messiah of the nations, He calls himself, in various *figures*, "the *meat* which endureth to everlasting life;" "the *true Bread* from Heaven;" "the Bread of *God*, which giveth life to the world;" "the Bread of *Life*;" "the *Living* Bread;" "the *Flesh*, which he giveth for the life of the world." But, when speaking of *the process and act*, in which we *receive* Him as a Savior, or become *partakers* of His salvation, He describes it in plain language; or, if *some* of it were originally *figurative*, still, it has become so common as to be considered virtually literal. He describes that process as being "*drawn*" by being "*taught*;" and as a "*learning*" which follows "*hearing*;" and he describes this act as *faith*, as "*believing* on Him;" as "*coming* to Him;" and as "*seeing*" Him. At the point in his discourse which we have now reached, he *changes* his speech, it is true, even in describing *this act*; and, instead of calling it any longer, *believing* on Him, or *coming* to Him, He throws *this* also into a *figure*, and calls it "*eating the bread* which cometh down from heaven." Thus, he prepares the way for carrying this figure still farther, and expressing the idea of *believing* on Him, or of *coming* to Him, under the altered dress of, not only "*eating the bread* which cometh down from heaven," but also "*eating the flesh* and *drinking the blood* of the Son of

Man." And yet, even *this* change does but show, still more unquestionably, the really *figurative* character of the whole main body of the discourse; since, to "*eat the bread* which cometh down from heaven," and to "*eat the flesh* of the Son of Man," are undeniably the *same act*, both equally *figurative*, both finding their *literal* sense in *faith*.

Having thus, by the clew put into our hands, threaded our way through the changes of this discourse, and also, by the key furnished us, unlocked its meaning, we are now ready to enter on that part of it which I have called the key-text to that peculiar doctrine of the Eucharist which has been stated.

At what Christ had just said about giving *his flesh* for the life of the world, "the Jews," with utter perverseness, understanding him *literally*, or rather *mis*understanding his words, fell to "strife among themselves, saying, How can this man give us *his flesh to eat?*" To this evidence of their determination not to take his meaning, or of their sinful blindness to that meaning, Jesus, not choosing to throw off its figurative dress, replied, in continuance of His discourse, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

After the remarks which I have already offered, tracing the discourse onward from its starting-point in *the eating of the barley loaves and the fishes*, the meaning of all this, I conceive, is no longer doubtful. It is a most strikingly fig-

urative close of a discourse highly figurative throughout; conveying, indeed, the most weighty of all meanings, and yet conveying it under the dress of *an unquestionable figure*. Reading it by the light already gathered round it, it may be thus paraphrased, or put into its appropriate *literal dress*:

(vs. 52, 53.) "There is essential and necessary truth in what I have been teaching; and, therefore, though ye choose to 'stumble at the word,' and to cavil at the dress, in which I have seen fit to clothe my speech, yet I reaffirm what I have said; and, taking up the last *form* which the figure of my discourse hath assumed, I solemnly assure you, that, unless ye do what I have taught you; unless you '*see*,' or spiritually discern, 'the Son;' unless you are '*drawn*' to me by '*hearing*' and '*learning*' the spiritual '*teachings* of God;' unless you thus '*come* to me,' and '*believe* on me,' as your only Savior; unless you thus 'labor for *the meat* which perisheth not,' and thus eat 'the bread which cometh down from heaven;' *yea, unless you thus 'eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man*, as given for the life of the world,' you *can not be saved;* you give evidence that you have not that *spiritual life* in you which hath its root in the very faith required of you, and that, therefore, you can not come to that *eternal life* which is to follow the glorious resurrection at the last day. (v. 54.) For they only who *thus eat my flesh and drink my blood;* they only who thus spiritually discern and truly believe in me as the Son of God, the Savior of the world, enjoy the consciousness of having this inward life now, or have promise of inheriting that eternal life at the resurrection. And this consciousness and this promise *all* enjoy who do thus receive me. (v. 55.) For my flesh and my blood, thus *by faith* received and applied, are meat and drink indeed: my teachings rightly understood, and my salvation accepted, *by faith*, beget a spiritual life in the soul which shall never be extinguished. (v. 56.) He that, in the sense intended, eateth my

flesh and drinketh my blood, he who spiritually discerns my true character, and believingly comes to me and receives me as the true Savior, *he dwelleth in me* and *I in him;* he is a living branch in me as the true vine, and receives both the graces and the growth of his inner life from me as their true source; he is a member of my spiritual body, by the faith which he has in me; and *I live in him* by the power of that truth which he has received of me, and by the workings of that life which is thus nourished from me. I live in him by the sweetness of those thoughts which such a life hath of me, and in the comforts of that hope with which such a life is inspired by me. (v. 57.) As the Father, who is essential life, hath sent me to be a Savior, and as I live by the Father, through a participation in His essential life, or by having the holiness of my humanity sustained by His providence and by His influences; so, he that, with a true faith, receives me as I have taught, even he shall live by me; his faith in me shall, as a root, nourish in his soul a spiritual life *similar* in its holiness to that of the Divine nature itself; a life upheld in its present power by my providence, and nurtured to its final perfection by my grace. (v. 58.) *This* is what I mean by the bread that cometh down from heaven, as expressed under the former dress of my figure; *this* is what I then meant by *eating* that bread; and *this* is what I *now* mean by *eating the flesh* and *drinking the blood* of the Son of Man as given for the life of the world. And if you have a right understanding of my meaning, you will see that, marvelous as was the supply of manna which God gave by Moses, it was at best but a perishable type of me, and of the vitally nourishing truths which I teach. Your fathers ate that manna and died: I give you a bread, which whosoever eateth, shall never die. They who truly believe in me, may drop their *bodies* for a season in the grave; but in their *souls* they shall live on a most blessed life; and at the resurrection I will raise, and spiritualize,

and glorify even their *bodies* to be the appropriate and the immortal companions of their blessedness."

It was said, a few moments since, that, in all this discourse of Christ, not a shadow of the cross is seen. What was meant by the saying is now manifest. In this discourse, Christ was undoubtedly bodying forth, through figures, the fact which *comprehends* the great doctrine of atonement, the all-embracing fact that He came to save His people from their sins, and to give them life, spiritual and eternal, through faith in Him as their Savior. But to *His cross* and *His passion*, as the mysteries in which His *atoning sacrifice was to be consummated*, He evidently was *not* pointing. He spake naught of *suffering*, he spake naught of *death*. The figure which He finally adopted of "*eating His flesh and drinking His blood*," He plainly drew, *not* from His *crucifixion*, as then future; but from His miracle of *feeding the multitude*, as just wrought. It is clearly observable throughout His discourse, that at *each change* in the figurative dress of His *one thought*, He does but seize and spiritualize upon hints thrown out by His opponents, as, at the first assumption of that dress, He does but seize and spiritualize upon the incident of His *feeding them with the barley loaves* and *the fishes*. Thus, when they came seeking Him, after having *eaten* of His miraculous supply, He takes up that incident, makes a garment of it for His speech, and exclaims, "Labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for *that meat* which endureth unto everlasting life." Thus, again, when they seek to turn the point of His discourse, by bringing forward Moses and the manna which he gave as "bread from heaven," He seizes on their allusion, changes the dress of His thought, wraps that dress still more closely around himself, and thus prevents their escaping from His point by exclaiming, "I am the bread of life," "the *true* bread from heaven," "the bread of God," "which giveth life unto the world." And thus, finally, when He had spoken of giving

"His flesh," that is, *himself*, "for the life of the world," and when they perversely torture His language into the harsh idea of His *literally* "giving them His flesh *to eat*," though of *eating* it *He* had said *nothing*, He again takes up their own language, changes once more the dress of His *one thought*, draws that dress more closely than ever around *himself*, and without deigning to drop His figure in accommodation to their perverseness, exclaims, "Even so; I will teach my truth in your own terms; most solemnly do I assure you, with a firm reiteration of my meaning, covered as it may be from you by its figurative dress, and by your own voluntary blindness, most solemnly do I assure you, that unless, in the sense which I have already *repeatedly* as well as *literally* expressed—unless, as thus explained, you eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you."

The thought need not be followed again through the remainder of the discourse. My object in thus recurring to it is to bring out, into still greater prominence, both the *figurative* character of Christ's teaching, and the fact that His figure originally, and the *changes* of His figure throughout, are drawn, not from the then future crucifixion-scene, but from His *past* miracle of *feeding* the multitude, and from the *passing* hints, which He took and turned to use, from the cavils of his unreasonable opponents. The idea of "*eating* His flesh" was not originally His own, but that of the cavilers at his words; and, like the phrase "bread from heaven," was merely seized upon as a new form to the figurative dress of the one, great, all-pervading thought of His discourse. He was teaching the doctrine of salvation by faith in Him as an atoning Savior, and illustrating it by past and passing incidents; not pointing forward to the crucifixion as the mystery in which His work of atonement was to be consummated. I repeat, in this discourse the shadow of the cross is not seen. He spake not a word here of death; not a word here of suffering. HIMSELF *given for the life of the*

world through FAITH—*this* was the single burden of His teaching; and the dress in which He clothed it He gathered from His recent *feeding* miracle, and drew it closer and closer around himself at every attempt of His opponents to tear it off.

There is one circumstance to which I have not yet adverted, but which confirms the view just given, that *the one thought* which has been brought out runs *throughout* the discourse, and lies under all the forms which the *figure* of the discourse assumes. At the very *opening* of the discourse, Christ says, "Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for *that meat* (*τὴν βρῶσιν*) which endureth unto everlasting life."—v. 27. And just before the *close* of the discourse, after it had assumed the last form of the figure, He adds, with evident recurrence to what He at first said, "My flesh is truly *meat*" (*βρῶσις*, v. 55); thus showing that, under all changes of *dress*, He had carried through one unchanged *body* of truth. The same thing is evident in the recurrence, at the *very close* of the discourse, of *another* term, which He had used just after its *opening*. In the thirty-second verse He took up the allusion to the *manna*, and called himself the "true *bread* (*τον ἄρτον*) from heaven." In the fifty-eighth verse He says of "his flesh" (a mere synonym for himself), "*This* is that *bread* which came down from heaven." "Whosoever *eateth* this *bread* (*τὸν ἄρτον*) shall live forever." These two correspondences are a double chain, linking all the figurative parts of the discourse together, and, in fact, making them all but a single dress, though of several folds, inwrapping the one vital body of truth, which Christ sought to illustrate and commend to the understanding of His hearers. Whether, at the opening of His discourse, He exhorts them to labor for that *meat* which himself would give—and then, near its close, says that *His flesh* is *meat* indeed—or whether, near its opening, He calls *himself* the true *bread* from heaven, and then, at its close, says that *His flesh*

is that *bread*, He equally shows that, while the *figure* is *manifold*, the *thought* is *one;* HIS FLESH—that is, HIMSELF—*given for the life of the world through* FAITH.

It is, of course, self-evident, that if, in all this, Christ draws His manifold figure from past and passing incidents, and not from the future crucifixion scene, there can not be, in the last paragraph of the discourse (that great key-text of the doctrine of the Eucharist as it has been exhibited), any allusion to what this doctrine terms "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ," as conveyed in and by the consecrated elements and the hands of him who dispenses them. If that discourse draw not its dress from a yet future *cross*, this dress *can not* cover that meaning of *sacramental* eating and drinking which lives only in *sight*, and at the *foot*, of the cross.

If the true doctrine of this discourse were to be stated in somewhat fuller terms than those of the very brief summary just given, it might be stated thus: "As the Divine Son of God, I am come into the world to be the bread of life, the true and only Savior from sin. Without me there can be no salvation. Without *coming* to me, therefore, and *believing* on me, no one who hears my Gospel can receive the salvation which I bring. And *whosoever*, under the *drawing* and *teaching* of my Divine Father, thus comes and believes, wherever his lot may be cast, and however destitute of *outward* privileges he may be, has *thereby* eternal life, and, continuing steadfast in his faith, shall never perish." Here, indeed, we have a truth which lies at the *very heart* of the Gospel; which makes this Gospel what its name signifies, "*glad tidings;*" and which pours into the evangelic temple a glory that outshines all other glories: but we have not one word about the sacrament; not one word to divert our thoughts from Christ himself to any outward rite in which His atoning work might subsequently be symbolized.

This sixth chapter of John, then, though it thus luminously displays the Gospel of Christ, has yet nothing to do with an illustration of the *nature* of the Lord's Supper. Its 53d and three following verses are *wrongly quoted*, when they are brought to illustrate this point. There is no ultimate reason, or authority, for thus quoting them, but *naked* assumption; and this assumption, by however many *post*-Nicene writers it may have been made, can not bear the intense light which pours against it from out of the very centre of the Divine Record itself. It may be well to add, that, did my object require it, and the limits assigned to my treatise admit, it would be very easy to show that the view which I have taken of this chapter is fairly consonant with the theology of the *ante*-Nicene Fathers, and substantially sustained by the authority of the best standard Biblical interpreters in our own Church.

My examination of John vi. has occupied considerable time; not so much, however, as the importance of the subject would have justified. I have not attempted a complete analysis, nor an exhausting commentary on the chapter; but only such an analysis of the Discourse into its *principal* parts, and such a commentary on its *chief* truth, as were necessary for my purpose; that of showing that we *can not* have recourse to this chapter, nor to *any part* of it, for an explanation of *the nature* of that solemn ordinance, which was, more than a year afterward, instituted at the last Paschal Supper of Christ with His disciples. How far this purpose has been effected it must be left for candid minds to judge. This much, however, must be acknowledged: the authority of Scripture, as it here forces its own explanation, is greater than that of any merely *assumed* meaning, however imposing be the array of names, whether from middle, or from modern ages, upon which this assumed meaning may be shown to rest. And this would be the case, even were there no *counter-array* of names in support of the view

which has been taken. When the Bible clearly and consistently explains itself, its authority carries a power of weight which, at least with all sound Protestant minds, bears down and sweeps away the opposing authority of all human names; the more so, when these names are gathered, not from the purest, but from the more corrupt ages and portions of the Church.

2. I pass now to a brief notice of *another* passage, usually cited in support of that view of *the nature* of the Lord's Supper which is here opposed. It is found in the tenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (v. 16), and is in these words: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not *the communion* of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not *the communion* of the body of Christ?"

In interpreting this passage, two things are taken for granted by those who hold the view just named: 1. That the real body and blood of Christ are *verily* present *with* the consecrated elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper: 2. That the word rendered *communion* means *communication*, or *conveyance;* and that, therefore, the bread and wine *communicate*, or *convey*, that real body and blood to the faithful recipient.*

But this interpretation can not stand, unless it be first *proved* that the real body and blood of Christ, "the very body and blood," which were offered in "sacrifice for sin,"† *are*, in themselves, as well as by their *representatives*, present with the elements in the Supper; nor unless it can be

* "The bread which we break is the *κοινωνία*, communion, or *communication*, of the body of Christ;" that whereby His body is *given*, and the faithful are made partakers of it."—*Tracts*, vol. i., p. 205, N. Y.

Dr. Pusey renders the other part of the expression thus: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not *the participation* of the blood of Christ?" attaching, of course, to *this participation* the idea which runs through his discourse.—*Sermon before the University of Oxford*, p. 10.

† See Pusey's Discourse, p. 9.

shown that the Greek word rendered "*communion*," truly carries in it the *active* sense of a *communication*, or *conveyance*. Neither of these things is *expressed* in the passage; neither is *proved* by those who quote the passage; but both are *assumed*, as being intended. This, however, is to assume most important points; the very points in controversy on this subject; the very things which are to be settled. It is easy to *say* that a certain text has a certain sense; and if we grant it *because* it is said, we may, indeed, have an "end of controversy;" yet we may not have *the truth* in that "end." *How* are Christ's body and blood connected with the Eucharist? And *how* are the bread and the cup the *communion* of His body and blood? These are questions which we must not allow any one to settle for us by a word. We must look at the Scriptures themselves, and seek to draw from them their own decision.

As to the former of these questions, then, without anticipating what is to be said of it hereafter, it will suffice for the present to say, that this passage, 1 Corinthians, x., 16, leaves it untouched. It says that "the bread and wine are the communion of the body and blood of Christ," without saying either *where* or *what* that body and blood are. We may have the communion of an *absent* thing; and if, as it is said, "the very body and blood which were broken and shed on the cross" be here meant, we *necessarily* have the communion of things absent. That body and blood no longer exist; unless (contrary to what St. Paul teaches) "flesh and blood *can* inherit the kingdom of God." The body and blood which were broken and shed on the cross have been changed from corruptible to incorruption, and from mortal to immortality. They have become Christ's "*glorious body*," a spiritualized form, which is *no longer* "*flesh and blood*." *Necessarily*, therefore, I repeat it, if the "flesh and blood" which were offered on *the cross* be intended in this passage, we have, in the Lord's Supper, the

communion of *things absent*. And so we actually have, let this passage mean what it may. That flesh and blood, so offered, were the very sacrifice for sin, through which, *by faith*, we are pardoned and saved; and with them, in the character of that sacrifice, we are unquestionably concerned in the mystery of the Supper. But, then, it is with them as *absent*, and not with them as *present*, things. *They can not* be present, in any other sense than that of being present by their *representatives*.

As to the latter of the questions, "*How* are the bread and cup in the Lord's Supper the *communion* of the body and blood of Christ?" I remark, that the interpretation which renders the original of the word "*communion*" into the similarly *sounding*, but not similarly *significant* term, "*communication*," appears to be wholly unfounded. Κοινωνία means *fellowship*, *partnership*, *common* sharing of somewhat among several persons. It expresses the *passive* condition of an object, which is shared *in common* by a plurality of individuals—not the *active* sense of *communicating* that object to them. It means, "*possessing*, or *enjoying*, *in common*"—not *impartation*, or *conveyance*. Understood in this, its right sense, there is no difficulty in the passage. True Christians, at the Lord's Supper, have *fellowship*, or a *common share*, in the very body and blood of Christ, as they were actually offered on the cross, a sacrifice for sin. But they have this fellowship, this common share, in them as *necessarily absent* things; or as things present only by their divinely-ordained *representatives*. And the *medium* by which they hold this fellowship of interest in the *absent* body and blood of their crucified Lord, is, as our Church defines it, *faith*. "*Faith*," here as elsewhere, "is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen." Looking at its ordained *symbols*, faith makes the very sacrifice on the cross *appear* present; and enables the Christian to realize his *interest* in that sacrifice, as effectually as though

he had been on Calvary, when the cry sounded "*It is finished;*" and as though he had then laid a believing hand on the very head of his accepted substitute.

A company of men may have *fellowship*, a *joint* and *common right*, in an *absent* estate, though it be on the opposite side of the globe, and no one of them have ever seen it; and when the sure and stated *income* reaches them, they are as well satisfied as though the estate itself lay at their very doors, or as though its value were counted and deposited in their hands. The title deed by which they hold it is in their possession, and it is *good;* no one can dispossess them of it, and it is to them *the visible evidence and representative* of the absent treasure which they hold, and enjoy in common.

Thus, the great company of faithful Christians have *fellowship*, a *joint* and *common interest*, in the *absent* body and blood of Christ, as actually offered in sacrifice for their sins upon the cross. With the Divine revenue of holy comfort, hope, and strength, which infallibly reaches them from their unseen treasury of blessings, they are sweetly satisfied. The covenant, by which they hold and enjoy their common interest in it, is in their actual possession. The *great seal* of that covenant, in the consecrated symbols of the Lord's Supper, is often exhibited to their eyes. And from this visible evidence, this sensible assurance, that their title is good, that "He is faithful who hath promised," their faith gathers its richest income of present and of satisfying benefits. Thus is it that "the cup of blessing which we bless, and the bread which we break, are to them the *communion* of the very body and blood of Christ;" of the very sacrifice which was offered for their sins on the cross.

The idea which I have now presented of *communion* or *fellowship* in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, as represented at the Lord's Table, is, I think, sustained by what follows the words which have been explained.

The apostle having said that the elements in the Supper are the *communion* of the body and blood of Christ, adds, "For we, being many, are one bread, one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." That is, "in this communion, we, though *many*, are yet *united* into *one fellowship*, the mystical body of Christ; a union and fellowship represented by *the one* bread, of which we are all partakers." "Behold Israel after the *flesh;* are not they which eat of the sacrifices *partakers* (κοινωνοὶ) of the altar?" "Have they not a *fellowship*, not *literally* in the *altar itself*, but in that which the altar *furnishes?*" So, also, in applying the argument, might it be said, "Behold Israel after the *Spirit;* the great *company* of faithful Christians; are not they who eat and drink the consecrated elements *partakers* (κοινωνοὶ) of the body and blood of Christ? Have they not a *fellowship*, not literally in the very body and blood which were offered in sacrifice for sin, but in what the sacrifice of that body and blood supplies—pardon and peace through faith, present adoption and eternal life?" Or take the case of the heathen: "What say I of this? That the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? No; but that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *devils*, and not to *God;* and I would not that ye should *have fellowship* (κοινωνοὺς γίνεσθαι) with devils. Ye can not drink the cup of *the Lord* and the cup of *devils.* Ye can not be partakers of the Lord's Table and of the table of devils." That is, "fellowship with *Christ*, and fellowship with *devils*, in the sacred rites performed to each, are utterly incompatible things; and partaking, not *literally of the tables themselves*, but of what is present *on* the tables of *both*, is an impious profanation of Christ's ordinance."

It is observable in the language which I have thus paraphrased, that, when the word κοινωνοὶ comes to be joined with *devils*, our translation renders it, not *partakers*, but "*fel-*

lowship." *Fellowship* with devils is an intelligible idea, but *partakers of* devils, if intelligible, is also absurd. The term should have had the rendering of "*fellowship*" throughout the passage, as more faithful to the true sense. Men may have "*fellowship* with devils," but can not be "*partakers of* devils." So the Jews had *fellowship* in the *benefits* of the altar, but could not be *partakers of* the *altar itself.* In like manner, faithful Christians have *fellowship together* in the *benefits* of Christ's death and passion, but *can not* be *partakers of* the very body and blood which were offered in sacrifice for their sins.*

This passage, then, in the writings of St. Paul, does not sustain that view of the Lord's Supper which I have presented. It is only by the usual way of *assuming* a meaning for it that it can be forced to speak the language of that view. The passage, *interpreted*, speaks the language of the only sound theology on this subject.

3. I come now to an examination of that important Scripture, the instituting words of Christ; for really this is the only remaining passage which it will be necessary to examine. There are, it is true, other passages in the New Testament which relate to the Lord's Supper, but they are merely incidental allusions to it, or to the naked fact of its administration, and contain nothing which can help us to an understanding of its *nature.* Thus, in one place, the ordinance is spoken of as a "coming together to *break bread*" (Acts, xx., 7); and in another, as "eating *the Lord's Sup-*

* Κοινωνοὶ τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι really ought to be rendered "to be partakers *of* devils," if κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος, καὶ τοῦ ἄιματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be translated, on Dr. Pusey's principle, "a participation *of* the body and blood of Christ." The truth is, that the proper rendering of each is as I have paraphrased them. The former means, "to be *the fellows* of devils," or, as our translation renders it, "to *have fellowship* with them;" while the latter means, "the *fellowship* of the body and blood of Christ." The *former* is that *fellowship* in which the wicked are influenced and governed by the devil; the *latter* is that *fellowship* in which Christians are influenced and benefited by the body and blood of Christ.

per" (1 Cor., xi., 20); the latter phrase corresponding with that noticed a few moments since, of being "partakers of *the Lord's Table*."—1 Cor., x., 21. Upon such expressions, therefore, it will not be necessary to pause. The *nature* of this ordinance must be learned mainly from the words of Christ, in which it was instituted. To these words, then, let us now, with all earnestness, attend.

The writers who give the instituting words are the evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and the Apostle Paul; to this last of whom they were specially revealed. As given by these writers, they are substantially the same. St. Matthew, indeed, is the only one who, in connection with the giving of the cup, records the expression concerning the blood; that it was "shed for many *for the remission of sins*." But the idea here *expressed* is *implied* in what the others record in common with him, in these words: "Blood of the New Testament," and "the New Testament in my blood;" since this New Testament, or, rather, *New Covenant* (διαθήκης), includes the promise of *remission of sins*. It is also true, that St. Paul is the only one who records the important expression, "*This do in remembrance of me*," in connection with the giving both of the *bread* and of the *cup*. St. Luke records it only in connection with the giving of the *bread*, while St. Matthew and St. Mark omit it altogether. But, then, its record by *two* out of the four, to one of whom it was *specially* revealed, is enough to assure us that it formed a part of Christ's words at the institution, and that it is essential to a right understanding of the *nature* of the ordinance. So the first two evangelists *record* what St. Luke and St. Paul *omit*, *the* "*giving of thanks*" after Christ had taken the *cup;* while, in like manner, the *latter* two *record* what the *former* two *omit*, the "*giving of thanks*" after He had taken the *bread;* or, rather, the former two say that "He took bread and *blessed it*," instead of saying that "He took it and *gave thanks*." But the same remark applies to

this as to the last case. It is enough that any one of them *records* an expression which the others omit. It shows that the expression was used at the institution. Once more: St. Matthew alone records the valuable words in connection with the cup, "*Drink ye all of this.*" St. Mark merely says, "*They all drank of it*;" while St. Luke and St. Paul wholly omit the expression. But, then, the comment in St. Mark *implies* the command in St. Matthew, while the omission of it by the other two is no contradiction. Again: the first two evangelists use the words, "*This is my blood* of the New Testament," while St. Luke and St. Paul say, "*this cup* is the New Testament in my blood." And yet these are but slightly varying expressions of the same general idea. And, finally, St. Paul says, "This is my body which is *broken* for you," while St. Luke says, "This is my body which is *given* for you." This difference, however, is immaterial, as is also the fact that St. Matthew and St. Mark record the circumstance, that Christ, having taken the *bread* and the *cup*, "*gave them to the disciples*," while St. Luke records it only of the *bread*, and St. Paul omits it altogether. It is sufficient that *the main words* in the form of institution are the same in all; and that, by comparing the four records, we doubtless obtain the whole of that important language of Christ on which is based the *authority*, and from which must be deduced the *nature* of this precious ordinance. This work of comparison has been partly done by the framers of our Communion Service. They evidently took, for the basis of our form of consecration, the words of Christ as specially revealed to the Apostle Paul, incorporating and harmonizing with them such expressions as are peculiar to one or more of the three evangelists. As more fully harmonized, the whole form of institution and consecration stands thus:

"The Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when He had given thanks, or bless-

ed, He brake it, and *gave it to His disciples*, saying, Take, eat; this is my body, which is *given* and broken for you; do this in remembrance of me. After the same manner, also, He took the cup, when He had supped; and *when He had given thanks, He gave it to them*, saying, *Drink ye all of this* (*and they all drank of it*); for *this is my blood of the New Testament;* this cup is the New Testament in my blood, *which is shed for you and for many for the remission of* sins. Do this, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

The words in italics show what is taken from the evangelists, because not recorded by St. Paul; while the beginning, the close, and the general order of the form evince that the framers of our service adopted the words of St. Paul, rather than those of the evangelists, as the *basis* of the form.

It is not my purpose, at this stage of the discussion, to examine *all* the parts of this form of institution and consecration. This purpose confines me, for the present, to the meaning of the words "*This is my body*," and "*This is my blood*," since upon that meaning the whole controversy concerning *the nature* of this ordinance turns.

From what has already been said, we can very easily anticipate the meaning put upon these instituting words by the advocates of that theory of the Lord's Supper which I have exhibited. The notion, that the very body and blood of Christ must, some how, be received into the body and soul of the Christian in order to their joint immortal life in blessedness, having, in the growingly impure ages of the Church, obtained possession of men's minds, and this notion having found the shadow of a cover in that strongly-figurative language from the sixth chapter of John, which I have examined, it was, of course, brought forward from that chapter, and applied to the interpretation of the instituting words themselves. Hence it was argued, that when, on

the eve of His crucifixion, Christ took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to the disciples, saying, "Take, eat; *this is my body;*" and when, on the same occasion, He took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, "Drink ye all of this, for *this is my blood* of the New Testament," He must be understood as saying that, by the *miraculous* energy of His blessing and giving of thanks, the bread and the wine which He held in His hands became indeed, not only the ordained *signs* and *symbols* of His body and His blood, but also His very body and blood themselves. This was considered necessary to make His words *true;* and to deny this was then, as now, by the advocates of the theory, accounted daring presumption, deserving excommunication from the Church.*

Now, that our blessed Savior spake *truth* when He said, "This is my body, this is my blood," and that he who charges the Divine Teacher with falsehood in these words is deserving of excommunication, can not be denied by any one who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ. But the real question here is, not whether Christ spake *truth* in those words, but what *is* the truth which His words convey? The *true* meaning of His words *must* be received by every Christian; and yet, not the less *necessarily*, *must* a false meaning of them be *rejected.* What, then, *is* the true meaning of the words, "This is my body, this is my blood?"

* "Those words which our blessed Savior used in the institution of the blessed sacrament of the Eucharist, 'This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood, which is shed for you, for the remission of sins,' are held and acknowledged by the Universal Church to be most true and infallible; and if any one dares oppose them, or call in question Christ's veracity, or the truth of His words, or refuse to yield his sincere assent to them, except he be allowed to make a mere figment, or a bare figure of them, *we can not and ought not either excuse or suffer him in our churches;* for we must embrace and hold, for an undoubted truth, whatever is taught by Divine Scripture."—*Tracts*, vol. i., p. 190, N. Y., quoted from Cosin, Bishop of Durham.

The right answer to this question settles the whole controversy.

1. In seeking this right answer, I observe, first, the notion of this sacrament against which I am reasoning, is, so far as it is drawn from the present text, based on the assumption that the words of Christ, "*Take, eat*," and "*Drink ye all of this*," refer, not *back* in the sentence to the *bread* and the *wine*, which He had just taken up, but *forward* to His *body* and His *blood*, which He was about to name. It is a notion which really requires us to paraphrase the text thus: "And as they were eating, Jesus took *bread*, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take, eat my *true* and *real body; this* which I hold in my hands has, by the marvelous power of *my blessing*, *become* that body.' Then, also, He took *the cup*, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of my *true* and *real blood; this* which I hold in the cup has, by the mysterious energy of my thanksgiving, *become* that blood;'"* a paraphrase which needs but to be expressed in

* Even *Calvin* retained something of this notion, as is shown by Cosin, in his treatise. The following is part of the quotation which this author makes from Calvin's writings: Christ "declares that His flesh is the food and His blood the drink of my soul, and my soul I offer to Him to be fed by such nourishment. He bids me *take*, *eat*, and *drink* His *body* and *blood*, which in His holy Supper He offers me under the symbols of bread and wine; I make no scruple but He doth reach them to me, and I receive them." Again, "Except one presumes to call God a deceiver, he will never dare to say that the symbols are empty, and that Christ is not *in them*." Again, "We most firmly believe that, receiving the *signs* of the body, we also certainly receive *the body itself*." Again, "The Son of God offers daily to us, in the holy sacrament, *the same body* which He once offered in sacrifice to His Father." — *Tracts*, vol. i., p. 196, 197; *Cosin's* quotations from *Calvin*.

The above language is, indeed, susceptible of a Protestant explanation; and yet, like some expressions in our "Homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ," it shows how deeply the minds of the Reformers had become imbued with the *language* on this subject of an earlier and an impure age, even though they rejected the erroneous *meaning* of that language.

words to be at once rejected, inasmuch as it involves the plain impossibility that the yet uncrucified Jesus actually held in His hands the body from which He was speaking, and the blood which was then coursing through His veins!

2. But, secondly, I observe that this view of the sacrament rests on *another* assumption: that the substantive verb, "*IS*," in the text, *has* and *can* have *no* other force than that of its proper and *literal* signification; that it means, and *must* mean, simply and *literally*, "*IS*." Let us see whether this assumption have any ground of support.

It must be remembered, then, that, in the time of our Savior, the *spoken* language of Judea, in which He and His disciples conversed, was not the *Greek*, in which the evangelists have *written* His history and His discourses, but the Syro-Chaldaic, or Hebræo-Aramean, as the then current dialect of the ancient *Hebrew tongue*. Besides other historic evidence, we have that of the New Testament itself to the fact here noticed. Hence, when Jesus met the persecuting Paul on his way to Damascus, the latter "heard a voice speaking unto him, and saying, in *the Hebrew tongue*, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" &c.—Acts, xxvi., 14. And hence, when Paul would address and calm the excited multitude of his countrymen in Jerusalem, from whose murderous hands the chief captain had just rescued him, he stood on the steps of the Castle of Antonia, and spake to them, not as the chief captain expected he would, in "*Greek*," but "in the *Hebrew tongue*." "And when they heard that he spake in the *Hebrew tongue* to them, they kept the more silence," while, in their own familiar speech, he proceeded to tell the wonderful story of his own conversion.—Acts, xxi, 30–40; xxii., 1–21.

Now it is well known that the Hebrews, and those neighbor nations whose languages were cognate with their own, although they had verbs expressive of something like the sense of our words, *to signify, to mean, to denote, to repre-*

sent, to typify, to symbolize, yet rarely *used* them in discourse. When they wished to say that one thing *signified* or *represented* another, they *customarily* said the one *was* the other; and, in saying so, they were not liable to be misapprehended. Their intended meaning was perfectly well understood.

So deeply rooted in the genius of these languages was the idiom to which I refer, that I am not aware of the occurrence, in the *Hebrew Scriptures*, of any one *verb* which has the sense of our words to *signify*, to *represent*, and their various synonyms. The noun, "*sign*," and its plural, "*signs*," are of frequent occurrence, carrying the sense of *miracle, prodigy, index, military standard;* but it has no corresponding *verb*, and, if it had, that verb would be of no avail in the present inquiry. There is, indeed, *one* verb in our *English translation* of the *Hebrew Scriptures*, which, if it had any correspondent in the *original*, would be of some importance here. It occurs in the following passages: "What *mean* these seven ewe lambs?"—Gen., xxi., 29. "What *mean* ye by this service?"—Ex., xii., 26. "What *mean* the testimonies"—"which the Lord our God hath commanded you?"—Deut., vi., 20. "What *mean* ye by these stones?"—Josh., iv., 6. "What *mean* ye that ye beat my people to pieces?"—Isa., iii., 15. "Know ye not what these things *mean?*"—Ezek., xvii., 12. "What *mean* ye that ye use this proverb?"—Ezek., xviii., 2. That is, What do all these things *signify*, or *represent?* It happens, however, as any one who reads his *Hebrew Bible* will see, that in the *original* there is no word corresponding with our English word *mean*, in the translation. There is an ellipsis; and the questions in Hebrew run thus: "What — these seven ewe lambs?" "What — this service to you?" and so of the others; and there can, I presume, be no doubt, that if an Israelite were to supply the ellipsis in all such cases, he would do so by simply inserting the substantive

verb *are*, or *is;* so that the questions written in full would read, "What *are* these seven ewe lambs?" "What *is* this service to you?" and the like.* The truth is, as I have said, the *Hebrews* and their cognates in language were not accustomed to use *any* verb in expressing the idea *to signify, to represent, to symbolize.* Ordinarily, in expressing the typical, or representative relation, they either used the substantive verb which means "*to be*," or, more frequently, made an *ellipsis*, which any Hebræist would supply by *inserting that verb.* Thus, when Moses would express the idea that the ancient Paschal Lamb *signified*, or *represented* the Lord's Passover, he says, "It *is* the Lord's Passover." —Exod., xii., 11.

To show that this sense of the Hebrew verb "*to be*" is not got up to sustain a theory, and to avoid a difficulty, I give a few of the numerous passages in which it occurs. When Joseph was interpreting the dreams of Pharaoh, he said, "The seven good kine *are* seven years: and the seven empty ears *shall be* seven years of famine."—Gen., xli., 26–27. So, when one of the heavenly ones was explaining to Daniel the vision with which the prophet had been favored, he said, "These great beasts, which are four, *are* four kings." "The fourth beast *shall be* the fourth kingdom." "And the ten horns out of this kingdom *are* ten kings."—Dan., vii., 17, 23, 24. So, also, when Joseph was

* In two passages, the Hebrew, אָמַר, "*dixit*," "*he said*," is rendered, in its plural form, as though it had the force of our verb *intend*, or *mean*. Vide Josh., xxii., 33; 2 Chron., xxviii., 13. But I see no necessity for departing from the usual sense of the word in those places. Thus, Josh., xxii., 33, may be rendered, "The children of Israel blessed God, and *spake* not to go up against them in battle." So, also, 2 Chron., xxviii., 13, may be rendered, "Ye are *speaking* to add to our sins." "What ye *propose* to do with the captives would greatly aggravate our guilt." Even, however, if the primitive sense of אָמַר were, "*he intended*," "*meant*," or "*designed*," instead of "*he spake*," or "*said*," it would not be the sense required in expressing the idea of one thing's *signifying, representing*, or *symbolizing* another.

interpreting the dreams of the butler and the baker of King Pharaoh, and when Daniel was interpreting the various mysteries which were proposed to him, their language abounded in similar forms of expression.—Gen., xl., 12, and 18; and the Book of Daniel, ii., 37, 38; iv., 20–22; viii., 20, 21. In two of the passages which I have recited, Gen., xli., 27, and Dan., vii., 23, the substantive verb is *expressed;* in the others it is *omitted;* as is the case in the language of Moses, when he says of the lamb, "It *is* the Lord's Passover." In none of the cases, however, would any Hebræist think of supplying the ellipsis with any other than the substantive verb.

This same peculiarity of the *Hebrew* language manifests itself very strongly in the influence which it had over the idioms of that peculiar form of the *Greek* in which the inspired penmen of the *New Testament* wrote, and which, by way of distinction, is sometimes called *Hebrew-Greek;* because the writers, being mostly Jews, although they wrote in Greek *words,* yet instinctively abounded in Hebrew *idioms.* The instances in which this influence of the *Hebrew* of the *Old* over the *Greek* of the *New* Testament manifests itself, in the use of the substantive verb to express the idea of *signifying, representing,* &c., are numerous. I add some of the more prominent, as illustrations of the remark.

When Christ was explaining "the parable of the tares of the field," he said to His disciples, "The field *is* the world; the good seed *are* the children of the kingdom; but the tares *are* the children of the wicked one: the enemy that sowed them *is* the devil; the harvest *is* the end of the world, and the reapers *are* the angels."—Matt., xiii., 38–39. Again: when St. Paul was explaining the miracle by which Moses gave the people water from the rock in the wilderness, he said, "They drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock *was* Christ."—1 Cor., x., 4. And, finally, when Christ himself, in the sublime visions of

the Apocalypse, was explaining the mystery which had been exhibited to the beloved disciple, He said, "The seven stars *are* the angels of the seven Churches, and the seven candlesticks *are* the seven Churches."—Rev., i., 20.

These references, both to the Old and to the New Testament, in illustration of the idiom in question, might be made more full and complete; but they have already extended far enough to show both the nature and the strength of the argument which they furnish, and by which the meaning of Christ in the instituting words before us is demonstrated. In all the references which I have made, the substantive verb clearly has the sense of *signifying*, *representing*, or *symbolizing;* and no Hebrew who reads them would ever *think* of understanding them in any other sense. To take a few of the instances as examples, their true *English* would run thus: "The seven good kine *represent* seven years, and the seven empty ears *represent* seven years of famine." "The fourth beast *represents* the fourth kingdom." "The field *represents* the world, and the reapers *represent* the angels." "This Lamb *symbolizes* the act of the Lord's Passover." "They drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock *typified*, or *symbolically represented* Christ."

But, if this be the true and unquestionable force of these, and the numerous similar expressions which are scattered so profusely through the *Hebrew* and the Hebrew-*Greek* Scriptures, and which open to us one of the most deeply-rooted idioms of Oriental speech, by what law, I pray, is it that we, or any other interpreters, may set ourselves at work to show that, in the instituting words, which are a perfectly analogous idiomatic expression, our Savior dropped the forms of His own native tongue and assumed that *literal* meaning of the

verb "is," which obliges us to maintain that He was then working the *impossible miracle* of holding in his hands not only the *ordained symbols* of His body and blood, but also His *very body and blood themselves?* Why resort to such a straining and violent force upon language, when the customary sense of the words is so plain and so satisfying?

The paschal lamb, we know, was one of the great Old Testament *types* of Christ. Hence (1 Cor., v., 7), St. Paul calls Christ "*our Passover.*" So the rock which Moses smote in the wilderness we are justified in considering a remarkable *symbol* of Christ, the Rock of our Salvation, smitten for our sins, and pouring forth the reviving waters, the never-failing stream of eternal life.—1 Cor., x., 4. And it would have been just as reasonable, if the Jews had taken the words of Moses, "This *is* the Lord's Passover," and argued from them that the Paschal lamb was not only a *symbol* of the Lord's act in *passing over* their dwellings and sparing their first-born at the sight of the blood sprinkled on their lintels, but also, by a marvelous transubstantiation, *his very act itself* of thus passing over and sparing them; or, it would be just as admissible if we should now take the words of St. Paul, "That rock *was* Christ," and argue from them that the rock which Moses smote in the wilderness was not only a *symbol* of Christ, but also, by some mysterious change, nothing less than *Christ himself;* as it is to take the instituting words before us, "This *is* my body, this *is* my blood," and argue from them that the bread and the wine, in the Lord's Supper, are not only the divinely-constituted *symbols* or *representatives* of the body and blood of Christ, as offered in sacrifice for our sins, but also, by some mysterious transformation, that *very body and blood themselves!* To say truth, all this is utter force on the natural and simple

meaning of these instituting words. The verb "is" here has not its *primitive* and *literal*, but its *derived* and *idiomatic* meaning; a meaning which must have been perfectly well understood when the Divine Speaker uttered it; and the true sense of the language may, with the utmost fidelity to its *spirit*, as well as to its *grammar*, be thus expressed: "This bread and this wine *represent* my body and my blood;" "I hereby constitute these elements significant and perpetual *symbols* of that atoning sacrifice for sin, which on the shameful cross I am about to offer."

Having thus carefully examined these instituting words of Christ, and having formerly given such a paraphrase of them as is required by that view of the Lord's Supper which I am opposing, it is proper now to paraphrase them in conformity with the sense which they really express. Taking, then, the whole passage, as I have harmonized it from the writings of the evangelists and of St. Paul, it may be thus more fully set forth:

"The Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when, according to Paschal custom, he had given thanks, or pronounced the blessing over it, He brake it and gave it to His disciples, saying, '*Take, eat this* BREAD. *This* REPRESENTS *my body*,' which, as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, is already given and broken for your salvation. 'Do this yourselves, and enjoin it on my Church, as a perpetual *memorial of me*, and of my sacrifice for the sins of the world.' After the same manner, also, He took the cup, when he had supped; and when, according to the custom of the feast, he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, '*Drink ye all of this* CUP' (which they all accordingly did), '*for this* REPRESENTS *my blood of the new covenant*; this cup is the *symbol* and *seal* of

that new covenant, which hath "*force*" through the blood already virtually shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins. Do this yourselves, and enjoin it to be done by my Church, *in remembrance of me;*' for a perpetual memorial of my atoning death and sacrifice, wherever and whenever, till my coming again, that death and sacrifice shall be celebrated."

Separated from the body of the paraphrase, the words which have been more particularly examined stand thus: "Jesus took bread, blessed, brake, and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'Take, eat *this bread;* this *represents* my body, which is given for you.' He took also the cup, gave thanks, and distributed it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of *this cup;* for this *represents* my blood, which, according to the new covenant, is shed for the remission of sins.'" This paraphrase, as it will be seen, makes the words, "Take, eat," "Drink ye all of this," refer *back* in the sentence to the *bread* and the *cup* which Christ had first taken into his hands, and not *forward*, as in the paraphrase before given, to the *body* and the *blood* which He was about to name; and I am now willing that others should judge for themselves whether the former paraphrase or the latter gives the true meaning of Christ in these most important words.

It is observable that, in all the passages which I have cited, whether from the Old Testament or from the New, as illustrative of the idiomatic character of Christ's instituting words, the speakers were *explaining* something *significant*. I add, so, evidently, was Christ, in the language before us. In *breaking and blessing the bread*, and in *pouring the wine into the cup* with thanks, He had performed *most deeply significant* acts; acts which He intended His ministers should *copy* to the end of time. These acts, therefore, He must needs *explain*, to the end that they might ever be rightly understood by

the unbiased mind. He took the bread and brake it. He took the wine and poured it forth. These were His momentously *significant acts*. Their *explanation* immediately followed. Of the *bread* He said, "*This* is *my body*;" and of the *wine*, "*This* is *my blood*;" using a customary idiom of their native tongue which His disciples doubtless perfectly well understood to mean, "This *represents* my body; this *represents* my blood." Hence, in speaking of the Supper themselves, before superstition had crept into the Church, and, with her transforming touch, had wrought up a Divine memorial into an unutterable mystery, they gather round it no words of dark and awful import; they simply name it, "the Breaking of Bread;" "the Lord's Supper;" "the Lord's Table;" "the *Communion* of the Body and Blood of Christ." And, considering the work which, in more modern days, Truth hath wrought in unweaving the thick spells of superstition from around the monument of Himself which Christ hath left in His Church, I confess it appears a matter for profoundest wonder that any in our own Protestant Church should be found eager to weave once more the fearful covering of mystery and of miracle, and therewith to enshroud again in terrible pomp these blessed memorials of their Savior's death and sacrifice for sin. Through the clear light of our Protestant day the very idiom of His native tongue sounds louder than ever, and, in its most intelligible tones, rebukes the strangely unnatural force which they would again put on His simple words!

In what has now been said no pretension to infallibility is urged. The Scriptures alone have been taken as a guide; and, in submission to their sole authority, there has been an honest and a prayerful endeavor to understand them. *As* thus consequently understood, they are wholly opposed to the idea that, in order to salva-

tion, it is necessary that the very body and blood of Christ should be literally given by the hands of His ministers, and received into the bodies and souls of His disciples, along with the Divine symbols by which they are represented. On this subject the Bible teaches no more than this, that, in order to salvation, Christ, as our Divine and atoning Savior, must be *believed in*, *trusted*, *loved*, and *obediently followed;* and that, in the sacrament of His Supper, we feast, *in common* with the whole *fellowship* of believers, on the *constituted symbols* which represent His death and passion, as endured in order to procure the pardon of our sins, and to render forgiveness possible to our fellow-creatures. For the contrary view no authority in the Bible is discoverable; and so far as *human* authority should justly have weight here, its teachings must be received as addressed to that *faith* which, in the sacred Supper, sees the absent body of the Savior as though present, or as present only in its divinely-communicated benefits, and in its divinely-appointed representatives; to that faith which, thus seeing Him, feeds *spiritually* on Him, to the great comfort and refreshing of the soul; so that, in the language of our Communion service, we "take and eat *bread* in *remembrance* that Christ died for us; and feed on Him in our *hearts* by *faith*, with thanksgiving."

CHAPTER IX.

THE NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

I Cor., xi., 23–26: "23. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: 24. And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, 'Take, eat: *this is my body*, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.' 25. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' 26. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

In the previous chapter, on the nature of the Lord's Supper, I exhibited a view of the subject which was deemed erroneous, and the error of which was evinced by an appeal to the Sacred Scriptures. In the present, I shall add a few comments, by way of preparing for a statement of the true Scriptural account of this institution. And let not the reader be shocked when I say that, in making these comments, I shall do what was proposed in the third place; in other words, shall set the erroneous view which has been exhibited in the light of *reason* and of *experience*. Reason and experience are sacred things. The one is that light which God hath set in the soul, and without which we can read neither his Word nor his works. The other is that Providential test, to which He himself brings, for a trial far from useless, the truth or the falsehood of all human theories. And that theory, even of this holy institution, which will not abide the test both of reason and of experience, gives at least one weighty proof that t can not abide the higher trial of God's Revealed Word.

III. The view, then, to which I advert, consists in

maintaining that the very body and blood of Christ, which were offered in sacrifice on the cross for the sins of the world, are, in a manner inexplicable by us, really present in the elements of bread and wine at the Lord's Supper; that they are thus present "*independently of faith*," or that, whether the communicant have *faith* to discern them or not, still they are there; and that the office of faith is, not merely to believe in Christ as a crucified and atoning Savior; not merely to contemplate the broken body and the shed blood of Christ, as they were offered in sacrifice on the cross; not merely to view his risen and glorified humanity, as it ascended into heaven and as it remains there at the right hand of the Father; but really to discern that broken body and that shed blood in the elements, by believing those words of Christ, "This is my body and this is my blood," which *make* them present; and to receive them into the body and the soul of the faithful communicant at the *same time and together with* the signs by which they are represented.*

This view is not content with affirming that Christ is present at his Holy Supper in His *Divine nature* as an *Infinite Spirit*, or by the special benefits of his death and sacrifice, which he communicates to his faithful disciple, but asks us to believe that His very broken body and shed blood are, however inscrutably, yet *real-*

* "Our faith doth not cause or make that presence, but apprehends it as most truly and really effected by the Word of Christ; and the faith whereby we are said to eat the flesh of Christ is *not that only* whereby we believe that He died for our sins (for this faith is required and supposed to *precede* the sacramental manducation), but more properly that whereby we believe those words of Christ, '*This is my body*,' which was St. Austin's meaning when he said, 'Why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? *Believe*, and thou hast eaten.' For in this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly receive the *substance* of Christ's body and blood *as much as if we should eat and drink both visibly*."—*Tracts*, vol. i., p. 199, N. Y., *quoted from Cosin, bishop of Durham.*

ly present with the elements; and that they are actually conveyed by the hands of the officiator, and received into the body and the soul of the Christian at the same time with those elements. And they who urge this view, call that opposite interpretation, "which regards the consecrated elements as visible symbols only of his *absent* body and blood," an "ultra-Protestant theory."*

1. Having sufficiently recalled this view of the Lord's Supper, the first remark which I have to offer upon it is this. It is based on the notion *that salvation depends on receiving into our bodies and souls the substance of the body and blood of Christ;* that there must be, somehow, a commixture and co-union of the substance of His body and blood with our bodies and souls, in order to impart to our own the incorruptibleness and the purity of His;† a commixture and co-union, indeed, which do not take place by the process of *natural* digestion, but which, nevertheless, by some unknown process, are actually effected.

This notion, it has already been shown, is unscriptural. Receiving Christ, as Christ himself explains the act, even under the strong figure of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," is *believing* on Him; being "*drawn*" to Him, "*coming* to Him," and "*seeing*" Him with that *spiritual* discernment which results from being "*taught* of God," and from having "*learned* of Him." It is *relying* on His sacrifice and righteousness, *loving* Him, and *obeying* His Word. It is taking *by faith* such a view of His nature and character, of His office and work, as to be thereby made partakers of the grace of pardon, and, through the accompanying power of the Spirit, to be influenced to newness and holiness both of heart and life. It is, by *faith*, "beholding as in a glass

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, N. Y., p. 96.

† Dr. Pusey's Sermon, p. 8, 9. Also Tracts, vol. i., N. Y., p. 206–7

the glory of the Lord" (a glass which becomes most powerfully reflecting when placed in the light of this sacrament), till "we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord."

It is now added, that receiving Christ in any other sense is as *unreasonable* as it is *unscriptural*. Neither *carnally* nor *spiritually* is the *substance* of his flesh and blood, however spiritualized, to be received into and commingled with the substance of our bodies and souls. Except simply as *faith* relies and feeds on His atoning sacrifice for pardon, adoption, and eternal life; and as thus, through the power of the Spirit, it brings *His character* into *our characters*, fashions us into a moral likeness to Him, and gives us herein the true secret of immortal life and blessedness; aside from *this* reception of Christ, there is no eating of His flesh, no drinking of His blood. He gave His body to be a sacrifice for sin; and the bread, *broken* in the Sacred Supper, *represents* the gift and the sacrifice in which it was offered. He shed His blood for the remission of our sins; and the wine *poured out* in the Divine Feast *represents* the blood and the shedding, through which it avails for remission. Yet, when we *eat* that bread and *drink* that wine, *our* act is but *love's memorial* and *faith's reception* of *His* act. We thereby "celebrate His death till He come;" while, at the same time, amid the solemnities of our commemoration, and through the sanctifyings of the Spirit, *faith* feels a quickening as it feeds on the *benefits* of His sacrifice; *love* burns with an intenser flame as it realizes *His* love for our souls; and *obedience* grows stronger with both *faith* and *love*, because the soul is rapt away into heaven, in unwonted communions with her risen Lord, the now glorified Lamb of God.

Except in such a sense, there is no eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ. The exercises which

have been described are, indeed, called a *sacramental* eating and drinking of that flesh and blood. This, however, rightly understood, means no more than receiving the Lamb of God *by faith*, while we partake of that bread and wine, which are the constituted signs of Christ crucified, and which are *figuratively* called by the name of the things signified.* But what Christ says, when He speaks of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," was, as we have seen, not spoken of sacramental eating and drinking; but, as He himself explained it, a year before instituting His Supper, it was a strongly typical expression of the act of "*coming* to Him" in the obedience of submissive hearts, and of "*believing* on Him" as the only Savior from sin; an act which every true Christian performs not only at the Lord's Supper, but also at other times; and which, if we would go guiltless, we must perform before we ever approach the Lord's Table.

In the early, and toward the Middle Ages, figurative language, like that of Christ in the sixth chapter of John, was profusely used, abounding in most florid exaggerations, and applied to the sacraments of the Gospel, apparently with the design of exalting them in the estimation of a people who had long been accustomed to the dark and hidden mysteries of Paganism; and thus of meeting the charge that the new religion was a naked system, without any deep and interior secrets. By this process *error* was at length bred; the legisla-

* "'If sacraments had not a certain similitude of those things whereof they be sacraments, they should be no sacraments at all. And of this similitude they do, for the most part, *receive the names of the self-same things they signify*.' From these words of St. Augustine, it appeareth that he alloweth the common description of a sacrament, which is, that it is a visible sign of an invisible grace; that is to say, that setteth out to the eyes and other outward senses the inward working of God's free mercy, and doth, as it were, seal in our hearts the promises of God."—*Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments*, N. Y., 1817, p. 296–7.

tion of the Church transubstantiated the *figurative* into the *literal;* and the notion that the real flesh and blood of Christ are verily given and received in the Lord's Supper took possession of the Church herself, and for ages ruled both the faith and the language of her millions. So deeply did the poison of this error infect the theology and the modes of thought and speech of the Christians of the middle ages, that it influenced the phraseology of those Reformers of the 16th century who were willing to go to the stake for discarding the very error which that phraseology had been accustomed to enwrap. And even now, to those who read much and reverentially the theological works of those ages of corruption, although such readers may for the present reject the final absurdity of transubstantiation into which the error ran, yet there is great difficulty in dispossessing their minds of the seminal principle of that absurdity—the idea that, together with the elements of bread and wine, and by the hands of those who minister, the very flesh and blood of Christ are given and received into the bodies and souls of the faithful in the Lord's Supper. To use very modern language on this subject—language which I could not make my own without a shudder—Christ's ministers are "intrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood;"* and this body and blood, "in the celebration of the holy Eucharist, are as truly *given* as they are *represented.*"† But to the spiritually enlightened as well as devout traveler into antiquity, who leaps over that immense mass of scholastic subtleties which makes even the truths of the Middle Ages dark, and who alights far back amid the unobscured truth and glory of the Age of Revelation itself, there is no difficulty in understanding that *sacramental* eating and drinking con-

* Tracts, vol. i., p. 55. † Idem, p. 214.

sist simply in receiving the divinely-constituted *symbols*, or *representations*, of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, accompanied by a living faith in the sacrifice represented, and in Him who gave himself to be that sacrifice; and that the language in which, a year before He gave himself to the cross, He spake of "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," is but a strong, though vitally important figure for what He so uniformly inculcates as the very ground of our hope of salvation; I mean the act of obediently "coming to Him," and truly "believing on Him," as the only Savior of lost men.

2. The second remark which I have to offer on this part of the subject is this: that the erroneous view which has been exhibited includes the doctrine that *pardon*, or *the remission of sins after baptism*, is not only commemorated and sealed, but also *conveyed* by this ordinance.

Of the connection of *baptism* with the remission of sins I have already spoken. That of *the Lord's Supper* with the same benefit equally demands our discriminating regards.

One of the expressions in the instituting words of Christ is to this effect: "This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many *for the remission of sins*." On the theory, then, that, by the act of consecration, the elemental bread and wine become mysteriously changed into the body and blood of Christ, it easily follows that this blood, being still shed, still poured forth, does actually *convey*, in the mystery of the sacrament, "*the remission of sins*." Hence the following language from a distinguished advocate of this theory. Having spoken of the benefits of the Lord's Supper to *Christians*, of its "gift *for the holy*," and proceeding to speak of its benefits to "*sinners*," of its "*special joy*" for the guilty, he says, "Although most

which is spoken belongs to Christians, as belonging already to the household of saints, and the family of heaven, and the communion of angels, and unity with God, still here, as elsewhere in the New Testament, there is a subordinate and subdued notion of sin" (that is, there is this notion of sin in the sacrament); so that "what wraps the *saint* already in the third heaven, may yet uphold us *sinners*, that the pit shut not her mouth upon us. The same reality of the Divine gift makes it" (the sacrament) "angel's food to the saint, *the ransom to the sinner;* and both, because it is the body and blood of Christ. Were it *only* a thankful commemoration of His redeeming love, or *only* a showing forth of His death, or a strengthening *only* and refreshing of the soul, it were, indeed, a reasonable service; but it would have no *direct healing for the sinner*. To *him* its special joy is, that it is his Redeemer's very broken body; it is His blood, which was shed *for the remission of his sins*. In the words of the ancient Church, he 'drinks his ransom;' he eateth that, 'the very body and blood of the Lord,' the only sacrifice for sin: God 'poureth out' for him yet 'the most precious blood of His only begotten.'"* Again: "This may have been another truth which our Lord intended to convey to us when He pronounced the words, as *the form which consecrates the sacramental elements into His body and blood*, that that precious blood is still, in *continuance* and *application* of His one oblation once made upon the cross, *poured out for us now*, *conveying* to our souls, as being His blood, with the other benefits of His passion, *the remission of our sins also*." "That which is in the cup," St. Chrysostom paraphrases, "is that which flowed from His side, and of that do we partake." How should we approach His sacred side, and remain leprous still? Touching with

* Dr. Pusey's Sermon, N. Y., p. 9.

our very lips that cleansing blood, how may we not, with the ancient Church, confess, "Lo, this hath touched my lips, and shall take away mine iniquities, and cleanse my sins?"*

So, then, we have the full-grown doctrine, that this sacrament brings a "*direct healing for the sinner;*" that those who fall (as all *do* fall) into actual sin after baptism may, though not Christians in the sense of being *saints*, or *holy*, go, *as sinners*, to the sacrament, "touch their lips to the blood which flowed from the side" of their Redeemer, "and remain leprous no longer;" but receive there remission of their sins, and have their iniquities taken away! And this, because Christ, by His form of words, "consecrates the sacramental elements into His body and blood!" By that perpetual miracle, "His blood is, in *continuance* and *application* of His one oblation, still poured forth for us; and still, by this continuance, *conveys* the remission of our sins."

How different this from the true doctrine of the Bible! This Word of God, interpreted by the laws of the language in which his own inspired servants spake, does not say that the words of Christ consecrate the elemental bread and wine into his body and blood. All that His words really imply is, that the bread and the wine *are* His body and His blood, in the well-known Scriptural sense of *representing* that body and that blood. Thus, by the force of its own simple, self-interpreting law, the Bible sweeps clean away the very foundation of the monstrous superstructure of doctrine which has been built on these truly reasonable words of Christ. The blood of Christ was shed for the remission of sin, *not* at *the institution of the sacrament*, but on *the Cross of Calvary;* and the pouring of the wine in the Lord's Supper is, and till the end of time will remain, but a silently-speaking *memorial* of that glorious sacrifice in which proph-

* Dr. Pusey's Sermon, N. Y., p. 10.

ecy was fulfilled, and on which hangs the hope of a world's salvation. With this, the instituting words of Christ, interpreted by the idiom of his own language, perfectly accord. "Drink ye all of this cup; for this *represents* my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Do this, as often as ye drink it, *in remembrance* of me." To convert this simple memorial into a mysteriously actual "*continuance*" of Christ's bloodshedding; to consider the body of the Church as, by a standing miracle, the *perpetuated incarnation* of Christ; and the high sacrament of the Church as that *miraculously-continued sacrifice* in which His blood still flows for the remission of sins (and this is now the undisguised form of the theory here opposed), is most evidently to fabricate a mere human notion, for which, as the Bible furnishes it no support, the Bible is in no way accountable. Every where, through the Bible, the pardon of sin is seen to depend on the shedding of the blood of atonement; every where, through the Bible, we see outward rites pointing us to this central truth of our religion; but nowhere in the Bible are we taught that the pardon of sin is *conveyed by* these outward rites.

Hear what the apostle says of these rites under the *old* dispensation. "Every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which *can never take away sins*." Hear, too, what he says of the One true sacrifice, which *does* take away sins, and which was *once* beheld by looking *forward* through the *types* of the *old* dispensation, and is *now* seen by looking *backward* through the symbols of the *new*. Speaking of Christ, as the only real, atoning High Priest, he says, that "after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins, He *forever* sat down on the right hand of God," no more to appear among men in the work of sacrifice; "for by *one offering* He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." *In Him* we "have redemption through

His blood—the forgiveness of sins." Mark, now, what follows. "Where remission of these is, *there is no more offering for sin.*" — Heb., x., 11, 12, 14, 18. Christ, by His *one* bloodshedding, having, *once for all*, opened the way of forgiveness, *all* sacrifice for sin thenceforward *ceased*. The *true* offering for sin was *full* and *complete*, when, on the cross, Jesus exclaimed, "*It is finished*," bowed his head, and died. And being *finished* then, it needs no *continuance* now, other than that *outward* revelation of the *Word*, and that *inward* revelation of the *Spirit*, which make it effectually known to *faith*. The High Sacrament of the Church is not designed to be a daily or a stated repetition, or continuance, of Christ's once and forever *perfected* sacrifice—a repeated or continual opening of the fountain of his blood, in order to render remission of sin still possible, or accessible. It is, like the types of the old dispensation, but a *silent*, *significant*, *symbolic teacher*, telling us, guilty sinners, *where to go*, *where to look*, as the *only* source to which we *can* go or look for that forgiveness, without which our everlasting perishing is sealed.

One great danger, additional to the intrinsic error, or growing out of the inherent falsehood of the teaching which directs men to this sacrament for the pardon of post-baptismal sin—a pardon authoritatively dispensed by priestly intervention — is, that multitudes of darkened souls will, as they so often have done, *stop* at the sacrament itself; *rest* in the mere *sign* for their forgiveness; and never see, *through* or *beyond* it, that grand, life-giving, soul-saving act of Christ, in which *alone* is wrapped up their everlasting salvation, and missing the *sight* of which by *faith*, they miss forever the *enjoyment* of what it offers. The teaching here indicated is too full of peril to be found in the Gospel of our salvation. It is calculated to hush myriads of otherwise uneasy consciences into a quiet indulgence in a life of actual *impenitence*, under the soothing thought that they may, if not pur-

chase a pardon with money in a mass, at least "drink" it, with "their ransom," from a chalice. To such blind self-deception, woful experience tells us, is the natural mind every where prone! It is not necessary, in this place, to speculate on the question, how far *some* minds may hold *error* here in connection with *truth;* or how far they may see *through* the error and *reach* the truth; or whether they may not thus, in *spite* of their error, be saved *through* the truth? It is enough for us to know that such power to penetrate the mists of moral darkness is not natural to the eye-sight of the human mind; and that neither is it the ordinary way of the Spirit to use *error* as a medium through which to make the *truth* apparent. It is enough for us to know that the human mind is always fearfully inclined to rest in *outward* observances, and to make a religion of *forms* a salve to the conscience when rendered sore by the neglect of a religion of *power*.

When viewed mainly as *signs*, this sacrament readily points us, by a language peculiarly its own, to the vastly important and vital thing *signified*. But, when considered as a *conferring* and *conveying* ordinance, *communicating* the pardon which it only *symbolizes* and *seals*, it proves but a *veil* to make still darker the already darkened heart of the natural man. *Christ* evidently designed His ordinances to be a system of *indices*, pointing men solely to Himself. *Error* makes them but a set of *blinds*, screening Him the more effectually from view!

What is contended for on this point is, that it is the great teaching of the Gospel, that Jesus Christ came to be "the Lamb of God, to take away the sin of the world" (John, i., 29); that He came to be this Lamb of sacrifice, by shedding His blood *on the cross;* that "whosoever believeth on Him" (thus crucified) "shall receive remission of sins" (Acts, x., 43); that He is "the end of the law for righteousness to *every one* that *believeth*" (Rom., x., 4);

that "by Him *all* that *believe* are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts, xiii., 39); in short, that "God so loved the world that *whosoever believeth* on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John, iii., 16); should receive a free forgiveness of sin, and (continuing in the faith) a full and perfect salvation. All this, and much more to the same purpose, is said in the Gospel of the remission of sin, in those unqualified, absolute, universal terms, which avail to carry the assurance of pardon and life to every believer in Jesus, wherever the knowledge of His atoning sacrifice may come; an assurance of this pardon and life to *faith* alone as the secret link of union with the Savior, and as the root of all true holiness. This teaching is the one glorious burden of the Gospel; and we can no more put it out of sight than we can put out the sun in the firmament! It opens God's way for the remission of sins; a way in which whosoever walketh shall never perish.

But, says the theory which we are examining, although the atoning sacrifice of Christ be the only *meritorious* cause of the remission of sins, yet the sacraments of the Church are the truly *instrumental* cause of this remission. The pardon which Christ *purchased* on the cross, He *conveys* through the sacraments.

Here, however, starts up the question, What, then, becomes of those myriads who have the Word of God, and hear the Gospel preached, and *believe in Christ* "*with all the heart*," and yet have not *access* to the sacraments of the Church in the only sense in which this theory understands the sacraments? a question to which the theorists have nothing to reply but this: that if such are saved, it is not by *promise*, not by *guarantee*, not by *covenant;* but in some way of which God hath been pleased to tell us nothing; perhaps by those superaboundings of grace, of which the Church, as "a vessel of mercy," is so unconfina-

bly full that they *overflow*, and reach even to those hapless believers who are providentially left (if not left *too far*) beyond the limits of *covenanted* favor. This reply, however, brings out the thoroughly unscriptural character of the theory to which it belongs. According to the Bible, *all* to whom the Gospel comes, and who truly believe in Christ, are saved, not by the vague possibilities of "*uncovenanted* mercy," but under the guarantee of *promise*, *covenant*, and *oath*. The *covenant of grace* goes with the *Word of God*, and reaches wherever that Word is received into the faith of renewed hearts. It is not circumscribed by the walls of a visible Church, especially as those walls are built by the architects of this restrictive theory. It covers with its Divine Palladium every believer in Jesus who, having that Word in which it is revealed, clasps it to his heart, and lives on its assurance. *Every* such one has, by those "two immutable things, in which it is impossible for God to lie, a strong consolation;" he is among those "*heirs of promise*" to whom "God hath more abundantly shown the immutability of His *counsel*," in that He "confirmed it by an *oath*." Such a one "hath fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before him;" and this "hope he hath as an *anchor* of the soul, both *sure and steadfast*, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the Forerunner is for us entered—even *Jesus*, made a high-priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec."—Heb., vi., 17–20. Every such believer, I repeat, is saved, not by *chance*, or by *possibility*, or by *peradventure*, but by *promise*, and under the *oath of the covenant*, whether he fall *within* or *without* those walls of the visible Church, which are drawn and reared by the hands of this limitarian theory. God hath not *two* revealed ways in which He extends remission of sins to the disciples of Jesus; He hath but *one* such way; this way *excludes* every other, wherever the knowledge of the Savior comes; and *this* way is thus marked out: "God so loved *the world*, that

He gave His only-begotten Son, that WHOSOEVER *believeth* on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

What, then, have the sacraments to do with the remission of sins, that our Church should, in her offices for baptism and the Lord's Supper, say so much of this remission in connection with those sacraments? I reply, as when the subject of baptism was under consideration, they have just *this* to do with the blessing: they are *symbols* of remission, and *seals* of the *promise* to forgive on the terms of the covenant.* *The covenant*, as bound up in *God's Word*, may go without its *seals*, as placed in the hands of *His Church*; and yet these seals, where they may be had, are not trifling things; they are of deep significancy, and of rich value; better *have* them than be *without* them; and yet, better that our right arm were palsied, than that we should attempt to stay the flight of the angel of the covenant, as He goeth forth to carry, with the "everlasting Gospel," pardon and peace to every poor sinner that will *believe*, because that Messenger of good news carrieth not with Him every where those rich and precious *seals* with which, for their *greater* comfort and benefit, He hath been pleased to favor the actual members of the Church.

3. The third remark which I have to make on the theory before us is this: *The real presence of the body and blood of Christ in this sacrament, as now so zealously taught, is a thing impossible.*

It is true, we are told by the theory that this presence is *spiritual* and *invisible*. Still, we are also told that it is *real*; that it is not an *ideal* presence; that it is not *faith*, seeing Christ's crucified body on the cross; nor *faith* seeing Christ's glorified body in heaven; but that it is his *real*

* So says the Homily, when it speaks of the sacraments as "visible signs, expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed *the promise* of free forgiveness of our sins," &c.—*Homily on Com. Prayer and Sacraments*, N. Y., 1815, p. 299.

body, sometimes described as "the very body and blood which were broken and shed on the cross,"* and at others named without any such limitations; but, whether thus defined or not, still his *real body and blood, present with the elements of the sacrament;* and thus present, whether faith discerns them or not, or though the communicant have no faith for the discernment. This, I repeat, is *impossible*. For, besides the truth taught by the apostle, that "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God"—and that, therefore, Christ's risen, and spiritualized, and glorified body has *neither flesh nor blood*, in any sense of those terms—besides this, it is a universal and necessary attribute of *body*, even in its spiritualized state, that it exists in *place*, is *limited* by place, and *can not* be present in more than *one* place at *one and the same time*. Refine, spiritualize, glorify body as we will, and render it as invisible as we may, even by the absence from it of flesh and blood, still it is *but body*, with its lines and limits, and can no more exist in *two* places at one and the same time than it can when robed in its grossest visibility.† It is, therefore, impossible that even the spiritual and glorified body of Christ should be in *heaven* and yet on *earth;* or that it should be present on earth, *at one and the same time*, in all the places where this sacrament is simultaneously administered. Of course, such a presence is still more impossible (if impossibilities may be *compared*) when predicated of the "very body and blood of Christ

* Dr. Pusey's Sermon, p. 9, N. Y.

† The English Prayer Book, in explaining the posture of *kneeling*, as required of the English communicant, says, among other things, "It is hereby declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural body and blood of our Savior Christ are in heaven, and *not here*, it being against the truth of Christ's natural body *to be at one time in more places than one*."

which were broken and shed on *the cross*," which, as composed of the corruptibilities of flesh and blood, were dropped when his glorified body sprang up from the rock of Joseph; and which, consequently, are no longer in existence any where, as a separate, organic human frame. To suppose such a presence of his body, whether under the one or the other of these forms, is to suppose that *finite body*, like *infinite spirit*, may be *omnipresent*. It is to teach as thorough an absurdity and impossibility as that the bread and wine are, by the miracle of a priestly consecration, *themselves transubstantiated* wherever this sacrament is administered, so that they are no longer bread and wine, but the true, visible body and blood of Christ; yea, as many such bodies as there are simultaneous administrations of this sacrament, or even as there are separate communicants who, at one and the same time, are held to receive, each and every one, whole and entire, the undivided body and blood, soul and divinity, of the Lord Jesus Christ!

Take this subject as it lies in the Bible, and all is simple and plain. The crucified and broken body of Christ exists for us, in its organic form, only on *the cross*, where, once for all, its great office "*was finished*." His risen and glorified body exists only and always in *heaven*, where he "is forever set down at the right hand of God." At his sacred Supper, then, wherever simultaneously administered over the face of the wide earth, *faith* takes the soul of every believer either to his cross on Calvary, or to his throne in heaven, and shows him there, according to the bent which his spirit may have received, either the pierced and bleeding form of Him who once died for his sins, or the beatified and triumphant form of Him who now reigns, his Advocate with the Father on high. No matter from what wide extremes of the earth His communing disciples thus look upon Him; *there He is*, the one gathering-point of all their worshiping thoughts, the one object of *faith's* adoring

vision to all his countless followers below; made, through their faith, the "spiritual food," and the "heavenly refection" of their longing souls.*

But the moment we adopt a theory which brings His body down either from the cross to the communion table, or from heaven to earth, and which makes Him really and bodily present in the sacrament, as simultaneously administered in numberless places, or in any two places, that moment our theory involves an impossibility; while, at the same time, it plunges the company of His followers into a sea of confusion, where waves of conjecture and imagination, of superstition and error, toss and mix themselves incessantly, leaving the inquiring mind no resting-place but that which it finds by driving through uncertainty into utter dissatisfaction; from utter dissatisfaction into perplexing doubt; and from perplexing doubt into blank unbelief!

I said the *inquiring* mind can find no resting-place but this, under such a theory. I add, some minds will be always inquiring, and, at times, the mass of mind will be roused to inquiry. The mind of man can not be, always and every where, broken into bondage, into an unquestioning submission to mere human authority, as it binds its burdens of absurdity on the backs of abject ignorance, even though it be beneath the awfully heavy rod of religious terrors that it is first made to stoop. Prone to the earth as all minds are through *sin*, and willing as many are to be fet-

* "We ought" (says the Homily, repeating "the advice of the Council of Nice"), "we ought to *lift up* our minds by *faith*, and leaving these inferior and earthly things, *there* seek it (the body of Christ) *where the Sun of Righteousness ever shineth.* Take, then, this lesson"—"that, when thou goest up to the reverend communion, to be satisfied with *spiritual* meats, thou *look up with faith* upon the holy body and blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it" (not with *thy lips*) "with *the mind*, thou receive it" (not from the hand that ministers) "with the hand of *thy heart*, and thou take it fully" (not into thy body) "with *thy inward man.*"—*Homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ*, N. Y., 1815, p. 279–80.

tered even for life in *ignorance*, yet there are always some that will not be slaves in understanding, though they may be slaves to passion; and others, who will not be slaves either in the one sense or in the other; while, at the same time, there is ever a liability to those crises, when the mass of mind will be roused from ignoble lethargy, and when those master spirits that always rise from such a "vasty deep" of agitation, will seize on the excited elements, and work them up into a tempest capable of scattering the gloomy fabrics of superstition into one wide wreck. Such crises have occurred; they may again occur; and whenever they do occur, they present those emergencies in which myriads of valuable minds are driven from their moorings in the harbor of the Church, and thus, what was intended to keep them bound to an unquestioning credulity (for it can not be called faith), results in forcing them off into cold unbelief, and even into utter atheism!

The difficulty in the theory under examination, which arises from the necessity of supposing the body of Christ to be brought from heaven to earth, and, in fact, to exist *simultaneously* in more than one place, has not been unperceived by the advocates of that theory. Hence some, although they seem disinclined to meet the difficulty in its whole breadth, yet tell us thus much: "This manner of presence is unaccountable, and past finding out; not to be searched and pried into by *reason*, but believed by *faith*. And if it seem *impossible* that the flesh of Christ should descend and come to be our food through so great a distance, we must remember how much the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds our sense and our apprehensions, and how absurd it would be to undertake to measure His immensity by our weakness and narrow capacity; and so make our *faith* to conceive and believe what our *reason* can not comprehend."*

* Tracts, vol., i., N. Y. ed., p. 199.

I am not ignorant of the explanation of this difficulty given in the fa-

But to what does all this amount, but the presenting of an unaccountably absurd notion, demanding for it an unques-

mous Tract No. 90. But, really, that explanation seems to me a quibble unworthy of a serious author. The writer was led to it by the force of the language of the English Prayer Book, already cited. This language, as we have seen, denies the "*corporeal* presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" in the sacrament. This, the writer intimates, was intended to deny, not the *real*, but only the *carnal* presence of Christ's body. That is, Christ's presence in the Eucharist, though not *corporeal* in the sense of *carnal*, is yet *real* and *bodily* in the sense *uncarnate*.

Again, the language of the English Prayer Book says, "The *natural* body and blood of our Savior Christ are in heaven, and *not here;* it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." And this, the writer intimates, is intended again to deny, not the *real*, but only the *local* presence of that body and blood in the sacrament. And then he gives a dissertation of several pages to prove that, in the Eucharist, Christ "is *really* here, yet not *locally;*" and to show what is meant by being "really, yet not locally present." The result which he reaches is, that "*locally*, Christ's body and blood are at God's right hand; yet *really*, they are present *here*."

And how does he reach this result? I can not follow the whole process by which he reaches it; but its principal steps are these. "Why should the perception of our eyes or our ears be the standard of presence or distance? Christ may really be close to us, though in heaven, and His presence in the sacrament may be but a manifestation to the worshiper of that nearness; not *a change of place*, which *may* be unnecessary." "The body and blood of Christ may be *really*, *literally* present in the Holy Eucharist; yet, not having become present by *local passage*, may still, *literally* and *really*, be at God's right hand." Illustration. "A thing is *present*, which is so circumstanced as to *act* upon us, and *influence* us, whether we are sensible of it or not." "The *stars* are millions of miles off, yet they impress ideas upon our souls through our sight." "*Sight*, for certain purposes, annihilates *space*." "*Other* unknown capacities, bodily or spiritual, may annihilate it for other purposes." Christ may "open the heavens," "in the sacramental rite," and "then dispense with time and space, in the sense in which they are daily dispensed with in the sun's warming us at the distance of 100,000,000 of miles." "Locomotion is the means of a *material* presence; the sacrament is the means of His *spiritual* presence." "We kneel before his heavenly throne, and the distance is *as* nothing; it is *as if* that throne were the altar close to us."—*Tract No.* 90, London, 1841, p. 52–57.

At this explanation I confess astonishment! Does all the talk of these writers, then, on this point, come but to this: that the body and blood of Christ are *present* in the sacrament because, though *locally* in heaven, they are yet so circumstanced in that rite as to *influence* us on earth? that, as the

tioning faith, and forbidding reason to inquire into its possibility? If this principle be allowed, what unaccountable

stars and the sun affect our senses and impress ideas on our souls through the distance of incalculable millions of miles, and may, therefore, be said to be *present* to us; so the body of Christ *influences* us and impresses ideas on our souls, even from its seat at God's right hand, and may, therefore, be said to be present to us in the sacrament! Why, this *seems* to amount *only* to the scriptural and reasonable truth, that the body and blood of Christ are, at the Lord's Supper, present to our *faith*, as the *spiritual* faculty which annihilates time and space; that *faith* sees them, though *locally absent*, and thus makes them *effectively present;* giving them *influence* over our souls, and making them "our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy sacrament." This is the very doctrine which *we* hold, and against which, in other places, these writers so strenuously contend! Can such an explanation have been seriously given? Notwithstanding all that has, in so many ways, been said to prove that the very body and blood of Christ are in the Eucharist, and that they are conveyed by *the hands* of the minister, and received into the body and soul of the communicant at the same time and together with their signs, does it, after all, mean but this: "We kneel before His heavenly throne, and the distance is *as* nothing; it is *as if* that throne were the altar close to us?" No; this is not all that is meant; and there are phrases in the explanation which *show* that it is not. I refer to such as these: "We know nothing to negative the notion, that the soul may be capable of having Christ *present* to it by the *stimulating of dormant*, or the *development of possible* energies. As *sight*, for certain purposes, annihilates *space*, so other *unknown* capacities, *bodily* or spiritual, may annihilate it for *other* purposes." This shows that, after all that is said by way of explaining a real and bodily presence into a mere presence to the contemplation of *faith*, they still carry the idea of a presence, which can be effected only by a *miracle;* by the "*stimulating of dormant*, or the *development of possible* energies," or by the working of an "unknown *bodily* capacity," which, for the purpose contemplated in the sacrament, may "annihilate space," and so make Christ's *body really present* in the Eucharist, though *locally absent* in heaven.

The truth is, no one can read the other writings of these authors, and then read the explanation to which we have been attending, without feeling that what is ostensible in that explanation is but a cover, convenient for the occasion, thrown over the real meaning which is held of a true bodily presence in the Eucharist. This may be well intended, but it is wrong. In sober discussion, *no* man may use at one moment plain English terms, and at another moment virtually say they mean no such thing as their words imply. They must be held to the *literal* meaning of their *ordinary* language, and not be allowed to escape through an explanation to which they may be driven by an emergency.

absurdity, nay, what palpable impossibility, may not be brought forward and urged on the unreasoning credulity of blinded men?

The extract, as I have remarked, does not meet the whole breadth of the difficulty. This difficulty does not arise from the necessity of bringing the body of Christ once or twice, or any number of times, from heaven to earth; but from the necessity of *so* bringing it down to *earth* as that it shall yet remain in *heaven*, where it is "set down forever at the right hand of God;" nor only so, but, moreover, from the necessity of *so* bringing it down as that, while it remains in heaven, it shall yet be present, whole and entire, at one and the same moment, in many and in distant places of the earth. Nevertheless, though the extract does not meet the *whole* of the difficulty, yet it looks toward that difficulty; and, in doing so, adopts a principle which, if allowed, will be found to imbody a power sufficient to force any absurdity, any impossibility, on the unreasoning credulity of blinded men. *Such teaching cometh not of the Bible!* This is not a question whether "*faith* shall conceive what *reason* can not comprehend." Such demands on the faculty addressed by revelation may undoubtedly be made. Thus, reason can not comprehend how the human and the Divine natures were once so united as to form one Christ. And yet *faith* may be called on to receive the doctrine, because, while it is *revealed*, it involves neither absurdity nor impossibility, being merely incomprehensible. Nor, again, is the present a question touching the possible modes of God's existence as an *infinite Spirit*. For although reason can not comprehend how God, as such a Spirit, can be *omnipresent*, yet *faith* may be required to *believe*, because the doctrine is revealed, and because it involves nothing either absurd or impossible. But the question now before us is one which touches the presence or omnipresence of that *body of Christ*, in which God hath been pleased to become

"manifest in the flesh;" "of that very substance which He took of the Blessed Virgin, and afterward carried with Him into heaven."* *This* is the question with which we are here concerned; and being such, we say to it, that of the modes of *bodily* existence we do know something, and in the simple light of that *reason* with which God hath endowed us, can conceive more. We are not, therefore, to be awed from inquiries into it by the suggestion that this would be to question the omnipotence of the Divine Spirit. It is, indeed, said that "with God *all* things are *possible*." But this is spoken with necessary and well-known limitations. *Some* things are impossible even with *Him*. *Change*, *incongruity*, *sin*, *falsehood*, *absurdity*, are impossible with Him. This notion of the *implied ubiquity* of Christ's glorified *body* is both false and absurd. It, therefore, is clearly impossible, and can not be forced on us as the meaning of that Divine Teacher, in whom dwelt ever the spirit of clear, transparent wisdom, and of *reasonable*, though sometimes *unfathomable* truth. Let us believe Him when He says, "This is my body, this is my blood;" and let us believe *all* that He *means* by the saying. But, at the same time, let us believe *only* what He means as interpreted by the laws of His own language; for to believe *more* or *other* than this is to believe not *Him*, but our own perhaps absurd conceits.

4. The fourth and last, perhaps the most important, remark which I have to offer on the theory before us, is this: the great error which it imbodies is a *moral generant;* that is, it produces *other* errors.

If the error concerning the real presence of the body and blood of Christ stood *alone*, a *barren* notion, incapable of moral production, the evil from it would be less; though even then it would be of sufficient magnitude to justify the strongest protest against its admission. But it stands *not* alone; it is *not* a barren notion; it is *prolific;* and its offspring are,

* Tracts, vol. i., N. Y., p. 202.

if possible, more mischievous than their parent. This remark opens a wide field: so wide, that I shall not attempt to explore its whole breadth. A few words must suffice to indicate something of its extent and of its contents.

(1.) Perhaps, then, the first offspring which the error produces, is the doctrine that, in the Lord's Supper, there is offered a "*true host;*" in plainer English, *a real sacrifice.* This conception had its birth centuries ago; and it is fast growing, or, rather, has fully grown, into the views and language of many of our own religious teachers. Hence, we are told that, in the Lord's Supper, the sinner "drinks his ransom; he eateth that, the very body and blood of the Lord, the only *sacrifice* for sin."* "That precious blood is still, *in continuance and application of His one oblation once made upon the cross*, poured out for us now, conveying to our souls, as being His blood, with the *other* benefits of His passion, the remission of our sins also."† The writers in question call the *sacrifice*, which is offered in the Eucharist, a "*commemorative, impetratory* sacrifice;" and hold that, "*by* this sacrifice is obtained remission of sins for the whole Church, and some additional refreshment for the souls of the dead in their intermediate state."‡

If it be true that Christ's body and blood are really, even though invisibly, present in the sacrament, His body broken and His blood shed, and both made an oblation unto God, it of course follows that, in every repetition of the sacrament, there is a repetition, or "*continuance*," of the sacrifice of Christ; in a sense subordinate, it is true, to that in which it was offered on the cross, but still, a "true host," a *real sacrifice;* "commemorative and impetratory;" available for pardon to the living members of the Church; and (as the theorists will have it) not without benefit to the be-

* Pusey's Sermon, p. 9. † Idem, p. 10.

‡ Tract No. 81, p. 4–7, as referred to in Good's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, on "Some of the Difficulties in his late Charge," Phil., 1842, p. 10.

lieving dead. Hence, in their phraseology, what St. Paul calls "the Lord's *Table*" becomes an *altar;* the consecrated elements cover a *victim;* and the minister of Jesus stands a *priest* amid the awful solemnities of a veritable *sacrifice.* And hence, under the *Christian* as well as under the *Jewish* dispensation, "every priest standeth *daily* ministering, and offering *oftentimes* the same sacrifices;" of which we may say, as the apostle said of those typic offerings of old, they "can never take away sins." If this theory be right, it ceases to be true that Christ, by "offering *one* sacrifice for sins," "hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." The work of their salvation can not be completed without *many* sacrifices; sacrifices more numerous than even the great annual types of atonement under the Law.

All this, it is obvious, is utter subversion to the Gospel. This Divine system knows nothing of any sacrifice but that which Christ "*finished*" on the cross; and by finishing which, he brought to an end forever the whole system of even *typical* sacrifices. The Gospel knows nothing of a system of "*commemorative and impetratory sacrifices*," which have succeeded to the *types* of the Law, and which look *backward*, as their predecessors look *forward*, to the cross; while, at the same time, they avail for pardon to the living, and for grace to the dead. The Lord's Supper is, indeed, a *commemorative rite*, looking backward to *the cross;* but its character as an "*impetratory sacrifice*" is a human invention, added to what the Gospel calls simply the "*breaking of bread*," "the *Lord's Supper*," the "*Lord's Table*," and the "*communion* of the body and blood of Christ;" that is, a *social fellowship* in partaking of the bread and wine, as consecrated *symbols* of Christ's body and blood, in contradistinction from a merely *private and irregular feast* upon those elements, as though they were but an

ordinary and profane meal. If the Lord's Supper was designed to carry with it, in *any* sense, the character and efficacy of a sacrifice, why is there no intimation of such a design in all the New Testament? The truth is, that, by *ceasing* to apply the term "*sacrifice*" in its proper sense, under the Gospel, to every thing save the death of Christ as an atonement for sin, the inspired writers evidently designed to imbody this grave and vitally important teaching, that the One, great, and only propitiatory sacrifice having been offered once for all, the whole system of *typical* and *representative* sacrifices *is at an end forever*, and is forever to remain without successor and without substitute. And there is a *need* of this teaching now, which did not exist under the old dispensation. *Then* the great Atonement had been neither publicly offered nor fully revealed. It was necessary, therefore, to keep up a lively idea of *sin*, and of the *necessity* of atonement, by a system of most speaking types. Hence, *living* victims were ordered to be slain, and *animal* blood to be sprinkled, amid all the solemnities of an imposing ritual; a ritual carrying, nevertheless, on its very face, the truth, that "those sacrifices which were offered year by year *continually*," could not, of *themselves*, "take away sin;" while, at the same moment, it served to keep alive both a *sense* of sin, and the idea that a *real* and *efficacious* atonement was necessary. But *now* this real and efficacious atonement having been both publicly offered and fully revealed, the whole system of *typical* and *representative sacrifices* is abolished, and the pall of significant silence is, under the Gospel, thrown over the dead body of that system, in order that there may be nothing, not even *a word*, to turn away our eye from the sacrifice on the cross, the true "Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world," as He stands forth luminously manifest in the Gospel,

the only hope of the sinner. To introduce the idea that "impetratory sacrifices" are necessary and available under the Gospel, is to argue defect, incompleteness, in the one sacrifice of Christ. It is saying that that one sacrifice, through the Word which reveals it, and the Spirit which applies it, to our minds, when, under the teachings of the Gospel, we behold by *faith* the Lamb of God lifted up—*is not enough;* but that its efficacy depends upon, or must be conveyed through, the instrumentality of a visible form! A visible form, indeed, may, as we shall hereafter see, be of use in various ways; but to invest it with the character thus claimed for it is, I repeat, utter subversion to the Gospel.

The silence, for which the Gospel is so remarkable as to the *sacrificial* character of the Eucharist, is equally distinctive of the standards of our Church. The Gospel, it is true, calls the "*bodies*" of Christians, in a *figurative* sense, "*sacrifices*," even while they are "*living*" (Rom., xii., 1); it calls *faith* a "sacrifice" as well as a "service" (Phil., ii., 17); it calls *the liberalities* of Christians, in the spread of the Gospel, "a sacrifice," even "acceptable and well pleasing to God" (Phil., iv., 18; also, Heb., xiii., 16); it calls *praise* and thanksgiving to God a "sacrifice," as being "*the fruit of lips*" that know how to interpret the gratitude of holy hearts (Heb., xiii., 15); and it calls the worship and good works of all Christians "sacrifices," "*spiritual*" in their nature, and offered by "a *holy priesthood*" in "a *spiritual house*" (1 Pet., ii., 5). And the Gospel *calls* all these things "sacrifices," because, in their *proper nature*, they are *not* sacrifices; and because the beautiful *figures*, in which they are *called* so, carry with them their own interpretation, and can never mislead. But the Lord's Supper it *never* calls a "sacrifice," because, though in

its proper nature *not* a sacrifice, yet, such is its relation as the symbol of atonement, that even to *call* it *figuratively* a sacrifice, would be to mislead innumerable minds by the authority of apparently Divine sanction. Every thing else pleasing to God may be called *figurative* sacrifices; *but not this*, lest, in its peculiar connection, *superstition* should translate the *figurative* into the *literal*, and thus, to use the words of the *Homily*, "lest of the *memory*, it be *made* a sacrifice;"* that is, lest what was intended to be a *memorial* of Christ's death, be perverted into a *sacrifice*, in derogation of that of which it *is* a memorial.

Thus significantly silent is the *Gospel* on this point. I repeat, equally distinctive is this silence of *the standards of our Church*. Our office "for the administration of the Lord's Supper" calls the *alms* of the communicants "*sacrifices*," just as the Gospel does; and their offering "of *praise* and *thanksgiving*" it calls a "*sacrifice*," with a similar following of the Gospel; and the "presentation of *themselves*, *souls and bodies*," it calls a "*living sacrifice*," in the very words of the Gospel; and, finally, it calls the "*bounden duty and service*" of their worshiping act a "*sacrifice*," which, though "unworthy, through their manifold sins, to offer," they yet humbly present in their capacity, described in the Gospel, as "a holy priesthood, to offer up *spiritual* sacrifices, acceptable to God *by Jesus Christ*." All these things may safely be *called* sacrifices here, for the reason before stated; but the Lord's Supper itself may *not* be even *called* a sacrifice, lest, as before urged, the very *word* deceive. Not once, therefore, does our communion office apply this term to the Supper itself. It calls the ordinance by various *other* names; as, "holy mys-

* Homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, N. Y., 1815, p. 376.

teries," "pledges of His love," "a continual remembrance of His death," "the memorial" which the "Son hath commanded us to make," and "the banquet of a most heavenly food;" and, in doing so, it misleads no one; but not once does it call this Supper a *sacrifice*. *Our* Church has proved too faithful a follower, both of the *letter* and of the *spirit* of that Word, of which she is both a "witness and a keeper," to be guilty of so dangerous a use of language.

The same silence on this point which characterizes the communion office is distinctive of the *Catechism* also, and the *Articles;* in neither of which is this Supper once called a *sacrifice*.

How the *Homily* guards against the use of this term, and for what *reason*, we have already seen. To the language then quoted, however, the following may be added: "Herein" (in the Lord's Supper) "thou needest no other man's help; *no other sacrifice* or *oblation;* no *sacrificing priest*, no mass, no means established by *man's* invention." And this is the more significant, in that it is spoken immediately after a reference to the necessity of "a sure and constant *faith*" in the great truth that Christ "hath made upon *His Cross* a full and *sufficient* sacrifice" for every individual communicant; a faith which is called a "sticking fast to Christ's *promise* made in his Institution, to make" himself the believer's "*own*," and to "apply His *merits*" unto the believer's "*self*."* This language is addressed to the communicant in the second person, and holds up before him the *one* sacrifice on *the cross* as full and *sufficient;* to be received through *faith* in that *promise*, by which Christ makes Himself the Christian's own, and applies His *merits* to him; and to be thus received to the exclusion of all "*other sacrifice*, *oblation*, and *sacrificing priest*." The

* Homily on the Sacrament, N. Y., 1815, p. 379.

phraseology is discriminating; it does not say that, in the Lord's Supper, "the hands of the minister *convey*" the very body and blood of Christ, to be received by the communicant "at the same time, and together with their signs;" but it teaches that in this Supper *Christ* makes *himself* the Christian's "*own*," his own *Savior;* and applies to him, not his *flesh*, but "his *merits;*" and that this is done in such a way as to shut out from the sacrament the idea of any other *priest* or *sacrifice* than *Christ himself*, and His *oblation on the cross.*

The great *Hooker* caught the true spirit of the Homily on this point when he said, "*Sacrifice* is now *no* part of the Church ministry;" and when he added, "The word *presbyter* doth seem more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *priest*, with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ."

(2.) But the mischievousness of this notion of a *sacrifice* in the Lord's Supper will appear more distinctly when I add, that the *second* offspring of the error touching Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist, is seen in *Transubstantiation itself.*

This is that monstrous conception and birth in which is imbodied not only the idea that there is a real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, but also the progeny of that idea, that the very substance of the bread and wine is changed, so that they are bread and wine no longer, but the *visible* and *sensible* flesh and blood themselves of a crucified Savior, seen and eaten under the mere "*species*" or appearance of the bread and wine. The hideous features of this monster-birth I will not attempt to paint. It is enough to say, and to show, that it sprang directly from the doctrine of the Real Presence, as its parent. It is nothing more than the legitimate offspring of that parent.

To *say* this requires but a sentence. To *show* it re-

quires but little more. To whatever age the *origin* of transubstantiation be referred, whether to that of Parrhasius Radbertus,* in the 9th century, or to that of Innocent III. and the 4th Lateran Council, in the 13th, or to any age earlier or intermediate, one thing is certain, it must be traced to the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, understood in the most literal sense of the terms. Other origin than this the monster conception of transubstantiation could not have had. Had not the notion of a real presence, carrying with it the literal substantiality of flesh and blood, been in full possession of the minds which controlled the theology of the Church, transubstantiation never would, and, speaking in the light of moral probabilities, never *could* have been conceived in human thought. And it is equally true, that, having obtained full possession of those controlling minds, and, through them, of the major mass of those who necessarily read little, and ordinarily think less, this notion of a literal real presence—speaking in the light of the same probabilities—could not *but* work itself out in due time into an alleged metamorphosis of the bread and wine into the very substance of the flesh and blood of Christ. The idea of a literal real presence is one of those conceptions which necessarily put the human mind into a ferment; one of those marvelously strange things, which, when thrown among the mass of men's thoughts, act with the power of a moral earthquake, putting every thing around into the agitation of a heaving, working motion. In the case of this particular idea, the ferment into which it put the mind of the Church was made up, in part, of a struggle to throw off something repugnant both to sense and to reason; and, in part, of a diseased eagerness to seize upon something gratify-

* Usually written, Paschasius Radbertus.

ing to that sensuous philosophy of the natural heart which delights even in the strange imagery that fills the inner chambers of superstition. In others words, it was a ferment made up of an effort to reject what both sense and reason condemned, and of an eagerness to seize on what met the askings of the natural heart, trained to superstition, and delighting in a religion which powerfully addresses the *senses*, and keeps stirringly alive the emotions of *thrilling wonder*, and the workings of *excited imagination*. These latter elements obtained the mastery in the ferment; and hence the doctrine of a literally real presence in the Eucharist became prolific. Transubstantiation had both birth and baptism, and in due time was brought forth to final confirmation. The steps in this process, so far as they can be traced, appear to be as follows.

In the ninth century, the ferment which seems to have been produced by the doctrine of a literally real presence, led Radbertus to the attempt to satisfy the uneasiness which was felt, and to settle the controversy which it kept alive, by explaining the *nature* and *manner* of that presence. Accordingly, he first put the doctrine into this new form: that, "after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, nothing remained of these symbols but the *outward figure* under which the body and blood of Christ were *really* and *locally present;* and that the body of Christ, thus present in the Eucharist, was the same body that was born of the Virgin, that suffered on the cross, and was raised from the dead."* *This* was the *birth* of transubstantiation. Previously, but its *embryo* had been in being. At its first

* The words of Radbert in his book, "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini," are these: "Licet figura panis et vini hic sit, omnino nihil aliud quam caro et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt—nec alia quam quæ nata est de Maria, passa in cruce, resurrexit de sepulchro; et hæc, inquam, ipsa est, et ideo Christi caro est, quæ pro vita mundi adhuc hodie offertur."

appearance, many were amazed at the new shape; still, the energies which had given it birth sufficed to cherish it into growth. For a long time, however, it lived a mere birth; growing, indeed, yet without *a name*.

The period during which the new form of the doctrine, as put forth by Radbertus, lived thus unnamed, reached from the 9th to the 13th century; and, as the doctrine itself was yet without the sanction of any council or decree of the Church, instead of silencing, it rather stimulated controversy; for men were yet at liberty to form and express private opinions, even though counter to those which, on the whole, imbodied the mind of the Church. But this period of comparative liberty at length drew to a close. Early in the 13th century was held the fourth Council of the Lateran, and Innocent III., with the reckless audacity that characterized him, strangled all discussion of this point by pronouncing the opinion of Radbertus, as it had grown in strength and shape, to be the only true and orthodox faith on the subject of Christ's presence in the Eucharist; and not only so, but also by giving the doctrine, what it had hitherto wanted, *a name*. *That* was the *baptism* of transubstantiation; and by this name the doctrine has ever since been known, as the only *tolerated* faith of the Church of Rome on this point.

And yet, though *discussion* on this subject was strangled, the minds of men were not in all cases chained. The prodigy which had thus been nurtured toward maturity was far from inertness. It brought forth early and prodigious corruptions on every hand; till, at last, the deep and powerful, though silent workings, which were stirring in the minds of men could be repressed no longer. The ever-glorious Reformation burst forth, mingling awful thunders with the light in which it dawned, and shaking terribly the nations which it was

destined to bless. Startled by the shock, Rome at length summoned her famed Council of Trent; and there, in the 16th century, not only adopted anew the dogma of transubstantiation, but also bound it on the consciences of all her subjects, under the terrors of an anathema which consigns to endless torments all who dare gainsay her decree! *That* was the *confirmation* of the now mature child in the church by which it was bred. In the strength thus given it, it has already traitorously chained, and will, at last, resistlessly destroy, the parent that gave it being. It took Rome seven hundred years to train the great apostate from birth to full communion. It *may* not take her giant offspring so long to do the matricidal work for which, with such mistaken fondness, it has been trained.

I have thus traced transubstantiation from its unquestionable parentage, the doctrine of a literally real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It could have had no other parentage. The simple words of Christ, "This is my body; this is my blood," interpreted by the laws of His *own* language, as synonymous with the expressions, "This *represents* my body; this *represents* my blood," in which sense they were undoubtedly understood by those first disciples who, under the guidance of inspiration, afterward called the institution by the unpretending names of the "breaking of bread," the "Lord's Supper," the "Lord's Table;" those words of Christ, thus naturally and rightly understood, *never could* have suggested the unnatural conceptions in which Radbertus imbodied the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist. *Ages* of corrupting ignorance and superstition, brought in upon the Church by mixture with the philosophy and the fooleries of surrounding paganism, *must* have *gradually* perverted and transformed the simple and beautiful memorial which

Christ left of himself in the Church, till finally it became the alleged mystery and miracle of His literal flesh and blood, before even those mediæval minds, so strangely trained to the subtleties of the schools, could have conceived the monstrously unnatural thought that, by the priestly words of consecration, what had just been mere natural bread and wine, became forthwith the very body and blood of Christ, which the Son of God took of the Virgin, carried to the cross, and finally raised from the dead; retaining, in this their awful presence, the mere species, or appearance, of the substances whose place they had taken! *This* conception, I repeat, never could have originated in the simple and easily-understood words of Christ. Eight hundred years of change and of gradual depravation must have brought in the frightfully prolific error of *the real presence*, before even the spoiled mind of man, whetted to acuteness in the most egregious subtleties, and driven, by still uneasy common sense, to its last shift in maintaining its strange intellectual progeny, could have excogitated such an unnatural, such a pernicious dogma as that finally baptized transubstantiation; a dogma, in defending and enforcing which, Rome has filled the nations with more of error, corruption, change, and bloodshed than have ever flowed from any other single cause.

Why did not the Jews get a similar doctrine of transubstantiation from the similar words of the inspired Moses, "This *is* the Lord's Passover?" Because they understood the *idiom* of their own yet living language; and because, so long as that idiom was alive, even their 1500 years of mingled change and error could not breed subtlety enough in their schoolmen to misinterpret the simple phrase. For the same reason, the words of Jesus could not have been perverted, while as yet his living language and its obvious idiom survived.

The loss of that language, with its idiom, from the Church, by the dispersion of the Jews, the growing corruptions of the old Greek and Latin tongues during the decline of the Empire, the ripened subtleties of the Oriental philosophy caught into the theories and schools of the Church, and the consequently increasing impurity of her whole system of both faith and practice—these things alone can account for the surprising facts, first, of the succession of the doctrine of the *real presence* to that of the New Testament breaking of bread in *memory* of Christ; and, finally, of the coming in of the dogma of *transubstantiation* as the full development of that of the real presence.

But why dwell so strenuously on a position which is too plain to be denied? I answer, because I wish to bring fully before the mind of our Church both the *nature* and the *peril* of that doctrine of the real presence which is now so industriously taught to her members. Under our last general head of discourse, we noticed an attempt to explain this doctrine, as if it were something not only harmless, but Scriptural; while, at the same time, we saw that the explanation did but cover the real features of the doctrine from view, as though the time had not then come, among us, for fully drawing the veil aside. That time, however, has since arrived; and that veil, though perhaps unintentionally, has been since removed. One of the principal authors to whom I have heretofore referred has, I think, made it too evident to be longer concealed, that what they mean by their doctrine of a real presence, is nothing less and nothing other than that parent error, which was in the bosom of the Church in the ninth century, when Radbertus gave birth to the monstrous conception of *a change* in the elements of bread and wine; a change by which their *substance* no longer remained, but gave place, un-

der their *mere species*, to that very flesh and blood of Christ which was then held to be present in the Eucharist; a change, too, to which Rome has since done little more than officially to give it nurture and a name. This author tells us that what he and his co-authors insist upon is, as *they* term it, that very Catholic doctrine of the real presence, which was in the Church before the attempt was made to *explain* it by the theory of transubstantiation; and which has ever since been in the Church, though under the cover of that wicked device. The following is the language which he uses:

"We do not yield to the Romanists, as to the greatness of our privileges; we do not think that our Lord is less *really* and spiritually present than they; that He communicates *Himself* less by His sacraments than they; that we *less receive His body and blood;* that our sinful bodies *are less cleansed by His glorious body*," &c. Again: "We do not believe 'This is my body' less than they; we blame them, not as exceeding as to the greatness of the spiritual gift contained in that sacrament (all human language and thoughts must fall short), but for their carnal conceptions of it; for attempting *to explain* to man's senses the *mode* of his Savior's presence; for trying to solve the apparent contradiction that the elements are still what they were, but are, over and above, *to us* the body and blood of our Lord; for longing, with the weak faith of Nicodemus, to know the *how* of things Divine and spiritual; and so, for debasing them, and, by their explanations, leading at least their priesthood to pride, and then to unbelief."*

Again: "Our Church, as holding the original Catholic truth, of which the corruptions of Rome are the debasement, appears to me yet farther removed from those modern traditions, the inventions of men who

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, N. Y., 1839, p. 87, 88.

deny the truth. Rome, in this respect, has the truth, though mingled with error, and clouded and injured by it; the Zuingli-Calvinist school have forfeited it. In a word, *our* Church holds, with Rome, the *reality* of the communication of the body and blood of Christ through the Holy Eucharist, but denies her carnal way of *explaining* it, and protests against the corruptions thereby entailed; but, in what Rome retains in truth, she" (our Church) "must needs hold with her against those who, explaining to human reason Divine mysteries, can not but explain away what is mysterious, and resolve the hidden gifts of the sacrament into aids of contemplation, outward attestations of God's gifts, exhibitions to our outward senses, mere remembrances of His death."*

That is, in the matter of this sacrament, these authors being judges, our Church is nearer Rome than she is to the Continental Protestants. She holds, with Rome, the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in the full signification and alleged efficacy of that presence. She holds that her members receive the body and blood of Christ as really as the members of the Church of Rome are held to receive them; and that we receive the *same* body and blood which they receive. In short, she blames nothing in the view which Rome takes of this mystery, but her carnal way of *explaining the mode* of Christ's presence, and the corruptions entailed by that carnal explanation. Drop this explanation; throw away the *name* transubstantiation; leave the doctrine of the real presence as it was when Radbertus undertook "to solve the apparent contradiction" which it involves; and, these authors being judges, our Church would have no farther fault to find with the views of Rome on this great point.

Here, at least, is no concealment. These writers

* Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, N. Y., 1839, p. 97.

hold the doctrine of the real presence, as Rome holds it. They only object to her *mode of explaining it*, and to the consequences thereby entailed. Yet Rome gets her doctrine of the real presence, not, as has been incontestably shown, from the Bible interpreted by the idiom of Christ's own language, but from the corruptions of a far later age; an age in which pure Christianity had degenerated into a religion of *forms*, addressed strikingly to the *senses*, and operating powerfully on the *imagination*. In *that* age, the *great parent error* of the Church, the notion of the real presence, grew up; and all that has since followed has been but the legitimate offspring of that parent.

This it is which makes me so strenuous on the present point. Mankind have not yet been redeemed from a strong native bondage to both their *senses* and their *imagination;* nor has human nature yet lost its proneness to superstition; nor yet has the natural heart lost its fondness for a religion of mere *forms;* a religion which appeals luxuriously to the senses, and plays deliciously with the imagination; and which carries with it so much that is imposing and solemn in its ritual, as easily to satisfy beings who would gladly have *some* religion, though not prone to one which requires the labor of thought, and the mortification of *real* deadness to sin and the world. Under this constitution of our fallen and depraved nature, could we suppose the past history of Christianity, since the days of Radbertus and the opening of the ninth century, blotted out; and the Church, from that point, beginning her course anew, with her great parent error of the real presence already conceived of foregone corruptions, and fashioned merely into the form under which it was then held; or, could we suppose this error *now* for the first time conceived, distinctly fashioned, and made the prevalent and deep-

seated opinion of the great body of Christians; and the Church now beginning to move forward on her way as one great whole, nursing this prolific conception in her bosom, fostering it as her grand thought, defending it against opponents, and vindicating it by her authority—I can have no doubt of the issue which would be produced: the living error could not be confined to its mere conception; it would ask *expression*, and it would *have* expression; it would struggle for the birth, and it would *have* birth; another Radbert would bring it into utterance and shape; another Innocent would adopt and name it by authority; and another Council of Trent, in order to hush the remonstrances of reason, and the protestings of the senses, would bind it on the consciences of benighted men, under pain of eternal torments! The process, after its first conception, was natural, was unavoidable; and, instead of blaming Rome for bringing it to its issue, we should rather go back, search for the origin of the conception itself, and there seek to expel from the Church the great parent of all this progeny of errors, by showing that the doctrine of the real presence is not wrapped up in the simple words of Christ, but was bred amid the multiplying corruptions of a far later age.

But, even supposing that the error of the real presence were *not* (though, undoubtedly, it *is*) so vitally prolific as to *force* all the prodigious births which have followed it; who, I pray, that has any just appreciation of the Gospel, and of the preciousness of its great salvation through faith in Christ, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, would be willing to take the Church in the ninth century as their pattern of faith and practice in the matter of the Lord's Supper, and run the fearful hazards of carrying such a live error in their creed, struggling continually to multiply itself, and kept from

self-multiplication by nothing but apparent accident; while, at the same time, its own unmultiplied energies were sufficient to infect the whole body of associated truth, and to place the religion of the Church but at a slight remove from corruptions of the grossest character? Such, however, is the peril into which we are now running, and which we shall inevitably realize, if the notion, now beginning to prevail, of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, should ever become the thoroughly adopted, and the generally, as well as heartily defended doctrine of our own Protestant Episcopal Church. Nay, greater peril than this will be ours, if the error, which we are asked to embrace, should become general; for it *is* vitally prolific, and *can not* be kept from self-multiplication. Long ages, indeed, might be required in training its progeny to maturity; but those ages would again come round, and we should find ourselves, in our posterity, returned and clasped to the very bosom of those deep corruptions from which, in our ancestors, at the period of the blessed Reformation, we broke and fled away with horror!

(3.) After having dwelt thus long upon the character of the first two offspring of the doctrine of a literally real presence in the Eucharist, I shall, without attempting to name *all* their kindred, draw this part of my subject to a close, with a brief reference to two of the most conspicuous which remain: the *traffic in masses*, and the *worship of the Host.*

The traffic in masses sprang naturally from the idea of *a sacrifice* for the remission of sins, both of the living and of the dead, as brought into the sacrament by the doctrine of the real presence. If there *be* such a sacrifice in the sacrament, and if the pardon of sin be *conveyed* in its reception, then, what more natural than for

poor darkened sinners to seek the benefit *at any expense;* and to seek it thus for the quicker release from purgatorial pains of the baptized dead, as well as for the greater ease in their sins of the baptized living? The *purchase* of salvation is the very idea which, of all others, suits best the pride of the natural heart; and all history, *Pagan* as well as *Christian*, teaches that men can be made willing, yea, glad to part with the richest patrimonies, and to make themselves miserable mendicants, under the delusive dream of thereby meriting and purchasing the salvation of their souls. Thus the traffic in masses was introduced; and thus the Church found herself in possession of a means of amassing wealth, which, had not the Reformation in a measure broken up that traffic, would have speedily brought her into the splendid peril of literally "gaining the whole world, and losing thereby her own soul!" This peril may now never be realized; and yet, even the notion of a sacrifice in the Eucharist for the pardon of sin, as now gaining sanction among us, may, if sufficiently fostered and patronized, become the means of bringing into our Church an amount of riches which would make her virtually one of the kingdoms of this world, in deadly conflict with the spiritual kingdom of the temporally poor and unportioned Jesus.

"The *worship of the Host*," that is, the adoration of the elements in their supposed transubstantiated state, as the very body and blood of Christ, elevated with awful solemnity in view of prostrate multitudes, sprang, of course, directly from transubstantiation itself, as the traffic in masses did from the doctrine of sacrifice. The impulse to worship, in deep prostration, the supposed present and visible Deity, was at least natural. But over this amazing issue of the corruptions bred by the error of a literally real presence of Christ's body

and blood in the Lord's Supper, I am willingly forced, by the limits assigned to the discussion, to throw a veil. I will only say that, for overpowering splendor and magnificence, and for awful impressiveness and effect, the elevation and worship of the Host is a show which casts the greatest brilliancy of imperial pomp into shade; that, for deep impiety and blasphemy, it is a ceremony which outvies the rankest and the tallest idolatry of paganism itself; and that, as the unquestionable product of the error which we have been considering, it shows, perhaps more plainly and strikingly than any thing else, the essentially vital and irrepressibly prolific energy with which that error has wrought on the human mind, and with which, wherever cherished, it ever will work.

The notion of a literally real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements of the Lord's Supper, leads to the *multiplication* of error just as naturally and as necessarily as sin leads to the multiplication of evils in the moral disease of our nature. Were it not that the light of the Bible has probably become too strong in our Protestant Church ever to be again entirely put out, this doctrine, fully adopted and thoroughly cherished, would rapidly carry us back to the very darkness from which we have emerged. And even now, blessed as this Church is with light, that doctrine is capable of wrapping the "deceitful and desperately wicked hearts" of men in a darkness as *fatally*, if not as *literally* profound, as that of the Middle Ages themselves. Hence it is that men, otherwise intelligent and wise, and even amiable and virtuous, are found yielding to the approaches of an error, the form of which, in the dimness and shadowyness of their religious conceptions, they do not distinctly recognize, or the imposing impressiveness of which, in its address to

their senses, takes well with their love of a religion which, dispensing with the labor of thought and with the necessity of a real and utter deadness to sin and the world, gives them up to impulse, and to the dreamy luxury of wondering imagination.

One of the most dangerous aspects of this error, as now presented to us, is, that it is, *for the present*, associated with much sound and wholesome truth—truth earnestly held and fervently told; and with much apparent, and, doubtless, real purity and austerity of character in its principal teachers. Its advantages for self-propagation are hence easily apparent, and our obligations to guard against its spread are immensely increased. The most fatal seductions from the way of truth and life may have their beginnings amid a real increase of zeal and devotedness to some of the minor things of religion, especially when outward circumstances favor a backward movement from the restless activities and the sometimes apparent changefulness of the public mind, stimulated by the spirit of intense inquiry, and heaving amid the throes of incessant progress.

CHAPTER X.

THE NATURE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1 Cor., xi., 23–26: "23. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: 24. And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, 'Take, eat: *this is my body*, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.' 25. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, 'This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' 26. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

THE various passages in the New Testament which in any way touch upon the nature of the Lord's Supper have already been examined. In what I have thus far said, my object has been to refute an erroneous view of this point, rather than fully to exhibit the *true* one. This, however, may easily be gathered from what has been advanced. For, if the interpretations which have been given to the language of Christ, in the sixth of John, and in His instituting words themselves, be correct, they not only refute the error which has been exhibited, but also throw a distinctly guiding light upon the only remaining question, What *is* the true nature of the Lord's Supper? The answer to this question I shall now, as was in the fourth and last place proposed, proceed to educe from the Bible, and from the language of our Church.

IV. By way of introducing this answer, I recur for a moment to the principal points established by the interpretations to which I have referred. According to those interpretations, the language of Christ in the sixth of John, in which, after having fed the five thousand, He speaks of "giving His flesh for the life of the world," and of our "eating His flesh and drinking His blood," refers, not to

the sacrament, nor to sacramental eating and drinking, but to *Himself*, as the *only atoning Savior;* and yet without any allusion to the act of *crucifixion* as that in which His atonement was to be consummated. It also refers to our *reception* of Him as such an atoning Savior; which reception He himself explains as "*coming* to Him," "believing on Him," and "*seeing* the Son" with the true spiritual discernment of those who are "*taught* of God," and who thus "*learn*," and are "*drawn*" of "*the Father*." In short, that language of Christ refers to *Himself*, as the only atoning Savior, and to that great deciding transaction between the soul and God, in which the penitent sinner, in the secrets of his own mind, is *taught* and *drawn* by the Spirit in the use of *truth;* and in which, thus *taught* and *drawn*, he voluntarily yields his heart to Christ, and receives Him *by faith* as his only, all-sufficient, and life-giving Savior; a transaction which lies at the very beginning of the true, inward Christian life, and which, in the case of every real Christian, *precedes*, or *should* precede, his first sacramental commemoration of his Savior's death.

Again: according to those interpretations, the words of Christ, in instituting His Supper, teach, not the real, bodily presence of Christ in the elements of the sacred feast, but the symbolic and representative character of those elements, and of the ordinance in which they are used. They are, in truth, exactly equivalent to this expression, which I give again, as a fair paraphrase of His words, and of the apostle's brief comment on them: "Take, eat and drink this bread and this wine; they *represent* my body and my blood, which, according to the tenor of the new covenant, are given in sacrifice for the sins of the world: eat and drink thus in *memory* of me." "For as often as ye do this, ye *celebrate* the Lord's death; a celebration which is to be perpetuated till the period of His final coming."

The *ground* of these interpretations has been stated at

sufficient length, and I humbly venture to think it wholly *unassailable*.

1. What, then, is the view which they give of the *primary* nature of this Christian ordinance? Bring together, as thus interpreted, the only expressions which bear on this question. "Take, eat this *bread;* it *represents* my body." "Drink ye all of this *cup;* it *represents* my blood." "Do this in *memory* of me." "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do *celebrate* the Lord's death." In what light do these expressions place the nature of this sacrament? It is a light which shines with broad and resistless demonstration on this conclusion—that, in the *primary*, most *obvious* attribute of its nature, the Lord's Supper is a divinely-*ordained*, and divinely-*obligatory* MEMORIAL of the death of Christ for the sins of the world. The breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine represent the fact and the manner of that death; Christians partake of the bread and the wine in *memory* of Him who died for their sins: as often as they do so, they *celebrate*, or proclaim the fact of His death and sacrifice; and to a perpetuation of this memorial they are individually bound by the command of Him who is Lord both of death and of life.

In answer to the question, then, I repeat, in the *primary*, most *obvious* attribute of its nature, the Lord's Supper is a divinely-obligatory MEMORIAL, and the Christian's reception of it is a divinely-obligatory COMMEMORATION of that solemn act in which our blessed Redeemer gave His body and His blood on the cross as an atoning sacrifice for sin. This is the most palpable meaning of all that He said at the time of the institution, as recorded by the three evangelists, one of whom was His eye and ear witness, while the other two are His inspired historians. This, in like manner, is the most palpable meaning of what He said after His ascension into heaven, when He specially revealed the instituting words to the great Apostle to the Gentiles, as recorded in

his first Epistle to the Corinthians. It is worthy of observation, that both at the original institution, and at the subsequent revelation of the instituting words, He not only said the same things in the main, but also so spake, on both occasions, as to leave the MEMORIAL character of the institution its most observable feature; to show that His *leading* purpose in ordaining His sacred Supper was, to leave in His Church a standing and an imperishable monument of that solemn act for which He came down from heaven—the act of making Himself "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world;" and to leave such a monument as a *gathering*-point, around which, till His coming again, His faithful disciples should statedly assemble for social "*communion*," or "*fellowship*" in the love and blessings of the Gospel.

Much is said, in the writings to which I have so often referred in this discussion, about the deep and awful *mystery* involved in the nature of this ordinance. Nor do I wish to detract from its true character as one of the great Christian mysteries. But, then, it may be a mystery without being *incomprehensible*. In the New Testament, this word has several senses, subordinate, indeed, to one general sense. Its *general* sense is that of something "*shut up*," *secret*. In its *subordinate* senses, it means, 1. Something thus secret, because it *can not be* known; because it is, in its very nature, incomprehensible. Such is "the mystery of God, even of the Father and of Christ" (Col., ii., 2), called elsewhere "the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh" (1 Tim., iii., 16); the absolutely inscrutable union of the Father and of Christ; the literally incomprehensible mystery of the incarnation of God. 2. Something *secret*, because not *revealed;* though, *when* revealed, easily comprehended. Such was "the mystery *kept secret* from the beginning of the world, but made *manifest* when Christ came and *revealed* it; namely, that His Gospel should be preached

to "*all nations*," *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*.—Rom., xvi., 25, 26. Eph., iii., 3–6, and 9. Col., i., 26, 27; iv., 3, 4. 3. Something intentionally kept from common knowledge or profane use; something sacred to the saints, though not necessarily difficult to be understood. Such were "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," which, in the plain teachings of Christ, it was "given" to *the disciples* "*to know*," but which were designedly concealed from the perverse Jews by the veils of *parable*.—Matt., xiii., 10, 11.

Now, in this last sense, the Christian sacraments are doubtless *mysteries*. They are sacred and richly significant symbols, designedly kept from common and profane use; pledges of love reserved as the exclusive privileges of the people of God; holy things, not to be handled by the wicked, ordinarily not even understood by them; and yet not difficult of understanding to those who desire to know and enjoy them. And, in this sense, they are doubtless included among the truths of the Gospel, in what the apostle says to the Corinthians, when characterizing "the ministers of Christ" "stewards of the *mysteries* of God." I say the sacraments are here included *among* the truths of the Gospel, because these sacraments evidently do not comprise *the whole* of those "mysteries," of which Christ's ministers are constituted "*stewards*." These mysteries embrace *every thing* with which those ministers are intrusted, and primarily, without doubt, those rich, though in the main *intelligible*, truths of the Gospel which it is their chief office to unfold to the Church and to the world. Such being the case, there is no more reason for supposing the sacraments of the Church to involve *incomprehensible* mysteries than there is for supposing that the ordinary truths of the Gospel involve incomprehensible mysteries. Some of the truths of the Gospel *are*, indeed, incomprehensible, absolutely so, to finite minds. Such are the truths of the *Trinity*, and of the *incarnation*. Others of them are so, in the sense of be-

ing unfathomable by the line of our understanding, though we can fathom them to great depths, and find them beautifully clear and comprehensible as far down as that line will reach. Such are the truths of the *atonement*, and of *election*, of *free-will*, and of a *particular providence*. But, then, many others of the truths of the Gospel are not only partially, but also wholly intelligible; clear as light, and bringing objects before our minds in full distinctness and beauty; and yet these, as well as the others, are included among "*the mysteries of God*," of which the "ministers of Christ" are "stewards."

In the light of what has now been said, place the mystery of the Lord's Supper. The truth of the *atonement*, as one of the *principal* to which it points, is mysterious in one of the senses just indicated. That is, though we can see a great way into it, and see it so far gloriously clear and comprehensible, yet we can not see to the *bottom* of it. Even this character, however, of the great truth exhibited does not make the Lord's Supper itself a mystery in the sense of being an incomprehensible thing. Were the grand truth which it exhibits absolutely incomprehensible, this would not make the sacrament itself incomprehensible. A *symbol* may be a very intelligible thing, even though that of which it *is* a symbol were absolutely beyond the grasp of understanding; much more so when the thing symbolized is, to a great extent, beautifully and blessedly intelligible. Such is the case with the Lord's Supper. It is a *mystery*, a *glorious* mystery, as one of the holy things intrusted to the stewardship of Christ's ministers; as one of those Divine symbols designedly kept sacred to the saints; as one of those consecrated emblems which are not to be touched and handled by profane and wicked hands. It is a richly significant and a preciously valuable thing; and yet it is, in its primary and most obvious meaning, a thing clearly and beautifully intelligible. The plain design of Christ on "the night

in which He was betrayed" was, to leave among his disciples an affecting *memorial* of his expiatory sufferings and death, a memorial never to be forgotten, and never to be looked on without *understandingly* recalling both the event itself, and the vital meaning of the event which it was ordained to commemorate. It is not a mystery, in the sense of imbodying that awful and incomprehensible *secret* of the real presence of Christ's body and blood which, in a sort of miraculously mechanical way, we know not how, develops the previously-communicated Divine nature within us. Nor is it a mystery in the sense of furnishing an impenetrable cover for holding in "*reserve*" the great doctrine of *atonement*, as something which was designed to be exhibited but *sparingly* to the common gaze. On the contrary, it is a symbol designed to hold that truth up in its most affecting light, and to exhibit it in its most touching power. The elements themselves in the symbol, the bread broken and the wine poured out by Christ's command, *represent* His atoning sacrifice offered, once for all, upon the cross. And the Christian's *reception* of those consecrated elements *represents* his own act in *receiving* the atonement, in *feeding* on Christ by faith, in *believing* on Him as the Son of God, the Savior of lost men; while, at the same time, it constitutes his affectionate *commemoration* of that "precious death," through which he ventures to hope for life. In all this, however much there may be that is unsearchable in the love that is commemorated, there is nothing incomprehensible in the memorial by which that love is kept in mind. It is a rich mystery, as holding up the most affecting of truths in a light the most beautiful, and as presenting us with a privilege kept sacred to the children of God; but, as Christ's institution, kept alive by the Christian's observance, it is a luminously intelligible ordinance.

On the character of the Lord's Supper as a *memorial* of His death and passion, our office for the communion is in

full accord with the language of Christ. Let us for a moment look at this point. In the notice given of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the officiator proposes "to administer the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; to be received *in remembrance* of His meritorious cross and passion, whereby *alone* we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven." This passage is valuable, not only as showing that the institution is a *memorial*, but also as virtually contradicting the dogma formerly noticed, that this sacrament *conveys* remission of post-baptismal sins. "We obtain remission of our sins," not by receiving the Lord's Supper, but by Christ's "meritorious cross and passion *alone*;" and our reception of this Supper is but a "*remembrance*," a *memorial* of that precious sacrifice. Again, in the exhortation at the time of the celebration, occurs this language: "And to the end that we should always *remember* the exceeding great love of our Master and only Savior, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which, by His precious bloodshedding, He hath obtained for us, He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as *pledges of His love*, and for a continual *remembrance* of His death, to our great and endless comfort." Here we see, distinctly, that the design of Christ's "precious bloodshedding" was to "obtain for us innumerable benefits;" while "*the end*" for which the Holy Supper was instituted, was to furnish "*pledges* of His love, for a continual *remembrance*," a perpetual *memorial*, "of His death." Again, in the prayer of consecration, after an adoring reference to God's "tender mercy in giving His only Son, Jesus Christ, to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption," it is added, that Christ "did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue a perpetual *memory* of that His precious death and sacrifice." Here the same distinction is kept up; Christ's sacrifice on the cross, our only hope of eternal life; His

Holy Supper, the great *memorial* of that sacrifice. So, in the same prayer, when we come to *the oblation*, and to the doing of what Christ requires of us in the ordinance, we have this language: "*According* to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, we, thy humble servants, do *celebrate* and make, here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the *memorial* thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in *remembrance* His blessed passion and precious death." Here, to make our act *accord* with Christ's institution, nothing is specified but the offering up of the great *memorial* of what Christ has done upon the cross for our redemption. Once more, in the actual delivery of the consecrated elements to the recipient, putting the two sentences into one for brevity's sake, we have these important words: "The body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were given and shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take, eat and drink these in *remembrance* that Christ died, and that his blood was shed, for thee; and feed on Him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving." The importance of these words will appear in paraphrasing them according to the two theories of the Lord's Supper which have been exhibited. The theory which includes the doctrine of the real presence would be obliged to paraphrase them thus:

"As Christ's authorized minister, and by his mysterious power, I '*convey*' to thee by these '*hands*,' and 'together *with* these signs,' the flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, which were given and shed for thee, and which are here 'in continuance' still given and shed. Preserve they thy body and soul unto everlasting life, by becoming 'commingled and co-united' with both, making them 'one substance with Him,' and 'preserving both for incorruption.' Eat and drink these signs, together with the awful mysteries which they signify, in remembrance that Christ died

for thee, and that His blood was shed for thee; and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving."

Between the latter and the former part of this paraphrase there is, indeed, an apparent discrepancy, since it represents the communicant as receiving the sacred emblems in *memory* of what is *present*. Still, it is the only paraphrase that I am able to draw from the language which I have from time to time quoted, and in which the theory of the real presence is stated in the words of its own advocates. The theory which I am engaged in exhibiting, and which rejects the doctrine of the real presence in the sense set forth, is bound to give a different paraphrase of the sentence; thus:

"Appointed to minister in the name and Gospel of our blessed Redeemer, I devoutly and fervently pray that the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were given and shed for thee, may preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, by being made to thee the meritorious cause of a free remission of sin, and of a future resurrection from the dead. Take, eat and drink these consecrated *symbols* of His great sacrifice and salvation, as the appointed *memorial* of His death and bloodshedding; and feed on Him in *thy heart* by *faith*, with thanksgiving."

I am not here engaged in the argument against the doctrine of the real presence; and yet it is impossible, I think, to look upon these two paraphrases of the words of our communion service at the delivery of the elements, without seeing that they imbody an argument of most cogent power against that doctrine, and in favor of the view which I have begun to present. Both here, and in the previous quotations from the communion service, we see the vital distinction preserved between Christ's meritorious sacrifice on the cross, and the intelligible *memorial* of it which He has ordained for our observance in the Church; while here, with even unusual distinctness, the nature of our act in keeping the memorial is set forth as a "feeding on Him *in the heart*

by faith," in the *heart*, with fervent *love* in return for *His* love unquenchable: by *faith*, with a *believing* appropriation of that sacrifice on the cross to which his love hath prompted.

Which looks most like the Gospel, the attitude assumed by the minister in the former of the paraphrases which I have given, or that assumed by him in the latter of those paraphrases? In the *former*, he stands up as one "intrusted with the awful gift of making the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ;" and, having exercised his gift, proceeds to "*convey*" with his "*hands*" the sign and the thing signified as that unutterable mystery which, by co-union with the body and soul of the recipient, is to "preserve both for incorruption" and everlasting life. In the *latter*, he appears as the servant of Christ, commissioned to minister for Him in the Word, in prayer, and in ordinances; and having set apart the appointed elements to the sacred office of representing, in a Divine symbol, the atoning sacrifice ot Christ on the cross, proceeds to deliver them to his fellow-Christians, with the fervent petition that the body and blood of Christ, which they *represent*, being received in *faith* and with *love*, may insure to his *body* a *resurrection*, and to his *soul* a *redemption*, unto life eternal.

Which of these attitudes is scriptural? Which is conceived in the spirit of the Gospel? Would not any seriously intelligent student of the Bible, who was, at the same time, a careful observer of his own nature, feel that the *former* attitude belongs to a religion which addresses itself with thrilling energy to the senses and the imagination; to all the strong, inborn tendencies of man to superstition and a perilous reliance upon forms; a religion which proposes to do its work by mysteries operating upon awed and prostrate minds, and encouraging a passive reception, in which thought lies still amid the excitement of the senses, and the overmastering of wonder; a religion, in a word, which tends

to exalt its minister into the rank of an almost superhuman caste, and to depress its subjects to the level of beings who bow with unquestioning submission to mere authority and to overpowering prerogative? And would not such an observer feel that the *latter* attitude belongs to a religion which addresses itself with instructive power to the affection and the faith, in combination with the reason and the understanding of the Christian, to all that is capable in man of being raised into a worship full of love and of light; a religion which, by the hand of intelligible symbols, leads the mind away to glorious acts and glorious truths symbolized, and there, through a teaching *memorial*, wakens thought, and kindles meditation, and calls up the whole mind to the activity of grasping, embracing, and feeling the work and the power of Christ's divinely rational, though fathomless *love;* a religion, in short, which shows its minister, though in the midst of unusually holy things, still *intelligently* exhibiting the one Gospel of our salvation, and its subjects, though receiving an unusually solemn ministry, yet receiving it into earnest minds as well as into yielding hearts, and voluntarily co-operating with the power of Divine grace, as well as reverently honoring the claims of that Divine commission under which this grace is proffered?

Such appears to be the difference between the tendency of this sacrament when considered as involving the *perplexing* mystery of the real presence, and its tendency when considered as imbodying the *intelligible* mystery of a *memorial* of Christ's atoning sacrifice on the cross.

But let us look a moment at the reasons why Christ left such a memorial in His Church, and why He gave its character, *as* a memorial, such prominence in his instituting words.

As the Son of the Father, Christ came into the world, and mysteriously took upon him our nature, for the purpose

of representing in that mystery the reconciliation of man with his offended God; and of consummating that work of atonement by sacrifice, through which this reunion was to be effected. He also came to teach that Divine system of truth and doctrine which is involved in the work of atonement, and to organize that simple and decent body of rites which should be appropriate to the Church of God in passing from a dispensation of shadows to a dispensation of light. Having effected these objects, He returned to the Father; and there, in the presence of the heavenly hosts, exhibited, in the union of his glorified humanity with the ever-glorious Divinity, what the eye of heaven had never before beheld—a living *symbol* of that splendid result which He went to achieve—the reconciliation of rebellious *man* with his offended, though forgiving *God*.

But before He finally took his departure from our world, He was specially careful to do something to comfort and support his disciples, and after them his whole Church, under his long *bodily* absence. *Bodily*, he was to be *present* with them no longer, at least till the time of His second advent. In the work of spreading His Gospel, they were to labor without his personal and bodily presence, though encompassed by a hating and a hostile world. They needed, therefore, something to cheer and sustain them in their perilous toils, and under their painful privation. This need he graciously supplied; and how? In the first place, just on the eve of His departure, He revealed to them those great and glorious truths which had been before but little the subject of his teachings, such as His own essential oneness with the Father, and their spiritual union with Himself; His purpose to prepare for them heavenly mansions in their Father's house; and, finally, to receive them to a participation of His own glory with the Father; the certainty that their prayers, offered in His name, should be answered; and that their efforts in gathering His fold from

the world should be crowned with success; a manifestation of Himself to them, which the world could not comprehend, and in which the world should have no share; and the joint dwelling of the Father and the Son in their hearts as a token of favor to those who should keep his commandments, and as realized in the sweet comforts of *mutual love* between Him and His obedient disciples; the precious legacy of His own Divine, inward, heartfelt *peace*, as that which the world could neither give nor take away; and, finally, as a mightily compensating substitute for Himself during His long bodily absence, the coming of the gracious *Comforter*, the Spirit of Truth from the Father, to guide them into all truth, to glorify Him, and to work mightily in their labors for the conquest of the world.—John, xiv., xv., xvi., xvii.

Having thus revealed to them these cheering, comforting, sustaining truths of doctrine and of promise, he proceeded to leave them *one thing more*, which had a still more special reference to His own approaching *bodily absence*. And what was this? Did He, as the theory of the real presence shapes the idea, leave His sacraments, as the instruments of perpetuating in the Church a *miraculous incarnation of Himself;* so that, though absent to *sight*, He would still be present in *substance?* Did He thus leave *His Church* an actual incarnation of Himself, in *a new form;* a living body endowed, *once for all*, with the full gift of the Spirit from Himself, and clothed, *once for all*, with the sole prerogative and power of communicating both Himself and His Spirit in a perpetual succession to those who were to become His people? Such a shaping of the theory could come from no other source than that which produced the first conception of the real presence; the workings of sense and imagination under the sombre power of old superstition, seeking to defend against reasoning remonstrance, and to entail on unquestioning credulity the monstrous birth of which it had

become the parent. It is a shape of the theory which could never have come from the Bible. Christ spake in good faith when He proclaimed to His disciples His approaching departure from the world, and return to the Father; a departure, in consequence of which "they should see Him no more," because *bodily* He was to be with them no longer till His coming again. "I go to my Father," says He, "and *ye see me no more*." "And now *I am no more in the world;* but these are in the world, and *I come to thee*. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. *While I was with them in the world*, I kept them in thy name." "And now *I come to thee*," &c. There was, it is true, a sense in which they still "saw Him," even after His departure. It was that sense in which "the world saw Him not;" because it *loved* Him not, and kept not His *commandments*, as they did. They saw Him, because *He lived;* and because *they lived also* a spiritual life capable of loving Him and obeying Him, and thus of enjoying inward tokens of His spiritual presence. But *bodily*, they saw Him not, after His departure, simply because, in honest truth, *bodily* He was *no more* in the world. In *every* sense which these words could cover, He was withdrawn from the world; and the Spirit came, *another* Comforter, in *His stead*. Nothing but the perverting power of a mighty error could extract from the Scriptures the idea that, after His visible withdrawal, Christ still left Himself incarnate, under another form, in the body of His Church; empowering this Church once for all, to dispense and communicate Himself and His Spirit solely through the sources of her living and quickening sacraments! Besides, the *mischiefs* of this theory, as an exhaustless fountain of corruption, and as the broad base of an intolerable spiritual despotism, are absolutely incalculable!

What, then, *was* that *one thing more* which He left with

His disciples in addition to the promised Comforter, and which had a still more special reference to His own *entire bodily absence?* It was that very MEMORIAL of Himself which we are considering, *His last Supper;* that divinely significant *representation* of the sublime act, in which His whole work of redemption was about to close. His body, spiritualized and glorified, was about to ascend into heaven, *never more to reside substantially with His Church*, till the period of His second coming, or till His Church herself should come to dwell personally with Him on high. But, in place thereof, He left them this precious *memorial* of Himself; this divinely-instituted *symbol* of His body and blood, as that body and blood were exhibited in His last wondrous office in the work of their redemption. He did not leave His *body* to reside *unseen* in the *present memorial;* but He left the *memorial* to represent to *sight* His *absent body.* He left, not Himself *in* the memorial, but a memorial *of* Himself.

In doing this, too, He acted with a plain and wise reference to one of the most deep-laid, and certainly operative principles of our nature; that by which *love* seeks to keep the *absent* in mind, and to preserve mutual affection *alive*, by asking, or by giving *tokens* of love, *pledges* of affection. He performed an act which every spiritually-enlightened follower would be sure to understand and *feel.* He knew that, whenever and wherever the light of His Gospel shone purely, the memorial-token which He left, as often as it should be brought forth and exhibited amid the solemnities of His worship, would bring the *absent* Savior to mind with unwonted vividness, and thus prove a sweet quickener of His disciples' love; that it would be the gathering-point of their freshly-awakened affections; the sacred pledge, around which their holiest feelings would cluster and mingle, and glow and burn, as they realized with freshened vividness the beauties and the glories of His once marred, but now

radiant form, in connection with the work of their own wondrous redemption. Hence His repeated precept, "Do this in *remembrance* of me." And hence His apostle's comment, "As often as ye eat this *bread* and drink this *cup*, ye do *show* the Lord's death till He come."

In the leading and most obvious feature of its nature, then, this ordinance is *love's* MEMORIAL of the bodily absent Jesus, and of that work of conquering mercy in which He achieved upon the cross the salvation of sinners. And the beautiful wisdom of such an ordinance is clearly manifest, when we consider the essential spirit and glory of that religion which Christ came to teach and to exemplify. What is that spirit? Open the Bible, and its light flashes from every page—the spirit of *holy love*. *This* brought Christ from heaven. *This* lived and struggled, acted and suffered in all He said, in all He did on earth. *This* makes the groans, and the darkness, and the mysteries of Calvary vocal with sweet sounds, and radiant with soft lights, and clear in a Divine meaning. *This* knits His true disciples into one living body, full of the sweet peace of heaven. And *this*, when perfected, is to be the secret of their all-conquering power over the enmity, the hostility, and the persecutions of a wicked world; *love*, that godlike temper, which will never refuse to act, to sacrifice, or to suffer, in the work of promoting the conversion of sinful men to Christ. With what Divine propriety, then, did Christ make His last and highest ordinance in the Church an appeal to His disciples' *love;* and thus, a means of quickening and perpetuating this Divine sympathy with Himself, and with all who should bear both His name and His image! Divine token from a most compassionate Savior! Sacred sign of the only true sacrifice! May it never fail of the end for which it has been given! May it be cherished, and kept pure and uninjured, till all mankind be knit together in love, and brought with one heart to circle it in sweetest memory of Him *who loved them unto death!*

With the account thus given of the leading feature of this ordinance there are no texts which do not readily harmonize. Take that so often quoted in support of the opposite view, in which the Apostle Paul censured the sensual Corinthians for "eating and drinking unworthily," declaring, "Whosoever shall eat *this bread* and drink *this cup* of the Lord unworthily, shall be *guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*;" and that "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body*."—1 Cor., xi., 27–29. Where, say the advocates of a real presence, were the *peculiar* sin and peril of eating and drinking unworthily, save on the ground that the wicked, in doing so, discern not the holy thing which is really, though invisibly present, the sacred body and blood of the Lord, become thus guilty of that body and blood, and find that they have received the sacrament of it, not unto *life*, but unto *death?** "On no other theory" "would the unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist be so much more dreadful than profane conduct in church, where, also, Christ is 'in the midst of us.'"

To this I answer, the apostle does not say that eating and drinking unworthily *is* so much more dreadful than *profane* conduct in church, where, also, Christ is "in the midst of us." He says, indeed, that unworthy eating and drinking is a great and perilous sin; but he was not com-

* "This real, spiritual presence it is, which makes it so awful a thing to approach unworthily." "On no theory, whereby the sacred elements should be *mere* representations, or signs, or pledges, or tokens, of an absent thing, or means to kindle our faith, would the unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist be so much more dreadful than profane conduct in church, where, also, Christ is in the midst of us.' All which Scripture says of this case, 'not discerning the Lord's body,' 'guilty of the body and blood of the Lord,' implies an *immediate*, unseen presence of that body, which the wicked discern not, can not partake of, but offend against; and so, eat and drink judgment to themselves,' in 'that they eat and drink the sacrament of so great a thing.'"—*Letter of Dr. Pusey to the Bishop of Oxford*, New-York, 1839, p. 86, 87.

paring this with the sin of profane conduct in church; and, therefore, he does not tell us *which* is the more dreadful. Perhaps, had he discoursed on the point of this comparison, he would have said as thrillingly severe things against the latter sin as he has said against the former. And this is the more probable, inasmuch as he has told us of at least *one* other sin, "*falling away*" from the beginnings of grace, which is equally dreadful with this of unworthy eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper. Such as thus "fall away," he says, "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame."—Heb., vi., 6. In truth, *all* the open sins of professing Christians are thus dreadful. All such, in the sense intended by the apostle, "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame." And even the profane conduct of the wicked in the house of God is one of the most flagrant of outrages that can be committed against that Divine Savior, who is spiritually "in the midst" of His worshiping people.

But even allowing that the apostle intended to represent the act of unworthy eating and drinking in the Lord's Supper as a sin *peculiarly* sinful, still, I apprehend, we can make excellently important and weighty sense out of his words, without resorting to the theory of an immediate real presence of His body and blood in that ordinance.

The occasion on which he spake is well known. The grossly "carnal" Corinthians had fallen into the practice of making the Lord's Supper a common meal, or, something worse, an occasion of excessive sensual indulgence. They paid no attention to it as a divinely-ordained *commemoration* of the death and passion of the Lord Jesus Christ. They "distinguished" not between this and an ordinary feast: they ate, drank, and were drunken. They "discerned not the Lord's body," in that they treated the consecrated bread and wine, which were its symbols, as though they were a profane feast. They had lost sight of the true

character and design of the sacrament, and had gone to such "excess of rioting," that, as a special judgment, some of them were seized with "weakness and sickness," and many of them were fallen "asleep," either in literal death or in awful spiritual insensibility. They thus realized, in their own sad experience, that "to eat and drink unworthily was to eat and drink judgment to themselves." They were "*guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*," not by failing to "*discern*" *their* "*immediate*" *presence*, but by heaping contempt on that sacred ordinance in which they were *represented*. Contempt of the *symbol* is contempt of the thing *symbolized*. Contempt of the *representative* is contempt of the being *represented*. Thus, the *body of Christ* was dishonored by the abuse heaped on its *memorial*. Thus, "*the King of Saints*" himself was insulted by the slight cast on His divinely-appointed *representative*.

This, plainly, is the whole of the apostle's meaning. There is no need of searching for the alleged real presence of His body in order to justify the strong language in which he denounced judgment on the sin of the sensual Corinthians.

2. Having thus viewed the Lord's Supper as, in its nature, *Love's memorial* of the absent Jesus, I proceed now to consider another of its essential features of no less vital importance. I know not how to express it better than by saying that this ordinance is also *Faith's MIRROR of the sacrifice on the cross*.

The theory of the real presence admits that the Eucharist *is* a *memorial* of Christ. So far as this theory is embraced by a member of *our* Church, it can not do otherwise than make the admission. The formularies of our Church, in accord with the words of Christ, are too full of this memorial feature of the rite to allow of its being denied, or even left out of mention. But the advocates of the theory do little more, in their writings, than to recognize the *exist-*

ence of this feature. So far as I am informed, they dwell not on it; they seem not to consider it of much importance; they lay their main stress on another point, as though *it alone* were worthy of much consideration; as though it alone involved the whole vital essence of the sacrament. They consider the consecrated elements *such* signs as have the thing *signified* joined *with* them; signs of the body and blood of Christ really present *in* the sacrament, and actually conveyed *with* their significant emblems; signs which derive their chief importance from the fact that they are thus the *vehicles* of the mightiest mystery beneath the sun.

Now I admit, that if we were to limit the nature of this ordinance to its character as "a *mere* sign," though we should still retain something extremely important and interesting, yet we should have done somewhat toward robbing the "holy mystery" of a *part* of its fullness and its richness. Nevertheless, I hold that we may reject the dogma of the real presence, while, at the same time, we retain all "the marrow and fatness" of the rite which can be drawn from the words of inspiration. The feature which I have just mentioned, that of the Lord's Supper as *Faith's* mirror of the sacrifice on the cross, is doubtless one of the two most vitally important under which the institution is presented in the Bible; nor is it either easy or necessary to say which of the two is the *more* vitally important. In His instituting words, it is true, Christ says nothing of *faith* in His sacrifice on the cross, though He does speak of our eating bread and drinking wine in *memory* of Him. Still, faith in His sacrifice is necessarily *implied* in His words, inasmuch as we learn from other language of His that it is *by* faith alone that "remission of sins," for procuring which His "blood was shed," is received.

From the instituting words of Christ, we learn that the cup in the Eucharist "represents the new covenant in His blood." In this new covenant *itself*, the great covenant of

grace, under which the Church of the *old* dispensation, as well as that of the *new*, was placed, the sacrifice on the cross was promised, and *virtually* given (for thus only was Christ a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world"). Now this was a covenant which, while it contained, on the part of God, the promise of a Savior, required, on the part of man, *faith* in that promise, and, consequently, in that work of atonement by sacrifice which the promise guarantied. *Faith*, then, is the act by which we originally become *parties* to this new and gracious covenant of life. There may be significant rites in which this faith is to be specially *exercised*. Still, faith must be *antecedent* to any such rite, else the rite itself will be an empty and a useless form. For "*without* faith it is impossible to please God" in any thing (Heb., xi., 6), much more so in so serious a thing as a religious ordinance.

Let us look, then, more directly at the point before us. In the Eucharistic rite, "the cup represents the blood," which the new covenant guarantied should be shed, and which finally was shed, "for the remission of sins." And this rite is now, as one of the *seals* of that covenant, Christ's visible "*pledge*" that the promise *is*, and *shall be* fulfilled to every one that *believeth* in Him as the Son of God, the only Savior of sinners. In view of this "*pledge*," faith *realizes*, with unwonted vividness, the fulfillment of the promise; and thus the Lord's Supper becomes, to the true Christian communicant, *Faith's mirror of the sacrifice on the cross.* In that mirror, held, as it were, by the hand of the Divine Surety, faith sees *reflected* Christ's precious bloodshedding for the remission of sins. And as *faith* is the act by which we *originally* become parties to the new covenant of salvation, so, whenever faith is subsequently exercised in view of this *seal* of the covenant, this "*pledge*" of salvation, this *mirror* of the cross, there is a virtually repeated *renewal* of our act of covenanting. We there renewedly give our-

selves to Christ as His redeemed, while He renewedly assures us of the truth that He is our Redeemer, or enables us renewedly to realize the certainty of the assurance that "in Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sin." He does not *convey* this forgiveness through any "impetratory sacrifice" which is *then* offered (this forgiveness we had when first, in the faith of a true Christian, we gave ourselves to Him, and received Him as our Savior), but He then renews His *assurance* of our forgiveness, quickens our faith in His assurance, pours into our hearts the fuller comforts of our relation to Him, and thus makes our whole inner man stronger for all that remains of our walk, and work, and warfare in His service. Every time we go to the communion, in the exercise of a true faith, we thus renew our covenant with God in Christ Jesus; and the effect is, that our souls gather this rich and Divine refreshment, while Faith sees, in that sacred mirror, the visible *seal* of the promise, the ordained "*pledge*" of an infallibly certain salvation to every true believer in Christ.

This, as we may safely understand it, is the faith by which, in the language of our Catechism, "the body and blood of Christ are *spiritually* taken and received by the *faithful* in the Lord's Supper;" by those who have the *faith* of the true Christian.

Our Catechism teaches that in a sacrament there are two parts, "the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace;" and that, in "the Lord's Supper, the outward part, or sign," consists in the "bread and wine which the Lord hath commanded to be received," while "the inward part, or thing signified," is "the body and blood of Christ, which are *spiritually* taken and received by the faithful in that Supper."

Now between this, as I have just explained it, and that view of the sacrament which includes the idea of a real presence, there is an essential and vitally important differ-

ence. The theory of the real presence makes the body and blood of Christ, as the things signified, actually *in* the sacrament, and conveyed *through*, or *with* the signs. The Catechism teaches no such thing, but is perfectly consistent with the explanation, that the thing signified, the real body of Christ, is *absent*, and not conveyed *through* or *with* the sign, being only "*spiritually* taken and received" by *faith*. The theory of a real presence teaches that the body and blood of Christ can not be spiritually taken and received unless actually *in* the sacrament, and conveyed *through* or *with* the sign. The Catechism is consistent with the doctrine that this body and blood may be spiritually taken and received while *absent*, and though *not* conveyed through or with the sign. The former teaches that *both* parts of the sacrament are present on the altar. The latter teaches that the *sign* alone is present on the table, while the thing signified is *absent* at the right hand of God.

The Catechism, then, teaches *not* the doctrine of a real presence; nor, so far as I am informed, is the *term* real presence once used in the accredited standards of our Church. There certainly *is* a sense in which the true Christian *receives the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper* as he receives it at no other time, and in no other way; and this sense I have already stated. Inasmuch, however, as there are certain expressions in our communion service upon which I have, as yet, offered no special remark, I will here cite them for the purpose of stating more definitely the sense to which I refer, and which I suppose these expressions to imbody.

In that service, then, God is said to "have given His Son, our Savior Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our *spiritual food and sustenance* in that holy sacrament;" so that thither we "come to feed on the banquet of that *most heavenly food*." We utter there the petition, "Grant us, therefore, gracious God, *so to eat the flesh of thy dear*

Son, Jesus Christ, and *to drink His blood*, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." To a similar effect are the following words: "We most humbly beseech Thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, *with thy Word and Holy Spirit*, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them, according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, *in remembrance* of His death and passion, may be *partakers of His most blessed body and blood*." The following words also express the same idea: "Humbly beseeching Thee that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this holy communion, may worthily *receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ;* be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made *one body with Him, that He may dwell in them and they in Him*." And, finally, having uttered such petitions, and finished our act of communion, we make the following expression of our sense of the benefit which we have received: "We most heartily thank Thee for that thou dost vouchsafe *to feed us*, who have duly received these holy mysteries *with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Savior, Jesus Christ*, and dost assure us thereby of thy favor and goodness toward us; and that we are *very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son*, which is the blessed company of all faithful people."

Now all these expressions carry, in various forms, *one and the same idea;* so that, when this idea is once presented or ascertained, it opens all the forms in which it is inclosed. What, then, *is* this idea?

The advocates of the theory which I oppose would contend that it is the idea of *the real presence;* according to which, the very spiritual substance of the flesh and blood of Christ is given and received at the same time and together

with their signs; so that we spiritually, though none the less really, eat that flesh and drink that blood, in consequence of which we become, in a great mystery, one flesh and one blood with Christ, He dwelling in us and we in Him, commingled and co-united in one body by the communication of the Divine nature. They would say that, although the *term* real presence is not here *used*, yet is is *implied;* and that it is the only one which can open the true sense of the expressions within the various *forms* of which it is infolded.

But that the *idea* as well as the *term* real presence, in any sense which would satisfy these theorists, is wholly *absent* from these expressions, must, I apprehend, be evident to any one who will give them a candid as well as a careful thought.

In the first place, if *their* idea of the real presence be here implied, why do we pray that God would "vouchsafe to bless and sanctify His gifts and creatures of bread and wine with His *Word and Holy Spirit?*" Why do we not rather pray that He would vouchsafe to bless and sanctify them by uniting with them the present flesh and blood of His dear Son, that thus we may receive the benefit of His repeated sacrifice for our sins? Or, again, why do we pray for grace "*so* to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, as that our *sinful* bodies may be made *clean* by His body, and our souls *washed* by His most precious blood?" Why do we not rather pray that we may "so eat and drink as that we may become one body, one flesh, and one blood with Him, commingled and co-united with Him by the communication of His Divine nature, and by the conveyance of His spiritual substance?" The truth is, that to be "*clean*" and to be "*washed*" are well-known Biblical forms of speech, signifying to be *pardoned* and to be *purified* from all *sin*, and to be *perfected* and made *blessed* in all *holiness*, both of *body* and of *mind*. And that this is the true result

which is *at all times* realized by *faith* in the sacrifice and death of Christ—though more *largely* realized in this sacrament than at *other* times, through the *greater vividness of faith* in view of the Divine symbols of this holy ordinance—is evident from the fact, that when our Church, in her communion service, drops the use of her *symbolic* language and speaks out in *literal* terms, she expresses no other than this very result of *pardon* and *purification* from *sin*, with perfect *holiness* and *happiness*, as making up "the *other* benefits of Christ's passion." Hence, immediately after one of the petitions which I have cited, praying that we "may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood," she adds, "We earnestly desire thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant that, *by the merits and death* of thy Son, Jesus Christ, and *through faith in his blood*, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain *remission of our sins*, and all *other* benefits of His passion." Here we plainly see the *symbolic* dress dropped away from the body of *literal* sense which it had inwrapped, and leaving that sense exposed to clear view. "*By the merits and death of Christ*, and *through faith in His blood*," the very moment we first exercise this faith we "*obtain remission of our sins*," and at least *begin* to realize "all *other* benefits of His passion" in the *growing* holiness and happiness of our Christian character and lives. But in the Lord's Supper, this important work within us is specially expedited. *Faith* is here specially vigorous and invigorated. *Love* here is specially fervent and all-conquering over sin and the world, the flesh and the devil. And thus, even in uncommon measures, are "all *other* benefits of Christ's passion" insured in the ripening holiness and happiness of our souls. This is the *literal* sense of what our Church teaches in these parts of her communion service. Wrapped up again in its dress of *symbol*, it becomes "*so* eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ" (that is,

with such a spiritual signification), "that our *sinful* bodies are made *clean* by His body, and our souls *washed* through His most precious blood." The *symbolic* and the *literal* in these two passages are *not* two distinct and different ideas, but *one* and the *same* idea; and it is an idea which sets, as far off from this sacrament as the poles of heaven are asunder, the notion of an alleged real presence of the flesh and blood of Christ.

But it will be asked by those who maintain the theory of such a presence, Does not our Church, when she prays that we may "so eat the flesh and drink the blood" of Christ, "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood," immediately add the petition, that thus "*we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us?*" And does she not also, shortly after praying "that, by the merits and death of Christ, and through faith in His blood, we may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His passion," subjoin the petition, "that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this holy communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Christ, be filled with grace and heavenly benediction, and *made one body with Him, that He may dwell in them and they in Him?*" Does not this sustain the doctrine of the real presence, in consequence of which we are "made one body with Him, that He may dwell in us, and we in Him?"

To this, however, I reply, though our Church undoubtedly uses the language which is here quoted, yet she does *not* thereby teach the doctrine of the real presence, and the consequent commingling and co-uniting of the flesh and blood of Christ with the body and soul of the *individual* communicant; but the farthest from such a notion and its consequence. She is not, in that language, praying for the commingling and co-union of Christ's very flesh and blood with the body and soul of the *individual* communicant; but she

is, as in another part of her service, "praying for *the whole state of Christ's Church militant;*" for the whole body of those who are, or "shall be partakers of this holy *communion;*" in other words, all who shall be joined in this holy "*fellowship*" of true Christians. She is praying that all these, *as one grand whole*, may be "made *one body* with Him, that He may dwell in *them* and they in *Him;*" that He may dwell in this *great body*, this collective "*fellowship*," by dwelling *with* and *among* its members; and that this great body, this collective fellowship, may dwell in Him by remaining united as *a whole*, in the spirit of dependence on Him, and obedience to Him as its *Divine Head*. She is teaching the Bible doctrine, which she finds, as in other places, so especially in the twelfth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and in the second chapter of that to the Colossians; the doctrine, that the Church, *as a whole*, is a collective *body*, of which Christ is the *Head*, while Christians are its *members* in particular; and that there are benefits and blessedness in "holding the Head," *united together* in the spirit of holy dependence on Him, and obedience to Him, from whom alone "*all the body*, by joints and bands, having nourishment ministered, and knit together, *increaseth* with *the increase of God;*" that is, with a glorious and mighty increase. *This* is the doctrine which she is teaching in those expressions of her communion service, the doctrine that the *whole Church* is Christ's *body;* his body on *earth*, with its Head in *heaven;* and that Head sitting there supreme over all, ruling and defending all with power, and "filling all with grace and heavenly benediction."

That this *is* her meaning, take her own explanation as confirmatory of the view already given of her language. When, after having closed the solemn rite of consecrating and setting apart the sacred elements, and of delivering them to the communicants, she offers her great thanks-

giving for the benefits received, in that God has vouchsafed to feed her true children "with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of His Son," and to "*assure* them thereby of His favor and goodness toward them," and of their being "*very members incorporate in the mystical body of His Son;*" by way of showing what she *means* by being thus "incorporate, as very or true members, in *this mystical body of Christ*," she immediately adds, "*which is the blessed company of all faithful people.*" Here is the outbreaking of light over all her meaning in this and similar phraseology! It is not the *real*, though *spiritual*, the *very*, though *glorified body* of Christ, which her communicants have *individually* received into their bodies; Christ and the Christian commingled and co-united each with each; and forming thus, in *every particular member*, one body, one flesh, and one blood, with Him; but it is the *collective body* of the Church, "that *holy fellowship*," as it is immediately called, that "blessed *company* of all faithful people," THIS, into which, by the symbol of the Supper, the individual becomes incorporated, and is thus made "a member in particular" of that "mystical body," *the Church*, of which Christ is the head, and in our "fellowship" with which, she prays, we may ever "*continue;*" "doing all such good works as God hath prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Here, again, as in the former case, we see the Church dropping the dress of *symbol* from the body of *literal* signification, which it had inwrapped, and leaving that signification exposed to clear view. "Very members, incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people;" "the communion," or "fellowship," of which St. Paul speaks (1 Cor., x., 16), and into which we are brought by eating "the bread which is broken," and by drinking of "the cup which is blessed," as a Divine *memorial* "of the body and blood of Christ;" *this* is what our Church means when she speaks of our "*so*

eating the flesh and drinking the blood of God's dear Son," as "that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us;" or, as that "*all* who are partakers of this holy communion," the whole collective mass of members in the Church, may "be made *one body* with Him, that He may dwell *in them*, and they in Him." These two forms of expression do not imbody two distinct and different ideas; they imbody but *one* and the *same* idea. *In symbol*, it is "so eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, that He dwelleth in us, and we in Him," insomuch that *collectively* we are "made one body with Him," even His great "*mystical* body." In *literal* phrase, with the dress of symbol *dropped*, it is, so "eating the bread which is broken, and drinking the cup which is blessed," that we become *one Church* under His supreme government and influence; one "*communion*," one "*fellowship*," one great "*company*," made up of "*all faithful people;*" "knit together" with "joints and bands," and "holding the Head," from whom "nourishment is ministered," and the great "company" "increaseth with the increase of God." This, I say, is the true meaning of our Church in all this phraseology; and it is a meaning which puts utterly away the doctrine of the real presence, as this phrase is ordinarily understood. Our Church, in her communion service, is constantly carrying *sacramental symbol* and *literal sense* side by side; now wrapping up her meaning in the beautiful and striking dress of the *one*, and now unfolding it in the plain and reasonable language of the *other;* and in *both* following the example of Christ her Head in such a way that, to a docile disciple, taught of the Spirit, or even willing to be taught, each explains each; and both make one Divine whole of rich and powerful significancy.

In order that we may see more distinctly the important difference which exists between the two theories

which have been presented, I will now set down the two points which each theory includes, so far as they have just been the subjects of examination.

The theory, then, which involves the real presence, puts a *sacrifice* into the Eucharist, and *conveys* remission of sin by virtue of that sacrifice, and through the act of its priestly offerer. But the theory which rejects the real presence, makes the Eucharist the *memorial* of a sacrifice, and a *seal* of the *covenant* which assures remission of sin to every one that believeth, even upon his first exercise of a living faith in Christ. Such is the first point of difference; and it is of immeasurable importance.

Again, the theory which involves the real presence, brings the *true*, though invisible, the *real*, though spiritualized *body of Christ*, into the Eucharist, and *conveys* it *with* the sign into the body and soul of the recipient, commingling and co-uniting both, so that *each* communicant becomes *one body*, one flesh and blood, with his Savior. But the theory which rejects the real presence, makes the Eucharist *a symbol* of the body of Christ; and a rite, which brings all who receive it truly into one communion, fellowship, or company; into the one collective, mystical body of Christ, His Church; under Him as the Head, and receiving governance, grace, and heavenly benediction from Him, as the source of all authority, life, and blessedness. Such is the second point of difference; and it is, if comparison may be indulged between things immeasurable, of still more immeasurable importance than the other.

The evils which, in the movement of ages, flow from the doctrine of the real presence, as now taught among us, I have already partially sketched. I need not, therefore, in this place, repeat the sketch. I need only say, we have the seeds of them planted in our portion

of the vineyard, and that, just so far and so fast as they are permitted to have nurture and growth, their baleful influence will be inevitably visible in darkening the minds, confusing the theology, and corrupting both the faith and the practice of our Church.

I have said there certainly *is* a sense in which the true Christian receives the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, as he receives them at no other time, and in no other way; and the examination which has now been made of the language of our communion service will enable me to state, as I promised, more definitely what I mean by the saying. I mean that, while the true Christian may, and does receive the body and blood of Christ, when, *alone* in the privacy of his closet, and in the secrecy of his heart, he *believes* in his Savior, and relies on his atoning sacrifice for pardon, adoption, and eternal life; and when, thus alone, he rejoices in the blessed privilege, which is his, of being a child of God; he yet receives this body and blood with a still richer fullness of benefit, when, in the *company* of the faithful, in the *house of God*, and around the *table of his Lord*, his *faith* sees that same atoning sacrifice on the cross, reflected, with unwonted vividness, in the divinely-appointed MIRROR, which the hand of His surety holds before him; when his faith, thus social in its exercise, looks on the ordained, visible "*pledge*" of his Savior's love for his soul, and on the constituted, sensible "*seal*" of the promise, which guaranties the free and full forgiveness of all his sins; and when, with his *faith* thus awakened and strengthened, and his *love* as its fruit made proportionately glowing and intense, he identifies himself, or, rather, *realizes* his identity with the communion of saints, the fellowship of the faithful, and stands in that very company, and in the midst of those very solemnities which Christ most delights to

honor and to bless; which are, in themselves, best calculated to bring into one living assemblage, round his reverent, yet rejoicing soul, all that is most affecting and most quickening, most comforting and most hallowing, in the wonders of Bethlehem and of Gethsemane, of the cross and of the grave, of the resurrection and of heaven; and which are, therefore, to be regarded as those occasions of special and of sacred privilege, whereat Christ vouchsafes, in all its richness, the secret of His favor and loving kindness for His chosen; and whereon He sheds, in all their fullness, the blessings of His grace and heavenly benediction, even from out that heaven of life and that throne of glory unto which He is now exalted.

This is the peculiarity under which faith exercises itself in the Lord's Supper; and this is what is meant by saying that the true Christian *then* receives the body and blood of Christ, as he receives them at no other time, and in no other way. *Then only* is it that he receives them—not simply by faith in the sacrifice, which they constitute, and in which they were, *once for all*, offered on the cross—but, also, in sight of the very MIRROR which reflects them on his spiritual sense; in sight of the very "*pledge*" which certifies him of the never-dying love of Christ; and in sight of the very *seal* which assures him that he is a ransomed, pardoned, and adopted child of God. And this, I humbly suggest, is the only sense in which the Christian can with truth be said to receive the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. He receives them by looking, from the beating heart of *love*, and with the kindling eye of *faith*, through the MEMORIAL to Him whom it keeps in memory; through the MIRROR to Him whose face shineth therein; through the SYMBOL to the sacrifice which it represents; and through the SEAL to the par-

don which, on the terms of the covenant, it insures. To receive the body and blood of Christ into our bodies and souls, or to feed on them in the Lord's Supper, in any other sense than that of believing in Christ, relying on His atoning sacrifice by faith, and being spiritually refreshed and strengthened amid the privileges, and under the blessings, which are vouchsafed from heaven on that precious ordinance, is impossible. Neither reason nor revelation shows any other way of "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man," than that now indicated. *This* way both reason and revelation concur in showing; and it is the way of *life*. To seek any other, is to plunge deep into the peril of being lost forever amid those darkly wildering mists of error which are spread over the entrance to the way of *death!*

3. The most important and fundamental views of the nature of the Lord's Supper have now been given. Growing out of these, however, is a third, of great interest and importance; I mean that which presents this ordinance in its character as a *means of grace*. This, indeed, is not so much a distinct feature of the ordinance itself, as it is the *effect* of the ordinance, flowing out of its proper nature, as love's memorial of the bodily absent Jesus, and as faith's mirror of His sacrifice on the cross.

It is proper here to spend a moment in distinguishing between this ordinance as a *means* of grace, and the same as a "*source* of grace." It will be remembered that, at the very outset of this treatise, I referred to the notion, which is gaining extended currency among us, that "the sacraments are *sources* of Divine grace." Now this is either a most unguarded expression, or a designed enunciation of a doctrine which is full of error. A *source* is a fountain, first cause, or original pro-

ducer. A *means* is an instrument used by an agent in the production of an intended effect; or a medium through which some effect, or supply, is communicated. To say, therefore, in so many words, that "the sacraments are *sources* of Divine grace," or to treat them as though they were such *sources*, is either unguardedly, or designedly, to lead men to stop at the sacraments, to regard them as things endued with a miraculous, spontaneous energy, and to rest in them, as, by a secret power of their own, and in some mysterious way, of which we know nothing, whether as to its operation, or as to its effect, making us partakers of the Christian character and of the Divine life. The sacraments are *not* sources of grace; they are but *means* of grace. And even when we come to regard them *as* means, it is necessary carefully to consider and rightly to understand the sense in which they are means. They are not means, then, in such a sense, as that by them God *generates* the Divine life in the soul; but only in such a sense, as that through them God *nourishes* and *perfects* the Divine life *already* generated. Nor are they means even in such a sense as that God nourishes and perfects the already generated Divine life of the soul by any *power* or *virtue* lodged in the *very matter and substance* of the sacraments themselves; but only in such a sense as that, through the vital *truths* and *realities* which they affectingly symbolize and represent, the blessing of God in the influences of His Spirit nourishes and perfects the life which Himself had produced by the instrumentality of His own quickening and sanctifying Word.

This, then, is what I mean when I speak of the Lord's Supper as a *means of grace*. It is a medium through which the Holy Spirit increases and perfects all the graces of our Christian character by the peculiar and unusual energy with which, in the symbols of this sacrament,

He presents and applies to our souls those glorious *truths* and *realities* which cluster so movingly around the cross of Christ.

The Catechism of our Church represents "*the benefits* whereof we are partakers" by this sacrament, as consisting in "the strengthening and refreshing of our *souls* by the body and blood of Christ, as our *bodies* are by the bread and wine." That is, as our natural bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the natural bread and wine which are received into them and digested by them, so are our *souls* "strengthened and refreshed" by "the body and blood of Christ which are *spiritually* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The remarks already offered show *how* this strengthening and refreshing of our souls in the Lord's Supper come from the body and blood of Christ. The *body* has its own way of receiving and digesting its proper sustenance. The *soul* also has hers; and it is as peculiar to her as a *spirit*, as that of the body is to itself as mere *matter*. The soul receives her proper sustenance, or eats and drinks her spiritual food, with her *eye*, through that *faith* which *looks*, and *sees*, and *apprehends* the Divine truths and realities before it. *Faith* is that "spiritual faculty" of hers, which, for the purpose designed, "annihilates both time and space," by taking her, in its quick motion, to the cross on Calvary, or to the throne in heaven, and there feeding her ravished vision with a sight of Him who once bled for sin, and who now reigns unto salvation.

But before entering more at large into the idea of this strengthening and refreshing which the soul receives in the Lord's Supper, I must offer a single remark on the language just quoted from our Catechism.

It will be remembered that the authors to whom I have so often referred speak of our receiving the very

body and blood of Christ into our *bodies*, as well as into our souls, commingling and co-uniting with them, and preserving *both* for incorruption. Now, see how different this is from the teaching of our Catechism. In defining "*the benefits*" of the Lord's Supper, it says, they consist in "strengthening and refreshing our *souls* by the body and blood of Christ, as our *bodies* are by the bread and wine." Here is nothing about receiving the very body and blood of Christ *into* even our *souls*, commingling and co-uniting with them, and making them one flesh and blood with Christ. The simple idea is that of "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls *by* the body and blood of Christ," "*spiritually* taken and received by *faith*. *Faith* receives them, and the *soul* is thereby strengthened and refreshed. But the principal point in my intended remark is this: the Catechism is an utter stranger to the absurd notion that the very flesh and blood of Christ are received into our *bodies* as well as into our souls, commingling and co-uniting with their substance, and preserving it for incorruption by imbuing it with the principle of immortality! This is but a part of the general figment of the theory of a real presence. The Catechism leaves our *bodies*, after and notwithstanding all the sacraments which they shall have received, heirs to their natural corruption, to be raised at the last day and made co-inheritors of life with our souls, not by any principle of immortality which they had carried with them from the sacraments into the grave, but by the almighty power of God on that morning of eternal wonders.

I resume now the idea of the Lord's Supper as a means of grace to our *souls*.

The spiritual benefits, then, of this ordinance come through faith in Christ crucified, in that atoning sacrifice in which His body and blood were offered up to

God on the cross, and through the blessing which the Holy Spirit sheds on those peculiar helps under which faith then looks upon that sacrifice.

When promising to His disciples the Comforter, who should be with them during His bodily absence from the Church, Christ uses these important words: "He shall glorify me; for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you."—John, xvi., 14. Such being the office of the Holy Spirit, He takes this memorial as *one* of "the things of Christ," and "*shows* it" to the Christian's mind. He shows *how* it represents the death of Christ for the sins of men. He makes plain, through its symbol, the precious truth and efficacy of the atonement. And thus he "glorifies" Christ in the sacrament which Christ hath ordained. Through His blessing, the emblems in the sacrament become not only significant, but *affectingly* and *sanctifyingly* significant. The great truths and realities which they represent, find the Christian's *heart*, through His gracious influences, specially prepared for the touching and moving contemplation of those truths and realities. And thus, while his devout soul regards, by *faith*, the whole sacred memorial before it, his *love* as well as his faith, his humility and his hope, his courage and his zeal, his apprehension of Divine things and his relish for Divine fellowship, his deadness to earth and his longings after heaven, are mightily quickened, and his whole inner man powerfully "strengthened and refreshed" by his view of the body and blood of Christ, and of that Divine work of redemption in which they were offered a sacrifice.

From what I have now said, we see that the Lord's Supper becomes a means of grace on the same *principle* with that on which preaching or the reading of the Word becomes a means of grace; that is, through the blessing of the Holy Spirit in the exercise of *faith*.

This Divine Agent acts, not through the substance of the bread and wine, but through the truths and realities which they so affectingly symbolize. Those sacred symbols are designed to aid the Christian, through the influences of the Spirit, more touchingly and more movingly to realize and receive the whole body of truths concerning the death and sacrifice of Christ for his sins.

The great difference between this sacrament and preaching as means of grace consists in this. The sacrament takes up mainly those truths which respect the work of Christ upon the cross; and these truths it presents, through the blessing of the Spirit, with unwonted vividness, and, therefore, with unwonted effect, to the specially-prepared minds of *Christian communicants only*. But preaching is designed to take up *all* the truths of Divine Revelation, and to present them all, through the blessing of the same Spirit, to *all classes of hearers*, and under *all the circumstances of life;* for their *conversion* as well as for their *sanctification;* for their direction in all duty, and for their support under all trials; for their light in all darkness, and for their comfort in all sorrows.

But, whether in the sacrament or in preaching, the Spirit reaches the soul in the same way, through the *Truth* which He presents, and not through the material elements in the sacrament, nor through the living man in preaching. To suppose the body and blood of Christ really present in the Eucharist, and really conveyed with its elements, does not, as is urged, make the ordinance more full, more significant, or more efficacious. It does but burden its simplicity, darken its meaning, and, in the end, pervert its operation. Keep the ordinance pure, simple, Scriptural, and Christ by His Spirit will fill it with something better than His mere flesh and blood; with the power of His quickening, purifying, strengthening, and refreshing Truth; with intelli-

gent and soul-cheering views of His cross; and with clear and enrapturing visions into heaven. He will fill it with His *Divine* presence, as the heart-searching, heart-sanctifying *God*. He will fill it with full and satisfying foretastes of that eternal life which He came to purchase and to insure for every humble and obedient believer in His name.*

In addition to the views thus far given of this ordinance, there are some others, upon which, however, I shall touch more briefly, both because they involve no disputed points, and because some of them, being common to both the Christian sacraments, have already been exhibited when treating of *baptism*.

4. I say, then, the Lord's Supper is *a divinely-ordained test of men's obedience to Christ*.

"This do in remembrance of me." Such is Christ's command; and it is as obligatory on those to whom it is addressed as any other precept in the Bible; not as founded on the same reasons, but as coming from the same authority. *Other* commands bind to *instant* obedience, without any previous preparatory process. Such are the commands to "love God supremely, and our neighbor as ourselves;" and to have "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." But *this* binds to obedience as the *result* of a previous preparatory process. In other words, Christ does not command us to partake of His Supper *before* we have true repentance and faith; but, being always under ob-

* It is really astonishing that the writers of the school to which I have so often referred should be so ready as they are to admit the superior fullness of the privileges which Rome retains and enjoys in this sacrament; and to mourn over the meager portion which we, and those of the Anglican Church who agree with us, have gathered and brought with us in our wicked act of separating from that more favored communion! All that Rome retains, over and above these Scriptural views of the sacrament, is but darkness, putting out the light of truth, and corruption, bringing death into the place of life.

ligation to repent and believe, He requires us, *when* penitent and believing, to express our allegiance to Him in this high symbolic act. Inasmuch, however, as *all* are under obligation to repent and believe, there *is* a sense in which all are under obligation thus to remember Christ in His holy Supper. Christ claims *obedience* as well as love and faith; and this ordinance is a *test* of our obedience, as well as a *symbol* to our love and faith. If men have the temper of obedience to Christ, that perhaps best proof of love for Him, and even of faith in Him, they will approach His sacred feast, and manifest that temper before the world. But if they have it not, or if shame, or the fear of man, or the love of the world come into conflict with their rising reverence for their Savior's behest, and finally overmaster a sentiment which had else grown into a settled principle of obedience, they will refuse to approach that Supper, and will thus manifest, before heaven and earth, their disobedience to the Divine Savior of men. Christ, it is true, needs not this test to show *Him* who are obedient and who are disobedient; seeing that, as the Searcher of *hearts*, "He knoweth what is in man:" but He designs by this test to show us, the Church, and the world, whether we cherish the one or the other of these tempers, and thus to make it evident "what manner of spirit we are of." He has left this ordinance in His Church as, on the whole, a faithful visible "detecter of the hearts" of men. He seeks by it to reveal them to themselves as they stand revealed to Him; and thus to bring them, if possible, by repentance to God, and by faith to the cross.

5. Again: the Lord's Supper is, with baptism, one of the visible *badges* by which the disciples of Christ are distinguishable from the world, and held amenable to the divinely-instituted laws of discipline in the Church.

When once *baptized*, we can never become unbaptized; but, when once admitted to the Lord's Supper, we may be cut off from farther fellowship in that Divine symbol. Nor is such an excision a light thing. On the contrary, as to be admitted to this sacrament is the highest outward privilege which we can enjoy on earth, so, to be cut off from it, is the highest of earthly deprivations. By our admission to this privilege, we have applied to us the highest visible seal of the truth of Christ's precious promise of pardon and eternal life: by our excision from it, we are declared unfit, not only for the seal itself, but also for the mercy which, to the true Christian, it guaranties. By the *one*, we are brought into the highest company of Christ's spiritual followers; by the *other*, we are shut out amid the society of all the servants of sin and the world. By the *former*, we are encircled, in all their plenitude and perfection, with that whole system of outward means which God hath so graciously and so wisely devised for strengthening and embellishing our Christian characters in all the graces and beauties of the heavenly life; and by the *latter*, we are placed without this circle of blessings, and separated from the action of those influences with which that circle is filled; and in this condition are left once more, with the choice of life and death still before us, indeed, but exposed, in again making that choice, to all the opposing enmities and oppositions, and to all the perilously counteracting crafts and subtleties of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

This view of the Lord's Supper, as one of the visible badges of Christ's disciples, is extremely important. Without such a badge, the Church would be deprived of her most effective means of discipline, and exposed, without the possibility of purification, to even deeper corruptions than have ever yet defiled her.

This means of discipline has, it is true, like all other good things, been abused. In those ages when spiritual despotism ruled without restraint, even kings and their kingdoms have been made to tremble and bow down under the awful terrors of the Church's interdict. But those ages are passed. The rod of terror, which *abuse* of power had put into the hands of spiritual tyrants, has been broken; and, so far at least as *we* are concerned, has left in its stead nothing but the emblem of holy authority, placed in the hands of a spiritual parent, to be used for the *benefit* only of even her unworthy children. In this character, it were devoutly to be wished that it were more frequently, as it might then be more salutarily used. Discipline among us is plainly in a state of decay; and our Church harbors in her bosom many who, both for *her* benefit and their *own*, should be cast out, and received no more to her holy feast till they can come back robed in the white garments of most humble repentance, and shining in the evident graces of a heart-purifying faith.

6. And, finally, the Lord's Supper, in common, also, with baptism, carries with it *the evidence of a moral monument to the truth and Divine origin of Christianity, and to the identity of the Church through all ages.*

This point, however, having been sufficiently illustrated when treating of baptism, I shall not here repeat the illustration. I recur to it only for the purpose of noticing the connection which this evidence has with the ordinance that has now been examined; and of saying, once more, that this evidence is of the highest value. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as a simple memorial of the death of Christ, is one of the bright links in that infrangible chain which binds the Gospel and the Church to the throne of God. Every time we go to the Lord's Supper, we do, in effect, make a spiritual pilgrimage across the wide desert of Time; a pilgrimage

which ends in bringing us out upon that holy ground whereon "the Son of Man" was crucified for our sins; and which leaves us kneeling there, where myriads have knelt before us, with adoring hearts, around that sublime and imperishable monument erected on the triple plinth of the fact, the date, and the meaning of Christ's atoning sacrifice!

The views which have now been given of the nature of the Lord's Supper are in sufficiently full accord with those given in our Articles.

"The Lord's Supper is not only a *sign* of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another, but rather it is a sacrament of our redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with *faith* receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and, likewise, the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." . . . . "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is *faith*."*

Again: "Sacraments, ordained of Christ, be not only badges, or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good-will toward us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."†

Upon these definitions from the Articles, it will not, after what has been said, be necessary long to dwell. It will be sufficient to say, that the nature of the Eucharist, as *love's memorial*, is referred to in the words, "*Sacrament* of our redemption by Christ's death," and "*sign* of grace and God's good-will toward us;" that its character, as *faith's mirror* of the sacrifice on the cross,

* Art. xxviii. † Art. xxv.

is distinctly indicated in the phrase, "insomuch that, to such as rightly, worthily, and with *faith* receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and, likewise, the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ;" that its character, as *a means of grace*, is fully asserted in the expression, "*effectual* signs of grace, and God's good-will toward us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him;" that its character, as a *test* of obedience to Christ, and also as a *badge* of discipleship under Him, is intimated in the single phrase, "badges or tokens of Christian men's profession;" and that, finally, its character, as imbodying the *evidence* of a moral monument, &c., is apparently expressed in the terms, "certain *sure witnesses*" . . . "of grace and God's good-will toward us;" while, from the whole, the doctrine of *the real presence* is excluded, not only by the omission of the *terms*, but also by the introduction of a clause evidently designed to guard against the *idea;* "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only* after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the *mean* whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is *faith*." In the sacrament, *faith* takes the soul away from the *memorial*, the *symbol*, and the *sign*, to the *cross*, to the *throne*, to the *Crucified*, and the *Glorified;* and there, through its rapturous vision, feeds the soul on the *merits*, the *benefits*, the *life* of our great Sacrifice; of Him "that liveth and *was* dead, and is now alive forevermore." Thus, in "a *heavenly* and *spiritual* manner," through "the mean" of "*faith*," do we eat the body and drink the blood of Christ; and thus do the bread and the cup of blessing prove, to the "*worthy*" recipient, *effectual* signs of "grace and God's good-will toward us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us,

and doth not only quicken," where it *already* exists, "but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

When treating of baptism, I remarked that we may reject the theory of baptismal regeneration, as it has all along been in view, and yet leave the ordinance all that Christ intended it should be. I trust it has now been seen that we may, in like manner, reject the dogma of the real presence, and yet leave the Lord's Supper all that Christ intended to make it by His instituting words. Certainly, after such a rejection, we leave the ordinance invested with all the attributes that I can discover for it, whether in the Bible or in the standards of our Church; and I know not that I can close the whole examination better than by adapting to this part of the subject the language with which I prepared to close the views formerly taken of baptism.

In what I have said, then, upon the Lord's Supper, 'I have shown that the view which I have taken of this ordinance is at least all that the Bible and our Church, in her chief standards of doctrine, make it; and that, therefore, the Bible and our standards being guide, we may reject the doctrine of the real presence, as it has been exhibited from the writings of its advocates, without leaving this high Christian ordinance stripped of its solemnity and importance, a mere soulless, lifeless *form* of what Christ intended should be instinct with mysterious and awful power. In fact, the view which has been taken of this ordinance, while it is scriptural and simple, is, for that very reason, essential to its true beauty, value, and efficacy. To burden it with the thick covering of the theory of the real presence, however reverend and awful the robes in which it is thus designed to dress it, is but to disfigure Divine beauty, simplicity, and life, with what, in fact, robs them of much, if not all, of the salutary power which they were designed to exert. Disencumbered, and left as Christ left

it, and as our Church finds it in the Bible, the Lord's Supper commends itself alike to the Christian's highest esteem, and to his most reverential affection, as every way worthy of its Divine Institutor, and of the Divine end which, in its institution, He contemplated.'

It is not because I wish to take from it the smallest portion of its true value, or to lessen, in the smallest degree, the reverence which the most devout Christian should feel for it, as "the sacrament of his redemption by the death of Christ," that I have so earnestly urged the views presented (for I would as soon seek to put *Christ* out of his own *Gospel*, as I would to put his *intention* out of his own *ordinance*); but because I wish to separate from our apprehensions of this ordinance a feature which, I am most thoroughly persuaded, does not belong to it; and which, I am as thoroughly persuaded, can never be *supposed* to belong to it, without exposing the Church to the gradual, but certain introduction of corruptions the most dangerous, and of superstitions the most pernicious. It does seem to me that we must be blind to the teachings of all Church history for the last eighteen hundred years, before we can put out of sight the truth, that the two doctrines which I have opposed, and in the forms under which I have opposed them—baptismal regeneration, and the real presence—have been copious spring-heads to some of the worst corruptions, and to some of the worst superstitions, by which the beautiful and simple form of Scriptural Christianity has ever been marred.

The sum of what, in the present treatise, has been said, is this. The sole end of God, in all His gracious dealings with us, is the renewal and sanctification of our sinful natures: the sole agent of this necessary change is the Holy Spirit: the sole instrument which the Spirit uses in this work is Divine Truth: while both preaching and the sacraments are but channels of equal-

ly Divine appointment, through which, in their proper places, order, and degree, that Spirit pours the energy of truth, in all its renewing and sanctifying light, upon waiting, inquiring, and obedient minds.

Keep these principles in view, and the Church will be to us full of life, and the way along which she conducts us to heaven luminous with safety. Lose sight of these principles, and the Church herself is in danger of becoming but a body of death; and the way along which she leads us begins to be overhung with the darkness of error, superstition, and fearful peril to our souls.

The Bible, as a book of Divine truths, has been given to be the instrument of purifying a "world lying in wickedness." In this, its purifying work, it has been cast, as a sacred leaven, into the mighty lump, carrying with it, as forms through which the Spirit ordinarily operates, the Church, its ministry, and its ordinances. In the ferment which has followed this gift of God to man, light has mixed with darkness, truth with error, and pure religion with defiling superstition. During this fearful conflict, darkness, error, superstition, have seemed, for long ages, victorious; and light, truth, pure religion, have at times appeared not only vanquished, but almost extinct. Nevertheless, in the *written* form which God has given to His Word, and in the wondrous Providence with which He has watched over its *integrity*, He has given perpetual security to this instrument of a final triumph in favor of Himself and His cause. What has appeared so often worsted in the conflict has not been, in reality, the Word of Truth itself, but only those emanations from itself which, by the power of the Spirit, have gone out for leaven, for mixture, for operation, through the great mass of surrounding evil. In itself it has ever remained, on the whole, incorrupt; giving forth its power; maintaining the ferment of good in the midst of evil; and preparing the way for the time when,

the whole lump being leavened, truth shall every where prevail, the world yield to its sway, and all human things settle down into the unfermenting calm of light, and peace, and love, under Jesus, the spiritual king of all the earth.

In this great warfare of good with evil, the Church, though often deeply corrupted with error and superstition, has yet, on the whole, been the visible medium for diffusing the powerful truths of the Bible ; and the time, it may be believed, will come, when, free from all corruption, her influence shall be felt as simply benign ; when she shall become a widening circle of lights, radiating truth only from Christ, her centre, through the ministry, whom his right hand upholds ; and when all her ordinances, as included among those " mysteries of God" which have been committed to her stewardship, will be seen to operate, not in the darkly confounding prodigies of alleged perpetual miracle, but in the simple richness of that light of knowledge and of life which, as through all her ministries, so also through her signs and symbols, shineth down from her glorified and all knowing Head.

That her symbols are *mysteries* in this sense only, the present treatise has attempted to show. They are not such symbols as carry in themselves a perpetual incarnation of Christ; but only such symbols as collect and pour forth the powerful and sanctifying light, wherewith the Spirit seeks to glorify Him.

An illustration, just used, carries the mind back to one grand symbol which, though not in the form of a sacrament, has yet been left on record, and from which somewhat may be gathered not inappropriate to the subject at this its closing stage. It was given in the vision with which the evangelist of the Apocalypse was favored on the Isle of Patmos.

"In the Spirit on the Lord's Day," he "heard a great *voice;*" and, turning "to see the voice, which spake with" him, he "saw seven golden candlesticks, and, in the *midst* of the seven candlesticks, one like the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters: and he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a two-edged sword: and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength."—Rev., i., 9–16.

There was, indeed, a glorious symbol; a truly evangelic *mystery;* "the mystery of the seven stars, and of the seven golden candlesticks;" with him in the midst, who was "like unto the Son of Man." It was a "mystery" full of *voice*, full of *light;* and He who filled it was girt in the robe and golden zone of Divine beauty and gracefulness. It was full of *voice* for teaching, and of *light* for illumination; and the *garment* which was girt there was as a vesture of righteousness, zoned with truth. Its *voice* was as "many waters" for sounding forth, and as "a two-edged sword" for piercing; its *light* was as a flame of fire for searching, and as the sun in his strength for shedding perfect day; and its *garment* was as holiness for an enrobing glory, and as truth for a girdle of gracious beauty.

Such was the wondrous symbol in its *dress:* one like unto the Son of Man, standing in the midst of seven golden candlesticks, and holding in his hand seven shining stars; more glorious in array than words could describe, and more powerful for operation than thought could conceive. What, then, was the symbol in its *signification?* Not Christ's flesh and blood commingled and co-united with the bodies and souls of individual Christians, effecting thus a perpetual and living incarnation of Himself; but Christ, showing his relation to his light-bearing churches, and to those true

ministers, whom He upholds with his right hand, and who, as starry lights, catch and cast forth, through His churches upon the world, his own glorious effulgence of saving truth and life. "The seven stars," said the interpreting form, in the very idiom of Christ's native tongue as He spake on earth, "the seven stars are (represent) the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks are (represent) the seven churches." This, then, was not Christ incarnate in a darkly incomprehensible symbol; but it was the most gorgeously luminous symbol ever conceived *of* Christ and his churches; of Christ upholding His true ministers with His right hand; speaking through them His two-edged Word of life, in sounds terribly piercing to the sinner, and affectingly solemn to the saint; and casting, through them on the churches, and through the churches on the wide world, the effulgent daylight of His own saving truth.

This was "the mystery," the *meaning*, of the symbol. It was a mystery, not because it was *incomprehensible*, but because it was rich in a meaning *designed* to be understood, and luminously intelligible the moment the word of interpretation was spoken. As the language of Christ, "This is my body," "This is my blood," was really *interpreting* language, making plain what was intended to be understood, the symbolic mystery of his acts in breaking and blessing the bread and the wine; so, the words, "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven golden candlesticks are the seven churches," were truly *interpreting* words, making perfectly plain what was designed to be comprehended, the grand symbolic mystery which opens the Apocalypse.

In this symbolic mystery, Christ sets forth to all ages the relation which he holds to his Church, as one whole, composed of many branches; exhibiting Himself as the source and upholder of its ministry; the source and dispenser of its light; its centrally supreme and governing Head, directing its movements in the divinely merciful work of slaying sin, and

of spreading both the light of truth and the garment of holiness over all the earth. And this relation of Christ to His Church, this agency of Christ through His Church, must become more and more perfectly apprehended and appreciated. His Church must carry less and less of the darkness of *superstitious* mystery, and more and more of the light of *evangelic* mystery; till finally, what was represented to the Lesser Asia by the mystic circle of the seven golden candlesticks, with their accompanying seven shining stars, shall have widened and thrown its circumference around the globe; becoming thus the One Church of all lands, and, with its numberless stellar angels, making universal the light both of the knowledge and of the love of God in Jesus Christ our Lord.

To this splendid result every Christian, but especially every Christian minister, however humble be the station in which he is placed, should, according to the ability and the grace given to him, contribute his portion; and nothing can absolve him from the sin either of ceasing to shine forth in his Master's light, or of turning that light into mere radiating darkness. Influenced by the power of this consideration, whoever, in the spirit of teachableness, humility, and prayer, seeks to gather and give forth light from Christ, and, in this spirit and with this desire, goes to the Word of God, and looks at Him, who appears there as "the sun shining in his strength," may at least hope to be kept from becoming the unwilling disseminator of error instead of truth. Tremblingly, yet confidingly, may he place his work at the feet of Him who standeth in the midst of the golden candlesticks, and who holdeth in his right hand the whole constellation both of the greater and of the lesser lights; leaving his labor there to be used as the Infinite in wisdom shall see fit to use it, and quieting himself with the thought that, if His blessing justify, it will matter little who may condemn; while if, withholding His blessing, He condemn, it will be of no avail, though thousands attempt to justify the offering which is made.

Date Due

[illegible]

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01021 1953