# Miscellaneous Writings

# of

# Elder Samuel Trott

Elder Samuel Trott was never an editor of the “Signs Of The Times” but he was a huge contributor. Some times he signed his writings as “A Waldensian”, some times as “S.T.” and some times as “Trott”. He was the Pastor/Elder of Welsh Tract Assembly during the beginning Of The “Signs of the Times”. And he was one of the seven pastors who were brought together to compile the address entitled “Black Rock Address” in 1832.

I know that the writings that are contained in this document are but a handful of all of his writings. I hope though that these will prove a blessing to you the reader!

Please know that Elder Trott never referred to himself as “Elder Samuel Trott” in a document nor as a signature. That signature was added by the editor. Other editorial liberties are that the titles of the documents are ALL in capital letters now only for consistency sake. The writings are in alphabetical order which includes two sub-sections. One is “Circular & Corresponding letters” and the other is “Justification”. The sub-section of “Justification is NOT in alphabetical order but by the date they were written. I just felt it best to put these in that order.

One thing I have greatly appreciated about Elder Trott was his straight forwardness. He told it like it is. He held no punches when it came to God’s truth. Too many of today’s preachers are too wishy-washy and preach to the audience instead of simply preaching God’s truth no matter who is in the audience.

Tom Adams
February 2023

# Table of Contents

A CALL TO THE PASTORATE....6
A DISSENT FROM BROTHER BEEBE'S VIEWS ON A FINAL JUDGMENT....8
A DISSENT FROM BROTHER BEEBE'S VIEWS ON A FINAL JUDGMENT....14
(A HARD HEART)....20
A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE....23
ANTINOMIANISM EXAMINED AND ITS RELATION TO ARMINIANISM SHOWN....25
APOSTOLIC DIRECTION FOR DEALING WITH HERETICS, AND ON HERESY IN GENERAL. ....30
BARREN FIG & VIEWS ON ZECHARIAH 1:8....35
CALUMNY....40
CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE....41
CHRIST'S BEING MADE UNDER THE LAW &c....46
CIRCULAR & CORRESPONDING LETTERS....52
BROTHERLY LOVE AND UNITY....52
GOD'S GRACE....55
ON THE REIGN OF CHRIST....58
PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH....62
RELATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES AND MINISTERS....66
REMARKS ON I JOHN 1:3....73
SAVED BY THE LORD....77
THE LORD SHALL COMFORT ZION....82
THE LORD THY GOD WHICH TEACHETH THEE TO PROFIT....86
THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT MADE FOR SIN....91
THE NEW BIRTH: EXPERIMENTALLY CONSIDERED....96
UNITY OF THE BRETHREN....101
COMMENTS ON LUKE 16:19-31....105
COMMUNION WITH GOD....110
CONCERNING ELECTION & CALLING....117
CONCERNING HOLINESS....124
CONCERNING SIN....127
CORRESPONDENCE....131
CORRESPONDENCE....134
DEPRAVITY AND SIN....137
DID CHRIST PURCHASE HEAVEN FOR HIS PEOPLE?....141
DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO HEADS....148
DUTY FAITH & REPENTANCE....151
ELDER OSBOURN: HIS CHARGE OF SABELLIANISM, &c....161
ENQUIRIES CONCERNING THE SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY....169
EXPERIMENTAL DARKNESS....176
EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS: NATURAL & CARNAL....179
EXPOSITION OF COL. 1:12....181
GNOSTICISM....185
GOSPEL ORDER....188

HEAVENS DISSOLVED, AND ELEMENTS MELT WITH FERVENT HEAT....192
INQUIRIES & REPLIES....197
IS LOVE THE BOND OF UNION?....200
JUSTIFICATION ( IN ORDER OF DATE WRITTEN )....204
ETERNAL JUSTIFICATION?....204
MY THOUGHTS ON JUSTIFICATION....206
THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION....216
VIEWS ON JUSTIFICATION DEFENDED....224
LABORERS TOGETHER WITH GOD....227
MATTHEW 2:23 – NAZARENE....230
MATTHEW 24:27, CONSIDERED....234
MISSIONARY PRIESTCRAFT....240
MOREOVER THE LAW ENTERED....245
NOT A NOVICE &c....248
ON FAITH....250
ON ISAIAH 20th – No. 1....256
ON ISAIAH 20th – No. 2....260
ON THE ATONEMENT....266
CHAPTER I....266
CHAPTER II....271
CHAPTER III....275
ON THE IMPORT OF THE TERMS: EVERLASTING, ETERNAL, &c....281
PARABLE OF WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED THE PRODIGAL SON....285
PRAYER OF THE UNREGENERATE....291
PUBLIC FASTING....294
REGARDING A LETTER BY OSBOURN....298
REGULATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES....302
REMARKS ON ELDER WILLIAMS' LETTER & QUERIES....308
REMARKS ON EPHESIANS 1:3....314
REMARKS ON Gen. 6:6....320
REMARKS ON ISAIAH 51:1....323
REMARKS ON JAMES 5:14-15....327
REMARKS ON PHIL. 3:21....334
REMARKS ON ROMANS 8:28....337
REMARKS ON THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD....342
REMARKS RESPECTING THE SABBATH, &c....344
REPLY TO BRETHREN: SONSHIP & UNION....349
REPLY TO BRETHREN: THE NEW BIRTH....356
THE BEASTS AND THEIR IMAGE....363
THE BEING AND NATURE OF ANGELS....366
THE BENEDICTION....373
THE END OF THE WORLD....378
THE FOUR CHARIOTS FROM BETWEEN TWO MOUNTAINS OF BRASS....382
THE GOSPEL MINISTRY....387
THE GROUND OF CHRIST'S GLORY....390
THE LAW....396

THE LIGHT OF GOSPEL SIMPLICITY....399
THE NEW BIRTH....401
THE PARABLE OF THE WHEAT AND THE TARES....406
THE RESURRECTION....411
THE RESURRECTION. # 2....418
THE SABBATH....421
THE SABBATH....425
THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE – Rev. 3:1-5....438
THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE – Rev. 3:1-5....443
THE SEALING OF THE SPIRIT....449
THE SIN UNTO DEATH....453
THOUGHTS ON PREDESTINATION....456
SCRIPTURE: THE ONLY CERTAIN RULE & FINAL AUTHORITY....458
SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST....462
SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FROM Gal. 3:3....465
SOME OBJECTIONS ADDRESSED....468
SOME OBJECTIONS NOTICED....472
SOME THOUGHTS ON Heb. 11:40....478
SOME VIEWS REGARDING MANASSAH: KING OF JUDAH....481
SOVEREIGN GRACE AND GOOD WORKS....484
UNION OF CHRIST WITH THE CHURCH....492
VALID BAPTISM....496
VIEWS ON ELDER PARKER'S TWO-SEED SYSTEM....502
VIEWS ON Gen. 3:22....512
VIEWS OF HEBREWS 8:11....518
VIEWS ON ISAIAH 2:4....523
VIEWS ON I JOHN 3:15....527
VIEWS ON MARK 8:22-26....530
VIEWS ON MATTHEW 12:43-45....533
VIEWS ON I PETER 4:17,18....536
VIEWS ON PHILIPPIANS 3:10 & 11....541
VIEWS ON THE SEED OF THE SERPENT....546
WHAT ARE THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION?....551

# A CALL TO THE PASTORATE.

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

S.TROTT.

> *The Frying Pan & Mount Pleasant Churches Fairfax County, Va. – To Elder Samuel Trott, Pastor of the Welsh Tract Church, New Castle County, Del., send Greetings: –*
>
> VERY DEAR BROTHER: – This is to inform you that we have by an unanimous vote at our respective Church Meeting of business, chosen you as our Pastor; and you are to receive this as our joint call.
>
> *The Ebenezer Baptist Church, Loudoun County, Va. – To Elder Samuel Trott, &c., sendeth Greetings*:
>
> VERY DEAR BROTHER: – This is to inform you that at a special meeting, called for the purpose on Wednesday, March the 6th, we unanimously agreed to invite you to commence preaching for us, conjointly with your commencing to preach for the above named Churches, with the understanding that we will settle the call with you in due form, after you come on.
>
> Signed, in behalf, and by order of the above named Churches, by:
> WM. GILMORE.
> February 7, 1833.

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

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

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

---

*To the Ebenezer Baptist Church, Loudoun County, Va.*

BELOVED BRETHREN: – I hereby certify my acceptance of your invitation, through our much esteemed Brother Wm. Gilmore, the authorized organ of communication between us, to commence preaching statedly for you, on the days of your monthly meetings, connectively, with my commencing with the Frying Pan & Mount Pleasant Churches, leaving it with the Great Head of the Church to direct, as shall be most for your good,

and his own glory, whether I shall in due time become regularly your Pastor or not.

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

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

S.TROTT.

Signs of the Times
Volume 1, No. 10.
April 10, 1833

# A DISSENT FROM BROTHER BEEBE'S VIEWS ON A FINAL JUDGMENT.

FOR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

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

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

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

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

judgment, as well as his body and bride? Again, I might show, that all the descriptions given in the New Testament of the events connected with the resurrection of the saints, indicate that they are on, that event, to be manifested as participants with Christ in his glory; rather than to be associated with the world in the final judgment thereof. But I will forbear at present.

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

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

1st. You appear to place a *final judgment* of the wicked and of the saints upon the same grounds, blending both together, and opposing both by the same arguments. But I understand the case of the two to stand upon very different grounds. It appears to me evident, from the whole course of God's government as declared in the scriptures, that every act of the dispensation of his justice, is so ordered as to manifest his righteousness therein, even as his *setting forth Christ Jesus to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood*, was, *to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past*; and to declare it, *that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*. (See Rom. 3:25,26.) Now I cannot conceive but that God would have been equally just in acquitting from the demands of the law, all in whose stead Christ should have suffered the penalty of the law, had not Christ been thus publicly set forth to suffer before the world and his enemies, and without having his crucifixion published from age to age, as now, but his justice then would not, as now, have been made manifest in justifying *him which believeth in Jesus*. Even in the case of Christ himself, there appears to have been a summing up of the charges against him, as the Surety of his people, as well as an executing of judgment upon him, hence the *laying on him the iniquities of us all*, was, as represented by the High Priest's *laying his hands* on the head of the scape-goat, and *confessing over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel*, &c., (Lev. 16:21,) an actual bringing to view, those iniquities for which he was to suffer. These texts also, "By his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," and, "though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered," (Isa. 53:11; Heb. 5:8,) seem to me to import that he not only had *his work before him* and knew for whom he was to suffer, but also that he was made to know in his own soul, his people's sins, and the guilt thereof, and the justice of the wrath to be inflicted. Hence his agony in the garden, and his saying, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," &c.

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

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

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

Here then is the difference between the case of the saints and that of the world. The saints have been brought to special judgment, both in themselves and in the Head, as you admit, and their condemnation and justification both have been made manifest, as being in accordance with strict justice. But are the unregenerate thus judged in this life, and their sins in their true colors, and the justice of their condemnation manifested to themselves and to others? Certainly not; excepting that the saints know from their own experience, the justice of God in condemning the wicked; and excepting the instances of national judgments as such, which can only take place in this world, as all national

relations are dissolved with this life. – Hence the reason for a future judgment in relation to the wicked, and in distinction from the saints, is, I think, fully manifested. But I do not understand this future judgment to involve that arminian mass of nonsense which you connect with it, and by doing which, you have not done justice to the sentiments of your brethren, who differ from you. Neither will it be a process of enquiry, to give Christ, the Judge, a knowledge of their characters and crimes. But it will be a summing up of the evidence of their guilt, as given in their lives, and thus making manifest the justice of the final sentence then to be passed and executed upon them.

This leads me, in the 3d place, to notice the fact, that you have in your editorial blended the legal enactments, the investigation of charges, and the giving judgment thereupon, all together in the idea of judgment. The term *to judge*, may in some instances be used to denote the whole of a trial; but more strictly its import is, to pronounce sentence according to the testimony elicited in the previous trial, or investigation. In this latter sense, I think the words to *judge* and *judgment* are generally rendered. Hence, from your advancing the idea that the wicked were judged in this life, those universalists who were present at Welsh Tract, were so highly pleased with your preaching, saying that you had advanced exactly their doctrine; inferring, and with much propriety, that if you held the wicked to be judged in this life, you would also hold that they received their punishment here. I hold as firmly as you do, that all have transgressed the law of God, and are therefore already condemned by the law; so the laws of man condemn every transgression thereof, and declare the penalty due the transgressor. But you I believe would not on that account approve of the murderer's being immediately *lynched*, or summarily executed, even by those who might have been eye witness to the murder, but would say that he should first have an impartial trial, and that judgment should be regularly passed, and then executed. Again, I admit that the wicked are in a measure tried in this life, – not that they are probationers, for when a person has once transgressed, he is no longer a probationer under the law transgressed. But that God in bearing long with the world, is giving occasion to the wicked to give evidence of their native enmity to God, both by their opposition to the gospel, and by their worldly deportment, and consequently of their being transgressors of the law. And judging from the experience of the regenerate, I believe this evidence given by each individual in his own case is recorded, though in many cases unnoticed by him, in the book of his conscience, and when this book in connection with the book of the law comes to be opened by the Judge, (and which are called *books*, Rev. 20:12,) the guilt of the sinner, and the justice of the sentence then pronounced against him, or the judgment given, will be manifested. Now I think that you, yourself, will not contend that the impenitent have in this life any just knowledge of the extent of their sinfulness and guilt, or of the justice of their condemnation. If so, does it not prove that they are not fully judged in this life, and consequently, the necessity of a judgment beyond this life?

3rd. In reference to the arguments brought forward in your editorial, they mostly tend, and were probably designed to prove, that the saints will not again be made to stand in judgment; they do not therefore require an answer. The one drawn from the fact of Christ's being seated on his judgment seat when he executed judgment on the Jews, is perhaps excepted from the above remark. But I cannot conceive that Christ's having assumed his judgment seat, – not *when* he came to execute judgment on Jerusalem, but thirty-six years before, is any proof that he will not retain that seat until *he hath put all enemies under his feet*. Remember, *the last enemy to be destroyed is death*. I Cor. 15:25,26. Neither is the fact that he judged and executed judgment on the Jews at the appointed time any proof that he will not at the set time judge the anti-christian nations among the Gentiles, for their persecution of the gospel, or that he will not before giving up the kingdom to the Father, bring to a *righteous judgment* all them "that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," according to II Thes. 1:5-8. But rather, I consider the former exemplary judgment a sure pledge that these other predicted judgments will be also fully executed. Your views on Matt. 25:31-46, I do not in general object to, provided that passage be understood to be a figurative representation of the genuine effect of the coming of Christ in his gospel, whether before, or after the destruction of Jerusalem, or after the two Witnesses shall be again raised up and Babylon destroyed. For whenever he thus comes in the clouds or on the *white horse* of the gospel,* the preached gospel will have that discriminating effect. But in this view of the passage, I should consider the last verse to be a summing up of the figure by a positive declaration, that as the gospel points out the characters of these two classes, so their final ends will be. One exception however I must make, I cannot agree with what you intimate, that the preached gospel distinguishes between nations as such; setting one nation on the right hand, the other on the left. Peter's view I think more correct, viz: – "That God is no respecter of persons, but *in every nation* he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Acts 10:34,35. The declaration, "Before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats," &c., allowing for the brevity used generally in such figurative representations, does not necessarily require that the word *them* should have the word *nations* for its antecedent. The example referred to, that of a shepherd's dividing the sheep from the goats where they were all flocked together, leads to a different construction. The shepherd, we must conclude, must take his flock by individuals to make the separation.

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

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

---

* Matt. 24:30,31; and Rev. 19:11-16

Signs of the Times
Volume 9, No. 18.
September 15, 1841

# A DISSENT FROM BROTHER BEEBE'S VIEWS ON A FINAL JUDGMENT.

FOR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 139.]

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

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

Acts 17:31, I also refer to: "Because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." This passage I think cannot be made to harmonize with your views without wresting the words from their

plain import and connection. In the first place the expression, *Because he hath appointed a day*, must mean some period then future, and therefore cannot be construed to mean the gospel day, or dispensation, which the Apostle refers to as then present, and as contrasted with the period going before, by the expressions, *But now commandeth all men, everywhere, to repent*. Besides the expression, *hath appointed a day*, clearly designates a specific set period, a *day*, for this object. And who are to be judged on that day? The *world* – not the saints. Again, how does the fact of God's having raised Christ *from the dead*, give *assurance unto all men* of this judging the *world* on a set *day*, except on the ground that his resurrection from the dead, is a sure pledge of the resurrection of the dead? – Consequently the judgment must be subsequent to that event. If we take Rom. 2:12 & 16, in connection with the above text, we shall find that the *appointed day*, is a *day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ*. And brother Beebe certainly will not contend that the *secrets* of men of the world are judged in this life, that every *secret thing* of the wicked *is* in this life, *brought into judgment*.

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

Heb. 9:27, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment," demands some attention. I am aware of the turn you attempt to give this text; namely, that the *appointment unto men to die*, was to die in *trespasses and sins;* or to die unto the law. In reference to the first of these ideas, I would ask, did it remain for the appointment to take effect in reference to a single individual of the human family, to become dead in trespasses and sins, when this text was written? Certainly not, all that died in Adam and come into the world, in this sense, dead. How then in reference to this death, can it be said, "It is appointed unto men once *to die?*" Or has brother Beebe adopted the idea that infants come into the world pure, and that they die when coming to years of discretion by contracting the disease of sin? In reference to the other idea, that of dying unto the law, I will only remark; 1st. That the word *men* is here clearly used as denoting the species universally, and certainly all mankind do not become dead to the law; and 2nd. That the experience of the children of God shows that their *death* to the law is in consequence of the *judgment* had in their case, the judgment therefore in this case precedes the death. No, my brother, the plain import of the text points to that appointment contained in the decree, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return*. And the judgment being after this shows that it must be beyond this life. But you may say, that as it is appointed unto the saints, in common with others, the above construction of this text, would involve the idea, that they also shall be judged beyond this life. Not so. It is true, that in reference to their relation to Adam, the saints were in the same condemnation; the Apostle therefore notices this fact, in order to show their redemption from it through the substitution of Christ. For the very essence of his argument here, is,

that as this appointment to death and judgment stood against *all*, "So Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of *many*, (not *all*,) and unto them that look for him, (*by faith*,) shall he appear a *second time*, without sin unto salvation." His *one offering* then was as a substitute, to meet the judgment in their stead, to deliver them from it, and even from death as a penal evil. Hence when he comes a *second time*, it will be without sin, not to bring to remembrance again their sins; but, *unto salvation*, to the full experience of their salvation. One other scriptural testimony to this point I will notice; namely, Rev. 20:11-15. There is much diversity of opinion, and much absurdity afloat relative to the thousand years reign spoken of in the preceding part of this chapter, and which the judgment spoken of in the passage above quoted, shall succeed. – Of that thousand years reign I shall not express any opinion, save to notice certain facts stated in the account of it. 1st. This is expressly declared to be the *first resurrection*. 2nd. John saw as having part in it, those that "were beheaded for the witness of Jesus," and those that "had not worshipped the beast, nor his image, neither had received his mark, &c." These of course must include all those whose names are written in the *Lamb's book of life*. See Rev. 13:8. 3rd. It is declared that *these lived*, &c., by which I understand that they had been raised to life from the dead; else, what can be meant by that which immediately follows; namely, "But the rest of the dead *lived not again* until the thousand years were finished?" In reference to this judgment, John declares that he, "saw the dead, both small and great, stand before God, &c.," and the "dead were judged out of those things written in the books, according to their works." Now these dead thus judged were such as had been in the sea, and in death, and hell; and certainly they cannot be men living on the earth, and who are only *dead in trespasses and sins*. Now, my brother, I do think that on a calm reconsideration of this whole subject, with the proofs in favor of a *future judgment*, you will abandon the notion, which you perhaps took up and advocated too hastily.

But it is not alone in reference to your rejection of the idea of a *final judgment*, that I dissent from your editorial under consideration. Your quotation of, or rather reference to several texts of scripture, applying them to the coming of Christ in the destruction of Jerusalem; and thereby representing all those several *comings* of Christ spoken of in the New Testament, to have received their accomplishment in his judgment upon that city and people, must receive my decided dissent. On this point you are sustained by the expositions on Hebrews, by our esteemed and talented brother Klipstine; but though he or you or an angel from heaven advance the idea, if it is not according to the doctrine taught in the New Testament, I am required not to receive it. But to the point, you say, page 111, col. 2. *He went to receive a kingdom, leaving with his saints the kind assurance that he would come to them again – that he would associate his little flock with him in that kingdom – that it was needful for them that he should go away, but that he would return before some of them should taste death.* In these extracts connected as

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

There are also other texts which you, by your extracts, apply with equal indiscrimination to the taking vengeance on the Jews, and which I am about to show, clearly relate to future comings of our Lord Jesus; as in this passage, *Nor was that coming, nor those signs to be deferred, &c., but should take place when he should descend with a shout as he went up, and come to be admired by all who waited for his appearing, but to take vengeance on the Jews*, &c. I find but one text which speaks of the Lord's *descending with a shout*, that is, I Thes. 4:16,17, which reads thus, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, &c." Now, if anything like what is here declared took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, or has taken place from that day to this, I am ignorant of the history of it. The expressions, *The Lord himself shall descend from heaven*, can mean nothing less than his personal coming, such as the two men in *white apparel* told the Apostles should take place, when they said, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as you have seen

him go into heaven." Acts 1:11. Their seeing him go into heaven, was a *personal, or bodily* going into heaven; in *like manner* was he to come again. Such an event I have no idea took place when Jerusalem was destroyed. His coming then, as in several other instances, was only in his power. By the expression, *come to be admired by all who waited for his appearing*, I know not to what you can allude, except it be II Thes. 1:10, which reads thus, "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, [not by them,] and to be admired in, [not *by*,] all them that believe." I would ask brother Beebe to tell us what this text, or what the persecution this church was enduring (see vs.4,) had to do with the destruction of Jerusalem, or what that event had to do with this Gentile church which was not situated even in Asia? Or how he was at that period *admired in all them that believe*, when he was then, and for many years after, suffering, *in them*, persecution throughout the whole Roman empire. In the expressions, *Destroy his enemies by the spirit of his mouth, and consume them by the brightness of his coming,* you must have had reference to II Thes. 2:8, and thereby applied that prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem. The text reads thus, "And then shall that Wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy by the brightness of his coming." – Now notice that, that *man of sin*, that *son of perdition*, that Wicked whom the Lord shall *consume* and *destroy*, was not *revealed* when the Apostle wrote this epistle, and there was a *let* which must be taken out of the way before he could be revealed, and also a *falling away first*, &c., verses 4-7. But certainly the Jewish nation and their wickedness also, had been fully manifested at that time; and of course this scripture had no relation to the destruction of that people. Other texts which you refer to, I will pass by. Hence it appears manifest that you referred on the one hand, to declarations and promises which relate to Christ's coming to his disciples from the dead, and his coming in the person of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost; and on the other hand, to texts which contain direct declarations concerning his coming to destroy that *Wicked*, the anti-christ among the Gentiles, and concerning his personal coming, when the *dead in Christ shall be raised*, and those saints *alive shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, and shall be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air;* and the whole you have applied to the one event, his coming in the destruction of Jerusalem, thus making that period and that event the center point of nearly all of the New Testament prophecies. If you and brother Klipstine are correct, I would like to be informed whether we have any good authority to expect any further coming of Christ, excepting as he has been coming in the preached gospel for the last eighteen hundred years. I know of no promise of his coming, which may not as consistently be made to apply to that favorite event of yours, and brother Klipstine's, viz: his coming in the instrumentality of the Romans in his judgment upon the Jews, as some of those promises you have so applied, or as the promises in the Epistle to the Hebrews may be made so to apply.

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

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

Signs of the Times
Volume 9, No. 19.
October 1, 1841

# (A HARD HEART)

FOR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

NUMBER 1

Brother Beebe: Writing a few days since to a distant friend, on a subject which she had proposed, namely *a hard heart*; I was led, in speaking on it as a distinguishing trait of an unregenerate state, to refer to Pharaoh as a Scriptural instance illustrative of this subject. And in drawing a contrast between the heart of Pharaoh and the hearts of the children of Israel, as manifested under God's dealings with them, I was led to some ideas, which may perhaps, be edifying to some, who have not thought particularly on the subject. I therefore send them to you for publication, if you see fit to give them a place in the Signs.

In contemplating that portion of Sacred History which relates to God's bringing Israel out of Egypt, I find the fact prominent, that Moses' mission, he having Aaron for his *mouth* or *minister*, was directed both to Israel and Pharaoh; that whilst God's purpose in sending Moses into Egypt, as foretold, and as accomplished, was to bring Israel in particular, out of their bondage, yet that He had a demand upon Pharaoh and that demand was made through Moses. From the fact that in the New Testament, the name of Moses is substituted for the law as given by him, see Luke 16:29 & Acts 15:21, we are scripturally authorized to consider Moses as prefiguring the Law. – And as Moses' message both to Israel and Pharaoh, was declared by Aaron as his mouth, see Ex. 4:15,16,30, so the true demands of the law, as *spiritual*, are brought to view only in the doctrine, the life and death of Christ. And it is the Law as thus *established* by the Gospel, and not the Sinai covenant, that speaks through our Spiritual Aaron, or in the gospel ministry, showing the just condemnation of all the human family, convincing the *regenerated* of sin, and producing *in them* a death to it, as the way of acceptance with God. I am aware that from Egypt's being denominated the *house of bondage*, Israel's bondage there, is thought to prefigure the situation of the sinner under the Law. To this I answer, that the *Law is good and the commandment holy, just, and good*; but the bondage of Egypt was unjust and oppressive. I therefore consider it more consistent with the tenor of divine revelation, to consider Moses as representing the Law. As Moses' mission to Israel, though the occasion of an increase of their oppression, for a season, was a gracious mission; so the Law, although the occasion of much bondage to the spiritual Israel whilst in their *Egypt*, was graciously given in reference to them, to convince them of sin, and to prostrate them at the feet of sovereign mercy. The fact is, the Law as given in *thunder* from Sinai, has no direct tendency to produce that slavish bondage under which men labour in seeking justification by their works; but on the

contrary, by *entering that the offense may abound*, or in other words by searching out and bringing to our view the depravity of our hearts, its tendency is, to show us the folly of looking to our own works, for salvation, and to bring us to cry with the Publican for mercy. On the other hand the Egyptian bondage, prefigured that bondage under which the sinner labors, in consequence of his disbelief of the testimony of God borne through the Law, his predetermination to cling to legal principles for life; and above all, of his substituting the Sinai covenant as given nationally to Israel, for the Law, as the standard of individual justification before God. To these things the pride and self-will of man, has, in every age, predisposed him to; and his own consciousness of transgression, driving him from a confident reliance on the moral principles of the Law covenant, substituting since the gospel day, baptism for circumcision, and natural faith and repentance, reformation, profession, prayers, &c. for the titles, and offerings to which the Jews clung. This drudgery is frequently called *legal obedience*, but it is more properly termed *illegal*, for it certainly is not sanctioned by the law.

Having premised thus much relative to Moses' mission into Egypt, and the bondage of Israel, I proceed to the point in view; namely, to show by the different effects the message of Moses had, upon Pharaoh on the one hand, and Israel on the other; the evidence of that hardness of heart, which is characteristic of unregeneracy, as manifested in the course pursued by the unregenerate relative to the demands of the Law as published through the gospel ministry, and as contrasted with that conduct produced by the heart being regenerated. For Pharaoh notwithstanding his exalted station, stood manifestly in the relation of a creature of God, and bound to yield obedience to the divine will, although his exaltation tended the more to harden his heart.

As the demand of God was pointed upon Pharaoh, and so declared by Aaron, so the demands of the Law are equally pointed toward every child of Adam, requiring him to give up his heart to God, and bow to His sovereignty; and should be so published in the ministry of the gospel.

As Pharaoh in reply to the first delivery of Moses' message to him, said, "Who is the Lord that I should obey His voice &c.," so the unregenerate practically treat with contempt the demands of God's law, many of them living as though they knew not, that there is a Lord, whom they should reverence and obey. Again, as Pharaoh appealed to his magicians to invalidate the miracles of Moses by imitation, and as God permitted them in these cases to perform acts resembling those miracles He wrought by Moses; so the unregenerate, frequently, try to evade the manifestation of their obligation to God arising from His providential goodness to them, by ascribing their preservation, their health, prosperity &c. to their own prudence, exertions, &c. and so the Lord often permits those who disown His special government, to prosper in the world, whereby their hearts become the more hardened against Him, and they fill up the measure of their

iniquities; and at the same time His purpose is accomplished by them, as it was in bringing about the occasion for manifesting His great power in bringing His people out from under the yoke of Pharaoh. They also seek to invalidate the truth of God's word, in which is revealed the helpless state of the sinner in reference to salvation, his necessity of *being born from above, &c.*, by appealing to their power to reform their outward lives, to perform the outward forms of religion &c. Indeed there are, at this day, many who are fitly prefigured by Pharaoh's magicians, from the mock conversions, they are producing by their various acts; and the Lord is permitting them to succeed in drawing the multitude after them, under the impression that theirs is the *great power of God*, and all this that God's mighty power may be known, not only in sustaining His church, in opposition to the rage of the foaming current, but also in the complete, ultimate overthrow of the man of sin in all his entrenchments.

In other instances, Pharaoh finding himself pressed by the judgments of God, sends in haste for Moses and Aaron, and proposes a partial submission to the demand made, and in some cases promises compliance on condition of being relieved from the evil he dreaded, but when relief was had, he forgot his promises. We see much like this, at this day, in persons under those natural convictions which are produced, either by the fears of approaching death, or by excitements produced, whether with, or without the methodical forms of camp or protracted meetings. Many persons condemn death-bed repentances, who extol as a high state of religious exercise the very same kind of terror when produced at meetings by the preachers harrowing up the feelings of the afflicted or, as though it was his element, pouring forth torrents of hell-fire against those who have not as yet submitted to be converted by him; and this in a manner that would be considered insufferably coarse, if coming from any other source than his pulpit. But these slavish fears, excited by what they may be, are as void of pure religion as was Pharaoh's which was occasioned by seeing the *fire and hail mingled*. The unregeneracy of the subjects of these excitements is manifested, frequently in their *sinning*, like Pharaoh, *yet more*, in going back wherein they had reformed; if not in this, yet in manifesting a determination to adhere to their own terms for acceptance with God; saying with Pharaoh to those who would point to a finished salvation; *look to it, for evil is before you*, that is in depending as helpless condemned sinners, upon the free and sovereign grace of God in Christ for salvation, without having their prayers, and other performances, acknowledged, as good and acceptable in the sight of God. And when they professedly submit to acknowledge themselves to be lost sinners, and to *give themselves up*, as they say, *to be saved by Christ*, it is with the understanding, on their part, that in consideration of their doing so, Christ has bound Himself to save them. Thus instead of acknowledging and submitting to the righteous and unalterable demands of God's Law, and being willing to rely for salvation, as objects of mercy, upon the sovereign pleasure of God in Christ, they would have God to come to such terms as they

according to their various systems, think are right. Who, that has eyes to see, does not see in this kind of religion, put on in order to be saved, a correspondence in principle and practice, with Pharaoh's attempts to escape the judgments of God? If his was the workings of a hardened heart, so must theirs be.

S. TROTT.
*Fairfax C. H. Va. March* 10, 1835.

Signs of the Times
Volume 3, No. 7.
April 1, 1835

## A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE.

BROTHER JEWETT: – I am pleased to learn that so many are being led, I trust by the Holy Spirit, to a more scriptural view of the important doctrine of Justification, and of the order of gospel churches; as being designed by their Great Head to be independent of all other religious ORGANIZATIONS or bodies; and that yourself among others have been thus led. As thou hast received the gift, my brother, so minister the same; freely and boldly impart the light given thee in the Scriptures; relative both to doctrine and practice. What is told thee in darkness that speak thou in the light; and what thou hearest in the ear, that preach, or publish, upon the house-top; whether in illustration of truth, or exposure of error.

I am truly rejoiced to find you where you are, on a little spot, surrounded by vast and diversified fields of error; and that the Lord has led you on step by step, to this spot, giving you an opportunity to examine each place as you passed along, and unfolding to

your view the mystery of iniquity, as under the assumed garb of *religious benevolence*, it stalks abroad in various forms of doctrine and practice.

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

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

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

And you, my brother, the more you are brought to see and feel the marked distinction there is between divine revelation and human science, will you be disposed to adopt a

motto corresponding to our republican charge, that where liberty is, there is my country, and say that where gospel truth and christian experience is clearly presented to view, there is the composition which you admire, and the learning which you prize.

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

# ANTINOMIANISM EXAMINED AND ITS RELATION TO ARMINIANISM SHOWN.

FOR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

BROTHER BEEBE: – I received a letter a short time since, from Bro. P. Meredith, in which he requests me also to give my views of the text, Job 28:7,8, in reference to the enquiry *whether there is not a path which passes between the sand bars of Arminianism and the granite rocks of Antinomianism.*

Your answer to this enquiry as published under the editorial head in No.9 of present Vol., he says is very explicit in reference to Arminianism, but not so full in reference to Antinomianism as he wished. He gives as a further reason for requesting my views, that he has lately heard, "that to be a thorough going Old School Baptist, one must believe that it is not the duty of the unregenerate, to believe, repent, or pray." I will therefore add my testimony to yours on this point. The one may strengthen the other.

I will first examine the subject of Antinomianism and see whether "the path which no fowl knoweth, and the vulture's eye hath not seen" can be a middle track between that and Arminianism.

The signification of the term *Antinomianism* is, according to its etymology, *against the law*, as shown by Brother Beebe; and the charge evidently intended to be fixed upon those to whom this term is applied is that they are opposed to the law of God, or do it away by their doctrine. This charge, if the enemies of truth were admitted to be judges,

would have been fixed upon the *Master of the house*, and *upon those of His household* in every age, from Paul down to Brother Meredith and myself, who preach a finished salvation in Christ. But I appeal from those *would be* judges to the scriptures of truth. I would stand at the judgment seat of Christ.

Those who anciently claimed to be disciples of Moses in distinction from Christ, evidently supposed that the letter of the Sinai laws, moral and ceremonial, together with the traditions of their fathers, constituted a code of law which supplanted the original law under which man was created; and that this was the standard by which man's acceptance with God, or rejection, was to be decided. Because Christ and His Apostles preached a doctrine adverse to this Pharisaical law, they were denounced as opposers of the law of Moses. The modern *Nomians* or legalists also understand the original law of God to have given place to a milder law, compounded of the letter of the Ten Commandments and what they conceive to be certain requisitions and conditions of the gospel, and that this *gospel law* is the standard of righteousness, by which all men under the gospel are to be tried, and a want of conformity to it is the ground of condemnation; and according to some, a personal conformity to it, is the ground ofjustification. But no individual who has been brought truly to love the law of God, can admit of its being supplanted by such a medley of human contrivance, and when it is opposed, either as a standard of right or as a yoke of bondage attempted to be put upon the neck of disciples of Christ, its opposers are at once denounced as Antinomians.

In making my appeal from these partial Judges, I file the following answers to their charge: 1st. That God in creating Adam a living soul, laid him, and his posterity in him, under obligation to love the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his strength; and to love his neighbor as himself; that this constituted the law of his creation, and the eternal standard of right, which no apostasy of man could make void. 2nd. That the revelation which God has made of His mind and will in the scriptures, the alone standard of truth, no where teaches that God has ever abrogated this law of man's creation, altered its requisitions, or abated its demands to suit the weakness of fallen man. This answer is sustained by Matt. 5:17-20 & Rom. 3:31. 3rd. That the prohibition given to Adam in the garden not to eat of the forbidden tree, was designed as a test of his subjection to God and to the law of his creation; his transgressing this prohibition was therefore the just ground of his being condemned and his posterity in him to a state of depravity or *death in sin*. And that the law of Ten Commands given from Sinai, in its general bearing upon all men, distinct from its special reference to Israel nationally, was not designed as a *covenant of works* and to lead men to depend on their obedience to it for their final acceptance with God, either Jews or Gentiles; but it "was added because of transgression, till the Seed should come to whom the promise was made, &c.;" (Gal. 3:19) it "entered that the offence might abound." (Rom. 5:20) In a

word, it was given in its spiritual import, in the sense in which Paul says the *law is spiritual*, – (Rom. 7:14) as a schoolmaster to teach both Jews and Gentiles their entire depravity and guilt, and the impossibility of their being justified by the deeds of the law, and their need of just such a salvation as is revealed in Christ, a salvation from sin and sovereignly free. Hence it is written, "We know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped and all the world become guilty before God;" and again, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:19,20. Neither, I will add, was this law of Ten Commands given, in itself considered, to be a *rule of life*; it was designed to teach us what sin is, and its moral precepts are sanctioned by the New Testament as illustrating that which is a proper deportment toward God and toward man in a general and moral point of view. But a *rule of life*, to be correct must be an exact measure of all that is required of us to perform. – This law was not such to ancient Israel; other laws were given them, which they were required also to obey, and which were of course component parts of that rule by which their lives were to be squared, such as certain positive institutions of a ceremonial nature, &c. Neither is it a perfect rule to spiritual Israel; the life of a christian as such, must be upon a broader scale than the letter of the Decalouge, in order to its being squared with the gospel. Repentance toward God for his daily wanderings of heart, and living daily by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and an establishment in the truths of the gospel must enter into the composition of a christian's life or walk in order to his conformity to the gospel standard; and these things are beyond the compass of the Ten Commands, "For the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them." Gal. 3:12. There are also positive institutions belonging exclusively to the gospel to be observed by the christian if he would "walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel." If therefore the legalists call us Antinomians for denying that the law is a rule of life to the disciples of Christ, we may well call them *anti-gospelers*, or *anti-new-testamenters* for their attempts to make it a full rule to the christian's life. Thus much for our views concerning the much insisted upon notion that the law is a *rule of life* to the christian, and I will now return to the further consideration of the answers I have filed.

1st. Whilst these answers stand, and they must stand according to the standard of eternal truth, it is evident that we are justified in opposing this law of conditions of which faith and repentance and various religious ceremonies, are the principal terms, being foisted into the place of that unchanging standard of right, the law under which man was created, as that by which man is to be judged before God, and consequently their charge against us of being Antinomians on this account will not stand. 2nd. So long as it is written, "Whosoever offendeth in one point is guilty of the whole," it must be evident that whoever sets up anything other than the spiritual or original law of God in its exceeding broadness as the standard by which man is to be tried before God, by which he is to be justified or condemned, opposes or makes void that law and is therefore an

Antinomian in the strict import of the word. The teaching that the law will accept of anything short of perfect obedience to its everlasting demands, or that it will admit of any substitution in the place of this perfect obedience, such as repenting and believing the gospel and the like, is according to the above view of the subject Antinomianism.

Having thus shown what Antinomianism is, and the characters on whom the charge properly rests, I will briefly show its position in relation to Arminianism by a few questions. 1st. Who are they that are opposed to the enforcing the rigorous demands of the spiritual law of God? – The unregenerate, whether professors or not; – "for the carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to the law of God," &c. But unregenerate professors more fully act out this opposition; they then are the practical Antinomians. 2nd. – Who are they that are fond of the Arminian, or do and live system? The unregenerate universally; but those of them who profess religion, more openly avow this system. Hence the Arminian in heart is an Antinomian in heart, and the professed Arminian stands in his doctrine opposed to the unchangeable demands and rectitude of the original law of God, and is therefore in truth an avowed Antinomian. Or thus: Those who make void the law of God by their traditions or systems must be Antinomians. What is Arminianism, but a system that teaches that men's acceptance with God depends on certain conditions to be performed by them, short of a perfect obedience to the original law of God? Christ having according to some taken away the original law, and according to others, made an atonement for sin abstractly considered, to make room for such conditions being accepted. Hence Arminianism and Antinomianism terminate at the same point, are two different names for the same system of opposition to the law of God. How then can the "path which the vulture's eye hath not seen" pass between the two? There is no middle ground there. But Brother Meredith is ready to ask, is there no system which opposes the obligations of the law of God, different from the systems of conditions? In answer I admit it has been said that there were those who held that the elect were never under the law, and that God never saw any sin in them &c. But such a sentiment would as completely do away redemption by Christ as it would the law. Besides this sentiment would be so irrational, so contrary to that sense of accountability which men have, that I cannot think such a sentiment ever existed in the breasts of any who believed there is a God and admitted the authenticity of the scriptures. The sentiment also that the elect as the children of Adam were actually justified from all demands of the law before time began, and were then, absolved from all charge of guilt, would, if carried out in its legitimate bearing, amount to an abrogation of the law in their behalf, and therefore be Antinomianism. But I know of none who contend for this sentiment that would admit of its being carried out to what I think its full implication; therefore, though they may be inconsistent, they are not Antinomians in the way they hold it.

Consequently, my brother, we in vain look for the granite rock of Antinomianism (where the charge of Antinomianism is just as implying opposition to the law of God) so severed from the sandbars of Arminianism as to admit of the path or *way of holiness* passing between them. – Indeed I may confidently ask, how would sandbars ever be found in the sea were there not a granite rock or something like it to form an eddy or obstruct the passage of the drifting sand and thus cause it to become a deposit? And how could any conditional or Arminian system ever get foothold were there not enmity in the human breast to the government and law of God; an Antinomian principle latent there, that would overturn the sovereignty of God, and bring down His perfect law from its pure and holy demands, to a level with the capacity of depraved mortals to obey?

I will notice that *path which no fowl knoweth*, that *way of holiness* in which the child of grace is led. And my brother, if you have eyes to see, as I think you have, and do not suffer men to put their fingers or systems into them, I shall show you that this path as Brother Beebe stated, leads directly off, alike from the ground of Antinomianism and of Arminian opposition to the truth.

The very first step in which a person is led in the christian life takes him off from that firm standing he before had on Arminian ground; – regeneration being the implantation of that life in the soul which is love to God and to His law. Sin, instead of holiness and the divine law, now becomes the object of his hatred. Long and hard may he struggle to regain a standing on Arminian ground, or in other words, to feel a confidence in his own doings, but in vain, every struggle but removes him farther from this confidence; he is led to an enlarged view of the law in its spirituality, sees it to be holy, just and good, and his love to it makes him loathe every thing that comes short of its righteous demands, as all his acts and thoughts do; and his confidence in his doings and exercises is therefore more and more destroyed. He finds himself at last without any standing, lying upon the absolute mercy of God, having no good prayers, repentance or reformation to hold on to, and feeling that if mercy does not hold him up he must in justice sink eternally. Hence, love and reverence for the law of God instead of making a person pleased with his own righteousness, and giving him a desire to be accepted with God on the ground of his own doings, leads him to throw aside his own doings and makes him willing to be saved as a poor sinner; just in proportion therefore an *Antinomian* opposition to the law is eradicated from his mind. Arminian confidence in creaturely performances is destroyed. Here is the mystery of the christian's path that the *culture's eye cannot see*; no person, not taught of God, can comprehend how that love and subjection to the law of God should cause one to loathe his own righteousness, nor how a person who relies entirely on the mercy of God in Christ for salvation, can be *zealous of good works*. Yet such is the case. The same love to the law which leads a person to renounce all human works as the ground of his acceptance with God, makes him cling to and rely alone on the work of

Christ for acceptance when that work in its completion is once revealed to him as having been wrought for such poor sinners as he. The reason is that the one would degrade the law whilst the other perfectly honors it. Hence he *who rejoices in Christ Jesus, has no confidence in the flesh*; (Phil. 3:3) and he who with Paul can say I *delight in the law of God after the inward man, would also with him, not have his own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith*. Rom. 7:22 & Phil. 3:9.

I think from what has been shown that Brother Meredith will be satisfied that the christian's path which is *as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day*, cannot lead him in a middle way between Antinomian opposition to the law and Arminian love of human works, but that it leaves both in the background.

The other branch of Brother M's enquiry I will leave for another communication.

S. TROTT
*Centreville, Fairfax Co., Va. July* 5, 1839.

Signs of the Times
Volume 7, No. 15.
August 1, 1839

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pgs 158-164

# APOSTOLIC DIRECTION FOR DEALING WITH HERETICS, AND ON HERESY IN GENERAL.

Brother Beebe: – I, a short time since received by letter a request to give, through the Signs, my views on Titus 3:10: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." As the request was that I should give the exposition as soon as convenient, I send these remarks on, with a request, that you will publish them as soon as you can find room without crowding out other communications.

The direction contained in this text was given directly to Titus; but as Paul had left him in Crete, *that he should set in order the things that were wanting, &c., as he had appointed him* (1:5); this injunction must be considered as a part of that order which Titus, under Apostolic authority, was to establish in the churches. The term reject might have been considered here as confined to the idea of refusing such characters when offering for membership, or for the eldership or ministry, were it not that this rejection is presented as the closing part of a course of discipline; being preceded by a "first and second admonition," by which it is evident the person was, previous to his rejection, not only under the watch care of the church, but also under its discipline. Hence this must be considered as an apostolic injunction to reject or exclude from the communion of the church, persons who retained their heretical sentiments after having been twice admonished to renounce their error.

The expression, a *man that is an heretic*, appears rather discriminating, as though females were not so likely to become heretical, or that their being heretics was not so likely to disturb the peace of the church as in the case of the males. But it is to be remembered that the parallel direction in Rom. 16:17, makes no such distinction; but requires *all who cause divisions*, whether male or female, to be *avoided*.

This rule evidently includes the idea of rejecting from the privilege of preaching to the church all that bring and persist in heretical doctrines. The provision in this rule requiring a *first* and *second* admonition before rejection or exclusion is designed to lead the church to make the attempt to reclaim the heretic before excluding him, as well as to prevent a too hasty decision, by which a person might be made an offender for a word, or be rejected when the error was perhaps only in expression, not in sentiment; or had been fallen into through ignorance, not from determinate choice. But when after being once and again admonished of his error, a member persists in it, the church should act decisively in rejecting him, "Knowing," as the Apostle says (verse 11) "that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."

This rule has been undoubtedly entirely too much neglected by the Baptist churches. The enormities practiced by the Catholics under the pretense of dealing with heretics has probably had considerable effect in bringing the idea of disciplining heretics, as such, into disrepute. Another reason for this neglect may be traced to the error the churches themselves had fallen into of consulting human creeds and human authors as standards; and as these varied it became difficult to fix the charge of heresy on any but a very flagrant corruption. Owing to the continued prevalence of this error among the churches, it is a particular difficulty in obeying this injunction to decide on what constitutes a *man an heretic*. But this point, at the request of my correspondent, I will try to illustrate.

If we look at the etymology of the original words rendered *heresy* and *heretic*, we find them to import the idea of sentiments of men's own choice, being from a verb which signifies to *choose, elect, pick out*, &c. Hence that man is a heretic who chooses, or picks out his doctrine or system of doctrine of himself, and to suit his own notions. The heretic is thus manifestly distinguished from one who receives the doctrine of Christ as taught of God; for the latter has been brought to desire, not to be left to choose his doctrine for himself, nor to pick out a system, to suit reason or popular opinion. What God reveals to his mind as truth, that he receives as such, and because God has revealed it, without stopping to inquire whether human reason can comprehend why it should be so, or whether it be popular or not. His prepossessions fall before the truth, when thus received, as dagon fell before the ark.

Again, if we look at the use of these words in the Scriptures, we shall find they involve the idea of division, or of forming a sect or party. Thus, we find the word used in Acts 24:14; and in Acts 28:22, the translators have rendered this word by the term *sect*. In I Cor. 11:19, it evidently, from the connection, has the same leading idea. Heresy, therefore, in the scriptural use of the term, is not only something of human device and choice, but it relates to a leading sentiment, such as will so affect the faith, or practice, or both, as to form a dividing point in the faith professed, or in the order and practices. Thus Peter speaks of the *damnable heresies* which some should bring in, as being "even a denial of the Lord that bought them" II Pet. 2: 1-3. Most religionists calling themselves christians, profess to believe that the Lord Jesus Christ has bought or redeemed them. Connected, however, with this very profession, many of our day deny Him as *Lord*; for it is not enough to say Lord, Lord, to be exempted from this charge, whilst they "Do not the will of His Father which is in heaven." See Mt. 7:21. Some, by their systems, deny His essential Godhead, some the divine perfection of the work of redemption, some, His divine sovereignty in ordering the work of salvation, and others deny Him as Lord in denying His sovereign authority as King of Zion. These *damnable heresies*, the Apostle foretells, they shall *bring in privily*; not openly avowing them at once, but disseminating them by degrees, and under a profession by the saints, having their corruptions wrapped up as to conceal their bearing towards a denial of the Lord. With feigned words of great zeal for the cause of Christ, great love to souls and great pretended affection for the saints, they will gain multitudes of followers, and on this account wax bold and revile the truth and those that adhere to it; others again will charge their absurdities, and the divisions occasioned thereby among professors, to the cause of truth, and thus the *way of truth* comes to be evil spoken of. They will, through their covetousness, make merchandise for a while even of the churches of Christ. But I need not enlarge upon this prophecy, for the last thirty years affords a full comment upon it, in the manner in which corrupt systems have been introduced among the Baptists, and the plans for gaining

money, &c., which have been so fully manifested. The consequence to themselves will yet be as fully verified as has been their heresies.

The standard by which we are to test the truth or heresy of any sentiment next demands attention. On this point, I cannot admit the right of churches to set up any human composition such as expositions, creeds, confessions of faith, &c., as an unalterable standard by which to test the correctness or incorrectness of doctrine or practice; although I admit the propriety of churches making declarations, and giving summaries of what they consider to be the doctrine and practice taught in the Scriptures, yet, instead of establishing these as fixed standards of truth, they ought ever to hold them subject to correction by any additional light they may, through any medium, receive on the Scriptures. The proper objects of such declarations of faith are, first, for cultivating an acquaintance and correspondence with brethren abroad, by thus making ourselves known in our religious character; secondly, for a testimony towards those that are without. In objecting to declarations, &c., being set up as standards, I would not be understood as admitting that all points of doctrine are mere matters of opinion; that there are no fixed principles which all the children of God are taught in their experience, and of which they have received the inward assurance that they are infallible truths. But the fact is, that we are liable to connect with these truths, as parts, and perhaps as inseparable parts of the system of salvation, certain ideas which we have received, as inferences, connecting points, explanations, &c., and as there will be differences of opinion on these points, whilst we believe them true, we are likely to be very tenacious of them, and to have them set forth in our declarations of faith; when after all, if we should be graciously led to inquire into the correctness of them, we shall find we had no higher authority for them than that certain men whom we esteemed sound in the faith, had in their writings, preaching or conversation held them forth as parts of the doctrine of Christ; and that we had received them as Joshua and Israel did the declarations of the Gibeonites, without asking *counsel at the mouth of the Lord*. Josh. 9:1-15.

As a test of truth and error, the Holy Spirit has given to the children of God an infallible standard, a more sure word of prophecy sustained by a twofold testimony, to which, as Peter has said, we do well that we take heed. “To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them,” is the unalterable rule given by the Holy Spirit. Everything else must stand or fall as it is found genuine or reprobate, when tried by this standard. The letter of the Scriptures alone can be applied to as a rule bearing upon the unregenerate. And although to them much that is contained even in the New Testament is *done in parables*, yet there is a sufficiency of the plain declarations of Jehovah to leave them without excuse, in bringing in their *will-worship*, their vain ceremonies, vain hopes, and false systems. *To you*, says Christ to His disciples, “It is given to know the mystery of the kingdom of heaven;” and says Paul (I

Cor. 2: 15), “But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.” This then is it, the inward teachings of the Spirit of God affords to the child of grace a ready test, if he will attend to it, by which to detect heresy. But then this inward teaching is not to him a safe standard until he has “tried the spirits whether they be of God.” If the teaching be from the Spirit of God, he will find it so written in the Scriptures; and the one, as his understanding is now opened to understand it, is found to be an exact duplicate of the other. Hence he has a twofold testimony for the truth of what he receives. And when he hears the same things affirmed in the preaching of the gospel, it is with him that in the *mouth of two or three witnesses every word is established*. Having this standard at hand as he would not *grieve the Holy Spirit of God*, it becomes him to consult it, instead of going to the creeds and expositions of men as a standard. And whatever application of the Scriptures, inferences drawn from them, or professed preaching of the gospel, which contradicts his experience as thus confirmed by the word, he should reject as false and heretical. Hence it is to this internal standard that the Apostle refers the saints as that by which to test heresies, as in Rom. 16:17 – “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.” Here the standard set up is not the doctrine which they have read or heard, but *which they have learned*, of course, from the teachings of the Holy Spirit. Again, in Gal. 1:8,9, he says: “But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other doctrine unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say we again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that *ye have received* let him be accursed.” This is a high stand which he points out to the Galatians; yet high as it is, the *gospel which they have received*, is in the conclusion the ground on which they are to take this stand. I trust I am writing for those who understand the difference between a receiving of the gospel and a mere hearing of it.

In conclusion, whenever the saints can be generally brought back to primitive simplicity, and to view the Scriptures as the wise man describes them, when he says: “They are plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge”(Prov. 8:8), instead of viewing their meaning as so closed from the unlearned of this world, that none but a set of *priestly beings*, or men having a certain grade of the human learning can unlock them and bring that meaning forth; when, instead of going to the writings of any man as a standard by which to understand and test the doctrine and order of the Scriptures, they will go to the Scriptures for themselves, to try the doctrines of men, depending on the key which they carry in their own breasts, *the teachings of the Holy Spirit*, as that which best can unlock the Scriptures to them, then we shall find the saints *all speaking the same things, and being of one mind*, on every essential point in doctrine and practice. And not till then will this desirable period arrive, for so long as the writings of men are consulted as standards, the opinions of the saints will be as various as are the

writings which they set up as standards; and not only so, but the children of God, many of them, have too high a sense of christian liberty to suffer their minds to be trampled down by any creed or confession of human composition, how much soever sanctified it may be by age or by the estimation of the many, so as not to think and inquire for themselves. As the Spirit of God teaches the same things and dwells in all the saints, so far as His teaching alone is consulted, so far there will be uniformity of sentiment among the saints. May the period soon arrive when this will be the case with all the saints; then it will be no great difficulty for the churches to detect the *man that is an heretic* and to unite in rejecting him. Then also will they experience the truth of the Master's promise, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" John 8:32.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan.31, 1840.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES. Vol.8 (1840)

Select Works of Elder Trott: pgs 208 – 213

## BARREN FIG & VIEWS ON ZECHARIAH 1:8

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: – A sister has requested my views on the parable of the barren fig tree, and another sister has by letter requested my views on Zech. 1:8, through the SIGNS, and as I have not much to say on either, I will include my views of both in one communication.

1st. The parable, Luke 13:6-9. “He spake also this parable, A certain man had a fig tree planted in his vineyard,” &c. Christ had in the preceding verses, informed those who talked with him that those Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices were not sinners above the other Galileans, and that those eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam fell, were not sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem, and that excepting they repented they should all likewise perish. He then spake this parable, as I understand it, as illustrating those remarks. Hence I consider the parable as having a special reference to the Jews both of Galilee and Judea.

“*Had a fig tree planted in his vineyard*.” Israel is often, in the Scriptures, represented as a vineyard, a *fruitful field*, &c., in distinction from the other nations, who were left uncared for, like a wilderness; whilst Israel was fenced in by the provisions of their law and by the providence of God, and cultivated by the teachings of the law and the prophets. Judah or the Jews are represented as a fig tree planted in this vineyard.

“*And he came and sought fruit thereon and found none. Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this fig tree and find none; cut it down*,” &c. Said the Lord unto Moses, “I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.” Deut. 13:18,19. Jesus was that prophet. Christ had sent, his messenger, John, to prepare his way before him with the message, saying, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” He afterwards sent forth his disciples, two and two, to the Jews only, with the same message. This then was the fruit he had been seeking for about three years from the commencement of John’s ministry. Hence John said unto the Jews, “Bring forth fruit worthy of repentance.” Luke 3:8.

*Cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground.* From that time our Lord began to foretell the destruction of Jerusalem.

*And he answering said unto him, Lord, let it alone this year also, till I shall dig about it, and dung it; and if it bear fruit, well; and if not, then after that thou shalt cut it down.* This denoted that his ministry and that of his apostles was to be continued among them for another year, and if they repented of their self-righteousness and received the kingdom of heaven, *well*, if not, then their city and nation was left to destruction.

However much Satan, may throw this text at the children of God to worry them, and through his ministers, in their *not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God*, may apply this parable to the saints, it evidently does not belong to them. As when a fig tree is properly planted and cultivated it is expected that from the resources it has it will produce fruit, so the Jewish nation were required to bring forth the fruit of obedience to

the letter of the law, and therefore to receive that prophet or the Messiah when he came as a condition of their continuing to enjoy the good land which God had given to their fathers. Not so with the children of God; they are not under a conditional covenant. The Lord does not come requiring fruit of them to compensate him for their planting, but he comes to supply all their needs from his own abundant fulness. Hence it is said concerning Ephraim, "Ephraim shall say, What have I to do any more with idols? I have heard him and observed him; I am like a green fir-tree. *From me is thy fruit found*." Hosea 14:8. So in reference to the fruit of repentance; Christ is exalted as a Prince and a Savior to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. Again, Israel is represented as saying, "But now, O Lord, thou art our father; we are the clay and thou our potter, and we all are the work of thy hand." Isaiah 64:8. Instead then of repining because we have nothing of our own, *no fruit of the ground* which we can bring as an offering to the Lord, let us be thankful and rejoice that we may come and receive of his fulness and trust in his righteousness.

Zech. 1:8 – "I saw by night, and behold a man riding upon a red horse, and he stood among the myrtle trees that were in the bottom; and behind him were there red horses, speckled and white." I have to inform sister Ball that I have no special light on this text; I will give her, if they will be of any use to her such general views as I have of it.

1st. Zechariah prophesied after the return of some of the Jews from Babylon and during the building of the second temple. The principal burden of his prophesying seems to have been to encourage the Jews under their difficulties. For this end he referred pretty fully through the types to the building of the antitype of that temple, the Gospel church, by "the man whose name is the Branch" – the antitype of Zerubbabel and Joshua – the Lord Jesus Christ, who is truly a *priest upon his throne*. And here, permit me to add, is the *counsel of peace between them both;* that is, in his having all power in connection with all prevalency of intercession founded upon the sacrifice of himself. Zechariah includes in his prophecy events connected with the type and antitype. Such I think is the prophecy in the text under consideration. By the red horse and his rider I conclude, from what is said in Rev. 6:4 of a similar representation, that war is intended. As a white horse and its rider is used to denote the conquests of the gospel of peace, (Rev. 19:11 & 6:2,) I conclude that the *red horses, speckled and white,* or as it reads in the margin *bay and white,* intimated that there would be war, and after that unsettled times among or with the Jews, or as Daniel calls it, *troublous times,* (Dan.9:25,) yet that the temple and wall of the city should be built. My recollection of the history of the times will not admit of my attempting to designate what particular was intended by the *red horse,* and its *rider*. Yet, from what is said in Ezra and Nehemiah, we may learn that though *all the earth* (verse 11,) or the Persian empire, was then *still and at rest,* yet the Jews experienced troublesome times in their building the temple and walls of Jerusalem from the

opposition of those nations occupying the country formerly inhabited by the ten tribes. History also, as well as some of the prophesies of Daniel, inform us that after the time of Nehemiah, under the reign of the Antiochuses or the Grecian empire, the Jews experienced much trouble before they became again established in the enjoyment of their national and religious rights. We learn from the context (verse 10,) that the *war* as well as *peace* horses were sent forth of the Lord. So in chapter 11, we are informed of four chariots, having in one bay horses, in the second white, in the third black, in the fourth grizzled and bay horses, coming out from between two mountains of brass. These mountains may denote God's purpose and grace; or, in other words, his predestination of all things in the government of the world and his special predestination to salvation. These are as immutable as mountains of brass. Here then is war, gospel, famine, (see Rev. 6:5 & 6,) and probably pesthence, called the spirits of the heavens, going forth from the Lord. We learn also from verse 16 and 17 of the context, that the Jews were ultimately prosperous and spread abroad.

If we turn to the antitype, the building of the gospel church, we shall find the same ideas holding good; wars and the spreading of the gospel have been connected in all ages. The Roman conquests by war of all the nations around, by which all the earth was brought to sit still and be at rest, at the time of our Savior's being manifested in the flesh, by bringing all those nations under one government, made those nations far more easy of access to the apostles, and therefore favored the spread of the gospel. The succeeding wars of the Romans, by forcing many of the christians into their armies, shielded those thus employed, from the persecutions raging among those remaining at home, and gave them an opportunity they would not otherwise have had, of bearing their testimony to the truth of the gospel of the grace of God, among their fellow-soldiers and among the nations whither they were sent. And their testimonies, no doubt, were blessed of God to the accomplishment of good. Hence, no wonder that when Constantine came to the throne, he found the armies filled with christians. The conquest of the Romans by the Goths, &c., served to shield the true church in some measure from the persecutions of the Catholic church, and to favor their retreat to the wilderness or valleys of Piedmont. As the after war upon the Waldenses and driving them from those valleys scattered them, and therefore led them to disseminate their testimony among the several nations of Europe, our revolutionary war was the instrument by which the religious establishments, existing in several of the provinces, were broken down, and the way prepared for our free enjoyment of that religious liberty, which has since existed among us. The wars among the various kingdoms in Africa, and the selling of their captives into slavery, were the leading instruments of bringing many of the Africans among us, where thousands of them have been made to hear and rejoice in the gospel of Christ. Other instances might be mentioned, but these are sufficient to show how God has caused the *red horse* of war to lead the way for the going forth of the white horse of the gospel, and

that the white horse has followed, and though it has been often speckled with opposition and divisions, yet it has held on its way. The gospel, where God has sent it, has had *free course and been glorified*. In Revelation, the 6th chapter, the *white horse*, is put forward, to show that the spread of the gospel or the cause of Christ was the first object in view, in God's predestination, and that many of the wars which should follow would be on religious accounts. We are not, my sister, to infer from these prophesies that the spirit of war and the spirit of the gospel in themselves harmonize. They are as opposite as are earth and heaven. The spirit of the gospel is *love* and *peace*. The spirit of the world is war and contention. This spirit can no more be conquered by the wisdom and devices of men, than the Ethiopian can change his skin. It may be curbed for a time, but on the first occasion it will again break forth in all its rage. In Zech., the 6th chapter, these emblems of war, of famine, of the gospel of peace, and of pesthence, are all alike called the *spirit of the heavens*, not to show that they are alike heavenly any more than the *evil spirit of the Lord* which troubled Saul was the same as the *spirit of the Lord*. I Sam. 16:14. But to show that they are all alike sent forth from the Lord, and are under the entire control of his predestinating purpose without the earth's having any share in limiting or enlarging their movements. Says God by Isaiah, "I make peace and create evil; I, the Lord, do all these things." Isaiah 45:7. This is the reason why we Old School Baptists love the doctrine of God's *absolute predestination of all things*, because that according to this doctrine, instead of being left to the gloomy consideration that the evils which are in the world, any of them, come by chance, or are in anywise controlled by men or Satan, we believe that they are all confined by the predestinating purpose of God as *between two mountains of brass*, and can go forth only where God sends them, and only to accomplish his wise and good purpose; and that wherever they go, the white horse of the gospel, or, in other words, some gracious purpose of God concerning salvation, follows in this train. And this also is the reason why we have no confidence in the missionary operations, believing God will send his gospel just where he has a purpose for it, and that it will accomplish that whereunto he sends it; and that his gospel can go no where but as he sends it; and any spurious gospel which may be sent by men will accomplish no real good.

My sister, without noticing all the particulars in the text, I have written down such views as have been presented to my mind on the general subject. My reflections have, perhaps, been led in a different channel from what you anticipated; I certainly have extended them much beyond what I expected when I commenced; otherwise I should not have included the two texts in the one communication. What I have written, I have written; and I desire it may afford as much satisfaction to you and others in reading, as the contemplation of the subject has afforded pleasure to me. One remark more. When we feel that this predestinating, this God-governing – God of all events, is our Father, the

sound of thunder and of the raging tempest, however terrific otherwise, is as music, and the lightning's flash is both grand and beautiful.

Yours, with christian regards,
S.TROTT.
*Fairfax C. H. Va., Aug.* 20, 1856.

Signs of the Times
Volume 24, No. 18.
September 15, 1856

## CALUMNY.

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

me, when he took a letter. And in every other case, I take it upon me to say there has not, since my being with the Church, been a single known instance of a member's falling into that, or any other known sin, but that Gospel steps have been taken to reclaim him, and when these have failed, exclusion has taken place. And as to the general and known characters of this Church, previous to my coming into it, and that for considerably more than a century, I venture to say it will bear a comparison with any other Church existing in the United States, for anything like the same length of time, whether in reference to a constant succession of sound, able and esteemed Pastors, or in reference to a steadfast adherence to the faith, and covenanted order on which it was originally constituted. It is true that a conscientious adherence to that faith and order, which in years that are past, commanded the esteem of the Baptists of those days, exposes it to the reproach of modern Baptists; but this only shows that the Baptists are not what they once were.

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

## CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

Brother Beebe: There have been occasionally communications in the Signs, written as relations of experience, which have occasioned in me a desire that something might be said in reference to them. And I now undertake it, although I am aware that either my former communications, or the remarks of some others, have raised in the minds of many of the brethren a prejudice against me, as though I wished to be thought a little more correct than any others on doctrinal points, and therefore that such will now think that I am setting myself up as better acquainted with experience than others. As I have

heretofore tried to state in candor my reasons for opposing what I believe to be error in my brethren; I know of no better way than, if they will think thus without just cause, to let them think. Though I would not have it understood that I am, or wish to be, indifferent to the good or bad opinion of my brethren, or that I am so stoical as not to feel hurt at being the object of their prejudice. But what I mean is, that when a sense of duty, or inclination to enjoy my privilege, leads me to write, that I should not be deterred from it, because some will not receive what I advance, whilst there is a hope that others may be comforted or edified.

My objections to certain relations of experiences to which I have reference is not that I think the persons not subjects of grace, but that they have missed stating the exercises in which they were brought, first to exercise faith in Christ, and have stated other things as those which they look to as constituting their deliverance, which in themselves afford no evidence of faith in Christ. Take, for instance, the communication of Brother Burroughs in the last (or sixth) number of the Signs (1845). From some things which he states as being the ground of his trust, etc., I hope the Spirit has taught him and applied the gospel consolations to his mind. But I should not be able to draw any such conclusion from what he relates as constituting his change; namely: that he was greatly distressed, and from what he says, this distress mostly arose from an apprehension that the time was about to pass in which he could be saved, and that this distress went off and was succeeded by a pleasant and cheerful sensation. The magicians of Egypt can produce as great a miracle, or as good an experience as such would be. Mere natural men are capable of being excited to just such exercises. They can be so alarmed as to be greatly distressed at the idea that their supposed, or rather fictitious, day of grace is passed, or about to pass. And it requires but little attention to the workings of nature to know that these excited feelings are very apt to subside during a nap of sleep, or even from mere exhaustion, and that they are naturally succeeded, like any other pain, by a pleasant feeling; and it is easy for the imagination, as in the case of the front-bench converts, to draw the conclusion that this great change of feeling is an evidence that they have got religion. It is no wonder that this excites them to as great a pitch of joy as they were before to that of grief. I feel sorry to see such things given as a relation of experience among Old School Baptists:

**First**, because, as in the case above referred to, there being grounds to hope that they are subjects of grace, I feel sorry to see the children of God so bewildered as to their deliverance, and as having no clearer evidence to their minds, to refer to at times, of their having passed from death to life. I know how to pity them, having been in like situation; from not having been conversant with clear, experimental persons, and not having heard discriminating, experimental gospel preaching, when Christ was revealed in me to the apprehending of Him by faith as a Saviour suiting my case, I had no idea

that the exercise I had at that time was a being born again, or a first believing in Christ with that faith which is the gift of God. The exercise was something new and made a deep impression on my mind, but I considered it only as an evidence given me that I was truly a subject of religion, as I had most of the time before for three or four years hoped I was. And when I went to offer to a Baptist church, I had no idea of relating this exercise as an evidence of my being a believer or a fit subject of baptism, though I think something of it was drawn from me in their questioning me. But my own statement was similar to what I had made to the church session when I joined the Presbyterians some years before; that I had been impressed with a desire to be religious and to serve God, etc., with the addition of some of my ups and downs since, and the manner of my being convinced concerning believer's baptism, etc. It was not under fifteen months after that I had an idea of that exercise being that in which I was first brought to know Christ crucified and to believe on Him; so completely had my mind been bewildered by the muddy preaching I had been accustomed to, but then it was so showed to me that the thing appeared plain. And from that day to this I have known when and how I was taught the way of salvation for poor, condemned, helpless sinners, as I then was, through a crucified Jesus; and I know that man had no hand in teaching it to me, that I never learned it from reading nor preaching. Yet I have since passed through many dark seasons as to my interest in Christ, and to this hour have many doubts, from the awful corruptions within me, whether I can be a subject of grace, or whether my spot is the spot or exercises of God's children.

I feel sorry because such relations unnoticed make it appear as though the experience of Old School Baptists is nothing more than that of camp-meeting converts.

Because such unexplained statement are calculated to deceive inexperienced persons as to what an experience of grace consist in. Yet, I blame not this brother, nor others similarly circumstanced, seeing he is located where he can have but little intercourse with such as know what gospel experience is, for embracing the privilege of stating, through the Signs, what he had been led to look to as his conversion, doing it, as he evidently does, with a desire to be instructed in the way of God more perfectly, or, if he is deceived, to be undeceived. But in such cases I think it important that some one should be ready to act the part of Aquila and Priscilla; and my volunteering to do this is what may subject me to the charge of setting myself up as the standard of gospel experience. And it might have savored a little more of humility for me to have waited for some other one to step forward; in other similar cases which have occurred, I did wait, but in vain.

As to a standard, my wish is to make the Scriptures the standard of Christian experience, as I have ever aimed to set them forth as the only standard of gospel doctrine. As I have freely objected to the relation this brother gave of his experience, it is incumbent on me

to show what it is that makes one manifest as a subject of salvation, according to the New Testament. For brevity's sake I shall touch only those points which might be questioned. A coming to Christ is admitted as necessary by all professors. I will, therefore, here show that Christ has said that none can come unto Him except they are taught of God. The words are, "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him, and I will raise him 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, etc.," (John 6:44-45). Thus He evidently represents the drawing and teaching as the same thing. Teaching has to do with the mind, not the animal feelings; it is an instructing of the judgment, or a giving of understanding to the thing taught. But God's teaching is not like man's, a mere enlightening of the head whilst the heart is untouched. It is a revelation of truth in the heart, so that the affections are arrested; there is a heart-feeling of the truth taught, and a heart-love for it. To come to Christ, or to be believers on Him, we must know Him in His true character as the Saviour of sinners; as said he that had been blind: "Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on Him?" (John 9:36). Thus to know Him, we must know what it is to be sinners in God's account. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." "The law is spiritual." Spiritual life is, therefore, first imparted to give spiritual discernment or understanding, and the commandment then comes, that is, the person, under the divine teaching, is made to understand its force and special application to himself, condemning him and all his seeking and doing; and ultimately he is made to know (if not, as in some cases, at once) its spirituality and exceeding broadness to the thoughts and intents of the heart. He then knows why he is distressed; the curse of God's law stands against him; all his former hopes and expectations of doing anything to obtain the favor of God are cut off, and he lies helpless and dead under the righteous sentence of the law. Were it not that the Spirit in that case helpeth his infirmities, making intercession for him with groanings which cannot be uttered, that is, leading him to lift up his heart to God in desires for mercy, if it can be extended to a wretch so vile, he would be silenced in dead despair. Ask this person now what distresses him; his answer will be not that his time for obtaining salvation is passed, but that he is such a sinner against God that he sees not how any salvation can be for him, consistent with justice. Nothing which he has sever learned of Christ from reading or from hearing of preaching reaches his case. He cannot believe on Him, for he knows not His fullness of grace and truth, neither can he know Him till God teaches him the knowledge of Him. But when the Father thus teaches him, or the Spirit takes of Christ's and shows to him, he understands the mystery of salvation through Christ crucified, views Him as the Lamb which God had provided for a sacrifice to His justice in the room of the guilty, condemned sinner. He now sees how he can be saved consistent with justice and how the mercy and promises of God can come to a wretch like him; and from this time his trust is fixed on a crucified, risen Jesus, and he has hope

towards God and approaches Him as a Father (Ephesians 1:13 and 1 Peter 1:3). Now he will rejoice even unto tears, and knows what occasion he has for rejoicing in God his Saviour. The knowledge he now has of Christ as the Way of salvation is altogether different from what he had before conceived of; and the purpose of God, as he now sees it, of saving polluted, helpless sinners, instead of such as can help themselves, and the salvation of Christ being so fully and exactly adapted to the case of such, is all new to him and all lovely and glorious, reflecting a glory upon all the ways and works of God around him. Can a man be taught these things of God and not know that his views of himself and his views of Christ and his expectations of acceptance with God are all new, all different, from what they once were, and that they are what he never learned of men?

The Spirit had probably implanted in Brother Burroughs the principle of life, causing a desire after God before the exercises he speaks of; but it may not have been till some time after this that he was truly drawn to Christ. I think if he will review his past experience there will be brought to his recollection a time when the awful depravity of his heart was so laid open to his view as to make him feel the justice of his condemnation, and the utter impossibility of anything good or acceptable to God coming from him; so that all idea of seeking salvation on his part was excluded; “Lord, save or I perish”, was his cry in substance. Again, that in reading the Scriptures, or in hearing preaching, or in some passage of Scripture being presented and opened to his mind, he had a view of Christ crucified as a foundation just suited for such a condemned and helpless sinner to lean upon and trust to for salvation; and that since that time his hope of acceptance with God has not been from his determination to seek, but wholly through Christ and His finished work; and since then, it has been that he has known something of the God of Israel’s opening rivers in high places, etc., for the poor and needy when everything else fails and they cry to Him. This revelation of Christ in him may have been at once by an opening up of the Scriptures to him, or it may have been more gradually that his mind was enlightened to understand the way of salvation.

The exercises which he related are such as are frequent with persons under a work of grace, by which Satan tries to settle them down on something short of Christ. Besides, being led by a way we know not, we are apt to look for a resting-place short of the proper one.

The position I have taken relative to this subject will, I think, be admitted by every reflecting Christian as the Scriptural one when he considers that the promises of salvation run alone through faith in Christ, “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him” (John 3:36 and Mark 16:16). And that faith implies a knowledge of Christ, and this knowledge evidently is only from being taught of God. “No man knoweth who the Son is, but the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son and he to

whom the Son will reveal him" (Luke 10:22). I hope this brother, on a re-examination, will be able to tell us something of what he has learned of Jesus and of His saving power.

Yours;
Elder Samuel Trott
1845
Centreville, Fairfax County, VA

## CHRIST'S BEING MADE UNDER THE LAW &c.

EXPOSITION OF GALATIANS 4:4 & 5.

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

The main points, I presume, of Brother Lowe's enquiry, are in reference to *redeeming them that were under the law*; and as to *the Son of God being made of a woman and made under the law*. But in pursuing these enquiries, others at once arise; namely, whether Paul is here treating of the law given from Sinai, or some other law. And if of the Sinai law, whether the Gentiles were ever under it. The term *law* is used in the Scriptures in other senses than that of denoting the commandments, which God gave from Sinai; but in such cases the term is generally accompanied with some other identifying expressions. The definite expression, *the law*, as found in this text, I believe uniformly refers to the Sinai law. But should any doubt as to this being the law the apostle is speaking of, a little attention to the context will, I think, if they are candid examiners, convince them of the fact. Beginning with the 3rd chapter, where Paul commences this particular argument, we find him in verses 2 & 5 contrasting the *works of the law* with the *hearing of faith*; here I presume none will dispute his meaning the

law which was given by Moses. In verse 10, he asserts, that "as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse," and quotes from Deut. 27:26, with a little variation of expression, in confirmation of this assertion; thereby showing clearly, that he is here speaking of the law of Moses. He then in verse 13 says, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Thus showing, that, in order to redeem from the curse of the law, He was himself made subject to the curse, of course must have been made subject to, or under the law that cursed, and that law, as proved above, was the Sinai law, or law of Moses. Here then is proof positive, without going further, that the law Christ was made under, was the Sinai law. But Paul goes on further to declare, that the law he is speaking of, was given *four hundred and thirty years after* the promise made to Abraham. What law will this apply to but the Sinai law? Surely I should think then, that this point is established beyond doubt.

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

We now pass to the other enquiry; namely, Whether the Gentiles were ever under the Sinai law. As above noticed, the establishing of the fact that the Sinai law is here intended, establishes also the point that the Gentiles are under it; else they had no part in that redemption, which God sent forth his Son to accomplish. But Paul writing to the brethren both at Ephesus and at Colosse, Gentiles of course included, connects them with himself in saying, "In whom we have redemption through his blood," &c. Eph. 1:7, Col. 1:14. And in the connection of our subject, chapter 3, verses 13 & 14, he speaks of Christ's being *made a curse for us*, &c., *that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles*; thus showing that the "curse of the law" stood in the way of the Gentiles experiencing the blessing of Abraham. And in chapter 4, verses 6 & 9, he says, "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts," &c., "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son," &c. What can the Apostle mean here but to show these Galatian brethren, that they were interested in the redemption just

spoken of, as evidenced by their receiving the spirit of sonship or of adoption, and that they ought not, therefore, any longer to consider themselves servants under the law? But as the law was given to national Israel, the difficulty with some is, how the Gentiles could be under it. In the mere letter, as a national covenant, the law was given exclusively to national Israel, and in that covenant form, it had nothing to do with the Gentiles, but to bar them from the worship and privileges which belonged to Israel; it was a separating wall between the two. This *wall of partition* Christ, by his crucifixion, *broke down*, so that the Gentiles now stand on the same footing with the Jews, as to the privilege of having the revelation of God's will published to them; and as to acceptance with him. But under the light of the Gospel, the law is manifested as a spiritual law, emanating from God who is a Spirit, and having a demand upon man as a rational being, having a soul as well as body alike derived from God. Hence it shows, that nothing short of loving God with all the heart, with all the soul and with all the strength, and loving his neighbor as himself, is righteousness before God; and it proclaims that a falling short of this, in any point, is sin, and subjects to "the curse of the law." As our Lord informs us that all *the law and the prophets hang upon this* obligation thus to *love* God and our neighbor, it is evident this obligation existed before the giving of the law, and therefore was not limited by that *wall of partition*. Indeed the Decalogue is but a transcript of this obligation, illustrating its nature by distinct acts. Hence, "until the law, sin was in the world." As the letter of the law was proclaimed indiscriminately to all Israel; to those that fell in the wilderness, as well as to those that entered the promised land, showing the same standard of national righteousness to the one as to the other, and pronouncing the same thing to be sin in the one case, as in the other; so the law in its spirituality, is under the Gospel proclaimed alike to Jews and Gentiles, to those that perish, and to those that afterwards believe, as the one standard of righteousness, and that by which is the *knowledge of sin*. Hence Paul says, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." Rom. 3:19. According to Paul then, *them who are under the law* include no less than *all the world*.

Paul, in his figure of the *schoolmaster*, and of the *heir being a child* &c., seems to me to refer to that collective body of Christ, in which there is *neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free*, &c. The childhood state of this body, or church, had its existence in the type, in the natural seed of Abraham, having the Messiah in it yet undeveloped. In this state it was in servitude "under the law," differing nothing from a servant; the law as a schoolmaster enforced its instructions by the rod; and *tutors and governors*, the priesthood, were enforcing and expounding the requisitions of the law, and directing the conscience. But since Christ, the object, the *author and finisher of faith*, has come, the church is no longer under a schoolmaster. He has taken the hand-writing of ordinances, the Sinai covenant, *out of the way*, and the church is brought into the liberty of sonship.

But in the second place, as the body and members are one, and therefore the travel of the church and of the individual members correspond, so Paul shows by the same figures the experience of the elect in their quickened state; and how, when *faith is come*, or given, they have Redemption through Christ's blood, and receive the Spirit of God's Son. But the elect in their state of unregeneracy, like others, are *aliens*, living as *having no hope and without God in the world*. Eph. 2:12. Whatever educational knowledge they may have, they are like Paul *alive without the law*. But when quickened by the Spirit, like Israel when brought out of Egypt, they are put to work under the law, and *differ nothing from a servant*, toiling to obey and to be accepted upon their obedience; but are only learning more of the broadness of the law, of the infinite purity of that God they have to do with, and of the depth of their own pollution and depravity; so that the Law is continually wasting them and their hopes, as Israel was wasted in the wilderness. And like them they frequently murmur saying, "Behold, we die, we perish; we all perish; whosoever comes anything near unto the tabernacle of the Lord shall die." Or thus, "Wherefore have ye made us to come out of Egypt to bring us into this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates; neither is there any water to drink." Num. 17:12,13 & 20:5. Thus, though the law does not *bring* them to Christ, as the translators make the passage read, Gal. 3:24, by adding the words *to bring us*; yet it was *unto* or *until* Christ; that is, it held its dominion over them, until they were stripped of all hope, condemned and just ready to be in justice forever banished, and thus made to know themselves to be in that desperate case, as to be just fit objects for the display of God's mercy, and of the power of Jesus to save; and when faith comes, they see that the salvation by Christ is just fitted and adapted to the case of such polluted, ruined, helpless sinners, as they are. By the application of this salvation they find themselves delivered from the law and brought into the relation of sons to God.

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

First: The expression *made of a woman*, as well as that used by the Angel, {Luke 1:35,} "that holy thing which shall be born of thee," forbids my believing, that the body of Jesus was a super-human or previous existence, which dwindled itself down to pass through Mary in the form of a child. I believe, the child Jesus was born of Mary, the fetus receiving its nourishment and growth from her, the same as any other child is born of its mother. Some have objected, that as Mary was of the same depraved stock with the rest of the human family, if the child Jesus was made of her or received its growth from her, it must have partaken of her depravity. But not so; the depravity of the human family proceeded from Adam, not from Eve, and is therefore communicated by the father, not the mother. Besides, the depravity or sin is not inherent in the mere flesh and

bones and blood of the body, that thing which was born of Mary, these in depraved man are *instruments of unrighteousness*, as Paul speaks; but it has its existence in that principle of life, which animates and gives life to *that thing* which is born of the woman; and this principle of life which in ordinary cases is communicated from the man, was, in the case of Jesus, the immediate and uncontaminated production of the Holy Ghost, which came upon her. So then, though Jesus was made of a woman, he *was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners; not* conceived in sin.

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

2:17, that “in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren.” Now, his brethren exist as perfect men having souls and bodies, besides having the spirit of Christ, the spirit of God’s Son, or Christ who is their life in them. The Son of God therefore, to be *in all things made like unto his brethren*, must not only be the Head of spiritual life, and as their Elder Brother have it in common with them as brethren, but he must also be a complete man having a human soul and body, and therefore human passions, though not swayed by depravity. Being such, he could know what his brethren suffer in mind, as well as body, from being tempted; and having been in like manner tempted, he knows how to *succor them* and have *compassion* on them. And having a human soul, he could know and feel in soul as well as body, the condemnation and curse of the law; and thus feeling it, he said, “My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death.” Matt. 26:38.

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

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

S. TROTT.
Sept.6, 1844.

# CIRCULAR & CORRESPONDING LETTERS

## BROTHERLY LOVE AND UNITY.

**CIRCULAR LETTER & CORRESPONDING LETTER:** *The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association, in session with the Church at Black Rock, Baltimore County, Md., May 14th, 15th & 16th, 1856, to the several Churches of which she is composed, sends love in the Lord.*

Beloved Brethren: – As an expression of fellowship, we again address you this our annual Circular, and on this occasion we have selected as our theme, the subject of Brotherly Love and Unity. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.” – Psa. 133:1.

First. The character and relationship of brethren; and secondly, the manner of their living together in unity. In the Scriptures, the words *brother* or *brethren* are used in a variety of senses. Some are so called in a proper sense, as by immediate descent, the children of the same parent or parents, according to the flesh, and some by affinity, kindred or nation, and also by common participation of our human nature, in which all men are brethren. But the saints of God are all brethren in a spiritual sense, by the grace of God, they all having God as their Father, and Christ as their Elder Brother. In this sense we were brethren in eternity, as the members of Christ’s body. “Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned as when as yet there was none of them.” Psa. 139:16.

Christ's incarnation is another proof of this brotherhood. "I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." Psa. 22:22. Again, "Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praises unto thee." Heb. 2:12. "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Heb. 2:17. "For whom He {God} did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He {Christ} might be the first born among many brethren." Rom. 8:29. "But go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and unto your Father; and to my God, and your God." John20:17. His death is a strong proof of His love to His brethren. He was delivered for their offenses, and raised again for their justification. And He received gifts for men, to quicken whom He will. {See John 5:21.} And He said, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory," &c. John 17:24. "And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. 2:1. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." Gal. 4:6. In this way they are brought to view as brethren. Not like national Israel, under a covenant of works; but as the spiritual Israel, in the covenant of grace. National Israel was a separate people, and not reckoned among the nations, and in that sense they dwell alone. For Moses said, "If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence; for wherein shall it be known here, that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us, so shall we be separated from the nations around about us." The brethren are separated from the world, for they are not of the world, as Christ was not of the world. Not that they chose Christ. No. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you out of the world;" therefore the world knoweth you not, because it knew Him {Christ} not. "For they neither know me nor my Father." So in dwelling together they are one body. "My dove, my undefiled is but one." Christ is the head, and they, the brethren, are His body, and members in particular; members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. Christ is the living Stone, as the Foundation, and the brethren are lively stones, to compose the spiritual house, the holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God, by Jesus Christ. They, the brethren, dwell together in love. "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love. Beloved, if God so loved us we ought also to love one another. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment, because as He is, so are we in the world. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" I John 4:7,8,19,20. "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth."

Another evidence of thus dwelling together in unity, is that we endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. “There is one body and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Eph. 4:3-6. So the life which the brethren live is a life by the faith of the Son of God, who has loved them and given Himself for them. As they are living members of Christ’s living body, the church, so they have bowels of sympathy; if a brother is in bonds, as being bound with him, and with such as suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body. Bless them which persecute you; bless, and curse not. Rejoice with them that do rejoice, and weep with them that weep. Make not a man an offender for a word, nor lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gates; nor turn aside the just for a thing of nought. Isa. 29:21.

Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye, which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself lest thou also be tempted. Let nothing be done through strife or vain glory; but in lowliness of mind, let each esteem the other better than himself.

As evidence of the unity of the brethren, they all have the same prospect in view, and are heirs alike to an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that cannot fade away; which is reserved in heaven for them, and they are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time. I Pet. 1:4,5. When we all shall have come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Eph. 4:13. “Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father.” Mt. 13:43. And then shall they enjoy the presence of their God, and sing praises to Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, who is the light of the city forever. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it; and the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day; for there shall be no night there. And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie, but they which are written in the Lambs book of life. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” May grace, mercy and peace be with you all.

---

## CORRESPONDING LETTER.

Dear Brethren: – By the indulgence of our Heavenly Father, we have been favored with another opportunity of meeting together, and have been favored by the visits of brethren from Maine to North Carolina, and from the Atlantic coast to the prairies of the West, all speaking the same things, and exhibiting a united and common interest in the things of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Why this interest, and why this unanimity of

sentiment among those who were born in different climes, raised up under different circumstances, and subject to different influences? The answer can only be, that they have one common Teacher, who teacheth as never man taught; whose school is subject to no locality other than the hearts of His pupils. When thus assembled and thus united, may we not confidently call both upon the interested and the curious to come and behold our order? Or say to them, in the language of David: “Walk about Zion, go round about her; mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that ye may tell it to the generation following.” O, how delightful to contemplate that, exposed as we are continually to the envenomed shafts of the world, and the fiery darts of the wicked, that God has enclosed us in the invincible walls and bulwarks of salvation!

As it was only Him that dwelt in the bush, that preserved the bush from burning; only Him that walked in the midst of the heated furnace that kept the smell of fire from the garments of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego: so it is only by His appearing as a wall of fire round about Jerusalem, and the Glory in the midst, that Zion has ever been and still is preserved as a monument of the praise and glory of God’s grace.

Our next Association will be held {the Lord willing} with the church at Harford, commencing on Wednesday before the 3rd Sunday in May, 1857, when and where we hope to meet a goodly number of your messengers.

S.TROTT. Moderator.1856.

## GOD’S GRACE.

**Corresponding Letter:** *The Corresponding Association of Old School Baptists held with the church at Occoquan, Prince Wm. Co., VA., August 7, 8 & 9th, 1851, to all Old School brethren, churches and associations in correspondence with us, sendeth christian salutation.*

Beloved Brethren: – In the providence of God we are once more permitted to meet on the shores of time, and according to a long established custom, we send you this our annual epistle; in which we would offer a few remarks upon the subject of *God’s Grace*.

This is a theme upon which ministers have declaimed, sages mused, and poets sung, in ages that are past, and yet the tale remains untold, and is one of the few subjects upon which repetition is not irksome; its sound is still charming, its effects still transporting to the children of God. Near six thousand years ago in the land of Asia, now wrapped in heathenish night, and under the influence of blind idolatry, appeared a solitary individual making an offering to God, expressive of his faith in the doctrine of salvation by grace, and incurring at once the approbation of his God, and the enmity of his brother, who offered the result of his own labor. Four thousand years subsequent was seen and heard in the same country, a meek, quiet, unassuming individual, bearing indubitable testimony of having been sent of God, yea of being God Himself made manifest in the flesh, proclaiming to the world in a voice so loud that the sound has even reached us of the Nineteenth Century, that there is no Salvation but by grace; yet there are found multitudes who like their ancient brother Cain, think to obtain salvation by their own works. It is true, they talk about grace, about obtaining it, and losing it, obtaining it by good works, and forfeiting it either by bad, or by neglecting to attend to those things which are reputed good. But brethren, we have not so learned Christ, we have not been taught to regard this grace as a commodity which may be obtained at a price, or upon conditions, but as the act of a Sovereign God having mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and hardening whom He will. The qualifying or distinguishing terms: Free, sovereign, &c., are not found in the Scriptures, are deemed wholly superfluous and unnecessary, because all the acts of God, whether of a gracious or other character are sovereign and free. Sovereign, because His will is the standard of His own acts; and all that He does is right, because so it seemed good in His sight. Free, because He requires nothing of His creatures as a return for what He does for them; and because an act ceases to be gracious when it ceases to be free. Salvation is either of works or of grace, for there is no affinity between the two. If it be of works, it is no more of grace; if of grace, it is no more of works, and the question is settled in the scriptures, and in the experience of the children of God, that salvation is of grace. In a state of nature they have no evidences of being interested in the favor of God, but what are common to the rest of mankind. They are fed and clothed, protected and defended in Providence, and so are the rest of mankind, the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea. The raven and the lion both seek their meat from God; but they are no less interested in this grace because they are ignorant of it; nor do they partake of it any more freely because they know it. Prior to regeneration, they ascribe all their destiny to their own skillful or unskillful management {as the case may be} of their own affairs; but after regeneration, they say, as Paul said, “By the grace of God I am what I am.” And what was he? An apostle, a minister of the gospel, a persecuted and afflicted saint, a prisoner in bonds, enduring the buffeting of Satan, in perils, by land and in perils by sea, in perils among false brethren, and carrying about continually a body of death that made

him wretched, &c., and yet the grace of God had made him what he was. Every act of God expressive of kindness or favor is an act of grace; and every act performed upon or in relation to His chosen people is an act of this kind. All the provisions necessary to their eternal salvation were made in Christ, while they were yet in a state of nonentity, yea, from all eternity. For their sakes the foundations of the earth were laid; light and darkness, life and death, evil and good, angels, men and devils, and all things present, past and to come, are so many expressions of God's grace to His people. And they are assured, through the apostle Paul, that no creature shall be able to separate them from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus. What though they fell in Adam, and became dead in trespasses and sins? It was in full view of this state that God loved them with a perfect love, and made for them all that rich provision of grace of which we read in the Scriptures. What though when born they go astray from the womb, and run into all the excesses of riot and debauchery to which their depraved natures incline them? God's grace is commended to them in that while they were yet sinners Christ died for them. What though being dead they are unable to know or appreciate His kindness towards them? God's grace has made provision for their being quickened into life; but not through the means of a preached gospel as some suppose, for to admit this would be to deny that any were quickened until about eighteen hundred years ago when the gospel first began to be preached; or that any have been quickened since only where the gospel has been preached. To us such an idea savors more of the language of Ashdod or Arminianism than of being a mere different form of expression, to express the same idea with those who contend that the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead *shall* hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear *shall* live. What though being quickened they are left to feel themselves exposed to wrath under the sentence of God's violated law and borne down by a weight of guilt sufficient to sink a world to hell? There is in store for them, as the fruit of God's grace, a righteousness which shall hide all their shame, a sacrifice that shall atone for all their sins, and a victim that their faith shall behold, enduring all the wrath that was due to them. What though in the christian pilgrimage they meet with sore temptations and dire afflictions? My grace, saith God, shall be sufficient for them. They shall glory in infirmity, and in weakness shall be made strong. Affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground. Job 5:6; but these are sent in loving kindness and tender mercy, for God has promised to be with them in six, and not to forsake them in the seventh. When His providence seems to frown and bear strong marks of displeasure, yet while He chastens He loves, and works all things together for good to them who are the called according to His purpose. That grace therefore which ordained the plan of salvation for God's elect, shall be their companion and comfort through this vale of tears; their support in death, and it has in store for them in heaven an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and cannot fade away. May we not then joyfully sing,

"O to grace how great a debtor!"

Our meeting, whilst it has been one of peace and pleasant intercourse together, has been one well calculated to lead us to mourn over the desolations of Zion; but few churches united in the correspondence this year, and messengers from but one association, were in attendance with us. Whilst we mourn before God the causes of the thinness of our meeting in reference to brethren, we would not repine; we sometimes feel that if our brethren abroad knew us as we know ourselves they would not care to associate with us. And when we contemplate God's dispensation in this affair, instead of repining we have ground for great thankfulness to Him that He is still granting us the privilege of meeting together in peace, of receiving epistles of love from a few sister churches, which are indeed little flocks, surrounded by wolves, and having nothing to hope for, but from God's rich grace in Christ, and His protecting care; and from two or three associations. Though we have but little to commend us to the favorable notice of our brethren abroad, yet we feel a desire for a continuance, and even extension of the correspondence of churches, corresponding meetings and associations who are united with us, in the glorious doctrine of salvation by the grace of God, and in that order marked out in the New Testament. And would therefore say again; Brethren visit us with your letters of christian affection, and your messengers, at our next meeting to be held with the Frying-pan Church, Fairfax Co., VA., to commence on the Thursday before the 2nd Lord's day in August, 1852, at 11 o'clock, A.M.

S.TROTT. 1851.

## ON THE REIGN OF CHRIST.

**CIRCULAR LETTER:** *The Baltimore Association of Old School Baptists, convened with the church at Black Rock, Md., May 18, 19 & 20, to the churches of which she is composed, greeting.*

Time like some mighty whirlpool will sooner or later engulf all that floats in its channel. Every returning period tells of many that have already been swallowed up, and we too are hastening to the vortEx. But while upon the surface we would indulge another

opportunity afforded us of communicating with those we love of the things that make for our peace, as children of the same family, and things whereby one may edify another. Considering the uncertainty and many changing scenes of time, the thousand allurements and great oppositions that are in the world, the wily arts of the Devil with his armed legions, the lust of our flesh with its propensity to evil, and above all the rapid strides and boasting threats of the man of sin, it is thought there is no subject we can contemplate with greater pleasure or profit than that of the *Reign of Christ*. He is that King that Isaiah said should reign in righteousness and whose princes should rule in judgment. The prophets universally ascribe sovereignty to God, and David says, Psa. 62:11, "God has spoken once; twice have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God." Christ, not as the essential God, but as the head of His church and the executor of the Father's will possesses a delegated power, conferred upon Him for a special purpose and for a limited period, and the question as to how far that power extends or what it is made to effect, is one that forever separates between Christ and antichrist, or the children of God and the children of the Devil: the one believing it to be omnipotent, the other that it is limited; the one, that He does His pleasure and none can let Him; the other, that it is dependent for its execution upon the co-operation of His creatures; and while the saints are hailing Him as King of kings and Lord of lords, and rejoicing that there is one possessed of all power that careth for them; the whole antichristian brood are very busy in taking care of their little idol, which they call Jesus, and transporting him from one country to another. Now, in all the little that we may write upon this important subject, we wish to take divine inspiration as our guide, and in order to render the subject intelligible, we will briefly consider it in three branches, namely: Its extent, its nature and its duration. In considering first the extent of the reign of Christ, it is needful that we take into consideration the object for which it is conferred upon Him, in order to ascertain how far it was needful that power should extend. That object is declared in scripture, and that by Himself, to be that He should give eternal life to as many as the Father had given Him. These are in the world, have to do with the things of the world, stand connected with the rest of mankind, and have a frail and evil nature in common with all the human family. It therefore became necessary that Christ, in order to secure to them eternal life, should have unreserved control over all things that stand in the least degree connected with them, as it is written, "As thou hast given Him power over *all* flesh, that He should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given Him." John 17:2. Nor does He simply possess a power in earth and over flesh, but He informed His disciples after His resurrection from the dead that All power was given unto Him in *heaven* and in earth, Mt. 28:18; by which we may learn that the eternal power of the Godhead, and whatever power the Prophets and the Psalmist speak of as belonging to God is involved in the mediatorial reign of Christ. Old Testament scriptures are therefore as applicable to define the power of Christ as those of the new, for "it pleased the Father

that in Him should all fulness dwell." It is not to be expected that we should find in the scriptures an express declaration that the power of Christ embraces this, that, and the other particular thing or occurrence; it is enough that we find evidence of its extending to all things in all worlds. We have already shown that it embraces heaven and earth, as Peter says, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him. It now remains to show that it extends over hell and the power there. He is regarded by us as the mighty angel that John saw descend with a great chain, and lay hold of the dragon, and bind him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up. The apostles having fulfilled their mission and returned on a certain occasion said, Lord, even the devils are subject to us through Thy name. This power is not only declared but acknowledged, for, said the devils to the seven sons of Sceva, Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye? We might here make a number of other quotations to the same import, but these are deemed sufficient. Here let us ask what comfort or enjoyment could christians feel in view of the storms and tempests that are howling around them, did they not know that in Jesus dwelt a power that rules the raging of the sea and stills its angry waves. What security could they feel in a world of opposition, did they not know that He made the wrath of man to praise Him, and restrained the rest. In short what hope could they have of final blessedness, but in the belief that Jesus holds the keys of hell and death, controls all the angry passions of their natures, and every being, every thing, and every act; whether standing in opposition or needful to be employed for their comfort. So they can unite their voices with, and make up that great multitude, many waters and mighty thunders spoken of in the book of Revelation, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. He reigns over Heaven, earth, and hell. The winds and the seas obey Him. The sparrows in their flight are moved and directed by His care, and not one of the countless hairs that deck our heads can fall or remain unmoved but by His government. His is a power to wound and a power to heal, a power to kill and a power to make alive, this is the King that saves His subjects and destroys their foes.

In the second place we are to consider the nature or character of this reign, and wish it borne in mind that there is no reign but His, for the kingdoms of this world are become "the kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ," and Solomon says, Proverbs 8:15,16 – "By me kings reign and princes decree justice. By me princes rule and nobles, even all the judges of the earth." It is also written in the New Testament: There is no power, but of God. The powers that be, are ordained of God. We wish it also borne in mind that He reigns for the exclusive good of his people, His chosen. Isaiah has characterized His reign as a reign in righteousness. Whether we consider Him, then, as dethroning kings, or exalting to sceptres base and blood thirsty tyrants; whether as sending wars with all the evils that follow in their train, or causing the clarion of peace and good will to men to be blown, still His reign is in righteousness, because so it seems good in His sight.

“Righteous art thou, O Lord, and upright are thy judgments,” Psalms 119:137. He governs the world by a power which they neither see nor acknowledge, and to describe it fully, would be beyond the capacity of angels. It is to His reign in Zion, where His power is both felt and acknowledged, that we would confine ourselves in treating upon this branch of our subject. It is there that He has laws, or more properly, a law, which is unchanging as His own eternal throne, and extending to all the subjects of His kingdom in all time and eternity too. It needs no fire and fagot, no sword or bayonet to enforce it; it exerts no tyrannical influence, holds to view no terrors; promises no rewards. It is not recorded upon tables of stone or pieces of parchment, and deposited in the archives of some moldering edifice; nor is it subject to abrogation or amendment like the laws of men. This law is the *law of love*. The promptings of this law are recorded in the New Testament; but let this be obliterated, let bonfires be lighted up with the pages of scripture, still the law is in their hearts and will teach them the way that they should go. Whilst then in the precepts and commandments of the New Testament, we have a transcript of the mind and will of God, they furnish us also with an expression of christian desire. They delight to do the will of God; a service called forth by any other law, either looks for a reward or dreads punishment; but this is all performed for the sake of Him who hath loved them and given Himself for them. If a man preaches truth and does not love it, he is no better off than if he had preached error, and he that practices morality and loves iniquity, is no better off than if he practiced iniquity. Self love has a governing influence over us in nature; but here: “the love of Christ constraineth us.” But whence this love? Paul in his letter to the Romans informs us that it is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. So that, as Solomon says, If a man should give all the substance of his house for love, it would be utterly contemned. As it exists independent of the creature, so it operates independent of his mind and will. It extends to all the family of God and no further. It is therefore no marvel that christians cannot love those that give no evidence that they love God. But we now pass to the consideration of the third and last branch of our subject, which is, the duration of this reign. While we are utterly unable to find any limit to the extent of His reign, the scriptures justify us in fixing a period to its duration and this is no other than the full completion of all that work for which His power was conferred upon Him. Viewing Him as Jehovah the scriptures speak of Him as reigning for ever and ever, but in His mediatorial character they figuratively speak of Him as reigning a thousand years. When that thousand years shall expire no man can tell; but certain it is that He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet. The last enemy to be destroyed is death. When He shall have called up the slumbering bodies of His saints from their graves, and thus taken the prey from the mighty, then cometh the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when He shall have put down all rule and all authority and power, See I Cor. 15:24; and when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also

Himself be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all; verse 28. And now brethren, may we not rejoice in the universal power of Christ, since being controlled by His power no weapon that is formed against us shall prosper and every tongue that shall rise up in judgment against us we shall condemn. May we not confidently look for the complete glorification of all the election of grace since it is His will that they may behold His glory, and all power is His to execute that will. May we not rejoice in the nature of His reign, since, all His works being done in righteousness, all things work together for good to them that love God and are the called according to His purpose. Being by the law of love, we have nothing to dread from our many short comings and repeated wanderings; He heals our backslidings and loves us freely. He holds no threatening judgments over us; nor spurns us from His face.

"The poorer the wretch, the welcomer here."

Lastly, may we not rejoice in the termination of that reign, since with its end will be the eternal overthrow of the kingdom of antichrist, the complete destruction of all enemies including the last, which is death, and the raising up of His church, both soul and body, to dwell with Him in bliss forever. Finally, brethren, farewell; the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

S.TROTT. 1848.

## PRESENT STATE OF THE CHURCH.

**CIRCULAR LETTER:** *The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association met with the Church at Black Rock, May 19th, 20th & 21st, 1858, to the Churches connected therewith.*

Beloved Brethren: – Permit us to address you on this occasion on the Present State of the Church of Christ. That the Church is at this time surrounded with darkness in a peculiar manner, is generally admitted. It is like the plague of darkness of Egypt, a darkness that may be felt. It is a wintry state of the Church. The sun occasionally shines, but its shining has not that warming, enlivening and cheering influence upon the plants as at other times it has had, and it is soon obscured by cold bleak clouds. There are clouds rising from the mists of this world, from the various agitations in the world at this time,

politically and otherwise, which much darken the hemisphere of the Church and saints, and produce a corresponding chilliness. There is not that liveliness in our love to the brethren, nor to the truth and ordinances of the Gospel, nor that engagedness in religious exercises, and in religious conversation, and meditations, as have at other times been felt. As in night and wintry seasons beasts of prey crowd round the settlements of men, to raven; so it is with the Church at this time. There are those around the saints and among them, that would persuade to scare the sheep from their fenced folds to ramble with them in the wild rages of human wisdom, and to repose with them with them in their dens that they may prey upon them, and no doubt they have bewitched some of the sheep. There are others again who would persuade the children of God, that they ought not to follow or receive the light which God has given to their continual guide – the Scriptures and blessed teachings of the Spirit – but to be guided in their belief and practice by the mixture of light and shade which is found in the writings of eminent men of past ages; and as these are various, so as they are followed they produce different views and dissensions among the saints. Again, Satan takes the advantage of this darkness, to assault the saints with temptations. It is an old complaint with the children of God that,

"Temptations every where annoy,
And sins and snares my peace destroy."

How it may be with the brethren generally at this time we know not, but some are peculiarly tried with temptations. Satan so stirs up their passions, appetites, &c., that they think it is altogether themselves. And indeed it is their own vile nature that thus shows itself; and what is a worse annoyance to them, the old man when left to act itself loves as much as ever it did, the indulgence of itself in its corruptions, and hence under this wildness and darkness, or in other words not having the spiritual man in lively exercise, we are led on under the influence of our corruptions, till we are on the very brink of acting them out, and were it not for the faithfulness of God who has promised that with the temptations He will make a way for our escape, we should plunge into actual sin. Though the escape is brought about, we know that it is not of ourselves, but that the sin is ours, though we were not left to carry it out; then arises the trying doubts, whether, if we loved God and His cause and believed the declarations of His word, &c., we could be led on thus contrary to His word and to the exposing of His cause to reproach. We are sometimes thus tossed upon the billows of temptations, until like Jonah, we become exceedingly displeased, and angry, and pray the Lord to *take away our life*, thinking it *better for us to die than to live*; yea, with Job, our souls, those souls which others tell us are made heavenly in regeneration, *choose strangling and death rather than life*. Again, as in wintry seasons, clouds have heretofore at times gathered over the Church, but at this time they appear to be gathering thicker than ever, as though

preparing to burst in a storm upon us. The *Young Men's Christian Associations* which are organized in most of our towns, and united throughout the country in a general convention, appear as very innocent combinations at first sight; but when we consider that they are composed of persons of different denominations and likewise of those who are not professors, all united together for promoting religion, though they appear like the little cloud which Elijah's servant saw rising out of the sea, yet there is evidently in them the elements of a great rain, tending as they are to promote a matured, combined and concentrated effort in their religious enterprise. Again, these *union* prayer meetings which are said to have originated from these young men's associations, are tending still more fully to concentrate and combine all the sects of Protestantism in a grand effort to bring the country and the government under the control of their religious influence, and thus enable them to dictate to the government, and to silence opposition to their plans and measures. Indeed the unprecedented and wonderful effects of these union prayer meetings, in making converts, looks more like *making fire come down from heaven in the sight of men*, and of consummating the power of the Protestant Beast, than anything that has appeared yet. How soon it will be consummated is not our province to say.

But, brethren, it is with the Church now as it was with Israel during the plague of darkness in Egypt. *All the children of Israel had light in their dwellings*. So we think the churches of the saints have at this time as clear light in the great truths of the Gospel as in any former period; and it is more distinguishable from every false system then formerly as it makes manifest the darkness without, by being so contrasted with it. The ministers of Christ, although frequently on account of the wintry darkness when going to their appointments, feel more as though they were on some worldly concern than to deliver a message of peace, yet are enabled generally to preach the gospel with much clearness, to feel while preaching the vast weight of their subject, the precious fulness and freeness of the gospel of salvation, and the importance of contending earnestly for the faith, and of preaching Christ as the only way of salvation. Private members are as well established in the truth, and have as clear a discerning spirit to distinguish between truth and error when preached, as at any former period; and whilst complaining of many doubts, fears and temptations, are as well established in the truth that their whole salvation is in Christ Jesus as in any former period, and manifest as much anxiety to know the Scriptures, and to be in all things conformed to them.

The enquiry is frequently made, What can be the reason of the Church's being in this dark wintry state, and whether it is not owing to the unfaithfulness of the Church that this has come upon her? The inquiry is also made whether the Church cannot adopt some course, whether some measures cannot be taken to bring the Church back to more sunny seasons, and whether individuals by proper efforts, by prayer, &c., cannot deliver themselves from their coldness? Some few have urged the making certain exertions to

relieve the Church and saints from this unpleasant situation. Brethren, does not the same God reign in the heavenly kingdom as in the earthly? Does He not reign as supremely in the one as in the other? Does not the declaration of the Lord, “I form the light and create darkness, I make peace and create evil; I the Lord do all these things” apply as fully to the spiritual world and its government as to the natural? Try your powers, brethren, in mid winter to clear away the storm clouds, to avert the long, dark cold nights and to bring the sun back to its summer solstice, and if ye can do this, then may ye hope by your efforts to hasten on again the period when in reference to the Church ye may sing, “For lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land,” and not till then. We know, brethren, that all this coldness and darkness and the corruptions, that cause us to doubt and fret, and are the materials for Satan’s temptations to act upon, are in us. We cannot say with our Lord, “The prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me.” No, the evil is all in us, and when we rightly feel, we take all the shame and blame to ourselves. But can we shake off to overcome these evils of ourselves? No, the more we feel the evil of these corruptions and coldness, we feel the more our entire impotency to relieve ourselves from them, we cry for God to interpose His grace or we must fall under them. It is true, that amid the severest colds and storms of winter, if God in His providence provide us with shelter, with food and clothing we may keep from perishing, so under all these dark and wintry seasons spiritually, God’s grace will be sufficient for His people to secure that *their faith fail not*. He will *keep them by His power through faith unto salvation*, though He may leave them, for more humbling of themselves, and for the trying their faith, to fall into the mire.

The people of God, are likened to sheep. Sheep are feeble, defenseless creatures of themselves, very simple in providing for their defense against their enemies, or in providing for, and protecting themselves and their young from perishing in the wintry storms. They need the constant care of a shepherd to provide food and shelter for them, and to protect them by keeping them embosomed, or by watching over them, or they will wander off, get scattered and devoured. The people of God are equally as dependent upon the care of their Shepherd. But David personating Christ in His body, the Church, says, “The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me besides the still waters. He restoreth my soul, &c.” So that even the souls of the children, get off at times from the simplicity of gospel truth and order and need to be restored by the great Shepherd. This does not look like the souls of saints have been changed into heavenly souls.

As to the reason why the church is in this dark and wintry state; we would say, it is not that the Shepherd is unfaithful to His charge; not because He has not power to preserve His sheep in perfect peace, and to keep them in the constant enjoyment of light; nor

because they are left to their own care; but because He has seen it best for the church to be in this state. In a word, because it is so written, and the Scriptures must be fulfilled. The present dark and cold state of the church, will no doubt be more for the glory of God, more for a manifestation of the power and exceeding riches of His grace; more fully to display to the admiration of saints and angels, the divine efficacy of the blood of Jesus to cleanse from all sin, and that perfect fulness there is in Him to present the vilest sinner without spot or blemish before the throne of God, than would the church's being kept in the constant exercise of that faith and love and zeal such as characterized the lives of Peter, John and Paul. Because now it appears so manifest that it is all of grace that they are saved and kept, all of Christ in which they will appear with acceptance before God, and shine in glory.

Let us then, Brethren, amidst all the darkness around, rejoice in the power and faithful care of our Shepherd and may we be found walking as children of light.

S.TROTT – 1858.

## RELATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES AND MINISTERS.

**CIRCULAR LETTER**: *The Delaware Baptist Association, to the Churches they represent.*

Beloved Brethren: – Having again been permitted through the mercy of God, which *endureth forever*, to meet in our associate relation; and to receive, as tokens of your mutual fellowship, the epistles sent by your messengers; we in turn address you by Letter, praying that *grace and peace* may be multiplied unto you.

As a subject that may be interesting and profitable unto you, we present for your consideration a view of the relation of gospel Churches and Ministers, as we believe is revealed in the word of God, the only correct standard of gospel order.

This relation is therein represented as a household or family relation. The churches, as the bride of Christ, are the mistresses of their respective families. For although the term

*bride* is more generally applied to the collective church, or body of Christ, yet as each branch into which the body is divided, is individually spoken of in the New Testament as a distinct church, and as an independent body is entrusted with an administration of the discipline and order of Christ's house, in its own sphere, {see, for instance, Paul's direction to the church at Corinth, concerning the disciplining of its members, I Cor. 5:1-13 & II Cor. 2:6-10,} each branch may be considered as the bride of Christ, owning Him for her Head and Husband, and as the Father of her children.

The gospel ministers, stand to the respective families or churches with which they are severally connected, in the relation of *servants*, as the term *minister* denotes. The minister of the gospel is primarily the minister or servant of Christ, being by Him entrusted with the ministry, {see I Tim. 1:11 & Col. 4:17.} Hence says the Apostle, "Let a man so account of us, as the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." I Cor. 4:1. Being the servants of Christ, they are of course, especially called by Him, and gifted or qualified for the work assigned them. Hence in all their ministration they are to be governed by the New Testament; it being the law of Christ, which they are to seek at His mouth, as the *High Priest of our profession*. See Mal.2:7. To Him they must also ultimately account for the manner in which they have discharged their stewardship. Luke 12:42-48 & I Cor. 4:2-5.

But whilst the gospel minister is to act as the servant of Christ, he is also to consider himself as a servant of the church of which he is a member, and which he is appointed to serve; and is therefore to act under her direction in all things committed to her government by her and his Lord. And surely the Lord has not appointed His bride to be subject to the servants, as many will have it, but His servants to be subject to the church. Paul says to the church at Corinth, "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus sake." II Cor. 4:5.

To the churches it belongs in administering the government of their Lord's house, to set her servants to work, or in other words, to call into public service the gifts bestowed upon them respectively. But in doing this as they are so abundantly cautioned by their Lord to "*beware of false prophets, which come in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are raving wolves*," and to "*try the spirits*," &c., it becomes them to be very cautious that they set none to work whom the Lord has not sent forth into *His harvest*. And to the churches it belongs to examine the credentials of those who would introduce themselves into the family of the Lord's servants. They are to examine the certificate of their appointment to His service; that is, the gift imparted for the work of the ministry; namely, *aptness to teach*; and their *experimental* call to it, and discovering their Lord's signature, which is nothing less than an *experimental witness* in their own breast, that the messages delivered are from God; then, and not otherwise, to appoint them to their work, as the case may require; either to labor as a pastor in the duties of that office, or as

teachers simply, that is as preachers not having a pastoral care. The appointment to be manifested according to the pattern given, namely: *by prayer, and the laying on the hands of the Elders*; as in the case of setting apart Paul and Barnabas to the work whereunto the Holy Ghost had called them. Acts 13:1-3.

We are aware, brethren, that in the above remarks we pass by one practice common in our Baptist churches, namely: that of *licensing* preachers. Upon this point we will propose, for the candid consideration of our brethren, the following queries: 1st. Do we anywhere in the New Testament, find any pattern or direction for licensing preachers? 2nd. Does our Lord anywhere commission any to preach His gospel, whom He does not commission to baptize? We know that we ought to "*lay hands suddenly on no man*," nor ought we in anyway to send them out into the world as Christ's ministers, without a thorough trial.

But in the case of *licensing* preachers, this caution is not always sufficiently regarded. Too many churches, in sending out preachers in this way, act under the impression that it is only a licensing of them, and therefore think it not necessary to have the same full evidence of the individual's being called of Christ to this work as in the case of ordination; as though a person being imposed upon the churches and the world as a gospel preacher without having the gospel of Christ *committed*, of God, *to his trust*, was of much less consequence than his baptizing without being specially called to do it. Another evil arising from the plan of licensing, is that many persons who are fellowshiped by their churches, as having been called of Christ to preach, but whose gifts are not great, or who have not confidence to crowd themselves forward, are left to labor for years under the difficulty of being allowed to obey but one part of their Lord's command. He says to His ministers, "*Go and teach all nations, baptizing them*," &c., but the churches say to these, "No, you may go and teach, but not baptize."

Again, gospel ministers, whether pastors or others, being servants of the church, and connected with the churches where they severally belong as members of the family, are as much under the watch and care of the church as are the other members. Consequently if it is the duty of each church, as it manifestly is, in maintaining the order and discipline of Christ's house, to know how its members attend upon the institutions of the gospel; and to call those to an account who shall be found treating with neglect, or turning from the gospel and its ordinances, as they professed to receive them; it is equally its duty to see that each minister belonging to the church faithfully discharge the duties of his station; and not only to *know* that he preaches Christ's gospel, but also to know that with fidelity, as providential circumstances permit, he exercises the gift committed to him in the *work of the ministry*. Thus Paul and Barnabas, although specially sent forth by the Holy Ghost to a certain work, yet considered it their duty to account to the church, how they had fulfilled the work assigned to them. Compare Acts 13:2 with 14:26,27. But how

different from this is the present state of things among the Baptist churches generally. They leave the preachers which are among them, other than the pastors, to roam at large; and if they abstain from immoral conduct, and from the grosser errors, such as Universalism, or Campbellism, or the like, the churches exercise no more watch over them, either as to the exercising of their gifts, or to their doctrine, than over those who are not members with them. In consequence of this, among those who profess to have been called by the Lord, to go and preach His gospel, even with the urgent direction to *let the dead bury their dead*, rather than neglect this work; and whose *call* their churches have declared a fellowship for by licensing them, we find *one* engaged in the business of the world, preaching but seldom, if at all; *another* is wandering far and wide, probably more intent to hunt a settlement than to preach the gospel; a *third* we find in a seminary of learning, studying the heathenish writings of the ancient Greeks and Latins to qualify him to preach the gospel of Christ; a *fourth* is traveling as an agent of some society, to collect monies, &c.; a *fifth* has engaged as a missionary, to some mission board, to be subject to their direction, to hold himself accountable to them, and to acknowledge his dependence on them for his reward. Thus we find him a member of two distinct families; one the household of faith, by which he was licensed, the other a household of *human contrivance*. To the latter he cleaves, and owns their government; the other he despises as an inefficient institution for spreading the gospel. We would not have it understood by these expressions that we are opposed to spreading the gospel upon New Testament principles. Perhaps a *sixth* may be found living within the bounds of his church, and engaged as far as circumstances permit, in preaching the gospel to the destitute.

But to return; the duty of the churches to watch over the preachers, as such, which are among them, involves in it their accountability to their Lord, for the employment of those gifts which He has bestowed upon them. For the apostle tells us, Eph. 4:11-13, that "He gave some, Apostles," that is, evidently, to some churches, as in the first age of the gospel. "And some Pastors and Teachers," and they were given *for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ*. By the *body of Christ*, in the passage, as appears from what is said in the following verse, we are evidently to understand the whole collective body, of which each church is a branch. Hence though these gifts are given to the individual churches, yet as they are designed for the *edifying of the whole body*, it becomes the duty of the churches, to see, according to circumstances, that they are thus employed. It is true that as each church can only act in a limited sphere, and as each gift can only be employed in a like sphere, a church will feel the propriety of requiring the gifts committed to it, especially in the pastoral office, to be employed for its own edification, so far as in connection with the good of the whole, it is judged proper. Not that the labors even of the Pastor should be wholly confined within the

bounds of his church; much less that the other gifts, in the office of *Teachers*, should be thus confined.

We do think, brethren, that the churches have been too remiss upon this point. They have of late years acted too much upon the principle of *mine* and *thine*, as though the pastor was exclusively for the church to which he belonged, and as though the individual church had no concern in the whole body's being edified. Poor and destitute churches have been left to shift for themselves as well as they could. For that care which the churches ought to have exercised towards the *feeble branches* of the body, and towards destitute neighbors, *human contrivance* has been substituted in the form of Mission Societies; whereas let the churches but discharge their duty towards, and with the gifts entrusted to them, and it will be found that the institutions of the great Head of the Church are perfectly adequate to the edifying of His body, and the accomplishing of His purpose of salvation, without the intervention of human wisdom to guide His affairs.

You will perhaps say, that we do not feel able to support more than one preacher, nor hardly that; and we should not like to insist on a man's leaving his business, and going from home to preach, without being able to secure him a compensation for his time, &c. How was it, brethren, in the early ages of the church? Oh! but, say some, that was a day of miracles; and we cannot now expect preachers to be supported by miracle. Jesus has the same power as then, and the promise that He *will be with* His ministers *to the end of the world* still holds good. But where have we an instance of the Apostles performing a miracle to procure themselves substance? Paul's *own hands* ministered unto his necessities, when the churches did not communicate to him; and he tells the elders of the church at Ephesus, I have shewed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak. Hence we have here an example for preachers, when the churches fail to minister to their necessities, that they should *labor, working with their hands*, to support themselves while preaching the gospel. See Acts 20:34,35. It is true, the Lord has *ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel*; but He has never appointed that his ministers should wait till they have competent wages secured to them, before they go forth to preach the gospel. And if they have put their hands to the *gospel plough* in a right spirit, they will not be looking back for their gains, before they can move on.

But let not the churches conclude that they are not under obligation to communicate a support to those who preach the gospel, or to their families. *Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things*, is the direction of Zion's King. Gal. 6:6.

An important enquiry arises, how this support is to be communicated; whether as a fixed salary, or otherwise. Much is said in favor of salaries on worldly principles; but we no

where find this to be the New Testament plan; nor is it congenial with the gospel spirit. It places the preacher and church in opposite scales, as much as are the parties to a mercantile transaction. Indeed this stipulating with a preacher to give him a certain annual sum on condition of his being their preacher, looks too much like a worldly bargain, and places the preacher in circumstances very much like those of a hireling. It deprives the preacher of the sweet consolation of receiving the communications from the church and individuals as a token of love for his work's sake; for they are naturally received as the fulfillment of a contract. Many other evils arising from this plan might be specified, had we room.

On the other hand, by a due regard to the family relation, in which the churches and preachers are connected, the occasion for a stipulated salary for the ministerial support will be excluded. In a family where proper equality reigns, those members of the family who are laboring in the harvest field, or engaged in tending the flocks, will come to a family table, and partake equally free with those who have been concerned in making ready the provisions. So the preachers being called to labor in the *gospel field*, or as *shepherds* to take the oversight of the family in spiritual things, are or ought to be principally engaged in these things; whilst the other members of the family are attending to their worldly avocations, and thereby collecting the *meat that perishes*. Now as these come and freely receive for the supply of their spiritual wants, out of that distribution which the preachers make, as *stewards of the mysteries of God*, is it anything more than a proper equality that the preachers should be allowed to come freely for the supply of their temporal wants to the stock which the others have collected? This is evidently the New Testament view of the subject. See Gal. 6:6. "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." And I Cor. 9:7 – "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?" Again, verse 11 – "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things?"

A correct view of this relation, and a conformity to it in practice, will place the preacher in a happy remove from the two extremes; that of being engaged as a *hireling*, and that of being supported upon the ground of common charity. It will place him at *home* among his brethren.

But you are ready to enquire how this thing is to be come at; and whether your property is all to be thrown into *common* stock? This was the case in the beginning of the gospel church, and that by the voluntary act of the disciples, from an ardent love to the gospel cause, and a sense of the present necessity. Compare Acts 4:32-37 with I Cor. 7:26. But the peculiar circumstances of the first church, which called for these great individual sacrifices, having passed away with the increase of disciples and churches, with it

passed away, even in the Apostles' days, the practice of *having all things common*. Still, however, a circumstance arose out of this which produced a peculiar demand upon the liberality of the Gentile churches; and Paul speaks of it as an act of just return in these churches; his words are: "and their debtors they are." See Rom. 15:26-27. That is, as we understand the Apostle, as the liberality of the saints in Jerusalem, in giving up their individual possessions to the church, enabled the Apostles and the other gifted brethren, to give themselves to the *ministry* of the word; and be supported, without a *miracle* too, by which means the knowledge of salvation was extended to the Gentiles, and Gentile churches were planted; so the after suffering state of these disciples, in consequence of their voluntary poverty, in connection with the oppression of the church at Jerusalem, called for a suitable return of liberality from the Gentile churches, to supply their temporal wants. The Holy Ghost, in handing down the particular description of the management of this collection, contained in Romans, chapter 15; I Cor. 16:1-3 & II Cor. , chapters 8 & 9 appears to have designed it as a pattern to the churches in after ages, in reference to those demands which the gospel would at all times have upon their liberality, for the support of its preachers and the poor of the church. Taking this collection then as our pattern, we conclude that the preachers are not to be supported by tithing, taxing, or restraint in any way, but by a voluntary and liberal return made for benefits received. We also conclude that no individual is required to throw his possessions into a *common stock*, but to improve them with care and industry. Upon the proceeds, however he will find, and feel too, if he feels aright, that the gospel has a claim, for a due share. *Let every man lay by him in store as God has prospered him*, is the direction: I Cor. 16:2. Not that the preacher *should be eased and they burdened*; but that, whilst he is engaged in feeding the flock with the bread of eternal life, they by a proper distribution of their worldly increase may yield him a supply for his wants; and thus *there may be equality*. For to be placed on an equality, as to the circumstances of temporal support, for himself and family, with the other members of the church, is what the preacher has a right to expect, for services rendered, in the gospel; and with which he ought to be satisfied. If the preachers could feel and exercise that humbleness of heart which is proper to the servants of Jesus, and if the other members of the churches, instead of expending the surplus of their incomes in vain trappings, that their families may make a show in the world, or in adding farm to farm or stock to stock, would freely allow the gospel claim to its share of what God from time to time is pleased to bless them with; many churches, which now think, they cannot give one preacher a support, would find themselves able not only to make their Pastor comfortable, but also to say to other preachers which they may have among them, "go preach the gospel to the destitute around, as the Lord opens a door for you, and the wants of yourself and family in the mean time will be our care." Or if they had no gifts among them save the Pastor, they could contribute something towards the support of those who were laboring with small

and poor churches, or in destitute neighborhoods, as did the Philippians to Paul, while laboring in Thessalonica and Corinth, Phil. 4:16 & II Cor. 11:9.

In a word, when we get back to the proper state of gospel feeling, to be of *one heart and of one soul*, to realize that we are *one body*, animated by *one spirit*, even *as we are called in one hope of our calling*, owning and loving the *one Lord, one faith, and one baptism*; then will vanish all difficulties from the way, in supporting the gospel ministry according to the gospel *pattern* and *order*, even to any extent to which the Lord may *send forth laborers into His vineyard*.

Brethren, let us, both preachers and churches, strive more to cultivate the spirit of the gospel; and to act more in conformity to that family relation by which we are bound together, and as those who are to give an account, not unto men, but unto our Lord. In proportion as this is the case, we shall find it *good to stand in the ways, and to see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and to walk therein, for we shall find rest to our souls*. Jer. 6:16. Though others may say, *we will not walk therein*, yet we should find our confidence in the Lord's wisdom and power to accomplish His own gracious purposes increasing, according to the plan laid down by Himself in His word; and of course shall be less disposed to wander after the traditions and inventions of men.

The Lord, we judge from the signs of the times, *will suddenly come to His temple*. But who may abide the day of His coming? How many, alas, will He have to scourge out, for having made His Father's house a house of merchandise? Brethren, may all our loins be girded, and our lights burning, that when He comes, we may welcome His approach with the salutation, "EVEN SO COME, LORD JESUS." Amen.

S.TROTT. Moderator. 1833.

## REMARKS ON I JOHN 1:3.

**CIRCULAR LETTER**: *The Corresponding Association held with the Mt. Pleasant Church, Fairfax County, Va., to all Old School brethren, churches, associations, corresponding and annual meetings, sendeth christian salutation:*

Beloved Brethren: – “That which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ.” I John 1:3. The Apostle in the above text seems to express a desire to cultivate christian fellowship with those to whom he is writing, and to this end declares unto them what he has seen and heard; and as ours is the same desire, we wish in the following address to confine ourselves to what we have seen and heard, believing as we do, that the believers in Christ, in every age and country, were all embraced in the same eternal purpose; were all interested in the same grace which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began; are all watched over by the same kind Providence which brings them to, and preserves them in their natural existence; are all sanctified by the same God and Father, preserved in the same Christ Jesus; called with the same holy calling; the same pangs and sorrows bring them all into their spiritual existence; the same provision is the support of each, while on his pilgrimage; and the same heaven will be their home, when mortal scenes shall end. We can but believe also that the language of one who is in the *light* will be the language of all; and if we would all speak the same things, we must walk in the same light; and if we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another. Here two questions arise for our consideration. 1st. What is light? And secondly, What is fellowship?

In answer to the first of these enquiries, it is not our purpose to enter into an illustration of the various significations with which the term *light* is used in the scriptures, nor to direct you to any *new light* which has sprung up in these modern times; but to ascertain if we can, what is the nature of that light in which the saints are called to walk. And 1st. It is not the light of human reason; for this is often at war with the whole government of God, instead of enjoying fellowship with Him. It is not the light of nature; for this is called in the scriptures a darkness, which will eventually lead those who follow it into interminable woe, unless God call them out if it into His marvelous light. It is no blazing comet beheld by the natural eye; for, “We walk by faith, and not by sight.” Nor is it the pillar of fire literally, that was the directory of national Israel through the wilderness into Canaan; but what this pillar of fire was to them figuratively the Lord Jesus Christ is to His church substantially; hence they are required to follow Him; to hear Him, &c. “In Him was life; and the life was the light of men.” God has given Him for a light of the Gentiles. Isa. 42:6. Again, He is said to be the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. John 1:9. And John 3:19, where it is said that men loved darkness rather than light; and concerning Christ it is said: “He was despised and rejected of men.” And Christ says of Himself, “I am the Light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.” John 8:12. Without multiplying quotations, we think the above sufficient to establish the fact that Christ is the light in which the saints are called to walk. But it may be asked, since Christ has ascended up on high, are we not each at liberty to walk according to our own sense of

propriety, and to put our own construction upon His own word, and walk accordingly? We answer, No! There has been too much of this done, hence the lack of fellowship and union among us. This would be like departing from the Lord, and thinking to have peace by walking in the imagination of our own heart. Deut. 29:19. What then are we to understand by following Christ, or walking in Him as our light? And where shall we find the substance of what was shadowed forth in the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, that guided Israel after the flesh in their windings through the wilderness? The spiritual Israel experience, both darkness and day, and it is truly a wilderness through which they are called to pass. How important then that we should have a safe Directory, a bright and shining Light to conduct us on our pilgrimage. Well, our strong Deliverer has not left us to grope our way in the dark, but has afforded us a Light whereunto we do well that we take heed. “Is not my word like as a fire, saith the Lord?” Jer. 23:29. And says the psalmist, “Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path.” Psa. 119:105. It is Christ Jesus who shines in this word, that makes it a fire and a light. And as this is evidently a night season with the church, how important that we should give the more earnest heed to this light, and have our eye steadily fixed on Him who is clothed with light, as with a garment. We know that there are many who profess to be the children of God, and profess to be governed by His word, and yet are pursuing different plans and schemes; but we are inclined to believe that by far the greatest part are following some fancy of their own, instead of waiting for the moving of this fiery pillar. The scriptures in themselves are but as a dark body, even to the children of God, only when Christ, who is our light and life shines therein. And whilst, dear brethren, we are wading through this dark night, anxiously watching for the morning, let us be *still*, like our ancient types, when the pillar of fire is not moving before us, that is, let our lips be sealed in silence, and our pens keep their places where nature grew them, rather than advance one sentiment, either in doctrine or practice, much less move therein, if we have not a thus saith the Lord for it. When there exists a diversity of opinion among brethren, touching any one point of doctrine, it is clear that they are not all following the light, in contending each for their peculiar sentiments; and as these things are confined chiefly to the ministry, it only goes to show that the *cloudy* pillar will not do to follow in the night; but when the morning shall again dawn upon the church; when “Zion’s watchmen shall see eye to eye;” when the ministers of the gospel who are also called clouds, shall be embodied as one pillar; then may Zion’s children follow on; then our peace shall be as a river; and then shall our fellowship be sweet. But to our second enquiry, what is christian fellowship?

This term, as used in the scriptures, and experienced by christians, means something more than formal friendship or kindness. This kind is experienced by the world, and by the various anti-christian societies that are in the world, consequently is nothing more than a fleshly feeling, while the saints are required to “know no man after the flesh,” all

fleshly attachments and preferences should be laid aside; no creature fondness should be suffered to predominate over that fellowship which is of God. This term is not particularly defined in the scriptures of truth, but according to its application as there used, seems to be somewhat synonymous with love, and is an inevitable consequence of fellowship or communion with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ; “For if we love Him that begat, we love them also that are begotten of Him.” This fellowship with God is brought about alone by being born of God, having our souls washed in the blood of Jesus and made holy, otherwise there could be no communion with Him; for as soon might we expect that light and darkness might have fellowship one with the other, or righteousness and unrighteousness; but being purified we become experimentally connected with Christ, and in Him enjoy communion with God, as did Noah in the big ark, while it rode sturdily upon the bosom of the mighty deep. There is a fellowship that is merely nominal, but like that which exists merely in the flesh, it always fails to produce those delightful effects flowing from a fellowship of kindred spirits – this is to take an individual by the hand and call him brother, for whom we do not feel that endearing relationship, and to whom we are not bound by any fleshly ties. This kind is sometimes expressed towards those who have gone out from us, that it might be made manifest that they were not of us – contrary to the Apostle’s injunction, that we have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather to reprove them. Christian fellowship is a union of soul, and does not exist towards an individual *because* he is called an Old School Baptist, or because he professors to be a believer in Jesus; but because he gives evidence of being born of God, and manifests a conformity in his life to the precepts of the gospel; and in his conversation an unyielding attachment to the doctrine of Jesus, thus bearing His image; and the more christians discover of this in one another, the more closely will they be knit together in the bonds of christian love and union; and where this exists, instead of opposition and persecution from their many enemies, having a tendency to untwist the chains that bind them together, it will but rivet them more firmly; lead them to speak often one to another, and endeavor to comfort and console each other with the rich promises of the gospel; to administer to each other’s necessities; and to drive them often to a throne of grace, to tell God their sorrows.

Fellowship with God, and with one another, is what constitutes our happiness here below; but more particularly the former; for by it we have the promise made to us of a rich inheritance beyond the narrow bounds of time, when we shall be fully fitted to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; ‘twas this that burst off the prison bonds of Paul and Silas, and lightened up their dark abode; ‘twas this that made the burning furnace a pleasant palace for Shadrech, Meschech and Abednego; ‘twas this that buoys up our fainting spirits, in our lonely sojournings. But when we meet the children of God associated together for the worship of their Father, and enjoy the comfortable evidence that He is in the midst; we unite our melodies in praise to His name; we unite

our supplications to a throne of grace; we are charmed alike with the gospel proclamation, and we are led to enquire, “From whence doth this union arise?” The answer can be found alone in Him who has made us one; and who has made it our desire to dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of our lives; to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to enquire in His temple, Psa. 27:4.

Our meeting has truly been a season of refreshing to our souls, having enjoyed, as we trust, the presence of our God, and the visits of a goodly number of our brethren. The letters from the churches express peace and love among themselves, and they seem to enjoy an unshaken confidence in God.

Finally, brethren, farewell. “Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might.”

S. TROTT. Moderator. 1842.

## SAVED BY THE LORD.

**CORRESPONDING LETTER:** *The Fryingpan Old School Baptist Church and the churches and brethren uniting with her in a meeting for correspondence, – To the churches and Associations corresponding with us together, with all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and walk in truth: Send brotherly greetings.*

Beloved Brethren: – In addressing to you this our letter of correspondence, we would call your attention to the declaration found in Deut. 33 – part of verse 29, as a theme of contemplation. “Happy art thou O, Israel: who is like unto thee, O, people, saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help, and who is the sword of thy excellency.”

Moses having in the preceding part of the chapter pronounced prophetically a blessing upon each tribe severally, then addresses Israel collectively, first as *Jeshurun*, and in the text above quoted as *Israel*.

“*Happy art thou O, Israel*.” Israel is here addressed as singular, as one whilst she is spoken of as a people. Wherein was this unity found but in him to whom this name Israel was given, and from whom as his posterity they inherited it, together with the

blessing therein implied? This was evidently the case with national Israel, and can be no less so with spiritual Israel the antitype. At the time Jacob received this name he was in very straightened circumstances. He had just received word that his brother Esau was coming to meet him, and four hundred men with him; he knew Esau's enmity against him, he no doubt felt conscious of the provocation he had given him. He therefore feared that himself, his wives and children and all that he had would fall a prey to Esau's vengeance. After making certain arrangements, and having sent all over the brook, "Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day, and when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh, and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh, And he said I will not let thee go except thou bless me. And he said, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said, thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." Gen. 32:24 – 28. This has all undoubtedly a typical reference to the spiritual Israel, but we cannot now go into a full illustration of it, lest it swell our letter to too great a length. We will remark that Jacob's posterity were all involved in his sin toward Esau, and in the threatened vengeance, and in his prevailing to clear away his sin before God, and to have Esau's enmity subdued, his posterity, those already born, as well as those that should be born after, participated in the same blessing. Hence the name *Israel* was attached to them, and so recognized of God. Exod.4:22 – "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn." Now brethren, would we not insult your feelings, were we to ask you whether as spiritual Israelites, you in your own persons, as *princes have power with God and with men*? How then have you prevailed, and have been manifested as Israelites? National Israel as we have seen thus prevailed in an eternal sense and obtained the name Israel through and in their immediate head Jacob. Have we not a Head, a Jacob through whom as Israelites we have power with God and with men? Jacob was so named from the circumstance of his hand's taking hold of Esau's heel. Esau as from his names, Esau and Edom, as well as from his being the first born and being disappointed of the blessing was evidently typical of national Israel as manifested under the Sinai covenant. Had not Christ hold of the heel of national Israel, in all the manifestation or birth of that people from the promise to Abraham to give him a seed on through the giving of the law with all its ceremonies and forms? That is, was not all, designed to prefigure the coming of the Messiah, and to introduce Him to the view of faith as well as to prepare the way for His manifestation in the flesh? Thus we see His hand hold of Esau's heel in the declaration to Abrham, "And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," as well as in His being the substance of all the sacrifices of the law. Again Jacob was distinguished as the *elect* of God. See Rom. 9:10, 13. So Christ is declared as the *elect* of God. See Isa. 42:1 & 65:9. But the posterity of Jacob were elected in him to be

participants in the blessing of Isaac, and that whilst Jacob was yet in the womb, and therefore it must be as they existed in him, and hence it was said to Rebekah: "Two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels" which could only immediately have taken place in the birth of Esau and Jacob. Gen. 25:23. So the children of God are said to have been *chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world.* See Eph. 1:4. If before the *foundation of the world*, of course when He only, as their life existed in God, before sin existed and therefore before He could be manifested or declared in the world. And if then chosen *in Him*, it must have been, that according to the type, they were chosen in His election, and must have existed in Him and were a distinct *manner of people* in time to proceed from Him. Brethren, is it not in Christ and in Him only, that you find your Israel, your *power with God and with men*? Is it not alone through His atonement, and intercession that you have confidence to approach God with your supplications, and hope for acceptance with Him? Is it not *Christ in you the hope of glory. Christ living in you* {Col. 1:27, Gal. 2:20} that gives you the victory over the old man and over the allurements and opposition of men? Or is it from some new strength that you have obtained of your own? In other words, Is that *faith which is the victory* &c. a faith of your own, or is it not the *faith of the Son of God*? See Gal. 2:16, 20. Happy indeed art thou, O, Israel; thy life being one with the Son of God. I John 5:12. Christ being thy life, thy salvation and righteousness, no curse can now reach thee, nor any plague come nigh thy dwelling in a spiritual sense. The blessing of God rests upon thy head and therefore upon His body and upon each member thereof. Thy very afflictions are blessings, and not in disguise neither, but often seen openly as such.

"Who is like thee, O, people saved by the Lord?" Truly in all times, the spiritual Israel, the members and body of Christ, have been singular, a different manner of people from others, in their salvation. Saved by the Lord, by Jehovah as it is in the original. As He is, as His name signifies, self-existent, He is all that He is, absolutely of Himself, therefore in the manifestation of Himself in His power, in His grace, or in His holiness, or in His love and mercy, He cannot be controlled, influenced, nor helped by any other, nor governed in the manifestations of any of His attributes, but by His own purpose and His purpose and design, must be like Himself eternal. Hence His people in being brought to know His salvation, are brought off from every idea of conditions. Their repentance instead of being viewed by them as a condition, is in itself a turning with loathing from every doing and exercise, yea from their whole Adamic nature, with all its works and faculties, as being depraved and rendering them unworthy of the favor of God. Instead of viewing their faith as a means of their salvation it gives them to see their salvation as already complete in Christ Jesus, that He is that salvation, {Isa. 62:11} so that we might as well talk of faith's being the means of Christ's existence, as of its being the means of salvation. As we are saved by Jehovah, Christ must be, and is Jehovah, existing of Himself, and not of another. If the life which *is the light of men, was in Him in the*

*beginning*, He was still the Word and the *Word was God*. If He is the only begotten Son, He is in the bosom of the Father, He and the Father are one. John 1:18 & 10:30. Hence the life of believers is hid with Christ in God. If Christ is in His people, the hope of glory liveth in them. Col. 1:27, Gal. 2:20. God, even the Father is in them there, "I in them, and thou in me." John 17:23. If that as the Mediator, He might make that offering to law and justice which was required for the redemption of His people. He partook with them of *flesh and blood*, He was still, *God manifest in the flesh*. Contemplate the salvation of Israel as you may as completed in Christ or as existing experimentally in the believer, his hope of glory, it is by the Lord; it was His purpose, it is all His work, all that was necessary for accomplishing it, He provided in Himself, and communicates it with Himself as the life, to His people, as His body. Hence the *church* of which He is Head is the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Eph. 1:22, 23. Who then is like thee, O, people? Who is there of all the shades of religion in the world that do not manifest their opposition to Thy salvation? "The shield of thy help." That is, Jehovah is the shield &c. Israel by his relation to Adam was ruined, condemned and helpless. But God laid help upon one that is mighty, exalted one chosen out of the people. Psa. 89:19. By David in this connection, we are evidently to understand the antitype of David, He who was David's Lord and Son, Jesus Christ as we have showed is mighty as the Jehovah, and He is called the Mighty God, Isa. 9:6. Help was laid on Him, in that He was appointed the Surety of the better testament, a Mediator between God and men, and the High Priest of our profession. Israelites are made to know by experience that all their help must come from Him. As He said to His disciples "Without me ye can do nothing;" {John 15:5} and that they can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth them. Phil 4:13. And Christ says, "Because I live, ye shall live also."

A shield is an armour of defense. Christ as the helper of His people was assaulted with the wrath of the law, it met Him at His birth and pursued Him to His tomb. He was assaulted by all the rage of Satan. Nothing short of the Godhead could have sustained Him under the assaults and enabled Him to triumph over them, and to bring His body the church out with Him unharmed from the contest. The help itself, the salvation of Israel is assaulted by many enemies, external and internal, but Jehovah shields it. "He that keepeth Israel, &c., Psal.121:4,5. "And who is the sword of thy excellency." The word here rendered excellency, signifies exalted, or exaltation. In the passage already quoted, Psal.89:19 where David is spoken of as the type of Christ, it is written: "I have exalted one chosen out of the people." David was chosen from among his brethren and exalted to the throne of Israel. So Christ is manifested as one with His brethren. Thus, it is written: "For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren." Heb. 2:11. And thus Christ said to Mary; "Go to my brethren and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." John 20:17. Here He fully acknowledges a brotherhood

with His disciples, as having with them one common Father, and one God. Not only this, but it is also written that: “Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death, &c.” Heb. 2:14. In the foregoing verses He had both acknowledged them as brethren and as children, and thus claims a father and a brother’s right to redeem them. And that the law might recognize His right to redeem, and accept of satisfaction at His hands He came into the law place of the children by taking part of the flesh and blood of which they partook and in which they had sinned. He thus humbled Himself to come under the law, both as God {Phil. 2:6,7} and as the Son. Hence it is written: “Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered.” Heb. 5:8. His humiliation thus was the ground of His exaltation as spoken of in the text above quoted from Psal.89. See Eph. 4:9 & 10, and Phil. 2:6 – 10. As the condemnation of Christ to death lawfully, could only be by His standing in that relation to His people as their life, by which the law could hold Him as one with them and their sins as the sins of His body and members, and hence could inflict the penalty on Him. If their sins were not thus considered as His, how could David when speaking of Christ in Psal.40 represent Him in verse 12, as saying “Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of mine head, &c.” Christ individually had no sin.

If then Christ is so one with His people, He the life and head, and they the body and members in particular, {I Cor. 12:12-27}, that their sins were His, did not Paul rightly say “I am crucified with Christ”? Gal. 2:20. If crucified together, were they not raised up together? Hear what Paul testifies: “But God who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, {by grace ye are saved;} and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.” Eph. 2:4-6. Notice that this quickening, this raising &c., is not only together with Christ, but it is *in Christ Jesus*, it must therefore have been in His being quickened, in His being raised; and therefore as one with Him. And who is it that has the presumption to call in question a truth so divinely testified to by an inspired Apostle? In the exaltation or excellency of Israel; the Lord is the sword of this excellency. By this sword, by the power of His self-existent Godhead, Christ cut His way through the curse of the law, through death and the grave to the exaltation of His people. This sword was stronger then the flaming sword placed at the east of Eden. Jesus by His death vanquished that. The religion of Christ is a living and experimental religion; it is not to be supposed that Christ as the head and life of His people hath ascended to glory with the purpose of leaving His body or a single member of His body behind. The head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you. I Cor. 12:21. As every member of a body is quickened by the same life which animates the head, so every member of Christ’s body must be quickened with that life which animates Him as the head, “If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His,” and they must be born

of the seed of Abraham, of Israel, or they are not Israelites. Again the saints must be kept and their bodies raised spiritual bodies before they can participate individually in the glory, the exaltation of Christ. But when we consider that Jehovah Himself is the sword by which this excellency, this high exaltation is achieved, who can doubt its accomplishment, whatever obstacles we see in the way, whether within us or without?

Brethren, this is the salvation in which we believe, and to which we would bear our testimony. It meets with opposition and false representations even from some who once professedly walked in fellowship with us. But we rejoice to know and to testify that this is the God we worship, the Saviour we adore, the Mediator in whom we trust. Even Him of whom John testifies that, “This is the true God and eternal life.” I John 5:20. Therefore though reviled and reproached, we would rejoice in the consolations of our trust.

Our meeting which is drawing to a close has been truly refreshing and comforting to us, we have been highly grateful at receiving a goodly number of corresponding messengers from our sister associations, ministers and other brethren. The preaching that we have had has been of Christ and His salvation and in opposition to all the attempts of men to save themselves; so that we have been made to think the language of Moses to Israel applies to us. “Happy art thou O Israel, who is like unto thee, O people saved by the Lord, the shield of thy help and the sword of thine excellency.”

To our sister Associations we would say, we desire a continuance of your correspondence by minutes and messengers. Our next association will be held by appointment, the Lord willing, with the church at Mt.  Pleasant Fairfax Co. Va. on Thursday before the second Lord’s day in August 1853.

S.TROTT. Moderator. 1852.

## THE LORD SHALL COMFORT ZION.

**CIRCULAR LETTER** & **CORRESPONDING LETTER**: *The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association, to the several churches of which she is composed, send christian salutation.*

Beloved Brethren: – As an expression of our fellowship, we again address you in our associational circular, and on this occasion we

have selected as the theme or subject of our address, the following declaration made in the scriptures concerning Zion: “The Lord shall comfort Zion.” Isa. 51:3.

In this passage we find four things which demand the attention of the redeemed of the Lord. First: Zion, which is to be comforted. Second: Zion’s Comforter. Third: The absolute character of the promise. Fourth: The Comfort promised. May the Lord by His Spirit guide both writer and reader into the experimental enjoyment of the subject under consideration.

First: Zion, or the city of David, see I Kings 8:1, is frequently used in the scriptures as a type of the church of Christ, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all; and we regard it as a very beautiful and instructing figure: first, from the meaning of the word *Zion*, which signifies a *monument raised up*. The church of Christ is truly a monument raised up and founded on the eternal purpose of God, based on His unchanging love, secured against all evil by His omnipotence. Every individual believer is a monument of grace, seen and read of all men. The whole church forms a monument which shall remain resplendent in glory when all the glories of this world, yea, when the creation itself shall no longer exist. But, some will say, the word Zion, means a *heap of stones* – rough, unpolished, useless. Do they come from nature’s quarry? Are they not made living stones and polished by divine grace? They are raised up as the spiritual seed of Abraham, and built upon the foundation which God hath laid. Each stone, whether great or small occupies the place which was from eternity assigned it, by the great Architect, who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will. But again, Zion is emblematic of the church in being the object of God’s peculiar love. See Psa. 87:2 – “The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob,” and even so hath He loved the church; yea, “He loved the people.” Deut. 33:3. And He so loved them that He gave His Son to die for them. I John 4:10. And although the Lord’s tender mercy is over all His works, so as to supply all His creatures with food and raiment; yet His love for His church is peculiarly manifested in providing for them in an everlasting covenant, spiritual food and raiment in the Person and righteousness of His dearly beloved and only begotten Son. Zion is the object of God’s choice. Psa. 132:13 – “The Lord hath chosen Zion.” So hath He chosen the church in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world. Eph. 1:4. Zion is well garrisoned: “Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof; Mark well her bulwarks.” Psa. 48:12. So also is the church. Her walls are Salvation, and her gates Praise. The Lord will be a wall of fire round about her. God, with all His wisdom, power, love, mercy, longsuffering and goodness is for her; who can be against her? She has watchmen upon her walls, to warn

her of danger, and they have a trumpet on which to blow *a certain sound*, that her inhabitants may prepare for battle.

Second: Let us notice Zion's Comforter. And this is the Lord: He is God the Father; for all her comfort, all her joy, and all her hope springs from the heart of Jehovah, the Father, and descend to her through the Son, whom He declares to be: "Lord, to the glory of the Father." For in Him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. All spiritual blessings were given to the church in Him, and of His fulness they all receive their strength, light, hope, joy and peace. These are all in Him in their fulness; and for the use of thirsting souls, to whom they are applied by the Spirit who is expressly called the Comforter. John 14:15-17. Because His covenant engagements are to give the church a knowledge and enjoyment of her most gracious Lord and Master.

Third: We will now glance at the absolute promise of God: "The Lord shall comfort Zion." All the promises of God in Christ Jesus are yea, and in Him, Amen. That is, they are sure and certain, irrevocable and irrevisable to all the promised seed of Abraham. And the nature and attributes of Jehovah confirm the same. For if Jehovah, the Father hath given comfort, the Son received the same, and the Spirit engaged to communicate it to the hearts of the elect. Jehovah being unchangeable in His nature, is consequently immutable in these wonderful acts, whereby the comfort of the church is secured. Not dependent on any contingency or uncertainty: for God has so arranged from even the most trying circumstances of their lives. If the comfort of Zion depended on her deserts, she would indeed be comfortless; or if it depended on her improvement of anything committed to her care, she would be destitute; for she feels daily and hourly that she can only stand as she is held up, and only use what is given to her; for the Spirit of God works in her both to will and to do of His own good pleasure.

Fourth: We will now offer a few remarks on the comfort, and the manner in which the Lord applies it to Zion. It is by His word, by the ministry, and by the direct agency of the Holy Ghost. 1. The Lord comforts His people by His word when it quickens them, as it did David, Psa. 119:50, and when through patience and comfort thereof they have hope. Rom. 15:4. Seeing themselves, in the early stage of their conversion, and in their daily falls into sin, to be altogether helpless, they imagine themselves to be in a hopeless state, until by the word, they see the foundation of hope to be not in themselves, but in Jesus Christ the Lord. 2. He comforts them by the ministry, when a full and free salvation is proclaimed, as in Isaiah 40:11 – "He shall feed His flock like a Shepherd," &c, and when His ministers have been led into trouble, and comforted, expressly that they might be enabled to comfort those who are in any tribulation, with the same comfort wherewith they themselves are comforted of God. II Cor. 1:3,4. But neither the word, nor the ministry, valuable as they are, can afford any comfort, only as instruments in the hands of God, by His Spirit. Now all the comfort of Zion's citizens consists in relying

*entirely* on Christ in every emergency, and in all trying circumstances. 3. The Holy Ghost becomes a Comforter in testifying of Christ, and by leading the soul to Him. Are any suffering under a sense of indwelling corruptions; He leads them to Jesus for sanctification. Are they naked; He leads them to Jesus for the mantle of His righteousness. Are they hungry; He leads them to Jesus for the bread of life. Are they weak; He teaches them to rely wholly upon that strength which is made perfect in their weakness.

Fear not then, ye drooping, doubting and desponding saints; for *Christ is All*. The Father hath given you all. The Holy Ghost is engaged to bring you to Him; and thus the Lord *shall* comfort Zion, and all her children shall rejoice. Yet a little while, and the Lord God shall wipe away all tears from their faces, and lead them to fountains of delight, to cast their crowns at His feet, and praise Him forever and ever, even so, amen, and amen.

---

## CORRESPONDING LETTER.

Dear Brethren: – Agreeably to our last year's appointment, we have been indulged of our Heavenly Father with the privilege of once more meeting together; and considering our ingratitude and many short comings, of which each church, and each individual member among us will plead guilty, and stand convicted. We are amazed at the goodness of God in granting us privileges so inestimable. Yet, we enquire on the other hand, if while we were dead in sins, God so loved us as to give His Son to die for us, will He not also with Him freely give us all things? Cold, ungrateful, and indifferent as we are, we do feel an assurance that we hold and love the truth as it is in Jesus. For our attachment to what we understand to be the doctrine and order of the gospel, and our opposition to the innovations and inventions of men, we have not only to endure the persecutions of men made religionists, but to resist the popular current of the world. All this we could well bear and even rejoice in knowing as we do that it is a part of the saint's inheritance on earth; but the Lord seems to have in a measure withdrawn His presence from us, and because of this we mourn. Many of the churches in our connection, have, from the ravages of death and other causes dwindled down to a mere moiety, while some have entirely disbanded, and we are in a great measure dependent for ministerial gifts, on other associations. The evidences of the power of divine grace are few and far between, and our harps are hung upon the willows; but amidst the raging storm, to whom shall we look so confidently as to Him "who rides upon the stormy sky, and thunders when He please." Perhaps these things may be to prove our steadfastness in the stand we have taken; or it may be that the Lord is about finishing His work in this part of the land, and that the gospel, like the sun, arose in the East, and is traveling on to the West, leaving us to repose in its evening shade. Let the purpose of our God be what it may, we desire to

still contend for His truth, submit patiently to all His will, and live upon the assurance that all things work together for good to them that love God, and are the called according to His purpose.

Our meeting, which is drawing to a close, has been one of unusual comfort and christian enjoyment. Your messengers and ministers who have come to us have brought us the pleasing intelligence that you are enabled in some good degree to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. The preaching that we have had has been of Christ, and His salvation, without a jarring note.

Our next Association will be held, the Lord willing, with the church at Harford, Harford County, Md., to commence on the Thursday preceding the third Sunday in May, 1852, at 10 o'clock, a.m., when and where we hope to receive a continuance of your correspondence.

S.TROTT. Moderator. 1851.

## THE LORD THY GOD WHICH TEACHETH THEE TO PROFIT.

**CIRCULAR LETTER:** *Of the Baltimore Old School Baptist Association to the churches of which she is composed.*

Beloved Brethren: – As an expression of fellowship, we again address you in our Associational Circular. On this occasion we have selected as our subject the address to the Israel of God contained in Isaiah 48:17-19. "Thus saith the Lord, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; I am the Lord thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go. O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments," &c. We understand spiritual Israel to be here particularly addressed. In the first verse of chapter 48 God addresses the house of Jacob, which art called by the name of Israel, &c., which swear by the name of the Lord, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth, nor in righteousness, &c., thus showing that national, and not the true Israel are there addressed. Hence their idolatry and obstinacy, &c., are spoken of.

In verse 12th, and onward, the Lord addresses *Jacob and Israel His called*. Paul says, "But unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God." I Cor. 1:24. So that being *called* is distinctive in believers or the true Israel. Hence these are the people we think are addressed in the verses we have selected as our subject. In directing your attention to this subject, we will notice.

*First*. The person speaking, who being Israel's Redeemer, can be no other than the Messiah. Hence whilst He declares Himself to be the Lord, or Jehovah, *their God* {verse 17} as He is in truth the self-existing God, and whilst He claims the prerogatives of God, saying in verse 13, "Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens," &c; He in verse 16 saith, "And now the Lord God and His Spirit hath sent *me*;" thus showing that whilst He is Jehovah, God, He also exists in a relation personally distinct from the Lord God and His Spirit; and is the Messenger of God.

*Secondly*. The characters under which He speaks. – 1st. *The Lord thy Redeemer*. He is the Jehovah, whilst He is also *thy God*, thy *Near Kinsman*, who stood of course in this relation to thee, before thy thralldom; whose right therefore it was to redeem thee and who was not like Ruth's kinsman afraid of marrying His own *inheritance* in doing it; but who has accomplished thy redemption from all bondage and from all iniquity, by the sacrifice of Himself; and who is to thee, and for thee, all that righteousness which the law requires; who indeed gave Himself for thee, that He might in justice, be manifested as thy Lord and thy Husband. – 2nd. "The Holy One of Israel." He is to His people all that holiness in which they will shine through eternity, was to them all that holiness in which they stood before God from before the foundation of the world, as His body, His bride; being loved in Him, and in Him predestinated to the adoption of children. His blood is their purification from all pollution, and He in them is the principle of personal holiness and of love to God.

*Thirdly*, What He says. 1st. He says, "I am the Lord thy God, which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way thou shouldest go." – As before noticed, Christ is truly the self-existing God, whilst He is He who was sent of the Father; and being God in Christ, He is as such peculiarly the object of His people's worship, trust, and love; is their God; whilst as such He is to all others the *unknown God*. As the *Root and offspring* of David, He was given a Leader and Commander to the people. As such He *teaches* His people to *profit*. He by implanting His spirit in them, gives them spiritual discernment, gives them ears to hear, and hearts to understand, and when He speaks the word, whether He speaks through others, through the written word, or in visions of the night, they know it, and rejoice in it as the truth, whilst all other teaching but deludes. All that He teaches is good, and He teaches them all that is good or profitable for them to know, whether in relation to doctrine or practice. Let us then beware of other teaching. Which

leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go. As the Leader of His people, He goeth before them, and draws them with cords of a man, with bands of love. John 10:4 & Hosea 11:4. When He thus draws, they willingly run after Him. He does not lead His people to places of worldly rest and ease, but to the experience of tribulations and trials, to temptations and darkness, and thereby to the knowledge of the plague of their own hearts. He does not lead them to partake much of the applause, honors, &c, of the world, but to receive its reproaches and persecutions. He leads them to know the law, but He also leads them out from it, to the enjoyment of the privilege of sons of God. He leads them to death, but He will also lead them to participate in the joys of the resurrection. He leads them about through the way of the wilderness, but it is by a right way that they might go to a city of habitation. Ex. 13:18 & Ps. 107:7. He has gone before leading them in the way of patience, meekness, uprightness, holiness and self-denial. Both by precept and example He leads them into the ordinances in which they should go, and out from the traditions, and commandments of men. Where the footsteps of Jesus are seen going before, there is the right way. Where they are not found, there let His people not go.

2nd. He says, “O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments,” &c. All our Lord’s instructions whether in relation to faith, or to acts of obedience, are with authority, hence they are here with propriety called commandments. So the Evangelist speaking of Christ’s instructions to His disciples as recorded in Matthew, Chapter 10, says, chapter 11:1 – “And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding His disciples, He departed thence to teach, and to preach in their cities.” His instructions came to the Jews as the preaching of men does to the world, but to those to whom He has given ears to hear and hearts to understand, they come as commands. But it may be asked: Do any of the people of God neglect to hearken to the instructions of Christ after having once received His commands with joy? We answer, the church, the visible Israel of God, evidently has done it in two ways. First, she has neglected to adhere to the instructions received; and secondly, she has been much disposed, instead of hearkening to hear what He commands, to listen to the suggestions and commands of men. Thus, the churches of Galatia, instead of adhering to the gospel testimony, which they had no doubt once received with joy, proclaiming them *justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses*, were disposed again to return to the law. And so the church went on listening to the suggestions of reason, and the teachings of Satan’s ministers, until the *man of sin* came full robed into power; and the bride the Lamb’s wife had to retire from the pomp, the splendor and persecution of an established religion, to the wilderness, to find a lodging place. Still with all this evidence of the evil consequences of not hearkening to the commands of her Lord, the church has been too much disposed to hearken to the reasonings and commandments of men, even to this day. Hence instead of her peace flowing as a river, divisions and contentions prevail, instead of her true righteousness rolling on to view she is covering herself too much with

*linsey-woolsey* or the flimsy stuff of human doings. We also think that individual believers have not as they ought, hearkened to the commands of the Lord, though times have been when His word was all precious to them, and they wanted nothing else for their comfort and directory. But enticers from without and from within have succeeded in turning away their ears from hearkening to His commands, and led them off from the simplicity of the word. Hence they have been bewildered and confused with the traditions and systems of men, have been contending for things that are not according to the word, or have found themselves walking in paths of disorder and disobedience, and to aggravate the wretchedness that has resulted, instead of the regular flow of peace and righteousness, Satan has charged these disorders home upon them, as evidences that they are not christians.

*Then had thy peace been as a river and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea*. We do not, brethren, understand by this complaint, that God has been disappointed, or His purpose at all frustrated by the disobedience of His church and people. On the contrary this very oppression and diminishing of His church is abundantly pointed out in prophesy; and these very trials of His people, are fully anticipated in the Scriptures. But we understand that it was designed to set forth on the one hand, the direct tendency of a faithful hearkening to the commands of the Lord in all things pertaining to religion; namely, unity of faith and consequent peace. On the other hand, the evil consequences of seeking guidance and instruction in religion from any other source. *Then had thy peace been as a river*. A river flows on in a constant current, bearing down and overcoming every obstacle to its progress. Such would have been the peace of the church had they uniformly been disposed undeviatingly to have hearkened to the commands of the Lord, and suffered no opinions of men to usurp the place of His instructions. Not its external peace with the world, for in this sense Christ *came not to send peace, but a sword*, {Mt. 10:34,} but peace within, a oneness of mind and heart. *And thy righteousness as the waves of the sea*. The sea is in constant motion, and its waves or swells are therefore constantly rolling on in regular succession. So would their righteousness have been constantly rolling on to view, that is, *The Lord their righteousness*, in all their preaching, in all their conversation, in all their approaches to God. *Thy seed also had been as the sand and the offspring of thy bowels as the gravel thereof*. Instead of multitudes of the children of God having been led off with the various sects that separated from the Apostles' doctrine and order, and multitudes more being deterred from making a profession, by the divisions among the professed disciples of Christ, there would have been but one doctrine, one order, one professed church of Christ, and all the children of God should *have been borne upon her sides, dandled upon her knees; and sucked and been satisfied with the breasts of her consolations*. See Isa. 66:11 & 12. And who will say that in that case her seed would not have been manifested to be numerous as the sand of the sea?

*His name should not have been cut off, nor destroyed from before me*. Instead of the expression as it stands in the text, *should not have been cut off*, &c., in the margins of some Bibles we read, *Shall not be cut off*, &c. This we think is the correct reading of the text because it corresponds with the declaration of our Lord – "Upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Mt. 16:18. It also corresponds with what is said in the next verse, "Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the ends of the earth, say ye, The Lord hath redeemed His servant Jacob." So that instead of Jacob or Israel's being *cut off* for his rebellion, he is yet to be redeemed and come forth from *Babylon*, or from all the *confusion* occasioned by the *man of sin*. How rich and free the grace and mercy of our God!

Now, brethren, we see and we lament that there are discords among the O.S. Baptists. Whilst instead of *hearkening to the Lord's commandments*, we say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ*, and suffer opinions, whether our own or of other men, to govern us, can we expect our *peace to flow like a river*? Opinions of men always have, and always will conflict one with another. If then we were to stop all means of public correspondence, whilst each is swayed by opinion, can we *be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment*? Methods were resorted to in the earlier ages of the church, for supplying the place of the remedy pointed out in our text, to produce unity of faith and practice in the church. Councils were called, Creeds and Confessions of Faith were formed, ceremonies and forms were agreed upon, and the observance of these was attempted to be enforced by laws and persecutions; but all would not do. Do you ask why? We answer, that all of the children of Zion are to some extent taught of the Lord, and are led more or less to wait on Him for further teaching, and so far as He reveals to their faith His doctrine or order, or any point thereof, all the fetters and chains which men may forge will not bind their consciences to prevent their testifying to that which they know is truth, nor against what they know is error. Could we give up all contending for opinions, if we have occasion to mention them, mention them only as opinions, as it is written, *The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream*, and contend only for what we have been taught of God to know is truth, then would contentions cease among us; for the Spirit of truth cannot give different views on the same subject to different persons; though He may give more extended views of scripture to one than another. It may be asked, How are we to distinguish what is taught us of the Lord, from what is merely made up opinion? We answer, there are certain things which every child of grace so knows to be the truth, that neither the sophistry, nor wrath of man can lead him to deny them. He knows that he did not attain this knowledge of them from men, nor from books, except, it may be, instrumentally, and that he did not reason himself into it. He was taught it internally; there was an enlightening of the mind to see, to taste and feel that it was truth and that the Scriptures bore testimony to it. And

since the first revelation of Christ to him as the way, he has in like manner had his understanding enlarged in the knowledge of the Scriptures on particular points. There is an exercise of faith in the thing, a knowing that it is God's truth. When he states these things and points to the Scriptures which he has seen as so clearly sustaining their truth, he does it with confidence, feeling that he is girt about with truth. But it is not enough to have an internal impression, there must be an opening of the Scriptures to view as sustaining it. If there were with us more of a waiting to *hear what God the Lord will say*, and of hearkening to His commandments, then might we look for unity and peace. It is not however probable, that we shall altogether be divested of our attachment to human opinions, whilst the church remains encompassed by Babylon. But if we cannot agree in opinions, let us try to *love as brethren*, to be *courteous*, and not to give place to anger and bitterness, nor to a wresting and distorting of each other's views, that we may put down by prejudices what we cannot confute by argument. And let us remember for our comfort that amidst all the confusion, Jesus will in His own good time show Himself as walking upon the waves, and will hush all to peace.

S.TROTT. 1850.

## THE NATURE OF THE ATONEMENT MADE FOR SIN.

**CIRCULAR LETTER:** *The Corresponding Association of Old School Baptists, held with the church at Mount Pleasant, To her brethren scattered abroad sends greeting.*

Dear Brethren: – It is under peculiar and trying circumstances that we address you in this our annual epistle. Peculiar because hitherto we have been permitted to regard all who wear the cognomen of *Old School* as being partakers of our joys and sorrows and although not particularly connected in our correspondence, we felt that their God was our God, and their Christ our Christ. Trying because, we have seen such a disposition for strife manifested by many, and to set up new and unheard of tests of fellowship, so that instead of feeling assured as formerly that we have the prayers and sympathies of many with whom we have been in habit of associating as brethren, some have withdrawn themselves from us, who, if they read our epistles at all, read them for criticism and not

for edification. And why this strife? Or whence these estranged feelings? It is difficult for us to believe that the principles of the religion of Christ or the fruits of the spirit are productive of such results, we must therefore look to a departure from those principles and to the depraved nature of man, to find an origin for such a state of things. We are all doubtless striving for the faith of the gospel, but are we according to the apostles admonition striving together? And not rather about a difference of *opinion* upon extraneous matters that do not effect the principles of the faith of the gospel? The limits of a circular forbid that we should notice all the points upon which a difference of opinion exists, nor do we think it necessary; but we would call your attention to the Nature of that Atonement or Sacrifice which has been made for Sin. In doing which we will try to divest ourselves of all preconceived *opinions* and utterly disregarding the views or opinions of others, take the scriptures as the man of our counsel, as the lamp to our feet and the light of our path. Whilst we have but little hope of being able to reconcile conflicting views upon this subject, we pray you brethren to hear us patiently and weigh well the scriptural evidence we bring in support of our views, before you judge us harshly or decide that we are heretics. We are perhaps all agreed that the sacrifice upon which sinners alone can have any hope of acceptance with God, is that of His own Son, this at any rate is the position we occupy, and as we do not intend to advance a single idea unsustained by the scriptures of truth we will before we proceed further, introduce some scripture proof relative to this point.

In Romans 5:10, it is recorded: “We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son.” Rom. 8:3 – “For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh” and 8:32 – “He that spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all.” Gal. 4:4 – “But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son made of a woman, &c. I John 4:9 – “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son into the world that we might live through Him,” see 10th verse also. The point being fully established, we next proceed to enquire what constitutes the Son of God? Was it the human nature in which He appeared, the Deity and humanity combined, or was it a real existence as the first born among many brethren. If the human nature alone, then as a matter of course there was no such thing as the Son of God until He was thus curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth, see Psa. 139:15. If it be the deity and humanity united, then there was no Son until this union took place. And do the scriptures authorize us to believe that 4000 years of time should roll away and that Abel, Noah, Lot, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Gideon, Barak, Sampson and all the long train of patriarchs and prophets should live and die without any real Redeemer, but such as existed merely in the design and purpose of God. No, but on the contrary we hear Christ declare: “Before Abraham was, I am.” We cannot therefore think it was the seed of Abraham which He took upon Him, but rather, He that

took the seed of Abraham was the Son of God. This conclusion we find sustained by scriptures both of the old and new testament, not only as being before Abraham, but before all things, and by whom all things consist. When four men were seen walking in the fiery furnace, it was said that the form of the fourth was like the Son of God; and how we ask, could there be a likeness of that which had no existence? In Proverbs 8:23 {where it is generally admitted that the writer, under the name of Wisdom is personating Christ,} it is said – "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth was &c., read to verse 30. Again, in Proverbs 30:4 hear the words of Agur: "Who hath ascended up into heaven or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in His fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is His name, and what is His Son's name, if thou canst tell?" Job exclaims in the depth of affliction as though it were the only comfort he had: "I know that my Redeemer liveth." In John 6:62, Jesus asks, "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before," and also in Eph. 4:9 & 10 – "Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things." In the John 17:5, Jesus asks to be glorified with that glory which He had with the Father before the world was. Therefore it seems clear that in ascending up where He was before, He was going to return to some position that He occupied with the Father, not only before He was born in Bethlehem, but before the world began. Again, if He had no existence prior to His incarnation we are at a loss to know how it was that the saints were blessed and chosen in Him before the foundation of the world. Now brethren we think from these and other considerations we might notice, we are fully warranted in contending for the doctrine, that the Son of God existed before time began, and that therefore neither His humanity, nor deity and humanity united constituted Him such. The essence of sonship we cannot attempt to define any further than to say that He was and is a spiritual head of a spiritual family. But some may be ready to enquire, How long has He existed as such? To which enquiry we can only reply in the language of the same divine authority by which we have established the positions already taken, and we wish it borne in mind that we are not treating of His self existence as Jehovah, but of Him as the only begotten Son. And whilst we acknowledge ourselves utterly unable to trace His existence as such to any point, the scriptures everywhere speak of that existence as posterior to the existence of His Godhead. In Proverbs 8, already referred to, He is represented as having been set up from everlasting. In John 1:1, it is written: "In the beginning was the Word." In Col. 1:15, He is said to be the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; verse 17 – "He is before all things," 18 – "who is the beginning." And in Rev. 3:14, He styles Himself – "The Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God." And we acknowledge ourselves unable to see any difference in the language last quoted, which are the words of Christ Himself,

and an expression found in the Signs of the Times, much caviled at, that “He is the first production of Divine Power.”

Nor does it become cavilers to dispute the doctrine that Christ, as the Son of God, is the production of God, until they can show that these scriptures do not mean what they say, and discard the idea that His Sonship consists in His humanity which is to all intents and purposes a creature; for He was *made of a woman*. He is spoken of frequently as the begotten of God, the sent of God, the messenger of God, and as coming to do not His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him. When He comes He is manifest as the Mighty God, though veiled in humanity, because it pleased the Father that in Him all fulness should dwell, and His humanity no more constituted Him the Son of God than it did God Himself. Then why was He clothed with humanity? Because the children are partakers of flesh and blood, therefore He took part of the same, and we may add, for the same reason that Moses put a veil upon his face when he came down from the top of Sinai. Moses had been upon the mountain and talked with God, and his face in consequence shone with such a glory that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold him. Christ proceeded forth and came from God, yea has His dwelling in the bosom of the Father. If then it was necessary that the mediator of the administration of condemnation should veil his face, how much more that the mediator of the administration of righteousness which exceedeth in glory should veil Himself. This He has done, hence says Paul, “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which He has consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, His flesh.” Here His flesh is expressly called a veil, and was not therefore that which constituted Him the Christ. He comes at the appointed time and this is the manner of His appearing, clothed with humanity and embodying the whole of Deity. At the appointed time He was delivered up and dies. Forsaken of the Father, insulted by devils, and denied by friends, is yet borne testimony to so strongly by the Father, who hides the sun and rends the rocks, that the amazed centurion cries, “This is the Son of God!”

Now we ask, is not such a sacrifice of infinitely more value than that which is merely human? If the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

“So great, so vast a sacrifice,
May well our hopes revive;
If God’s own Son thus bleeds and dies,
The sinner sure may live.”

If this brethren be the doctrine of the Bible it should not be withheld because some do not *believe* it, nor because they refuse to worship this Son of God, though God has said "Let all the angels of God worship Him," and those who would convince us that we are in error must bring some scripture proof rather than to say falsely, that this is Arianism, new things, heresy, idolatry, &c.

This sacrifice we do not regard as being only the substitution of one person or thing for another; but as the sacrifice of the head for the body, which is His church, and the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. Nor do we imagine that although the *Son* of God was delivered up and put to death, that He for one moment ceased to be; but that in Him at His death was fulfilled the word of the Lord by the prophet Isaiah, 54:7,9 – "For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee," &c., and that though passing in connection with the body through the vale of terrors, He was the same vital head, and when He arose, it was with His body completely justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses.

Our present meeting has been one of peculiar interest evincing as it has done, how christians can dwell together in unity. We have none of Hagar's mocking children among us, and although a much larger number than usual of our brethren have been together, they seemed to be one of heart and one soul. Our ministering brethren have come to us in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ, and their preaching has been a full exhibition of the glories of our Redeemer in the full and complete salvation of His elect. We feel thankful to God and those of our sister associations who have thought enough of us to send us their minutes and messengers, and desire to reciprocate their kindness. Our next meeting is appointed to be held with the church at Upper Broad Run, to commence on the Thursday before the second Lord's Day in August 1854, when and where we hope to great you again and enjoy another season of refreshing from the presence of the Lord.

S.TROTT. 1853.

# THE NEW BIRTH: EXPERIMENTALLY CONSIDERED.

**CIRCULAR LETTER:** *The Baltimore Old School Baptist Association, to the several churches therein represented, send love in the Lord.*

Beloved Brethren: – In addressing to you this token of our particular relationship and regard to you, we would call your attention to the subject of the *new birth*. This doctrine in all by-gone ages has been almost as distinguishing a mark of the Regular Baptists, as is baptism. Although the multitude bearing the name of Baptists have dwindled down the idea of a second birth to a mere wordy phantom, a change which an individual can procure, if not accomplish for himself by his efforts, and others claiming to be Regular or Old School Baptists, have substituted for it, imaginations of the human mind, having no direct resemblance to the idea of a birth, the scripture testimony still is: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And the necessity for it remains as strong as in past ages, for still it remains true, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." We do not contemplate entering into, in this letter, an elaborate argument in support of the doctrine of an actual *new birth*, but would content ourselves with giving you a brief view of what it is, as illustrated in the scriptures. For this end, we beg leave to call your attention to the births of Ishmael and Isaac. Perhaps it may be thought that the birth of Jacob and Esau are similar in their figurative application to the above, but the scriptures do not so represent them. Jacob and Esau are brought to view as illustrating the sovereignty of God in election from among the posterity of Adam. See Rom. , chap.9-12. Hence they were both of the same birth, and therefore alike after the flesh. As their mothers were allegorical of the two covenants, so they represented in their births the children of the two covenants. But the things of the new covenant are spiritual, or things of the spirit of God, and therefore are only known by the spiritual man. {See I Cor. 2:12-15.} Hence Ishmael is said to have been born after the flesh, and Isaac in distinction from him, is said to have been by promise; and the promises of God we know do not run through Adam, but through Christ Jesus. See Gal. 4:22,23 & Rom. 9:7-9. So that whilst Ishmael represents the natural seed of Abraham, or fleshly birth, Isaac represents the spiritual seed, or the spiritual birth; and Christ is that spiritual seed, and the believer is of the seed of Abraham as he is Christ's. See Gal. 3:15 & 29. Not that we do not suppose that Isaac was a fleshly man in his birth; but we believe that his birth had those peculiar characteristics connected with it which made it a fit allegory of the spiritual birth in distinction from the fleshly. Hence in further confirmation of this view, we have taken of the birth's of Isaac and Ishmael. Whilst the scriptures represent the birth of Ishmael as being altogether without faith, being the result of human reasoning or contrivance, and

fleshly actings, they represent that in the birth of Isaac all fleshly powers were previously dead, and that it was only through faith that Sarah received strength to conceive seed &c., Heb. 11:11, and faith is not a fruit of the flesh, but of the Spirit.

Having thus far, as we think fully established the position that the birth of Isaac was a figure of the spiritual birth, in distinction from the birth of the flesh, we will proceed to illustrate the new birth by it.

1. We will remark that this birth in the figure had its particular seed, that faith was connected with its conception, and therefore points to that incorruptible seed which Peter declares the saints to be born of, by the word of God. I Pet. 1:23. It was the promise of God that secured the birth of Isaac, so it is the word of God or His declared promise, or purpose and grace that secures the spiritual birth of all the elect; and as before noticed, all the promises of God are in Christ Jesus, so the purpose and grace of God which secures the salvation of all who are saved is in Him, excluding all our Adamic powers from any part in accomplishing it. Christ is the substance, the grand whole of all the revelation of God, of all the promises, the grace and purpose of God; as we have Christ we have the promises and grace of God. And He is the life and therefore the embodiment of His church; hence they are saved according to God's purpose and grace given in Him, See II Tim. 1:9. We might go on to notice the effect of the conception of this incorruptible seed, how it produces faith in God, quickens the man to a sense of his relations, and accountability to God, of the spirituality and broadness of the law, and of the sin in his acts, thoughts, and nature; of the distress occasioned thereby; of the darkness that covers the whole operation within, hiding all excepting certain external effects from the individual view, so that he is a mystery to himself, and can tell no more why he is thus, than he can tell of the wind whence it cometh or whither it goeth. We might show that whilst the soul is thus quickened to such a deep sense of the law or of sin as being against God, that it still evidently is not changed from a natural to a spiritual soul, and therefore it cannot receive the things of the Spirit, or the things freely given us of God, but entirely looks to the deeds of the law as the way of acceptance with God. But we forbear, and come to the birth. We are told that Sarah bear to Abraham a son at the set time of which God had spoken to him; and that Abraham called the name of his son whom Sarah bear to him, Isaac; also that Sarah said on the occasion. "God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me." And she further said, "Who would have said unto Abraham that Sarah would have given children suck &c." Gen. 21:1-7. The name Isaac signifies laughter, as Sarah says, God has made me to laugh. Laughter is an expression of sudden, but transient and light joy. The name Isaac therefore and Sarah's being said to laugh, is strikingly expressive of that joy which is experienced when a person is first born again, or brought by faith to behold the light of the Sun of Righteousness into liberty. It is all joy and excitement at beholding the way

of pardon and acceptance with God. But as it is a general, but rather superficial view which the child of grace has at this time of the way of salvation, and not that full understanding which he has afterwards when taught of Christ as the way, his joy is easily and quickly turned again to sorrow and grief, and his light is obscured soon by clouds and darkness. Still with the very first burst of joy, there is a feeling in the individual that it is God and no other that hath made me to laugh. There is also a feeling as with Sarah, that all who hear shall laugh, and he is therefore anxious for the moment to impart the good news to others, some under the idea of publishing it to all, and therefore as having a kind of preaching excitement. As Isaac retained his name of laughter through life, so the believer in his after pilgrimage has his times of this transient excitable joy. {Note: There is much of humility and astonishment connected with this laughing. Who would have said that Sarah should give suck, &c. So says the new born child of grace, who would have thought that ever I should have found pardon, that all my distress which I have suffered on account of my sins should have been but preparing me to know and rejoice in salvation by Christ; that such a vile sinner should have been an object of God's love.} But brethren, let us not stop merely to laugh with Sarah, let us inquire what has transpired to occasion it. It was not that any change had taken place in Ishmael, he had not been transformed to be the son of the free woman, or of Sarah; he remained to be the son of Hagar, and subject to bondage with his mother. But it was that a new and distinct existence had come to light in the family, that Sarah had a son of her own, and that as she was a free woman so her son was free born. As she represented the children, or child of the new covenant; the spiritual man, for there is one spirit, and the Lord {Christ} is that Spirit; and it is Christ in all the saints, their life, and the hope of glory. Thus we have the new birth in a figure before us. That which was born of the flesh, the whole natural man, soul and body, remains fleshly and under bondage, after the new birth as before. It remains subject to notions of legality and bondage, and therefore subject to be continually annoyed with doubts and fears. It remains subject to all that depravity and all those afflictions, and diseases, and that death which was entailed upon man by the transgression of the natural Adam. It is true that in reference to the believer, the whole curse has been removed by the atonement of Christ from all these evils of sin; but they in themselves remain to disturb his peace and hopes, only when faith is in exercise, then he can view and rejoice in the whole as blessings. But there is a new existence, spiritual in its nature, that opens its eyes from the first, not to behold the light of the natural sun, but to delight in the shining of the Sun of Righteousness; not to behold the alternate blaze and thick darkness of Mt. Sinai, but to rejoice in the light of life; not to cry and fret, and to labor and toil for that which is not bread, and which satisfieth not, but to behold and feast upon the rich supply of the bread of life, the bread which came down from heaven ready prepared at his hands. It is true that faith when looking through the natural senses as it sometimes does, takes a view of natural things;

but instead of seeing the curse written upon them, views engraven on all, from the blaze of the sun to the glimmering of the glow-worm, the glorious truth, that God is love. But it is not by the fleshly senses that this spiritual child, this new man sees or judges of anything, it is by faith; faith is to it what the senses are to the natural man. Hence when faith is not in exercise and we look at, and attempt to judge of things by our senses and the faculties of our souls, much of clouds and darkness obscure our vision, and much that appears threatening and injurious hovers over us. But all that faith looks upon is light and peace, with no darkness to obscure, nor any threatenings to create fear; that which is most gloomy to sense, is light to faith. It beholds God in all, and God as He is manifested in Christ Jesus.

Hence as the two, the Ishmael and the Isaac in the believer, are so different in their birth, look at and judge of things so differently, and are so different in their pursuits; the one being earthy and clinging to earthly things, the other being heavenly and soaring towards heaven, and that which is heavenly, it is no wonder that there is a continued warfare going on in the breast of the believer; making him feel that whilst he would fly heavenward, he is still confined to the earth, that when he would do good, he is full of evil. But leaving this point with much that might be said on it, we pass in the next place to notice the weaning time, and the events connected with it. We are told that the child grew and was weaned; and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned. Also that “Sarah saw the son of Hagar mocking,” and she said to Abraham, “Cast out this bondwoman and her son, &c.” Gen. 21:5-12. Milk is a light food prepared in the order of nature to suit the tender stomach of the young infant. It is sought after by the infant as a balm for all its little ills and griefs. But it is necessary for the relief of the mother, that she may obey the mandate of God, to be fruitful and multiply, and that her children may be proper and healthy; as well as for the child, that it should be fitted to fill its station in the world, that it should be weaned from the breast and learn to live on stronger food. So for the spiritual Isaac’s, the children of God; they at first live on such food only as they look to their mother – the church for, that which has a good deal of animal sympathy, and creaturely doing in it. They look to their frames and feelings and to the discharge of what they call duty, for their nourishment and growth as well as for the healing of their woes. This is all light food, it is momentary in its effects, it may occasion them to laugh, but there is nothing solid like the feast we have to speak of. They are continually changing either up or down. Hence the importance of being weaned from the breast and of being fed with meat. But some even in the apostles’ days did not get weaned. Paul complains of the Corinthians that he had fed them with milk and not with meat, for hitherto they were not able to bear it; and adds, “neither yet are ye now able.” This he says to show that they were yet carnal, and that he could not speak to them as spiritual, but as carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I Cor. 3:1-3. In like manner he complains of the Hebrews, that instead of being teachers, they needed to be taught

first principles, to be fed with milk; and adds, “For every one that useth milk is unskillful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe.” Heb. 5:12-14. It would appear that many also among us are in the same condition, not weaned from the breast. Hence, the cry for what they call practical preaching, and the fondness for hearing and reading of first experiences to the exclusion of doctrine, &c. It would seem that the complaint against Ephraim, that “he is an unwise son, for he should not stay long in the breaking forth of children,” applied to them. {See Hosea 13:13., with the words in *italics* omitted.} As for the mother, so for the churches, it is necessary if they would have proper and healthy children, and have them grow up to a vigorous manhood, to see that they are weaned from milk, and fed through the ministry with sound doctrine, such as the scriptures and the whole experiences of the children of God correspond with. Isaiah asks: “Whom shall He teach knowledge? and whom shall He make to understand doctrine?” And he himself answers the inquiries thus: “Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts.” Isa. 25:9. The enquiry is, not whom shall men, but whom shall *He*, that is, the Lord, mentioned in verse 5. So that according to this scripture the Lord leaves them who hang on to the breast, to continue in a puny state.

But when are they weaned? The natural child as was Isaac is generally weaned at a certain period; not so with the spiritual Isaacs, with them there is no fixed time. They have to do, not with time, but with spiritual things. Some begin their weaning and feasting on doctrine almost as soon as they are born, whilst all have more or less of the weaning process to experience through life. How about the feast? At feasts it is usual to have a rich supply of choice provisions, accompanied with wine. Such is the doctrine of Christ. It is true persons may speculate on this doctrine, and may discuss and argue it in a carnal spirit, and produce only coldness. But when any one is led to seek of God – His teachings in the revelation He has made of Himself in Christ Jesus, and enabled by faith to receive any part of that glorious truth, he finds in it a feast of fat things. How can it be otherwise? There is not only the fullness of Christ’s atonement, the purpose and grace of God in Christ Jesus, but God in all His attributes, as He could not be known in all the works of creation and providence, couched in it. Hence, even the angels desire to look into these things. And the love of God, as wine on the lees well refined, flows through the whole of it, to cheer, to invigorate and to strengthen the child of grace to bear all the fatigues and trials of the way, and to support him under them. As he is led to feast on this glorious doctrine, he is weaned from the light food of frames, excitements, and creaturely discharge of duties. Not only this, but also as he is thus weaned from creaturely dependencies, he with Sarah sees the son of the bond-woman, the fleshly nature mocking. He sees how it has mocked him, disappointing him in all his fleshly expectations for solid, lasting comfort, and spiritual enjoyment, how much soever they may have made him laugh at the time; and even when the rich feast of gospel grace is spread before him, the flesh mocks him, by suggesting to him that those consolations are

not for him; that he, a poor sinful wretch as he is, can have no claim to those consolations, that it would be presumptuous for him to trust in the absolute promises of God, unless he could find something in himself more worthy of God's favor, and the like. But God has confirmed the declaration of Sarah, "Cast out this bond-woman and her son; for the son of this bond-woman shall not be heir with my son, with Isaac." Not only is it decreed that flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God, but also we find that whenever we are led to God for consolations we have to cast out everything fleshly, in feelings and in action, and to depend alone on the mercy of God in Christ for acceptance, and we receive the blessings as coming alone through that channel.

Brethren, we have thus given you what we understand to be some of the outlines of the new birth, and of its effects as illustrated in the birth of Isaac. In conclusion let us say, brethren, that in this season of commotions, religious and political, separate and combined, shaking the heavens and the earth of the mere human mind, we need some stronger food to support and steady us than we can draw from excited feelings, human reasonings, or even acts of obedience. May we follow the example of David. He says, "Surely, I have behaved and quieted myself as a child that is weaned of its mother. My soul is even as a weaned child." How this is, he shows by saying, "Let Israel hope in the Lord from henceforth and forever." Psa. 131:2, 3. Again we find him quieting himself thus: "Why art thou cast down O my soul? And why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God; for I shall yet praise Him who is the health of my countenance and my God." Psa. 42:11. Brethren, farewell.

S.TROTT. Moderator.1855.

## UNITY OF THE BRETHREN.

**CIRCULAR LETTER**: *The Brethren assembled with the Mount Pleasant Church, Fairfax County, VA, August 9,10, 1849, in a Meeting for Correspondence: To the Churches, Associations and Corresponding Meetings, in correspondence with us, send this token of love.*

Beloved Brethren: – Having received and read your communications to us, we would reciprocate the correspondence by addressing our epistle to you in return. The Psalmist says: “Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” Ps. 133:1. In order to *unity*, they who dwell together, must be brethren, children of the same family, having a common interest. Such is the case with the children of God, when not bewildered; the truth of God, the order of His house as established by the Head, the peace and prosperity of Zion, are with them a common interest, as well as the joys and sorrows of the individual members. But when *strange children* get in among the household of faith, her *sons* become stunted in growth – her *daughters* lose their polish – her *oxen* become weak to labor – her *garners* become impoverished, and there is a breaking in, and going out, thus breeding confusion. These *strange children*, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and whose right hand is a right hand of falsehood, Ps. 144:11, are children of the *strange woman*, Prov. 7:5. How careful should we be to keep, and to be kept separate, from all religious intercourse with such, that our harmony and unity be not broken, and an interest averse to the interest of Zion be not set up in our midst. We have mentioned the truth of God, as one of the items connected with the *interest of Zion*, and which is of vast importance toward the brethren’s dwelling together in unity. By the *truth of God*, we mean that which God has revealed as truth, and which is according to the standard of truth as He hath given it in the Scriptures. When we begin to bring in other standards, or the writings and opinions of men as standards, however eminent they were or may be, they are but the opinions of men, and we shall feel here to indulge in our partialities, as they did in the Church of Corinth, and one will say: I am of Paul, another, I am of Apollos, &c., and this will cause bickerings and divisions and wrestings of the words of Scripture to make them conform to our standards. But, when brethren are agreed to let the *thus saith the Lord*, and as He has said it, decide all points, our unity in doctrine will then be preserved; as Watts says:

“This is the judge that ends the strife,
Where wit and reason fail.”

We have named, as another item in the interest of Zion, the order of His house as established by the Head, the one King of Zion. Where a number of heads are acknowledged, unless they form a unity among themselves by deciding by majorities, there will be conflicting orders, and clashings in practice. But where Christ alone is acknowledged as King, and His directions as the order, there will be no confusion, nor contention in the observance of the order of the house. In thus acknowledging Him alone as *King*, we render to Him no more than is His just due, both in reference to His claims on us, and to His claims to qualifications to be Head. This order includes ordinances, discipline, the choosing of officers, and the manner of their officiating, the meeting of the Church, the worship, the business transactions, and the manner of publishing the

Gospel abroad. As we value the good of dwelling together in unity, let us therefore, be careful to observe its commands, to confine ourselves to them, and to His directions through Apostolic example for observing them.

We named, as a third item, *The peace and prosperity of Zion*, as belonging to the common interest of the children of Zion. In promoting the peace of Zion, and her prosperity, in the showing forth her salvation, in attracting those who love the Lord, within her borders, and in her being built up in purity and love, it is important that the several members should conduct themselves orderly, meekly and affectionately in the Church, and toward one another; that they see that the discipline of the Church be exercised faithfully and impartially, and that they submit when subject to it, quietly and patiently; that each be found occupying his proper gifts, station, or sphere in the Church; that in the support of the ministry, the relief of the poor, and in meeting other rightful demands for contributing of our temporal goods, none hold back through covetousness, but that each contribute freely as the Lord has prospered them; that the brethren show their love toward one another, by a manifest preference for each other's society, comfort and welfare, and that they be not estranged from these things by indulging in the love of the world, or by being entangled in alliances or pledges, with other societies, whether secret or otherwise; and further, that the brethren conduct themselves honestly, humbly, quietly and blamelessly toward them that are without, and who may differ with us; and in all their intercourse with men, aiming to be governed by the directions in the New Testament. Brethren, if these things were so, would not the people of the world be again constrained to say, "Behold how these christians love one another!" And, if we were found fearlessly and earnestly contending for and bearing testimony to the faith once delivered to the saints; bearing patiently and quietly, the scoffs, reproaches, indignities and persecutions if they come, incident thereunto, from those who oppose the truth, would not others be made to acknowledge that we are actuated by another spirit than that of the world? And would we not then experience; *How good it is to dwell together in unity*?

Brethren, although the children of God are now somewhat scattered by localities, and perhaps worse, by different standards set up, and consequently different views of doctrine and order entertained, yet, even in this day of darkness, and of the scattering of the flock, our Churches are generally permitted to dwell together in a good degree of unity, and from time to time many of the brethren, from distant parts are permitted to meet together, and sit together, in a good degree of unity. How long we shall be permitted to enjoy these privileges, without for a little season being deprived of them, is known only to Him, who orders *all* events. But come, when it may, whilst it will come in accordance with prophecy, it will come as a just chastisement upon the Church and people of God, for permitting their unity to be so much marred by clinging to the creeds

and systems of men as their standards, instead of *taking heed to the more sure word of prophecy*; and in other cases for suffering the peace of Churches to be broken by winking at, and countenancing disorderly walk among the members. It will also come as a needful fire, to purge away all this dross from the Churches. The seven thunders mentioned in Revelation, chapter 10, which are a prelude to the killing of the two Witnesses, are apparently sounding. Whether the *seven thunders* designate seven particularly astounding events, or whether they denote seven years duration of such events or rather, whether as is frequently the sense of the number seven in the Scriptures, it is here used to denote that *full* shaking of the governments of the world, necessary so to concentrate the powers and branches of antichrist, as to enable them to accomplish the killing of the Witnesses, we will not say. But, as before said, we think we hear the sound of the thunders, and hear the voice from Heaven, saying, *Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not*, in that such dark obscurity hangs over every event which transpires, as that all the expectations and calculations made on the particular event, are disappointed. It is not improbable that some of these thunders, before they cease, may burst over the head of our government, and shake it to its foundation.

But, Brethren, let what will come, and come when it may; God grant that we may be found standing in our lots, being neither traitors nor cowards towards the cause of our Lord and His truth, but enduring hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ. And may God, by His grace, so keep us from all corruption in doctrine, or in walk, that the enemy may have no evil thing to say of us justly.

Our meeting has been pleasant; your ministering brethren came to us bringing the precious gospel of the grace of God in its fulness; our congregations have been large and quite attentive.

The Bethlehem Church having invited our next Meeting to be held with them, we have appointed to meet with them, to commence on Thursday, before the 2nd Lord’s day in August, 1850. We continue our cordial invitation to Churches, Corresponding Meetings and Associations, to meet with us by their Letters and Messengers, at that time and place.

S.TROTT. Moderator. 1849.

# COMMENTS ON LUKE 16:19-31.

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

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

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

truth believe the gospel. Christ's words on another occasion, are, "If ye believe not his {Moses} writings, how can ye believe my words." John 5:47.

But while I believe such to be the design of this passage, I do contend, that it is in itself a *parable* in distinction from the idea of a *fable*; that is, that the figure contains nothing inconsistent with the nature and order of things; nothing which might not be truly matter of fact. I cannot think of charging our Lord with using fabulous representations, when the Holy Ghost has through the apostles so fully cautioned the saints against turning to fables, giving heed to fables, &c. We have then, besides the general instruction designed by the parable, the following ideas presented by it as general truths: 1st. That the souls of the dead, both of the wicked and the righteous still have a distinct and active existence, either in a state of torment or of happiness. 2nd. The ministration of angels in reference to the dead. And 3rd. That the wicked still retain, after death, their ignorant, arminian notions. To these general heads, we shall endeavor distinctly to attend.

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

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

punish man for his transgression, God gave him, the created lord of this world, and all his dominions up to its corrupting influence and effects. The sentence was passed, “Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, &c., cursed is the ground for thy sake &c., for dust thou art, and unto dust shall thou return.” The whole history of man’s mortality and of the world with all its changes from that day to this, is but the effect of the brief sentence’s being carried out, which God passed upon man, upon the woman, and the serpent. Gen. 3:14-19. And the gospel of Christ alone develops the gracious purpose of God in permitting this corrupter to enter his creation. What then was left for man to discover in this matter? So far from the Scriptures leaving it to be correctly inferred, that the dissolution of man, and of nature is the effect of a deficiency in God’s creating power, they in reference to the dissolution of the old world, represent it as the effect of *repentance* {figuratively,} in God. Gen. 6:6. That is, God is here represented as turning about and exerting the same power to sweep man from the earth, which he had put forth in creating and sustaining him upon it; just as man would do, if he repented of any work he had made. Not that there was any change in the mind or purpose of God. So much for man as made of the dust of the ground. Is the soul material also, was it made of the dust of the ground ? If so, then it is evidently subject to the same sentence, Dust thou art &c. If not, then it requires proof direct to believe it subject to that sentence. But have we a soul or spirit distinct from animal life? Yes, we know we have an existence within us called a *living soul*. 1st. Because the Scriptures declare, that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. Gen. 2:7. 2nd. Because we are conscious of its existence. We know it is not matter, because we cannot bring it to the test of any of our natural senses. We can neither taste, smell nor see it; neither can we hear or feel it, as we do the wind. Yet we know it is within us; an intelligent something which can think &c., a something which remains active whilst our natural senses are locked up in sleep. Besides it was the breath of God. It must therefore be a spiritual existence. We know that it exists, and that its existence is from God; what authority can we then have that it will ever cease to exist, unless God has declared his purpose, that it shall so cease, or we can prove that it necessarily must cease to exist? Have we any Scriptural testimony that the soul is mortal? None. Sensible evidence we of course have none, because we cannot bring it to the test of our senses. Have we an inward consciousness, that the soul will die with the body? How stands this point, you that deny the immortality of the soul? Have not some of the most hardened infidels given evidence in death of a consciousness of an existence beyond death? Upon what authority then does the declamation rest, that the soul which we know exists, and exists from God, will cease to exist? There is no authority, either Scriptural, or rational for it. As rational beings we are then bound to reject it, till proof is brought to sustain it. But again, what is the mortality or death of the body? It is not annihilation; annihilation is not a doctrine of the Bible. Death is a cessation of animal life, and an ultimate

decomposition of the particles of matter, of which it was formed, or a returning to its original element, dust. Will the advocate for soul mortality, contend that the souls of wicked persons at death become decomposed and return with all their depravity to their native element, the breath of God? I think not.

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

The writer in the PREDESTINARIAN BAPTIST, already referred to, has made a discovery which rather surpasses any made by philosophers going before. It is this, “If man was wholly *natural* in creation, then of necessity he was wholly mortal, nothing immortal about him.” Whether he here by mistake used the word *natural* for *material* and meant thereby to convey the idea, that the *breath of God*, which he breathed into man, was matter, and of course, that the soul is something, which can be handled; or whether he used the word according to its proper meaning, and intended to convey the idea, that if man was wholly what God made him, then of necessity he was wholly mortal, &c., I cannot say. But it is astonishing to what extremities men, and even good men, will run, when they undertake to be wise above what is written. God expressly declares in his word that sin made man mortal, “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;” and “as sin hath reigned unto death.” Rom. 5:12,21. And yet this writer has the presumption to say, that from necessity man was wholly mortal in his original creation; that is, that God from necessity so made him. He has also some wonderful discoveries, as to how it was, that man became capable of transgressing God’s law, different from anything which the Holy Ghost has told us on the subject, in the Scriptures. But as I would prefer depending on what God has revealed, to trusting to his discoveries, I will leave him.

I have already said, the Scriptures do not take the ground of those, who suppose the burden of proof lies on the advocates for the immortality of the soul. God has declared that the soul was produced by him, and has made its existence manifest to every man; he has never declared his purpose again to take it out of existence, it would therefore have

been something like supererogation for the Holy Ghost to have given express declarations in the Scriptures, that the soul will not cease to exist. But at the same time, whenever the Scriptures speak of the soul in connection with the death of the body; its language is such, as corresponds only with the idea of its separate existence after the death of the body. Thus in the case of Rachel, Gen. 35:18, her dying is expressed by her *soul's departing*, not by its ceasing to exist. In the case of the son of the widow of Zarephath, Elijah prayed unto God, not to give the child a new soul, nor to revive his old one, but that his soul might come into him again; and we are told that, "The soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." I Kings 17:21,22. Again, Christ, cautioning his disciples against the fear of man, says, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, &c." Matt. 10:28. Does he not here clearly teach that the soul is not subject to the same death, to be *killed* as the body is? It may be said that, Christ spoke this to his disciples. True he did; but it is equally evident that he said it not in reference to their regeneration, but spake to them as men, because he immediately speaks of God's being able to destroy both soul and body in hell. Besides it is expressly of the soul, and not of spiritual life that he speaks. Passing other texts which may be supposed to relate to the persons as saints, I will come to the case of the rich man in the parable under consideration. The rich man died and was buried, and yet in hell he lifted up his eyes &c., and he saw and knew Abraham and Lazarus afar off. Of course his rationality, his soul still existed in its full vigor and he was conscious of existence. As evidenced by preceding remarks, I do not understand this parable as designed to reveal the immortality of the soul, but I understand Christ as employing such ideas in his figure, as were familiar to his hearers, and such as he himself endorsed; for certainly none can think that the blessed Jesus would convey ideas, which in themselves were false. In this view of the parable, it fully sustains the doctrine of the immortality of the souls of the wicked, because it only accords with such doctrine.

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

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

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

## COMMUNION WITH GOD.

Brother Beebe: – I some time since received a letter signed S., N.Y., requesting my views on the important enquiry, How far communion with God may be expected to be enjoyed by christians in this day.

Since receiving this letter, I have had much to prevent my earlier attention to it, which must be my excuse for so long neglecting the request of my unknown friend.

From the explanation given in the letter, it appears that the enquiry therein contained, refers more directly to the idea of receiving special and manifest answers to prayer for intimations of the Divine will, to be given us as a guide in cases of difficulty, that is, whether we may look for such answers in this day.

In reference to the general enquiry, I will here briefly remark, that communion with God in this, as in every other age, depends entirely on the pleasure of God. “For the preparations of the heart in man, and the answer of the tongue is from the Lord.” Prov. 16:1. To the same effect says the Psalmist; “Lord thou hast heard the desire of the humble; thou wilt prepare their heart; thou wilt cause thine ear to hear.” Ps. 10:17. It is the desire of the humble that God heareth; it is grace alone that can humble the heart, even of a believer, truly before God. – Again, John informs us that – If we ask anything according to His will, He heareth us. I John 5:14. “But the things of God knoweth no

man, but the Spirit of God." I Cor. 2:11. Hence if we ask anything *according to the will of God*, it must be alone by the influence and guidance of the Spirit of God, as says the Apostle again: "For we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." Rom. 8:26, 27. Just so far therefore as the Spirit indites our petitions for us, so far will God answer our prayers. But to come to the special enquiry proposed; if my own experience in the case might be considered proper authority, I should unhesitatingly say that, in some instances, when God's children, in cases of difficulty, feeling their utter incapability to decide for themselves as to what is duty, are led to entreat of Him for some special intimation of His will as their guide in the case, He does in answer to their prayer, give them such intimations. In the early part of my life as a believer, I received in several instances, what I then considered to be, and still believe to have been special intimations as to what was duty in particular cases of difficulty; such as related to my engaging in the work of the ministry, and to some other instances of special anxiety of mind.

The method in which to receive an answer, that I was more generally led to ask for, and look to, was that I might open to some passage of Scripture which should be given to me as an answer. The idea was not, that I should take any text which I might chance to open to, as an answer – but that I might be directed to some passage which should convey to my mind a proper answer to my enquiry, and be impressed upon my mind as such. (Christians know the difference between merely reading a text, and having it applied by the Spirit of God.) I was probably first led to seek answers in this way, from having in some instances, when in deep distress concerning my salvation, on taking up the Bible, opened without any previous design, to texts which when they first met my eye, seemed to have something in them specially suited to my case, and were so applied to me as to give me instruction and comfort. I have in some instances on receiving answers as above mentioned, been led to admire the wonderful treasury which the Scriptures contain, and have thought that they contained a text suiting every case either of anxious enquiry, or of distress to which a child of grace may be subjected.

In the several instances to which I have referred of having received answers to my supplications, not only did the texts to which I opened, in their expressions, contain appropriate answers to my enquiries, and were so impressed upon my mind, and so rested upon, that my course was shaped accordingly; but in every such instance, the events thus promised or predicted have been exactly accomplished and that in a way independent of any plans or exertions of mine, manifesting the special providence therein. So that whoever else may doubt the fact of such special intimations of the Divine will being given, I have ground for confidence in them, unless I am altogether

deceived in reference to having been called to the ministry. There have been some instances in which I expressed, by other modes than that above described, what I have received and rested upon, as special answers to my supplications for direction. But I would by no means have it supposed that my experience has led me to believe that I can command such special answers, whenever I am pleased to ask for them. On the contrary, many were the instances in my early experience, when under deep anxiety to know whether I was truly a subject of grace or not, and in other instances to know what was duty in particular cases, that I have spent hours together in some solitary place, in prayer and in turning over the Scriptures, to obtain some direct intimation from God to satisfy my doubts, and that, without receiving any answer. In other instances wherein the Lord ultimately granted an answer, it was not until my mind had been long burdened with the subject, and application had often been made for relief, that it was obtained.

I will here make a partial digression, which to some may not be uninteresting, to remark that christians, more especially in their early experience, are apt in seasons of doubts to be anxious to obtain some special intimation from God, to assure them of their interest in Christ, or of their being of the elect. But that which has been the pleasure of God to reveal in the Scriptures, is, Christ as the Saviour and complete salvation of His people under the character of lost, helpless sinners, the same He reveals in them when taught their just condemnation and helplessness. But He has not revealed that they by name or personal distinction are of the election of grace. It is therefore I conceive vain to expect that God will give us any special intimation to assure us particularly of our having been chosen in Christ, or that He died especially for us. It is the will of God that we *should walk by faith and not by sight* – by faith in Christ as He is revealed in the Scriptures the Saviour of helpless, ruined sinners. To rest our expectations for acceptance with God, on a special revelation made to us of our election, would be to walk by sight. It is true that God is pleased at times so to reveal Christ to His people, in His fullness as suiting their case, and so apply some of the promises which are yea and amen in Christ Jesus, that they then have all the assurance they can ask for, of their interest in Christ, and of course, of their election. But this is a revelation of Christ to them – not as adapted to their election: but to their ruined, helpless case, as sinners, and their knowledge of themselves as such, and of Christ's having undertaken and finished the salvation of such, is to them through faith the evidence of their salvation and ground of their hope.

But to return to the subject, before us; I have been led to the conclusion, whether correctly or not, that it is mostly in their early experience that God grants to His children communion with Him, in this special way of their seeking and receiving these sensible indications of His will concerning them, in particular cases. This conclusion is founded, 1st. On their then lamblike state, and the peculiar tenderness which our kind Shepherd is wont to exercise towards such, as we are informed by Isa. 40:11 – "He shall feed His

flock like a shepherd: He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." – Again, upon the consideration that the repeated trials of a believer's faith which he passes through, worketh patience, and patience, experience; and experience, hope, &c., that is, his repeated experience of the faithfulness of God inspires him with hope, that God will grant him the guidance which he needs, if he but commit his way unto Him. And as Paul says in reference to salvation, "If we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it;" so in this case the believer is led to a patient waiting for the openings of providence as his guide, without seeking these special intimations from God. But then I would not infer from this, that there are no instances in which an experienced believer may be led to seek and receive such special intimations of God's will concerning him. Neither would I have it inferred that it is not the privilege and the only safe course of every believer to commit all their ways unto the Lord, to seek direction from Him in all their changes and to submit to His guidance, in whatever way He may manifest it.

As I have dwelt thus long on my own experience in this case, I will further add that I have experienced the evil of engaging in enterprises merely from the impulse or inclination of my own mind, without specially seeking direction from God therein. Such for instance was the case in my removal to the West in 1815. The disappointments I met with in my expectations, and the reflection of having left the church I had been connected with in New Jersey, in an entire destitute situation, soon made me sensible of the error I had committed in undertaking this removal without especially seeking counsel from God in the case. The reflection thus occasioned, prevented my ever feeling settled or satisfied with that removal, and therefore when an opening in providence appeared to be made for my removal back, I readily embraced it; and returned after six years absence, to the church I had left. There was however much in the dispensations of providence toward me, during those six years, calculated as I thought to keep alive the recollection of my error. This may enable some satisfactorily to account for what has perhaps appeared to them a strange move. But my unknown friend will wish some higher authority than my own experience for the answer I have given to his enquiry.

**1st.** Then; We are abundantly authorized from Scripture, to ask for those things which are according to God's revealed will, in such texts as these: "Ask and it shall be given you." Mt. 7:7. "But in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." Phil. 4:6. "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it." John 14:13,14. But then this asking, to receive, must not only be in faith in Christ, as the Mediator, but also in faith to believe that God will for Christ's sake grant the thing asked, as shown by Mt. 21:22 – "And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer believing, ye shall receive" – also James 1:6; and I John 5:14,15.

**2nd.** The case of Gideon is one instance to the point left on record for our instruction; God condescended to grant special repeated signs to Gideon as an assurance of his being called to the work pointed out to him, and of his duty to engage therein. The Lord had shown Gideon one sign of his call of God to the work assigned him, in the consuming by fire from the rock, the flesh, of his offered kid, &c. Judges 6:18-21. Yet Gideon's doubts still prevailed of the Lord's designing him for such a work, and he entreats for further confirmation, and specifies the sign once and again. The Lord grants it in the fleeces first being wet with dew, and then dry, verses 26 -40, same chapter.

Other instances might be pointed out in the Old Testament; but I will come to the case of Thomas in the New Testament. John 20:25-29. Thomas would not believe that his Lord had actually risen from the dead, without receiving a particular sign as confirmation, notwithstanding the testimony of his brethren. The sign is granted, he is permitted to put his hand into the wounded side of his Lord, and his fingers into the print of the nails in his hands. It is true that these doubts of Thomas was made the occasion for giving to him and the other disciples, a clearer testimony than they otherwise could have had of Christ's having actually risen in the same body in which He had entered the tomb; and that without having seen corruption. But it also stands on record as a testimony of the condescension of Christ to the doubts and weakness of His children; and is an encouragement to us – not to indulge in unbelief; but to seek Him in giving to us that evidence which is necessary to enable us to believe in any case; and of course, also to understand what is duty. This subject would open a still extended field were I to undertake to draw the mark of distinction between these instances of special communion with God, which we have noticed, and those impressions which are frequently made upon our minds, often, no doubt, by Satan, and which we are apt to mistake for intimations of the Divine will; and also to notice objections which might be raised to the position I have taken. But as I have already been so lengthy on the subject, I will pass these by for this time.

I however wish to be indulged a little further, to offer a few additional remarks on the general enquiry, how far the churches of Christ are *at this day* enjoying communion with God.

On this point I shall have to differ from those who talk so much about the *present sickly state of the church*. That this is a day of rebuke to the churches of Christ I readily admit. When we look at, and judge from outward appearances, the following scriptural complaints would also appear truly applicable to our case, namely: "We have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind; we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth, neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen." And we might add, our enemies are deriding us for it. But then the gracious answer of God to this complaint, stands on record for our encouragement, in the same connection. "Thy

dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs; and the earth shall cast out her bread. Come my people enter thou into thy chambers and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself for a little moment until the indignation be overpast." &c. Isa. 26:18-21. Thus is showed that notwithstanding the complaints which the church makes of herself, she is at that very time the object of the special recognition and care of her Lord; and that of which she complains is, in His gracious dealings, but the means of separating her from the multitude, against whom He has indignation, and who have shed the blood of the saints; and of preparing her to enter into the chambers He has prepared for hiding her from the storm during this indignation. And indeed I think those saints who complain so of the *sickly state of the church* take altogether a mistaken view of the subject. They think that truth is much fallen now to what it was thirty or forty years ago, and has much fewer advocates now than then. But the fact is, that truth, then, was at a much lower standard than now: scholastic divinity was then mostly the standard, and the truth as it is in Jesus was obscured by the glosses of men. Now the true churches of Christ are being led to renounce such standards of 'truth', and to take the Scriptures as their only standard; the consequence is, that with many these human glosses are stripped off and the truth and order of the gospel are preached and received by such in that plainness in which they are revealed in the Scriptures; and they are depending more on the teachings of the Holy Spirit, and less on the teachings of men. Hence carnal professors, instead now of professing love to the doctrine of the Scriptures in its plainness, come out in opposition to it, and openly advocate human teaching and human systems, contrary to that, to which the saints are led.

Again the churches, formerly through their general appearance of union, increased in worldly respectability and enjoyed more pleasant feelings. Now they experience much to mar these feelings, but have in exercise a much more conscientious and greater regard for the truth and order of the gospel, as delivered in the Scriptures, and from the glory they now discover in the simplicity of Scripture revealed, compared with the wisdom of men, they cheerfully meet reproach in their strenuous adherence to the former, and rejection of the latter.

Formerly their great increase in numbers and respectability, occasioned a manifest decrease in true spiritual strength; now the true churches of Christ are diminished in numbers, and by the religious world are considered the reverse of prosperous and respectable, but they experience much more of the sweets of spiritual union and fellowship, and rejoice that in the Lord alone is their righteousness and strength. Formerly they were like a person increasing in corpulency, but becoming thereby gross and subject to disease; now under the management of their all skillful Physician, they are having that grossness purged from them, and though losing much of their

corpulency, yet are becoming more healthy. So that whilst the churches have abundant reason to mourn their past too great conformity to the world, they have abundant reason for thankfulness, that their kind and all-wise Shepherd's care toward them has not diminished; and that although they are made to experience the pain of divisions, and much opposition and contempt; yet He is thereby separating them from that only, which was hurtful to them.

Upon the whole view therefore of the subject, I am led to the conclusion that the churches of Christ are *at this day* looking more entirely to the guidance of the Holy Spirit and receiving more of His communications in being led to clearer views of divine truth in its original purity, and to greater love to it, than for a long period before, as manifested by their preferring God's truth, with reproach; to the systems and expositions of men, with worldly applause. But still, whatever just ground some few may have to boast of their *deep experience in divine things*, and to glory over their brethren on account thereof, the great body of the saints fall, (and feel sensible of it,) far short of the apostolic church, in purity of religion, in being of one heart and one soul, and in that strength of love to Christ and His cause which would lead them to count everything else as *loss and pollution* compared with Christ, and being found in Him. There is much *traditionalism* still among us, much of an inclination to consult the flesh, and the world, and to seek *that honor which cometh from men*; but our great Immanuel is now sitting as a *Refiner and purifier of silver*, and is skillful and faithful to temper the fire so as to purge away the dross, and that only. Being thus in the crucible it is not a time for great rejoicing and lively frames, but one which calls to taking up the cross, and to the exercise of strong faith in our gracious Leader and Commander. May He increase our faith and love to Him.

Centerville, Fairfax County, Virginia
Nov. 22, 1839
S. Trott
From: SIGNS of the TIMES

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs 173-181

# CONCERNING ELECTION & CALLING.

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

The proof that the elect were chosen in Christ, is at hand, "According as he hath chosen us *in him* before the foundation of the world." Eph. 1:4. This is not a choosing them *into* Christ, a taking them out of another head to put them into him as their Head. There was no other headship before him, *In all things he has the preeminence*; being he, who *is before all things*, and by *whom all things consist*, as he is "the head of the body, the church." Col. 1:17,18. But if in that nature, in which we were created in Adam as rational beings, the elect were put into Christ as a head, either in their whole nature or their souls only, it is evident that Adam must have been first *viewed* as a head, and that Christ was afterward set up as a head of those chosen from the predestined Adam. And I cannot understand the views of many in any other light, than as involving such a degradation of Christ as a head. Thus Watts, in these lines,

"Christ be my first elect, he said,
Then chose our souls in Christ our head,"

implies one of two sentiments either of which I am bound to reject as an error; namely, either that the elect were created without souls in Adam, their souls being created in Christ, and of course that the non-elect are without souls; or else, as before observed, the elect must have been first viewed in their relation to Adam and their souls afterwards transferred by election to the headship of Christ. The election in Christ must have reference to that life, in which the saints eternally existed in him; of which they are born, when born again, and by which they are manifested as his seed and the sons of God.

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

The other branch of my position; namely, that the elect were chosen *from* the headship of Adam; that is, out of his posterity, is more opposed by some of our brethren. Elder Parker and others with him contend, that only the elect were created in Adam; of course they suppose, that God in saving a part only of mankind, is only making a distinction between his own good creation and the devil's progeny. They would thus explain away the Sovereignty of God in election. If there had been this very rational excuse for *hiding these things from the wise and prudent* and for *revealing them unto babes*, it is a wonder our Lord had not assigned this reason instead of resolving it altogether into the sovereign pleasure of God, as he did in saying, "Even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matt. 11:25,26. One of the proofs, which they would draw from the Scripture in support of their position, is that Adam was *made in the likeness of God*, or as Paul explains it, "was the figure of him that was to come." Gen. 5:1 & Rom. 5:14. Hence they say, that as Christ in being set up had only the elect in him, so Adam in being created in his likeness, must have had only the elect created in him. But Christ was set up with his bride in him, in this respect also Adam was a figure of him, being created with his bride in him; therefore by the same rule by which they come to the other conclusion, Eve must

have been the church, the Lamb's wife! But this theory of theirs is altogether a new one, that a *figure* or *likeness* must be the very essence of the thing prefigured. Carry this out through all the types of the former dispensation, and where would it lead us? Aaron in officiating in the priest's office was a type or figure of Christ, the blood therefore of bullocks and goats, which the presented must, according to this theory, have been the blood of Christ, the holy place, into which he entered, must have been heaven; and the twelve tribes of Israel, whose names he bore on his breast-plate and on his shoulders, must have been the very people represented by Christ. Such ideas of the figures of Scripture, in which natural and earthly things are made to represent spiritual and heavenly things, are preposterous. Adam truly was created in the likeness or as a figure of Christ. 1st. In being created male and female with Eve in him, as Christ was set up with his church and all its gifts and graces in him. 2nd. In being created with a posterity in him, as Christ eternally existed with the elect in him, in that life, of which they are born, as the sons of God. But whilst Adam was thus a figure of Christ, there is this vast difference between them, the one was of the earth, *earthy*; the other *is the Lord from heaven*. And so of their distinct posterities, *that which is born of the flesh, is flesh*; and *that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*.

Again, Elder Parker and those with him, attempt to prove their position, that only the elect were created in Adam, by God's declaration to the woman, that he would greatly multiply her sorrow and her conception. Though God claims the prerogative to himself alone, to give this multiplied conception, not allowing the *serpent* any part in it, his words being, "I will greatly multiply," &c., yet as some writers on that side still persist in ascribing that *multiplied conception*, somehow, to the Serpent's influence, though reminded, again and again, that God asserts his own authority in the case, I will propose some queries for their consideration.

First, Did God's original purpose of peopling the earth include in it the existence of all who have lived or shall live upon it; or did it not? If it did not, is it not manifest that he has changed his purpose, and is therefore a changeable Being; and hence that the doctrine of predestination cannot be maintained? If God's eternal purpose did include the existence of all who have lived, was his declaration to the woman anything other, than that of carrying out of that purpose? If God did originally purpose the existence of all mankind, did he not in finishing the work of creation in six days, provide for their being brought into existence in the creation of Adam? If you deny this, is it not incumbent on you to show wherein he made such provision? Or will you say that he left his work unfinished? Again, as we have God's testimony, that Cain, who gave as full evidence, as any have given, of being a seed of the Serpent, came into existence through Adam's intercourse with Eve, and therefore must have been seminally in the loins of Adam, {Gen. 4:1,} if then he was not originally created in Adam, must he not have been

either an after production of God, or in some way communicated by the Serpent? In either case, is it not evident, that God did not *make of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth*, and that the Apostle, therefore, bore a wrong testimony in Acts 17:26? In a word, brethren, if you admit the truth of the testimony of Scripture, that the heavens and the earth *were finished and all the host of them* in six days, and that *on the seventh day God ended his work*, and in that day *rested from all his work which God created and made* and that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth," Gen. 2:1-3, and Acts 17:26, must you not give up your notion of the non-elect's not being created in Adam, and of their not being represented by him in his *one offence*?

I now proceed to the proof that the elect are chosen out of the posterity of Adam. And 1st, We are told, that "by the disobedience of one man many were made sinners," and that "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" &c.; further that "by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12,18,19. *And so death passed*, &c., is there not a meaning in this word *so*? Is it not equivalent to *in that way*, or by that means; that is, that *by the means of sin's entering by one man, death has passed upon all men*, &c.? The Apostle is clearly sustained in this by the history of the affair. God said unto Adam, in consequence of his transgression, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." This together with the whole sentence which God passed upon him {Gen. 3:17,19,} has been visited upon all the family of man, excepting Enoch and Elijah. Is it not then a plain revelation of Scripture, that the sentence of death, under which all the generations of men have returned to dust, was passed originally upon Adam? And hence, that as the sentence of death, passed through Adam upon all mankind, and death only passes upon them, because *they have sinned*, is it not equally a manifest Scripture doctrine, that all the human family were *made sinners* through Adam's one offence, and therefore were represented by Adam as a head?

Now, if in the face of the above testimony any will persist in denying, that all on whom the sentence of death has passed, and who were therefore viewed as sinners, were represented by Adam as a head; is it not manifest, that they prefer human speculation to God's revelation, seeing that they can show no declaration from God that there was any other head, through whom any part of mankind were made sinners and were sentenced to death? Seeing then, that as far as God's revelation is received as a guide in the matter, it is so conclusively evident, that all who are sinners and who die, came under this condemnation to depravity and death in consequence of their connection with Adam, as a head; and as, from the same revelation, it is so evident, that the elect were chosen to salvation, and therefore were foreknown as sinners; it is clear that the elect are of the posterity of Adam. And further as it is equally evident that some *die in their sins*, and

who therefore are not of the elect, but who as above showed must be of Adam's posterity, it is demonstrated, that the elect were chosen *out of* Adam's posterity; that is, that whilst some who were represented by Adam as a head, were chosen to salvation, others thus represented were passed by and left to die in their sins. That the elect were chosen to salvation, and were therefore viewed as sinners, see II Thes. 2:13, "Because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation," &c., and I Pet. 1:2, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

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

Corresponding with the above proven position, is the uniform revelation of God concerning his election. Thus Christ says to his disciples, John 15:19, "But because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world," &c. If by the world is here to be understood Adam's posterity as such, then of course their being chosen out of it shows, that some of that posterity were not chosen. Or make the *world* here to mean the Jewish nation, or what you please, the disciples being chosen out of this world clearly proves them to have been of it, and some of that world not to be chosen, or not of the elect. Again our Lord, speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation, that very people, to whom he said on another occasion, "Behold, your home is left unto you desolate," Matt. 23:38, said, "Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the *elect's* sake those days shall be shortened." Matt. 24:22. So that there was, or still is, an *elect* to come out of the chaff of that nation, that very chaff which in itself was to be *burned with unquenchable fire*. Matt. 3:12. Hence as an *elect* is to come out of that *valley of dry bones*, that nation after being pursued for ages with this *unquenchable fire*, what other conclusion can we come to, than that the elect and the non-elect are, according to the flesh, all of one blood, of one people? Thus the Apostle in Romans, the 9th & 10th chapters, speaking of those Jews who were *going about to establish their own righteousness*, and who were *cast away*, speaks of them as *his*

*brethren*, his *kinsmen according to the flesh*, as the *seed of Abraham* &c., and prays to God for them that they might be saved. Surely the Holy Ghost had never revealed to him anything of that distinction between the elect and non-elect which it is said has been discovered to Elder Parker; namely, that the elect were created of God in Adam, whilst the non-elect are the devil's progeny or were brought into existence through sin; or he would not so have lamented over the fall of that people. But again Paul instead of wishing to set aside the sovereignty of God in election, delights to hold it forth in its clearest light. He brings forward the strongest possible figure to illustrate it, and to show that the difference between the elect and non-elect, is only what the *purpose of God according to election* has made. He takes the case of Jacob and Esau, children not only of the same parents, but also of the same birth, and shows that the decision of God concerning them was made before the children *had done either good or evil*, and before they *were born*. Again he brings to view, as illustrating this subject, God's declaration to Moses, saying, "I will have mercy, on whom I will have mercy," &c. So also Rom. 11:5-7, where he shows, that the remnant which were saved, was *according to the election of Grace*, not according to God's creation in Adam. And further says, "the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded." Paul thus makes the whole distinction to rest in the sovereignty of God in election; very different his view from the notion, that the distinction consisted in one part's being God's *good creation* and the other the serpent's seed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

# CONCERNING HOLINESS.

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

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

In the use of these terms in the Scriptures we find them applied to God, the Father, the Son and the Spirit, to angels, to believers, to national Israel, to the priests as such and to their garments, to the tabernacle and temple, and to the vessels and apartments thereof &c. From this diversified use of these terms, we must discover, that they are used in relation to an external and an internal holiness, a ceremonial or typical and a spiritual holiness. Now if any external holiness, which can be attached to places, persons or things, could effectually bar sin, {and it is absurd to speak of internal or spiritual holiness as if belonging to heaven itself, as a locality;} then surely Nadab and Abihu could not have sinned as they did in offering *strange fire before the Lord*. Lev. 10:1. They had just been consecrated to the holy priesthood, as Moses had been commanded to *sanctify* them as priests to the Lord, and as God had said he would sanctify them, or

make them holy, to the priest's office {Ex. 28:41 & 29:44;} they were clothed with the holy garments and had the holy anointing oil upon them; {see Ex. 30:25, Lev. 8:30 & 10:7;} and they were in the holy place before the ark of the Testimony; yet they there conceived of offering strange fire before the Lord, *and there went out fire from the Lord and devoured them*! What greater holiness could belong to any mere locality, than was concentrated here? The Lord had manifested his presence in it by his glory filling it, when the tabernacle was reared, and again by consuming the sacrifice of Aaron and his sons; Ex. 40:34,35 & Lev. 9:24. It may be said, that SIN was then already in the world, and not so when the angels are supposed to have sinned. But it has been showed, that wherever created, living intelligences are, if left of God to themselves, they will think and act for themselves with a special reference to their own individualities. Even believers are not always restrained from the acting out their old nature and wounding their own consciences; though *called to be saints* and have formed in them a *new man, created in righteousness and true holiness*.

The primary idea of the Hebrew word, rendered *holy, holiness*, &c., is to *set apart, to separate* &c.; not that to be holy we must live as isolated beings, only to and for ourselves, but on the contrary, because that, to be holy, since sin has entered into the world, we must be separated from the world and from its spirit and principles. So in things and persons being sanctified, that is externally, they were set apart to be employed only in the service of God, according to his appointments; and thus ceremonially were taught the doctrine, that to be spiritually holy we must be entirely subject to God's will as the alone standard of true holiness.

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

As God's will is the standard of our holiness, so he is the pattern of it. Hence the exhortation, "but as he who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy." I Pet. 1:15,16. In all the

manifestation which God has made of himself in the works of creation, providence and redemption, there is nothing of selfishness in it, nothing which He needed for himself, to increase his glory or happiness; but everything is for the sake of communicating happiness or good to others. Hence the holiness of the Law in requiring, that "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." God being the supreme good and the source of all good, to love the greatest good, the good of the whole, we must love God; and to be like God we must love our neighbor as ourselves and be as desirous of doing him good and only good, as of doing good to ourselves. Thus the law, if man could of himself have obeyed it, though it would have produced perfect harmony and peace in the world, would have been a constant restraint upon man's selfishness and individuality, and of course kept him in bondage. But as already remarked, I cannot think, that anything short of the communication of a distinct principle of holiness from God to angels and to men, could have enabled them so to overcome their individuality of will and desire, as to lose that individuality of feeling in a desire to live to the good of the whole. But in the glorious purpose of salvation it is provided for, that saints should be holy in heart by their deriving a new life from Christ in the heavenly birth. This life as flowing from Christ as its Head, and not being an individual creation, but being Christ formed in them, and being ONE SPIRIT in all the saints as they are ONE BODY, is essentially holy, or is the love of God instead of individual love. And so far as this love is brought into exercise in us by the indwelling Spirit of truth, we feel our self-love lost in love to God, and our self-gratification lost in the desire to glorify and obey God, and our individuality lost in feeling that WE ARE NOT OUR OWN and in a desire to feel and act as members of one body with our brethren; to live for the cause of Christ and for the good of others, and to esteem others better than ourselves. And were it not for the new creature's being "made subject to vanity," in having still to carry about our old man and its corruptions, we should reflect fully the image of Christ. Thus also the angels are holy, as I understand it, not only from their being "set apart" in election; but also from the love of God or a principle of holiness being communicated to them, by which their standing is confirmed in Christ, as the Head of all principality and power and HEAD OVER ALL THINGS TO THE CHURCH.

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

One point more; ceremonial uncleannesses are often referred to in the Scriptures, and to cleanse from them was to *sanctify*. This may be thought not to correspond with the view I have taken of holiness. But I think it does; those uncleannesses being naturally

loathsome, were well calculated to show how odious self-indulgences in all their various shapes are to God and to the new man of the believer; and as nothing but cleansing could remove the one, so nothing but an application of the blood of Jesus, can give peace to the believer. As frequent as were the occasions for ceremonial ablution or cleansing, more abundant are the occasions the believer has for applying to the blood of Christ. What a blessed privilege, that we have such an efficacious pool ready troubled, whenever faith is at hand to put us in; and such an Advocate we have with the Father in all our straits, whose intercession is all-prevalent, however impotent we may feel ourselves to be.

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

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

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

## CONCERNING SIN.

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

First: Sin. What is sin? Will the brethren allow the Scriptures to answer this enquiry? If so, the decision is made, that "sin is the transgression of the law." I John 3:4. Not to *love*

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

Many seem to think, that sin could not have gotten into the world by the good creation of God, unless either God created it, or it had a previous self-existence. These suppositions are contradictory to the testimony of Scripture; they imply, that there *may be transgression* and *sin be imputed, where there is no Law*. This notion of sin's being an existence by itself, though entertained by good and understanding brethren, is a manifest absurdity. Can we suppose the existence of theft or any other crime without supposing the existence of the perpetrator of such crime? This absurdity of supposing, that sin may exist independently of the existence of a sinner, is not confined to the system of Elder Parker; it is involved with equal fulness in the idea, that God created sin, or brought it into existence in his creation of intelligent beings. If God brought sin into existence, He must have been the first transgressor, as sin is a transgression of the law; an inference they would shudder at. The Fullerite notion of Christ's having made an atonement for sin abstractly, implies its having an existence distinct from the sinner, equally with Elder Parker's views; and therefore shows the two systems to be much nigher akin, than their respective advocates have supposed.

This notion of sin's having an existence *antecedent* to the transgression of Adam, or of the first transgressor, whether angel or man, and its previous existence being necessary to account for the creatures of God becoming transgressors, implies that man was not, and that angels could not have been, voluntary actors in first transgressing; but must have been acted upon; according to one, man was subjected to it by the creating hand of God, according to others, he was acted upon by the self existent spirit of wickedness. If this had been the case, and man in his original transgression, was not in circumstances to choose his course, with a view to the consequences, and to act voluntarily, he could have been no more justly accountable for the act, than would be your flock of sheep for trespassing on your field of grain, being let in by an enemy or driven in by yourself. God in making man a *living soul*, must have given a mind, *active* in all those powers belonging to the soul, such as those of reflecting, judging, choosing and rejoicing. And I must confess, that for myself, whatever others may be able to do, I cannot conceive of man's being thus brought into existence, as a distinct being, finding himself possessed of a mind to choose or reject for himself, and having individual feelings to gratify, without considering him liable, without any influence from without being exerted upon him, to prefer the gratification of his own will and choice even to that of his Maker's will, unless God, who alone is the fountain of holiness, has been pleased to communicate to him such a holy influence, as would lead him to prefer subjection to the will of God, to living to and for himself, as we see manifested in the holy Jesus, when he said to his Father, "Not my will, but thine, be done." Such communication of a principle of holiness, to man, God was under no obligation to make, in addition to having created him an intellectual, upright being. That man was thus liable to choose to live to himself and for himself, rather than live as the creature of God and the subject of his government, is evident from God having put him under the prohibition of a special command. On the other hand, without such prohibition there had been no transgression. The wise man evidently had so found the thing concerning man's sin, when he said, "Lo, this only have I found that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Eccl.7:29. There is a reference here manifestly made to what is said in Gen. 5:1,2, "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God created he them," &c. So here God made *man* upright; but *they have* &c. *God hath made man upright*, of course he did not create in him any bias to sin; and *they sought out many inventions*, consequently it was *their* own act, the act of the male and female, in seeking out and doing what God had not commanded, but what they chose for themselves. So also says the apostle, "As by one man sin entered into the world." Rom. 5:12. The advocates of the existence of sin as God's eternal opposite, have tried to make something out of the expression *by one man*, as though sin came into the world from some other source than man's transgression. If, as I contend, it was man's voluntary transgression that entailed sin upon the world of the human family, I know not what more definite expression to

convey that idea the apostle could have used. But if sin was infused into the woman by the serpent, and she communicated it to the man as the cause of his transgressing, then it was by *one serpent*, not by *one man*, that sin entered into the world, whether that serpent was a *created* devil, or a *self-existent* devil.

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

But it may be said, that man is represented as being under the reign and power of sin, which does not comport with the idea of his bringing sin into the world by a free and voluntary act of his own. Herein is where I think brethren, losing sight of Scriptural testimony upon the point, have strangely confounded things which are importantly distinct; namely, the introduction of sin into the world, and the infliction of the penalty of a *death in trespasses and sins* upon Adam and his posterity, in consequence of his revolting against the government of God by eating the forbidden fruit. I have already showed, I think conclusively from the testimony of the Scriptures, that "Sin is the transgression of the law," that sin could have no existence, had it not been that God pleased to create rational, or intellectual beings, &c., to prescribe to them a law or command, as a test of subjection. But the creating man and creating him in uprightness, *unswerved*, and prescribing to him, as a test of his subjection, a command that was *holy, just and good*, is one thing, and was an act of God's goodness and holiness; and God's inflicting upon Adam and his posterity in him the penalty, that was annexed to the command, the penalty of death, or total depravity, is another thing, it is an act of God's righteous judgment. So man's standing as he came from the hand of his Creator upright, in a state that was good is one thing; and his having fallen by voluntary transgression, and being justly condemned to a state of depravity, or subjection to the reign and power of sin, is another thing. And thus the scriptures, I think, clearly represent the case, that

man's being under the dominion of sin or in a state of depravity, banished from the *tree of life*, was not the act of God's creating goodness, nor of Satan's power to mar God's good creation beyond himself; but was the act of God's just sentence of condemnation for transgression. The apostle speaks of *death's reigning by one man's offence* and of *judgment coming upon all men to condemnation*. What was this condemnation? Certainly not to the state of the *second death* in everlasting *punishment*, for then all men had been in that state; but to a state of death in sin, of subjection to its power.

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

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

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

# CORRESPONDENCE

Fairfax Co., Va., Nov. 11, 1859.

Dear Sister Harriet: – Your interesting letter of Sept. 15th, came to hand in due time, but I have been much from home since, and have really had no time to attend to correspondence. Indeed, owing to infirmities of mind incident to age, writing has

become a real task to me. When I get home after my journeys I feel more like resting or being composed, than using that exertion of mind which is necessary to writing.

You address me as father, and then ask my views upon the propriety of calling any man father. I am not partial to the term in addressing any man, or in being addressed by others. There is certainly a certain sense in which we should call no man father, or our Lord would not have forbidden it. In the very sense in which I understand him to forbid it, popular preachers in every age have been ambitious in being called father. This has tended to render my mind averse to the use of the term, excepting with relation to natural parentage, but the Scriptures justify the use of the term with respect to age, as 1 John ii. 13, 14, and as perhaps in the case you quote from 1 Cor. iv., where it is used to denote the persons having been instrumental in conveying gospel truth first to our mind, but when, by the use of the term, we would acknowledge any person or thing, such as Sunday Schools, Tracts or other things, as that which produced in us spiritual life and light, we entirely transgress our Lord's instruction, and contradict the truth of the case. For if we have over been begotten again, begotten to a spiritual existence, our God sovereignly and independently has done it, and not any preacher. Again, if we receive and rest upon anything as religious truth, because any man has taught it, and not because we have an internal evidence that it is God's revealed truth, we acknowledge that man as our father, or the father of such truth, or rather sentiment, and thus go contrary to our Lord's instruction.

Still further, our Lord's instruction upon this point was designed to guard his disciples from looking to men, or to any man, for spiritual instruction, instead of looking to God alone, that they might be taught of him. When God teaches us, though he may make man instrumental in conveying to us the truth taught, we shall receive it, not as the word of man, but as the word of God, and shall thus rest upon it as God's truth, feeling that God has enlightened our minds to know the truth.

You complain of feeling very sinful in all your ways, and express fears on this account that you may have been deceived. If you did not feel, and thus know your entire sinfulness, you might well doubt your having been taught or enlightened of God. We know from God's word that we are altogether depraved, that the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, and if therefore God has ever taught us the knowledge of ourselves, we shall not only know this to be the truth in theory, but we shall also feel it to be so. Where there is life there is feeling, as well spiritually as naturally. If there is anything good or lovely in us, it is the spiritual man or Christ in us, and not the old or natural man changed. Love to God, love to his people and cause, love to the truth, and a desire to be holy, and live to God, these things are good, as well as faith in Christ. And it is our having this knowledge of God, and his love shed abroad in our heart, that makes us truly feel our sinfulness, and loathe it. Hence it is that we have

no confidence in ourselves, nor in our doings, and that we come to trust alone in Christ for acceptance with God. These are evidences to others, and ought to be to ourselves, that we are born of God, and are therefore his children.

There are thousands of religionists about us, whose religious knowledge is derived altogether from men and from books, and who look to these to be taught, these are therefore the disciples of men, and may well call men their fathers. These do not feel themselves to be sinful and vile, but have a good deal of confidence in themselves, and in their own doings, and think that they are better and more holy than others, who do not say their prayers, &c.

There is something mysterious in the ways of God toward your family, that your grandmother, mother and yourself, should be Old School Baptists, and yet have been located so far away from all with whom you can have fellowship. It must be that God had some use for witnesses to the truth there, either for condemnation, or for good to those around you, or he would not in his providence have placed you thus far from your brethren. It is at any rate a witness to the sovereignty of God's grace, that he can by his grace constrain whom he will to profess and to contend for the truth, how much soever alone they may be in their faith, and how much soever they may be surrounded with opposition. Surely it may be said, "what hath God wrought," in keeping your grandmother, and mother, in the faith, and in bringing you into it, under the circumstances in which you all have been placed. Had you followed the leadings of nature, or been influenced by worldly considerations, you would have embraced some of the systems of religion around you, and found plausible cause for it, rather than to have separated yourselves from all the influential and learned people around you. So God's placing you in this isolated condition, affords to you and to others, a strong testimony that your profession is not only sincere, but that you have been constrained by a higher influence than that of self, or the world, and that the love of God must have constrained you.

But I will close. Mrs. Trott wishes to be remembered to you. My love to you and the whole family. "Write again when you feel like it.

Yours,
SAMUEL TROTT.

Signs Of The Times
Volume 68, No. 15.
AUGUST 1, 1900.

# CORRESPONDENCE

Middletown, N. Y., Dec. 27, 1880.

The following letter from our late venerable brother, Elder Trott, written to brother John Thorne, of Baltimore, when he was unsettled as to his duty in uniting with the church, contains of suggestions which may be useful to others in the same condition; therefore I have obtained the consent of brother Thorne to allow it to be published in the SIGNS. I am sure that very many readers will feel the revival of enduring memories that the sight of that once familiar name, as well as receive valuable instruction from the thoughts presented.

WM. L. BEEBE.

ESTEEMED FRIEND THORNE: – Your favor of the 9th inst. was yesterday received with pleasure, for I was glad to hear from you concerning your further exercises. I have been quite unwell for week or two from the cold, so much so that it is quite doubtful whether I get on to Black Rock in February; and therefore, lest I should not see you soon, I have concluded to write you in answer. It seems you have found that the Canaanites and Amalekites are still in the land. Yes, and the Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation; so that he must expect the warfare to continue. But having an altar with Jehovah-nissi (the Lord my Banner) written on it, you have nothing to fear. See Exodus xvii. 15, 16. I conclude from the few remarks you make about Sunday schools, and the like, that you are satisfied that human efforts can not make spiritual children, that to be spiritual they must be born of the Spirit, “Born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” In reference to missions, that if any feels, that is, has by faith the covenant in himself that the Lord has called him to go and preach to the destitute, live and go, and the Lord will prosper him; and let others whose hearts the Lord opens, by giving them to have fellowship for his call to the work, contribute to his wants as they would to him who preaches to them, and thus on the subject have one purse; this was apostolic practice, and will undoubtedly be the practice again among the saints when the Lord’s time comes to send his gospel among the heathen. This is very different from men’s selecting fields and sending missionaries there without knowing or asking whether the Lord has any people there, then to be gathered in, as is the mission plan. So that upon all these points you are a pretty correct Old School Baptist.

Now, dear friend, I come to the important inquiry which you have confidingly made of me, Had I better wait, or come out at once? I might answer you in a few words, and

correctly, by referring you to the text, Eccles. ix. 10, “Whenever the hand findeth to do, do it with thy might,” which you quoted to me, and gave your views on it, that is, Whatsoever you find pointed out in the word as your duty to do, do it with you might; and doing with your might, I should say would be doing it in the strength of the Lord, who is told you that his gray shall be sufficient for you. But I prefer enlarging a little on the subject. First. It certainly is the duty, according to the New Testament, for the disciples of Christ, or those taught of God, to be connected with his church. The more I have reflected on your exercises as she related them to me, the more I am satisfied that God has been teaching you, but in a way peculiar by displaying his own sovereignty; and that he had commenced his dealings with few at the time of your first exercises when you join the church. You’re being left to wander in the desert of skepticism so long is no worse, as I can see, than for others to try, for the same length of time, to produce salvation from the sterile, barren Mount Sinai. There appears to me to have been something of God’s control in your skepticism, for was in itself consistent as I understand you, that you came to the conclusion to believe nothing that you did not for yourself know the truth of. In the affairs of this world such a position could not stand; it would be derangement if carried out, for we are dependent one on another for our knowledge; so that the most we know, we know from the teachings of others. But when we come to that spiritual religion which is of God it is very different; that can only be known by revelation from God. God has hid these things from the wise and prudent and has revealed them unto babes. Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God. Hence all the reasonings and searchings of men by human reason and human teaching to find out God and the truths of his religion, lead but into labyrinths of folly, for God has made foolish the wisdom of this world. Hence, the conclusion you was led to from the fact of God’s having revealed himself to you as the *one* God in Christ, viz., that you was a child, was correctly drawn. You evidently was led to know your own ignorance and entire dependence on God to teach you. But from the relation ye first gave me, I was in doubt whether you had been fully led to a sense of your just condemnation as a transgressor of the laws of God, and to a corresponding view of the blood of Christ as that which alone with cleanse you from your sins, and be the ground of your acceptance with God. Hence I thought probably there was a lesson or two more necessary for you to learn in the school of Christ before you would be properly fitted as a member of the church of Christ; for the church is rightly composed of those who know themselves to be sinners saved by grace, if saved it all, and that alone to the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. When, therefore, you suggested keeping still a while, I rather recommended it. But from some questions I afterwards asked you, and from further reflections in the way you had been led, I must conclude that in substance you had been led to know your guilt and just condemnation as a sinner, and that alone through the atonement of Christ you can have hope of salvation. If such is the case, as I think it must

be, there can be no advantage gained, nor is there in the scriptural ground for your waiting longer, however I would advise you to go before the church at their next meeting, and tell them what the Lord has taught you.

There's one more on which I think of offering a few remarks, though perhaps they may appear unnecessary in me. You have once been baptized, and baptized by a proper gospel administrator, your father; hence there could be no call for your being again baptized on that ground on which we require those have been baptized in the New School churches to begin baptized; that is, on the ground of their not having been baptized by a properly authorized administrator. It is probable the Ebenezer church would not require you to be baptized again in order to be received among them. Neither should I insist on it if I were with them, the church being satisfied, and you being satisfied for yourself that you have complied with the gospel requisition on this head, viz., To believe and be baptized; that is, believing first. But my opinion is, that to be strictly conformed to New Testament order, it would be proper you should begin baptized, and I mention it for your reflection, hoping that he on whom to have been depending for direction, made direct you on this point to your satisfaction, if your mind is not satisfied about it. To constitute gospel baptism, there is required immersion in water; and administrator, one who has been called of God and fellowshiped by the church as a gospel minister; and as a candidate, one who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ with all his heart. You were immersed by your father, and he was undoubtedly a gospel administrator, that his being a gospel administrator could no more make you a proper gospel subject, without faith, than a gospel subject could make a gospel administrator out of a man-made preacher. But there is another view to be taken of the subject and which I am not prepared to say is not the correct one; I think it probably is; for I know not how far a person may backslide, nor how along, and yet be a subject of grace; that is, you may have been a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ at the time you was baptized; that is, had had such a revelation of Christ made to you as the way of salvation, that you was enabled to rest on his blood alone for pardon in cleansing. If that be the case, there can be no ground for your been baptized again. All that can be required is for you to relate to the church your former experience, and shall them from your recent exercises that the Lord has healed your backsliding, and giving you repentance for them, for them to receive you into membership. May the Lord direct you to that which shall be your peace and establishment in the truth and consolations of the gospel, is my prayer for Christ's sake.

S. Trott.

Signs of the Times
Volume 49, No. 2.
January 15, 1881

# DEPRAVITY AND SIN

FOR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

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

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

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

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

propensities, but that they have a new and spiritual nature formed in them, distinct from, and in opposition to, their old nature, and therefore that they are born of God.

I now pass to brother Guice's last inquiry, as being intimately connected with the above; namely, "Whether John was not deceived when he said, Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God." I John iii. 9. Differing some from brother Guice's quotation. John certainly was not deceived. But others I think have been frequently mistaken in their understanding of this text, when they have inferred from it that if a person is born of God he is divested of all depravity and propensity to sin. An idea which is calculated to sink every child of grace who receives it, into despondency. John evidently speaks of that which is born of God, the *new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness;* not of the *old man* which remains *corrupt according to the deceitful lusts*. See Eph. iv. 22 & 24. But as an illustration of this subject, and of the fact that the *new creature is made subject to vanity, not willingly;* and that this therefore is the creature intended, {Rom. viii. 20,} I will notice Paul's own experience in the matter. That Paul *was born of God*, and was therefore a *new creature*, I presume brother Guice will admit. Hear his complaint of himself! "For I know that in me, {that is, in my flesh,} dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." What a perfect riddle this must be to a person who believes that nature is changed in regeneration, or that the nature of man is not depraved! Is not sin depravity? And if sin dwelled, made its home in Paul, was he not depraved? But it certainly was not that *I* that *would do good* that was depraved, not that which was born of God, but the *I* that did that he would not, the sin that dwelled in him, the flesh, the *me* in whom dwelleth no good thing, that was depraved, and which of course must be his old nature, that which was born of the flesh. He goes on to say, "I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." He concludes this declaration of his experience with saying, "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh, the law of sin." Rom. vii. 18-25. What was this law that was in his members, in his flesh, this law of sin, but the law of his nature? It was not *the law of God* which he *served with his mind*, nor *the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus*." – Rom. viii. 2. With the mind *I myself serve the law of God.* Is not this as strong as John's assertion, "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not?" And yet Paul says in the next breath, what evidently amounts to this, "But with the flesh I serve the law of sin." Thus making this his act too. So there were two I's, two Pauls in this one person; Paul who was born of God, and Paul or Saul who was born of a Jew. Was not this being brought into *captivity to the law of sin*, this

*doing that he would not*, this *not finding how to perform that which is good*, by the *new creature*, the regenerated Paul, a being *made subject to vanity*, to that which is void of good? And Paul's own testimony is, that it was *not willingly* that he was thus subject to the law of sin. As was Paul's experience in the case, so is the experience of all the children of God, if I know anything about it. It is no wonder then that the *whole creation* {in Christ Jesus} including the Apostles who had the first fruits of the Spirit, groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; waiting for the adoption; to wit, the redemption of our body, when they also shall be changed into the likeness of the glorified body of Jesus. See Rom. viii. 20-23.

I will now return to brother Guice's other inquiry. I having represented the *sin which doth so easily beset us* (Heb. xii. 1,) as being *unbelief*, he asks, "If the absence of faith is unbelief; and if so, and unbelief is sin, would not God's having created man without faith be equivalent to his being created a sinner?" – By *faith*, I presume brother Guice intends that faith which is the gift of God, and by which we receive and rely on Christ crucified as our whole salvation. I am not prepared to say that the absence of this faith is not in some instances intended by the term *unbelief*. But I am prepared to say that if that were the only sense in which unbelief is spoken of in the Scriptures, I could by no means consent to the idea that unbelief is sin. *Sin is the transgression of the law*. The law did not require of Adam in his original creation to believe in Christ as his righteousness and salvation, but it required him so to love and obey God as not to be a transgressor of the law, and therefore as not to be a subject for salvation, nor for having the righteousness of Christ imputed. Consequently, a want of this faith cannot be a transgression of the law. But there is an unbelief spoken of in the Scriptures which, according to my understanding thereof, is sinful. I will notice some instances. In I John v. 10, we read, "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." Here the faith in Christ which is connected with salvation, is expressed by a believing *on the Son of God*; the other belief is spoken of as simply a *believing God, a believing the record*, &c. thus making a manifest difference between the two. The same marked difference is observed in John iii. 36. Certainly that unbelief, or not believing, which *makes God a liar*, must be sinful. Do any ask how this unbelief can be a transgression of the law? I reply that the law under which Adam was created, evidently required of him to believe whatever declaration God made to him; otherwise, it would not have been sinful in him to disregard God's declarations concerning the tree of knowledge, &c. The declarations which God has made concerning man's condemnation, and concerning his Son &c. are equally the words of him who cannot lie; and disbelieving them must therefore be equally a transgression of the law. Again, we are told that Christ appeared unto the eleven and "upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was

risen." Mark xvi. 14. Their unbelief must, therefore, have been sinful, or I think he would not have upbraided them for it. Their not believing them which had seen him after his resurrection, included an unbelief of his own declarations beforehand made to them, that he should rise on the third day. In Rev. xxi. 8, the *fearful and unbelieving* are ranked with murderers, &c. as having a part in the *lake that burneth with fire and brimstone;* hence they must be one class of sinners who are thus punished, as murderers are another class. The unbelief, on account of which the natural branches were broken off from the good olive tree, and which led the Jews to reject Christ as the Messiah, I think was sin; so, also, I think was the unbelief which prevented those Israelites from entering the promised land, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, a sin. Heb. iii. 17-19. "The evil heart of *unbelief* in departing from the living God," against which the Apostle cautions his brethren, (Heb. iii. 6,) appears to me is sin, and one to which, if my experience is a criterion, I should judge the children of God are very liable. So that I really do not see any just ground for retracting from either of those ideas to which brother Guice objects; and I have given, in answer to his enquiries, *plainly* my reasons for this conclusion, though I have not given them perhaps as concisely as he requested. If he is not satisfied with my views on these points, I should like for him to give his reasons for dissenting, as well as for him to give some more scriptural views.

Yours, &c.
S.TROTT.
*Centreville, Fairfax County, Va. April* 15, 1846.

Signs of the Times
Volume 14, No. 10.
May 15, 1846

## DID CHRIST PURCHASE HEAVEN FOR HIS PEOPLE?

Brother Beebe: – I am aware that this, by many, may be considered as mere speculation; and it may not appear to any to have the same importance attached to it with some other

subjects. There is, however, with me one consideration alone besides others which I shall notice, which renders it, I think, not an uninteresting nor an unimportant enquiry; that is, whether we as Old School Baptists will conscientiously carry out our professed stand by allowing the Scriptures to decide for us, on all points of doctrine, that is, receiving the doctrine as therein revealed, or whether, to carry out certain systems of the schools we will hold and contend for principles which subvert the plainest declarations of Scripture.

I have been led to this subject by the remarks of Brother Janeway, in his communication opposing my "Thoughts on Justification." He quotes the following passage therefrom. "It is, I think, a mistaken notion that justification is what entitles the saints to heaven. Equally erroneous is the notion that Christ, by His death, purchased heaven for His people. Their union to Christ as His bride, their being the children of God, is what entitles them to the heavenly glory." He then remarks: "I believe the above sentences to be *egregiously false*," and refers me to the arguments, which he quotes at some length, of an English author, as justifying his *condemnation* of my remarks. But as neither this author, nor his arguments, possess with me sufficient weight to decide this point in contrary distinction from the Scriptures, I must be allowed to bring forward the testimony of Scripture, in the case, in justification of those remarks which my brother considers so false. "To the law and to the testimony" (Isa. 8:20), is what I wish to have inscribed as my motto in the spirit, and in the letter, of all my discussions of religious subjects.

In bringing forward the revelation of Scripture on this point, I shall, first, give its testimony concerning *the title to the heavenly kingdom;* secondly, concerning *the object of Christ's death.* First: Concerning the title to the heavenly kingdom, the Scriptures not only speak of the heavenly kingdom as being a gift, and a gift freely bestowed, as in Luke 12:32; Rom. 8:32, and 6:23, &c., but also as an inheritance. 1st. It is expressly called an *inheritance.* "Which is the earnest of our inheritance &c." Eph. 1:14. "Giving thanks unto the Father which hath made us meet to be partakers of the *inheritance* of the saints in light" Col. 1:12. In this text we have two ideas distinguished, which I apprehend that brother J. and others confounded, namely, the title, which is that of *inheritance,* and the *making us meet for being actual partakers* thereof. The latter they have mistaken for a purchase of the title. See also I Pet. 1:4 and other texts.

2nd. The saints are denominated heirs. I will write a few of the texts on this point. "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect" Rom. 4:14. Compare this with Gal. 3:18. "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise &c." I have in these a twofold testimony, and that Divine, that it is not a *legal righteousness* or *justification* which *entitles to heaven.* <u>Again</u> Rom. 8:17 – "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and *joint heirs* with Christ;" and Gal .4:7 –

"And if a son then an heir of God through Christ." These are the two texts which brother J's author quotes, and tries to explain away. He seems to suppose that they are all on which we rest our proof, for the idea that the title to heaven is derived from *inheritance,* and not from *purchase.* He also mistakes in supposing that we found the right to all spiritual blessings in adoption, such as pardon, liberty, peace &c. We believe these come to us in consequence of our being predestinated to the adoption of children, not as the inheritance, but as that *meetness* for it, which is spoken of in Col. 1:12, and that the right to these could only exist in our being redeemed from under the law. Not only do these texts represent the title of saints to glory as being that of heirship and founded on their being sons of God, but the one, Rom. 8:17, places their *title* on the same footing with Christ's. If Christ's title to that *glory which He had with the Father before the world was,* was the purchase of His blood, then is the saint's title derived from the same source; not otherwise? One more text on this point: "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise" Gal. 3:29. He does not say *according to a purchased right.*

3rd. The new covenant is represented under the idea of a *testament* Heb. 9:15-17. Hence the Scriptures are very full and pointed in representing the title of the saints to heaven as an *inheritance,* in distinction from a purchased right. See this distinction illustrated in reference to the possessions of natural Israel in regard to the year of Jubilee Lev. 25:14-55.

Second. The testimony of Scripture as to the object of Christ's death. I will under this head commence with some of the types of the Old Testament. It will be admitted, I presume, by our brethren, that the redemption of national Israel from Egypt, and bringing them through the wilderness into the promised land by the hand of Moses, Aaron and Joshua, was typical of Christ's redeeming spiritual Israel from under the law, and bringing them home to glory. I will then ask: Did God thus redeem Israel from Egypt &c., to purchase for them a right to possess the land of Canaan or was it to fulfill the promise He had made unto their fathers to give it to them for an everlasting possession? The latter I presume my brethren will admit was the fact. If any do not, let them look at Gen. 17:8; Exod.32: 13; 33:1; Deut. 9:4-6 & 10:15. If they do admit the above, what becomes of the notion of Christ's purchasing or meriting heaven by His death and obedience to the law? If Christ's obedience to the law is that which entitles the saints to heaven, why was it that Moses and Aaron must both die short of the promised land, and that Joshua alone could be allowed to lead Israel into their possessions? And, on the same supposition, we might say that there *was a law given which did give life;* contrary to what is implied in the Apostle's remarks in Gal .3:21.

Again, the sin offerings and other sacrifices under the law were evidently typical of that *one offering* which Christ should make of Himself. These, in their relation to national

Israel, were not to purchase their title to their typical inheritance but to remove their sins that they should not mar their possession of that inheritance. The law concerning ceremonial redemption does not present the right of redemption as a privilege to purchase a. title to the land of the Israelites; but is founded on a previous, unalienable title which they had, by inheritance, to their possessions, and was designed to remove the hindrances which were in the way of their peaceable possession of such inheritance. See Lev. 25:14-17; 25:28.

The New Testament account of Christ's death will be found exactly to correspond with those Old Testament types, in reference to the design &c. thereof. "But now once in the end of the world hath He appeared" for what? "To put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9:26-28. "He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin," – for what object? "That we *might be made the righteousness of God* in Him" II Cor. 5:21. "Who was delivered *for our offenses,* and raised again, *for our justification*" Rom. 4:25. The Scriptures go farther in defining the spiritual object to be attained by Christ's death; as in Gal. 4:4,5 – "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might *receive* the adoption of sons" Eph. 5:25-27. "As Christ 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* &c." Titus 2:14 – "Who *gave Himself for us,* that He might *redeem us* from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people &c." If Christ *gave Himself* for these objects, I would ask brother J. what He had left to give for the purchase of heaven? It will be readily seen that I have selected but a few of the many texts having a bearing upon, or a direct reference to, this point. But if we allow those to speak according to their plain, legitimate meaning, we shall be convinced that Christ gave Himself, not as a purchase price, but as a *ransom, a redemption price;* not to purchase or *redeem heaven,* for His people; but to *redeem them* from under the law, and *meeten them* for heaven. The Apostle speaks in Eph. 1:14 of the *redemption of the purchased possession* which some may understand to mean heaven. But if any do understand that heaven is the *purchased possession,* I would like for them to tell me what idea they can have of its being *redeemed,* after having *been purchased.* Besides there is no corresponding passage of Scripture to support this idea. And, remember that it is in the *mouth of two or three witnesses* that every word shall be established. But understanding by the *purchased possession* the church of Christ, and we have our two witnesses to support the idea; thus: "Ye are bought with a price" I Cor. 6:20; 7:23. "To feed the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood" Acts 20:28. But as I have showed from other Scriptures, this purchase is a *redemption purchase;* not a purchase of *title.* And the idea of *redemption* as applied to this *purchased possession* is perfectly consistent, according

to the sense in which the term is used in I Cor. 1:30, and in other passages, as meaning the complete deliverance of the whole flock of Christ.

In reference to the absolute necessity of the people of God being *redeemed* from sin and from under the law in order to their being brought to heaven, we consider the Scripture to be full of this doctrine. And for myself, I cannot conceive of any way how *creatures* could be made to partake of the privilege of sons of God but in that way unfolded in the Scriptures, namely; their being left to fall under the curse of the law, whereby occasion was given for their Spiritual Head to be manifested as their Redeemer, to deliver them from under the law, and from sin. Without death to the law, we never could have been severed from it. And while under the law we never could partake of the privilege of the sons of God. See Rom. 7:1-6 & Gal. 5:18. Neither can I conceive that Christ as the Messiah, being once *made of a woman and made under the law,* could ever have re-possessed that *glory which He had with the Father before the world was, without finishing,* by His perfect obedience, the redemption of Himself as the Husband, Surety &c., of His church, and of His church in Him, from all the demands of law and justice. Hence; Luke 24:26; John 17:4,5; Heb. l:8,9 & 2:9,10. But all this, the Scriptures teach me, are the means which God had appointed in His eternal purpose for *bringing the many sons unto glory,* not to purchase glory for them. But the sentiment that Christ purchased or merited heaven by His death is not merely a departure from the plain language of Scripture, but also involves other errors. It degrades the personal merits of the Messiah as He was set up from everlasting and His church in Him. For as He and His church were *one,* if He had no merits, independent of His blood, by which to present His church, as in Him and one with Him, as proper objects of His Father's love, and worthy to be recognized as sons and heirs, with Him of God; it must have been the merits of His blood only that entitled Him to be *appointed heir of all things.* But very differently from this is the testimony of the Scriptures concerning the glory of the Son of God. See Col. 1:15-19 & Hebrews chapter one.

Again the idea of Christ's purchasing heaven by His blood, savors too much of the cold speculations of a mercantile transaction to correspond with the riches of Divine grace as revealed in the Scriptures. For according to this, although God was willing that His predestinated sons should be made partakers of heavenly glory, and therefore appointed for them a Surety who should *purchase* it for them; yet He could not bestow it upon them as the bequest of a Father, but must have an equivalent for it. Some are fond of talking about the provisions of the everlasting covenant being *suspended on conditions* to be performed by Christ, and about the *great contracting parties* in the covenant &c.; but this savors entirely too much of the wisdom of this world. To suppose the Divine Three meeting in council to devise ways, and close a bargain concerning the redemption of men, each proposing and accepting of terms &c., by which they enter into *contract*

infinitely degrades the idea I have of God, of His unity, His dignity, His sovereign majesty &c. And as neither the above, nor any equivalent terms, are used in the Scriptures relative to this subject, I feel at liberty to enter my protest against their use. It is contended by the school men, and those who derive their system from the schools, that the term, *covenant,* implies the idea of a contract; but this I deny to be the case as we find that term used and explained in the Scriptures. When God made a covenant with Noah &c. (Gen. 9), was there anything like a contract between God and Noah? Did Noah propose any of the terms of this covenant? Did its being established depend in any measure on his giving his consent to the terms? Very different from all this. God established a covenant with Abraham, Gen. 17, also with David, II Sam. 7:4-17; 23:5 & Ps. 89: 19-37. Is there anything like contracting, like proposing and accepting conditions between the parties in either of these? Does not God in these declare His Divine sovereignty, saying *I will,* and *thou shalt,* whilst at the same time He gives them the strongest ground to rest their faith and hope upon? If we look at the new covenant, Jer. 31:31-34, we shall find it in conformity with the others. The *shall* of Jehovah establishes all! If we look at the promises which the Father makes unto the Son as in Psa. 89 as above quoted, in Isaiah 42:1-9; 49 & 53 &c., we find them made in the absoluteness of Divine sovereignty and freeness; no condition, no *ifs* to clog that freeness. Hear the language of the Son, "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Psa. 40:7,8; Heb. 10:5-10. What harmony and oneness does this express in the Godhead! What loveliness and beauty in the Divine freeness with which the Son does the will of His Father, and offers Himself in the place of burnt offerings and sacrifices, for His people! How different would it appear if we were to suppose Him adopting, instead of the above declaration, language suiting the idea of a contract, and saying, seeing O God, that according to stipulations, thou hast prepared a body for me, Lo, I will come and fulfill my part of the contract? What a letting down of dignity there would be even to the littleness of human bargaining.

Once more, the notion of Christ's having purchased heaven by His blood, tends greatly to diminish the view which the Scriptures and our experience give of the exceeding evil of sin; for according to this notion, it was not for our sinfulness and vileness alone, that debarred us from heaven; a title to heaven must be purchased. Neither was it our sins, and to redeem us from the curse of the law alone that caused Christ to bleed on Calvary, but His blood was in part shed for purchasing a title to heaven.

If on the other hand we will let the revelation of God speak for itself, in this maimer *not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth,* making known that the kingdom of glory is an inheritance given, in the better Testament, to His Son and to the church in Him, as His bride, *bone of His bone,* and as joint heirs with

Him, of which Testament Christ is made the Surety or Executor, we discover the whole transaction to be a display of the rich, free and sovereign love of God, as of a father to his children, in Christ; and the barrier to our felt enjoyment of it – not the want of freeness in the gift, but our vileness as creatures of the dust, and sunken, by transgression, under the curse of the law. And the pureness of Divine love, and the riches of Divine wisdom is displayed in God's predestinating His people to the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ, constituting them *one* with Him in that *He*, which was, *in Him*, which they derive from Him, and which is thus the *light of men;* by which union, on the one hand, they are entitled with Him to the heavenly inheritance, and on the other hand, He was involved in their accountability, as creatures, to law and justice, and bound to meet the demands thereof in their behalf, whereby their complete redemption and justification from all demands of law and justice were secured. Pure justice thus shines forth in the infliction of the penalty of the law upon Christ, and the heavenly inheritance, whilst it comes to the heirs as the free gift of the Father, comes to them through the *redemption that is in Christ Jesus,* by which His love to them, as His bride, is sealed by His heart's blood.

Hence, in the Scriptural view of redemption, instead of beholding the deadened colorings of a mercantile transaction, we see every attribute of our Jehovah God shining forth with heightened lustre and glory, all Secretly combining and harmonizing, in the predestination, calling, justification and glorification of the elect sons of Adam.

Our sins, as they are seen contrasted with the love of God and felt to be a barrier to our enjoying that love which nothing but the fountain of a Saviour's blood, applied by the energies of the Holy Ghost, could remove, appear indeed as exceeding sinful and odious; and whilst the value of a Saviour's blood and righteousness is enhanced by a sense of our vileness and sinfulness, we are humbled in the dust on account of that vileness as contrasted with the stupendous love and favour of God to us.

From those Scriptural considerations, I feel fully justified in maintaining that it is not justification from the law which entitles the saints to heaven, and that the object of Christ's death was not to purchase heaven for His people. Whether brother J. and others will ever in this life see eye to eye with me on this point and on the subject of justification I know not. I desire that we may, providing it be as the Scriptures teach. But if kept by the grace of God I trust I shall adhere to the doctrine as taught in the Scriptures, as far as my mind is enlightened to understand it, whether thereby I go, with, or against, my brethren. And I cannot feel that my Old School brethren are justified in blaming me for not going with them, wherein they fail to show some direct Scriptural authority for their belief or practice; neither do I wish to blame them for not seeing with me on every point, so far as the Holy Ghost is pleased to teach them or me, we shall be made to see whoever else may remain blind, and however strong our prejudices may

have been in opposition. May He teach us all to know, to feel, and to live more and more the truth as it is in Jesus.

One word more, if my brethren cannot agree with me on these points, I think from what I have now written they will discover that my views do not clash with the doctrine of Sovereignty in predestination, election &c., nor with the richness and freeness of the gift of grace that bringeth salvation, nor of the fullness there is in Christ to present His people faultless before God; neither in the sovereignty and perfection of the work of the Holy Spirit. Why then are my brethren so alarmed?

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
April 24th, 1838.
S. Trott.

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 133-140

# DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO HEADS

As in the distinction between the two Heads, the first man and the second Man, so is the distinction between the two lives brought forth severally in these distinct Heads; consequently so is the distinction between the bonds of union by which each Head is united with its body and members.

The one bond is earthly, the other is spiritual; the one commenced in time and is dissolved in time, the other commenced in eternity, and therefore unchanged by changing time, will be eternal.

The one head, Adam, being created under the law, and his posterity in him; the other Head, Christ, as the Son of the Father, was set up and His posterity in Him, under the everlasting covenant, that is “ordered in all things and sure,” they are therefore as sons loved with an everlasting love, and therefore with “loving kindness” are they drawn.

Again as the members of Adam's family, or of the creation in him, are made manifest as such by being "born of the flesh;" so the members of Christ's body can be manifested only by being "born of the Spirit." They are by this brought into personal existence – as new creatures, and are now personified by their new life.

Hence says Christ speaking of His disciples; "They are NOT of the world, even as I am NOT of the world." (John 17:16;) and says Paul; "If I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." (Romans 7:20 – See also 1 John 3:9 and 5:18.)

As the posterity of Adam came into existence under the curse of the law as having been in him when he fell; so the posterity of Christ in their new birth, are born into the blessings of the new covenant, as well those exceeding great and precious promises given them in Christ as that full provision for their deliverance from under the law; therefore they receive not the spirit of bondage again to fear; but they receive the Spirit of Adoption, whereby they cry, Abba, Father.

This much in relation to the union of Christ's people with Him. I will now briefly notice this union with Adam &c. – Whilst they were thus set up in Christ, and as such, loved with an everlasting love, it was the pleasure of the Father that they should be partakers of flesh and blood, and therefore as rational creatures they were created in a natural head, Adam, and under the law; were in common with all his posterity, left to fall in him, and become subject to the curse of the law.

While they were thus a part of the same fallen family of Adam involved in the same condemnation, they by the eternal purpose of God were distinguished from the rest of the human family – and were from the beginning "chosen unto salvation," and "predestinated unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ," and were given to Christ as His portion, as it is written, the "Lord's portion is His people; Jacob is the lot of His inheritance."

It was also necessary in order to their being brought into liberty as sons, and receive the spirit of adoption, that they should be redeemed from under the law, and also to be slain by it, that their union to it might be dissolved.

For all this provision was made in the everlasting covenant, and the accomplishment thereof assigned to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit in their respective offices.

Their redemption could alone be accomplished by One who could fulfill the demands of the law, and make it honorable in their behalf, and consequently alone by one who could be acknowledged by Divine Justice, as standing in their law-place.

Christ being their Brother, their Head, their Husband in the everlasting covenant, an in relation to the life therein set up, the right of redemption belonged to Him, He could take their law-place and obey in their behalf, and be accepted by Divine Justice.

WAS CHRIST CREATED WITH HIS PEOPLE IN ADAM? If so He is but an earthly creature, and a branch of fallen stock! Again we are told that Christ laid down His life for the sheep. Now if He did not lay down His life in the place, or stead, of the sheep, how will we find an atonement in the death of Christ? and how will we find a ransom in it? If He laid down His life for us in any other sense than as suffering that punishment which was due to our transgressions?

Instead of that nominal union which many talk of, which is produced by the creature's believing – the Scriptures speak of a real oneness. "Both He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified, are all of one;" is the Scripture testimony (Hebrews 2:11), and so I believe.

Instead of this union being founded in Christ's assumption of a human nature; the Scriptures speak of His taking flesh and blood as a consequence of His relation to the children who were partakers thereof. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also likewise Himself took part of the same; &c." – What children? – Those of whom Christ says; "Behold, I and the children which God hath given Me." (Hebrews 2:14,13). And this is not simply a oneness of views, but a oneness of life.

Now, Brother Jim, I pass on to address the scattered believers whose trust is in the Lord, and have no confidence in the flesh – not theirs, not preachers' nor any other creature. A lovely and lovable scattered flock; not esteemed by the self-righteous and confident, whose soul-troubles are nor so sharp or trying that they cannot rest on their lees, with a pain of conscience now and then. "Simon, I have somewhat to say unto thee." "There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell Me therefore, which of them will love him the most?" Simon correctly named the one that owed the most. "Thou hast rightly judged." (Luke 7:41-43.) I think sometimes it is a pity that the one that owes so little are the ones so quick to join the church; while the ones so great in debt are the more backward. And I steam when I sense, rightly or wrongly, that one who owes so little is ready to castigate the poor trembling Mary, full of fear, and hesitantly, yet bravely finally slipping in to weap at His feet. Simon – the self-righteous hypocrite! "If this man were a prophet, He would know what manner of woman touchest Him, for she IS a sinner." But the sweetness of the gentle Savior, inspired the writer to not let that stand! The text, "she WAS a sinner." Blessed difference in vantage-points!

Elder Samuel Trott, 1833.

# DUTY FAITH & REPENTANCE.

An enquiry concerning the duty of the unregenerate to believe, repent or pray.

**PART 1.** Brother Beebe: – I will now notice the charge which Brother Meredith has been informed is made against the Old School Baptists, that they hold it "not to be the duty of the unregenerate to believe, repent or pray." I will in my examination of this charge endeavor to show what there is of truth and what of falsehood in its several items. I will commence with the subject of belief. The charge that we hold it "not to be the duty of the unregenerate to believe," has originated evidently from persons who do not know or distinguish the difference there is between believing the Son, and believing on the Son, or between believing the record that God gave of His Son, and believing on the Son of God. See John 3:36 & I John 5:10. Such distinction not only is made in the texts above referred to, but is evidently manifested in christian experience. The one, the believing on the Son of God, is no other than the exercise of that faith which is the gift of God, and is distinguishingly denominated the faith of God's elect. It is a reliance on that obedience which Christ has rendered to law and justice in behalf of His people, as our alone and complete righteousness before God and redemption from under the law, and a trust in Christ, as our whole salvation. But it is evident that, from a very early period in the travel of the church on to this day, a great proportion of the professed church of Christ have mistaken a simple belief of the truth of the record which God has given of His Son; or indeed a simple belief in the truth of the scriptures, for that faith which characterizes one as a believer in Christ. That is, the revelation made of Christ in the scriptures has been considered as a proposition presented to the minds of men for their reception; and the reception of this proposition either as dogmatically laid down, or on examination, has been understood as constituting one a believer in Christ, and the rejection of it, the ground of condemnation. Hence the solicitude that has been manifested to instill into the minds of children the knowledge and belief of certain summaries of what was considered essential points to be believed in order to constitute them christians. Hence the catechumenical system in the earlier ages of the church, and Sunday School and Bible Class plans of our day. Hence also creeds and catechisms as essential summaries of christian doctrine which must be driven into the minds of children by parental and priestly authority, and often beaten in by the rod of the schoolmaster, in order to make christians of them.

Owing to the mistake which has thus existed, when it has been asserted that the natural man is not required of God to exercise that faith which is peculiarly the faith of God's elect, and is not condemned for not exercising it, it has been construed into a denial of its being his duty to believe, that is, the record which God has given, or the testimony of the scriptures. The fact is, so far as I understand what is the Old School or apostolic Baptist doctrine on this point, it is this; that the peculiar faith which constitutes one a believer in Christ, in a gospel sense, and which goes out from one's self and from all he has done or felt, to rest upon, and plead Christ's obedience to the law, as his whole righteousness, and ground of acceptance with God, &c.; is a belief which the law knows nothing about; for the law is not of faith; and which can in no sense be considered a natural duty, it being not the acting of any natural powers or faculties of man as created of the earth earthy, but is the peculiar exercise of that spiritual life which was created in, and is derived from the Son of God, as the Head of His people; and which requires that a person be born of God to exercise it. Hence this faith in contra-distinction from its being a legal duty, is declared to be the gift of God. On the other hand, I understand the Old School doctrine to be, that it is the duty of all rational beings to believe all God has spoken in the scriptures as they have access to them directly or indirectly, and to believe the testimony of the works of creation and providence, where the scriptures have not come. To disbelieve the record, which God hath given of His Son, is to make God a liar (I John 5:10;) and surely no person can do this and be guiltless. The obligation man is under thus to believe God, arises, not from any demand which the gospel as such peculiarly makes upon him, but from the nature and fitness of things, and from what God is. It is a law of our creation.

The "duty of the unregenerate to repent," comes next under consideration. This owing to the confusion into which it has been thrown by the introduction of the various systems of conditionalism, and other causes is a difficult subject rightly to understand and explain in all its bearings. My own mind I confess has been much difficulted to draw a clear line of distinction between the different relations and senses in which the idea of repentance, is presented to our view in the scriptures, and between the idea of its being a duty incumbent on men at large, and that of its being a free gospel blessing bestowed by the exalted Saviour on the spiritual Israel of God. But as it is highly important that we should understand the true import of the scriptures on this subject, I have at different times elicited considerable enquiry from me; and such as I have, give I unto you. I will add that ever since I knew by experience what repentance is, as given by Christ, (as I have a hope that I do know it to some extent,) I have been fully convinced that the manner in which repentance is held and preached by the conditionalists of all grades, is altogether foreign from the scriptural view of it. On the other hand I have never been able to receive in all points as correct, the explanations which Doctor Gill and other sound brethren have given of it. There will be found some difference between the

explanation of this subject which I have to give, and that given by Brother Beebe in No.14, more particularly in relation to John's preaching repentance; this difference I trust is not such as to break any bones.

I shall lay down the following positions, as waymarks, in the investigation of this subject. **First:** If we suppose that the original law of man's creation, or the law as published in Ten Commands from Sinai, commanded repentance as one of its requisitions, it will lead to the following insuperable difficulties. *1st.* Repentance presupposes sin, therefore the law's commanding repentance as one of the conditions of its fulfillment, would be to command the previous existence of sin. *2nd.* If the law commands repentance, then repentance is essential to that righteousness which the law requires, and consequently Christ in bringing in that righteousness and magnifying the law in behalf of His people, must have repented for them, as well as obeyed in their behalf in other respects. This supposition therefore I think cannot stand. *3rd.* If we suppose that the gospel commands repentance as a condition of acceptance with God, then the gospel must in some sense be a law under which the human family exists. Consequently a failure to obey this command would involve condemnation. And if the gospel thus comes from God who changes not, with its demands upon the human family at large, then from the moment any individual existed as an accountable creature to God, he was obligated to render obedience to this gospel-law, and failing at any moment to do it, he incurred condemnation from it. If he lived twenty years, or more, or less, in impenitency or in transgression of this command of the gospel, and then became a penitent, his after repentance could not make satisfaction for his former neglect of it. Hence it is evident that all must be viewed as transgressors of this gospel-law. Now Christ redeemed His people from the curse of the law; but who is revealed as a redeemer from the condemnation of the gospel? And if not redeemed from it, must we not lie under the condemnation or suffer the penalty? If then no Redeemer is provided to save from gospel condemnation, who can be saved? If it be said that Christ redeemed from this as from the law, then as before He must have repented for His people. This is but one among several absurdities arising from a supposition of this kind.

*4th.* If on the other hand we suppose that the unregenerate are under no obligations to repent, we must consider them as justifiable in continuing on in their sins of whatever grade they may be. This I think none will admit; for there certainly are instances in the scriptures of unregenerated persons being exhorted or admonished to repent. The query then arises, Whence does this obligation to repent arise? This I will endeavor to answer, after a little. The difficulty on this subject has frequently been attempted to be solved by a reference to the fact of there being two kinds of repentance spoken of in the scriptures. There certainly are these different repentances brought to view, designated by different words in the original of the scriptures; but I find there is but one word in its formation

and derivations, used in all those passages of scripture which are immediately connected with our present enquiry; such as Matt. 3:2; 4:17; 11:20,21; Acts 8:22; 17:30; the same also is used in these, and the like texts, namely: Luke 24:47; Acts 5:31; also the word repentance as found in II Cor. 7:9,10. (The word repented in this 10th verse, is a different word in the original and of different import.) Hence I think there is but the one kind of repentance we have to do with in this case. And I know not that it is here necessary for our present enquiry to consider this repentance as classed into outward, and heart repentances, or the like. The original word used in the above texts, metanoco, according to its etymology, signifies "To reflect on, or to be wise after the act, or to return or come to a right understanding." This repentance therefore imports a change of mind after an act has been committed, and which therefore implies a condemning of the act, and of course, sorrow for it, and a change of conduct. This sorrow may be natural or worldly sorrow, or it may be godly or spiritual sorrow, as the act is viewed in the light of reason, or in the light of the Spirit. If the former, it needs to be repented of again. But the main point in the idea of repentance, is I think altogether missed by conditionalists, and perhaps is frequently overlooked by others, and which in fact, is the substance of the thing. It is this, that as repentance is self-condemnation, it stands in direct opposition to all self-righteousness, self-justification, or reliance on our own acts for acceptance with God, &c. Hence the utter absurdity of making repentance a condition of salvation. In pursuing the enquiry concerning the obligation of men to repent, I shall have again to refer to the law of Ten Commands; and as I had occasion in the preceding communication, and have again in this to speak of it in distinction from the original law under which man was created, I wish here to guard against being understood as meaning that they are separate laws. I understand them to be in substance the same law, but differently revealed. In the original creation of man the law requiring him to love God with all his heart, &c., was not delivered to him verbally in so many words, nor in a series of implied prohibitions as in the Decalogue; but was written in indelible characters upon man. I do not say, nor mean in his heart; but upon his existence as a rational being, and upon all by which he was surrounded, for all declared the wisdom, power, and goodness of their Creator, and therefore reflected the obligation of man to love his Creator with all his powers and faculties. Thus it is said, Rom. 1:19,20. "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." Had man continued in the state of uprightness in which he was created, he would not have needed the specifications contained in the Decalogue to show him what was right or wrong. Though a test of his love and subjection to God was needed, and that was given him in the prohibition of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But man having sinned and come short of the glory

of God, and sunken into a state of condemnation, God, in bringing in that dispensation which was particularly designed to typify the salvation in all its parts, of spiritual Israel; as well as to prepare the way for the manifestation of the Messiah, saw proper, to give a new edition of the law, or to declare it in Ten Commands from Sinai, which commands are but so many specifications by which are showed man's entire departure from the standard of right. Hence says Paul; "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. This law was given in the letter of it, in covenant form to national Israel; and was written on tables of stone to show that the law in itself cannot give life; that its commands in their outward address to man leave the heart as lifeless and hard as the stones on which they were written.

This law of Ten Commands, in its spirituality and as addressed to all, both Jews and Gentiles, I understand was given expressly to teach repentance. I do not say, to show that repentance was a part of the original requisition of the law, and a part of the righteousness it required; but that it is addressed to man as depraved and condemned, to call him off from self-confidence, and to repentance. I feel myself fully supported in this by the declarations of scripture, that the law was added by reason of transgression; entered that the offence might abound, &c.; and especially by this text, "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law" – for what? – "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." What is this but self-condemnation before God, that is designed to be accomplished by the declaration of the law? And what is such self-condemnation, but repentance toward God? It is then I think clear, that it is the law of Ten Commandments in its spirituality that calls for repentance. But it may be asked, Is it the laws thus calling for repentance that makes it the duty of man to repent, or thus to be humbled and abased before God? I answer no; for the law calls for it only as it shows the nature and truth of man's case, that he is a guilty condemned creature, polluted in all his ways. The fitness, propriety and obligation of man to repent arises from the nature and truth of the case. If it is a duty of man to practice truth toward God and toward man, then it is his duty thus to be humble and abased before God and men, because the truth is that he is thus debased by his transgressions of the law; and to plead or trust to his works for justification is to plead and trust a falsehood, as showed by the Decalogue; for his works condemn him. However I would here remark that I doubt the propriety of using the term duty in a strict sense in relation to repentance, although it may be admitted in a loose sense. Of the fitness of repentance, and of the obligation man is under to exercise it, from his still existing as the creature of God, and a subject of His moral government, I have no doubt, that is, so far as the light of reason and external revelation can show them the evil of sin.

Let us now look a little at christian experience on this point; for the Spirit's teaching is truth. When a person is led by the teachings of the Holy Spirit truly to know the law and

by it to know his guilt and depravity, he at once falls prostrate at the footstool of mercy, acknowledging the justice of his condemnation, and feels that from the fitness of things, he cannot be too much abased and humbled before God against whom he has sinned. It is true that in the former stages of his exercises, he may have sought to work himself up to a repentance, as a something that was to make amends for his transgressions and make his peace with God; but he now abhors this attempt to mock God and dishonor His law as much as any of his former open sins. And he would no sooner think of pleading the condemnation and contrition he now feels as a reason why he should escape punishment, than the criminal before a court would think of pleading the fact of his being clearly proved guilty, as a proper ground for his being cleared. This contrite penitent sees and feels that there is no way by which in justice he can be released from enduring the curse of the law, until he is led by faith to behold that satisfaction which Christ has made to the law for such sinners as he. He now feels that there is a natural fitness that he and every other person should be abased and humbled before God as transgressors of His law and abusers of His goodness. But further, being brought into the light of the gospel, he sees that it was sovereign grace alone which brought him thus to repentance, and that the condemnation which man lies under in consequence of his awful departure from God, is that he should be given over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient, or fit, or as the Master saith, that he should love darkness rather than light.

In accordance with what I have above shown as taught by experience, of the fitness and propriety of men's being thus humbled before God, the Apostle speaks of the goodness of God, that is, in the riches of His goodness, forbearance, &c., toward man, leading him to repentance, or in other words, as naturally tending to produce in him humbleness and contrition of heart, if he rightly viewed himself, but that instead of its having this proper effect, he, after his hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto himself wrath against the day of wrath, &c. See Rom. 2:4-5. Now I understand the Old School doctrine thus to teach the natural fitness that all men, to be consistent with truth, should be abased and penitent before God as transgressors of His law. And farther, I understand it to be in accordance with Old School doctrine for a person, when he knows of another's committing any sin, whether he be regenerated or not, to exhort him to repent of that sin, as Peter exhorted Simon, Acts 8:22. But this exhortation will of course with propriety, be nothing other than a persuading of the person to use that light which God has given him, relative to this sin, whether that be the light of reason, or of grace. Such exhortations however must not be considered as, peculiarly a part of the ministerial office. If the above comes up to what others would import by saying that it is the duty of the unregenerate to repent, let them have this phrase, to convey the idea that men can or are required of themselves to exercise that repentance which is unto life, or that it is their duty to exercise repentance as a part of legal righteousness, or to make amends for a

deficiency in that righteousness, or as a condition proposed by the gospel, in either of these senses the Old School doctrine does not represent it to be the duty of the unregenerate to repent.

Although I have already drawn out this subject to what many will think an unprofitable and unreasonable length, yet I cannot as I have entered upon it, feel satisfied without pursuing the enquiry as to what constitutes the preaching of repentance both under the day spring, and the sun rising of the gospel.

**PART II.** The branch of the above enquiry now before us is, What constitutes preaching repentance both under the day spring, and the sun rising of the gospel day? The day spring of course comes first, and under this we find both John and Christ preaching, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." In order to come to a proper understanding of the import and design of this preaching, it is necessary to refer back to the peculiar standing of the Jews. I have already remarked on another branch of this inquiry, that the law of Ten Commands in the letter of them, were given in covenant form to national Israel. Connected with these commands and as conditions of the same covenant, was the observance of the whole Jewish ritual as commanded by Moses. In the offering of sacrifices and in other rites, repentance or an acknowledgment of guilt and condemnation was implied and taught; also the hearing and reception of the Messiah, when He should come, was commanded. Deut. 18:15-19. Hence the "foundation of repentance from dead works" is named, Heb. 6:1,2, among the principles or first rudiments of the doctrine of Christ, which the believers from among the Hebrews were called upon to leave. Hence also when Messiah came, it was according to the Divine and revealed plan of His manifestation, that He should first present Himself to the Jews, nationally, for their reception or rejection; on the principles of the Sinai Covenant. Hence it is said, Christ "came to His own and they received Him not," &c. John 1:11. It was as I understand it, in accordance with this arrangement, and the provisions of the Sinai Covenant, that John came preaching repentance and that Christ preached it; and also that the Seventy were sent two and two to give notice of His coming, or that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. They preached repentance to show that according to the order of Messiah's kingdom, and to what had been figuratively taught in the Sinai ritual, repentance, and not self-righteousness, was requisite to a right reception of the Messiah, and to entering into His kingdom. They called upon them thus to repent upon the principles of that covenant under which they as a nation in a peculiar manner existed, and according to which Christ thus first presented Himself to them as the Messiah for their reception or rejection. It is true, as Brother Beebe said, in his remarks on repentance, that a special design of John's being sent preaching repentance was "to make ready a people prepared of the Lord." But still I think John's preaching, saying Repent, &c., was addressed to the Jews nationally upon the principles of their covenant; and that

it was thus left to the Holy Spirit, whose province it peculiarly is, to make manifest the "people prepared of the Lord," to lead such through John's preaching to be convinced of their sinfulness and just condemnation, and to hope for the immediate manifestation of the Messiah; and as a fruit of their repentance, to renounce their self-righteousness, and their dependence on, having Abraham for their father, for justification; and were accordingly prepared to come to John's baptism as a baptism – not of self-righteousness for justification, but of "repentance for the remission of sins." Hence in the text already quoted, John 1:11, after it is said "He came to His own, that is nationally, and His own received Him not, it is further declared that to as many as received Him, to them gave He power, &c., which were born not of blood," &c. Thus showing that their being distinguished thus from the nation, was peculiarly of God. From this view of this subject, Pedobaptists may think it consistent to preach repentance according to John's manner of preaching, because they imagine their children to have been brought in under the Abrahamic covenant; but surely no consistent Baptist will think of blending the principles of the Sinai covenant with the gospel ministry in calling upon men to repent as a self-preparation for receiving the gospel.

I will now come to the preaching of repentance under the sun rising of the gospel day. On this point we have a plain direction in Luke 24:47, where Christ after His resurrection teaches His disciples that, "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This I understand to be the particular instruction given how repentance is to be preached since the ascension of Christ.

*1st.* It is to be preached in His – Christ's – name. Not in Moses' name. Not as a demand of the law; nor as John preached it to the Jews on the principles of the Sinai covenant. Neither does preaching repentance in the name of Christ, consist with calling upon men to repent, for this implies that the repentance called for is such as the natural man can exercise, or the reflections of the natural mind will produce. Hence this preaching tends to build men up in the notion of their own ability and to satisfy them with such repentance as they are capable of exercising; and therefore tends to produce in their minds the very reverse to that repentance which Christ gives, a being abased in the dust as guilty, ruined, helpless sinners.

Repentance is truly preached in the name of Christ, when the law in its exceeding broadness, unchangeableness and spirituality as taught and illustrated by Christ, and established by the gospel is preached, as cutting off all human works as the ground of acceptance with God, "Stopping every mouth and presenting all the world as guilty before God." This is the preaching which, when the heart is opened by the Holy Ghost to receive it, and by Him applied, produces the fruits of genuine repentance, namely: a being stripped of all self glorying and self confidence and an abhorring of one's self and

being humbled as in dust and ashes. But further in preaching repentance in the name of Christ, as He is "exalted as a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins," the sensible sinner [text obscured in original] should be pointed to Christ as Him who alone can melt his heart and give him that repentance which needeth not to be repented of. And the intimate connection between this repentance, and the receiving of the forgiveness of sins, must be clearly held forth; so that none, on the one hand shall indulge in the hopes of experiencing pardoning mercy through Christ, unless brought to know and feel the odiousness and exceeding sinfulness of sin; and on the other hand, that those who are mourning over their own vileness and ruin may be encouraged to hope for the forgiveness of their sins through Christ. Now I will leave it to Brother Meredith and others who have been alarmed at the cry against our Old School preachers, that they do not preach repentance to sinners, to judge whether the above described kind of preaching; or the calling upon the unregenerate to repent and the trying to scare them to it by dwelling on the horrors of hell, and thus leading them to infer that repentance is a bodily exercise, a mere excitement of the passions, appears the most consistent with gospel doctrine and preaching, and the most like preaching true "repentance toward God." But there is another point which it is incumbent on me to notice before I quit this subject, namely; Acts 17:30. "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent." We must first notice the import of the expression now commandeth. If the obligation of the Gentiles to repent, rests upon this command, as a new law then instituted, as those who dwell so much upon this text seem to intimate, then their previously gross idolatry afforded no just ground for repentance, and they were guiltless in practicing it. But such a conclusion is entirely inconsistent with Paul's view of their case given, Rom. 1:18-32. The true import of this expression as connected with the idea that God had heretofore winked at the times of this ignorance, appears to me to be this, namely: That although hitherto the law of Ten Commands as designed to teach the knowledge of sin, was confined mostly to the Jews, while the Gentiles were left without any special revelation to teach them their sins; yet now under the gospel dispensation, this law as connected with the gospel proclamation was "to be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations," showing the absurdity and wickedness of idolatry, and the guilt and condemnation of all as transgressors of the divine law. Hence wherever the gospel came among the Gentiles thus accompanied with the proclamation of the law, those Gentiles whose hearts were opened to receive the word, were led to renounce all their hopes arising from those idolatrous rites which they had performed and to fall prostrate before God as guilty sinners, needing His pardoning mercy; as were the Jews stripped of their legal righteousness. And not only this, but God is so revealed in the external testimony of the law and the gospel as human reason becomes convinced comes are more or less made to feel that they are dependent on, and accountable to the living God. In accordance with

this view of the import of this text, I will add that the primary idea of the word here rendered command, is to instruct, teach, direct, and hence also it came to be used to denote commanding as one mode of directing; it further signifies to give notice or warning, &c. Hence I understand the text as designed, not to intimate that under the gospel God had instituted a new command or law for the Gentiles, or laid them under a new obligation to exercise repentance; but to show the bearing and effect the gospel proclamation as embracing an illustration of the spirituality of the law was designed to have upon all people, and that it was thus addressed to all, in distinction from what was the case under the former dispensation.

Lastly, the subject of prayer, or the enquiry whether it is the duty of the unregenerate to pray, demands attention. If the charge that Old School Baptists "believe it is not the duty of the unregenerate to pray," is designed to convey the idea that they do not hold, or preach that it is the duty of unregenerate persons, or right for them, to read or say over a form of prayer, as a regular or occasional task, and as means of salvation, or a condition of acceptance with God, whilst their hearts are insensible of the wants their words express; every consistent Old School Baptist, and every other person who knows the wickedness of mocking God with lip service, while the heart is far from Him, must plead guilty to this charge. But as this charge imports that we do not admit it right for any person, under a sense of his dependence on God and feeling his need of divine mercy or aid in any case to ask God for it; I think the charge is false. I for one believe it right for anyone to pray to God for any aid or mercy that he truly feels the need of, and is authorized by the Scriptures to believe that God bestows upon the sons of men.

To say it is the duty of unregenerate persons to pray, as a form of worship is to say that God requires of them that worship which is neither spiritual, nor from the heart. But Christ informed the woman of Samaria that, "God is a Spirit and they that worship Him, must worship Him in Spirit and in truth." John 4:24. But for a person to pray, not as a form of worship, but simply to ask God for mercy because he feels he needs it, is the privilege of any; hence Peter exhorts Simon to pray God, if perhaps the thought of his heart might be forgiven him; under the impression, undoubtedly, that Simon from the sharp rebuke and warning he had given him, would see and feel the wickedness of his thought and the need of forgiveness.

I have thus traveled over a good deal of ground upon these subjects, whether Brother Meredith will be any better satisfied than with Brother Beebe's brief explanation, I know not. The confusion into which these subjects have been thrown by conditionalists and their use of them, seemed to require a general and particular examination of them. I cannot say that after all I have said, and my anxiety to place the subjects in a clear light, I have succeeded to any degree.

But I leave it. God may enable some others to set the subject in a clearer light, or may lead some to comprehend the ideas, I have attempted to convey; and if they are wrong to show the right. Yours in the gospel of Christ,

Samuel Trott
SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.7 (1839)

## ELDER OSBOURN: HIS CHARGE OF SABELLIANISM, &c.

BROTHER BEEBE: – As the several pieces published in the SIGNS on the occasion of Elder James Osbourn's charging the Old School Baptists of the West with Sabellianism, have raised quite a resentment against you and the SIGNS on account thereof, from certain quarters; and as I was the first to call this subject up to the notice of our brethren, I feel disposed to say something further on the matter. I shall not attempt a defense of all which has been said through the SIGNS on the occasion. And indeed those letters of brother Saunders which have been so much denounced call for no defense. If after the repeated acknowledgements published by brother Saunders for certain expressions used in those letters, and the declaration made by brother Beebe, {SIGNS, volume 8, pg.15,} that previous to the publishing of those letters, brother Saunders had requested him to correct the unguarded expressions used in them; and that he had failed to do it in consequence of being unavoidably absent when they went to press, persons will denounce the SIGNS on account of those expressions, as the Woburn and North Berwick churches have done in their letters published by Elder Osbourn in his recent pamphlet, they may as well be let alone to denounce on, until they come to a temper which will dispose them to receive a brother's acknowledgements.

At the time I called upon our western brethren to notice the charge Elder Osbourn had published against them, I did not design engaging myself in any discussion on the subject; but as, owing to the abuse poured forth, I feel disposed to take up my pen as a friend of the SIGNS and of our Old School cause, I may, before I close, touch the whole matter in debate, and also show mine opinion. The first thing I shall notice is the very

uncandid course taken by Elder Osbourn and his special friends to impress the public mind that the present excitement has grown out of an attack of I.T. Saunders and the SIGNS on Elder Osbourn, as a servant of God. Whereas the plain state of the case, as we shall further show, is that it has arisen from an attempt of Elder Osbourn to brand the Old School cause as connected with the SIGNS, through our western brethren, with the charge of Sabellian heresy, and the opening of the pages of the SIGNS by brother Beebe, to the brethren thus directly charged, to show the injustice of such charge. Previous to Elder Osbourn's pamphlet coming out, Mr. Booth of Dayton, Ohio, wrote a communication for the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE, in which he attempted to lead the attention of his readers off from Elder Osbourn's unchristian like charge, to brother Saunders' letter, which was designed originally as a private friendly communication to Elder Osbourn; and construing that letter about as uncandidly as Elder Osbourn himself has done, he has endeavored therefrom to fix upon brother Saunders; 1st, Osbourn's charge of Sabellianism; and 2nd, censure for presuming to make any objections to Osbourn's mode of expressing himself, and especially as Osbourn is so *experimental and spiritual a man*. Having noticed Mr. Booth's communications, I will add, that apparently to settle the point in dispute, it is a little amusing that he should give an extract from Romaine which strikes a blow at the fundamental and most objectionable point of Osbourn's system. Romaine as represented in that extract, separate from his use of the term *person*, and his telling more about the Eternal Three's entering into a *covenant agreement among themselves*, than the scriptures do, has given quite a correct view of the design of the term Father, Son and Holy Ghost as designating the Three. His language is, "They took these names, not to describe the manner in which they exist, but their manner of acting; not what they are in themselves, but how they stand related to us in the economy of Redemption, &c." What then becomes of Osbourn's position relative to the term *person*, as on page 43 of his *Calm Investigation*; namely, "that it is expressive of that perfection of the divine nature whereby it subsists three different ways, as in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, each of which persons possessing the divine essence after his peculiar manner, thereby becomes a distinct person;" that is, the Son being a begotten god in distinction from the others, and the Holy Ghost being a breathed forth god, &c.

But to return to the enquiry as to where the fault lies in this case, let us notice the facts as they have transpired: 1st. Elder Osbourn in preaching at the Miami Association in 1837, expressed himself in such a way as, in the estimation of brother Saunders, and others, to convey the idea that the *Three* were *three gods*. Brother Saunders believing that Osbourn did not in reality hold what his words implied, and that the using of such terms unexplained, would injure his usefulness, he immediately wrote an affectionate letter to Osbourn for the purpose of trying to show him the impropriety of expressing himself in so strong terms on that point, &c. The spirit of this letter shows for itself, as it

is now published. The greatest fault in the letter, in my estimation, is its containing too much flattery; but Saunders was evidently induced to speak in the highest terms he could of Osbourn's preaching, in order to prepare the way for touching the other point without giving offence. Now I appeal to the candor of any man who has not embraced the idea that Elder Osbourn is something higher than the *ordinary gifts* which the Great Head of the Church bestows for the work of the ministry, to say if there was anything wrong in Brother Saunders addressing that letter to Osbourn, under those circumstances. Was it not brotherly in him to do so? And ought not Osbourn, if he considered himself in any wise amenable to his brethren for the sentiments he advanced among them, to have thanked brother Saunders for his kindness in this, although he dissented from his views? But Saunders used in that letter some very unguarded expressions in illustrating the subject. True, he did; and Osbourn and he had shortly after an interview on the subject, and an explanation, and Saunders here considered the matter as dropped, ought not Osbourn to have so considered it? But no, Elder Osbourn treasured up those expressions for after use. He occasionally showed this letter to a few where he thought it would have effect. He also communicated those objectionable expressions, perverting entirely their application from that which Saunders manifestly designed in their use, and representing him as using them in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, to a certain Dutch Reformed Minister, in two letters together with inferences therefrom of his own, and charges of Sabellianism founded thereon, against the Old School Baptists of the West indiscriminately. Whether he expected his Paedobaptist brother to communicate these letters for publication in some Paedobaptist journal, or not, I cannot say. But one thing I can say; namely, that the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE having gotten into extensive circulation, and from the flattering respect it had paid to his communications and other publications, and he having flattered it and its conductor much in several communications, and apparently concluding that here was a periodical that would serve his interest, and having laid claim to it as such by asserting that "I have nothing to do with any other periodical at present, nor do I intend to have, &c.," {ADVOCATE, Vol.2, pg.246,} he sends on copies of those letters containing the charge against the western Old School Baptists to be circulated thereby abroad. From all the circumstances connected therewith, I do feel justified in entertaining the belief that he intended by thus throwing a firebrand into the ranks of the Old School Baptists to scatter them, and draw off a party who should follow his lead, having the ADVOCATE for their flag; and those who would not thus rally around his standard, were to be published before the whole host of the Philistines as *heretics, graceless professors, dry breasts*, &c. Now I again appeal to common candor to say whether on the principle of his having in any way identified himself with Old School Baptists, it was christian-like or honest for Elder Osbourn thus to put afloat among a denomination on which we cannot recognize as belonging to the visible gospel church, a charge of *gross heresy of the Sabellian kind*

against the Old School Baptists, limited only to the bounds of what he calls the *far west*, and afterwards to publish the same through the ADVOCATE. See the number for June, volume 2, page 367. Was not this an attack of the most wanton kind, founded as it was upon an individual's expostulating with him upon the use of certain terms, in a private and friendly way?

And I, a third time appeal to common candor to say whether those assailed brethren ought not to be allowed to come forward in their own defense, even though it was against the eminent *servant of God*, Elder Osbourn? And was it anything more than common justice in Brother Beebe to open the pages of the SIGNS to those brethren to publish in their defense, seeing his paper is *devoted to the Old School Baptist cause*? I am well aware there are Old School Baptists, who seem to think that Elder Osbourn must be allowed the privilege of labeling individual preachers, in standing among the Old School Baptists as *dry breasts*, and of charging whole communities of Old School Baptists with being *graceless professors* and *gross heretics*, and no reply must be attempted lest the *unity* of the Old School Baptists be marred. Such may think for themselves, and I will think for myself.

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

for the word, but the thing. It is enough for us to say with the text, *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost*." How does this comport with Elder Osbourn's denouncing all as *heretics* and *unregenerate*, all who will not say the Three in the above text are *Three persons*, or with Mr. Booth's pre-judging that brother Saunders is a Sabellian on the supposition that he will not admit the Three to be *Three persons*? Again on page 188, he gives a similar view of the import and design of the names Father, Son and Holy Ghost, with that given by Romaine in the passage already quoted as furnished by Mr. Booth.

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

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

sect who have ever valued themselves on their soundness in doctrine, according to the standard of a class of English authors esteemed high-toned Calvinists. Their peculiarities are; 1st. Strong assurance of their own gracious state, and having more than ordinary unctions of the Holy Spirit; 2nd. Claiming to have special revelations made to them by the Spirit; 3rd. A neglect or disregard for the ordinance of baptism and church relation; 4th. A confident denouncing as *graceless professors* all who do not warmly approve of them and their standard. The first knowledge I had of this sect was in 1811; it was then composed of six or seven females, among whom was Mrs. Ann Fradgely and Mrs. Bogart, whose names have appeared in the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE; with Mr. Doughty as their leader. They professed and appeared to have the strongest assurance, as they said communicated by the Spirit to them, that they should live to see the millennium brought in; and that Mr. Doughty was to be, under Christ, the leader in introducing it, as he professed to have his commission, if I recollect right. He used to attend public places, to make known as opportunity offered the speedy approach of the special reign of Christ and the down-fall of sects and governments, &c. I recollect of being at a place where two or three of these ladies were at tea, and hearing them assert that they had the same assurance of living to enjoy the millennium as they had of being subjects of grace; that the knowledge of both was communicated by the same Spirit; if they were deceived in one case they were in the other. So I understand Mr. Doughty contended. They mostly, if not all of them, had separated from Paedobaptist churches; Mr. Doughty and perhaps the others from the Dutch Reformed. They acknowledged believers baptism to be right, but said they were not to submit to it until the coming of the millennium. They, I believe held stated meetings for Mr. Doughty to expound the scriptures to them, but had no church relation. But after several years Mr. Doughty died without introducing the millennium; I do not recollect in what year, but when I removed back from the West in 1821, he had thus left them in extreme disappointment. They however after a length of time, as I understand, became reconciled, having an explanation wherein Mr. Doughty had been mistaken. About this time one G.H., formerly a member in the 1st Baptist church, was trying to be recognized as a leader among them, though I believe without effect. Sometime between 1824 & 1826, two or three men who had on one account or another separated from Baptist churches, united with the remaining followers of Mr. Doughty in procuring a place for worship, and Elder Osbourn located himself among them as the preacher of this mixed company of baptized and unbaptized persons and continued with them a year or more, his family remaining in Baltimore. After he left New York they became, I expect, pretty much scattered; though some of them I find, especially Mrs. Fradgley and Mrs. Bogart keep up an intercourse with certain of the Old School party of the Dutch Reformed church, as appears by a correspondence between Mrs. Fradgley and minister C.Z.P., published in the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE, for April 1839; and I presume in conjunction with Elder

Osbourn, as he has an intimate intercourse with the same party of that denomination, as evinced by a considerable portion of his correspondence as published in the ADVOCATE. Mrs. Fradgley, after Elder Osbourn made the ADVOCATE the special medium of his correspondence, sent on a letter which was published, but the number containing it I cannot now find, in which she professed that by a *vision* or special revelation of some kind she was introduced to the knowledge of that periodical, as a cloud from which she would derive some refreshment.

Now to the point of Elder Osbourn's being identified as of this peculiar sect. 1st. As to his soundness according to the standard of certain English authors, and his professing great assurance, like that sect, of being in a gracious state, and of enjoying extraordinary unctions of the Spirit, his writings abundantly testify. 2nd. To his confidently denouncing as *graceless professors* all who dare to differ from him, his writings and his resentment towards the SIGNS bear full testimony. 3rd. His disregard for the ordinance of baptism in common with that sect, is showed from the following instances. 1st. Previous to his ordination he confessed to the pastor of the church to which he then belonged that he was in favor of mixed communion; hence this pastor would take no part in his ordination, and has from that time been the object of his denunciations. 2nd. In his preface to his first bound volume; {the book I have not, and therefore quote from memory,} he, speaking of others contending for the ordinance of baptism, says, *let them give themselves to the tithing of mint and anise, whilst I will attend to the weightier matters of the law*. Thus, he contemptuously compared a contending for the ordinance of baptism to the Pharisees *tithing mint and anise*. 3rd. His consenting to settle down as the preacher to that mixed company in New York is another proof to the point, as his *brotherly* inheritance with those Paedobaptist preachers is a fourth. 5th. I shall mention, is this: At the time of the division in the Dutch Reformed church, about 1826, a family residing in New Jersey, who had separated from the New School church in that place, had thoughts of joining the Baptists, they were evidently enquiring on the subject. Baptist preachers were invited there to preach. Elder Osbourn being at that time with his party in New York repeatedly visited them and preached; I by invitation once visited them and preached. After this I enquired of a relative of this family on whose information I could rely, whether they had concluded to join the Baptists, and she said no, they had given it up, that Elder Osbourn advised them so to do, the ordinance he said was not material, and in the present state of the church, they would be more comfortable out of connection with the Baptists, than in it.

4th. That Elder Osbourn, in common with that sect, believes in special revelations communicated to him aside from the scriptures, is evident from his letters to C.B. Hassell, published in the SIGNS, Volume 3, numbers 14 & 15. In these numbers he represents the church to be in a sickly and famished state, and makes the positive

assertion that this state of things is to last for many years, and that there is to be no persecutions by the sword during that time, and this without giving one scripture as proof, but gives as his authority in the case, this declaration, “I know and am persuaded of the Lord, that my mind has been led into those things by that very Spirit which testified of Christ to my soul many years ago.” See Vol.3, page 226. If this is not a plain declaration of having received a special revelation in the case I know not what to make of it; and this aside from the scriptures, for he in the same piece pronounces it a “whim for to undertake to find out this secret by calculations of numbers, times and seasons, &c.,” which are given in the scriptures. Does not this then come up to Mr. Doughty’s revelation concerning the millennium, and like Doughty, his confidence in it, rests upon the same ground with that of his knowledge of Christ. If the same spirit made both revelations, he must have been mistaken in one case, for the views given concerning the prospects of the church by the two are very different, and how can we know that he was not mistaken in both cases; as Elder Osbourn shows us no miracles in confirmation of his prophecy. If they are allowed to have been different spirits, one is as liable to have been mistaken as the other, from all we know. We have no evidence in favor of Elder Osbourn from a comparison of the spirit and lives of the two men. Mr. Doughty was, separate from his delusion, an example as to a conscientious deportment and amiable walk, with whom Elder Osbourn would not bear a comparison, as I could show, if disposed to run a parallel on certain points.

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

Thus much for Elder Osbourn.
S.TROTT.
Centerville, Fairfax County, Va., July 6, 1840.

# ENQUIRIES CONCERNING THE SABBATH AND THE LORD'S DAY.

Brother Beebe: – I received a letter a short time since from brother Thomas McColl, of Canada West, requesting my views on Rev. 1:10, with a general reference to the observance of the first day of the week as a Sabbath. I have thought to address him, in answer, through the *Signs;* but if you think I am crowding too many communications upon you (as I have recently sent you several) for the prosperity and usefulness of the Signs, will you be so good as to enclose this in another envelope and send it to him? You know his post-office address; if otherwise, you will please publish it in its course.

Brother McColl, you mention in your letter having been accustomed to the observance of the first day of the week, as so strictly observed in Scotland, as the Sabbath, and the influence of custom on the mind. As I was in early life brought up among the New England Puritans, and was afterwards among the English Presbyterians, I know how to sympathize with you in reference to the influence of educational prejudices on the mind. But I have, I trust, as well as yourself, been led by Divine teaching to look away from all traditional teachings to the Scriptures, as the directory God has given for all religious observances. To the Scriptures therefore it becometh us to look, and to them alone, for our authority for observing the first day of the week. But in order to meet your former educational prejudices, it may be well first to enquire as to what the Scriptures teach concerning the Sabbath. We will come first to the fourth command as it stands in the decalogue, and inquire into its nature and design.

First; As to its nature in the letter of it, whether it is to be viewed as a *positive* or a *moral* command. I use the term *moral* here, not as relating to common morals, but as denoting that which has an obligation arising from the nature of things; or, in other words, that which is necessarily obliga tory in consequence of our obligation to love God, and to love our neighbor. From our Lord's teaching on this point, I am led to the conclusion that this fourth command, in the letter of it, is *positive,* and not *moral.* That which is

moral must alike be obligatory upon all who are obligated to love God and their neighbor. So the Jews seemed to view this command. Hence, when the Jews complained of the disciples doing that which was not lawful on the Sabbath day, Christ said to them, Mt. 12:5 – "Have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless?" That is, in their kindling the fire on the altar, and offering the continual burnt offerings, &c. Now if this command was moral, it would be equally obligatory upon all. None could transgress the first command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and be blameless. He further adds, in the same connection, "For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day," thus showing that this law of the Sabbath in its letter, instead of arising necessarily from man's obligation to love God, depended altogether upon His sovereign command, and hence obligatory only on those whom He had commanded to observe it. And as it was given to national Israel, distinctively from the other nations of the earth, it was only obligatory on them. Again, Christ said to the Jews, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" Mark 2:27. But man was made to honor and love God; hence it is manifest that the keeping of the Sabbath is not essential to man's loving God, only as he is especially commanded to do it. Other texts might be quoted to the same effect, but the above are, I think, sufficient to convince you or any candid inquirer that the fourth command, concerning the seventh day Sabbath is positive and not moral, and therefore binding only to those who are directly commanded to observe it. And as there is not a text in the whole Bible to show that any but the nation of Israel were commanded to rest on that day, no others are obligated to observe it. Again, a *positive* command must be *positive* in the very wording of the command, and as this command particularly specifies the *seventh* day as the day of rest, we see how futile is the reasoning of those who would represent that the spirit of the command is observed by keeping the *first* day as a day of worship.

A second inquiry relative to this command is, Why, if it is not moral, was it placed in the decalogue among those that are moral? I answer, Paul tells us that *the law is spiritual;* meaning, evidently, the whole ten commands. Again, by showing us that *Love is the fulfilling of the law* (Rom. 13:8-10), he shows us that the law in its spirit is all moral. So is the fourth command in its spiritual import. Let us consider it in its parts. First: *Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work.* There is manifestly a reference to the curse with which God cursed the ground for man's sake Gen. 3:17-19. In this, connected with his labor, or the *sweat of man's face,* is the *sorrow* with which he shall eat of the ground, and the *thorns and thistles* which it shall bring forth. Would not love to God, with all the heart, lead us patiently and cheerfully to endure the labor and to bear all the sorrows, the thistles and the thorns He has appointed to us in this world? The second branch: "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," &c. "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and

rested the seventh day," &c. Here is the reason assigned for the command, namely: That the heavens and earth and all that in them is are God's finished work; and therefore all that we are, all that we possess, and all with which we are surrounded, is God's, as being made of Him, and therefore rightfully subject alone to His government and disposal. Hence love to God would lead us to rest entirely in God, satisfied with what He has made, and for Him to dispose of us and all around us at His pleasure, and to seek to serve and glorify Him in all that we are and in all that we enjoy, not only for one day in seven, but, as *seven* and *seventh* signifies, and is used frequently to denote, a fullness and completeness, so this teaches that all our time should be the Lord's and all we do be for His glory. "By the law is the knowledge of sin." And I know of no command more fully calculated to show us our depravity, our selfishness, our want of submission to God's government, and our propensity to choose for ourselves, than is this fourth command when viewed in its spirituality. But all this is lost by confining it down to a seventh day rest. Truly, by their traditions the Gentiles, as well as the Jews, have made void the law.

A third inquiry is, Whether the seventh day rest or Sabbath is not typical, and of what? It is written, Ex. 16:29, "See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." As to the bread here spoken of, the *manna,* it was typical of that true bread which the Father giveth from heaven, so the Sabbath must be typical of a gospel rest, in which those to whom it is given shall not have to labor for the bread then to be eaten, but it shall be given them beforehand. God says to Ezekiel, "Moreover, also I gave them" (that is, Israel) "my Sabbaths for a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctifies them" Ezkl.20: 12. This must be typical of God's dealings with His spiritual Israel. But the apostle, in his epistle to the Hebrews (4:1-11), shows from a reference to the 94th Psalm that there is a rest remaining to the people of God, both after the rest which Joshua, here called (verse 8) Jesus, gave to Israel in the land of Canaan, and also God's rest on the seventh day; and further showeth it is by faith, and by that only, any do enter this rest, which was shadowed forth by the other two. This then is that rest which the believer finds in Christ. For this the reason is assigned: "For he that is entered into his rest hath ceased from his own works as God did from His" (verse 10). Many of our brethren understand by the *He,* who is entered into his rest, in this verse, the believer. It is true that when any, by faith, enter into this rest in Christ, they *cease from their own works,* but not, I think, as God did from His, as having finished it, and pronounced it all good. When Christ entered into rest in His glory, it was that He had ceased from the work of redemption, having finished it, and it was accepted as good, as well as pleasing to the Father. To the believer the fourth command and other commands concerning the Sabbath apply with full force anti-typically, and find a ready response in his heart. This work is all done beforehand. Christ has performed the whole six days work, and the curse with

its thorns is removed; and he, therefore, rests in a finished redemption; he goes no more out to *hunt sticks to kindle his fire* – no more to look for bread beyond that he finds in Christ crucified. Why, then, my brother, should we cling to the typical rest, when the substance is already come, and we find it all in believing in Christ?

A fourth inquiry is, have we scriptural authority for considering the first day of the week, as particularly pointed out, as the day for the meeting together of the churches? I think we have. I do not say for worship as is commonly said, because if we do not feel led to reverence and worship God daily, I fear our hearts are far from Him. Some, in their opposition to a legal Sabbath, may have denied that any particular day is specified as a day for the church to meet together. I differ from them on this point. I cannot think there would have been any regular meetings of the churches kept up, if there had been no particular times or days set apart by apostolic custom and authority for the churches to meet to observe those ordinances and that order which the apostles, by the authority of Christ, had enjoyed. In those times of severe persecution after the apostles day, if the meetings of particular churches had not, from time to time, been broken up so as to prevent their making appointment for any future day of meeting, they would have been tempted not to make any regular appointments to avoid persecution, and thus their regular meetings would have been broken up, and they would have had to depend on some particular notice to get together again. Take away any regular day of meeting, and you take away all regular appointments of meeting.

But if you suppose that the apostles, by their institutions, established a uniform custom in the churches of observing the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, as the day on which they were to come together, then it is evident as that day, from time to time, occurred, they would be reminded of their obligation *not to forsake the assembling of themselves together.* When we examine the New Testament on the subject, we find not as much said in reference to the observance of the first day of the week as might be expected from the confidence with which it is asserted that it is substituted for the Jewish Sabbath. From the Acts of the Apostles, it would appear that the church at Jerusalem was daily together and engaged in that which appertained to the gospel and its ministry. The apostles, as they went from place to place preaching the gospel, went, of course, where the gospel had not been preached, and where churches had not been planted. There they embraced, in the first place, the meeting together of the Jews in their synagogues on the Sabbath for preaching Jesus; and then other places of public resort, and even went from house to house preaching the gospel. In Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians, he repeatedly speaks of their gathering together and coming together in one place as a church. This, of course, implies that they had stated times of coming together, but he, in these cases, gives no information in reference to the time of

their coming together. Where, then, it may be asked, do we find any intimation of the first day being the day on which the disciples met together?

First, we know that it was on the first day of the week that our Lord arose from the dead; that He showed Himself to certain women and to Peter, and afterwards to two of His disciples, and then at night, when the disciples, with the exception of Thomas, were together, it being as expressly said, *the first day of the week* He met with them. (See Luke 24, John 20:19-23.) We are again told that after eight days His disciples were within and Thomas with them; then come Jesus, &c. (John 20:26). It has been said that the expression *after eight days* would carry this second meeting to the second day of the next week; and so it would, according to our mode of computing time. But the scriptural mode is different; according to that, the day from whence a period commences and the day on which it terminates are both computed. I need but refer to two instances to establish this position; the first is found in Lev. 23:15-16: "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering, seven sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days," &c. From the morrow after the Sabbath to the morrow after the seventh Sabbath would make but forty-nine days, unless we reckon both the morrow after the first-mentioned Sabbath, and the morrow after the seventh Sabbath in. Yet it is expressly said to be fifty days, and the feast is called Pentecost; that is, the fiftieth-day feast. The other is the declaration of Christ: "For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. 12:40).

It was about the ninth hour of the sixth day that Jesus gave up the ghost, and He arose early on the first-day morning. So that we have to reckon the sixth, seventh and first days to make the three days and nights. According to this mode of reckoning, an eight days after would bring us to the next first day at evening. Our Lord met His disciples at other times, but no mention is made of which day of the week it was. Hence we have a two-fold testimony of His meeting with them on the first days of the week, but none that He met with them on any other days than the first days.

Again the day of Pentecost, when the baptism of the Holy Ghost ushered in the kingdom of heaven in its full light, was on the first day of the week, as we have seen from Lev. 23:16; that is, the morrow *after* the Sabbath. As on this day was the first establishment of New Testament order, it would seem to designate it as the proper day of the week for the church to meet together to observe that order. We find, also, that when Paul came to Troas on a certain occasion, he waited seven days, until the *first* day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread (Acts 20:7). Again, in 1st Cor. 16:2, we find Paul, in giving directions concerning the collection for the poor saints, tells them upon *the first* day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, &c. The incidental

manner in which the *first day* of the week (or the *first of the week,* which is the same thing), is spoken of in these two instances, seems to me clearly to show that it was the custom of the disciples in those days to meet together in their church relations on that day. We have thus a double precedent of Christ's meeting with His disciples on the first day of the week, and a two-fold testimony of the apostolic churches meeting together in conformity to that precedent, as well as the clear testimony that on that day of the week, the morrow *after* the Sabbath, the apostles received their power from on high and commenced their witnessing to the resurrection of Jesus Christ in the preaching of the gospel, and that with great success.

We have thus ample testimony, as in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established, to establish the order of the disciples meeting together in their church relations, and, of course, for the churches attending to those ordinances and order, as directed in other parts of the New Testament, on the *first* day of the week. And nothing beyond this. It would seem that the Holy Ghost, in inditing the New Tes�tament, was particularly careful that nothing should be written, not an apostolic injunction, to give any countenance to that legal observance of the day as especially holy, which he foresaw would be the case by legalists. There is no authority to show that wherein disciples are in any way providentially prevented from assembling together with the church, they should observe the day as a special day of rest, any more than there is for their eating the Lord's Supper by themselves, when prevented from meeting with the church to do it. The practice of the churches meeting together on the first day of the week is marked in church history and other writings up to the apostle's days. But I know of no account of its being observed as the Sabbath, until Calvin instituted the observance of it as substituted for the seventh day, Sabbath, under the law. Mosheim, in his church history, speaking of the internal history of the church in the fourth century, says: "The first day of the week, which was the ordinary and stated time for the public assemblies of Christians, was, in consequence of a peculiar law enacted by Constantine, observed with more solemnity than it had formerly been." This shows how the first day of the week was observed previous to Constantine's time, merely as a stated time for the assembling of churches. And even Constantine's law does not seem to require its observance as a Sabbath. But Calvin taught that the Abrahamic covenant was binding on the gospel church and that the law was a rule of life to the believers. Hence the Presbyterians have observed the first day as the Sabbath, and from them the Independents or Puritans of New England regard it as the Sabbath. And from them this view of the first day has been adopted by other denominations who are by no means favorable to Calvinism.

I now come, my brother, to your text, Rev. 1:10, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." The term *Lord's day* in this text has been considered by some as designating the gospel

dispensation. The gospel day is in a peculiar sense the Lord's day; it is a day enlightened by Him as the Sun of Righteousness, and is the day of His reign, as the Mediator, having all power in heaven and in earth. It *is one day that is known* to the Lord, and is a day to be observed by His subjects, or spiritual Israel, as a day of rest, as noticed in the view of the anti-typical Sabbath. But John, I think, certainly intended to designate by this term the particular day, or point of time, in which the Lord Jesus appeared to him, to make known to him the things written in that book. And I think it altogether probable that the first day of the week was intended. But I cannot think that this name was given to it to denote that the Lord claimed this day as especially His out of the seven days of each week. For, as noticed above, the whole gospel day is peculiarly His, in which He exercises His kingly power, and in which He requires His Israel to rest from all their works, and to honor and obey Him. If this name was designed to designate the first day of the week, it was evidently designed to mark it as the day observed by the saints for assembling together in commemoration of Christ, as the other days of the week were named after certain heathen gods, and probably to denote the times of their worship.

There is one point more in connection with this which it seems proper to notice. It has been contended that for the good of man, and of society, men should rest from their worldly labors one day in seven; and there are evident traces of such weekly rest being observed by other nations beside the Jews. To all this, in itself considered, I do not object. And I have no doubt that God, in giving laws to Israel as a nation, had in view their natural good in giving them the seventh day Sabbath, as well as their other holy days and sabbaths. But when these things are brought forward as arguments to support the idea of a first day Sabbath as belonging to the religion of Jesus Christ, I do seriously object to it. According to the argument, this *rest* belongs to national or worldly policy; but the religion of Christ belongs to a kingdom not of this world. As our Lord has, in His revelation of the institution and order of His religion, severed it from all connection with worldly governments, not intermeddling with their laws and policies. They have no business to intermeddle with His religion, or to hitch any of their policies or plans on to it. If civil governments think that custom and public opinion are not sufficient to protect the dependent laborer in the enjoyment of his weekly day of rest, it might be proper to pass laws requiring the release of minors, servants, &c., from their regular daily labor one day of seven, on the same principle with the ten and twelve hour systems of daily labor adopted by some States. But they have no right, under pretense of authority from God, to connect anything of religion with it, any further than to have those whose religious views would lead them to observe the seventh instead of the first day, to do so.

I have thus, my brother, given you what I think is, and what I believe you will on examination find to be, a scriptural view both of the Jewish Sabbath and of the New Testament practice of meeting together on the first day of the week. I have been lengthy,

because I wished to take in review the whole subject in its various connections. I shall probably be thought too tedious on the subject, but I hope you will bear with that.

With brotherly regards, Yours,
Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
March 21, 1856.
S. Trott.

From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.24 (1856)
Writings from Elder Samuel Trott
pages 414 – 422

# EXPERIMENTAL DARKNESS.

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

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

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

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

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

before. Indeed if the Lord should continue me only in consideration of my usefulness or fruitfulness, I think he must take me away very speedily as a barren branch.

With christian regards yours,
S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., April 29, 1848.

## EXPLANATION OF THE TERMS: NATURAL & CARNAL.

BROTHER BEEBE: – Will you permit me to propose an answer for the consideration of brethren a little differing from yours on page 113 of the SIGNS for Aug.1, 1848 – to the first of Elder Goldsmith's queries on page 115, same number. To your answer to the second query I have no objections.

This first query is, "Is it certain that *natural* and *carnal* are synonymous terms as *used in the Scriptures*? You give an answer according to the import of the two words as found in lexicons, but the query was in reference to the use of the terms in the Scriptures. There is this difference in this, as in some other cases. Lexicons speak of men and things as they are manifested in the world to the natural eye, or human reason, the Scriptures speak of them by the revelation of God. I understand, and so I presume you do, the term *carnal* in its application to man as designating him as depraved. This is what I understand God as charging him with, when he says, "For that he also is flesh." Gen. 6:3. As man universally is *flesh* or *depraved* we cannot contemplate the *natural* man as he exists in the world but as *carnal*. But the term natural is not, I think, in the scriptures confined to man as carnal or depraved. My recent experience on the point is this; in preaching a short time since, I had occasion to quote I Cor. 2:14, "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, &c.," and in quoting it the idea was presented with considerable force to my mind that the Apostle did not design to convey the idea only, that man in consequence of his fallen state, "receiveth not the things," but, that man as *made a living soul*, being of the earth, earthy, had no faculty, either in his original upright, or present fallen state, capable of *receiving the things of the Spirit of God*, and I

so explained the passage. In reviewing the subject since, I have been confirmed in the correctness of that idea, both from the connection of that text, and from the use of the term *natural* in I Cor. 15:44-46, where it is evidently used to denote man in his original creation as distinguished by his peculiar formation, faculties, &c., from the *second man who is the Lord from heaven*; without its having any special bearing as to the state of man, either as upright or fallen. Hence whilst the word is here used in relation to man in his original creation, and therefore whilst in his upright state, it is just before, in verse 44, used in relation to the human body as mortal and therefore as subject to the consequences of sin. So that neither uprightness, nor carnality are essential to man as natural. If I am correct in these views, the terms *natural* and *carnal* or *flesh* as found in the Scriptures are not strictly synonymous. The difference is about this; the *carnal man* is the natural man as he exists in consequence of the disobedience of Adam, a depraved creature; the natural man, is the same man, as he exists in his distinct formation and powers as a creature of God, whether in his original upright or present carnal state. From what I have said, it will be seen that one expression of mine found in the queries I proposed, published in SIGNS for July 15, 1848, page 106, is according to my present views incorrect. It is this, "Is the *mind* which by *nature* is earthly and *fleshly* &c.?" The mind of man is by nature *earthly* being so formed of God as adapted to man's earthly residence. But man's mind is *fleshly* or *carnal*, by *the offence of one*, Adam. This makes the idea involved in the query still more formable, for the mind of man in order to become spiritual and heavenly must be changed both from its *carnal* state and its earthly nature. Excuse me, Brother Beebe, for introducing my views in answer to a query addressed to you and differing from yours. I thought perhaps the query was induced by my expressions above referred to, though not meeting them exactly. Besides as the query was introduced, I wished it to receive an answer through the SIGNS, such as the scriptures will fully justify. If you and I have both failed in giving a correct answer, some other brother may be induced to set the thing right.

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Aug. 4, 1848.

# EXPOSITION OF COL. 1:12.

"Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."

Dear Brother Beebe: – Having had my mind somewhat impressed for some time past with the text, Col. 1:12, and having some more distinct views than formerly of its import, I have thought of offering a few remarks on the passage. Although the subject and my remarks may be considered controversial, as differing from the opinions of some others, yet my object is to present for the consideration of the brethren my view of the subject. Whether they be correct, or whether they be of any importance, they may judge. Brother Dudley has anticipated me on some points of my subject, but there are other points not in contradiction to what is contained in his excellent communication in the fourth number of the present volume, which I wish to notice.

The text reads thus: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." The expression, "Giving thanks unto the Father, which, &c.," clearly shows that the making meet, &c., is the work of God and not of the creature. But that on which I wish particularly to remark is the *making meet to be partakers of the inheritance,* &c. By the expression, "the inheritance of the saints in light;" whether we understand by the *saints in light,* the saints in glory, or believers in general, I think none will dispute that we are to understand the inheritance to be that inheritance *which is incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them;* and therefore that it must be entirely distinct from that inheritance which was given to the natural seed of Abraham through the lineage of Isaac and Jacob. That was a natural inheritance and the nature derived by their natural birth as the posterity of Abraham, and certified by their circumcision, made *them meet to be partakers* of it, their nature being suitable to the enjoyment of it, and they being known as the legitimate posterity of Abraham, see Gen. 17:1-14. But the inheritance of which

our text speaks is not earthly, but heavenly; not corruptible, but incorruptible, not natural, but spiritual; it is not given of God merely as the sovereign disposer of events upon covenant obligations and conditions, but it is bequested of God as a Father, for an inheritance for His children. Hence it appears to me that to those who have ears to hear what the Spirit saith it is an easy task to describe what is requisite to make any meet for this inheritance. We must possess a nature that is heavenly, incorrupting, and spiritual; for without a nature corresponding to the inheritance we cannot enjoy it. And further we must have the witness that we are the children of God, "and if children then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together" Rom. 8:16,17. The question may be asked whether adoption, with its necessary accompaniments: redemption, and emancipation from the law, would constitute this *meetness* for the inheritance? It might make us *partakers of the inheritance,* but not *meet* to be partakers of it; and our text speaks of being meet to be partakers, &c. Adoption and redemption have an important place in our being made heirs, because as the children of Adam we are bond servants under the law until redeemed, emancipated and made partakers of the spirit of adoption. But redemption and adoption give no new nature. They only make us, as we were the children of Adam, legally partakers of the inheritance, without giving that heavenly, that spiritual nature, adapted to the nature of the inheritance. Hence the declaration; *ye must be born again,* sounds as emphatically from the word as does the doctrine of adoption or redemption. It bears as prominent a place in the gospel revelation, is as important a point in the plan of salvation. I see not why the declaration, "Except a man be born again," &c., is not as definite in its import as are the declarations concerning adoption and redemption; or how a person can speak loosely of the nature of the new birth any more than he can of the nature of redemption, consistently with a correct view of gospel doctrine.

The question may be asked, whether we understand by the terms *regeneration,* and *born again, born of God,* &c., *a washing?* Do we not form an adequate idea of what is intended to be conveyed by those terms in the Scriptures? I answer, No.

1. Because the idea conveyed by the terms being born, in their uniform use, is very different from that conveyed by the terms being washed.

2. Because no washing can give to an earthly person a new and heavenly nature. No washing will change the *Ethiopian's skin,* or the *Leopard's spots.* No washing will change the sow into a sheep, but after being washed she still retains her old nature, and will therefore *return to her wallowing in the mire.* But do not the terms *washing of regeneration* found in Titus 3:5, convey the idea that washing and regeneration are one and the same? Will any say the terms *renewing of the Holy Ghost,* found in immediate connection, convey the idea that the renewing and the Holy Ghost are one and the same? Yet both expressions are similar in construction. The plain manifest import of the one

expression is that the renewing is the result of the operation or communication of the Holy Ghost; so that of the other is that the washing is the result of regeneration. The one is the Holy Ghost's renewing, or a renewing which is experienced only where the Holy Ghost is given (John 7:39), the other is regeneration's washing or a washing which is experienced where regeneration takes place. There is an experience of washing, both of the water and of the blood, resulting from regeneration. But I think I have said enough to show any true inquirer after truth that this text does not convey properly the idea that a washing is regeneration; and I know of no text of Scripture that does.

But the question returns. What do the terms regeneration and born again mean? I cannot conceive that anyone has a right to say that they do not mean just what they say; that *regeneration* is not a regeneration, that being *born again* is not a being born again. If then no one has authority to say that the meaning of these terms do not correspond with the word used; I think I may safely say they do mean what the words import. And this is just what is needed to make us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. For as showed, the inheritance is not earthly or fleshly, but spiritual. In our first birth we were born of the flesh, and that which *is born of the flesh is flesh,* and will remain till death does its office to return it to dust. That only *is spirit which is born of the spirit.* In our first generation we were generated as the seed of Adam the *living soul,* but *earthy man.* Those who are regenerated are generated a second time; generated as the seed of the second Adam, who is the *Lord from heaven* and a *quickening spirit.* In the first birth, persons are brought into manifest existence in a nature that is of the *earth, earthy.* In being born again, they are born of a nature that is spiritual and heavenly; capable of receiving the things of the Spirit, and enjoying that which is heavenly. So that those who are *born again* exist in an *old man* and in a *new man,* in the same person; exist as the seed of Adam and as the seed of Christ; as the children of Adam and the children of God. Hence, notwithstanding their *old man* clinging to its mother earth and corrupt, yet they are made meet to be partakers of the incorruptible inheritance; for who so meet to partake of the inheritance laid up by a father as his own children? Hence the declaration of Paul before quoted: "If children, then heirs of God." &c. I have above represented this second birth to be of the seed of Christ, and I think I have truly so represented it according to the Scripture. But our text reads, "Giving thanks unto the Father who hath made us meet," &c. How is this? It is even so: The believer is born of life and *Christ is their life* (Col. 3:4); he is born of the Spirit and the Lord is the spirit of the New Testament, II Cor. 3: 17. The second Adam was made, not a living soul, but a *quickening spirit.* What is it that quickens a dead body but life imparted? So what will quicken a dead soul but spiritual life imparted? Christ is that spirit and is that life. Hence that which is in the believer, the hope of glory according to the Scriptures, is not the old soul new formed, but it is Christ in him Col. 1:27. That Christ is the seed, the life of which the children of God are born, I have contended (if brother Beebe, you will allow

me to glance a little at old things), heretofore as now; but though charged with it, I never have said that Christ, as the quickening spirit, was the regenerator. I have said that I knew not from the Scriptures, or to what effect that the Holy Ghost, as such, was the regenerator. And I have said that the Scriptures ascribed the work to God, but whether as Father, or Word, or as Holy Ghost, they did not say. Here, according to my present construction of this text, I was mistaken. For what does the text say? "Giving thanks unto the Father," &c., not unto the Word or the Holy Ghost. But how has the Father made us meet? 1. The *new man,* which I understand to be the production of the *new birth,* is said to be *after God created in righteousness, and true holiness.* Again it is said, "For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works" &c. If then we were created in Christ Jesus, we are, in our second birth, the seed of Christ, as our being created in Adam constituted us the seed of Adam; but in both cases it was God that created us; in the one case as servants, in the other as sons. In the second place, it is God, even the Father, that regenerates. For it is written, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" &c. God's shining in the heart to give the, light of the knowledge, &c., is His regenerating, by imparting that *life which is the light of men.* Hence Christ said, "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." If Christ is that *eternal life which was with the Father* (see John 1:2), and that life is the light of men, then God shines in the heart to give the light of the knowledge, &c., by regenerating with that life.

I have thus given my view of what it is to be *made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light,* and who it is that makes meet. It is not for me to say that God could not in any other way meeten heirs for His inheritance, but I think I may say, this is the standard which God has revealed, "If children then heirs;" and that these children are born children by a second birth; born not of the flesh, but of the spirit; born *not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;* born not as the seed of Adam, but as the seed of Christ. I think also from the view I have taken of the Scripture testimony on the subject that, although there is a *washing of water by the word* and a washing *from our sin in the blood of Christ* connected with salvation, yet that no washing can constitute the regeneration and new birth spoken of in the Scriptures, or can change one from a natural person to a spiritual born child of God. You may wash an African slave until you rub the skin off and yet you cannot make him a free born son of his white master.

I do desire that our brethren would examine this, and other subjects of like importance, carefully in the light of the Scriptures; and be careful that they look at it in the Scripture light, and not in that of the theories of men. If the Scriptures do not sustain the views I

have given, I hope any discovering the error will point it out in the spirit of christian love.

I remain yours; the same poor sinful wretch as when younger.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia.
March 8, 1855.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.23 (1858)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 409-414

# GNOSTICISM.

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

A strong evidence to me that the church of Christ, at this time, is not only surrounded with Babylonish confusion, but is about to find herself captive in Babylon, is the great propensity manifest by our brethren to *refuse the waters* of Shiloh that go softly, and to rejoice in something new or strange, something which has the velocity of human imagination in it. Whilst Judah was content to drink the waters of Shiloh which flowed from the foot of Mount Zion, they were kept of course from being far scattered from their home. But when they must take other and untried waters, God for this discontent, *brought upon them the waters of the river, strong and many*. See Isa. 8:6,8. So of spiritual Judah, if they would be content with the simple testimony of Scriptural revelation, made plain in their experience, they would be of one heart, and speak the same things. But whilst we must have human expositions on the one hand, or on the other, allow imagination to stretch itself to bring in something more *full* and more *rapid*, than what we find in the Scriptures, we shall be confused in our views, and scattered in

our feelings; and God will bring upon us the strong waters of Babylon and cause them to *go over* and *reach even to the neck*. Ah, they may reach *even to the neck*, but their proud waves must stop there; Zion's Head cannot be brought under; whilst this is her case, though she may be greatly *chilled*, there is no danger of her *drowning*.

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

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

The preceding remarks I had written, previous to receiving the 18th number of the SIGNS, in which Brother Beebe proposes to publish in pamphlet form, a "Scriptural Refutation of the Two Seed Doctrine." I shall now omit the remarks I had intended on that subject. I will go on to remark that the origin of the devil, so far as it is viewed merely in relation to his existence, is a subject not worth contending for. But when men will, in advancing their opinions on that point, publish that which reflects on the character of God, or the truth of Divine Revelation, no lover of God's truth can, I think, consistently hold his peace from bearing testimony against it. If one opinion is attempted to be pulled down, merely to build up another equally imaginary, it is labor poorly spent. When the sentiment is advanced among the Old School Baptists that the *devil was made such* of God, I feel bound to bear testimony against it, because it represents sin and holiness to be both on a footing as to their origin, making both to proceed directly from God, contrary to that revelation which God has given of himself, as a God of infinite holiness and purity, as "Righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works." Psal.145:17. On the other hand, in representing the devil as a self-existent being, he is set up as a competitor with God for the sovereignty of the universe; each alike existing in the universe by his own independent power, each so far as I can conceive, might, on this principle, have an equal claim to the sovereignty. Besides it is giving to the devil a claim to the name Jehovah, which is expressive of self-existence, when the Scriptures declare that God's *name alone is Jehovah*. Psal.33:18. Beside this, it strikes a fatal blow at the doctrine of predestination, making the whole purpose of God going before, concerning the plan of redemption, and the events which should take place in the world, a matter of entire contingency. For if the devil exists by his own pleasure and independent of God, then his acts would be alike independent of God and according to his own and not God's counsel. It is true, Elder Parker to obviate this, lays down the position, that the devil by coming into God's dominions comes under his law and was subject to his government. But were we to admit the consistency of this idea, it would not obviate the difficulty in the way of God's having beforehand and certain purpose as to the government of the world. It, from the nature of things, is impossible, that God could have known beforehand, with certainty, that the devil would enter the garden of Eden, unless he from the beginning so existed in dependence on God, as to give God a governing control over all his movements; and without this certain knowledge that the devil would enter the garden and tempt the woman, it is gross absurdity to suppose, that God could with certainty have predetermined those events which *have transpired in the world consequent upon sin*. Brother Newport's Declaration of Faith, published in the 1st number of the Predestinarian Baptist, is as good as any I ever read; and how it is, he can thus believe in the predestinating purpose of God, and yet believe that the devil, who has had so great an agency in all the events of the world, existed independent of God and therefore entirely without his control, until he appeared in the garden, is to me strange. I

wish he would explain this point for us, and let us know how far back, according to his and Elder Parker's views of the existence of the devil, God's predestinating purpose can be extended. Elder Parker I am told has published an answer in the Predestinarian Baptist to my remarks on his *Third Dose*. He may in that have offered some explanation on these points, as I have never seen it, for although most of the Numbers have been sent me by the kindness of some friend, the Number containing that, with some others, has never reached me.

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

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

## GOSPEL ORDER.

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

I am somewhat surprised, that any O.S. brethren should harbor the idea, that a departure from the faith should be no bar to fellowship; or that corruption should be held in estimation as if manifesting a body of persons, to be a church of Christ, equally with truth and disorder, and disorder equally with order. I readily admit, that there is no direction given in the New Testament, for churches dealing with and excluding other churches, as is the case with individual members. But be it also remembered, that the New Testament contains no authority for churches combining, or being bound together with churches in any external union or form, by which any such discipline, or exclusion,

or act of dismissal, should be required to produce a separation. Neither do the scriptures justify us in owning the *tares* as wheat, the synagogues of Satan as churches of Christ, error as truth, or contempt of Christ as obedience to Him; nor our recognizing any body of people, not continuing steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, as a gospel church. Such being the fact, relative to New Testament authority on the subject, the opinion of those spoken of by brother Ashbrook, stands at once condemned, as being *antichristian usurpation*, and *not* gospel order; I mean, that it is usurpation, which requires us to fellowship everything brought in by the will of man. I will, however, enlarge a little on this subject.

The Redeemer's interest, as established in the world, is called a *kingdom*, but a kingdom *not of this world*; accordingly we find its manifestation under the ministry of the apostles. The Apostles, as they planted churches, instead of combining them under territorial governments and these again being made subject to a great central, visible power, after the manner of the governments of this world – gathered a little flock at Antioch, one at Ephesus, at Philippi, several in the region of Galatia, called the *churches* of Galatia. Each of these was organized as a distinct church, having its own bishops or elders and deacons; and when addressed, were addressed distinctly as a church, whether on doctrine, order or discipline; so that in each place, where the gospel standard was planted, the kingdom of Christ appeared only as a *little flock* meeting together for worship, having nothing in its appearance calculated to alarm the fears of the governments of this world, as though it were a power growing up to overturn their authority. It is true, jealousies and opposition were aroused against these lambs of Christ, but not by any just provocation from the Gospel.

When the interest of Christ collectively is spoken of, it is called *the church*, as it is the one body of Christ; but when spoken of as manifested in the world, *the churches*, and *the churches of the saints*, are mentioned; each a little flock by itself having no other bond of union with each other, than that invisible bond of being made to center in Christ, and on being quickened by the *one Spirit*; and having no visible form of union {except the congregating of individuals in church relation,} but the "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and being "called in one hope of their calling." But so soon as Antichrist began to gain power in the churches, the propensity to mould the visible form of the church into a conformity to the kingdoms of this world, was manifested; and we quickly find territorial bishops, assuming a control over all the churches in a certain district, and these again uniting under the government of patriarchs, or of archbishops and a Pope. And when the Reformation took place, the same disposition was manifested, in all the reformed churches, to have their government conformed to the kingdoms of this world; and each sect has to this day its confederacies and combined government over the churches. We can but be struck, in reading history, with the distinction in narrating the

state of the Novatians and Donatists, {as those who separated from the corruptions of the early church were called,} from that of the other sects, these are only spoken of by their churches, whilst others are mentioned by their bishoprics, patriarchies, &c. The same peculiarity is observable in the history of the Waldenses. No instance can be produced, wherein the Baptist churches, either during the apostolic period, or after their separation from the corruptions of the churches, until since the reformation, were confederated into any kind of territorial bodies, or under any external form of central government, or oversight. During the former part of the 17th century, the Baptists in England took it into their heads to try to get rid of the peculiar odium and persecutions, which as Baptists they had suffered. To accomplish this they held general meetings to agree on a *one confession of their faith*; these meetings they ultimately molded into constituted associations, by which under the notion of *advisory councils* they might keep an oversight over the churches and prevent their showing any departure from the *one confession of faith*, lest they should be charged with duplicity in putting it forth, as Mosheim does the Mennonites. And, as an additional preventative against contempt and persecution, they adopted measures, such as the establishment of schools &c., for having an educated ministry. From this move, associations have become general among the Baptists.

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

and practice, what in truth it is, *wheat* or *tare*, a church of Christ, or of antichrist; and each church alike free to recognize another body as a gospel church, or an antichristian combination, according as they may judge that they discover the marks of the one or the other.

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

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

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

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

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

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

S.TROTT.
Nov. 8, 1843.

## HEAVENS DISSOLVED, AND ELEMENTS MELT WITH FERVENT HEAT

VIEWS ON II Pet. 3:12-13

Dear Brother Beebe: I see in No.21, Sister Dutton requests my views on II Peter 3: 12-13. "Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

I somewhat regret being called on for my views on this text; because, in the first place, I think I have in some of the earlier volumes of the Signs expressed my views of it, and,

secondly, I am aware that my views of this text differ from those of some of the brethren whom I have quite as much reason to believe are, in their general views, subjects of God's teaching, as I hope that I have myself been thus taught. Still, as I am not convinced of the error of my views, I will give them.

The first point of enquiry is, What are we to understand by the heavens and earth which are to be burned, and what by the new heaven and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness? The opinion of some is that by the former we are to understand the covenant of circumcision and legal dispensation, as being appointed of God a fixed residence for national Israel to dwell in; and that by the latter is intended the new covenant and gospel dispensation. I admit that the terms heaven and earth are sometimes used to denote the old covenant and legal dispensation; as in Is. 13:13 & Hag.2:6-7, compared with Heb. 12:26-28. I also admit that in the gospel covenant and kingdom there dwelleth righteousness. But the heavens and earth spoken of in these texts were to be shaken and moved from their place, not burned, that I am informed of. This, as I understand, according to the prophecy of Haggai, was by the coming of Christ, when He gave up the Ghost, having taken the hand writing of ordinances out of the way and nailed it to His cross. Hence the veil of the temple was then rent in twain, showing that God no longer dwelt in the holy place of the temple, and was there no longer to be worshipped by legal rites. And from the day of Pentecost believers have dwelt under the dispensation and blessings of the new covenant, and received that kingdom which cannot be moved. But the old heavens and earth of which Peter speaks were yet reserved unto fire, when he wrote A. D. 65, thirty-two years after the gospel dispensation or kingdom of heaven had come and taken the place of the legal dispensation. And the new heavens and new earth of which he spake were yet looked for as something yet future.

But, secondly, taking the context as a correct criterion by which to judge of what Peter intended by the heavens and earth that were reserved unto fire, we must conclude that he spake of the natural heavens and earth, which still exist. For in verses 5 & 6, he speaks of the heavens of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water, whereby the world that then was being overflowed with water perished; meaning, evidently, the antediluvian world which perished. Consequently, the heavens and the earth, which, he says, verse 7, are now by the same word; that is, which still exist by the same word of God, are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men, must be the same natural heavens and earth. However slack God may appear to some men to be, in thus destroying this world, yet Peter assures us that "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burnt up" Verse 10. Hence I understand the apostle to mean what his language so definitely expresses, that these material heavens are to pass

away, and this earth, with all the works which belong to it, are to be burned up. Hence also by the new heavens and new earth which, he says, is looked for, I understand him to refer to a distinct place of residence where the saints, being raised and changed when this day of the Lord shall come, shall forever be with the Lord.

The idea has been entertained that these heavens and this earth being dissolved and burnt up, they will only be burned over and purified by fire. Whether Peter's strong language will admit of such construction, I will not stop to enquire. To me, it is of no importance whether the new heavens and the new earth are to be formed out of these old materials, or whether they will be altogether new. The revealed change of the bodies of the saints at the resurrection, from natural to spiritual bodies, would favor the idea of a change of the present heavens and earth, corresponding thereto, for their future residence. The saints, though their bodies will be raised spiritual bodies, must still occupy some locality, because they will not be omnipresent. The same is the case with the glorified body of the Son of God. Where He is, there will be the heaven of the saints, there they will behold the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person, for such is the Son. But of whatever the new heavens and new earth may be composed, there are important differences between them and the present heavens and earth, some of which I will notice. 1st. In the heavens which John saw, there was no more sea; consequently there will be there no water needed, but the fountain of the water of life; no materiality there Rev. 21:1-6. 2ndly. There will be no temple there, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. They will truly worship God as they will see Him in the Lamb, in spirit, without any need of external forms to express their worship. They will be wholly swallowed up in and filled with the love of God Rev. 21 :22. 3rdly. There will be "no need of the sun nor the moon there, for the glory of God and the Lamb, will be the light thereof. And there will be no night there" Rev. 21 :23-25. As the saints will be wholly changed from natural to spiritual in their bodies, there will to them be no natural darkness and no need of natural light. And as the Lamb, who is the light thereof, will be constantly present with them, and the brightness of the glory of God constantly shining upon them, there will be no spiritual night or darkness there.

Again, Peter informs us that righteousness dwelleth therein. In this world dwelleth sin, making it a sin-defiled and sin-disordered world. There is no purity, no truth in it; look where we will within ourselves, or without, we behold corruption, and that which maketh a lie. But because in the new heavens and earth dwelleth righteousness, according to the pure law of love, there "shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither that worketh abomination or a lie" Rev. 21:27. Hence, there shall be there "no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor pain" Rev. 21:4. What a glorious and happy residence the saints will have in their heavenly inheritance!

I will now pass to notice Peter's exhortation to the saints in view of those things of which he wrote. In doing this, I will also take the 11th verse in connection. "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness. Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God," &c. I do not understand Peter here as intending to shake the minds of, or trouble or terrify, the saints to whom he wrote any more than Paul did the Thessalonian brethren by writing to them that: "the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night," &c. I Thes. 5:l-3 & II Thes. 2:1-1O. It is not much to be wondered at, that persons who view the Scriptures as an instrument of terror to drive people to a servile religion rather than as a revelation of peace and good will to men, should,. in view of such declarations as this of Peter's and the one of Paul's just noticed, do as did many in the latter part of the tenth century, who, thinking that the millennium or the thousand years of Christ's reign on earth was about closing, and therefore that the world was about coming to an end, gave up their possessions to the Catholic Church, and became monks and hermits; or as did the Millerites a few years back in running into all their wildness, manifesting, in both these cases, and in many others, that "God had sent them strong delusions that they should believe a lie." But you, my sister, I trust, are not left to that delusion which would lead you to suppose that, to maintain a holy conversation and godliness, you must neglect to fill with fidelity your station in society and in the world, or that you must neglect to provide things honest in the sight of all men. The truth is, we manifest more of a holy conversation and godliness by a proper attention to the wants of our families, and to the several affairs of this life appertaining to our station, than by neglecting them. A holy conversation and godliness are a deportment corresponding with our profession of not being our own, but the Lord's, and of being governed in all things by His revealed word. The consideration that all worldly relations and things are perishing and hasting to dissolution should keep us mindful that our inheritance is not here, and lead us to live as those who are looking for another and better country. Such a sense of things would prevent our being covetous and grasping after the world, and from hoarding it up. If we are entrusted in Providence with this world's goods, whilst as faithful stewards we shall not waste it by extravagance or neglect, we shall hold it as not our own but the Lord's, subject to be taken from us if He pleases, or to be used for the good of His cause and people where the duty is pointed out by His word. If in providence we are destitute of this world's goods, we shall still manifest a cheerful and thankful spirit, knowing that a destitution of these things is no evidence that we are not heirs of God or objects of His love and care. Hence also, in our holy conversation we shall not suffer these perishing things of time, nor reproaches, nor persecution to hinder us from attending upon our ministry, if in the fellowship of the church we have been called to minister, nor from assembling ourselves together with the saints to whom we have given ourselves to walk

in fellowship; nor from connecting ourselves with the poor and despised followers of the Lamb, if we have a good hope of being saved through grace.

Looking for and hasting unto the coming; or, hasting the coming day of God, as it reads in the margin. Not that we are to look for or hasten the coming of that day by practicing the devices of men for hastening on what they call the millennium. Nor that we are to expect its coming before the whole purpose of God, revealed in the Scriptures to transpire in the world shall have been accomplished. Nor that we are to hasten its coming personally to ourselves by dissolving our connections with the world by suicide or by secluding ourselves from it, but by habitually looking for the coming of the day of God wherein all these earthly things and relations shall be dissolved, we shall hasten the coming of that day in our experience, in that we shall thereby feel less tied to the world and less solicitude and anxiety about its affairs, and live more in the anticipation of the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Could we thus live in anticipation of that glorious residence which is in reserve for the saints, the warfare within, temptations without, poverty, and other afflictions, reproaches and persecutions, and the commotions in the world, would have less effect upon us to disturb our peace than they now do with many of us.

In answer to Sister Dutton's request, I have given such views as I have on this portion of Scripture. Happy would it be for many of us (I speak of such as, with myself, have reason to complain of our coldness and want of spiritual enjoyment) if we might be enabled, by grace, to give more heed to Peter's injunction, in view of the day of darkness and trouble which seems fast coming upon the church; we should then find, according to Paul's declaration: "Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." That is, the new heavens and new earth which the day of God shall reveal.

With Christian regards, Elder Samuel Trott
Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia, Dec. 15, 1856.
SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 25 (1857)

# INQUIRIES & REPLIES

FOR THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

AN INQUIRY #1

BROTHER BEEBE: – In the DOCTRINAL ADVOCATE for June 1839, there is a letter from Elder James Osbourn to the Editor, containing some remarks which I wish to bring to the notice of our Western Old School Brethren. Elder Osbourn, after noticing his book, which professes to be an exposure of missionism in the great valley of the Mississippi, refers to errors of a most pernicious kind as existing in that country, and then says, "I shall venture to say that the great darkness and the odious errors now alluded to, are to be found and there too I found them, among men and churches professing orthodoxy, and the true Christian faith. But forsooth orthodoxy and Old Schoolism are terms which stand but for little, etc. Hence a man may be a full grown Quaker under the unmeaning term, as it is now mostly used, of orthodoxy; or a gross heretic of the Sabellian kind under the abstruse and new fangled term of Old Schoolism. And in short, thus it is with the people now referred to in the far West. They indeed greatly pride themselves in what is called orthodoxy and Old Schoolism, and yet they literally hiss at and make common sport of a TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE ETERNAL GODHEAD, and insultingly call the divine Father, PA, and the Holy Ghost a TOOL. And hence under this orthodoxy and Old Schoolism we clearly see heterodoxy and downright blasphemy, etc."

I think there must be some mistake in this matter. But mistake or not, the thing has gone out, through what is recognized as an Old School periodical, as an indiscriminate charge against our Western brethren, for the New School party to rejoice in. If the above charge is true, I do not blame Elder Osbourn for pronouncing it blasphemy. Not that I am disposed to consider it blasphemous to deny that the Three, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost are in any sense three Gods, or that they are three distinct persons, or that they blaspheme who dissent from the Nicene Creed, or from my creed concerning the divine Three, in which the One God has revealed himself, providing that either of the Three is not degraded. But when we consider that Father, is one of the names by which God has been pleased to declare himself, as expressive of a relation which, he, the Father sustains in the economy of salvation, as he is declared to be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and Christ says to his disciples, "I ascend unto my Father and

your Father, and to my God and your God;" I say when we consider these things, we must conclude that no person having a becoming reverence for God, whatever may be his views of the doctrine of the Trinity, can trifle with or make sport of this name and relation in which God has revealed himself. Neither can we conceive that any such person would either deridingly or considerately speak of him as a tool of whom Christ thus speaks, "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of Truth, etc." John 14:16-17. And again, "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, etc." I hope therefore that some of our Old School Brethren of the West will set this matter right; if it is a wrong charge which Elder Osbourn has made, that they will clear it up; or if any do hold in contempt the names and relations, Father and Holy Ghost, I say not, as declared in the Athanasian Creed, but as declared in the Scriptures; I desire that they may be made manifest; and be no longer recognized as of us. If this charge had come from our avowed enemies it might well be passed unnoticed; but coming from the quarter it has, I do think it calls for some attention.

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

Yours, etc.
S. TROTT
July 1, 1839.

## AN INQUIRY #2.

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

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

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

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

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

# IS LOVE THE BOND OF UNION?

Brother Beebe: – As we sometimes hear some of our ablest preachers say that love is the bond of union between Christ and His church and people; I have presented the above query hoping that some who thus assert will show us by good authority and argument that it is so; or failing, become convinced that they have been asserting for revelation, a traditional or self-invented notion. But in proposing the query for the consideration of others, I presume I may be allowed to accompany it with a statement of some of my objections to the idea. It is true, the advocates of the idea that love is the bond of union sometimes say in proof of it that love constitutes the union of husband and wife. But the proof fails from its own falsity. Love may unite a couple in affection, but it is not that which unites them as husband and wife, neither legally or scripturally. Not legally; for many couples have loved each other who have never legally become man and wife; whilst other couples, it is apprehended, are legally united as one flesh who never loved each other. Scripturally, it is a becoming one flesh that constitutes the relation of husband and wife. Hence Paul after exhorting "husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the church" goes on to say, "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." (Eph. 5:29) In the case of Adam and Eve, in which is the true representation of the union of man and wife, and a true figure of union of Christ and His church, the ground of their union as assigned by Adam was that she was "bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh." (Gen. 2:23,24) One more remark I will make before assigning my objection, viz. that the life in which Christ and His people are one is love, it is the spirit of the law, it is love to God, and therefore the union in this defined sense I admit is one of love. If brethren in speaking of love as the bond of union were thus to explain and define their meaning as characterizing the holy nature of that life in which Christ and His people are one, I should not object to the idea. But in speaking of love as the bond of union, persons are generally understood as conveying the idea that the exercise or feelings of love each toward the other is what constitutes the union; and in fact it is mostly so represented.

My first objection to the idea that love is the bond of union as generally understood is that, as the love must be mutual in order to constitute the union between parties, this doctrine represents Christ, if a head, a head without any existing body until man was created, and as even now having but parts of a body united to Him; many predestinated members not yet being brought to love Him. For though Christ's love may have gone forth from eternity to His members as existing in purpose, yet it is evident His people never love Him until born of God. A loving head without a living body united to it would be a monster.

My second objection to the idea that love constitutes the union of Christ and His people is that it represents love as a distinct existing principle, contrary to every authorized conception we ever had of it; for according to such authorized conception love is but the acting of a pre- existing living principle, toward an existing object, or is the characteristic of such a living principle; it also contradicts the doctrine generally understood by Old School Baptists to be taught in the Scriptures concerning God's love toward His people and their love to Him. It is written, "God is love;" but it certainly is not understood by this that He who is revealed as God is only love in the abstract. I understand it as representing the distinguishing characteristic of Him who is the living God, the almighty and self-existing Spirit. His being love presupposes His existence as God. God's special love to His people even when they were dead in sins, has always been understood by consistent Baptists, as extending to them, not as in themselves considered, but as in Christ, not through Adam but through Christ; this implies that they had a previous existence in Christ which was the special object of God's love; and if a previous existence in Christ, then of course a previous union with Him. Consequently according to this, God's love to them, instead of constituting their union to Christ, was the fruit of such union. Again, consistent Old School Baptists, do not admit that our Adamic nature, prune it and cultivate it as you will, can truly love God; our loving God, then presupposes the implantation in us of a distinct principle of life capable of loving God, whence is this new life derived but from Christ as the head and is therefore the Spirit of Christ in us? If then that living principle by which we love God is derived from Christ as the Head it must have previously existed in Him, and thus in that life we must have been one with Him before ever we loved Him. But if love is the bond of union, we had no union and therefore no existence in Christ, previous to our loving Him. And if we love God we must love Him with the powers of our Adamic nature.

The third objection I have to the doctrine that love is the bond of union between Christ and His people is that, it contradicts the apparent import of many texts of Scripture which speak either directly or indirectly in relation to a union of Christ and His people. I will notice a few. John 3:3-6 represents a new birth, and that a being born not of the *flesh* but of the *Spirit*. Are we to understand that here being *born again* means nothing more than a change of the current of the affections to a loving of God? Or are we to understand by it what is plainly expressed in the word, a being brought manifestively into a distinct state of existence? If the latter, then we must remember that to be born is distinct in idea from being created. To be born implies a previous creation in a head, as our natural birth implies our previous creation in Adam. As this new birth is not a fleshly birth, it cannot be from the fleshly head Adam; and as the Scriptures reveal no other head but Christ and Him as a spiritual head, it must imply a spiritual creation and therefore a previous actual spiritual existence in Him. So in the texts where Christ's people are spoken of as His seed (as in Psalm 22:30; Isa. 53:30) the same idea of a

previous existence in Christ is fully conveyed, and consequently a created living union with Him. Again, Col. 3:3,4, “For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear....”, plainly declares a *oneness* of life in Christ and in His people and that Christ is this life. According to this text, the union of Christ and His people consists in life and must be as old as the existence of Christ as such. May we not then with confidence proclaim the *eternal union* of Christ and His people as a revealed doctrine? Hebrews 2:11, “For both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren,” I will lastly notice under this objection. I presume it will be admitted that Christ is here intended by the *He that sanctifieth*, and His people by the *they who are sanctified*. If so, the expression all of one ought to be admitted to express something more than a union between them formed by love; it positively declares a perfect unity, a one, and that in the very origin of their existence; all of one; that is, in the sense in which they are each here spoken of; their existence in a brotherhood, according to the latter part of the text, is the sense in which they are spoken of. It therefore neither refers to Christ’s essential Godhead, nor to His people’s creation in Adam. The expression *all of one* is so unlimited in the declaration that we may not confine the oneness to any one idea connected with the existence of a brotherhood without being guilty of limiting the declaration of God. According therefore to the declaration, they must have existed in Christ’s existing as their brother and from the same source; as Adam’s posterity existed in his existing and from the same source, the creating power of God. So we shall find this unity in relation to the brotherhood carried out in the Scriptures. Does brotherhood imply the idea of father, here the Father is one? Says Christ, “Go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God and your God.” (John 20:17) Does the idea of brotherhood imply a begetting; if Christ is the Only Begotten of the Father, (John 1:14) they must have been begotten in His begetting for they are born of God, and as showed, He is their Father? Does it imply a birth, and is Christ the first born *of every creature*; (Col. 1:15) His people must have been born in Him, for they existed in Him before the foundation of the world, were the *chosen in Him, had grace given them in Him* , etc.? Does a birth as before showed presuppose a creation, and is Christ the beginning of the creation of God (Rev. 3:14), here the unity also is found, for they are God’s workmanship created in Christ Jesus, etc.? (Eph. 2:10) Does the brotherhood imply sonship, here the unity continues? Is He a Son, so are they sons, and in their sonship have the Spirit of God’s Son *sent forth into their hearts*, etc.? (Gal. 4:6) And does sonship imply heirship, and is Christ *appointed heir of all things*, (Heb. 1:2) His people *are joint heirs with Him*. (Rom. 8:17) If then the union of Christ and His people is a oneness of life and of existence, how can love be the bond of union?

A fourth objection to the idea that love is the bond of union is that Paul plainly teaches that the headship of Christ is not the bond, but the source or fountain of union of Him

and His people, and charges some with a defect in this thing. See Col. 2:10, “And not holding the Head from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.” Here the Head is that from which the body has its increase, its nourishment and is knit together, etc. In a word, I object to the term *bond of union*, as not being Scriptural in idea nor in expression. In the text just quoted, whilst there are joints spoken of indicative of the distinct action of the several members of both, and bands, showing the binding together of those members, all is from the Head as the fountain. We might as well talk of binding a stream to its fountain, as of binding the church and people of God to Christ their Head. The church is not something bound to Him to make Him full, but is the *fulness of Him that filleth all in all*. (Eph. 1:23) The grand mystery of the gospel is not that we are bound to Christ, but it is “Christ in you the hope of glory.” (Col. 1:27) And Christ, in speaking of the unity of believers, does not speak of binding them more closely by eternal bonds, but says to His Father, “I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.” (John 17:23)

I will here leave these objections for the consideration of those who preach that *love is the bond of union*, hoping some one or more of them will let us hear from them on the subject.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
July 21, 1848.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 16 (1848)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 387 – 391

# JUSTIFICATION ( IN ORDER OF DATE WRITTEN )

## ETERNAL JUSTIFICATION?

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

First, because the Scriptures, no where as I can find, declare this to be the case, or directly imply it. Now to us Waldensis, this is a weighty objection; for being an inhabitant of the valley, and not having our residence on the *hill* of *Theological Science*, we have never learned to receive as *revealed truth*, those notions which are only found by drawing inferences from the *major* and *minor* propositions of the logicians. We are plain men, and require plain and direct Scriptural proofs for what we receive as *articles of our faith*. Thus *eternal* & *personal* election we find plainly stated or necessarily involved in the declarations of Scripture; the everlasting love of God to his people is also clearly revealed, and the eternal union of Christ and his Church, and the individual members thereof, is also evidently declared in such texts as these, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," and necessarily involved in the doctrine of the *headship* of Christ. So of the other particulars of the doctrine of the everlasting Gospel.

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

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

Last, I object to this notion, because, as justification relates wholly to the requirements of the law, the idea of *eternal justification* must involve in it the existence of the law

from everlasting. But how could a law exist without subjects? And who were the subjects of law before the creation of the world, if we admit that Christ, and his people in him, were wholly set up under another Covenant?

A WALDENSIS.
Valley of Achor, Dec.21st, 1832.

Elder Samuel Trott

# MY THOUGHTS ON JUSTIFICATION

Brother Beebe: – In heading this communication as “My Thoughts,” I have only reference to the fact known to many of the Old School brethren that I differ in my views from them on this important article of gospel doctrine, or at least in my manner of treating the subject. Whether these views are thoughts of my own hatching, or whether I have received them from Him whose office it is to guide the disciples into all truth I leave for my brethren to judge for themselves.

I have for some time intended, as soon as opportunity would serve, to communicate my views on this subject. My wish for doing so has arisen from the circumstance that in occasionally touching this subject in preaching, my brethren have discovered a difference, without perhaps being able to discover, wherefore and wherein, I thus chose to make myself singular in departing from the beaten trail of our Old School brethren on this point. And I freely admit that my brethren have on their side all the true advocates for the doctrine of Sovereign grace, who have published anything on this subject, perhaps for the last hundred years; that is, so far as I have been acquainted with their writings. On the other hand, I have met with no human author who has advanced my views on this doctrine. But though I thus stand alone on this point, if it should be that my views, weak as I am, are sustained by the Scriptures of truth, they will stand the test.

I am further induced to publish my views from the circumstance that the fact of a difference on this subject having existed has been brought to the notice of the readers of

the *Signs* through your Baltimore correspondent, (*Signs*, Vol.5, #13, pg.103). I would here just reply to our esteemed Baltimore friend that the correspondence between brother Hezekiah West and myself was not designed for publication, but merely for a free interchange between ourselves of the reasons of our different views on this point.

Lengthy as my apologies have already been touching this communication, I have still another one to offer, before I can enter upon the subject before me; that is, for coming out with this communication so soon after the publication of the recent Circular of the Licking Association lest any should suppose that I had the vanity to design this as an attack upon that ably written Letter. As I have already remarked, I have for some time had this communication in view; and I had intended writing it as soon as I had done with Mr. Giddings. Another inducement has pressed upon my mind for not delaying it, which I will not mention. Perhaps, however, it is quite as well on a general scale, though not so pleasant to me, that the two pieces should appear near together, as our brethren at large can thus conveniently compare the two, and see more clearly wherein the difference of our views consist and thus be able more clearly to judge of the correctness or incorrectness of my grounds for differing from my brethren on this point. I will now drop apologies and come to my subject.

My first objection to the term “Eternal Justification” as used by my brethren, or to the sentiment that the justification of the elect was an act of God passed in eternity, grows out of that prominent sentiment embraced in our Old School stand, namely: that a “Thus saith the Lord” is requisite to justify us in what we believe as well as in what we practice. I do not mean by this that the doctrine must always be expressed in the Scriptures in so many identical words. The doctrine of the “eternal union” of Christ and His people is not, that I know of, declared in just so many words in the Scriptures, yet I think this doctrine is therein clearly revealed. For instance compare Heb. 2:11, “For both He that sanctifieth, and they who are sanctified are all of one for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren,” with Rom. 8:29, “For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son that He might be the first-born among many brethren,” and they show that the oneness or the union is of as old a date as the predestinating decree of God; and that we know that from Eph. 1:4 & 5, to have been from before the foundation of the world. Inference is thus plain, because according to Heb. 2:11, Christ recognized His people as brethren on the ground of their oneness with Him; and according to Romans 8:29, the predestinating decree of God recognized them as the many brethren among whom Christ was first-born. This doctrine is also taught by the several figures by which the union is illustrated in the Scriptures. For instance, in the figure of the creation of Adam and Eve. As Eve was of Adam’s body, of his flesh, and of his bones, so the church is of Christ. (See Eph. 5:25-32) Eve was created in Adam in his original creation. Gen. 5:1 & 2. That the figure as used by the Apostle may hold good,

we must therefore admit that the church was brought forth and set up in Christ, her head, when He was brought forth from everlasting, when there were no depths, &c. Prov. 8:23,24. The same is further confirmed by the general doctrine of the gospel such as that they were chosen in Him, &c. Eph. 1:4. I would here remark that the doctrine contained in this text is not that they were chosen *into* Christ; but chosen *in* Him. Neither does it sustain Doctor Watts in the following couplet:

"Christ be my first-elect he said,
Then choose our souls in Christ our head."

These lines found in that otherwise excellent hymn of Dr. Watts, 54th, 1st book, are in my estimation an entire departure from the Scripture doctrine; both in reference to the idea that our being chosen was an after act, and as to the notion of our souls being chosen in Christ. But to return to the subject, if there are any passages of Scripture having reference to justification, which thus represent it or bring it to view as an act passed in eternity, I have never discovered them, neither have the advocates of that sentiment, as far as I have seen, brought them forward. Besides there are texts which, so far as I understand them, plainly contradict that idea. As Rom. 4:25, "Who was delivered for our offenses and was raised again for our justification." If the sentence of justification in behalf of the church of Christ was actually passed in eternity I cannot conceive how Christ only eighteen hundred years ago was raised for our justification. We needed not to be twice justified before God. "For by one offering He (Christ) hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." (Heb. 10:14) Remember, it was by one offering He perfected. They could not be justified from all things without being perfected, and the one offering which perfected them was that making His soul an offering for sin; that offering of His body once for all, which He has accomplished on Calvary, as a time act. (Isa. 53:10 & Heb. 10:10).

Again, according to Rom. 3:24, we are "justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." This justification must be the act of God, being "freely by His grace," and it is through the "redemption that is in Christ Jesus." If so, the act of justification cannot be considered as actually passed until the redemption was actually made. Redemption is "through His blood." (Eph. 1:7 & Col. 1:14). Again, "In the fullness of time, God sent forth His Son made of a woman and made under the law to redeem them that were under the law." (Gal. 4:4,5). Hence, as redemption is so manifestly a time act for those who before "were under the law," I cannot believe that the act of justification was passed until Christ was raised again. It is true Christ is said in Heb. 9:12, "To have obtained eternal redemption for us;" but a moment's reflection on the passage and its connection will, I think, convince any one that the redemption is here called eternal, not because it existed from eternity, but because it shall be, in its effects,

of eternal or everlasting duration. The fact of Christ's obtaining it denies its having eternally been, as well as the connection.

I will not multiply testimonies upon this point seeing that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. I will just ask how it is, if justification was designed to be received as an eternal act of God that it is never thus declared in the Scriptures? The choice and predestination of God are revealed as being before the foundation of the world; also that the "purpose and grace of God" were given in Christ before the world began.

I pass to a second objection, namely: That the sentiment of eternal justification as contended for perverts the plain Scriptural use and design of the term "justification." To *justify* and *justification* are terms which have special reference to legal proceedings as admitted by all writers on the subject, and signify the act of pronouncing a person clear from charges which may have been exhibited against him. In this sense these terms are evidently used in the Scriptures. We find them connected with law, Acts 13:39, with offences, Rom. 4:25, with redemption, which, of course, refers to law, Rom. 3:24. It is true that as taught in the gospel, justification has a more extensive bearing as used in other cases. The decisions of human judges whether in relation to the Sinai or other laws cannot embrace futurity; but the justification which the gospel reveals embraces all futurity, as well as past transgressions; it is a clearance from all the demands of the law past, present and to come; it is a judicial pronouncing of those whom Christ hath redeemed from under the law, as legally perfect, and that forever, as Christ "by His own offering hath forever perfected them." Hence justification is in this sense, as is the redemption obtained by Christ, eternal; that is, eternal in its duration. If then the meaning of the term "justification" refers exclusively to legal proceedings, and if it is uniformly so used in the scriptures, what can it have to do with any period before the foundation of the world? Before creatures had an actual existence and before therefore the obligations of law had any place? "Where no law is, there is no transgression" so of course no charge? How then can a legal sentence of justification be passed in the absence of all charge, of all law? It will be asked, had not the children of God an existence before the foundation of the world? I answer "yes" as is evinced by that I have said of the union of Christ and His people? They existed in Christ, as His seed, His bride, His body; as Adam's bride and posterity existed in him in his original creation. But this existence was as distinct from their existence in Adam and his posterity as Christ is distinct from Adam. And the Covenant under which they were set up and existed in Christ was equally distinct from the law under which Adam was created. This Covenant was "ordered in all things and sure;" had no requisitions to make excepting of Christ as its surety. (Heb. 7:22). This existence therefore opened no room for the requisition of a legal justification. A legal righteousness could just as soon be required of

the Son in order to His enjoying the love of the Father, as it could be required of His seed and bride as they thus stood in Him, heirs with Him, to the same inheritance. Herein, I cannot help imagining that my brethren have confounded, or at least, have not kept clearly in view the distinction between the headship of Christ and Adam, and between the law and the everlasting covenant. Herein also I object to the system of my brethren upon this point as transposing the act of justification from its relation to the law, to a provision to meet a demand of the everlasting covenant.

Should any say that they do not view the sentence of justification as actually passed in eternity, but only existing in purpose to meet the predetermined event of the elect's being created in a fallible head, and being left to fall into sin, &c., I would remark that I believe in the pre-existence of such a purpose, as strongly as any of my brethren do; and not only that such purpose existed in the Divine mind, but also that God made sure and full provision in Christ as the surety of the better testament to meet all the demands of law and justice, that, should stand against the elect, as they were to be related in time to the earthly head, Adam. But why confound language by representing that which existed only in the predeterminate purpose of God as being actually past in eternity? The creation of man was as much predetermined and stood as present to the view of God as did the justification of the elect. But I have heard of none who pretended to say that man was created in eternity. Why then say that the elect were justified in eternity? By this confusion of language will you not lead men to think that when you say that the people of God were elected in eternity you mean only that God proposed to elect them in time?

I will now notice some of the arguments used to support the sentiment of eternal justification. 1st. The argument drawn from the everlasting love of God to His people. This argument is that God could not have loved them as sinners, and therefore that He must have previously justified them that He might love them. But really if these premises were correct I do not see how this provision of justification would help the difficulty any. For according to this argument God must have extended His *electing* love to a people who were not then fit objects of His love, and provided for them a redemption in His Son, the strongest possible expression of His love, in order to justify them, and this done, that He might love them.

The premises, however, on which this, to me, absurd conclusion rests is wrong. Christ and not Adam is the channel through which the love of God flows to His people. Viewed in Christ their Head, and in that life which they had in Him, I may confidently ask what sin was then in Him as their Head to bar the love of the Father from them? And what love was there to charge a failure upon Him? Christ speaks of the Father having "loved them (His people) as He had loved Him." John 17:23. The Father loved Him as His only begotten Son, and not as having a legal righteousness to justify Him. And if He loved them as He loved Him, He loved them in Christ as His children and joint heirs with

Christ; and above what a legal righteousness could entitle them to. The truth is, Christ as the only begotten Son of God and Head of the church, had a glory with the Father before the world was, which no law servitude, no legal obedience could add to; and when about finishing His servitude under the law as the Redeemer of His people, He prays the Father to restore Him to that same glory. And what is more, He says to the Father, "the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them." (John 17:5 & 22). And surely, if Christ had given them, through their union with Him, that glory which He had with the Father, nothing which the law could impart could be necessary to make them lovely in the sight of God. Again, although it pleased the Father that the members of Christ's body should have an earthly existence, as such be under the law and fall under its curse; yet that law with all its divine rigor could no more destroy the love which God in eternity had placed upon them in His Son, than the Sinai law thundering its curses from Mount Ebal (Deut. 27:13-26) against the posterity of Abraham, could disannul the promise which had been confirmed only four hundred and thirty years before, of God in Christ, that is, to Abraham. (Gal. 3:16,17).

As another plea for the doctrine of eternal justification, it is asked, if we admit that the sentence of justification was passed eighteen hundred years ago in behalf of the whole church of Christ, why not admit that it was passed before the foundation of the world? I answer, for two of the best possible reasons. First, because eighteen hundred years ago, Christ completed the redemption of His church, by which they were cleared from all the demands of the law in Him, it was therefore fitting that the sentence of justification should then be declared in their favor, in and through Him their Head. But previous to Christ's being made of a woman and made under the law, the redemption of His church from under the law was not actually paid, and the sentence of justification could not therefore previously be passed in their favor, without clearing Him, as He stood as their Head through whom the sentence must pass, and as one with them, from His obligation to suffer the penalty of the law, and without making void the law. Second, the Scriptures declare that Christ, eighteen hundred years ago, was raised for our (the church's) justification, but they no where declare that she was justified antecedent to His redemption. Again it is argued from the doctrine of imputation that the church was justified in eternity. To carry this out it has been said that it was in consequence of the sins of the elect having been imputed to Christ, and His righteousness, which if it had remained His own, would have sustained Him under the load of their guilt, having been imputed to them, that He was subjected to fall under the curse of the law. But this is not the way I have read the Scriptures. If I have read them right, this position must fall. First, it calls for a double righteousness; for if Christ originally had such a righteousness as the sins of His people called for, to shelter them, He needed it not, only as He was one with them; and if therefore it sheltered them it must equally have sheltered Him as one with them, so that the curse could not have troubled either, the Head or the body. In the

second place, the Scriptures teach me that Christ had not originally such a righteousness as was called for by the sins of His people to cover them. What righteousness was this? Remember that their sins were altogether sins under the law, the righteousness therefore which could counterbalance them could be nothing other than a perfect actual obedience to the law, a complete honoring it as a transgressed law. This righteousness, holy and pure as He was before, Christ had not actually, until He was made under the law, took upon Him the form of a servant, became obedient unto death, &c. Let us see how the Scriptures read upon this point. “For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffering.” (Heb. 5:9). Hence, there was a perfection, a completing, wanting in Christ as He stood connected with His people in their apostasy, and as their deliverer from sin, until He was “made perfect through suffering.” Again, “He made Him to be sin for us,” not because we had been made the righteousness of God out of Him – but, “that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.” II Cor. 5:21. More I need not repeat, but read for yourselves.

Another argument in support of eternal justification is drawn from the fact of the Old Testament Saints having been accounted righteous, or justified. The conclusion drawn is that if the sentence of justification was not passed until the resurrection of Christ, all that lived before His coming must have remained under the condemnation of the law. If there was nothing brought to light touching this point in the Scriptures, the above would appear a very plausible conclusion. Justification as presented to view in the Scriptures is in a two-fold relation.

The first is the public declaration from the throne of God of the justification of the whole body of Christ collectively, though having reference to every individual member thereof. This transaction was wholly with and through Christ as the Husband, and surety of His church. Her sins were laid on Him, law and justice looked to Him for satisfaction; He met the demand in that nature from which the law required it, and having in His death fully satisfied the demand, was raised again for the justification of His people. In the resurrection of Jesus by the power of God, in the same body in which He was delivered for the offenses of His people, not only was justice declared to be satisfied, and therefore their justification made manifest in Him; but also the righteousness of God was made manifest in justifying whosoever believeth in Jesus and also in the remission of sins that were past, or previous to the coming of Christ. Rom. 3:35,26 & Heb. 9:15. Here, therefore in this public declaration of justification, there was a reference to the individual justification of the saints under the former dispensation, as though that had been done in anticipation of the great sacrifice to be offered by Christ.

The second relation is the experimental justification of individuals. This is at the bar of the believer’s conscience, faith is the medium by which this act of justification is

communicated. “Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” (Rom. 5:1). This justification is necessary to our enjoying peace with God, and secures it. As it is by that faith which “is the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen;” and as Christ was set forth from the beginning as the object of faith; hence said to the “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” (Rev. 13:8) I see not why the Old Testament Saints might not realize something of this justification and peace which we experience. But that they did not experience it in the same perfection I shall have occasion shortly to show. By Christ’s being the “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” I presume no one will contend that He was then actually sacrificed, and by the expression, “from the foundation of the world,” I do not understand the act of appointing Christ, by the Father to be the sacrifice of His people, intended for that was from before the foundation of the world, I consider the expression as having special reference to the fact of His being set forth from the first introduction of sin; in promises, types, &c., as the Lamb which God had provided for sacrifice, and as the object of faith. Thus Abel offered his lamb in faith, (Heb. 11:4) not faith in His sacrifice, but in the bloody sacrifice of the Lamb of God as showed forth by his. “For without the shedding of blood there is no remission,” (Heb. 9:22) consequently no justification. How does this stand with eternal justification?

My brethren, I think, ought to admit that if the act of justification in behalf of the saints was passed before the foundation of the world, the faith of all must look back to that act to find their justification in experience, seeing this is no other than a receiving and applying by faith the justification as found in Christ. According to the notion of eternal justification, Abel’s faith must have had the same back and perfect view of justification as have ours. And we to find peace with God must not stop in our view by faith at Calvary. If then the Scriptures show that the faith of the Old Testament saints looked forward instead of backward for this justification, it is proof positive against the notion of their justification having been in eternity. Not to multiply proofs where one case in point is sufficient, I will just cite to Abraham’s faith, the object of which “was accounted to him for righteousness;” and ask was that in a revelation which God made to him for something past? Or was it in the promise of something future? The apostle says, and that settles the point, “that God gave it to Abraham by promise.” (Gal. 3:18). See also Romans 4:20, 24, and notice the difference brought to view in this passage, in the manner in which the object of faith is presented to Abraham from what it is to us. Abraham believed that God “was able to perform that which He had promised.” We believe He has performed it in that He “has raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.” I will also notice one instance of prophetic faith, namely: Isa. 45:25, “In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory.” This surely presents justification of something then future. Other passages will be found to correspond with the above, as this is the name whereby “He shall be called the Lord our Righteousness.” (Not was

called.)(Jer. 23:6). Hence the Apostle's account of those worthies who went before (Heb. 11:39,40), "And these all having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." They received *a good report* – the report of good to come, but the manifestation of this *promised good* they received not. This text not only manifests that the faith of the ancients was in anticipation of good to come, but it also shows that there was an imperfection connected with their faith which nothing but the coming of the gospel day could do away. "That they without us should not be made perfect." Hence it is no wonder that the *prophets enquired* – "searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow." (I Peter 1:10,11). There is a *glory* connected with the full manifestation of justification, which they had not. For though as the redeeming Lamb, Christ was "foreordained before the foundation of the world," yet He was not *manifested* until *these last times*, for those that believe. (I Pet. 1:19-21). If these texts consist with the idea that the justification of the elect was completed in eternity, I must confess my utter inability so to understand them.

From the remarks which I have interspersed with my objections to the doctrine of eternal justification, it will be discovered that my thoughts concerning justification are that as it is presented in the Scriptures, it is altogether a legal transaction; though a gospel or gracious provision that has to do with the people of God, only as they stood connected with Adam, and under the law; and with Christ, as He was involved by His union with them in the demand of the law. That its use is to manifest their clearance by the redemption of Christ from under the law, and the righteousness of God in bestowing upon them, encompassed as they are with humanity and sin, the adoption of children. It is, I think, altogether a mistaken notion that justification is what entitles the saints to heaven. Equally erroneous is the notion that Christ by His death purchased heaven for His people. This union to Christ as His bride, His body, and being the children of God, is what entitles them to the heavenly glory. Justification could no more entitle them to heaven than the law could give life. (Gal. 3:27). Hence, my view of justification is that it was a provision made for the people of God in Christ, and which they needed, wholly as they are creatures of time, and from the nature of it, that it is altogether a time act, though appointed and provided for in the counsel of eternity, as were all other time things.

In reference to the eternal standing of the elect before God, as they were set up in Christ, they forever possessed in Him a spiritual beauty, excellency, and glory which nothing arising from their connection with Adam and the law could ever add to, or diminish from, excepting on the one hand this connection was till they were delivered from it, an insuperable barrier to their inheriting the kingdom prepared for them, and indeed to their

being manifested as the sons of God; and on the other hand the experimental knowledge which they thereby have of the evil and misery of sin, and of the grace, love and mercy of God, manifested in delivering them from their thralldom and sin, will enhance to them the excellency and enjoyment of their heavenly inheritance.

I have thus given a summary of my thoughts upon this subject. If they are wrong, it is because I have a wrong understanding of the Scriptures upon this point. If they are right, it is because God has graciously given me to understand the Scriptures concerning this doctrine, for I certainly never learned it from men. Were it not that the Scriptural account of this doctrine appears to me so clearly to support my views concerning justification being a law, and time transaction, the circumstance that so many more excellent, and more gifted brethren differ from me in their judgment concerning it, together with the reflection, *what am I* that I should be made thus to differ; would lead me much to doubt the correctness of my views. As it is, I must retain them, till I am led to see some direct Scriptural authority for the doctrine of *eternal justification*.

With love to the brethren, and a hope that I may be found to share with them in the perfection there is in Christ Jesus our Lord. I subscribe myself yours,

*S. Trott.*

P.S. I wish not my apologies, with which I commenced this communication, construed as a plea with my brethren not to answer my objections if they see fit. As I wish on this and all other religious subjects to see eye to eye with them, if any of them can give a more correct view of this subject founded upon direct Scriptural authority, I shall be glad to see it. I would further remark that perhaps some may think the view I have given of justification, and especially from my remarks being especially designed to illustrate those views in distinction from the sentiment of *eternal justification*, are calculated to diminish the importance of this gospel doctrine. I do not view it, as presented in the Scriptures, in a light any less important by its standing so immediately and intimately connected with the *actual obedience* of the Son of God *unto death*; an obedience yielded especially to bring about the accomplishment of this act, than though it was revealed as, like predestination, an absolute act of the Divine Mind, or as being passed in anticipation of the obedience of Christ. The fact is, the grace, love and mercy of God is far more displayed in the act of justification by viewing it as thus involving, as essential to it, the actual obedience unto death of the Son of God, than they could be, by separating the act in any measure from the obedience and sufferings of Christ. And it can be no less precious to the believer by viewing it as coming to him, a poor, guilty, law-condemned sinner of Adam’s race, alone through the righteousness of Christ brought in by His

actual substitution of his law place. And as they are made to view it, in their experience, whatever may be said of their having been eternally justified.

Fairfax C.H., Virginia,
Nov. 22nd, 1837,
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol 5 (1837)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 102 – 114

## THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION.

Explanation Of Views Heretofore Advanced On Justification.

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

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

exist, as was that of the Son of God their Head. And they also, were like him pure and holy.

But, whilst it was the pleasure of God to bring forth Christ as a head, from everlasting, having his posterity in him, called his seed; it was his purpose that this spiritual seed should in time, become one with creatures of the dust, and be manifested only in this connection; and that the individuals thus quickened, should in this complex existence, as born of two heads, in their first, and second birth, be recognized as the sons of God. Hence for this purpose, man was to be created, of the earth earthy, *in the image and after the likeness* of his Creator; that is, Christ, having his bride and his posterity in him; and to be created a rational and accountable being. From the posterity of this man, as present with God in eternity, an election was made of those *predestinated to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself*; and given to Christ, to be by him, preserved, redeemed, and quickened with that life which was in him. Hence the *purpose* of God, given to the elect in Christ from before the foundation of the world, as I understand it to be developed in the scriptures, instead of being a purpose to hold them from eternity justified from the demands of the law and freed from sin, was a purpose to create them in Adam under the law, and leave them in him, to fall into sin and depravity, that they might thus become proper subjects to be redeemed from under the law, and that, becoming dead to the law, and of course, to their relation to Adam, as their head under the law, through an application of the law by the Holy Spirit, they might in their whole complex persons as born of Adam, and born again of Christ, or of the Spirit, be recognized according to their second birth, as members of Christ's body, and sons and heirs of God; and through Christ's conquest over death and the grave, to be raised with their bodies changed to spiritual and incorruptible bodies, to live and reign with Christ in glory. And thus where *sin reigned unto death*, the grace given them in Christ before the world began, shall reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord; making even the reign of sin subservient to the eternal purpose of bringing the elect to reign in glory.

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

I will here repeat, what I have heretofore said, that Justification is a legal term, and relates to the law under which man was created. The text {Rom. 3:24,} "Being *justified* freely by his grace through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus;" compared with Gal. 3:13, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,"

would satisfy me that Justification relates to the clearance of the elect from the law, were their no other texts to the same point. Hence it is a provision made in Christ to meet the situation of the elect, as under the law in their relation to Adam.

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

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

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

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

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

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

But, 2nd. Christ as the Head of his Church, was the Head of her as composed of the elect quickened by life which was in him. This was the eternal purpose as has been showed, in the production of that life, that it should be communicated to creatures of the dust, and that it should be made manifest only in its communication to such creatures. For the accomplishment of this purpose also, Adam was created and the elect in him, that this life should be communicated to them; they are born that they should be born again. And as the elect when born again are recognized as members of Christ's body, or as his posterity, so as Adam represented all his posterity that ever should descend from him, involving them all in depravity by his fall, all being known to God; thus Christ represented all his posterity that should be born of him, known as his from eternity, given to him, that they might be made partakers of the life which was in him, and left to fall that they might be redeemed by him, &c. Hence as Adam was constituted in his creation the head of his posterity as they should be born into the world, and therefore when they come into the world they are born in a state of depravity, so Christ in being brought forth, and constituted as the Head of his Church and people, was thus constituted their head as they should be born again; and therefore when born of God, whether before the coming of Christ in the flesh, or since, they are born into a state of Justification, and of peace with God, those before the coming of Christ being thus born in anticipation of Christ's redeeming them from under the law, and their faith embracing him as revealed by types and in promise. Hence again as Adam was the head of all his posterity by anticipation of their being born of him, so Christ was the Head of his posterity in anticipation of their being born of God, and as Adam's posterity were involved in his previous transgression by their union to him, and as he went with his bride into transgression, so Christ was involved in the previous transgression of his posterity by his union to them, and he voluntarily without being deceived, went with his bride into the transgression in which she had gone. The union in both cases being so close, that where either the head or the body had transgressed, the other must be

involved in the same transgression, *vice versa*, when the Head, as did Christ, honored the law, the body were considered as honoring it in him, and were therefore in him justified from its demands, by virtue of the same union, which involved him in the transgression of his body.

Again. I would remark, that as it was only in and through Christ, that the people of God could be justified, or in other words, that the law could be honored, and the justice of God made apparent in delivering them from under the law, so it is only as persons are born again that their individual Justification can be manifested, for it is only by this second birth that they are made manifest as members of Christ's body. Herein I think some seem to err, in supposing that it is the elect as such that are justified. God can view them redeemed and justified, because their second birth is as present with him as is their first birth; but as creatures they cannot be known in their relation either to the first or second Adam, only by their being manifested. Hence as has been showed, Justification through Christ being a Justification for his people as represented by him their Head, so the scriptures I think speak of none being righteous or justified in a gospel sense, but believers. *Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness*. If I could be made to know any as being of the elect while in a state of unregeneracy, I should think myself required by the scriptures to speak of them as *children of wrath, even as others*, {Eph. 2:3,} and to say unto them, "Except ye are born again, ye cannot see the Kingdom of God." John 3:3. But when they are born *again*, they are born right into that state of Justification in which Christ has placed his Church by redeeming her from under the law. And this is what I understand to be experimental Justification or Justification by faith. And as the experimental Justification of the Old Testament saints was in anticipation of the redemption of Christ, so that redemption looked back to their Justification, and manifested the justice of God therein, as well as in the Justification of those that believe in Jesus under the gospel. See Rom. 3:35,26.

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

wholly of such as are born of God, and therefore born into that state in which the righteousness of Christ, as a spotless robe, covers them, leaving no legal blemish on them.

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

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

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

Baptists. My views of the subject were but incidentally and briefly given. I thought that probably that communication would produce such enquiries or discussions as would lead me to a full expression of my views. Instead of this however, it drew forth attacks and answers such as I had no anticipation of. The kind of opposition my "Thoughts" met with from many Old School Baptists, was to me entirely unexpected, as coming from such, and I really cannot to this day see what there was in that communication which could give such offence to those who are Old School Baptists in principle. I had conscientious objections to the use of that term among us, as calculated to convey wrong notions, and which was not in itself a scriptural term; those objections or some of them, I published, designedly for the candid consideration of my brethren; in doing this I tried to use language respectful to their feelings. I will not pretend to say that in answering some of those attacks, I have pursued a correct gospel course. I find it very hard for me to obey the Apostle's injunction, "Be ye angry and sin not." Eph. 4:26. And I certainly have felt wounded by some things published, and others not published in the SIGNS. But having given the above explanation, I have done I think with the discussion, in this way, of the subject of justification, unless I should have occasion incidentally to touch it in discussing other subjects.

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

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

Farewell,
S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., March 5, 1839.

# VIEWS ON JUSTIFICATION DEFENDED

Brother Beebe: – I much regret that my thoughts on Justification have been so much misunderstood, as they evidently have been, by several worthy brethren.

I cannot account for this so great misapprehension of what I advanced on this subject, but upon the ground that these brethren have in their early experience, as I did, drank in from the writings of men or the preaching they heard, the notion of eternal justification, along with the doctrine of salvation by grace, and had both thus blended together in their connection of the plan of salvation; the one their experience told them was true, and they therefore did not doubt the truth of the other. Hence when they found me objecting to the notion of the eternity of the act of justification, although I admitted all that many of them contend for – its existence in purpose – they felt as though I was striking a blow at the whole system of salvation by grace, and they therefore had not patience to examine candidly what I did write. As however brother Pitcher has proposed certain queries involving some of his objections to my views, and others have also communicated their objections, I feel it my duty to meet those objections, as I desire that mine should be met, that is, by a fair examination of them, so far as I am capable, and the removing of them so far as the scriptures appear to warrant it. But previous to coming to brother Pitcher's queries, I wish to notice certain ideas which seem included in the observation, which in substance has been made by several, namely: of regret or surprise that Brother Beebe should have admitted my "thoughts concerning justification" into the SIGNS. This remark might have originated either from the idea that my communication was a departure from Old School principles, or that it tended to do hurt by producing divisions among the brethren, or that it was calculated to weaken our cause, and occasion our opposers to rejoice. Feeling confident as I do, that my views are supported both by the scriptures, and by experience, I think there is not so much danger of their injuring the lambs, as there is of setting the old sheep to butting.

First: The idea of a departure from Old School principles. Brother Beebe certainly stands pledged that the SIGNS should be devoted exclusively to the Old School Baptist cause, and I am confident he has no disposition to forfeits that pledge. But this term as defined by Brother Beebe in the SIGNS, and by the brethren meeting at Black Rock, when it was adopted to designate our views and stand, has a meaning different from that in which it has been sometimes used; as when those who adhered to Dr. Gill's system, have been called old school in distinction from those who embraced Fuller's gospel. The sense in which it was adopted at Black Rock, and in which we use it, passing by all human

schools, points out the fact that we profess to belong only to the school of Christ, and to submit alone to what He has taught in the scripture, in matters of religion. It indeed has a bearing towards the ancient Baptists, in reference to the prominent trait in their character that in accordance with their professing to receive the scriptures as the only rule of their faith and practice, they required a "Thus saith the Lord," for what they believed and practiced as religion. Were it not thus, were our Old School brethren, in the stand we took at Black Rock, pledged to any particular system taught by men, I would be willing to be cast out as evil among you, – the New School would then have good ground for calling it Black Rockism, for it would be but one among the many isms into which the religious world is divided.

In my first attempt to preach, I was admonished by a female friend, to be cautious, never to have to say "Alas Master! for it was borrowed;" and before this, on a particular occasion, the expression of Paul had been applied to me with some weight, namely: "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood." Gal. l:16. The impressions arising from these two circumstances, have in some measure, followed me thus far through life, and I wish them not effaced, for I feel more and more their importance. If I were to give myself up to depend on, and be led by men, in religion, I might as well take Fuller for my master, as Gill; and Arminius or Socinus, as Calvin; for as a system that is only learned of men, will be of little use in reference to salvation; it would therefore be good policy to choose that which is most popular. If however, we speak of the merit of systems, in reference to their comparative consistency with the scriptures, I should prefer Calvin's to that of Arminius or Socinus and Gill's, by far, to that of Fuller. I was much pleased with an anecdote which I read somewhere not long since, of a boy and a priest; the priest was exhorting the boy to come to confession, offering to admit him for a small sum. The boy enquired, Do you confess? O yes, said the priest. To whom? To the bishop. Do you have to pay? Yes, a large sum. Does the bishop confess? Yes, to the Pope. Does he pay? Yes, roundly. Does the Pope confess? Yes, to whom? To Jesus Christ. And does he have to pay? O no, Christ pardons freely. Then {says the boy} I believe I will in future make confession only to Christ, that being the safest as well as the cheapest. So I think, if we must first try the systems of men by the scriptures, before we decide which we will take as our guide, we had better, as the safest way, take the scriptures only as our guide. I have seen so much evil resulting from those who preach from books, etc., who are in a habit of borrowing their ideas and illustrations of scripture from men, that I wish not to fall into the practice myself, nor to have my brethren do it. To notice but one of the evils to which I refer, we have all felt the disappointment of certain persons falling away, whom we once esteemed sound brethren. Who were they? As to preachers, they were Gillites, or some other ites; they preached Gill, not Christ, any farther than they preached Him through Gill's view of Him. Show me the man who preaches sound doctrine as he has been taught by the Holy Ghost from the scriptures,

and I will show you the one who will stand the test of the world's persecution or its flatteries.

But I do not wish it to be understand from these remarks, that I am opposed to the reading of human authors. I only wish them read as the productions of fallible men, and that we should be guarded against receiving or retailing their ideas as truth, because they advanced them. If the Holy Spirit is pleased to give me an idea, or understanding of a passage of scripture, through the instrumentality of any man, it is just as valuable as though given directly through the scriptures, it equally becomes my own. My brethren, know the difference between receiving an idea merely because it appears plausible, or because it is the opinion of one in whom we have confidence; and its being given us by the Holy Ghost. In the latter case it is spoken to us, as Isaiah says, "with a strong hand," {Isa. 8:11}, the scriptures are brought to our mind as supporting it, and we feel the internal witness of its truth.

To conclude my protracted remarks on this point. Had my "Thoughts on Justification," been a manifest departure from the scriptural account of that subject, Brother Beebe should not have published it; but if it was sustained by the scriptures, it was not a departure from Old School principles; and before my brethren decide on its being a departure, I hope they will examine it fully, comparing it, not with Gill, but the scripture.

Secondly. The idea that it may do hurt by producing divisions among the brethren. I did hope, and I still hope, that our brethren had counted the cost, and were conscientious in taking the Old School stand upon the platform of the scriptures, as our only rule of faith and practice. If, in accordance with this stand, we come to the enquiry raised upon any point of doctrine, desirous of unlearning all that we have learned not from the scriptures, and willing to abide by the plain declaration and construction of scripture, by comparing scripture with scripture: I, for myself, think that such enquiries, instead of creating divisions, will produce a greater oneness of views among us. But, my brethren, we ought to have our hearts more deeply impressed than they are with the fact that the blessed Holy Spirit hath revealed in the scriptures everything which Infinite Wisdom saw proper we should believe and practice in religion, and that agreeable to the prediction going before, {Isa. 35:8 & Heb. l:2,} it being so plain, that he may run that readeth. Excuse my digression, while I say, not that he may read while he runneth, but that reading it, it will be to him so plain, and give him so much confidence, that he will immediately run forward in the command, and not linger along as we do when in uncertainty.

Elder Samuel Trott

# LABORERS TOGETHER WITH GOD.

Brother Beebe: – I have been requested by a distant brother to give an exposition of I Cor. 3:9, through the *Signs.* I have once had occasion to give my views on this text through your paper within the past three or four years, but that exposition may not be in the possession of many of the present readers of the Signs, and hence my giving them again may not be unacceptable to some others beside the brother requesting them.

My opinion is that the translators entirely mistook the import of this text and also of II Cor. 6:1, which occasioned their giving them the turn they have in the translation; and it is something surprising they should have thus mistaken, as the context, as I propose shortly to show, so clearly fixes the import. They evidently understand the compound word, *sunergoi,* which they have rendered *laborers together* as designed to represent Paul and Apollos as being associated with God in their labors; whereas the Apostle clearly used it to denote the equality of him and Apollos, being associated together as fellow-laborers in God's service. Hence *Theos,* God in the translation, stands in the same relation to *sunergoi,* as it does respectively to the words rendered *husbandry and building*; it being *Theou,* in the genitive or possessive case, in each instance; and therefore required to be rendered *God's laborers together,* instead of *Laborers together with God,* just as the next clause was correctly rendered, *ye are God's husbandry,* instead of *ye are the husbandry with God*. There is a difficulty in conveying the precise idea intended to be conveyed in this connection by the word *sunergoi,* in our language without a circumlocution of words. It might be rendered *helpers, servants, or fellow-laborers*. But *helpers* or *servants,* would express in this relation, the one a wrong idea and the other not the full idea. That which comes nearest to the true translation of this passage is this: We are God's associate-laborers, (that is *laborers associated together in God's service*) ye are God's husbandry, God's building. In II Cor. 6:1, there is no excuse for the translators making it read as it does, excepting the making it correspond with their translation of this other text. It stands in the translation thus: "We then as workers together *with Him* beseech you," &c. The words *with Him* being printed in *italics* showing that there is nothing in the original answering to them. Why not then read it and understand it as the Apostle wrote it, "We then as workers together, (or *fellow-laborers*) beseech you," &c.

On noticing the context in I Cor. chapter 3, we shall find it fully supporting the import of the 9th verse as conveyed in the translation I have given above. In reproving the Corinthian brethren for their division, as in the first four verses, Paul represents them as accounting too highly of him and Apollos &c., hence his language in the 5th verse. But what is it? Does he say: Would you know who Paul and Apollos are, they are God's helpers, laborers together with Him in working out your salvation? No, very different! It is this: "Who then is Paul and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom you believed, even as the Lord gave to every man." In verse 6, he brings himself and Apollos to view as fellow-laborers, "I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase;" and in verse 7, "So then neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God, that giveth the increase." Thus he shows that God was all in all, in their salvation, whilst he and Apollos were nothing but God's servants by whom they believed. In verses 8 & 9 he reproves the Corinthians still further, as holding him and Apollos as different leaders, by one saying, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, and therefore he shows himself and Apollos, to be but one, but *fellow-laborers* not in their own, but God's *husbandry*. Whilst therefore this 9th verse as it stands in the common translation clashes in import with the preceding verses, in the construction I have given to it, there is a harmony in the import of the whole.

A few remarks in reference to the system of the missionaries. They bring these texts to sustain them in their notion of being *co-workers with God*, yea, they go so far as to say that God *cannot save sinners without the aid of preachers*. Admitting this to be the fact, and the conclusion is irresistible, that God has never in earnest purposed the salvation of sinners, notwithstanding His having given His Son, to save them, but that He looks on it with an entire indifference, whether they get to heaven or sink to hell. Let us just take one heathen, in a land where the gospel is not now preached, and count some of the leading contingencies that stand in the way of his salvation, according to the missionaries notions. A missionary must be sent to him, to obtain this, to go, back no further: **1st**, a young man must consent to become religious: **2nd**, he must devote himself to the ministry: **3rd**, schools must be established where he can obtain the necessary qualifications: **4th**, he being a poor pious young man; beggars must go forth and succeed in obtaining money to defray the expenses of his education, and the ladies must become sufficiently interested in his education to furnish him with clothing: **5th**, when all this is done, he must decide on going to the heathen, instead of seeking a call in some other field: **6th**, he must find a wife willing to go with him: **7th**, on application to the Board he must be judged to be of the right stamp: **8th**, the public must be induced to contribute money enough to sustain the other establishments, &c., and to enable the Board to furnish him his outfit, &c.: **9th**, the winds and waves and skill of the mariners must contribute to waft him in safety to his intended port: **10th**, he must not get sick of his undertaking, and therefore invent an excuse to return, as some have: **11**, after this, if

the natives neither conclude to eat him, being cannibals, nor drive him from them, he may become settled as a missionary among them: **12**, if he lives long enough he may acquire a knowledge of the language so as to write and circulate tracts among them, and preach, &c. Now to the individual heathen whose salvation we started for, and **13**, he must not have died during this long space whilst the missionary was being prepared: **14**, he must fall in with the missionaries' tracts or preaching: **15th**, he must be convinced by the missionaries' arguments of the truth of the christian religion: **16th**, he must have resolution sufficient to profess that religion and then, **17th**, if he hold out in his profession, he will, according to the mission notion of conversion, get to heaven. Here then are **17 contingencies**, besides chains of others connected with each, standing between this man and heaven, should any one of them fail to take place, all would fail, and neither the zeal of the missionary, nor the labors of the theological professors, nor the money collected and expended, nor the shed-blood of Christ would save this individual from the quenchless fire of hell. Can any man whose judgment is not perverted by religious frenzy, believe that a God infinite in knowledge, wisdom and power, could will the salvation of sinners and yet leave their salvation to depend on the uncertain issue of such a mass of contingencies? Can anything more absurd be found ascribed by the heathen to their gods, than the missionaries thus ascribe to their god, in representing Him as willing, and attempting the salvation of sinners through the sacrifice of His own Son, and yet leaving their salvation to depend altogether on such a combination of human contingencies? Well do the missionaries term their god, the *God of missions*, and not ascribe to Him the title claimed for our God, namely: **THE GOD OF OUR SALVATION**.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan. 7, 1841
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.9 (1841)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 236 – 239

# MATTHEW 2:23 – NAZARENE

"*And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets: He shall be called a Nazarene.*"

Brother Beebe,

From the conversation which passed when I was last in Alexandria, on the above text, I was led, on returning home, to give the subject a more closer examination. The result of this examination I will now offer to your readers as an illustration of this Scripture.

The apparent difficulties of this passage, are: 1st. That there are no prophecies in Scripture directly asserting that Christ should be called a *Nazarite*, or according to the Greek termination a *Nazarene*; and 2nd. That He was principally called a Nazarene from the mere circumstance of His being brought up in Nazareth.

There is some difficulty in deciding from which of the two Hebrew words the name of the city *Nazareth* was derived. One is *Nazar* which signifies *separated;* the other *Natzar* which primarily signifies *preserved*. These words, in Hebrew, are both spelled with three letters, the one with *zain* answering to z, in English; the other with *tzadhe* answering to *tz*, but both answering to the letter, *zeta* in Greek. Parkhurst (in Hebrew Lexicon) considers Nazareth derived from *Nazar*, others derive it from *Natzar*, and Calmet and others derive it indifferently from either. As the Evangelist refers to the prophets without specifying any one, we may, with Calmet, consider both words and their use in the Scriptures embraced. Whatever may have been the design of the founders of the city in giving it this name, it was evidently designed of God to point out, as the designated residence of the true Nazarite and Branch, or the *separated and preserved One*. The expression, "He shall be *called* a Nazarene," means nothing less than that He should be made manifest as the Nazarene: the term *called* is frequently used in this sense in the Scriptures, as in Jer. 23:6.

I will 1st, mention the word Nazarene as derived from *Nazar*, and show some of the instances wherein, in the use of that word, Christ is prophesied of. Nazar is the word to point out the Nazarite under his vow of separation. Here permit me to remark that vows generally, as recognized by the Levitical law, had a typical reference to the Messiah, to that suretyship which He had entered into, and to His devoting Himself to God in the place of legal sacrifices, and in behalf of His people, hence the strictness with which vows were to be observed (Lev. 27:1-29; Num. 30:115). Hence Jephtha's affliction in consequence of his vow: hence Christ says, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these

things, etc." Luke 24:26, and the Psalmist, I think, personating Christ, says: "Thy vows are upon me O God" (Psalm 56:12). If it is not so, and the laws concerning vows are to teach the spiritual Israelite the rigidness with which he must perform his promises to God, what a miserable case should we be in!

But to return to the subject, the law concerning the Nazarite (Num. 6), required that the person, during the period specified in his vow, should refrain from wine and everything of the fruit of the vine; should not come nigh any dead, even his nearest relatives; should not let any razor upon his head; and that he should all the days of his separation, be *holy to the Lord*. These things taught typically, or prophetically, the perfect holiness of Christ in His humanity, His entire separation from the depravity and defilement of sinners (Heb. 7:26). And thus also was showed the separation of His people in Him, from sin and the world *which lieth* in wickedness. The Nazarite, in not being allowed to drink any wine or anything fermented with the grape, showed forth Christ as acting in the work of salvation, from His own Divine, and not from a borrowed power, that He was not excited nor empowered to act from anything external or derived. Hence those who in this day would, by their prayers and schemes, excite and help Christ to save the world, are comparable to those who gave wine to the Nazarite to drink (Amos 2:12). But the hair of the Nazarite was the distinguishing thing in his separation. Hence Num. 6:5. His hair is called the *consecration*, or rather *separation*, of his God. "Because the consecration of his God is upon his head." In verse 19, in the translation we read: "After the hair of his separation is shaven"; but the words, *the hair of* are in italics, showing that in the original it reads: "After his separation is shaven." Hence if a person died suddenly by him, he was said to have defiled the *head of his separation*, verse 9. Thus in the case of the Nazarite, it is seen that the principal part of his consecration consisted in his unshaven hair and in the case of Samson, who was a Nazarite from the womb, his great strength lay in his Nazaritical locks, Judges 16:17, 19, 22. So in the unshorn glory of Christ, the Head of His Church in His contest with Satan, sin, death and the law, lies all the strength and action of His people; and the cause of their being made manifest as consecrated to God.

But it may be asked, what had Jesus' dwelling at Nazareth to do with His being a true Nazarite? I answer,

First; by His being brought up at Nazareth, He had the name given Him which pointed Him out as one separated to God. 2nd. As the Nazarite was to keep himself separated from the dead bodies even of his nearest relatives, so because Christ's brethren, the Jews, were now dead as a nation, as a typical people, and as a peculiar people to God, seeing that the Messiah, the promised Seed, and Substance had come out of them, and also that for their transgressions they were dead under the curse of the Sinai covenant, He must not be brought up in Judea, the national province of the Jews, but in Nazareth, a

city in the province of Galilee, called *Galilee of the Gentiles* (Isa. 9:1-2; Mt. 4:15). Thus Jeremiah prophesied of the Jews, saying: "Cut off thine hair, O Jerusalem and cast it away, and take up a lamentation on high places; for the Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of His wrath" (Jer. 7:29). The word here rendered hair, is *nizer*, from *nazar*, showing that it was the *hair of their separation* which was to be cut off, having reference to the fact that hitherto they had been a *Nazaritica*l nation, a people separated from the other nations and consecrated to the Lord. Christ, as He lay in them in type and in promise, was the *Nizer*, the *separation* or *consecration* of that nation. And as Jeremiah thus intimates, in the prophecy under consideration, Jerusalem, for her sins, was left to reject Christ when He came to them in His ministry; and in rejecting Him their peculiar national glory was shorn from them; the *middle wall of partition* between them and the Gentiles was broken down. And Christ being cut off from Jerusalem, became the *Nizer* in truth and in accomplishment of prophecy, or the manifestation of consecration to spiritual Israel, a people consecrated to God from both Jews and Gentiles. This, Christ intimated, was about to be accomplished by His being brought up among a mixed people of Jews and Gentiles, and in Nazareth a city *separated* from the province of Judea. Galilee was like Samaria, a part of the land originally inhabited by the ten Tribes, and was, when they were carried into captivity, re-peopled by those nations which Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, brought and placed there, (II Kings 17:24), and who were considered as aliens by the Jews, though many Jews in the time of our Saviour dwelt among them. Hence, as before noted, it is called Galilee of the Gentiles and the inhabitants are said to *walk in darkness, and to dwell in the region and shadow of death* (Isa. 9:1-2; Mt. 4:15-16).

2nd. The word *Nazar* is used in reference to Joseph and to his being separated from his brethren; intimating that in his separation he was a Nazarite to God. Joseph's Father and his brethren, in his being made a *Nazir* or *separated one* from them, considered him lost, and his Father's expectations concerning him, cut off, yet Joseph from that separation rose to great power, and to be a preserver to his Father's house. In this, as in other things, Joseph was a figure of Christ. Christ as the Anti-type of Joseph, received from His brethren, the Jews, the name of Nazarene which is the same as *Nazir*, *Nazarite* or *separated one*, and that out of *envy* and spite, as Joseph's brethren from the same cause made him a separated one. Not only so, but Christ from being separated from the Jewish nation in His rejection and crucifixion, was *highly exalted*, and had a name given Him which is above every name, etc. "That at the name of JESUS every knee should bow, etc." "And He hath put all things under His feet"; excepting Him who did put all things under Him; so that only the Father is greater than He. See Phil. 2:9-10; I Cor. 15:27. Christ also became salvation unto His Father's spiritual house; not only to them of the Gentiles, but of the Jews also. We find also an indication of these things and a personal correspondence in Christ, as in the flesh, with Joseph. For, from Jesus' being born in

Bethlehem, the city of David, and from other events connected with His birth, the expectations of many were raised concerning Him, that He was born to be a *Ruler over the people Israel*, yet from His being driven thence and being brought up in Nazareth, a city held accursed by the Jews, those expectations were, in their estimation, wholly blasted; and He was truly as a *Nazir*, as *one separated* from His brethren, according to the flesh. But though they viewed His infantile indications cut off, as Joseph's brethren considered his dreams brought to nought, yet God was with Him, owning Him as His Son, and preparing the way for His being manifested as the Messiah.

I will now notice one instance in which the word *Natzar* is used in reference to the Messiah. This word, as before said, signifies primarily *preserved;* it also signifies a *sucker* or *young tree* springing from the roots of a tree that has been cut down as being preserved whilst the old tree is destroyed, or perhaps as being *separated* from it, so that the idea differs not materially from the meaning of *Nazar*. It is used in this sense in reference to the Messiah in Isaiah 11:1, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a *Branch* shall grow out of His roots." In this text Christ, in His manifestation in the flesh, is pointed out as a rod (a weak or tender shoot) growing out of the stem (the *stump* as the word properly signifies) of Jesse, (the father of David) and as a *Branch* (Natzer) growing out of his roots. The idea, therefore, is clearly held forth in this prophecy that the family of Jesse should be cut off from the throne of David and should be nearly extinct (as knowing their direct lineage), when the Messiah should be born; and that the Branch of David, (Christ), should grow up, in the eyes of the Jews, as a slender twig having no promise of being the King of Israel. Or as Isaiah, in another place, has it, that, "He should grow up as a tender plant and as a root out of dry ground, etc.," that, "He is despised and rejected of men, etc." (Is. 53:2-3). Thus we find Jesus born at Bethlehem, the place of Jesse's residence and of David's birth, and at a time when Joseph, his supposed father, went there to be taxed because he was of the house and lineage of David, and therefore at the time when his name was recorded as being of the family of David and a rightful heir of his throne, but immediately he is compelled to flee to save the child's life from the cruelty of Herod, who had usurped the throne of David. He fled first to Egypt, and when recalled from there, he returned aside into Galilee, and went and dwelt in the city of Nazareth, for fear of Archelaus, who reigned in the place of his father, Herod (Mt. 2:13-23). Thus was clearly manifested the low estate of the family of David at the time Jesus was born. Joseph, it is true, was acknowledged to be of the lineage of David, but this was in the act of being taxed by a foreign power, by the decree of the Emperor of Rome, and in danger of the child's life from Herod who reigned in Judea by the privilege of the Roman Emperor.

Jesus being brought up at Nazareth, made Him, as professing to be the Messiah, peculiarly the contempt of the Jews. Even Nathaniel, an *Israelite in whom was no guile*,

when Jesus of Nazareth was spoken of to him as the Messiah, directly replied: “Can any good thing come out of Nazareth” (John 1:46). The Pharisees reply to what Nicodemus said, “Out of Galilee ariseth no prophet” (John 7:52). Thus the Jews, out of contempt, calling Jesus a *Nazarene*, was in direct accomplishment of the prophesies in Isa. 11:1-2; 53:2-3. And His being brought up at Nazareth was made the occasion of it. Besides the Jews calling Him the Nazarene, though in contempt, was as directly an involuntary acknowledgment of Jesus being the true *Nazarite* of God and the *Branch* from the roots of Jesse, as was Pilate’s superscription an acknowledgment of His being the *King of the Jews*, and as was Caiaphas’ advice that He should be put to death, a prophesy that, “He should die for that nation and not for that nation only, etc.” (John 11:49-52).

Thus let infidels say what they may upon this point, it is evident the Scriptures fully bear the Evangelist out in giving it, as a fulfilling of prophecy that Jesus should be called a Nazarene.

Yours,
S. Trott
Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan. 26th, 1838

## MATTHEW 24:27, CONSIDERED.

BROTHER BEEBE: – I see in the SIGNS for Sept. 1, 1848, a request for my views on Matt. 24:27, from a *humble brother* who signs himself, An Inquirer. As the grace of humility is so very rare, and so many of us who would be humble, find ourselves when tried, the reverse; it seems reasonable that when a humble brother is met with, we should pay all due attention to his inquiries. I will therefore seek to comply with his request.

The reading of the text is this, “For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” As the coming of the Son of man is here mentioned, it may not be improper to give somewhat fully my views of the coming of Christ as declared in the Scriptures. The Scriptures as I understand

them speak of two distinct comings of Christ, in reference to the saints as being in the world. The first was his coming in the flesh or being born in Bethlehem. Embraced in this personal coming, according to the general tenor of promise, and prophecy going before, is the whole of his coming in his kingdom in the world, both in the gathering together of his elect, and in the destruction of his enemies. Thus old Jacob's prophecy, Gen. 49:10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be," evidently embraces Christ's coming in the flesh, and his going forth in his gospel, gathering his sheep into his fold. In Psalms 50:1-3, it is said, "The Lord hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined." And that, "Our God shall come and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with my sacrifice." &c. Thus this corresponds with Jacob's prophecy above, in the coming of our God or Shiloh, and in the *gathering of the people unto him*; also with Matt. 24:30 & 31, the sending of his angels with the great sound of a trumpet and gathering together his elect, &c. Those who have made a covenant with him by sacrifice are evidently the *elect*; that is, in and through Christ their Head and Representative. In this connection it is said a *fire devoureth before him*, and remember, "A fire goeth before him and burneth up his enemies round about." Psal. 97:3, this also in connection with the Lord's reigning. Thus his reigning or having all power given to him in heaven and in earth, or calling to the heavens from above, and his burning up his enemies round about and the gathering together unto him his people or saints, are all connected with his coming in the flesh, for to this end was he born. John 18:37. See also Phil. 2:6-11. In Isa. 9:6 & 7 it is said of the *child born*, {and by comparing verse 1 & 2 with Matt. 4:14-16 it is evident that it is spoken of Christ, as coming in the flesh,} that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." But it is not necessary to multiply quotations to prove a point of which the scriptures are so full. Hence the comings of our Lord in reference to the spread of his gospel, to the destruction of the Jews, and other enemies; or to his dwelling with his saints are but points of his first personal coming; they are not distinct manifestations of himself in person, but only distinct manifestations of his power and of his grace and faithfulness to his people, &c.

That there is to be a second personal coming and appearing of Christ Jesus, is evident from the declaration of the two men in white apparel, unto the disciples, as they were gazing after Jesus as he went into heaven; namely, "This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

Acts 1:9-11. This is affirmed of *Jesus*, and therefore of his manhood, and hence can mean nothing less than that he shall again come visibly in that same body in which the disciples had seen him go up into heaven. Hence it is that I understand the Apostle in saying, "And unto them that look for him shall he appear a second time without sin unto salvation," {Heb. 9:23,} to have reference to the coming of Jesus *in like manner as the disciples saw him go into heaven*. A *second time*, clearly refers to a former time in which he appeared and marks a distinct appearing from that first time; and if it is a second appearing it must be a personal manifestation. This *appearing* or coming is to be "without sin unto salvation." In everything connected with Christ's first appearing, sin is in one way or other brought to remembrance; but this salvation without sin must be that ultimate completion of salvation, that entire deliverance from sin and death, which the saints by faith are looking for. Hence also I think I Thes. 4:16 & 17, has reference to this same second appearing, or coming in like manner. It reads thus, "For the Lord *himself shall descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." Some of our brethren differ from me in their views of Heb. 9:28, as also in reference to the 27th verse, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, &c." If I understand them, their view is that the 27th verse has reference to a will or testament; that the *appointment once to die* has reference to the laws and customs of men which require that the testator should be first dead, before his heirs can claim the execution of his will; and the *after judgment* to be the decision of the judge of probates as to the validity of the will. Whilst I would not treat with disrespect those brethren or their opinions, I must say that from the first of my hearing or seeing this idea advanced my mind revolted as it as tending to belittle this portion of Scripture; and still whilst I am conscious of the superiority of those brethren in gifts and judgment, I cannot view the idea otherwise than as degrading, that the eternal God should have appointed his Son unto death, or offered him, merely in conformity to the laws and customs of men concerning testaments, that the testator must first die, before his will is of force, and such must be the conclusion, from such exposition; for notice the comparison. "As it is appointed unto men once to die … so Christ once offered, &c." But the mischief of such an exposition does not stop here; it sets aside the whole doctrine of the cross of Christ, as Old School Baptists have ever held it; as those brethren themselves hold it. For if we admit that the laws and customs of men concerning wills, amount to anything like an appointment unto men once to die, what is the sum of it? It is this, that the testator must die to establish his will. He dies according to the general sentence of God by which *death passed upon all men*; there is nothing in his death expiatory, no bearing the sins of his heirs, no redemption in it. Now if the comparison in the text holds good, according to

this exposition, Christ's bearing the sins of many amounts to nothing; he only dies to give force or validity to the new testament, and the inheritance comes to the heirs without their being redeemed, or their sins being expiated. Is not this the legitimate conclusion to be drawn from the passage according to the above exposition? But let us examine the text with its connection, to see whether such exposition can be correct. I cannot see anything in the declaration, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment" applicable to the circumstances of wills. There is the appointment by the word of God or by the laws of men that men shall make their wills, or that having made them they shall then die. There is an appointment of God that men shall die because they have sinned, but this has no relation to their wills. The Apostle says nothing about an appointment in the case of a testament; he says, "Where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator," but this is very different from the idea of an appointment in the case. The necessity arises from the nature of things, because whilst the man still lives, his property is his own, and he may alienate it, or decide to make a different disposition of it. Hence some men have lived to make several wills, and others have died without making any, and some without having any property to be inherited after their debts are paid. Again, how is it that the judgment is after the death of the testator? In modern times, wills may be contested, and in that case there is a judgment as to their validity. But in general the judgment goes before, the man's will is the judgment that must stand in reference to the distribution of his property, and this has after his death to be executed; hence he appoints – not judges – but *executors* to his will.

Also, the connection does not favor the idea, any more than the words of the text, that the Apostle in speaking in reference to a will. God has been pleased to show to the heirs of promise, the security to them of the gracious provisions he has made for them in Christ, both by the idea of a covenant, and of a testament; and both ideas are carried out in the scriptures distinctly. The Apostle having in the eight chapter brought to view the superiority of the new covenant over the old, goes on in this ninth chapter to show that the specifications of the first covenant were but the shadows of the good things, the substance of the new, as in the case of the offerings of the priesthood, and of the tabernacle; and in bringing to view the death and blood of Christ as the substance shadowed forth by the offerings and priesthood of the old covenant, confirms the idea of the old covenant, confirms the idea of the necessity of his death, verses 15 – 20, by reference to a testament, and the necessity of the death of the testator, thus showing that the death of Christ was involved in both figures. He then again resumes the consideration of the specifications of the covenant in reference to the shedding of *blood for remission*, and offerings, &c., showing that he had fully dropped the idea of a testament; for a testament has to do with an inheritance, not with sacrifices and offerings for sin. In verses 25 and 26 he lays down the position, that Christ's offering of himself had not to be repeated like the offerings of the first covenant, "But now *once* in the end

of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." He then proceeds, verses 27 & 28, to confirm this position by the fact that the penalty of the law does not require that the sinner should repeatedly die, and therefore Christ as the substitute of his people could not be required repeatedly to *offer himself* or die; his language is, And as it is appointed unto men *once* to die, but after this the judgment, so Christ was *once* offered, &c., thus showing that Christ's *once* being offered met the appointment of God or the demand of the law that men should once die. But what, say some, has this sentence, "But after this the judgment" to do in this case? A great deal. What is the judgment, but the giving of judgment? And what is that, but the passing of sentence either of justification or of condemnation? Does not the whole scriptural testimony fix the time of judgment after death? Was it not after Christ's death that he was *raised for the justification of his people*? And in reference to himself, though he was first *manifested* in *the flesh*, yet it was in the *Spirit* that he was *justified*; not by his death, but by the resurrection from the dead was he "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the Spirit of holiness." I Tim. 3:16, Rom. 1:4. So in reference to the elect, it is after they have been slain by the law, that judgment passes upon them. Herein is the clear difference between the sentence or penalty of the law and the judgment, and shows that the sentence of the law is not the judgment; the convicted elect sinner is under the teachings of the Spirit convinced that the sentence of death by the law stands justly against him as a transgressor, and is expecting every moment the judgment in accordance thereunto to be given, and to be banished to eternal darkness; but behold it does not take place, and to his astonishment, instead of *condemnation*, it is *justification*, through the obedience of Christ. So of the world, or those who die in unbelief, Christ's words are, "The hour is coming in which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice; and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5:28 & 29. *Damnation* as used in the scriptures is synonymous with *condemnation*, and condemnation is the giving of judgment. If they are raised to this out of their graves it must be after death. If indeed there is no after judgment, in reference to the finally impenitent, no sentence passed upon them other than what is contained in the scriptures, or than the written penalty of the law; there would at least be a very strong argument in favor of their becoming extinct at death. For the penalty of the law is, the sinner shall *die*; and if there is no after sentence corresponding to the spirituality of the soul, the conclusion would be that death would be the end. Following the Apostle's argument through, that "as it is appointed unto men once to die," so Christ was once offered, corresponding with that sentence, and as, "after this the judgment;" so "unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation;" in open confirmation of their faith, and of the judgment passed upon them through him in his resurrection; we see a full

harmony in this passage with the connection, and a dignity in it corresponding to the exalted nature of Christ's death as generally revealed in the scriptures.

But to the immediate subject given for consideration. I think I have on a former occasion in writing my views of this 24th chapter of Matthew noticed that the disciples in verse 3, asked their Lord two distinct questions. 1st. "When shall these things be?" that is, the destruction &c., of the temple of which he had just spoken; and 2nd. "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" Some may perhaps suppose, and I know not but that I may have formerly supposed, that the disciples asked concerning two distinct periods in this second question; namely, that of his coming, and that of the end of the world. But not so, for then they would have enquired for the *signs*; that is, the sign of each, instead of connecting both as they did with *one sign*. The coming therefore embraced in this enquiry, is that which is immediately connected with the end of the world, and which of course is that *second personal coming* of Christ which, as has been showed, the scriptures authorize us to look for. The enquiry is, after the *sign* of this event, or these events connected. Christ in the course of the chapter gives such answers to the two enquiries and such instructions relative thereto as he saw proper. Preceding this 27th verse he forewarns of the coming of *false christs*, &c., in verse 26, he speaks of their calling upon the people to go into the *desert* or the *secret chambers* in order to their manifesting themselves to them as the Christ. He tells his disciples not to believe them; and in the 27th verse he gives them this one leading principle by which all such secret working imposters may be detected; namely, that the true Christ, the Son of man, comes in no such obscure way, "For as the lightning cometh out of the east" {and from its nature} "shineth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be." His coming personally, or coming in his gospel and the display of his power, is open and public like the light, not obscure like the darkness. As he says, Isaiah 48:16, "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I;" and as he told the high priest, John 18:20; "I spake openly to the world &c." So his religion leads to an open public profession of it; in vain is it sought to be enjoyed in secret. His doctrine is to be proclaimed from the house-tops, not talked of in the chimney-corner, but kept back in public. These are my present views of this text; and it was spoken I think to guard his disciples in all after ages against any of these *secret-chamber* systems, plans or professions of religion; Christ's religion being like his coming, and like a lighted candle designed to give light.

My respects to *Enquirer*, though I think I may doubt his humility from his being ashamed of his name.

S. TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Oct.10, 1848.

# MISSIONARY PRIESTCRAFT.

Brother Beebe: – As the Old School Baptists are so frequently charged with denying to others, the right of doing what they please with their money, a few remarks on this subject may not be unreasonable. It is said that we would deprive brethren the privilege of giving a ninepence, or a six cent piece to the missionaries, &c. But let us examine the subject; and would to God that those who thus charge us, and those who received these charges, were disposed to judge candidly.

In the first place, – Have the Old School Baptists, by their declarations of separation from the mission schemes, or by any of their resolutions attempted to dictate to others the course they are to take? We have not. I challenge those who complain of our stand to show an instance wherein we have. In our stand, we maintain that what is not of God, has no just claim to be put on the same footing with that religion, and its ordinances, which God has revealed in His word. And is there the missionary who has the audacity to say in direct terms, that the authority of man is equivalent to the authority of God?

We say that the whole mission system, or plans of *benevolent operations*, to use the *Ashdod* phrase, is devoid of the sanction of divine revelation, and of course of divine authority. In confirmation of this position, we say and show, that God, in His word, has prescribed an order for the spread of His gospel and the gathering of His elect, entirely different from the mission plan; and has given no direction for any part of that plan. And further we have, by every different motive we could present, called upon the mission advocates, if we have erred in this position, to show us from the scriptures our error, and without effect. They, it is true, say that the success which attends their plans, is an evidence that they are of God. But we cannot admit this as proof; because from the whole history of our religion, as given in the scriptures, as well as in posterior writings, we learn, that in every age, the multitude have been disposed to depart from the true God and His institutions, and to follow their own imaginations; and that in every age, has there been, comparatively, but a little flock, which adhered to the instructions of divine revelation, or have been owned of God as His true worshippers. Also, to receive such

testimony would be to admit that the opinion and practice of the multitude is higher authority than the written revelation which God has given us of His will. And, thirdly, to decide on the truth of a religious system according to the multitude of its advocates, would be to brand those who were slain, in ages past for their religion, and the Witnesses who are yet to be killed, with being martyrs to error. For the persecuting class of professors in times past have always been more numerous than the persecuted; and the great majority of professors must be on the side of Anti-christ, to enable him to establish his decree, that *no man may buy or sell save he that hath the mark or the name of the beast, &c*., and to kill the two Witnesses. Again, we not only believe and say that the mission system is not of God, from the fact that He has not stamped it with the *broad seal* of Christ's kingdom; namely, divine revelation, but we also say, that not being appointed of God, it must have originated with the *man of sin*. It not only bespeaks this origin, from its being palmed upon us as religious, by human authority, but in every branch of it, we see the image of the beast reflected, or a copying after the church of Rome, as a prototype. Where do we first find the mission plan brought forward, and acted on? In the church of Rome. These enquires might be pursued if we had room, until every feature, of the pretended *benevolent* operations, would be shown to be but copies of what is found in that corrupt church.

Hence, we must necessarily, according to our belief, consider the whole mission system, as being at so great a remove from the religion taught in the scriptures, that whilst we truly reverence the latter as having God for its author we must separate ourselves, both in practice and in fellowship, from the other. And I cannot comprehend how any person who has known experimentally the spirituality of the religion of Christ, and the divine communication of it to the soul, can, after a moments reflection, harbor the idea of placing the devices of men in conjunction with that religion which is from heaven and bears the stamp of divine perfection.

The above principles have been fully published in the several declarations made by Old School Baptists, as the reasons why we cannot fellowship as disciples of Christ, those who continue, after the subject has been thus brought to their consideration, to give countenance to the mission plan, in any of its parts. At the same time, we have, hitherto, and still would leave others to choose for themselves, whether they will seek our fellowship by giving evidence of a heart subjection to Christ the King of Zion, or will seek union with the missionists by countenancing their devices. And resting on the merits of the case, we have never to make converts, resorted to flattery or any of those arts, which missionists employ to draw persons under their yoke. We wish persons to be *fully persuaded in their own minds* upon this important subject, and to pursue with decision that course which they believe right. To fellowship the Old School Baptists in truth, and at the same time to approve of the mission plans, is impossible! *Can two walk*

*together except they be agreed?* Or can any person be agreed with us in conscientiously opposing the devices of men in religion, and at the same time support the moneyed religious schemes of the missionaries?

But in the second place, I cannot admit the principle involved in the charge against us, which is now under consideration; that is, that members of a church may indifferently employ their money either in the support of vice, or of religion. I readily admit that the New Testament recognizes a personal property in the possessions providentially given to anyone. But at the same time, when a person as a professed disciple of Jesus, gives himself up in fellowship with a church, there is more implied, than simply that he will occasionally, or constantly, unite with them in their worship; however *loose* many churches may hold their members. So long as this person continues to fellowship this church as a church of Christ, he is bound duly to regard the fellowship of the brethren in all his transactions. And in professing to be a disciple of Christ he professes no longer *to be his own*, but to be *bought with a price*, &c. Hence, his independent right to employ any gifts which may be bestowed upon him, or anything he may possess to his own exclusive advantage, or to his own pleasure, is absorbed in his greater obligation to his Lord, and is under the guardianship of the church. Under such tenure, I think we should feel ourselves and all that we possess, as held, if we felt fully under the influence of the spirit of the gospel. Hence the New Testament recognizes in the church the right to call upon each member to lay by in store, according as God has prospered him, for the necessities of the poor; and to administer of his *carnal things*, to those who administer in *spiritual things*. I Cor. 9,11 & 16:2. Hence from this guardianship of the church, a member who shows covetousness, as illustrated in the parable of the rich man – Luke 12:16-21 – and as condemned by the Apostle in Col. 3:5, or the member who expends his income in supporting his family in extravagance and folly, whilst he can spare little or nothing for the support of the gospel ministry, or for the wants of the poor, are each of them undoubtedly proper subjects of church discipline.

Again, the staking a ninepence on a hand of cards or a billiard table, is as decidedly gambling as the staking of a five or ten dollar bill. Would an orderly church excuse from its discipline a member who should thus gamble, merely from his plea that his money was his own? And why not? Not on account of the money lost in itself considered, but because of the principle and practice he thus countenanced.

But to come to the case in hand, the ardently plead for privilege, of giving a ninepence to the missionaries. What is your motive for wishing to give it? Is it on the principle of almsgiving, as you would give to a common beggar? They do not demand it on this principle; and a little reflection will, I think, convince you that such is a very foolish application of your charities. Remember that he who *giveth to the rich* is under the same condemnation with him *who oppresseth the poor* . Prov. 22:16. The agents of the several

societies, their managers and their missionaries, considering their high salaries, the style in which they travel and live may be considered rich. Whilst these various agents are making it a profitable business to travel and filch their salaries from the unsuspecting; there are many of the poor to whom your ninepence would be a real cordial. Yea, are there not those who have given themselves to the ministry of the word, who are poor in this world, and who from a sense of duty, are often constrained to leave their families, not very comfortably provided for, to preach the gospel to these poor and destitute brethren, to whose care-burdened minds your spare ninepences would often be a real relief? But those who are fond of giving to the missionaries, are not much disposed to give to those who preach the gospel, independent of fleshly considerations. The reason is manifest; because in giving to the one, they receive the applause of men, in the other case, they have to be content with the approbation of their own consciences. Or, secondly. Do you wish to give your ninepence, merely from fear of being thought singular, and of being reproached for not giving? And can you claim to yourself the character of the one who is *not ashamed of Christ*, whilst your money is given so freely to purchase an exemption from that reproach to which a conscientious and steadfast adherence to His word would expose you? And is ninepence the price at which you value the fellowship of those who from principle will not sanction a departure from the word of God as the rule of faith and practice, that you can so lightly hurt their feelings by giving your money to support an interest, so opposite to that of the pure and heavenly religion of Christ?

Or, thirdly. Do you truly believe that the mission plans are of God, and believe the truth of the principle on which they are built; namely, that the giving of money to support those plans is essential to the salvation of the heathen? And can you satisfy your conscience, whilst you thus believe, with giving now and then a ninepence, or a dollar? In what other light can we view you as that of unfeeling monsters, if you believe that God has suspended the salvation of the heathen on your giving money to provide them with preaching, and can content yourself with giving so sparingly? And in what light are we to view the mission agents who believe the above position relative to the situation of the heathen, (if we can credit their own repeated assertions,) and yet who can appropriate so large a proportion of the money so sparingly given to rescue those people from *dropping into the quenchless flames of hell*, in paying themselves those high salaries every year, and to decking themselves with their gold watches, guards, spectacles, &c.? Again, can you believe this mission system to be the religion of Christ, and yet wish to have any religious connection with us Old School Baptists, who are entire unbelievers in your whole system? We do not believe that the giving of money ever did, ever will or can procure the salvation of one soul that would otherwise have perished. We do not believe that ever a College or a Theological School made one gospel preacher, or gave to one person the necessary qualification for preaching the

gospel of Christ. We do not believe that Bible Societies are at all necessary to enable those whom God *has converted to know that He has converted them*; or to those who have a desire for the scriptures to obtain them. Neither do we believe that Tract Societies, Sunday Schools, or Bible classes are of use in converting souls to God, or in any sense the so-called *means of grace*. Nor do we believe that God employs the modern, or the more ancient Romish missionaries for preaching His gospel, or making known His salvation. But we believe that all these are important links in that chain, which is forging to bind down the minds of our countrymen under the dominion of priestcraft; and that they are parts of the Image of the Beast, the *dedication* of which by public decree, will consummate the power of Anti-christ. Hence those missionists who denounce us as infidels are much more consistent with their own creed, than those who pretendedly wish to enjoy our fellowship or to live in church relation with us. But before they decry us as infidels, they ought to give more decisive proof of their own genuine belief in their creed, by a more faithful appropriation of the money they collect, to the specific object for which it was given.

In a word, where there is a moral honesty and a faithful examination of the subject, there can be no neutrality, no indifference relating to the mission system. It either is of God, or is not of God. If we believe it is not of God, and truly love Christ and His cause, we cannot consistently countenance it by the giving of even a nine-piece for its support, any more than had we lived in the days of the primitive christians, we could have thrown incense on the heathen altars, to countenance those sacrifices, which Paul says they *sacrificed to devils*. If we believe this system to be of God and have any love and reverence for God, we certainly should feel constrained to enter fully into the whole system, and be actively engaged by every exertion and every sacrifice in our power to promote all its branches and to prove the superior efficacy, over the death and life of Christ, of human contrivance aided by money, to save souls and evangelize the world. Paul said: “For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more being reconciled *we shall be saved by His life* .” (Rom. 5:10). But Paul was an Old School Baptist. The gospel which he preached, he *received not from men, neither was he taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ*. (Gal. 1:11,12). Therefore Jesus Christ and Him crucified – not money – was the sum of his preaching.

To conclude, my Friend, if you believe the mission system to be of God, be consistent, give your money freely, but neither fellowship us in our opposition to it, nor ask us to fellowship you. Let each be governed by his own religion, as distinct, the one from the other, as is the production of the Eternal Mind, from the imaginations of the human brain.

If you do not believe the mission system to be the appointment of God, take heed how you countenance it as religious lest you give the world reason to conclude that you

consider all religion to be the device of men, and lest you be found enlisted among the enemies of truth. Farewell,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.5 (1837)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 96 – 102

# MOREOVER THE LAW ENTERED

Brother Beebe: – I saw in a number of the *Signs* some time back that sister A. A. Ford, of Lexington, N.Y., requests my views on Rom. 5:20, "*Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.*"

It appears to me that any person who reads this text with attention, believing it to mean what it says, will be surprised at the view Paul had of the purpose of God in the giving of the law as differing so materially from the view so generally entertained of the use of the law. The idea of many is that the grand design of the law is to make men moral and better, and to enable them by obedience to it to secure acceptance with God. No doubt the letter of the law, where it has been known, has had a tendency to restrain persons somewhat from outward sins, at any rate to establish a better standard of morals then exists among the heathen. But God had a much higher purpose than this in giving the law; and when men preach it as a way of life, and look to their obedience to it as means of their acceptance with God, they entirely pervert the law and the design of it. The law is spiritual, and as such is the standard of righteousness; and was given to show the depravity of man and to prepare the way for the manifestation of salvation by Christ and

of grace. Paul said, “I had not known sin but by the law.” Of course he would not have known the need of salvation by Christ, without this knowledge of sin by the law. “The law entered that the offence might abound,” is a positive declaration without any reservation. We evidently are not to understand by this that man has become any more depraved, or has acted out this depravity any more since the law was given, than before. God, before the coming of the flood, “Saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” But the depravity of man was made more manifest by the law’s being given, in showing thereby his want of conformity to it, as illustrated in the continual disobedience of national Israel, and the consequent repeated judgments incurred. There was everything to induce and to favor that people’s obeying the law, if the heart had not been entirely alienated from God, in the repeated manifestations of His power in delivering and preserving them, and in fulfilling unto them the promises made unto their fathers, and in blessing them with an abundance of increase when obedient; yet their hearts were continually going off after their idols. But the grace of God did much more abound in their case, in His repeated and marvelous deliverances of them from those distresses brought upon themselves by their rebellion against Him, and in preserving them until the long-looked-for promise made unto their fathers of the coming of the Messiah was fulfilled. Then were they left to fill up the measure of their iniquities in rejecting Him. And then was it manifested that this grace abounded toward them, not for their sakes, but for the sake of Christ and His seed, which was in them concerning the flesh, and typical.

But I think the Apostle had more particular reference to the spiritual application of the law in the experience of the subjects of grace. Men, while in a state of unregeneracy have all that depravity which they under God’s teaching afterwards discover in themselves; but they know it not; it perhaps lays in a great measure dormant in them. So that Watts was correct in saying:

“I was alive without the law,
And thought my sins were dead.”

**Again,**

“My guilt appeared but small before,
Till terribly I saw,
How perfect, holy, just and pure,
Was thine eternal law.”

The law is spiritual, but the natural man cannot discern spiritual things; he only knows the letter of the law. And as *by the law is the knowledge of sin*, we can only know sin as

we know the law. When that spiritual life which is the *light of men*, is imparted to men in regeneration, or God shines in the heart, he now sees the law in that light as it is applied of God to him; and there is a majesty, weight and broadness to it that he had not felt in the letter before. It penetrates and searches his heart, and joys open to his view as contrasted with its holy demands, the exceeding sinfulness and deceitfulness of his heart; so that his soul is by the law converted from its notions of self-righteousness, and he dies under the sentence of the law. Thus, I presume, sister Ford once thought that she had only to turn her attention to the law and observe it more closely, and she would soon purge away those sins she was then conscious of, and become very good. And probably that would have been the result in her estimation, if it had been only her turning her attention to the law. But when God spake the law to her, and caused it to enter her heart, she found the offence abounding. This is just the difference between man's teaching and God's teaching; between men's seeking God, and God's seeking them and searching them.

*But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound*. Yes, grace abounds to the free pardon of all the multitude of our sins, and the depth of our depravity. It superabounds above all our unworthiness, poverty, pollution and guilt, to give instead of the curse we deserve, peace and joy in believing, and the hope of heavenly purity and glory beyond this world. It superabounds, in that it makes our depravity and ruin the very occasion, and I may say a *means* (though the expression may startle the *means* folks) of our being subjects of God's grace and salvation. Without being sinners we had not been subjects of salvation. Hence without knowing our sinfulness we could not have known what it is to be saved, and without a knowledge of the depth of our depravity, we could not have known the loveliness and the riches of that grace which brings salvation to such vile sinners. The entrance of the law was a very important part in the salvation of the elect, and it was rich grace which caused it to enter in its majesty and strictness to our hearts, searching out the abominations therein, and stripping us of our self-righteousness.

Those who know not the law as spiritual, may please themselves with their goodness and with their obedience as being means of their salvation, but when they go hence they will leave behind all the heaven, they can know. The super abounding of grace over our abounding sins, is manifested, in that it has provided for the believers an infinitely better righteousness than man could have obtained by the law, a far more stable foundation for the hope of future happiness, than man could have had in his own obedience; and also has brought the believers into a nearer and far more glorious relation to God, that of sons of God, than they could have known had they not sinned, for they could only have remained servants. Lastly it has secured for them in Christ a far more glorious inheritance than they could have had through Adam had he remained in uprightness; for he was of the earth, earthy.

If these views will be of any use or comfort to sister Ford or others, I am glad to impart them. Yours, in love,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
May, 1858.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 26 (1858)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 452 – 455

## NOT A NOVICE &c.

Brother Beebe: – I see by *Signs* for Dec. 15, 1845, that brother Mitchell of Alabama requests my views of 1 Timothy 3:6 – "Not a novice; lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil." I have never had any special light on this text; my views must, therefore, be such as arise from a comparison of this with other Scriptures according to my understanding of them. Sickness in my family, with my being much from home, prevented for a time my attending to this request.

The subject of which the Apostle is here treating, as seen by the context, is that of the qualifications which he mentions is that of being a *novice*, and the reason for its being such is assigned in the text proposed for consideration. A *novice*, properly signifies, one *new-made* a disciple, or *new-born* into the gospel faith. Such persons have not experienced enough of the warfare within, nor of the *wiles of the devil*, to serve as a proper ballast and to prevent them, if too much prompted and flattered in the church, from becoming inflated and top-heavy.

But Brother Mitchell more particularly inquires about falling into the *condemnation of the devil*. **1st.** What is intended by the *condemnation of the devil?* I presume no one will seriously entertain the idea that condemnation here, as referring to the devil, is to be taken in an active sense; that is, the devil sitting as judge will condemn him for being

lifted up with pride. Neither do I think it will be supposed that the devil will comparatively condemn him as being worse than himself; as our Lord said the *Ninevites should condemn that generation* Luke 11:32. How else, then, can we understand this than in a passive sense; that is, as the condemnation into which the devil is fallen, or to which he is adjudged? This, therefore necessarily involves in it the idea that the devil, like Adam and his posterity, is under condemnation; hence also it involves the idea that the devil was originally under the law, and therefore a creature of God.

Again, the Apostle speaks of this condemnation of the devil as a something known. He may have referred to some particular sentence of condemnation passed upon the devil and handed down by tradition, and now first confirmed by the spirit of inspiration in Paul; as was the case about *Michael and the Devil's disputing about the body of Moses*, as recorded by Jude, verse 9. But, I am inclined to the belief that this relates to the state of the devil as understood among the disciples, and as referred to in a different form in other portions of Scripture. Thus Jude refers to the angels which *kept not their first estate*, as being *reserved in everlasting chains under darkness*, &c.

I, with some others, understand these angels to be those evil spirits called devils. So our Lord spake of the Devil not as having never been in any other state; but, as having *not abode in the truth* as though that was the first estate in which he was created. And why? Because, *there is no truth in him;* Christ, or the Truth, having been no more implanted in him by the Spirit, than he was in Adam in his first creation. Christ says further of him, "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar and the father of it" John 8:44. Such appears manifestly to be the condemnation into which multitudes of young upstarts have fallen, having been lifted up with pride and self-conceit; their minds evidently being *chained down under darkness* as to the truth revealed in the Scriptures and are retailers, if not manufactures, of false systems of religion, or lies. And even there are persons whom some of us have known, who, when they first commenced preaching, appeared to know something of the truth experimentally, but being much flattered and caressed, began to go off into the popular current; and now their minds seem entirely dark as to the authority and import of God's revelation, and are the strenuous advocates for what we understand to be doctrines of devils, or false doctrines, of which the devil is the father.

Now, in my opinion, these have fallen into the condemnation of the devil; how long they will remain there is not for me to say. Such, therefore, I give as my opinion of this text in connection with those others; and I give it only as my opinion, though the text (I Tim. 4:1 & 2), "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the last times some shall depart from the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy," &c., I think tends to confirm the correctness of this opinion. When they depart from the faith

they give heed to seducing spirits, as in themselves or in others, and to the doctrines of devils, and, of course, they fall into the same condemnation, under darkness and falsehood.

My brother, if we have been kept from this condemnation, may the same grace continue thus to keep us. Yours, &c.,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Feb.13, 1846.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 14 (1846)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 330 – 332

# ON FAITH.

Brother Beebe: – I thought my pen was nearly laid by, excepting for private correspondence. I had concluded the readers of the *Signs* were tired of discussions; and nothing of a different class seemed to present itself to my mind. But brother Johnson's request through the *Signs* for my views of Heb. 11:1, affords an occasion for again writing, which I readily embrace. *"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."* Heb. 11:1

The Apostle having in the preceding part of this epistle drawn a comparison and a contrast between the carnal things of the earthly or typical dispensation, and the spiritual things of the anti-typical or heavenly dispensation, comes in this 11th chapter to describe that faith by which these spiritual things are known and received in distinction from our natural faculties, by which those carnal ceremonies were apprehended. He commences his description of faith with the position laid down in our text, and then illustrates it by showing its power as exemplified in the experience of the ancient worthies.

Whether we consider the faith here described, in its special relation to the spiritual things of the gospel, as contrasted with the carnal ceremonies of the law, or as exemplified in the experience of the patriarchs, or in the position laid down in the text before us, we must in either case arrive at the conclusion that, it is a spiritual exercise, and as distinct from natural belief, as are the spiritual truths of the gospel from the external ordinances of the law. The requisitions of the law upon national Israel as such, consisting only in the letter, could be taught by parents to their children, and were required so to be taught; and therefore could be understood by their natural faculties, and be believed as their natural judgments were enlightened. But the knowledge of the truths of the gospel in their spirituality, is not imparted by, nor received from human instruction. Even after all the oral instruction which Christ had given His disciples while in the flesh, He had, after His resurrection, to open their understanding that they might understand the scriptures; that is, in their application to Him. Luke 24:45. And before this, when Peter declared his faith in Christ as the Son of God; Jesus said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Barjonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven; thus showing this knowledge of Jesus, was not science, but direct revelation from the Father. Hence Paul says, “No man can say Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost.” I Cor. 12:3. See also Paul’s own experience in the case. Gal. 1:11,12. But why multiply proofs on this point? For after all that men may do, in their attempts to carnalize the gospel so as to make it a subject for human instruction, the testimony of God will stand sure, that, “The natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God,” and that, “Except a man be born again he cannot see the things of the kingdom of God.” I Cor. 2:14 & John 3:3.

But to the Apostle’s position: Faith is the substance of things hoped for, &c. What are *the things hoped for*? They are the perfect deliverance from sin &c., which is promised to the saints. Or they may be any particular instance of a promise, applied to us, like the special promise which God made to Abraham. Gen. 15:5, 6. There are many things which we at times hope for, which have no substance but in our imaginations, for God has never promised them to us, and consequently, with such, faith hath nothing to do. Faith is the substance of those things hoped for, that is, with a true gospel hope. The word here translated *substance* is different from the word so rendered in the tenth chapter and 34th verse. The lexicons give an explanation to this word evidently with reference to its use here, as meaning to be present to the mind; that is, to be seen or felt by the mind, as natural substances are seen or felt by the outward senses. It seems explained as by contrast, by chapter 10:1 – “The law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things,” &c. That is, the legal ceremonies could only present a shadow of spiritual things, and therefore left the comers thereunto without an actual sense of their sins being cleared away as before God; or as the Apostle says, could not make them perfect. It is true, faith, in those who had it, gave them the

assurance that there was a substance thus shadowed forth, and therefore gave them hope of acceptance with God. Now, instead of this shadowy, imperfect view, faith under the gospel, presents to the believer the salvation of sinners, as finished in Christ Jesus, and also, all the promises of God as flowing through Him, and as being *in Him yea, and Amen.*

Thus through faith the believer rests in this salvation, and these promises as solid substances. Again, the Apostle describes this faith by another mode of expression, namely as: *The evidence of things not seen. Things hoped for, are things not seen, for what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for*? Rom. 8:24. These are things spiritual and not apprehended by the natural senses; but faith being the substance of them, is the evidence of their reality to the mind; and it is also the evidence of our enjoying them, as it apprehends and gives us the assurance of the faithfulness of God, in bestowing what He has promised in Christ. So clear and decisive, is the evidence of faith in such cases, that wherein it is in exercise all doubt is removed.

Now the faith that can do this, that can present unseen things to the mind, and constrain the mind to rest upon them as present realities, must be a living principle, and possess a power independent of anything belonging to the natural mind. It is very different from that belief which is an exercise of the natural mind, and which is produced by instruction, or external evidence, acting upon the mind and convincing the judgment of the truth of the thing. Hereby we may be assisted in drawing the distinction between the living and dead faith, in their essences, which James speaks of. {James chapter 2}. That the *dead faith,* cannot be the *faith which is of the operation of God*, I think every child of grace will admit. Of course, it can be nothing more than an exercise of the natural mind. The living faith has, as already noticed, a controlling power over the mind, bringing it with all its powers into submission, to the will of God; but natural belief being but an exercise of the mind, produced by the exercise of other faculties of the mind, has of course no necessary control over the mind; though it may influence the mind to determine on action. Thus two persons may each be led by conclusive evidence, to believe that he has an estate left him in England; the one may be influenced by his belief to take measures to obtain his, whilst the other, from other considerations, may altogether neglect his. What is commonly called belief, that is, of the natural mind, is of two kinds. One is a mere passive assent to the truth of a thing. It is a belief arising from education, or produced by the declarations of others, without their ever investigating the subject, or judging for themselves. This has no claim to the name of faith; yet a little examination will convince any one, that on the subject of religion, this is all the faith which the greater production of professors have claim to; they being in their religious characters either the mere creatures of education, or the dupes of artful *priests*.

Again, there are others, who are accustomed to investigating subjects for themselves; and who have thus investigated the subject of religion, and what they believe concerning it, they believe because according to the light they have, or use, their judgments are convinced of the truth of it. This is often mistaken for true gospel faith, and yet it is only a belief produced by the exercise of the rational faculties. This was the faith with which Simon believed, from seeing the miracles performed by Philip, {Acts 8:5- 13,} and with which many believed, from seeing the miracles of Christ. This is the faith which the Campbellites claim as the gospel faith; though many of those they baptize evidently have nothing more than the passive belief before described. This rational faith may influence to many things called religious works. Yea, it may influence to a regular attention to the outward performances enjoined upon believers by the New Testament; such as a submission to the ordinances, and order of the gospel. It may lead to a bestowing of *their goods to feed the poor*, and to meet persecution, and a *giving of their bodies to be burned*. I Cor. 13:3. Or a person may have this faith, and yet not be influenced by it in his life, or to any act of religious obedience, or separation from the world. But whatever effect it may have upon the outward life, it is still nothing but a dead faith. It has no spiritual life, and therefore produces no spiritual action, nor makes any true application of the consolations of the gospel. It is an exercise of the powers of the natural man, and, "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." I Cor. 2:14. It knows nothing of resting, with the depravity and vileness of our hearts in view, upon Christ for full salvation. It knows nothing of a going out of heart in love to a poor sinner, because he has such a discovery of the awful depravity of his heart as to have lost all confidence in his own exertions, nor because it discovers that his hope is fixed alone on Christ for salvation. It may produce a love to sinners because it discovers them engaged on the subject of religion, or because it sees them conforming in doctrine and practice to particular views of religion. It knows not the sealing of the Spirit of God, whereby believers are sealed with the spirit of adoption, and are led to approach God with that confidence with which a child approaches its parent. Neither does it know anything of resting upon the promises of God, excepting as we can discover some supposed ground in us, or outwardly, why we should hope for the thing promised. The child of grace, though probably he is at no time without some traces of the actings of a living faith in Him, yet has much of this dead faith blended in his exercises, and which he often mistakes for the only faith he has; and finding it to want that power which in the New Testament is ascribed to true faith, he at times, concludes that he has been altogether deceived in himself. In most cases, the child of grace has this dead faith to a much fuller extent, than any unregenerated person can have it; from his being led through the teachings of the Holy Spirit, to a fuller and more intimate acquaintance with the truths of divine revelation. Hence it is that we frequently find the

child of grace under disappointments, and afflictions of various kinds, complaining of a want of submission and reconciliation of mind to God's dealings with them.

Tell them, God is doing it in wisdom, and love, they will reply, "We believe it, and know we ought to be submissive, but we cannot bring our stubborn minds to it;" which shows this belief to be but a dead faith. Were the Holy Spirit to bring their living faith into exercise, in relation to this dispensation of God toward them, it would present to their minds such a feeling sense of the goodness of God, as revealed to it, that their minds would be brought at once, into patient and cheerful submission to His will.

Again, our minds are frequently led to contemplate some particular promise, we see how appropriate it is to our case, and we have heretofore been enabled by a living faith so to apprehend Christ Jesus as the *end of the law for righteousness*, and as the medium of gracious communications between God and poor, vile sinners like ourselves, that we believe, unworthy as we are, that we may hope for an interest in it, and do believe that it will be verified, and yet this belief does not enable us to exercise that comfortable reliance on it, and that patient waiting for it, which we desire. Now if the Holy Spirit were to lead us to exercise faith in reference to that promise, or in other words, were He to apply the promise with power to us, we should receive it at once as the word of the living God, and all the powers of our mind would be made to rejoice in it as ours, and to admire the goodness of God in it, and to realize in sweet anticipation, the gracious fulfillment of it.

Thus brethren, I think, by a little attention to their experience, may readily trace, in this case, and in reference to the preached word, and to the various dealings of God with them, a manifest distinction between these two kinds of faith, as exemplified in them. Many of the children of God, at this day, I have no doubt, go for years, without any special exercise of this living faith; other than in its exercise towards the one great object which is necessary to their being known as believers, namely: its exercise in apprehending the blood and righteousness of Christ, as our plea at the throne of grace, and the ground of our hope of acceptance with God. But the inquiry may further be made, Whence is this living faith, and how is it brought into exercise? It is a spiritual exercise, as before shown, and can therefore be the actings only of the spiritual life of the believer.

This life, although implanted in the soul, is not subject to the control of the natural mind, and therefore cannot be called into exercise at our will. As its being brought into existence in the soul is *not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of men, but of God*, it is the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who alone controls its action, in faith. It is itself love to God, and to holiness, and therefore from its indwelling in us, we are made to feel a going out of love to God, to His ways, and to His people, and a corresponding loathing

of sin and ourselves on account of it. But the Holy Ghost, who knoweth the will of God, knoweth when to call forth the exercises of faith to apprehend Christ as our salvation, and when to lay hold of any special promise, or any unfoldings of the Scriptures; and when, through our faith, to make intercession for us in prayer, according to the will of God, and He only knows, and therefore has never left the exercise of our faith, to the control of our wills. Or perhaps a more correct illustration of this point, is this: Faith must have an object to be believed, set before it. The *word of God* is the proper object of faith. And by the *word of God*, I do not understand the scriptures, as such, although they are the proper standard by which to know what is the word of God; but I mean by it, the special application of some portion of scripture to us as a promise, a command, a consolation, or as instruction in doctrine or practice, so that we receive it as the word of God, entering our hearts with power. Now as the scriptures are thus applied by the Holy Spirit, faith is called forth and we believe. Thus when the revelation of Christ Jesus is made to the regenerated person, then he believes, and cannot before.

Again, by the illustration which the Apostle gives of this faith in the following part of the chapter, it is evident its exercise is what we call grace, when he says, “Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness,” &c. verses 33 & 34. We in similar cases, would say, the grace of God enabled them to do it, and we should say right, and yet it was through being enabled to exercise faith in God, and in His word, that they were strengthened to endure that to which they were called. Now as the *Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God*, {I Cor. 2:10,} He as the Comforter knoweth when the exercise of faith is needed, and in such cases in faithfulness brings it into exercise, and not otherwise. Hence the early disciples who were called to meet persecution, were *full of faith*. Most of believers when called to depart have faith given them as a shield in the conflict with death. And how often do we see those christians who are much afflicted manifest stronger and clearer faith than others, not so called to suffer. And thus when it is the pleasure of God to bestow some special blessing upon any of His children, He gives them to ask for it in faith frequently, and when we so ask we have the assurance of His hearing us, and therefore of receiving what we ask. See I John 5:14,15. If the Lord is withholding from many of His children, at this day, those special exercises of faith, which to us would be desirable, it is in chastisement, or because in His present dispensation towards His church, He sees it not required. Though really it would seem to us that we have need with the Apostles to pray: “Lord, increase our faith.” Luke 17:5.

I fear I have not done full justice to this subject. I have advanced some ideas which may appear new. But experienced christians will know whether they accord with christian experience or not. If they do not, reject them. I have been led sometimes, since I commenced writing this, to doubt whether *I know anything as I ought to know*. Not

whether *I know* anything, but whether I have that clear knowledge of it, which I ought to have; and this from the little experience we have of those special acts of living faith. Yours in a hope of salvation,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Feb. 13, 1845.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol 13 (1845)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 316 – 323

## ON ISAIAH 20th – No. 1

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

This and the preceding chapter of Isaiah had no doubt a primary reference to events which in part have already transpired relative to national Egypt, though I doubt whether that part of the prophecy contained in the 19th chapter, from the 18th to the 25th verse,

has as yet had its primary fulfillment, or will have, until the time of national Israel's being brought under the power of the gospel; when there will be no longer an Assyrian or Babylonish captivity, Egyptian bondage or Israelitish infidelity to oppose the Church of Christ.

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

Assyria being synonymous with Babylon, evidently represents spiritually the Church of Rome. Egypt as has already been noticed, being uniformly presented, in the Scriptures, as distinct from Babylon or Assyria, must refer to something other than that *interest* in the prophecy under consideration. If we can determine what is intended by that "great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified," Rev. 11:8, we shall undoubtedly get at the true application of the name in the prophecy. The name *Egypt* signifies *bondage*, and Egypt in the Scriptures is called the *house of bondage*, having been such to Israel. Israel soon passed into the house of bondage after being distinguished as Israel, or as *having power with God*, the import of that name. The church of Christ, after being manifested as the *true Israel*, or as *having power with God*; that is, as having boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, &c., {Heb. 10:19-20,} soon passed into a *house of bondage*, under the introduction of Judaism and a multiplication of ceremonies, or that mystery of iniquity which began to work even in the Apostles days. It was under the influence of a religion of this kind among the Jews, a religion which made void the law of God by the traditions of men that our Lord was crucified. As in Egypt literally, so in this case, the *task masters*, which bound heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and laid them on men's shoulders, would not move them with one of their fingers. And all their works they did to be seen of men, as the Egyptians kept Israel making bricks with which to build their Pyramids, those standing monuments of their ostentatious folly to this day. See Matt. 23:4 & 5. So the Apostles say in reference to the binding of the burden of circumcision

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

But this is called a *Great City*. And truly it is; men in all ages have manifested a fondness for a conditional salvation and a showy religion. In all ages the priests, the task-masters in the humanly contrived religions have been disposed to gratify the public whim, by loading their religion, with ceremonies and parade, and the more they have burdened the people with these things, the more popular they have been, and the more they have fattened on the spoils. This city has many streets. There is Mission street, which has Presbyterian Mission Alley, Baptist Mission Alley, &c., running out from it; there Bible Society Street, and many others. But there is one Main street or thoroughfare, where all the citizens intermingle, and where the "dead bodies of the Witnesses are to lie."

But this is also called Sodom, spiritually – not literally – remember. The sin of Sodom therefore, practiced here is in a spiritual or religious sense. And can this sin be found in the city we are describing? Yes; as the Prophet says of Jerusalem, "The shame of their countenance doth witness against them, and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not." Isa. 3:9. Look at the whole mission and moneyed concern; is there any intercourse

with the *bride the Lamb's wife*, or with her daughters, the individual gospel churches, as such in these things? Any consultation of pastor and church in managing those society plans? Not at all. The Boards of the various Societies, composed mostly of preachers, have all the intercourse among themselves. They send out the Agents and Missionaries, appoint their fields of labor, finger the money, what is not swallowed up by the Agents in the collection, and manage the whole business; it is altogether a *male concern*; Sodomy to the full! Yea, more. For as the Apostle speaks {Romans, chapter 1,} of a sin which was not even mentioned in Sodom; so in this great city we find female Tract Societies, female Mite Societies, female prayer meetings, &c., in which females *religiously* associate together, not as in churches, nor as churches, where "there is neither males, nor females, but all one in Christ Jesus;" but as females by themselves.

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

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

Ethiopia and Egypt are repeatedly connected together in Scripture prophecy. I however find no direct figurative application in the Scriptures, of Ethiopia, or the Ethiopians, except in Jer. 11:23, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil?" This was addressed to that adulterous generation of the Jews who were about to be carried captive to Babylon, and corresponds in idea with the prophecy of Daniel, concerning the Egyptians of our day; namely, that "the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand." Dan.12:10. Amos 9:7, also may be considered a figurative application of the term, where speaking of Israel as being rejected of God and about to be driven from their land, the prophet says, "Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, saith the Lord?"

The Ethiopians in the passage we have under consideration, may refer to a distinct class from the Egyptians, but I am inclined to the belief that they are designed to prefigure the same people, and to designate them as being of the same character, having the same blackness and depravity of heart, now they have floated down the broad stream of their *troubled* and *muddy* systems, till they have got into Egypt, and near the great Sea of Babylonish corruption, and of destruction which awaits the whole mass of the *Man of sin*, as when they started at the source of this over-flowing river. The term may also

show, that notwithstanding the *white washing* they may have put on, and their great pretensions to the peculiar favor of heaven, they, instead of being recognized of God as his *free-born sons*, are to him, as the *children of the Ethiopians*, and destined to be subject to perpetual bondage.

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

Yours, as ever,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Sept.26, 1836.

## ON ISAIAH 20th – No. 2.

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

As Isaiah and other prophets had to endure in their measure the same afflictions they were directed to pronounce upon the people, so the Great Prophet of Israel, the Antitype of those prophets, not only endured the same temptations, persecutions, and afflictions which he has appointed for his people, for *he was tempted in all points like as we are*; but he also subjected himself to the same wrath which is due to transgressors. And as Isaiah was *three years* a sign of what Egypt and Ethiopia was to suffer, so our Lord was three days a sign of what awaits the transgressors, the finally impenitent; for in his being

subjected to the curse of the law in his death, we see exemplified that eternal curse which awaits them. Hence “this gospel of the kingdom is to be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations.” But herein he far excels the type, Isaiah was only a sign, the Lord Jesus besides being thus a witness unto all nations of the wrath due them from the divine law, and hence his declaration. *If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?* But he also suffered as a substitute for his people, and was *made a curse for them*, “to deliver them from the curse of the law.” Gal. 3:13.

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

But 3rdly, the Prophet here, I think, represents the church of Christ; and as he had to endure beforehand nakedness and shame, representing that, coming upon Egypt and Ethiopia; so Peter assures us, I Pet. 4:17, that the *time is that judgment must begin at the house of God;* and adds, “And if it begin first at us, what shall the end of them be that obey not the gospel of God, &c.” The connection is evidently applicable to the gospel of God in every period of the gospel day, and so I understand the Apostle as intending by the *time*, the gospel time; that is, that such is the order under the gospel dispensation. That no less, than in the coming of the judgment upon literal Jerusalem, must it be in the judgment of God, coming upon the *Egypt where our Lord was crucified,* or the *man of sin;* that *judgment must begin at the house of God*, by which is meant the Church of Christ; hence Peter says, *if it begin at us.* It must there begin for the trial of the faith of the saints, {verse 12 of the context,} and also for purging of the churches; for it is written, “Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away.” But the same afflictions or persecutions which the Lord, for wise purposes, suffers the *Egyptians* and *Sodomites* of this day, to inflict upon his people; he will visit upon them in a more awful degree. He giveth *blood to drink, to those who have shed the blood of saints and prophets; the that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity, &c.* Rev. 16:6, & 13:10.

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

As to the degradation and shame, this was in the case of Isaiah, only so in the eyes of the people, in truth it was not so, for he was walking in obedience to the command of God; so in the case of the churches of Christ, and of the ministers of the gospel, every attempt will be made to *turn their glory into shame* by those who *seek after leasing;* or deception. And too successful will these benevolent Egyptians be in heaping shame and contempt before men, on those who will not tread mortar in their brickyard, or in other words, who will not do their dirty work of filching pennies from widows, orphans and servants, to increase the funds of what they call the Lord's treasury; or their slavish work of *grinding at their mills;* and who prefer the simple *manna* and the *water from the Rock* of the wilderness, to eating the fish, and the leeks and onions of Egypt. And truly this is the diet on which the Egyptians of our day live. For as the eating of fish increases a man's thirst, so the system which they live on, as gospel, is continually increasing their thirst both for money and for the praises of men. And as your breath will publish aloud the fact, if you eat leeks or onions, so these persons must have published, all their religious doings. Such will be the shame heaped at this period upon those who will not conform to have religious burdens imposed upon them, and will not admire their parade, that it will be too insufferable a disgrace to be an Old School Baptist, for any to endure, but such as choose rather to obey God than man, and who, like Moses, have been brought by Divine grace to esteem the reproaches of Christ greater riches, than the treasures of Egypt, yea than all the funds connected with their benevolent Institutions, and all their glory. As these things must be immediately connected with the killing of the Witnesses, that event must certainly be fast approaching, for these things *begin to come to pass;* therefore the direction is; *look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh.* Luke 21:23. But that which I particularly wish to notice, is the prophecy upon Egypt and Ethiopia; namely, that, "So shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, even with their buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt." Verse 4. As this is to be understood of a spiritual or religious captivity, it can mean nothing less than that these Egyptians shall be brought under the power of the king of Assyria, that is, of the Pope; and not only loose their liberty and forms of worship, and be oppressed as they have oppressed the true church of Christ, or as quoted before from Rev. 13:10, as they *have lead into captivity so shall they go into captivity;* but they shall be lead clear off, that is, as I understand it, be led to submit to, or embrace popery. For it cannot be a mere persecution, or force put upon them, because it is to be to the *shame of Egypt;* and no shame can be attached to the persecuted as such.

Again the expression used in reference to the nakedness of these must imply something more than Isaiah's walking naked. To me it is probable that Isaiah wore breeches such as the priests wore, Exod.28:42, and such as those Africans which *go naked*, wear. So the churches of Christ will not be left to expose themselves to shame by acting out the

corruptions of their hearts. But these Egyptians will have no such covering; all their uncleanness and vileness will be exposed to open view. The shame and contempt which they have endeavored to put upon the Old School Baptists, will be heaped four fold upon themselves; for when they go over to popery, their deception, and the tendency of their religious frenzy, toward that corrupt and beastly religion will be fully manifested.

Verse 5 and 6; "And they shall be afraid and ashamed of Ethiopia their expectation, and of Egypt their glory. And the inhabitant of this isle shall say in that day, Behold, such is our expectation, whither we flee for help to be delivered from the king of Assyria; and how shall we escape?" The term is frequently used in scripture to denote countries beyond the sea whether properly islands or not. The *they* of verse 5, and the *inhabitants* of verse 6, do not refer to the Prophet or the church represented by him; but to the inhabitants at large. There is, at this time, a considerable excitement among the citizens of this country on account of the great increase of Catholics among us, and the attention seems generally turned to the Home Mission, Bible, and Sunday School Societies, as preventatives to the Catholics gaining the ascendancy in our country; and the advocates of these Institutions are encouraging this excitement, and this expectation, and turning it to their advantage; to the increase of their funds and influence. Hence the sentiment which has been once and again advanced, by the advocates of the Home Mission Society, that *it has a claim upon us as citizens* to support it. And in thus *fleeing to those institutions for help,* they are building them up, increasing their influence, and thus empowering them ultimately to *scatter the holy people,* and *kill the Witnesses.* And when the expectations of the people, becomes a little more intensely fixed on these institutions, to save the country from the horrors of popery, they will sanction the putting down of those who oppose the progress of these institutions, as do we Old School Baptists, upon Bible grounds. But how awful will be the disappointment of the people, as seeing the leaders, agents, and notaries of these institutions, going over to popery. Well may they in their confusion cry out, *Behold such is our expectation!* The fact is, the putting down the Old School Baptist preachers, and scattering the churches, will directly hasten the consummation of this amalgamation of the Mission interest with popery; for contemptible as we may be in their eyes, whilst we have liberty to bear public testimony against their innovations and *trickery,* and to hold forth the doctrine and order of the New Testament. We have considerable influence in restraining them from going the whole length of their corrupt desires. Instances no doubt will occur to most of the readers of this, exemplifying the above position.

In the winding up of this great drama, will be fully exemplified that which is written, *Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world,* and also, *God taketh the wise in their own craftiness.* I Cor. 1:20 & 3:19. As it ever has been, so it will be in this case, when men lean to their own understandings to guide them in religion and thus exalt the

wisdom of men above the wisdom of God, they will run into the grossest absurdities. And God *will take* these, who are so *wise* to devise for Him, *in their own* craftiness, *sending them strong delusions,* by suffering them successfully to add scheme to scheme, until they land in popery, and thus turn the flattering expectations of the people, into disappointment and disgust, as the Ten kings, after giving their power *one hour* to the Beast, will be made to know the abominations of the *whore and to hate her,* &c. Rev. 17:12, 16. Besides being thus allured along by their vain imprudence and presumption into popery, these Egyptians will become finally identified with the Beast, and involved in the sudden destruction that awaits that whole interest, and the declaration of God will be fulfilled in them, "That if any man worship the beast or his Image and receive his mark in his forehead, or hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture," &c. Rev. 14:9, 10.

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

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

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

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

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

I have thus given the views my mind has been led to receive from this 20th chapter of Isaiah, and from a comparison thereof with other Scriptures referred to. The time I think is short, in which the correctness or incorrectness of these views will be decided. I have no idea that they will be found perfectly correct, or so in every point. They may be wholly wrong, I leave others to form their own opinions from an examination of the Scriptures referred to, and others relating to the same subject. One thing is certain, the word of God will abide, and every prophecy therein contained will receive its just and full accomplishment, and at the appointed time, whether we or any of us, have wisdom given us to discern the signs of the times as they approach or not, and in spite of all the devices of men to change the times. Daniel says, *the wise shall understand,* and *none of*

*the wicked shall understand.* Into God's hand would I commit my times and ways, and wait patiently for him. Still I think it my duty to seek and to understand what he has been pleased to reveal, and to discern the *signs of the times,* and if he give me understanding therein, to him belongs, and to him will result the glory and the praise.

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

# ON THE ATONEMENT.

Brother Beebe: – The third and last subject which has been proposed for me to give my views on is the Atonement. This is of itself a copious subject: it will, therefore, readily be expected that I shall be rather lengthy on it; and I may as well at once divide it into chapters to relieve in some measure its tediousness.

## CHAPTER I

Atonement, what it is, and its inseparable connection with redemption, as taught in the Scriptures.

I would here premise that the atonement made by Christ is shorn of much of its glory by being represented as a provision entirely distinct from redemption, or if redemption is spoken of in connection with it, there is no more extended idea given to it than what is contained in atonement or forgiveness of sin. This is a convenient way of representing the subject for those who will have the redeemed still retained under the law, or subject to conditions as grounds of their acceptance with God. But it is rather a matter of surprise that persons who contend for the scriptural doctrine of redemption have so frequently suffered themselves to be dragged into an argument on the subject of atonement alone. It is true there is a distinction of idea conveyed by each term, and the

two are mostly represented by distinct figures in the Old Testament; but that evidently arises from a deficiency in the types fully to represent the perfection of Christ's offering.

We will, in the first place, notice the distinct idea conveyed by each in their use in the Scriptures. First, Atonement: This word is found but once in our translation of the New Testament, though the same idea is abundantly taught therein. This instance is in Rom. 5:11. The word in the original is derived from the verb which in verse 10 is translated *reconciled*, and this word is in other passages rendered *reconciliation*, and such is evidently its import; that is, as representing a restoration of peace where wrath had before existed; of course, it has particular reference to God's wrath as manifested in the law. In the Old Testament, particularly in the law, we repeatedly find the word atonement. As in Lev. 4, 5 and 16. It is there used to denote a covering over of sin by sacrifice, so that the sinner is freed from the penalty, or is forgiven of his sins, whilst the law in its penal requisition, is honored and hence there is reconciliation for his sins, and the sinner is reinstated in the favor of the law; so says the Psalmist: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered" (32:1). But this, as by verse 2, is spoken more in reference to Christ's atonement; see Rom. 4:6. Atonement, thus in type as under the law, falls far short of representing the redemption and atonement as accomplished by Christ's blood, for though it represented a clearing away or covering over transgressions as past, it left the Israelite still subject to the law, and liable to its curse, in case of future transgression. And so I cannot see how atonement or reconciliation alone, even by Christ's blood, if that was all that was accomplished, could have secured any from future condemnation as it would leave them still subject to the demands and bondage of the law, unless there were ability secured to those whose sins were forgiven, to obey fully the law in future. The apostle notices the insufficiency of the legal sacrifices to make the comers thereunto *perfect* Heb. 10:1. Hence, because typical expiation of sin could not represent the redemption accomplished by Christ's blood in the sacrifice He offered for sin, there were distinct types appointed representing His redemption. This leads us secondly to notice the idea embraced in the term redemption as used in the Scriptures. 1st, we find it declared that the Lord *redeemed Israel out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh*. &c. Deut. 7:8, and in many other places this deliverance of Israel from Egypt is represented as a redemption. And this was clearly typical of the redemption of spiritual Israel. This was nothing less than an entire breaking of Pharaoh's yoke from off their necks and bringing them out of the house of bondage and into the promised land, and giving them a standing there as an independent nation, and as the people of God. Surely this is more than a mere expiation for sin; leaving His people still subject to the law. Again, God claimed specially all the first born of Israel being males, of man and of beast, as His, in consequence of His sparing Israel on the night He smote the first-born of Egypt. The first-born of man and of the ass He required to be redeemed Ex. 13:11-16, & 34:20. By this redemption they were freed forever from that special

demand, and were placed in similar circumstances with other Israelites. Here, then, we have another figure of redemption by which complete deliverance is accomplished. In the case of the Israelite who had waxed poor, and his inheritance or himself had been sold for debt; we have another illustration of gospel redemption. The redeemer must be one of his kin; and being redeemed, he is completely released from bondage and from all claims of his old master; and so of the inheritance. See Lev. 25:23-25, also from verse 47 to 55. It is true this Israelite might wax poor again and be again sold into servitude; the type could not prevent that. But the claim of the original creditor was in the redemption fully consulted, and this is what we contend is implied in redemption. I will now give one instance from the New Testament showing that the redemption by Christ fully meets these types, accomplishing a complete release from the bondage of the law Gal. 4:1-7. The expression in verse 5, "To redeem them that were under the law;" has been somewhat involved in obscurity by the different constructions put upon it. Some have supposed it had reference only to the Jewish disciples as having been under the law of Moses, and some one thing, and some another. This shows the necessity of attending to the connection, or the design of the apostle's argument. He was writing to the churches of Galatia, and, of course, to Gentiles, as is also evident in his warning them against being circumcised. His object appears to be to guard them against the errors of judaizing teachers, and of being involved in their minds in bondage under the law by being circumcised. In the 3rd chapter he shows that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek; that if they were Christ's, then were they Abraham's seed. He then goes on in this chapter to show, that according to the Roman law which held minors in the same bondage to their fathers, and gave the father the same right to sell them as though they were children of slaves, it required the going through a form of redemption or emancipation to give them the standing of citizens. Both forms were before they could be acknowledged by adoption the successors to the rights and estate of other persons, that they when children. Previous to their manifestations as citizens, and as having right to the privileges of the gospel kingdom, they were in *bondage under the elements of the world*. And what were these *elements* but law as established in creation both upon matter and mind, varying according to the nature of each? Hence the necessity of being redeemed from under this bondage to the law before they could receive the adoption of sons. The extent and limitation of the redemption is found, not in being *under the law*, for according to the figure, the servants as contrasted with the heirs, were in the same bondage, that is, *under the law*; but in being predestinated sons or *heirs*. Now the redemption of the servant, though it would free him from bondage, would not of itself entitle him to be accounted a son and heir of his redeemer; as in this case, it was not their being redeemed that entitled them to the adoption of sons; but it was *because they were sons*, that the *spirit of God's Son* was communicated to them. But as shown, it was necessary that they should be redeemed from the bondage under the law; otherwise to

bar them from the privileges and liberty of sons. The redemption, therefore, must be a complete and final redemption from the bondage of the law, and from its demands. So Paul says, verse 7th: "*Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son*, &c." And this is the redemption represented as accomplished by Christ in being *made of a woman and made under the law*, and is therefore gospel redemption.

We pass to our second general head, which is to show the intimate connection there is between, or rather the oneness of redemption and atonement, as accomplished by our Lord. Both must go together in order to bring the children of God into the comfortable enjoyment of the relation of sons. Atonement or expiation for sins alone would, as showed, leave them in bondage under the law; and redemption, that is, complete deliverance from the law without expiation for their sins, never could satisfy those who have been truly convinced of the evil of sin, nor give them confidence in approaching a holy God.

The idea has long been entertained by many and advanced in books, &c., that redemption from the law, as requiring perfect obedience, was distinct from atonement in that the one was by Christ's obedience to the preceptive requisition of the law, and the other was by His death as enduring its penalty; the one has been called His active, and the other His passive obedience. So of justification in distinction from pardon, which are but the results of redemption and atonement. This has heretofore been my view of the subject, and which I am now convinced I derived from tradition, that is from my early religious intercourse with men and books; and having not been particularly led to doubt its correctness, and I have held on to it; and when I have been led particularly to notice texts which did not read in accordance with those views, I have had the awful presumption to suppose it necessary to add something explanatory of that which is divinely perfect, as the revelation of God. Being now convinced of my error in this thing, I think it proper to confess and abandon it. It may be proper to assign some reasons for my present different view of this subject. I will, therefore, try to present my proofs of the oneness of atonement and redemption, as considered in the work of Christ, so as to meet both cases. **1st**, then, I will say, I have no doubt that Christ Jesus, in His manhood and life, was perfectly conformed to the law, loving God and his neighbor as it required. This was essential to His being *holy, harmless and undefiled* in His manhood and necessary to His being a suitable offering for sin. But I much doubt whether this could have been accepted by the law as a redemption price from the obligations His people were under to obey it. The original obligation man was under in his creation, *to love God with all of his heart, &c., and to love his neighbor as himself*, would have been perpetual had he continued in his state of uprightness, and one act in opposition would have incurred the penalty. Could the law have accepted any extra obedience as a redemption price for man's being released from his obligation thus to love God and his

neighbor? I think not. At any rate, I have never seen any intimation in the Scriptures that man ever would or could have been redeemed from the obligation he was under to the law had he not first incurred the penalty. If preceptive obedience by another could not have been a redemption price for man, then I see not how it could enter into his redemption price now. **2nd**. The penalty for transgression was death, and this eternal in its duration as borne by the creature. This being inflicted and borne, could the law demand anything more? Would not this, therefore, be an end to all its demands? If then the law looked to Christ as the Head, Husband and Surety of His people for satisfaction for their transgressions, and He could and did, in a limited period of time, bear the full weight of the curse or penalty thus due, would it not equally be an end to its demands on Him and them, and therefore a redemption from it? Paul certainly took this view of this subject, when (Rom. 7:6) he compared the relation between man and the law, to the relation of husband and wife. Could a man love and cherish his wife so faithfully for a given period, or could anybody else for him, as to release him from any further obligation to her as his wife, both still living? No. But let death take place in reference to either party, and the relation and obligation is at once dissolved. It is then *death*, and not life, that dissolves the relation between man and the law, or redemption from it.

**3rd**. The Scriptures no where ascribe the redemption of Christ's people to His life or obedience to the precepts of the law; but repeatedly and directly do they ascribe it to His blood or death. See Eph. 1:7 & Col. 1:14: "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins." Here, not only is redemption spoken of as *through His blood, but forgiveness of sins, or atonement* is represented as one and the same with it. Thus also justification is spoken of as being through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus (Rom. 3:24), and is said to be by His blood (Rom. 5:9). Peter also ascribes redemption to the blood of Christ, as of a lamb, &c. I Peter 1:18,19. So the elders, Rev. 5:9, in their song to the Lamb, sing, "For Thou wast slain and has redeemed us unto God by Thy blood, &c."

**4th**. Not Christ living under the law, but Christ crucified, is the theme of gospel preaching. "We preach Christ crucified," &c. I Cor. 1:23. "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified" I Cor. 2:2.

**5th**. But some may object to this view, on account of Christ's being revealed as our righteousness, &c., supposing that this must be by His conformity to the law in living under it. But, I would ask, is there not as much righteousness in the penal as in the preceptive requisitions of God's perfect law? I think there is. How is it that we were *made the righteousness of God in Christ, but by His being made sin or a sin offering for us*? See II Cor. 5:21. And how was He *raised for our justification, but by being first delivered for our offenses*? See Rom. 4:25. Examine also Rom. 3:21-26, and see if the righteousness of God, there spoken of, is not *declared* through Christ's *being set forth to*

*be a propitiation* , &c. If these things be so, the redemption accomplished by Christ for His people is nothing other than the perfection of His atonement. As is said, Heb. 10:14, as contrasted with the deficiency of the atoning sacrifices under the law, that “by one offering He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified.” And; “We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.” See verse 10, same chapter. If then we are perfected by the one offering by which we are sanctified or cleansed from sin, I think the atonement and redemption in the work of Christ, and in reference to the price of redemption, is one; and that perfecting us, we need nothing further on that score. As to the carrying out of this redemption in the complete salvation or deliverance of His people, that is by His life at the right hand of God. See Rom. 5:10.

There is one objection more I ought to meet: that is, an objection to publishing this in the *Signs* . For I shall probably be considered, by some of the readers, as treading on their toes. I can only say, in obviation of it, that I will promise not to reply to anything it may draw forth, leaving what I have written to stand by itself, unless the remarks may be written in that candor which shall evince a simple regard to truth, and shall call for something from me in the same spirit. Here I close chapter 1st.

## CHAPTER II

The particularity of the Atonement, as shown by the Old Testament Types.

As Atonement and Redemption are set forth in the Scriptures, as so intimately connected, and one in substance, in the offering of Christ, one would think that no reflecting person could entertain the idea that atonement was any other than for particular designated persons. It is absurdity itself to talk of a redemption price being paid, and that for no specific object; no designated persons, or persons not designed to be redeemed. Yet the ideas of indefinite atonement, or atonement for sin, general atonement, and universal atonement, are so prevalent, and that among the learned and wise of the world, that even the minds of honest enquirers after truth are frequently so difficultied therewith, that there is propriety in presenting for their consideration the testimony of Scripture on this head.

I propose, in this chapter, to bring forward some of the types of the Old Testament in proof of particular atonement.

I will commence with the Passover lambs (Ex. 12). That these lambs were typical of Christ is evident from what is said, I Cor. 5:7, “For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us,” as well as from the direction, “Neither shall ye break a bone thereof”

(Ex. 12:46), being quoted and applied to Christ John 19:36. This appointment presupposed that the Israelites, in themselves considered, were equally obnoxious to the plagues about to be inflicted, as were the Egyptians, and therefore that both were equally sinners before God, and equally subject to the curse of the law. The sacrifice, therefore, of the paschal lamb more fully represented both atonement, or a covering over of sin, and redemption (for it was a redemption from the plague), than perhaps any other type of the Old Testament. So Peter seems to have understood it when he said, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold, &c. But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world" I Peter 1:18-20.

Here he evidently refers to this and applies it to Christ, in speaking of Him as a *lamb without blemish*, as the paschal lamb was required to be; and as being *foreordained before the foundation of the world*, showing the design of the type in requiring that the lambs should be taken out on the tenth day of the month, and kept up until the fourteenth day Ex. 12:3-6. These five days seem very clearly to prefigure the period of Christ's offering. The tenth pointing to His foreordination or being set up before the foundation of the world; the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth, to the four thousand years before the coming of Christ, and the being slain in the evening of the fourteenth, to His being sacrificed at the close of that period. In this important type there was nothing like indefinite atonement or general provision. It was as particular in its provision as in its application. It was appointed alone for the families of Israel, and to be according to their eating. If one family were too small, two must join in one lamb; while the Egyptians were left exposed to the plague. It must be special in its application to each family. The blood of each lamb must be by the family who ate it, put upon the lintel and sideposts of the door of the house in which they were, as a covering from the plague. Could this type in any way have more fully shadowed forth a particular and definite atonement? Was there anything in it like a common or general stock for everybody?

We pass to the redemption of the first born, being males. Ex. 13:12-15 & 34:19. This type is full of instruction on the subject of redemption.

**1st**. The special claim which God made upon these first born, being males, on account of having spared them when He slew the first born of Egypt, shows the claim He made upon His elect in common with others, through the law, as His creatures.

**2nd**. The firstling of clean animals might not be redeemed: showing there was no redemption for his son from the curse; and that there could have been no redemption for the elect had they not become unclean by transgression.

**3rd**. The firstling of the ass must be redeemed with a lamb. This relates to the natural stupidity and uncleanness of the elect; and nothing but the sacrifice of the spotless Lamb

of God could redeem them. Or, as asses are in some other Scriptures made to prefigure ministers of the gospel, it may show the necessity of their being redeemed, as well as the heirs of promise to whom they minister. The injunction that if they would not redeem the ass, they should *break its neck*, that is, kill it without shedding its blood, shows that, as *without shedding of blood is no remission* (Heb. 9:22), so without redemption there is no remission of sins, or atonement.

**4th**. The first born of man, being a son, must be redeemed. There is a particular discrimination as to who were the subjects of redemption. The first born son, according to the usage and law of Israel, was the special heir, entitled to peculiar privileges. See, among other texts: Gen. 25:31-34, 27:29-37 & Deut. 21:15-17. We have then here a particular correspondence of this type to the redemption of Christ; those redeemed by Him being heirs, as shown (chapter first) in our remarks on Gal. 4: 1-6. The heirs redeemed by Christ are made such by the predestinating purpose of God Eph. 1:5, Rom. 8:29. These predestinated heirs, according to this type, and according to Gal. 4: 1-6, were those whom God specially sent His Son to redeem. So particular is redemption, and of course atonement, according to this type, that, as this law concerning their redeeming their first born was not to go into effect until they came into the land of the Canaanites (see Ex. 13:11), the Lord designing to take the Levites instead of those already born, thus showing redemption by substitution; He had the Levites and the first born each numbered, and there being an excess of *two hundred three score and thirteen of the first born* over the Levites, He required these to be redeemed at *five shekels apiece by the poll* Num. 3: 12,13, 39-51. Does not this show that everything like an indefinite or general provision transaction is excluded from the work of redemption?

To avoid tediousness on these types, as far as I can, I will notice but one more: that of the great day of atonement Lev. 16. By the contrast which is drawn (Heb. 9 & 10) between the order observed on this day of atonement and Christ's *entering into heaven with His own blood, now to appear in the presence of God for us*, there can be no doubt but the atonement made yearly for Israel on this appointed day was typical, or, as there said, a *figure* of that *eternal redemption* which Christ obtained for us. It is true, as is shown (Heb. 7), Christ is a High Priest of a far higher order than that of the Aaronic priesthood, He being after the order of Melchisedec; yet it is, I think, equally evident from what is said of Christ's offering and blood, &c., as contrasted with the offerings of the high priests under the law, that they were typical of His priesthood; for there is no account of Melchisedec's offering sacrifices, &c. Thinking this will not be disputed, I will not stop to argue the point, but will in proof thereof simply refer to Heb. 5:1-5; 8:1-6; 9:1-14& 10:1-23. In the first place, it was only the high priest that might enter into the most holy place, that is, within the veil; and that but once every year on this day of atonement, and not without blood, Lev. 16:1,2; Heb. 9: 1-7. In order to his lawfully

officiating as the high priest, Aaron, and after him his son, must be consecrated. See Ex. 28 & 29. Lev. 8: 1-12. To be consecrated he had to wear the holy garments, among which was the ephod having two precious stones engraven with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, six on each stone, fastened in the two shoulder pieces thereof, so that he should *bear their names upon his two shoulders for a memorial*. Also, there was the breast plate containing twelve precious stones, engraven with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, that Aaron should *bear their names in the breastplate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth into the holy place for a memorial before the Lord continually*. Thus showing that in officiating as the high priest, in going into the holy place to make atonement, he represented the twelve tribes of Israel, as a designated people, and none other. And thus typifying Christ as officiating in making atonement in behalf of a designated people known by name (for He calls His own sheep by name, John 10:3), whom He bears upon His heart as the objects of His love Rom. 5:8 & John 13:1. And also whom He bore with Him as upon His shoulders, when He entered into heaven, there to *appear in the presence of God for us*, not for anybody, everybody, and nobody; but for us a present and known people. (See Eph. 2:4-7.) As well also as showing that they were a people whom *He bore and carried all the days of old*; and in all their afflictions He was afflicted (Isa. 63:9). So on the day of atonement the high priest, in making atonement for Israel, was to take two kids of the goats, one for a sin offering and the other for a scapegoat, in order to show the perfection of Christ's one offering of Himself, which He should make, that in bearing the sins of His people in His own body on the tree, and in suffering the penalty due thereunto, He should conquer death, finish *transgression, make an end of sin*, and accomplish a complete redemption. The one for a sin offering could not have shown this; being burned to ashes it could only show the wrath of God against sin. But the scapegoat, in bearing the sins, after the sacrifice of the other, away to a land uninhabited, showed the perfection of Christ's atonement that He buried the sins He bore in the depths of the sea. In sending the scapegoat away, to carry out the type, Aaron must lay his hands on its head and *confess over all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat. And it was said, the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities to a land uninhabited* Lev. 16:21 & 22. Aaron, in thus officiating as a type of Christ, did not lay upon the head of the goat sin in general, nor the sins of all nations, but specially and only the sins and iniquities of Israel. Thus whilst there is a full and perfect atonement prefigured for all the iniquities and transgressions of God's Israel, a peculiar and special people; there is no representation of an atonement and redemption for any that God did not design should be redeemed and delivered thereby. I here close chapter 2.

# CHAPTER III

A brief view of New Testament testimony relative to Particular Atonement, with a notice of certain texts relied on as standing in opposition to it.

In turning to the New Testament we find, no less than in the types of the Old, a specific purpose declared in the birth and death of Christ in the flesh. Thus, in the declaration of the angel to Joseph (Mt. 1:21), "Thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins." Here is a special purpose declared in reference to Christ's coming into the world, namely: that He should be manifested as a *Saviour*; for He "shall save His people from their sins." Here is, therefore, a special people, the antitype of national Israel, a people whom He already knew as His, that are to be saved, and a special salvation with which they are to be saved. Hence here is nothing to warrant the idea of a general salvation, which is no salvation unless persons make it such by *delivering themselves from their sins*. On the contrary, everything is positive. He *shall save His people*, and shall save them *from their sins*; and He has His name *Jesus, or Saviour*, because He shall save this special people with this special salvation. Hence any one that says that Christ's being Jesus or a Saviour warrants the conclusion that any one may be saved by hitching himself to His atonement, sets aside the purpose of God, as declared in this text. The idea is entertained by some learned men that there was sufficient value in the blood or atonement of Christ, as they speak, to save the whole world, if applied, and therefore, though only the elect will be saved, yet others might be saved *if* they would make an application of His blood to themselves, by believing. But, learned as they may be in other things, they manifest great ignorance in this, in supposing that atonement consists merely in blood being shed, without any reference to the object for which that blood was shed, as an expiatory sacrifice or otherwise. According to this, there was as much virtue in the blood daily shed by the Israelites in killing animals for food as in that shed on the day of atonement.

Let us look back to the Passover. Suppose a spirit of sympathy and universal charity had got hold on the Israelites at that time, such as pervades the religious world at this day, and they had sent out their missionaries among the Egyptians to say to them: "That the Lord is about to pass through the land of Egypt; and He has given us directions to kill certain lambs this evening, and to sprinkle the blood upon the side posts and upper door posts of our houses, and to eat the flesh roast with fire, and He will pass by us and not suffer the destroyer to enter our houses. Now it is true you Egyptians have no sheep, as the keeping of sheep, or shepherds, are an abomination unto you (Gen. 46:34), but we shall have a great deal more blood than we shall need to sprinkle the door posts of our houses, and if you will come and get for yourselves and sprinkle the posts of your doors,

you will be saved. It is true that if Moses was here he would say that something more is necessary than a mere self application of blood, but he is one of those stiff old fellows that will not allow the human mind to have any scope in religion, but holds that everything must be limited and bounded by a *Thus saith the Lord*. Now, our life for yours, if you will try it, the blood will protect you, for here it is, in Moses' own words, 'For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians, and when He seeth the blood upon the lintel and two side posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you. Now here we have a general declaration on that when He *seeth the blood*, &c., without any specification of one man's house more than another's. It is true, when we notice the expressions *your houses and you*, and the general connection, we must admit that something might be made out of it to seem to confine it to the Israelites; but we do not think God to be any such partial being as not to give everyone a chance, and therefore we do not stop to enquire about connections, but catch a text where we can find it." Now if some of the Egyptians had been persuaded to try the experiment, is there a candid reflecting person, even among those who are at this day practicing the very chicanery above described in reference to the blood of Christ, that will venture the supposition that they would have been spared, and God's declaration concerning their destruction have been falsified? No; and why? Because, they would say, God had never directed it and He is not to be deceived in that way, and that the protection was not in the simple sprinkling of blood, but in the purpose of God, made known and carried out in the type, in the obedience of the Israelites. As typical of Christ as a redemption price, those lambs were appointed as a redemption price of Israel from the destroyer. So specific was the appointment, as heretofore shown, that each family must have its selected lamb to be slain and eaten by the family. Here was the redemption of the family in the lamb being made to represent the family: the blood on the door posts was but a *token to them*, (Ex. 12:13), a token of what? Why, that a substitute had been beforehand appointed and slain for the first born of the family, and that they were living by its death as expressed in their eating its flesh. Here were the appointment, the promise, and the direction of God, all uniting in reference to the Passover. These, and these alone, gave efficiency to the blood of those lambs. So of Christ's death; it was of God's appointment. If so, it must have been for a certain object. God would not have made the appointment without an object. We believe in the infinite value of Christ's blood, and of course, we believe that, being of such value, it could not fail to accomplish the object for which it was shed. It was shed for the expiation of sins. Whose sins? He had none of His own. It would be absurd to talk of His dying as an expiatory sacrifice or satisfaction for sins, when no sins were charged to Him, and He made accountable for them. His being thus accountable could only be by His representing sinners as a Surety. So says Paul, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace

which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began" II Tim. 1:9. So Gal. 1:4: "Who gave Himself for our sins, &c. according to the will of God and our Father." And so I Peter 2:24: "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree," &c.

Thus examine the New Testament through and we find that it was a particular people whom Christ died for, a people given Him of the Father, whom He represented, and that according to the will and purpose of God. Just so far then as the purpose of God in the promises extended, so far the atonement extended; and as we shown by the types of the Old Testament, and now by the New, it can be made to extend no further. All for whom Christ's blood was shed are redeemed and, of course, cannot suffer under the penalty of the law, but shall be saved. Can men or angels make any person a redeemed one, whom Christ has not redeemed?

As we have extended our remarks so largely on this point, it seems not necessary to quote other texts proving the particularity of the atonement, only as we may name a few. But in passing we will notice John 10:15, where Christ says: "I lay down my life for the sheep." In the connection He shuts every avenue for a general provision to come in. 1st. He contrasts Himself with, as distinct from, the hireling whose own the sheep are not. Hence He was not hired to make an atonement for sin by the promise of a certain portion being given Him. They *were His already, given to Him of His Father*, and because they were His, He laid down His life to protect them Jn. 10:14,16, 29. But that which I wish particularly to call attention to is the striking personification there is in this hireling shepherd, *whose own the sheep are not*, of the saviour of the general atonement holders of the present day. They will not admit that their Christ has any claim to any part of the human family as His while in a state of nature, though they perhaps admit that believers are His, in a special manner, when they believe and give themselves up to Him. So that the *hireling* is the *saviour* of the day. As to his *fleeing*, this is much like their representation of Christ as standing back and not interfering to *save* any, according to their notions of salvation, that is, to convert, lest He should destroy free agency and make machines of men. No: he fleeth; and if any choose to follow him and give themselves up to him, he will save them. Is not this the religion of the day? And if so, is not the hireling shepherd the saviour of the day?

Again, as a further proof that everything relative to the atonement is according to the fixed purpose of God, as Jesus says, *He came down from heaven to do the will of Him that sent Him* (John 6:38,39), we are assured that *He was raised again for the justification of those for whose offences He was delivered* (Rom. 4:25.). And Paul is very confident that those who *were reconciled to God by the death of His Son will be saved by His life* Rom. 5:10. If then all those for whom Christ was delivered, and who were reconciled to God by His death, shall be assuredly justified and saved, if any others could be saved it must be independent of Christ's suffering for them, or of their being

reconciled by His death. They must then abandon their hopes built simply on the infinite value of Christ's blood, and seek some other subterfuge.

It appears to be proper to notice one or two classes of texts touching this subject. I will first notice this class: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life" John 3:14,15. Again, verse 16, John 6:40, and others. A special purpose of God in Christ's death is no less positively declared in these texts than in those we have been noticing, showing a sure salvation. But here is a difference; salvation, or eternal life, is not here predicated as of the elect, but of whomsoever believeth in Christ. Hence those who know of no faith but that which is the act of the natural mind lay hold with avidity of those texts to support the idea that faith is a condition of salvation, and, of course, that the atonement is general, subject to this condition, losing sight of all those texts which declare a specific object in the death of Christ. But, what is more, they appear to be ignorant of the testimony of God concerning faith, that it is spiritual and not a natural act, that "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," and that *It is not of the flesh, but of the Spirit. it is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; but of God* John 3:3,6 & 1:13. What advantage then can Free Will derive from these texts, when it is thus testified that there can be no spiritual discernment without a spiritual birth; and this not of man's will, but of God? In accordance with this view, *faith* is declared to be a *fruit of the Spirit* (Gal. 5:22), to be *the gift of God* (Eph. 2:8 & Phil. 1:29), and to be *of the operation* of God (Col. 2:12 & I Pet. 1:21).

Hence, those who have in experience been taught the spirituality of the religion of Christ would as soon be persuaded that they could atone for their own sins as that they could believe in Christ of their own power; that their faith must be as special an operation of God as is the atonement. While to *those without, all these things are done in parables*, &c.

It may be asked why this mode of expression was used in the texts above referred to, if it was not to countenance conditional salvation. That it could not have been designed to countenance such an idea is evident. 1st, from the testimony the New Testament bears of faith, or believing, as being of God, and not of the creature, as we have shown: 2nd, there is nothing in the expressions to countenance in the least the idea that conditions are thereby proposed. It is not that whosoever will believe, &c., nor anything like it; but, as before noticed, the declarations are *positive and absolute*. But the reason is obvious why these texts are so absolutely free in their declarations, to the characters designated and those characteristics drawn from christian experience. If there had been no declarations given but such as that: "He gave Himself for the church"; "laid down His life for the *sheep*," or "gave Himself *for us*," as it is frequently expressed, what would the poor

lambs of Christ do with all their doubts, and their deep sense of their own unworthiness? They could not pry into the counsel of God's will, to see whether their names are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. While Satan would have emboldened thousands to claim to be the elect and the favorites of heaven, the child of grace would be the last to make any such claims, or to feel worthy to make them. How good and how kind then the provision which has brought down the test of individual salvation to one single point, and that an infallible test. *Whosoever believeth in Him*, without any exception, or any other limitation. Wherever it has been given it will show itself, and will produce hope. The individual may not know, nor be willing to acknowledge that he has true faith; but he knows that he believes in Christ as once he did not; that he once had no conception of that fullness and suitableness of Christ as a Saviour for lost sinners, as he now believes Him to be. In a word, he knows Him to be full and sufficient and the only Saviour, or the only Way in which a sinner can be saved. Knowing this, hope springs up in his breast that he may be saved, and sticks there in spite of all his efforts at times to shake it off. Thus we see the peculiar use and suitableness of this class of texts, to the children of God, though others may wrest them as they do other Scriptures to their own destruction.

There is another class of texts which, according to the construction which the advocates of a general atonement put upon the letter of them, must involve universal salvation. It will not answer to intrude upon the readers of the Signs to notice more than one of them; but I have selected the one they think the most direct in their favor, namely: I John 2:2, "And He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." While the Arminians of every grade make so much reliance on this text to support their system, merely from the expression "the *whole* world," there is not another text in the Bible whose instruction they so completely turn their backs upon, and whose direction and authority they so completely trample under foot, as they do those of this text. Its declaration is that, *He is the propitiation for our sins* , &c., and for *the sins of the whole world*, and if He is *the propitiation*, He is the only one for the whole world and for every part of it. What is the import of the word? Its import appears to be that which *pacifies or makes peace*, or, rather, through which the sinner can approach God in peace. The text informs us that Christ Jesus is that propitiation provided of God, or the way in which the sinner may approach in peace; not for a part of the world only, but for the whole world. That is, there is no other propitiation; no other way in which any individual of the human family can approach in peace; and the way in which any individual who feels the weight of his sins, as separating between him and God, so that he cannot approach in dependence on any effort or offering of his own, and has faith given him so to enable him to behold Christ as having by the one offering of Himself so removed sin and taken the curse of the law out of the way, in behalf of guilty, helpless sinners, that he can with confidence rely on the work of Christ for acceptance, I say, any such sinner, whoever or whatever he may have been, may approach thus and find peace.

"Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." As certain as that the religion of Christ is a spiritual and experimental religion, and a religion of faith, so certain is it that spiritual experience and faith have as much to do with this very point as with any other point. But persons are apt, when their minds become confused by the wiles of men in handling such texts as these, to lose sight of that important fact. Does the text say that the whole world rely on the blood of Christ as their propitiation? No. Do we find the whole world thus relying on it? No. Look around you. The Catholic, if he sins to wound his conscience, goes to confession; has his penalty or penance prescribed; pays it, and that is his propitiation. The Protestant, of the stricter and more legal class, if he thus sins, resorts to fasting and to increasing his tasks of praying and reading; and that is his propitiation. Those of the looser classes, when they thus sin, go to the next protracted meeting and get converted over; and that is their propitiation. Those who make no profession, instead of being pointed to Christ as the propitiation, are told that they must make their peace with God. So they trample under foot the declaration and authority of this text. But still perhaps some one is ready to say, there must be something more general in this text than you have admitted, as it speaks of the *sins of the whole world*. It is true it speaks particularly of the sins, for that is what propitiation has to do with. But here is the mistake: you do not distinguish between the import of the noun, as here used, and what would have been that of the corresponding verb, had it been used. Had it been written, *He has propitiated for our sins, and not our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world*, there would have been at once a positive declaration of *universal salvation*, and of a salvation of that kind that would have excluded from it all idea of the necessity of faith or spiritual experience. But it is not so written, at all. Christ is the *one propitiation*, as He is the one *way*; but no man will come to the Father by Him, nor trust in His blood as that which alone can be his peace with God, till faith is given him so to apprehend and trust in Christ.

But I must close this lengthy chapter and subject. If I have written anything that will be profitable to the honest inquirer, or any whose minds may have been puzzled with the cavils of men on the subject, I shall be satisfied, not having any expectation, or aiming to convince the opposers of this doctrine.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
March 4, 1848.
S. Trots.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.16 (1848)

# ON THE IMPORT OF THE TERMS: EVERLASTING, ETERNAL, &c.

Brother Beebe: – I see that Brother William Moseley of Georgia, requests, through the *Primitive Baptist,* that you or I, or both, would give the legitimate meaning of the terms *everlasting* and *eternal;* and to show the difference, if any, between them. As he includes you as well as myself in the request, I presume he expects the answer through the *Signs;* and as you are absent, I will take it upon myself to attend to the request.

The etymology of our English word *everlasting,* ever lasting – that is, lasting unlimitedly, shows the import to be *unlimited duration.* The words eternal and eternity are from the Latin words *aeternus* and *aeternitas,* signifying infinite or unlimited duration.

But the import of these words as found in the Scriptures may perhaps be more accurately defined by an examination of the Hebrew and Greek words so rendered, and the subjects to which they are applied, &c. 1st. In the Old Testament there are several words which, by the translators of our Bible, are rendered everlasting, eternal, forever, &c. The word more frequently found in the Hebrew as answering to these English terms is from a root which signifies to *hide, conceal,* &c.; and therefore denotes primarily, hidden, or unknown duration. It is applied to time things and thus used necessarily implies a duration limited by the continuance of time or perhaps, in some cases, by a shorter period. We thus find it used to denote a temporal, but otherwise a continued, unknown duration, in Gen. 17:8-13, as applied to the Abrahamic covenant and the land of Canaan, and in other instances. It is used in other cases without any such limitations being implied in the application or connection, and therefore with propriety in such cases is considered as conveying the idea of duration, unbounded, or extending *ad infinitum.* This word also is used both in reference to past and to future duration. Another Hebrew word rendered *everlasting,* &c., has for its primary idea *beyond, further,* &c.; and as a noun denotes *time* or *duration,* and hence when not limited in its extent by the connection or the nature of the subject to which it is implied, it denotes an unlimited or infinitive continuance onward that is most generally an eternity to come or future. The two words above defined we find sometimes combined, and translated *world without end, evermore,* &c., that is, as denoting an eternity to come. Again, these two words are frequently found connected, but not combined, and according to the import of the

particles by which they are connected, they are either both considered as having a future reference and are translated forever *more, henceforth even forever, and forever and ever,* &c., as Psal.10:16; 18:50; Isa. 9:7; (in Isa. 57:15, they are rendered *eternity*); or one has a past, and the other a future reference, and are translated from *everlasting to everlasting.*

The word translated *eternal* in Deut. 33:27, is from a root signifying to *remain, dwell,* &c. Another Hebrew word which we find translated *evermore, eternity,* &c, has for its primary ideas, *superiority, enduring,* &c., and when applied to time or duration imports *continuing, enduring,* &c., that is, overcoming and outlasting all the changes of time.

In the New Testament we find different Greek words used corresponding to the Hebrew words above noticed, and translated *everlasting, eternal, forever, evermore,* &c. AIONIOS in its formations is that which is principally used. This word is from AION, signifying *eternity, age,* &c.; this again is from AEI, always and on, being, that is *always being* the proper import of the word. AIONIOS is sometimes doubled, and then translated, forever and ever.

From what has been said, it is evident that the translators considered the words EVERLASTING and ETERNAL as being of the same import, as are also *forever, evermore,* &c., excepting that these latter words are confined to the idea of future duration, and the other are used both in reference to *past* and *future* duration. There are other equivalent words used in our translation confined in their idea to past duration, as ancient times of old, &c.

But from the diversity there is in the applications of the same original words, as well as of the English words: ETERNAL and EVERLASTING, it may appear on a superficial observation that there is a good deal of uncertainty in their use, whether importing future, or past duration, or both; and whether importing a temporal duration, or absolutely an infinite one. But not so, in reality, if common sense be allowed to decide on the point. It is unfortunately the case, however, that there are those who are so exalted with their attainments as linguists, that they would think it vulgar to submit to *a common sense exposition of the expressions of Scripture,* and who think their learned verbal criticisms lead them to a deeper and more refined understanding of the Scriptures than the common people can have. These often mistake the plain import of scriptural expressions, being led into mazes by their critical definitions.

Unprincipled cavilers also, by a resort to verbal criticisms, can make a show of establishing their own positions and of overturning the arguments and proofs of those whom they oppose, when in fact it is all a deception. It is a matter of manifest fact that what would be called learned criticisms upon the Scriptures have tended as much as any one circumstance to darken and confuse the plain meaning thereof. It is equally manifest

that the Scriptures, as originally written, were adapted to the understanding of uneducated and common sense readers, and that this excellent trait in them has been preserved, with few exceptions, in our common translation, through the interposing providence of that God who has all hearts in His hand and under His control.

I presume that I shall be understood as speaking here of the literal import of Scripture, not of that *hidden wisdom,* that spiritual mystery, which none of the princes of this world knew, and which the Holy Spirit alone can make known to any. But to return to the subject under consideration. There is perhaps no word that is always used to convey the same one definite idea, hence the connection in which a word is used must be taken into consideration in order to decide on the precise idea intended to be conveyed by it. So in reference to the words *eternal, everlasting,* &c., their connection as used in the Scripture will be found to have some bearing on their import, and will enable a candid, common sense observer to determine in any, or at least most, cases, whether they are used to denote duration absolutely infinite, or simply duration unknown in its extent to man but limited by the continuance of time; also whether they refer particularly to duration either past or future, or absolutely' to the eternity or existence of God.

The primary ideas of the original words which they represent as has been shown, are those of continued and unlimited or indefinite duration. Hence when used in reference to existence, either before or after the period bounded by time and its changes, we can conceive of no periods by which they can be limited in their import and are therefore necessarily led to understand them as conveying the idea of duration extending to infinitude. On the other hand, when either of these terms are applied to a subject that we know belongs exclusively to time, surely common sense would forbid our supposing that it was there used to convey the idea that such a time subject had infinite duration belonging to it. As, for instance, when *hills* and *mountains* are spoken of as *everlasting,* we certainly cannot, with propriety, suppose that literally there are any hills or mountains belonging to this earth which will escape the general conflagration of the world; neither that the literal priesthood of Aaron, because said to be an *everlasting priesthood,* was actually to exist beyond the limits which the purpose of God had fixed to that dispensation. But at the same time this term denotes that these time subjects were to have a continuance, and that of a duration unknown and unlimited in its extent in reference to the knowledge of those to whom these things were addressed. And further I think it will be found that all those time subjects to which the term everlasting is applied have a figurative reference to things not temporal in their duration, but heavenly and truly eternal.

In reference to a distinction to be made between past duration and duration onwards, I have already noticed that in the Hebrew this distinction is generally marked by the use of distinct words. The words *eternal* and *everlasting,* as used in our translation, do not of

themselves mark this distinction, they being used indiscriminately to denote past duration or future, or the existence of God absolutely without the intervention of time, as when God is said to inhabit eternity. The translators, however, have frequently substituted other words, more definite to denote duration onward or an extending forward *ad infinitum*, such as forever, ever more, world without end, &c. And the instances are, I think, very few where the words *everlasting* or *eternal* are used in which there will be any difficulty in deciding whether such terms denote past or future duration, or duration undivided by time. For instance, when the existence of God or the actings of the Divine Mind are spoken of, it would be absurd to suppose them bounded in either sense by the limits of time. Thus the terms *eternal* and *everlasting* prefixed to the purpose of God and the love of God, as these are the actings and exercise of the Divine Mind, must import that such purpose and love exist exterior to all the changes of time, and unchanged by them.

Again, when terms are used in the connection pointing out the beginning of a thing which is said to be everlasting, I should suppose that common sense would at once decide that the term *everlasting* or *eternal* in such case was intended to convey the idea only of duration onward *ad infinitum.* Thus when Messiah is spoken of as bringing in, within a limited time (seventy weeks), everlasting righteousness, (Dan.9:24,) if the terms, bring in do not import the bringing into actual or manifest existence the particular righteousness there intended, I do not know what they can import in that case. And if that is their meaning, then the term *everlasting* denotes only the infinite continuance of that righteousness. Should any one say, not so; the term *everlasting* must denote the past duration of that righteousness to have been infinite as much so as the future; then I will say that if such idea is absolutely essential to the use of the term *everlasting,* we must suppose that circumcision actually existed in the flesh of Abraham and of his seed from everlasting, that is from before the foundation of the world, for this is said to be for an *everlasting covenant in their flesh.* Gen. 17:13, compared with verses 10,11. The same remarks will hold good concerning the expression *eternal redemption* (Heb. 9: 12) as the expression *having obtained* imports a beginning to that redemption, if it imports anything.

I would remark further that when the terms *eternal* and *everlasting* are used in relation to that whose existence is manifestly after the dissolution of the world, as God has revealed no after terminating period, the Holy Ghost, in directing to the use of these terms in such relation, must surely have designed to convey the idea that such things are to have an infinite duration, as when we read of everlasting punishment and *life eternal* as existing after the close of time or the final judgment. And this, for this very plain reason that these terms as have been shown, denote of themselves continued, indefinite

or unlimited duration, and if therefore there is nothing in the connection implying a limit to the extent of such duration, they necessarily denote its continuance *ad infinitum.*

I have thus, Brother Beebe, given in obedience to the request of Brother Mosely, what I understand to be the manifest import of the words *everlasting* and *eternal* as found in different passages of Scripture. If what I have said should be of any use to him in defining their import, he can apply it as he may have occasion for, whether in reference to the doctrine of justification, or to the sentiment of universalism, or to any other subject. I remain yours, and His, to serve.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
June 13, 1839.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.7(1839)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 153-158

# PARABLE OF WHAT HAS BEEN CALLED THE PRODIGAL SON

Having been requested in a letter from brother James P. Howell of Michigan to give through the Signs my views of the Parable in Luke 15:11-32; I will extend this communication, with your permission, Brother Beebe, to the giving of my views of it. This passage, is not by itself directly styled a parable, though from its connection with the parable of the lost sheep, {Lk. 15:3-7}, and from its style, it has been generally, and I think rightly understood to be a parable. By a parable is understood a similitude, or relation, founded upon things natural or commonly believed, and designed to illustrate things spiritual; the persons or things therein mentioned being designed to illustrate characters spiritually, and the events related, to illustrate divine truth. But as these circumstances are such as relate to things natural, it is perhaps an error to suppose that in

all cases, every incidental circumstance has a correspondency in that which is prefigured.

Brother Howell wishes to know *who or what characters* (to express his queries in my own language) are designed by the *two sons; when the younger left his father's house*; and what was the *design of the parable in general*. The design of the parable, I understand, was primarily to illustrate more fully and distinctly the two characters brought to view in the commencement of the chapter, the publicans and sinners as the one; and the Pharisees and Scribes as the other, and to show the *purpose of the grace* of God toward the former.

Before we proceed to enquire who are represented by the *two sons* it seems proper to enquire who is designed by the *father*. Generally I believe, persons, who have attempted an illustration of this parable, have assumed the idea the God is immediately intended by the father; but I am led to the conclusion that Abraham is immediately intended. This idea is certainly countenanced by the fact that Abraham is prominently brought to view in the New Testament as having two sons, two distinct seeds, the *one born after the flesh*, the other *of promise*; the one natural, the other spiritual. Abraham occupies a peculiar station in the Scriptures. This name Abram, signifies *high-father* ; this was altered of God to Abraham, signifying a *father of multitude* or *many nations*. Rom. 4:11-18; to his being the father of *all them that believe, though they be not circumcised* or be *of the law*, or of his natural seed. He stands also at the head of the two covenants, or as the father of those existing under each of the two covenants, the earthly Jerusalem and the Jerusalem which is above; Hagar and Sarah representing these two covenants figuratively. Gal. 4:21-31. He represents both covenants, or testaments, in the case of his offering his son Isaac. In binding him and taking the knife to slay him, he evidently represented the law as about to inflict its penalty; and in taking the *ram and offering him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son*, he no less evidently represented the new covenant in its provision of a substitute, a sacrifice for God's Isaacs, those who as Isaac was, are the children of promise. Gen. , chapter 12 and Gal. 4:28.

It is frequently said that Abraham was a type of Christ; I find no authority for it in the Scriptures. Christ is declared to be Abraham's seed, Gal. 3:16. In the parable of the *rich man and Lazarus*, {Luke 16:19-31,} the rich man I think represents the self- righteous Jews; and Lazarus is said to be carried, when dead, by angels, to *Abraham's bosom*, which can mean no less than his being put in possession of the full blessing of the new covenant; Abraham thus representing it. On the other hand the rich man calls Abraham father, and Abraham recognizes him as his son. Perhaps I have thus sufficiently fortified my position that Abraham is the intended father in this parable. Of course the two sons must mean his two seeds, the *natural*, and *spiritual seeds*; as Paul said on another occasion, "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, afterwards that

which is spiritual," I Cor. 15:46, so in this case, the types as in Ishmael and Isaac, and in Esau and Jacob, represent the natural seed as the first-born, of course the spiritual seed is the younger son. The law as spiritual must therefore be the younger son's portion. But these spiritual ones, first exist as natural persons, and as such hold on to as long as they can in common with Jews; and which like Saul of Tarsus they esteem as *gain*. On the other hand the covenant of circumcision, including the Sinai covenant, and all therein promised in the letter of them, relative to the land of Canaan, &c., was the elder son's portion. Thus was divided unto them, Abraham's living, that which God secured unto him by covenant.

The enquiry next in order, is, *when did the younger son receive his portion and leave his father's house*? Of course not until he began to exist as Abraham's seed, or had spiritual life imparted to him. The idea appears to be this, that the elect of God, whether Jews or Gentiles, whilst in a state of nature, are living, in common with the nation of Israel, as under Abraham's roof, that is, they, like the Jews, expect justification, as Paul says, "*As it were* by the works of the law." Rom. 9:32. They feel at home there, as well as in the possession of an earthly inheritance, like the Canaan of the Jews. But when quickened by the Spirit, they begin to desire the *portion of goods that falleth to them*; that is, they desire to know more of God and of His law, and also to *gather all together* , or in other words to bring every good thing and good feeling &c., forward that they can, to render themselves righteous and acceptable to God. But they soon find that the law is spiritual, that they have to do with a God who searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins; the consequence is, they feel no longer at home in the possession of the things of this world, nor under Abraham's roof, or the Abrahamic covenant, nor sheltered by anything substituted for it, they willingly retreat from all such shelters; and indeed find themselves strangers in a strange land, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel; and as soon find all their *substance wasted by riotous living*, their good hearts, good deeds, sincere seeking &c., all gone, all vilely cast away as they think, by their carnality, their badness of heart, &c. Then comes a *famine*, they have spent *their labor for that which is not bread*; they are in a starving situation; they cannot feed upon their tears or prayers, they are loathsome. *He joined himself to a citizen of that country*. Many such citizens there are, who only know God and the things of religion by education, who are ready to receive these prodigals and give them such employment.

*And he sent him into his fields to feed swine*. This would look like making legal preachers of these children of Abraham. They however get but few of them so far entangled as that; though they may get many of them into their churches, or have done so in times past. Some of them stay there starving, without coming to themselves, probably till near their death, and then experience deliverance. Others may have Abraham's faith given them to receive Christ as their righteousness, and yet be so

entangled in mind, or by family connections, or by being put forward and into office in those churches, that they still remain in those fields, until God takes them away. Others come to themselves and come out. But to return to the import of the parable in this thing. *The joining himself to a citizen of that country*, seemed designed to show the propensity of these perishing sinners to adhere to the suggestions of *natural reason*, which is indeed a citizen of that country, and to be persuaded by it, or which is the same by their unbelief; that there can be no hope of God's saving them as they are, they must in some way become better; and as they have failed of coming up to the law, they must try to love God, and to repent and believe, and that God will meet them on this ground. The idea of *sending them into the field*, is that reason provides no shelter for the sinner, it leaves such *cast out into the open field, to the loathing of their persons*.

*The feeding swine*, as these are unclean animals and fond of filth, show that they succeed no better in performing the work of prayer and repentance &c., than in doing the works of the law; their hearts are seen to be so corrupt that the tears they shed are so polluted therewith as to be fit for nothing but for the swine to wallow in, and none but swinish multitude could be satisfied with them. *And he would fain have filled his belly with the husks* (the outside shells) *which the swine did eat, and no man gave unto him*. These poor sinners would be satisfied, if they could, with the outside repentance and faith, and perhaps at times fret that God does not meet and bless them in their praying and weeping before Him. But no man gave unto them, either to be satisfied with the outward shell of religious exercises; or which perhaps is the true meaning of this sentence, no man gave unto them bread that they could eat, or gave them the *bread of life*, they heard it preached, but it was not for them.

*And when he came to himself*; when these come to know themselves, come to their proper place as creatures of God, they see their entire, dependence on Him to sustain them in existence; and their no less dependence on His sovereign mercy to save them. They with this prodigal say *how many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger*. Yes, they look around them and see multitudes who are working for hire, as mere day laborers, under the law of the Abrahamic covenant, who seem to have plenty of goods, or that for which they expect acceptance, but alas, for me! says this poor one, I am such a sinner; there is none like me; there is but one thing left for me; that is, *I will arise and go to my father*. For what? Again to attempt to obtain justification by the deeds of the law? No, not that. Is it then to declare off from all relationship to your father, and to live in the full indulgence of sin, as without law, seeing you have no hope of salvation? No, no! What then? To give honor to God and the law; I will, say, *Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight and am no more worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants*. This exercise of these experimentally lost sinners, is fitly represented as going back to Abraham as a father;

for, “Though Abraham be ignorant of them, and Israel acknowledge them not” yet it is a going back to the law of which, as has been showed, Abraham was a covenant head, to honor it in its sentence, and to acknowledge the justice of God in their condemnation, and to renounce all claim to be accounted as Abraham’s sons, or to receive the blessing promised to his seed. And this expression put into the mouth of this returning son, *Make me as one of thy hired servants* is strikingly illustrative of the truly subdued spirit of those who are thus humbled before God. For though all hope of justification by the law, from such, is gone, yet let what will become of them, they do not wish to sin against God, but rather to continue to serve under the restraints of the law, though it be but serving as *hired servants* , having no claim to Abraham’s blessing as *sons*.

“*And he arose and came to his father.*” Yes, these poor sinners are no sooner brought to this last resolve, than in true supplication of heart, true lifting up of their souls to God, they cast themselves upon His mercy. “*But when he was yet a great way off*” – No exercise of the sinner brings him nigher or gives him to feel that he is nigher to God; God must come to him. “*His father saw him, and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him.*” His father saw him, saw his heart thus humbled and prepared for receiving pardon. And ran and fell on his neck, &c. This illustrates that first exercise the sinner passes through in experiencing deliverance. Suddenly and unexpectedly, as expressed by the *father’s running*, the cloud is removed, the sense of wrath taken away, and peace and joy fills his mind.

Still it seems impossible that he should be an heir of salvation, he is if anything more sensible of his vileness and unworthiness; and therefore with the son says, “*Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight and am no more worthy to be called thy son.*” But the delightful peace he feels in being resigned into the hands of God, who, he now sees is *Love*, together with the consequent hope of salvation, prevents his going further and saying, *make me as one of thy hired servants*. The father without appearing to notice the sentence of condemnation he pronounces against himself, “*Said to his servants, bring forth the best robe and put it on him and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet, and bring hither the fatted calf, and kill it and let us eat and be merry. For this my son was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found.*” There is work for gospel ministers to do, this is the proper sphere for the gospel ministry toward sinners, the pointing them to the Lamb of God. The whole of the above quotation, illustrates that view which is now given to the sinner through the gospel, as preached or as in some way brought to his mind, of the atonement of Christ and the consequent effect. I say, *now given*, as being the next view given, though hours, and even days may intervene, between his experiencing that peace, and his viewing Christ by faith; and he may endure much of distress in the mean time lest he was deceived in that peace and that as his burden is gone, he is in a worse state than before. *Bring forth the best robe*; Christ as of

God made unto him righteousness, through that perfect satisfaction He rendered in His obedience and death, to law and justice, which as the sinner now sees by faith, was wrought for such lost sinners as he is. Well is this called the *best robe*, as far surpassing any righteousness which Israelites could attain to under the law, or even the righteousness of angels. *And put a ring on his hand*. He is led to view the everlasting love of God in Christ; and to feel that it embraces him. *And shoes on his feet*. He is made to feel that his poor crippled feet are bound up by the promised grace of God, to go forward in obedience to the commands of the Lord. *And bring hither the fatted calf and kill it and let us eat and be merry*. The sinner is thus led to rest in the atonement of Christ, receives and rejoices in Christ's flesh as meat indeed and in His *blood as drink indeed*; as that which his soul relishes, and on which he can live as before God. Now as *Abraham is the father of all that believe*, this is properly represented as coming and being received as a son of Abraham; as a partaking of Abraham's faith, and a receiving the blessing of Abraham; a being *grafted in and made to partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree*. {By which I understand the promise made to Abraham and his seed.} See Rom. 4:11; Gal. 3:14 & Rom. 11:17.

"*For this my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found.*" He was lost and dead as under the law, but was found and raised to newness of life by the promised blessing. For, "The law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." – Gal. 3:17 – "*And they began to be merry.*" Both this now believing son of Abraham, and the other members of his spiritual family, who hear what the Lord has done for his soul.

The account given in the remaining verses, of the elder son's conduct on the occasion, is characteristic of the conduct, not only of those Pharisees mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, but also of the Jews toward the gospel in its being preached to, and received by the Gentiles. His declaration to his father, "*Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment; and yet thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends,*" is strikingly descriptive of them and of their situation under the law. Not that Israel never transgressed the law, but they esteemed themselves at that day as living up to it; see the Pharisee's prayer, Luke 18:11 & 12. Neither the covenant of circumcision, nor the law gave them a kid; they provided no substitute for them, but demanded all of them, even the daily and special sacrifices; all depended on their obedience.

The declaration of the father, "*Son, thou art ever with me and all that I have is thine,*" is appropriate in the mouth of Abraham toward the Jews his natural seed in the line of Isaac and Jacob; for they were included with Abraham in the covenant of circumcision; and all that God gave to Abraham in that covenant, including the land of Canaan, was theirs and that forever. The declarations of the covenant were, "I will establish my

covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant," &c. Gen. 17:7 & 8. The further declaration of the father, "*It was meet that we should make merry and be glad, for this thy brother was dead,*"&c., also befitted Abraham toward them. Because they had been taught in their Scriptures to expect that the Gentiles, even all families of the earth should share in the blessing promised to Abraham and to his seed; and also by the type of Isaac as the child of promise, as well as by the prophets, that Abraham should have a spiritual seed; and of course a seed that should be their brother as they were the brother of Ishmael. It was, therefore, meet that they should be glad and welcome the bringing of their spiritual brother from the dead: for *Abraham their father rejoiced to see the day of Christ; he saw it and was glad*; and the day of Christ was the day of this spiritual seed's being made manifest. John 8:56.

I have given and endeavored to sustain the views I have of this parable; if brother Howell, brother Beebe, or any other brother does not consider them supported by the testimony, I would be glad that either of them would give a more scriptural and consistent view of it.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Sept.23, 1847.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.15 (1847)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 353 – 359

## PRAYER OF THE UNREGENERATE.

Brother Beebe: – The following letter I had written in a private answer to brother Erastus Maynard of Penn., but having occasion to write to you, and thinking that others besides brother Maynard had objections to the *conclusion* I mention in the 1st Number of the

relation of my experience, being led to by certain circumstances, I have concluded to address it to you for publication in the Signs, if it does not over step your bounds.

S. T.

Brother Maynard, Yours of Feb. 24th came to hand, in which you object to the conclusion I arrived at from my experience in a certain case, and you ask further explanation relative to it. That to which you object is the idea that unregenerated persons may supplicate God's throne and be heard in cases of providential needs. The conclusion I consider a legitimate one from the circumstances I related. I had myself at that time no spiritual faith, and knew nothing of Christ as the way of acceptance with God. I had, as thousands of other unregenerated persons no doubt have, a rational faith in the providential government of God. Hence the conclusion that if I could be heard, other unregenerated persons who were under similar circumstances might be heard. The circumstances I related are to me known facts; and they may be, to you, my brother, facts, so far as you have confidence in the truth of my statement. My being involved in difficulty, my being led to look to God by prayer for deliverance, and my being delivered, must all alike have been under the control of God's providence; or all must have occurred by chance. I leave you to choose which position you please. For myself, I prefer acknowledging God's government in the whole affair. You say, *you cannot see how persons can pray acceptably to God unless they have faith.* I say, in substance, the same in reference to everything relating to the great matter of salvation, in connection with that to which you object. But since you have led me by your letter more to reflect on the subject, I think perhaps I went too far in saying in reference to salvation, *No person can approach God with acceptance but through faith in Christ.* I will now say, no person can have the assurance of being heard in reference to any of the blessings of salvation, excepting as he is enabled to pray in faith, nor can he receive and know those blessings, but through the faith of Christ. But the Publican's cry of, *God be merciful to me, a sinner,* I think was accepted, though he had not, when he uttered it, faith in Christ. And the similar cry of thousands since have been accepted before they had faith to behold Christ as the way of acceptance. They had faith in God, and in their just condemnation as transgressors of His law.

To return to the explanation you request. I understand from the Scriptures that God is the God of creation, of providence, and of salvation by grace; and that although creation and providence are subservient to the great purpose of salvation, yet in many points they are distinct from it; are subject to a different law from *the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus,* to which salvation is subject. Many persons were created in Adam, who have not spiritual life in Christ, and who have never, therefore, by the *law of the spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus been made free from the law of sin and death.* Yet, these are subjects of God's providential goodness; for He *maketh His sun to rise on the evil and*

*on the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and on the unjust.* Thus also He is "the Saviour of all men, especially of them that believe." That is, as I understand this text, He saves temporally all men from some calamities and evils to which they might be exposed. It is said, Acts 14:17, "Nevertheless He left not Him-self *without witness,* in that He did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." I do not see any inconsistency with the purpose of salvation in supposing that as a *witness* of God's providential goodness to the children of men and of their dependence on Him, He should, in many cases like mine where He has purposed to make manifest His delivering hand, first bring the persons to cry to Him for help. Thus in the 107th Psalm, while there is in it a spiritual reference to God's wonders of salvation, there is also a literal reference to God's providential goodness in delivering persons, *when they cry unto Him,* out of their temporal distresses. See verses 13, 19 & 28, with their connections. There is nothing there said about their crying in faith; yea, one class is denominated fools. So Nehemiah, whilst he gave to the children of Israel a character very different from that of believers in Christ, speaks of their crying unto God in their distresses and of His *hearing and delivering them.* Nehemiah 9:27, 28, and following verses. Look at Jacob fleeing from the consequences of the fraud he had practiced upon his brother Esau, and of the deception upon his father Isaac. He is met by a vision at night, in which he is assured of God's providential care and protection over him as the son of Abraham, through the ministry of angels. I have no idea that he then had faith in Christ as the way of acceptance with God; nor had he this faith until he wrestled with the angel, and received the name of *Israel,* or a *prince having power with God and men and having prevailed* Gen. 32:24-30. Hence in the instance above referred to (Gen. 28: 12-22), we find Jacob bargaining with God by a vow that if God would do so and so to him, then God should be his God, and on his return he would give to Him the tenth of all God should give him. I know it has been generally understood that the *ladder* which Jacob saw prefigured to him Christ as the medium of communication with God. This is inferred from what our Lord said, John 1:51. I do not so view the matter. I understand Christ's remark to Nathanael to be a *contrast* to Jacob's vision, and not as a *comparison,* as of the type and the antitype. Nathanael and the Jewish nation had seen, for ages past, the angels of God ascending and descending upon the ladder which Jacob saw in a vision; that is, they had seen God holding intercourse with that nation through the provisions of that covenant which He had established with Abraham. But says Christ to him, "Thou shalt see greater things than these." Hereafter, ye shall see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." That is, ye shall see God holding communion with His people through Christ Jesus and His atonement; a medium in which there are no rungs or steps to climb.

In conclusion I would say, we shall more clearly expose the delusions of men by which they suppose they are authorized by the Scriptures to believe they can climb to heaven

by repentance, prayers &c., as so many rungs of Jacob's ladder, by observing and showing the distinction between the dispensations of God's providence and His grace, than by blending the two together, and thereby denying His providential goodness towards those that are without. Hoping that this may be satisfactory, or if it is not, you will again write me and show its defects, I subscribe myself affectionately yours,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
March 12, 1851.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.19 (1851)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 401-404

# PUBLIC FASTING

Dear Brother Beebe: You have requested my views on Public Fasting, and by whose authority it was introduced into the Christian church. I presume the readers of the *Southern Baptist Messenger* are fully aware of the difference between the legal and the gospel dispensations. The worship under the former, as prescribed by the ceremonial law, consisted in outward forms, based upon creaturely sacrifices; whereas, under the gospel dispensation, the worship recognized by the New Testament is spiritual, and based upon the one sacrifice offered by Christ in His own person. Hence, under the law, mourning, affliction and contrition were, with propriety, expressed by putting on sackcloth, fasting, &c., while joy and thankfulness were expressed by feasting. But fasting is neither commanded by Christ or His apostles in the New Testament, nor by God in the law, unless the command to Israel, in connection with the yearly day of atonement, that on that day *they should afflict their souls*, be considered as embracing

fasting. See Lev. 16:29. So that fasting, unless the legal service of the day of atonement be an exception, was altogether a voluntary form, until it became established among the Jews, by the tradition of the Elders. The first account of fasting as a form in earnestly seeking God is that of Israel's fasting in their war with Benjamin. Judges 20:26. After that, we find occasional instances of fasting during the time of Samuel's judging Israel in the two books of Samuel; also, of David's fasting, on account of the sickness of his child. In this case, David seems to have done it as an act of humiliation and supplication to God for the life of his child. But his servants seem to have viewed fasting simply as an _expression of sorrow. See II Sam. 12:16-23. The first instance in Scripture of a fast being proclaimed by authority is certainly not a very commendable example to be followed. It was made by Jezebel at the time she would take the life of Naboth, by false witnesses, I Kings 21:3-14; though we afterwards find Jehoshaphat proclaiming a fast as an act of seeking help from God (and was heard of God in his supplication). In the times of Isaiah and Jeremiah, fasts appear to have become common, and much of hypocrisy in them. In the time of Zechariah, there were two stated yearly fasts among the Jews; one in commemoration of the destruction of the Temple by the king of Babylon, the other, as appointed by Esther. But God reproves them for hypocrisy in these Zech. 7:5.

But let us pass to the New Testament and see what authority we have there for Christians fasting. The first instance we have of instruction concerning fasting is in Mt. 6:16-18. Our Lord directs His disciples that when *they fast to be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance,* &c. "But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast." Here our Lord does not forbid His disciples to fast, but forbids their assuming the outward appearance of it, so as to appear unto men to fast. Consequently, it forbids public fasting to His disciples, though it admits of their fasting in secret or private, as before God. But I apprehend that many, in some measure, misapprehend much of Christ's instruction to His disciples in this discourse on the mount. It contains much instruction that applies to His disciples under the gospel, showing the spirituality of the worship belonging to His kingdom, in opposition to legal forms and outward ostentation. But, at the same time, it is addressed to them as under the law, as they were. Christ Himself, for the time He served, was a minister of the circumcision, and so were His disciples bound to observe the rites and forms of the law until Christ, by His death, redeemed them from under the law, and *blotted out the handwriting of ordinances,* nailing them to the cross. Hence, Christ said to the multitude, to *His disciples,* "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all, therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works" Mat. 23:1-3. Another case is: The disciples of John came to Christ and said, "Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bride-groom is with them? But the days will come when the bride-groom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast"

Mt. 9:14,15. The first idea here presented is that Christ represents *mourning* the same with fasting. The second is that in this case He justifies His disciples in departing from the tradition of the Elders. But, what is taught by our Lord's figure? The idea of the *children of the bride-chamber, and of the bride-groom being with them,* is that of a marriage feast, and joy. Was this feast and joy which the disciples of Christ experienced in having with them, carnal or earthly? Certainly not. They had not much of such feasting. But they joyed in His presence with them as the Messiah, and feasted on His word. So, from that day to this day, whenever the Blessed Bridegroom is present with the children of God, they have enjoyed a wedding feast, though suffering much worldly privation; it is spiritual. So the feeling or *mourning* which Christ intended must evidently be spiritual. In this sense, the children of God have experienced much of mourning, or fasting, since Christ ascended. That this was the idea intended is confirmed by the parables in the following verse, of the old garment, and old bottles, by which Christ teaches that gospel grace and blessings are not to be patched on to the old garment of legal rites and ceremonies, nor put into the old bottles of the legal covenant. Hence, this text affords us no authority for fasting from natural food. But, the instances which, more than any other, sanctions the practice of fasting among Christians are found in Acts 13:2,3 & 14:23, because we there have apostolic example for fasting. Apostolic example is, next to command, the best authority we have for religious order. But these practices, in all cases, are certainly not to be received as binding examples to the saints in after ages. Because the prejudices of the early disciples were so strong in favor of Jewish rites and customs, that even Paul, in many instances, was constrained to conform to their prejudice, differently from what he taught the Gentiles. Thus he circumcised Timothy, and by the request of the apostles at Jerusalem, he shaved his head, and went through other forms as though he had a vow upon him. See Acts 21:20-25. And I am inclined to the belief that these instances above referred to were in conformity to Jewish prejudices and customs. Seeing there is no command for it in the whole Bible, fasting looks to me so much like *will-worship and false humility, and neglecting of the body, not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh, that I feel like touching not.* See Col. 2:21-23. Besides, if I were to *fast twice a week,* I must rely alone on the atonement of Christ as my plea for my pardon and acceptance with God. But still, in view of these examples in the apostolic church, I do not wish to condemn such saints and churches as feel their minds led to practice fasting, provided they observe the directions of our Lord. Matthew 6:16-18.

Brother Beebe, you also requested me to state by whose authority fasting was introduced into the Christian church. Bodily mortification seems, in all ages, to have been a favorite element in natural religion, both among the Jews and heathen. Hence, the early disciples clung to it, and the Catholic church, when they commenced multiplying ceremonies, encouraged the practice of it as an act of penance. And Calvin also, in his blending much

of legality with his system of religion, encouraged its being practiced in his church upon the Pharisaical plan. But since the Jews nationally ceased, I know of no instance on record of fasting being observed as a national act, or by the authority of national governments, until the Puritans introduced it into New England. Soon after their settlement there, in view of their troubles with the Indians, and on account of their severe winters, and unimproved country, the General Assembly of Massachusetts appointed the observance of fasts twice a year, one in the spring, and one in the fall. This practice was continued for a number of years until, on one occasion, the General Assembly was about to appoint a Colonial fast for the fall, when a member arose, and with a good deal of national propriety, if nothing more, said they had repeatedly appointed days of fasting to supplicate God's protection, but had never appointed a season of thanksgiving to Him for the mercies they had received. He, therefore, moved that instead of appointing a day of fasting for the fall, they appoint a day of thanksgiving. It was carried, and from that day to this, Massachusetts, and the other New England Colonies, and States, have had appointed for them a day of fasting in the spring, and a day of thanksgiving in the fall, with, perhaps, the exception of Rhode Island. For a number of years past, New England influence, by means of New England settlers, has induced the Governors of several of the other States to appoint for their people days of thanksgiving, though seldom days of fasting. The influence has caused several of the Presidents of the United States to appoint days of fasting, and I think, in one instance, a day of thanksgiving. One of the Presidents, Jackson, I think it was, when petitioned to appoint a day of national fasting, refused, as did Governor Wise reject a like petition to appoint a day of thanksgiving for Virginia. Both assigned as the reason of their refusal that the observance of such days must be considered religious performances, with which they, as Magistrates had not right to interfere. It may be argued that as an example of natural religion, it may be proper, on special occasions, for a nation, or people, to humble themselves before God by fasting; and, that God has favorably respected such acts, as in the case of Ahab, I Kings 21:27-29; and of the king of Nineveh, Jonah 3:6-10. If nations observe such days without having any reference to Christ and His religion, I have nothing to say. But, this much I must say: That if rulers appoint the religious observance of such days, whether on the principle of natural or revealed religion, we as Christians cannot consistently participate in the observance, because that in all things pertaining to our religion, we should acknowledge no king but Christ, and no rule but His word. In other matters it becomes us to be obedient to Magistrates.

Dear Brother William, I have given you my views, and such information as I have, on this subject. I hope I may not have written anything which will be offensive to any of the brethren. I am not favorably situated for writing, living, as I do, within a seven mile space that divides the guards of the two contending armies, liable to be visited with scouts from Lincoln's army, as well as by our own scouts, and in daily expectation, and

have been for weeks, of the advance of one or the other army to bring on a battle. But we know the Lord has the control of every move, great or small.

Yours, with Christian regard, Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia, July 8th, 1861.

Elder Samuel Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 30 (1862)

## REGARDING A LETTER BY OSBOURN.

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

1st. He has brought to view certain ideas relative to the present and succeeding state of the church for *many years to come*, which have not to my knowledge, been generally entertained. The ideas are that the saints are dieing a *mystical death*, are suffering an inward martyrdom, from a famine that is now upon us, &c., and that this state of things is to remain for many years; that this is all the suffering worth speaking of that they need to fear for many years, &c.; that this famine is not to be accompanied by the sword; that we are not near unto persecuting times, &c. Now these are Elder Osbourn's thoughts; and they may be correct thoughts; but his thinking so can be no authority for my thinking so. If he shows me good and Scriptural grounds for his conclusions, then I shall receive them as true. I am not; and I hope most of our Old School Baptists are not disposed to receive any man's assertions as authority in religion. Now what I want upon this point is that Elder Osbourn should give us his authority from the word of God for these views if he wishes us instructed by them. The Lord by Amos says, "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets."

Amos 3:7. If therefore the Lord has determined to bring and continue such a state of things upon the church as Elder Osbourn describes it stands recorded in prophecy, in the scriptures of truth; and as he speaks positive as to what God's thoughts are in this matter, I think we have good right to expect of him that he will show us the prophecy and its application to this time and case. He has, it is true, given us some texts. But the point is; has he applied them correctly? He quotes Jer. 14:2 & 3, as being a prophecy of the calamity that is now upon gospel Zion. I am not disposed to dispute its application, but if admitted, his hypothesis falls, for the sword and the famine and the pestilence are to go together, see verses 12, 15 –18. And so we know in fact, they went together in the primary fulfillment of this prophecy as it relates to the Jews. Lam.1:6, is liable to a similar remark. Again, he quotes Dan.11:34, evidently as a prophecy relating to this event, saying, "But in this calamity {that is of the famine,} of ours, we shall be holpen, &c." Now by taking verses 33 and 34 together, we find that the calamity from which they are to be *holpen* is that of the sword and flame and captivity. So that I cannot find anything there to support his view. Again, Jer. 30:17, is no more favorable, for it is from the wounds of a cruel enemy that they are to be healed, and those that have *devoured* Zion, and who were adversaries and preyed upon her, &c., that were to be destroyed; see the connection from verse 14. He also quotes Rev. 3:2, as applicable. I will not say it is not, but am however inclined to believe that in the order it refers to an earlier period than this. And whether it does or not; it is not those who are ready to die, but, the things which remained that are ready to die, as it stands in the text.

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

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

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

And in reference to what he says of the ministry; that is, what he admits to be gospel ministry, I may misapprehend him; but I think he speaks rather too contemptuous of us, and not to manifest that fellow sympathy which he ought to feel for our deplorable state if we indeed are Christ's ministers. If he is more favored in his own soul, and in being enabled to administer *savoury food* such as *deeply exercised can feed on*, he has nothing whereof to glory.

But the 3rd point is one in which as Paul said to Peter {Gal. 2:11,} he is, as I think, to be blamed. It is simply an allusion in his 2nd Letter; but he refers to the ninth part of his life, {a work which he published this past winter,} for a full account. He in that chapter of his own biography, speaks very disrespectfully of a brother who stands firm as an Old School Baptist. This brother is considered by some as rather severe in his manner of preaching against errors; but it is nothing he has borrowed, it is simply his own peculiar manner of expressing himself, and to those of us who have had some familiar acquaintance with him, he appears to possess much of the spirit of meekness and humility; yea, in every respect more of the spirit of the gospel than many who make higher pretensions to holiness. I will not say what was the substance of this brother's preaching at the period to which Elder Osbourn alludes, for he was at that time on a high pinnacle of popularity, a station which I do not myself believe favorable for administering wholesome food to the *poor* or afflicted of the flock, but since that, he has been through the fire, with the furnace much heated, and during the whole has been a steadfast, firm advocate for gospel truth. If Elder Osbourn cannot be himself reconciled

to him, so as to fellowship him as a brother, still as others whom he acknowledges as saints, do feel a fellowship for him; I should consider it more consistent with a gospel order and spirit for him to have borne his grievance by himself, seeing it is nothing he can make a proper subject of discipline, rather than to have published him as he has done. And especially I think the SIGNS ought by no means to be made a vehicle for conveying these attacks on the feelings of a brother already suffering oppression on every hand. This I think my brethren will generally admit, when in addition to what has been said, we consider his steadfast and disinterested course in support of truth, notwithstanding all the opposition and discouragements he has had to contend with in the city where he resides. Instead of leaving the little company of disciples, who adhered to him for the truth's sake, to be scattered or find pasture where they could, because they could not furnish him a support, as others have done, he has engaged in a laborious but honest business for his own support while he continues to preach regularly unto them.

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

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

# REGULATION OF GOSPEL CHURCHES.

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

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

But the truth is; that rule was never designed to embrace the whole course of church discipline; if it had been, we should not have found other directions given on the subject in the New Testament; and the holding it in that light by so many, tends evidently to produce a looseness of discipline in many churches in reference to several important subjects. For instance, brother Meredith and myself may be members of the same church, I may broach some new idea upon the resurrection, virtually denying the resurrection of the body, and consequently of Christ's ever having redeemed the bodies of his people, or his being able to preserve the body with the soul and spirit blameless unto his coming. You think it is an important error, you believe the Scriptures plainly teach that the bodies of the saints are to be raised in a glorified state, and that Christ is able and faithful to save, wholly and fully, all that the Father hath given him. But how are you by any course of consistent reasoning to make this error of mine a trespass against yourself? The word is, "If thy brother shall *trespass against thee*." I break none of your bones, by advancing this error, nor bruise your flesh; neither do I take away your liberty to think for yourself or to advocate your own views. And I am certain, that your christian humility would not allow you to assume the ground that you have authority to

think for others, and that they are bound just to take your opinion as theirs, and therefore that in thinking for myself, I was transgressing against your authority. How then would you make it a trespass against yourself? You cannot in any way without assuming to yourself that judgment which belongs alone to the church collectively. What then is to be done? Why, you believe it to be a trespass against the faith of the church and the cause of Christ, and as a faithful brother you bring the case directly before the {earthly} *judgment seat* of Christ, the church. The church on examining my views and comparing them with the standard, pronounce them heresy, and admonish me of it; they find me persisting in it, they admonish me again, I still persist, they reject me; that is, exclude me. Thus we find a rule, that meets the case, and that without one individual's undertaking to pass a judgment upon the faith of another member, which Christ has vested only in the Church the right to do. See Titus 3:10, 11. And why, my brother, is this rule to be rejected more than the one in Matthew 18? Christ did not deliver it in person, but delivered it through one of his apostles; it therefore emanated from the same divine authority with the other. If we had no other rules given, for the regulation of the gospel churches, than what Christ delivered in person, we should come very far short of having a full pattern. He did not deliver his apostles a body of rules, and send them forth with their lessons ready learned, for the whole campaign; as our modern, theological students go forth; but they were as dependent on him from time to time, for a revelation of his will, to meet the various circumstances that occurred, in planting and setting in order the churches, even as we are to understand what they have delivered as his revealed will; so that the words of Christ were equally true in reference to them with all their gifts, as they are in relation to us, that "Without me *ye can do nothing*." John 15:5. Christ commanded his disciples to "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," &c. We find them {Acts 2,} teaching & baptizing, but we find something more, about which nothing is said in the commission; *there were added to them*, that is, to the apostles or church. Now do you not believe, that this adding to the church is equally binding upon the disciples in after ages, as is the teaching and baptizing? So far as the Commission went, it was necessary as authority for them to go forth; and when the Lord gave efficacy to their word, the Holy Ghost was present to guide them as to the next step after baptism. So the rule in the 18th of Matthew was necessary for the disciples in their then state, as it is for the disciples in all ages. Christ therefore then gave it to them. But, it was not till after churches were formed in full gospel order and liberty, that cases could occur directly against the church and cause of Christ; and as they occurred, the apostles were by inspiration empowered to give the necessary rules, and did give them. And if you can tell, why the churches are not under as much obligation to act in obedience to those rules in the cases to which they apply, as they are to observe that in Matthew 18th in its proper place, I would like to know.

As I have supposed the case of a denial of the resurrection, I will remark, that brother Blakeslee in his generally excellent communication in the same number of the ADVOCATE, on the resurrection, has suffered, I think, his modesty to carry him so far as to say that, "While I feel no disposition to charge with heresy or unchristianize any of my brethren who may differ from me on this subject; believing that the faith of some in this matter may be overthrown by some means {doctrinally considered} while the grace of faith still remains unmoved," and quotes II Tim. 2:13 perhaps he meant 18. As to unchristianizing, if he means by that the excluding them from the benefits of Christ's atonement, neither individual members, nor the churches have anything to do with it. "The foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal: The Lord knoweth them that are his." We have no means of judging what degree of heresy a person may embrace and yet be a subject of grace. And yet I think it would puzzle brother Blakeslee to reconcile his above quoted position with I Cor. 15:16,17, "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, *your faith is vain*; ye are yet in your sins." With regard to charging with heresy, if brother Blakeslee meant by his remarks on that point simply that he felt no disposition to set himself up individually to denounce as heretics, brethren who might differ with him on this point, I have not so much to object, excepting that I would wish he had expressed himself a little more definitely. But taking the whole of the above quoted sentence together, it is certainly calculated to convey the idea, that in his estimation, a denial of the resurrection of the bodies of men, is not to be accounted a heresy, and therefore not a proper ground for church discipline; but that the subject is to be treated by the churches, as one of those measurably harmless differences of opinion, which may occur without breaking fellowship. If this was the idea Brother Blakeslee intended to convey, and if it is to be the position taken by the O. S. brethren, those who believe in the resurrection of the bodies, I for one, and I think some others, would like to know it. From the view I take of the subject as presented in the New Testament defined as it is, and with the involved consequences of a denial of the resurrection of the dead so fully expressed, if it does not show such denial to be a heresy, I feel prepared to defy anyone to prove any specific sentiments, by the New Testament to be a heresy, excepting an actual denial of the Lord Jesus Christ, or that he has come in the flesh. I may not be able to define why so much more stress is laid upon this error than upon some other errors noticed in the New Testament. But this is another thing. Has the apostolic decision been delivered on the subject, and have they decided that a denial of the *resurrection of the dead* subverts the very foundation of a believer's hope, the resurrection of Christ? Then upon O. S. Baptist principles, the churches are bound to be governed by such decision, whether they understand the whys and wherefores or not. And if they are bound earnestly to contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints {Jude verse 3,} then certainly that which overthrows *the faith*, which they are thus to contend for, {II Tim. 2:18,) is not to be winked at as an indifferent thing. It is true,

that for taking this very stand in former discussions on this subject I have had many hard things said of me by O. S. brethren, have been charged with having been in a *pet*, with being too *censorious*, with aiming to lord it over the faith of others, or as one expressed it, to condemn all who would not hew to my line &c. But so long as I have the apostolic decision so manifestly on my side, I ought to be contented. If the judgment thus passed upon me is just, I of course would wish to submit, and if it is not just, I stand at the judgment seat of one who can reverse it at his pleasure; and so I would leave it; but still as the blame of harshness and bitterness was principally laid on me at the time in the controversies had, when I see the thing referred to by brethren with censure, as I occasionally do, old nature, like the worm when trod on, will squirm in spite of me. But excuse me, my Brother, for this digression, and I will return to your communication.

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

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

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

The middle-grounders are of three classes. 1st, Those who are missionists in the general extent, but do not approve of camp and protracted meeting excitements. 2nd, Those who advocate Bible, temperance and domestic mission societies, but go not to the full length of missionism, and profess to preach sound doctrine. They go just far enough into popular measures and preaching to escape reproach, but not so far as to be very expensive in money contributions. The 3rd class are principally preachers with certain adherents, that they lead. These, though they may not be theological students, have studied, as their guides in preaching, certain old Baptist and other authors, called sound; hence their preaching passes for sound preaching. They are from circumstances connected with the O. S. Baptists in associations, but manifest by action no wish to be with the O.S. preachers at meetings, associations &c., except merely to attend the association to which they are connected, and then are with their wives, rather than with their brother preachers, and give clear manifestation, that if they could only get a call

and comfortable location among the 2nd class of middle-grounders they would gladly shift their connection. Yet, when thrown into company with decided O.S. brethren, they are very friendly and tender, but give you to feel that there is a certain dignity of age, station, &c., which they claim. On the other hand, when they meet with middle-ground preachers, and they seek such meetings, they are very friendly with them, calling them brothers, and telling them that, though they are among the O.S. they do not go with Beebe, and that class in their abuse of others, but wish to be sociable with others; and they take every occasion, where they can do it without reproof; for abusing the SIGNS and the O.S. preachers for their harshness in preaching &c.

Now, Brother Meredith, how is it possible, when we see persons pursuing the above course, and that for years, that we can have any confidence in them or in their heart attachment to O.S. principles? Can we with consistency extend the right hand of fellowship to them, whilst they are showing their attachment to those, who are building up the interests of the *man of sin*, they themselves helping, in trying to destroy the force of our testimony, calling it abuse? Christ says, "He that is not with me, is against the; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt. 12:30. So that he admits of no neutrality, no middle-groundism in his cause. If we are wrong in our Old School stand, others need not wish our fellowship. If we are right, and sustained, as we are, by the New Testament, we cannot without going wrong extend fellowship to those, who are seeking the friendship and welfare of another interest. Paul speaks of certain "false brethren," who were unawares brought in, and who came in; privily to spy out their liberty &c. They dealt very summarily with such, not going to the 18th of Matt. in the case, but not giving place to them by subjection even for an hour. Gal. 2:4,5. Why ought we not to follow their example with such characters, when they become manifest? In quoting some of the words from Galatians, chapter 2, I have placed a comma after the phrase, *who came in*, though our translators put none there, believing it important to show the connection of the word *privily* with the verb *to spy*.

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

Yours with Christian regards,
S. TROTT.
Centreville, Va., March 6, 1845.

P.S. – Brother Jewett, I do not mean what I have said in reference to Brother Blakeslee's communication as an attack upon him. But the point which I have touched, I think of

great importance, considering the great inroads the non-resurrection sentiment is making among us. I do not think, that I have any right to fellowship it. Yours, &c. – S.T.

## REMARKS ON ELDER WILLIAMS' LETTER & QUERIES.

BROTHER BEEBE: – It may appear superfluous for me to attempt any reply to brother Williams' letter, after the able answer you have given to his queries, {SIGNS for June 15th.} But, first, I only am responsible for spreading the extract from Elder Dudley's pamphlet before the readers of the SIGNS, to which brother Williams objects; I therefore feel bound to defend it, and this I feel a willingness to do, from being satisfied of the truth of its sentiment. Secondly, There are apparently certain sentiments intimated in brother Williams' queries and remarks, upon which I feel a wish to reason a little with him. I may have misapprehended his intended meaning, I hope I have, and that he will correct me by answering the enquiries I beg leave to make of him. The queries direct, I do not intend replying to, unless it be, I may offer some remarks to the first.

1st. I would ask brother Williams whether by exhorting the brethren to "be willing to be *little christians*" he intended to exhort them to be satisfied with knowing but *little* of the *doctrine of Christ*, to be ignorant christians? The connecting remarks tend to convey that idea. If so, I would ask him, whether, when he was young and little in experience and in the doctrine, he felt the same humbling sense of his own vileness and insufficiency to any good thing, as now? Or whether as he has grown in the knowledge of Christ, he has become bigger in his own estimation and more self-confident? I know there are other brethren besides brother Williams, who charge those who would know for themselves, what is the meaning of the Holy Spirit in the different parts of the scriptures, instead of being satisfied with what others have said is the gospel doctrine, with aiming to be big and to dig so deep as to get out of sight of others, &c. My understanding of the matter, so far as I do understand, is that every part of gospel doctrine has a relation to Christ, and tends to exalt him; and the more therefore we know of doctrine, in its relation to experience, the more we shall see of the glory of Christ, and the more abased in our own

estimation. What kind of a spirit can that be, which would lead us to say, “We know that Christ is the *Savior of sinners,* and that we have pardon through his blood, but we do not wish to trouble ourselves with any further knowledge of him or of his doctrine? Brother Williams, if I have rightly apprehended the import of your remarks, do they not tend to cultivate just such a spirit among the brethren? Bear with me, my brother, in being plain. If a knowledge of doctrine is of so little amount, or perhaps injurious, why are the brethren reproved for their “unskillfulness in the word of righteousness,” &c. Heb. 5:2-14? Why did Paul pray that the love of the brethren “might abound more and more in knowledge and in all judgment,” {Phil. 1:9,} and that the brethren at Colosse, “might be *filled* with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding,” &c. Col. 1:9.

2nd. From the general current of brother Williams’ queries and remarks I should infer that with him, the “new creature” is a mere change in the *natural man,* in that they imply that there is nothing in the *new creature* that was not through Adam dead in sins, and needed salvation. This change in the natural man can of course be nothing more than a change of views concerning God and his relation to him, and a consequent change of desires, affections, and pursuits, occasioned by being taught, and receiving the declarations of Scripture. If this be his ground, then he occupies the very position from whence originates all the difference between Old School Baptists and most popular religionists in reference to experience. For although brother Williams may hold in distinction from the Reformers or Campbellites that the natural man cannot arrive at the knowledge of spiritual religion only as he is taught by the Holy Spirit, yet the moment he assumes that no new faculty is imparted to the man, that it is a mere enlightening of his natural or rational faculties to understand spiritual things, he places this knowledge within the scope of human reason; and I have a right to challenge him to show according to the *principles of reason* why a man cannot impart to others, of like rational faculties, any knowledge which he has himself received by the powers of his natural mind. Let me be discipled to this belief that the natural mind is capable of receiving the things of the Spirit of God, and I shall be an advocate for the popular course of religious instruction by Sunday Schools, &c. If this be the ground really occupied by our brother, {which by the way, I still hope is not the case;} he has evidently overlooked the true import of what the Scriptures deny to the natural powers of man. It is not merely that they deny man’s capability of teaching, they deny also his capability of *receiving* the knowledge of spiritual things, by the exercise of any natural powers of his mind. See I Cor. 1:21. “For after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God,” &c. What is *human wisdom,* other than the highest attainments of which the natural mind is capable? Yet by this God is not known, but God has made foolish this wisdom, in things of religion, as is manifest in the religions of the world, and in the experience of the children of God, when all their attained knowledge was turned into ignorance and confusion.

Christ thanked his Father that he had “hid these things from the wise and prudent,” {Matt. 11:25,} from these who have made the highest attainments in knowledge of which the natural mind is capable. But see the full denial of the capability of the natural or Adamic man of receiving the things of the Spirit of God in I Cor. 2:14. “But the natural man *receiveth not* the things of the spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither *can he know them*, because they are spiritually discerned.” The *natural man* embraces all that belongs to man as he was originally created in Adam. As to the idea that the new birth is a production in the soul of a *spiritual existence* or *life* by immediate creation, instead of the being produced by regeneration from an original creation in Christ as a Head, as brother Williams’ queries and remarks do not involve it, I will not now notice.

3rd. In reference to brother Williams’ first query; namely, “Did any of the Apostles and Prophets ever write anything about the *bond of union*?” I must take somewhat different ground from you, brother Beebe. I agree with you that not only the Apostles and Prophets, but that all the sacred writers from Moses on, wrote about the union of Christ and his people. In Moses, the substitution of the animal for a sin offering in the place of the Israelite who had sinned; the high priest’s bearing on his breast plate and on his shoulders the names of the twelve tribes of Israel when he officiated in his office, and the right of redemption being in one who was near akin, all typified a union of Christ and his people in that great work of redemption. It is true these were only shadows of a real union, but shall we find in the anti-type that to which we look for in the substance, no more reality, than in the shadow? It may be said there was a foreordained union between Christ and the elect; but there was a foreordained union also between the sinning Israelite and the sin offering; hence when the animal was offered and his blood sprinkled, &c., it was as though the sinner himself had suffered the penalty of the law of Moses. But it was the individual’s bringing the animal to the priest for sacrifice that made him actually interested in the efficacy of the offering. So if there is only a foreordained union between Christ and his people, it is their believing in him as their sin offering, that makes them actually interested in his death; and therefore according to this view, faith would be the *bond of union*. But as to the term, “*bond* of union,” I do not find it in the scriptures; I cannot discover the idea in those texts which you quote, that is as that which binds Christ and his church together in a union. It is an old term consecrated by its use among religionists. And many persons I have no doubt use it from custom, when they mean only the *union* itself. Others again, need and mean the very idea of a bond of union, or that which binds together, in a nominal or acknowledged union, parts which before or otherwise had separate existences. As for instance, those who believe christians to be no other than *reformed Adamites*, or natural persons changed, must have to connect them with Christ, something to bind them to him, and faith as before remarked, according to their view, appears the proper bond. Again, those who hold that

the quickening of the soul with spiritual life, is not the imparting to that soul this life by regeneration from Christ, but actually a distinct creation of this life direct in them, as some of our brethren appear to hold, if I can understand them, of course need also, in order to connect this new creation to Christ, something to bind it to him. And perhaps *love* is as good a bond as they can have. But those of us who hold that Christ himself, as such, is the *quickening spirit*, that the new life, or new creature, or new man, is the spirit of Christ, or is Christ in us, imparted not by a new creation, but in regeneration; as says John, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." I John 5:11,12. And says Peter, "Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." I Pet. 1:28. I say those of us who thus believe, do not need any *bond of union*, the union itself is a being *all of one*; it is Christ in us, the hope of glory. Heb. 2:11, Col. 1:27. Adam and Eve did not need any *bond* of union to make them one flesh, they were already such in their creation. As natural persons, we had a distinct existence in Adam, as such we needed something to constitute us members of the body of Christ; this something is found in the *one spirit*, {"there is one body and one spirit,"} being quickened with that one spirit, the spirit of Christ, we stand manifest as members of the *one body*, knit together by it. This spirit thus animating us individually, is as *joints and bands*, giving individual action in our union with the body, as moved by the same spirit, as is the case with the members of the natural body. And all the nourishment by which this body increaseth manifestively, according to the increase of God, that is according to his purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus, is from Christ the Head.

4th. The quotation from Elder Dudley, I will now notice. Whether brother Williams intended to dress the sentiment borrowed from Elder Dudley, in false colors I will not say. I trust he did not; but certainly there is nothing in the quotation, nor in Elder Dudley's pamphlet, neither in any thing I wrote on the subject, which warrants such constructions as he puts upon the extract, by confounding that which is derived from Christ the Quickening Spirit, with that which is derived from Adam, so as to represent the *persons* quickened as not having been dead in sins and as not needing salvation. The terms *Quickened Spirits* as found in the extract, used instead of *Quickening Spirit*, which on reflection, I think I should prefer, might occasion some obscurity in the sentence, were it not that the connection shows so clearly that by these expressions is intended that spiritual life which is derived from Christ, and is contrasted with the *living souls* which we derive from Adam. As it stands I can see no obscurity in the meaning. But if it is the sentiment conveyed in the quotation, that brother Williams thereby aims to deride, let us look at the Scriptures referred to, and see if the doctrine does not stand on too strong ground to be shaken by anything which men may bring against it, whether scoffs or philosophy. The Scripture to which Elder Dudley referred is found in I Cor. 15:45-49. In

this passage the two Adams are spoken of and contrasted. And is it not too manifest to be denied by any candid enquirer after truth, that they are presented to view as two Heads, having each a distinct posterity or seed like unto himself, the one *earthy as is the earthy*, the other *heavenly as is the heavenly*? If the first Adam was an actual head having an actual seed; was not the last Adam an actual Head having an actual seed? If the posterity of the first were created and received a being in him, when he was made a living soul, were not the posterity of the last Adam, in like manner created in him, when he was made a *Quickening Spirit*? Again, does not verse 49, "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly," clearly show that the same *we* who bear the image of the heavenly, and are thereby manifested as his seed, also bear the image of the earthy, and are thereby manifested as his seed; first manifested as the seed of the natural, and afterwards as the seed of the spiritual? How are any manifested in the image of the earthy as to his nature, and in his likeness as to his depravity? We are told {Gen. 5:3} that Adam, "begat a son in his own *likeness* and after his image." There then is the answer. May we not then safely conclude that the seed of Christ are manifested in his image as spiritual, by being born of the Spirit, and in his likeness as the glorified Jesus, by their resurrection or being born from the dead, according to the two begettings ascribed to their Head, Christ Jesus? He was manifested as the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, when in the flesh. John 1:14. And he was the first born from the dead, Col. 1:18, and said to be begotten in his resurrection, Psa. 2:7, compared with Acts 13:33. And further, as the saints are brought to view as the *seed* of Christ, Psa. 22:30, and Isa. 53:10 and as his *children*, {Isa. 8:18, compared with Heb. 2:13,} will not brother Williams be constrained to acknowledge this comparison between the two Adams and their seeds as holding good? If so, all ground is taken from him to infer that, because we have been quickened by the spirit of Christ and therefore existed in him, as *his seed* before the foundation of the world, we therefore never existed in Adam, were not dead as his seed in sin, and did not need salvation. Indeed I cannot conceive how he could ever draw such an inference, if he admits that those who have been born of the flesh may actually be born again of the Spirit. As to the new man, the spiritual life of the believer, as Christ is that life, I am free to admit, that it was not created in Adam, did not fall in him, and never needed salvation any more than did Christ personally. But to draw the conclusion from this, that the persons quickened with this life, were never in a lost state needing salvation, is to me strange logic, and stranger divinity.

5th. As to eternal justification, I see not that it is involved in the subject of his queries. Besides, brother Williams probably was not aware that the first complaining among the readers of the SIGNS about doctrinal controversies, arose from our opposing the idea of the saints being justified from eternity, as he has in his communications.

6th. Brother Williams in speaking of the time when the saints first tasted that the Lord was gracious says, “You did not then think of an eternal actual existence with Christ, &c.” I have sometimes described the proper act of faith to be an embracing of Jesus Christ as the Savior of lost sinners, such as the individual felt himself to be without any special reference to his own being represented by Christ. I was wrong. A few nights since as I was reflecting on this point, my own experience when faith was first given me came forcibly to my mind. And I recollected that I then saw, that Christ as substituted to endure the penalty of the law due to condemned sinners was so exactly suited to my case that the conclusion was manifested to me that I once had in view when he was provided as a substitute, and therefore that he bore my sins. So that my faith embraced in substance a union with Christ as far back as his death; and I think, I was led to contemplate the provision as made in eternity. And I am now confident, I never could have hoped for salvation from a mere view of him as suffering the penalty due to sinners. For I then viewed my case an aggravated one, as I still do, and myself worse than any other, and therefore without having faith to view him as standing between me personally, and the law, I could not have had confidence to trust in him as my salvation. I think the same in substance must be the experience of all who are brought into liberty. They must view him as suffering in their stead, and therefore in effect view their union with him. They probably did not at the time have a clear view of all the details of that glorious union with Christ as their Head and Husband, by which he of right stood between them and all the demands of law. If they had, they would since have experienced no growth in the knowledge of Christ. But it is very strange to me that christians should be exhorted to make their first exercise of faith their exclusive standard of the doctrine of Christ, to the overlooking of all the enlargement of their understanding in that doctrine which they have since experienced. I hope brother Williams will reflect on these things and let us know where he stands. I have used plainness; I was not offended at his communication, but I have been impressed with the idea that it called for great plainness of speech. If he is a child of God and minister of Christ, as I hope he is, this will not hurt him; though he and others may be offended at me for it. May he be disposed to leave the a,b,c, of the doctrine of Christ, and go on unto perfection. If I have erred and thereby dealt wrongfully with his communication, may he feel to forgive me.

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., July 18, 1849.

# REMARKS ON EPHESIANS 1:3.

"Blessed be the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."

*Who hath blessed us,* &c., is what I wish particularly to notice. From the manner in which this text is quoted and applied by certain writers, one might infer that they considered the revelation of God to be altogether of His eternal purpose, and nothing of the accomplishment of that purpose, or that their attention is so much taken up with the purpose itself, that they can see nothing of its being carried out in the acts and events in time. These persons have certainly a right to present their own view of the subject; and this liberty I would not deprive them of. But being as confident as I am that God exists, that such a view of the subject is wrong, I will present for their consideration a different view of divine revelation, and of the text above named in particular.

Perhaps some may think that I have used too strong an expression, in saying that I am as confident of this thing, as I am that God exists. But my brethren; how can we know anything of God but by His bringing to pass the events purposed in His own eternal mind. Thus I understand God to declare beforehand in prophecy and in promise, His purpose, that the accomplishment of those events thus before declared, may be a continual witness that He alone is God. And this I understand to be the ground taken by God in His reasonings with Israel against idolatry, as in Isa. 41:8-20, 21-28; also in chapter 42:9; 42:8-13, and in other places.

There appears to me, to be a divine beauty and glory reflected, from the subject when we contemplate God's eternal purpose as rolling on in the unerring accomplishment of the preordained parts thereof, in regular succession; and in beholding the successive accomplishment of each event unfolding more and more of the manifold wisdom and gracious designs of Him who sits as a Sovereign, governing all, "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure;" (Isa. 46:10) thus also verifying His declaration; "I will work and who shall let it." I think far more of God is seen in

beholding Him bringing to pass in regular succession, His declared purpose, making every thing, even the *wrath of man* subservient thereto, than could be seen in contemplating Him merely as declared in the purpose. Just as the planetary orbs, by their constant and regular revolutions, bringing about, in beautiful order, the successions of day and night, summer and winter, seed time and harvest, proclaim far more distinctly the existence and government of God, all-wise, all-powerful and good, than the mere excellence of those orbs divested of their motions and of the changes produced thereby, could do. It was this motion of these heavenly bodies, and the changes thereby produced, which the Psalmist calls our attention to in the 19th Psalm.

The writers of the New Testament seem to have been ever intent on bringing to our view the purpose as coupled with, and showed in, its accomplishments, and the prophecies and promises as verified in their fulfillment; the types which were but prophecy or the purpose of God declared in emblems, are also in the New Testament brought to view in connection with their anti-types.

As one instance in which the purpose and its accomplishment are brought to view in their legitimate connection by the inspired writers I will refer to II Tim. 1:9. “Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but *according* to His own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.” Here we have God’s *own purpose and grace*, given to the saints, not in themselves, but in Christ Jesus, their Head, *before the world began*, brought to view – not as constituting in that original gift, their actual salvation and calling, but as being the purpose going before, or predestinated plan according to which, those, of whom the Apostle then spake, were actually *saved and called*. Here therefore we have the purpose as fixed before time began, now actually accomplished as manifested in the experience of the saints, and that of *grace* and not of works, presented together as one harmonious whole, manifesting God in the beginning, and ending of it. So in the text to be considered, (Eph. 1:3) I understand the Apostle not as speaking simply of the saints being blessed in purpose, or of their being chosen and predestinated to these blessings, but of their being brought into the experience of these blessings, according to God’s electing and predestinating love and purpose going before. Hence the text in its connection does not read as it should have done to convey the idea of the saints having been blessed, as the Apostle speaks, *with all spiritual blessings* in the electing and predestinating purpose going before. It should in that case have read, Who blessed us with all spiritual blessings, &c., *when He chose in Him* before the foundation of the world, &c. But the Apostle here speaks not of the saints having been blessed in their election to holiness &c., and predestination to the adoption of children, but of their having been then blessed *according to that* **CHOICE** and **PREDESTINATION** going before. See verses 4 & 5 in connection with verse 3. I therefore must understand him as calling the attention of the Ephesian brethren to the

fact, of the actual accomplishment of the electing and predestinating purpose of God going before, concerning them, as manifested in their experience.

The obligation of the saints thus to unite with the Apostle in blessing God, for having brought them to realize in their experience, all those spiritual blessings to which He had chosen and predestinated them, before the *foundation of the world*, was taught under the Levitical law, in the case of the Israelite who was to bring his "basket of first fruits" unto the Lord; according to Deut. 26:1-11. There is in the confession which the Israelite was to make on that occasion, something beautifully illustrative of our text, and also of the experience which the child of grace relates when he comes before the church, (as the Israelite came before the priest,) to offer also the *first fruits* of grace in his heart, namely; a thankful acknowledgment of being saved by Christ, and of subjection to Christ by submitting to the ordinance of baptism. Were it not so lengthy I would transcribe the whole passage; as it is, I will content myself with noticing some particulars therein; and request my brethren to read the passage for themselves. 1st. He was to say unto the priest, "I profess this day unto the Lord thy God that I am come unto the country which the Lord sware unto our fathers for to give us." (vs.3.) Notice the import of this confession; it was not, that God in swearing unto their fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had by that oath and promise put them then in actual possession of the good land; but it was, that now, according to that oath and promise, God had brought Israel into the possession of the land promised unto their fathers, notwithstanding all the difficulties that had intervened. It was not therefore the oath and promise that he was then to acknowledge, but the *accomplishment* of that promise as manifested in his actually now enjoying the fruits of the land. And yet the promise made unto their fathers and confirmed by the oath of God, as effectually secured the possession of the land to their posterity, as did the choice of the saints in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world, and the everlasting covenant established with Christ, secured to them, their being actually "blessed with all spiritual blessings." Again this Israelite, after the priest should take his basket of first fruits and set it down before the altar of the Lord his God, was to give a brief detail of Israel's origin, of their bondage and oppression in Egypt, of their crying unto the Lord, and of His hearing their cry and delivering them by a strong hand out of Egypt, and His bringing them into that land which flowed with milk and honey, and that the fruits which he then had brought were those which the Lord had given him, &c. How different the idea conveyed by this whole relation from that of their having been put into actual possession of national liberty and blessings in the land of Canaan by the promise made unto Abraham! That promise secured their being put into this possession, and the confession was, that it was according to that promise, and not according to their works, that they were thus blessed.

So in the relation which spiritual Israelites give of their experience, there is a correspondence with that of the national Israelites. “A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt,” &c., said one. The other says, a *deceived one*, (the import of Syrian) ready to perish was my father, and I have borne his image; and when the Lord opened my eyes to see my condition, I found myself a poor sinner lying under the just condemnation of the law, &c., and being *heavy laden* with its demands, I cried unto the Lord for mercy; He heard me and brought me from under it and to Jesus, for salvation, &c.

I recollect, if I may refer to the subject without giving offense, that in the discussion on justification, one esteemed brother said he had been taught the doctrine of eternal justification in his experience. If so, he of course found from the first discovery he had of his true situation, that he had always been actually blessed with all spiritual blessings. But although I have not the most distant idea that this brother designed to misrepresent his case; yet from his preaching as I heard him, I am confident that his experience taught him to view himself – not as a *justified one saved* – but as a *sinner saved* – not as always enjoying the milk and honey of Canaan; but as having groaned under the bondage and oppression of Egypt. So I think all who are taught of God, instead of viewing themselves as having been always in the blessed state of which the Apostle speaks in the text under consideration, find that they had been *living without God and without hope in the world*, and had been *aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,* &c.

In further noticing this subject, it will be proper, first to examine the import of the expressions; In *heavenly places, in Christ Jesus*. **1st.** The expression, in *heavenly places*. From the use of this and like expressions, in this and other texts, I do not understand the idea intended thereby to be conveyed, as one to be confined to that which is beyond time, either before or after; but the expression is evidently used to point out the peculiarities of the gospel dispensation and what properly belongs to it, in distinction from the legal dispensation. Thus I understand the Master, in the expressions “If I have told you earthly things and ye believed not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things,” (John 3:12) to intimate to Nicodemus that he had not believed the words of the Sinai covenant in their true and full import, and therefore it was no wonder he did not comprehend and believe the testimony of Christ concerning the new birth. And this text I understand as thus corresponding with John 5:47, with the difference that Christ here claims to have Himself spoken the words from Mount Sinai. In I Cor. 15:47-49, the terms *heavenly* and earthly refer to Christ and Adam the one as the head or father of the spiritual birth of the saints; the other of their natural birth. Thus also the *heavenly places* mentioned in Eph. 1:20 & 2:6, in which Christ was seated on His resurrection from the dead, and His people with and in Him, refer I think to Christ’s being thus exalted as King in Zion to administer to His people, not the regulations of the Sinai covenant, but

the provisions of the sure mercies of David. And we are thus taught that as Christ in consequence of His union with His people was brought under the law, so by the redemption which He completed in the same oneness with His people, and His consequent resurrection from the dead, His people were thus exalted with, and in Him, and together seated in Him far above the demands of the law and above all the principalities and powers, whether angels or men that are under the law. In a similar sense in the expression used in Eph. 3:10. Thus also, the *heavenly calling, heavenly gift, heavenly things, heavenly country, and heavenly Jerusalem*, Heb. 3:1; 6:4; 8:5; 9:23; 11:16; 12:22, all refer to the same spiritual idea relating to the gospel church. The term heavens also in Heb. 9:23, refers to the same spiritual nature of the gospel church. Hence the being blessed in *heavenly places* refers to the saints being under the *Everlasting Covenant*, and their being blessed according to the provisions of that covenant, as *ordered in all things and sure*, and not according to the conditional provisions of the Sinai covenant; they being recognized, not as bond servants under the law; but as *sons of God*.

We next enquire, what the import is, of the expression, *in Christ Jesus* as used in this connection. It is, as I understand it, designed to bring Christ to view, as the sole medium through which the blessings of God flows to any of the children of men, and shows farther the distinction between these blessings, and those, bestowed upon national Israel.

The blessings which national Israel enjoyed were bestowed upon them as the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; and according to the promises made unto them. The saints are blessed as the seed of Christ, and according to the promises which are *yea and amen* in Christ Jesus. The natural seed of Abraham were blessed as they were recognized as such by the circumcision in the flesh. The saints are manifested as heirs of the spiritual blessings by the *circumcision that is of the heart, in the spirit* . The blessings of Canaan came to natural Israel on the ground of their own obedience; these spiritual blessings flow freely to the saints, through that perfect obedience which Christ rendered from under the law. In a word, the believer, in having Christ as his, has in Him, all spiritual blessings, secured eternally unto him; and as from time to time he is enabled to exercise faith in Christ, he is made to rejoice in the assurance that the blessing of God rests upon him, without any mixture of evil, or any deficiency for rendering him truly blessed for time and eternity. And it is only as he can exercise faith in Christ, that he can thus realize that he is blessed of God.

In specifying the *all spiritual blessings*, many name election and predestination as standing foremost in the list, but however great and glorious blessings these are, as the flowings out of the love of God to His people, yet it was not of these the Apostle here spake, for it is *according* to this electing and predestinating grace, that they are thus blessed, or in other words, the blessings which are here spoken of, are no other than

what flows out of that *everlasting love* which God placed upon them in their election. As the Israelite already referred to, in bringing his basket of *first-fruits*, therein confesses unto God, not that God chose Abraham and swear unto him, to give unto his posterity the land of Canaan; but according to that purpose thus confirmed unto Abraham, he was in the possession, and actually enjoying the fruits of the land of Canaan. So the believer when brought to receive Christ by faith, is constrained to acknowledge, that in Him he finds not only all that he had conceived to be promised in the gospel, but infinitely more than it had ever entered into his heart to conceive of.

As to any attempt to count up these blessings, I consider it superfluous. I might enumerate; redemption, calling, repentance, faith, adoption, &c.; but are these all that are included in the Apostle's expressions, "Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings?" I think not. The expression *all spiritual blessings*, seem to me to embrace the idea, not only that they had been blessed with all that they had understood to be included in the gospel report; but that all they had experienced or should experience was blessing; that as the curse was now removed, their sins pardoned, and they justified in their experience through the redemption they now apprehended by faith in Christ, they had peace with God, and felt that everything flowed from His goodness. The being disappointed in their attempts to make their peace with God, by their works, and the condemnation, distress and broken-heartedness which they had been made to feel, they now see were all blessings, rich blessings, to their poor guilty souls; all were but preparing them to receive and rejoice in Christ. So faith, when exercised by the operation of God in the hearts of His people, assures them that all the trials of the way, inward and outward, how much soever sense may be disposed to pronounce them evils, are all brought with blessings, rich and spiritual; all are *working together for their good*. Having Christ, they are blessed in prosperity, in adversity; in sickness, in health; in darkness, in light; in life, in death; in the sounding of the trump of the Archangel, and in eternity.

Well and feelingly therefore may the saint, when faith is in exercise, say with the Apostle: *Blessed be the God, and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus; according as He hath chosen us in Him, &c.*

Centreville, Fairfax County Virginia,
Dec. 23, 1839.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 8 (1840)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pgs 181 – 188

# REMARKS ON Gen. 6:6.

Dear Brother Beebe: – I see that sister Ball, in the 1st number of the present volume of the *Signs,* has requested my views of Gen. 6:6,

"And it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at His heart."

I presume an explanation of this text can be given satisfactory to sister Ball, and other honest enquirers after truth; but to give an exposition that would stop the mouths of gainsayers is perhaps difficult. That God possesses such perfection, that there can be no repentance, or grief at heart, in His essential mind is evident from the general revelation? which He has made of Himself, as well as from positive declarations in His word to the point. James says, speaking of the Father of Lights, "With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning," chap. 1:17. Job says, "He is of one mind, and who can turn Him," chap. 23:13. God says, "I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient time, the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure" Isa. 46:9, 10. Even Balaam is compelled to say, "God is not a man that He should lie, neither the son of man that He should repent;" Num. 23:19. Samuel says, "The strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for He is not a man that He should repent" I Sam. 15:29. These texts as clearly show that God's perfection of mind is such that He cannot be subject to any such change as repentance, implies in man, as do the Scriptures, that God is a Spirit, and therefore that when bodily organs and limbs are ascribed to Him, the expressions are not to be taken in a literal, but in a figurative sense. Even those who are so ready to think that God can be made to see such imperfections in His past course as to repent of it literally, will admit that when God speaks of His arm, His feet, &c., that the expressions are not to be taken in a literal sense, that they are figurative expressions, used to convey more forcibly to the comprehension of weak man, a sense of God's power and presence, &c. Those who are so disposed to contend that repentance, when ascribed to God, is to be taken literally, as implying a change in the divine mind, thereby making the Scriptures contradict themselves, and contradict the immutability of God, may think to relieve their minds of any restraint from the Scriptures; but they are not aware that if they could succeed in destroying the absolute immutability of God, in His purpose, they would destroy the

whole ground on which man's safety and preservation on earth rests. If God could be induced to change His purpose one way, it could, with equal ease, be changed the other way. Hence, if we can believe that God has been induced by anything in us to change His purpose of cursing us to that of blessing us, we ought to believe that He would, by our acts of ingratitude and sin, again be provoked to change His purpose back, and at once to cut us off. Hence, to relieve His people from such a gloomy idea as this, God says, "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed" Mal.3:6. Thus showing that their preservation and safety, instead of being subject to their changeableness, rests upon His own unchangeableness. Viewing the terms repent, repentance, &c., when spoken of God, as figurative, we shall find them strikingly illustrative of God's dealings with men, under the law dispensation, and upon legal principles, whilst no ways effecting the immutability of God's mind or purpose.

According to the legal dispensation, God's dealings with men were made to depend on their conduct, they were blessed or cursed, prospered or afflicted, that is, in a worldly or outward sense, according as they did good or evil. There were those in Jeremiah's time that said, "Where is the word of the Lord?" Intimating that God said, and did not; that His mind changed. Wherefore, after giving to Jeremiah the figure of the potter, to show His sovereign right to deal with nations as seemed Him good, He declared to him the principle upon which He dealt with nations, saying, "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." So also, in the event of their changing from good to doing evil, God would repent of the good He thought to do unto them. See Jer. 17, 15, 18:1-10. God thus shows that His doing good or evil to a nation depended on their obeying or not obeying His voice, according to the nature of the legal dispensation. This also shows that God's repenting does not imply any change of mind with Him; that it is only a change of His course towards them consequent upon their change of conduct, according to His sovereign right to deal with nations, as they did good or evil. Again, in the days of Ezekiel, there were those who complained that God's ways were not equal.

But, God shows that the unequalness was with them, that His ways were uniform and just, that "when the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, he shall even die thereby. But if the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby" Ez. 33:12-20. Then the Lord shows that His dealings with individuals, in their national or worldly relations under the legal dispensation, were the same as with nations.

Thus when the Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah, God repented, that is, turned from the evil He had threatened them with, in accordance with the principle by which He governs nations Jonah 3:10. So God's repenting concerning the pestilence, and

staying the angel's hand from Jerusalem, evidently was not that He was sorry for having sent the pestilence; but it was that having visited His designed chastisement upon Israel, that sufficiently humbled David's mind, He stayed the sword which threatened destruction to Jerusalem II Sam. 24:15-17. Having thus allowed that God is not like man, subject to change of mind, but is immutable in His purpose, and that His repenting or changing from threatened evils or promised good, according as men repented of their evils or turned from their righteousness, was but the result of His equitable dealings with nations and men according to the nature of the legal dispensation under which they were, we are prepared, methinks, for understanding the expressions used in Gen. 6:6. It is true the expressions used in this passage are much stronger than those we have been noticing, but not more so than was the destruction thereby intimated greater than others with which He has visited the earth. For as a man having formed something for which he truly "repented and grieved at heart," would seek to efface it and the remembrance of it from existence, so God, by the use of these expressions, showed that it was His purpose, although He had created man and by His benign providence caused him to greatly multiply upon the earth, now to turn and destroy that whole race of men, and wash the remembrance of them and their evil doings from the earth by a flood, and re-people it directly from another, through an intermediate head, Noah, who had found grace in His sight. Thus, in accordance with the general testimony of the Scriptures concerning God and concerning His government, I understand the expressions used in this verse as figurative and as designed more strongly to impress upon Noah and others the fixedness of His purpose to destroy that race of men from the earth, and at the same time to show that this signal judgment was an expression of His abhorrence of, and the opposition of His nature to, the wickedness of man, though He had permitted it upon earth. The construction I have here given of this passage is confirmed by a similar use of the term "repent" in I Sam. 15:11, "The word of the Lord came unto Samuel, saying, it repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king." And yet in that same chapter, verse 29, as quoted before, Samuel says: "The strength of Israel will not lie or repent, for He is not a man that He should repent," thus showing that he did not understand the expression, "it repenteth me," as implying anything like sorrow or change of mind with God, such as is implied in men's repenting. We must, therefore, understand these words as merely expressive of a change of God's providence toward Saul, consequent upon Saul's sin in disobeying the command of God, and showing God's displeasure at such disobedience.

I have gone into a lengthier examination of the Scriptures upon this subject than perhaps others will think was necessary; but I wished to show, and I think I have shown, that the uniform testimony of the Scriptures concerning God and the general use of the word "repent" by Him proves that when God speaks of "repenting" in reference to Himself, He speaks in a figurative sense, the same as when He speaks of "His hand, His arms," &c. I have thus complied with sister Ball's request. Whether what I have written is

sufficiently instructive or interesting to justify its publication, I know not. I leave it with you, brother Beebe, to dispose of it as you think best, and subscribe myself yours,

From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.25 (1857)
S. Trott.

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 435-438

# REMARKS ON ISAIAH 51:1

(LOOK UNTO THE ROCK WHENCE YE ARE HEWN, AND TO THE HOLE OF THE PIT WHENCE YE ARE DIGGED)

Dear Brother Beebe: There is one more text which has been on hand for some time, for my views through the at the request, by letter, of an esteemed sister, on which I now wish to offer some remarks, if agreeable to you to publish them. I had hoped that this would have been the last request of the kind made of me; not that I am unwilling to give such views as I have of any text of Scripture, or that it is not a satisfaction to me to express them when I feel like writing; but I apprehend that the infirmities of mind incident to old age must begin to show themselves in my writing. These infirmities are much sooner discovered by others than one's self. And there are younger and much abler writers for the on whom brethren may call for expositions.

The text above referred to, on which my views are requested, is Isaiah 51:1, "Hearken to me ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord; look unto the rock whence ye are digged." The connection shows that Zion's members are here addressed, and that the design of the address throughout is to encourage and comfort them under all their discouragements and distresses. It is true that Paul represents Israel as *following after the law of righteousness*, and the Gentiles as not having followed after righteousness

Rom. 9:30-31. The Jews follow after the law of righteousness, but do not attain to it because they seek it, *as it were by the works of the law,* that is, being *ignorant of God's righteousness they go about to establish their own righteousness,* and therefore never attain to it, nor to an obedience to the law. But the Gentiles, while in a state of nature, do not follow after righteousness, they do not know it. Believers do *know* it, hence in the 7th verse of the context they are characterized as knowing righteousness. And such know where their righteousness is, that it is only in Christ; that He alone is the righteousness of His people. They are satisfied with it as being abundantly sufficient for their justification; hence they want no other, or are filled, as Christ said, those who hunger and thirst after it shall be Mt. 5:6. Yet it is a true characteristic of believers that they *follow after righteousness.* They even feel their need of it, as the ground of their acceptance in appearing before God, and therefore ever wish to be grasping it by faith as their plea. Not only this, but they are following after it, that they may grasp it more strongly by faith, and bring it more closely and more assuredly to themselves as theirs. Again, they want to find righteousness in themselves, and they follow after it (for they love the law), with the desire to attain to it in their works and in their thoughts.

Believers also are they *who seek the Lord.* They seek Him in that they desire to know more of Him. They seek Him because they constantly desire to have His presence with them, and to enjoy the tokens of His love. In these points of view He often appears to be hidden from them, hence they seek Him. Again, they seek the Lord in seeking to show forth His salvation, in seeking to honor Him, and be conformed to His word.

But the main points on which my views are requested are the *rock* and the *hole of the pit.* In preaching from this text some years since, I considered both expressions as having reference to that state of nature from which the people of God had been taken by grace. The rock as representing the hardness and impenitency of man in a state of nature, and both figures as representing their entire incapacity in a state of nature, their entire destitution of life or any principle of action by which they could sever themselves from their relations to the world as living in wickedness and under the curse of the law. Although I probably preached correct doctrine and experience, I am now satisfied that I gave a wrong construction to this part of the text and the import of these figures. In the first place, although the heart is represented as *stone,* yet God says He will take it away and give a heart of flesh. Whereas the hewing a piece of sculpture, or a block, from a rock does not alter the nature of that which is hewn out, it remains rock still. Although Peter represents the saints as "lively stones built up a spiritual house," &c., yet this representation of them as "lively stones," evidently refers to the new man in the believer, and not to the old man, for the old man would not form a spiritual house. In the second place, mankind is not in Scripture represented by a rock or anything solid, but by *dust* and *ashes,* by the *grass of the field,* &c., as light and vain. On the other hand, our God,

or God in Christ, is represented in Scripture as a rock, as is also Christ in His mediatorial person abundantly represented as a rock or stone, as in Deut. 32:4-31; Ps. 18:46; I Cor. 10:4, and in other places. Hence, in being governed by the testimony of Scripture, I feel bound to consider Christ as the rock spoken of in this text. *Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn.* This probably will appear as a strange idea to many that Zion in her members should be represented as hewn out of Christ. But it is no more strange than that Eve, in her distinct existence, should have been formed of Adam, and after her distinct formation remain bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. The term *hewn* is here used to denote the distinct manifestation of the church and her members in conformity to the figure of a rock as used. It brings clearly to view, in conformity with other testimony of Scripture, the existence of the saints or the church in their spiritual life in Christ before their distinct manifestation. In the art of sculpture, the statue lay in its substance in the block of marble before it ever received its distinct formation. The sculptor only brought it to view in its distinct form and features by the use of his chisel. Its substance was there before and it still remains, though it may be a statue of Washington, the same marble rock it was before. So the church and saints remain in their distinct manifestation as saints, the same Christ, the church being *His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all* Eph. 1:23. And the church collectively is called Christ I Cor. 12:12. Christ is in them the hope of glory, and is their life. Well, therefore, may the saints amidst all their difficulties, under all their persecutions, and their being dwindled down by divisions, and amid all their individual conflicts, be directed to the *Rock* whence they were hewn, *or of which they are hewn,* for the *whence* is a supply by the translator. And surely the *rock* of those who would worry and waste us by opposition and divisions, &c, *is not like our Rock,* our enemies themselves being judges. Our Rock is the Almighty, the only wise God, He is ever with and in the midst of His people, is and ever has been one with them, is their life, their foundation, their chief corner stone; with whom as such, no comparison can be made from human architecture; He is a living stone, and His life is disseminated through all the materials of the building, making them *lively stones,* and one with Him, so that this Rock, this foundation must be destroyed before the building can fall, or one stone.

"And to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." This, as I understand it, relates to that state of condemnation in which mankind are sunken as transgressors of the law, they being as prisoners shut up in the pit of depravity. Hence it is said to the daughters of Zion, "As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein there is no water" Zech. 9:11. The hole of the pit out of which they are digged, has reference to the fact that the whole human family are in *the pit,* or state of condemnation in a mass together; and hence when any are digged, or taken out, there is a hole made in the mass, or evidence left of their having been in that pit. Hence the direction is to the children of grace in their difficulties, distresses and discouragements,

to “Look to the hole of the pit;” look back to where you once lay in the darkness, ignorant of yourself and of God, and of the spirituality of His law. Afterwards there was light let into the pit; that is, your eyes were enlightened to see your relation to God, and your condemnation as a transgressor of His law. You tried to bring yourself into favor with God; but you were shut up under the law in this pit of depravity; you found it a horrible pit, and your feet sinking deeper and deeper in the mire. Nay, you knew of no other medium to look for relief but to the law, and that demanded full payment and held you fast as its prisoner, so that you found yourself as helpless to deliver yourself as would be a clod of dirt to throw itself out of a pit that was being dug. Now, if a believer, you can look back and see this hole of the pit, that place under the law in which you once lay. And you know you were thrown, or taken out of it. You know that you were once delivered from that sense of condemnation and guilt, and brought into a state of peace, and felt a confidence in approaching God with your thanksgivings and supplications which you had not felt before; and felt a hope springing up in your breast that your sins were forgiven, &c. You may have thought very soon after that you were deceived, and wanted to get back again under the law, and again to feel that distress, that sense of guilt and condemnation which had been removed from you; but you found you could not get back under it; that you were as much shut out from it now as you were shut up under it before. You were sensible that you were a vile sinner, but you could not feel the condemnation and wrath for it as before, and you were distressed that you could not feel it. You have never, from that day to this, thought of ascribing it to anything else that you were sent forth out of that pit, but to the blood of Zion’s covenant, or the new covenant. And you have never, from that day to this, thought of looking to the law, or to your obedience to it, as the medium of your acceptance with God. Now, if you can see that hole of the pit where you know you once were, and know that you are no longer in it, you have the evidence that you are no longer under the law. And if not under it, then, of course, not subject to its curse; and if freed from the curse of the law, nothing can hurt you. You may have heavy trials, difficulties and temptations, but no evil can come to you from them.

The people of God are further directed in the following verse to “look to Abraham their father, and to Sarah, that bear them,” &. In this we may see, if we will look, that Abraham’s being called alone, his becoming old, nor the barrenness of Sarah, could prevent the accomplishment of God’s promise to Abraham concerning a seed. Neither could the perverseness of Jacob’s sons, nor the obstinacy of Pharaoh, nor the Red Sea, nor the barrenness of the desert, nor the rebellion of Israel in the wilderness, nor any other obstacle, prevent the fulfillment of God’s promise to Abraham’s seed, that they should be put in possession of the land of Canaan. From this we may be assured that nothing is too hard for the Lord, and that all He has promised to his church and people He will assuredly accomplish.

But I have written enough to show my views of the text, and here I will leave it, as I fear I am not writing to much profit.

Yours in love, Elder Samuel Trott,
Signs of the Times, Vol. 27 (1859)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 153-158

## REMARKS ON JAMES 5:14-15

Brother Beebe: – The apostolic direction contained in James 5:14-15, is another subject of enquiry by Brother Moore. The text reads thus: "Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him." Until within a few months past, my views of this passage had been that it related only to that period in which special gifts of the Spirit were conferred on the churches; and that it was through the exercise of these gifts that this healing was to be expected. But four or five months since, in reading the passage, I was lead to a very different view of it, and the subject seemed to open to my mind so much light and clearness that I then thought I would embrace the first opportunity to write out my views for the *Signs*. When, however, such opportunity arrived, the liveliness of those views was somewhat gone, and dreading the charges being repeated that I was trying to bring forward things singular and new in order to become a leader, I therefore let it pass. If a desire to see our Old School brethren laying aside the traditions of men, both ancient and modern, and seeking to be closely conformed in all things to the only standard of truth in religion, the New Testament, and this desire prompting me to action in bringing things to the test of that one standard, regardless of the generally received opinions of men, justly subjects me to the above charge, so be it. As Brother Moore has requested my views on this text, I will now endeavor to give them; only aiming to bring forward what I believe designed by the text under consideration. If any consider my views wrong, let them show them to be such by the Scriptures, in a becoming spirit, and a kindness will be

done both to me and others. If not, and they are not satisfied with my views, it is not for me to dictate their course.

But to come to the subject in hand. I will in the first place remark that the form of the direction here given does not correspond with the idea that the intention was to recommend the sick to those on whom was conferred the *gift of healing*, as one of those special gifts conferred by the Spirit in the first age of the church. For, according to Paul's account, this, like every other special gift, was conferred only on particular individuals; hence he says, "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing?" etc., (1 Cor. 12:8-10, 29-30). It must, therefore, be manifest that the direction would have been, if those gifts had been designed, to send for those who had the *gift of healing* ; instead of this direction to *send for the elders of the church*, simply in their official relation, without any specification concerning gifts. Again, the direction given as to how the elders shall proceed does not comport with the view given of the exercise of the gift of healing. As in the instance of the healing of the *lame man*, by Peter's saying, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk," he was healed (Acts 3:6), so also in the case of Æneas (Acts 9:33-34), Paul's healing the father of Publius and others, appears to have been different from the direction here given. See Acts 28:8-9. If then this passage does not relate wholly to the exercise of the extraordinary gifts which were in the churches in the apostolic age, as I think will appear evident to those who will candidly examine this point, it must be considered as an apostolic direction to the saints at large, and therefore to extend to all after ages. In fact, from the circumstances of the Apostle's having written this epistle near the close of the Apostolic age, or the period which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem, it appears to me reasonable to suppose that this direction was designed by the Holy Ghost to meet the necessities of the saints after the gift of healing and other extraordinary gifts would have ceased; they having answered their purpose for the confirmation of the gospel, in its *first publication in all the world for a witness unto all nations.*

The direction here given, as I understand its import, is for the sick to commit their case directly to the Lord Jesus Christ, and in this prescribed form, by which faith in His sovereign power to heal is fully and publicly expressed, as also an acknowledgment of His authority in the case.

The faith that is necessarily required to perform this act acceptably to God (I speak not here of the *prayer of faith* which I shall again notice), is no other than the faith which the centurion expressed when he said, "Lord I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof; but speak the word only and my servant shall be healed; for I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me; and I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it" (Matthew 8:8-9). The

centurion, by this form of _expression, showed that he had faith to believe that the Lord Jesus had the same control over diseases, to send and recall them at His pleasure, as he had over his soldiers and servants which were under him. Although the Master declared this to be greater faith than He had found in Israel, yet methinks an Old School Baptist ought surely to have as great faith in his Lord.

I will now notice the direction in its several parts. **1st.** "Is any sick among you, let him call for the elders of the church." It is then to be the voluntary act of the sick, by which he shall thus manifest his confidence in the Lord Jesus and subjection to His appointments. It is also thus made the duty of the elder or elders sent for to attend. **2nd.** "And let them pray over him anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." Olive or sweet oil is evidently intended, as that is the common oil of the Scriptures. As pouring oil on the heads of persons appointed to office was expressive of the communication of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit qualifying the person for the office, and as anointing the head was also an expression of cheerfulness, thankfulness, etc., the ceremony on this occasion of *anointing with oil in the name of the Lord*, may be designed as expressing a cheerful hope that the grace of the Lord may be extended to the healing of the sick, as well as a cheerful submission to His will; or its application to the diseased parts, perhaps for its medical qualities; like Isaiah's applying figs *for a plaster* upon the boils of Hezekiah (Isaiah 38:21).

**3rd.** "And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up." I do not understand by this that in all cases where this direction is observed that the sick will be raised up to health or that in any case through the observance of this institution the saints will live beyond their appointed time. By the *prayer of faith* I understand that prayer which is specially indicted by the Holy Spirit and therefore according to the will of God (Romans 8:26-27). When the Spirit thus *helpeth our infirmities*, there is faith given us to believe that God hath heard our prayer, and hence a cheerful resting on Him for the accomplishment of the thing desired, in His own time and way. This *prayer of faith* is therefore a pledge to the sick, that the Lord hath rebuked his disease, and will again raise him up. It is the duty of the elders on this as in officiating on other occasions, to lead in public prayer unto God, but on this, as much as on other occasions, are they dependent on the special influence of the Holy Spirit to enable them to offer the *prayer of faith*; and as much so as are private members. Further we have reason to believe that where there is a submission to this institution in faith, even when the prayer of faith shall not be offered, and therefore the disease not removed, there will, nevertheless, be a blessing attend it, in giving to the sick a calm, resignation to the will of God, and a peaceful waiting for Him. A very different state this from that frequent distress of body, and anxiety of mind consequent upon submitting to, and waiting upon the doctor's prescriptions.

**4thly.** "And if he have committed sins they shall be forgiven him." This sentence, to me, conveys the idea that sickness is sometimes sent upon the saints as chastisement for their having indulged in sin. It also gives the assurance that, when this is the case, and the Lord is thus sought unto in the way of His appointment, the sin shall be forgiven and he healed. Isaiah 33:24, seems also to support this idea: "And the inhabitant shall not say I am sick" (why? because) "the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity." Thus also the case of the Corinthian Church (1 Corinthian 11:30-31).

When this subject was first presented to my mind, as applicable to the saints in all ages, I was particularly led to admire the care which the Lord had thus manifested for His people to relieve them from the necessity of being dependent on the learned professions of the world, and thereby of being subject to be oppressed by them. Of what the world denominates the learned professions, the *priesthood* is undoubtedly the worst and the oppression which they exercise upon the consciences and persons of those subjected to them, under the pretense that they alone are, by their learning, capable of expounding the Scriptures and declaring the will of God unto the people is the most galling and cruel. But the professions of law and medicine, from the consideration that a special course of learning is the essential prerequisite to the practice thereof, but more particularly from the fact of exclusive laws being enacted even in our free country for their benefit, may properly be considered as monopolies. Hence peculiar advantages are possessed by the practitioners in each of these professions to oppress those who are brought to depend on them. I would not be understood as intimating that there are not many honest and honorable men in each of these last two named professions, men who will be faithful to the trust reposed in them. Neither will I here assert that there are any of an opposite character; it being not necessary for my argument. It is enough to know that these monopolies give to each class great advantages to oppress if disposed to use them. The one practitioner, by protracting the course of law and by extravagant charges, may fleece his client almost at his pleasure; the other, by charges of a similar character and by procrastinating the perfect recovery of his patient, may take large sums from him. But worse still the practitioner of medicine may, with impunity from the law, trifle with both the constitution and life of his patient in trying experiments on his case, if rascal enough to do it. There is, therefore, great danger in putting ourselves on a general scale into the hands of men having such power, unless when we have the fullest confidence both in their skill and in their uprightness.

But when we reflect that *not many wise men after the flesh*, and therefore not many of the learned of this world *are called*, by grace; and consider further that by a determination to *live godly in Christ Jesus*, the believer draws upon him the opposition and even the persecution of the world, how important for the protection of the saints, under such circumstances, that they should not have to seek help for the preservation of

their rights and their health from persons having such power to oppress them. Brethren, we have in our generation been in a great measure freed from the persecutions which others have suffered, and having gone along so smoothly with the world, we do not feel the full weight of the gracious provision made in our text for the saints, and also in the text: Matthew 10:18-20. “And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the spirit of your Father which is in heaven.” But let times come, such as some of the younger of us may live to see, and then we shall prize such gracious provisions as are made in these texts for the saints. More might be said to show the guards which the New Testament gives to the saints against being brought under the power of these several professions; but enough has been said to lead my brethren to reflect on the subject.

Perhaps Brother Moore may be desirous to know whether I have ever acted in obedience to this apostolic direction. I answer that I have not. In the first place, I have no idea that it would be proper to *call for the elders of the church* on every slight attack of cold or disease, for which simple remedies are at hand, and within the knowledge of almost every family, any more than it is prudent to send for a physician in all such cases. 2nd. I should not consider it proper to insist on this course in reference to any member of my family, especially of any age, unless by their choice. In case of sickness myself, I now think, if my *faith fail not*, that I should obey the apostolic direction, if elders be within reach, who would be willing to attend the call. At any rate, I would prefer committing my case to the Lord to seeking to physicians as did Asa, as in II Chron. 16:12. If called to attend the sick in obedience to this apostolic direction, and I believed that the sick had faith in the appointment as being of divine authority, I should not hesitate to officiate.

One thing more remains to be considered in reference to this subject, namely: The objection which will be made against my views that *miracles have ceased*, and that this apparently implies a miracle, seeing that healing is anticipated without the use of adequate secondary means. But is it a fact that miracles have ceased, that is, that no events take place which are not brought about by the regular operation of certain fixed laws of nature? I admit that the gift of tongues, the gift of healing, etc., are not now in the churches, as in the apostolic ages, and that men are not now empowered to work miracles, as were the prophets and apostles. But I cannot believe that the Lord Jesus Christ has either laid aside, or suspended, His power to accomplish His own purposes concerning either the work of salvation or the government of the world, independent of the regular operation of any natural laws. In the affairs of the world many events take place which can be consistently accounted for on no principle but that of the special providential government of God, or rather, more properly of Christ, as Mediator, to

whom is given *all power* in heaven and in earth. As to the great work of salvation, which is continually going on, it is from first to last a continued series of miracles. No power of man, no natural cause, or law of nature, can give efficacy to the gospel of Christ so as to minister consolation to the child of grace, nothing short of the immediate power of God the Holy Ghost can open the heart of the unregenerate to receive the truth as it is in Jesus. The gifts which alone can constitute even a child of grace a true minister of the gospel of Christ, cannot be derived from the schools, they must be communicated direct from Christ, who alone has *received gifts for men*. But to come to the point in hand; Is there a natural and necessary connection between the skill and medicine of the physician, and the recovery of health to the sick? A Predestinarian Bapist who admits that *affliction cometh not forth of the dust*, at least, whatever others may think, will not believe that the skill of man, who is but dust, can control affliction, or that God is dependent on the exertion of the doctor's skill for the removal of affliction. There are instances of frequent occurrences when the physician acknowledges he has exhausted his skill and can do no more, and yet the sick person, after all, recovers. Many other instances, I will venture the assertion, there are in which physicians, if they would state the truth, have exhausted their skill, yet they continue to prescribe more to keep up the appearance of trying to do, or by way of experiment, more from any hopes of their patient's recovering. Now if under such circumstances, you will consent that the doctor's prescriptions had any hand in bringing about the recovery, you must admit that it was not big skill which directed the result. What was it then? Was it chance, or an overruling Providence that directed to the remedy? If then, whether it be miracle, or not miracle, God does thus interpose and restore health where the physician's skill has failed, why may we not hope that without the aid of the doctor, God will recall the affliction, when the sick, turning from every other helper, looks by faith to Him alone, and that according to the direction of His word? Will any still say that God has appointed the skill and medicine of the doctor as the alone means through the use of which we have a right to expect the earth to produce bread? Let them establish this fact and we submit. But one of two things must be proved in order to establish it. They must either show that there is a fixed law of nature by which healing is the natural result of the application of the doctor's skill and medicine, as the pointing of the needle to the polar star is the effect of magnetism or as the falling of heavy bodies let loose to the earth, is according to the fixed law of gravitation. Or they must show where God has revealed the appointment to such connection between the doctor's art of healing, and the removal of disease, as He has declared the appointment that in the *sweat of man's face shall he eat bread, until he return unto the ground*. Neither of which can they show, and therefore to divine appointment for a dependence on the doctor's skill for health, can be proved. Thus much for this subject.

The last text proposed as matter of enquiry by Brother Moore is Genesis 4:7. The difficulty I apprehend, apparent in this text, arises from supposing *sin* to be the subject spoken of in the latter part of the verse. I formerly so apprehended it, and the import of the text, was incomprehensible to me. In order to a correct understanding of this text, it is necessary to consider that Cain was the elder brother, and therefore considered himself entitled to the preeminence, hence his anger against Abel, considering the acceptance of Abel's offering and rejection of his own, as a preferring of Abel before him. The Lord is, therefore, in this text reasoning with him on this ground, showing him that if his offering was not accepted, *sin*, and not a preference to Abel, was the cause of it. That *if he did not well, sin lieth at the door*, and thus separated between him and the divine favor, God appears to him to say: If *he did well, should not he be accepted*, and after showing the cause of his rejection, namely: in sins *lying at the door* (that sentence being parenthetical), goes on to assure him that if he did thus well, Abel's *desire should be unto him, and he should rule over him*. The form of expression here used is the same as that used in Genesis 3:16, in reference to Eve's subjection to her husband. The expression: *Thy desire shall be to thy husband*, I cannot conceive was designed to import that her affections should be to him, for that could not be considered a punishment or an effect of sin, but the import I conceive to be is that she should feel herself dependent on him as her head. So in the other case: *And unto thee shall be his desire*, was designed to show that Abel should acknowledge his dependence on Cain and subjection to him. Thus the false religionists of our day quarrel with the saints and with the doctrine of election, &c., as though that was the cause of their religious services being rejected; whereas the sinfulness of their own self- devised performances, and their not worshipping in faith, is the ground of their being rejected as *reprobate silver*.

I remain yours, &c.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan.10, 1840
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.8 (1840)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 200 – 207

# REMARKS ON PHIL. 3:21.

Dear Brother Beebe: – Some months since, I received a letter from brother F.J. Beal, dated in Missouri, requesting my views through the *Signs* on the text, Phil. 3:21. I think I have at some former time expressed my views on this text, but out of respect to brother Beal and his kind and interesting letter, I will, with your approbation, give such views as may be presented to my mind on the passage.

The text is this: “Who will change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself.” The preceding verse reads thus: “For our conversation is in heaven; from whence, also, we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ,” &c.

I will offer a few remarks on the word “conversation.” According to the modern use of this term, it signifies a familiar talking with others, and therefore is understood by many to relate to our talk or speech. But at the time of the translation it evidently had a more extended import. The original word rendered “conversation” by the translators, signifies citizenship, and relates to that general intercourse as citizens of the same city or government, which the saints should have with each other, not as citizens of this world, but of heaven. “From whence, also, we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.” The idea of this looking for the Saviour clearly implies an expectation and an authorized expectation of His coming in a sense in which He had not come, and was not then present with His Apostles and Church. This, therefore, in connection with other texts of Scripture which it is not now necessary to refer to, confirms me in the belief that there is to be a second personal appearing of Christ Jesus to the saints on this earth. And it is at this appearing of our Lord in the air with the trump of God, that I understand the change spoken of in our text, is to take place, according to First Corinthians 15:51-53 & I Thes. 4: 17.

In order to properly appreciate the change which these “vile,” or earthly bodies of the saints are to experience, it will be necessary to notice the “glorious body” of the Lord Jesus, to which they are to be like. The whole testimony of the New Testament confirms the fact that Christ arose from the dead in the same body in which He died, and with it unchanged in its flesh and bone nature. Christ said to His disciples, “Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have” Luke 24:39. And He ate before them (see verses 42,43). Peter says they did eat and drink with Him Acts 10:41.

In Christ’s thus rising from the dead in the same body in which He entered the grave, and with His wounds on Him, we have the most complete testimony which could be given, not only that He had exhausted the curse that was due for the transgressions of

His people, and which justice rigidly inflicted on Him as their life and head, and therefore their embodiment, so that His soul was not left in hell; but also, that in dying, He had so entirely destroyed the power of death, and obtained the victory over it, that no corruption could pass upon Him. Now if Christ died for, or as representing His people, then He must have arisen in the same relation to them, and therefore in His destroying the power of death, it was that power over their bodies that was destroyed, just as much in His taking the curse out of the way so that His soul was not left in hell, was a delivering them from the curse. If the dominion of sin over the bodies of Christ's people was not to be broken, as well as the redemption of their souls from destruction by His death, I cannot conceive how His body could have been raised, seeing He *was made sin for us, and bore our sins in His own body on the tree;* for it was the power of our sins which sunk Him into the grave. If that power had not been broken by His death, it must still have held Him there. And as it was our sins which He bore in His own body, if the power of them was broken by His death, then they can no more hold our bodies in the grave than they could hold His body there. Hence Paul's declaration, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen" I Cor. 15:13. And well might he ask, "Now if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" verse 12.

But the enquiry arises whether the *glorious body* of our Lord Jesus Christ, like unto which the saints' bodies are to be changed, is that body still remaining in its *flesh* and *bone* nature, receiving nourishment from food and drink, or whether it was changed at His ascension from a material to a spiritual body? There is no direct declaration that I know of in the Scriptures that His body was thus changed. But it appears to me evident from the general tenor of the New Testament, that His body was changed. If it remains a material body, then the bodies of the saints to be like His glorious body must, in their resurrection, remain material bodies, and what change they will experience to be *fashioned* like His, I am not prepared to say. But we are assured that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" and that the body though sown a *natural body is raised a spiritual body* I Cor. 15:44 & 50. Indeed, Christ's transfiguration (Mt. 17:1-5) is, as I understand it, a representation given beforehand of the change which should take place in His body when He should enter into His glory.

But it is not necessary that we should dwell upon this point now. For whether we admit that Christ's body was changed from a natural to a spiritual body or not, all who admit the truth of the Scripture testimony, must admit that Christ arose from the dead and ascended in the same body in which He was crucified. And as our text assures us that the bodies of the saints shall be fashioned like unto His glorious body, it is self-evident that they must be raised from the dead in order to be thus fashioned. Indeed, I have briefly, though I think clearly showed, that the resurrection of Christ and of the saints, go

together. If He has arisen then must their bodies be raised; if they are not to be raised, then He has not arisen. The questions were asked in Paul's day: "How are the dead raised? And with what body do they come?" I Cor. 15:35. Paul goes on to answer these questions in the following verses to the 46th. As the same questions are asked in our day, I will notice one or two other considerations to show that Paul's use of the pronoun *it* in his description of the sowing and raising of the body, is definite and specific. Some say there is a resurrection, but deny that the material body which turns to dust, is raised. Others say that in the resurrection of the body all that ever constituted parts of the body must be raised with it; if a person has lost an arm or leg in some foreign country, or his limb is bitten off by a shark in the ocean, and he dies and is buried in this country, in his resurrection that lost limb will be reunited with his body. By the same rule they may, and some I think do say that all the particles of matter that ever belonged to the body must be raised with it, and therefore that those particles, wherever they have been extorted or dropped, must be gathered to the body. But Paul's *it*, in my estimation, justifies neither one nor the other of these ideas. We will take Christ, *the first-fruits,* as an illustration of what is raised. It was the same Jesus, in *person,* who was born in Bethlehem, and in that identical *body* which was nailed to the cross, and died on it, that was raised up, with the wounds on it, as was showed to Thomas John 20:27. And it was Jesus in that very body in which He had showed Himself alive unto His disciples, that was parted from them and taken up into heaven. See Luke 24:50,5 1 & Acts 1:1-11. Again, those that are alive and remain at the coming of the Lord, are to be changed. And the words seem clearly to convey the idea that just as they existed at the moment of their Lord's coming, their bodies will be changed from corruptible to incorruptible, and caught up, the identical persons, who, having been alive, and being changed in a moment to meet the *Lord in the air.* See I Cor. 15:51-54 & I Thes. 4:15-17. These cases thus illustrate what Paul means by his *its,* when he says, "*It* is sown a natural body, *it* is raised a spiritual body" I Cor. 15:44; namely, that it is the same identical body that is sown, which is raised, though changed from a natural to a spiritual body.

This is a mystery, and a great mystery; but that by no means justifies our rejecting or caviling at the declarations of God's word. We ought to remember that the power put forth in accomplishing this glorious work of the resurrection of the saints is as incomprehensible as is the work. It is *according to that working whereby He is able to subdue all things unto Himself.* It is the working of God in His infinite wisdom and almighty power. When we see what God by His working has subdued unto Himself, that He subdued the chaos so as to form the heavens and the earth in their beauty and order; subdued darkness in saying, Let there be light, &c., and made Satan and sin itself in their evil workings to result in the glory of God and in the redemption and salvation of His people; surely, we cannot doubt His being able to subdue death and the grave, so as to

make them give up their dead and to make them yield them back, purified from all that is earthly and sensual about them.

I doubt, my brother, if any who dispute the doctrine of the resurrection should read this, whether they will be convinced of its truth. The Scriptures are so plain and pointed on the subject, it is useless for us to expect them to believe what we say, if they can reject what is there written. Still it is our duty to follow the pattern of the apostles, in giving witness to the resurrection of Jesus, and consequently of His saints. For I cannot conceive how we can be *co-heirs or joint-heirs* with Christ, seeing that in His body He has entered in as *heir of all things,* if in our bodies also we are not made to participate in the inheritance, nor how we *can be glorified together,* that is, *with Him,* seeing that He has been glorified in His risen body, if our bodies are to remain subject to corruption. But I will here leave the subject. Yours in the hope of a glorious resurrection.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan. 10, 1859.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 27(1859)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 465-469

## REMARKS ON ROMANS 8:28.

Brother Beebe: – Brother S. Mabey, of Albany County, N.Y, in writing to me, some months since, requested me to give through the **Signs of the Times,** such views as I may have of the text, Romans 8:28.

> "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose."

As this text contains independent matter enough in itself for one communication, I will pass directly to its consideration, without stopping to notice the important subjects contained in the preceding context. First: Paul's assertion, **We know,** &c. He evidently intended in the **we,** the saints to whom he wrote with himself, therefore, the saints in all ages, for all bear the same characteristic marks. But Jacob was evidently a subject of grace, a saint, yet when Joseph had been mysteriously taken from him, and his sons would take Benjamin also into Egypt, and famine stared him in the face, unless he let him go, he did not know that all these things were working together for his good, but undoubtedly spoke what he thought, when he said, **All these things are against me.** So in reference to ourselves, there are many things we meet with in our experiences of ourselves, and in the dealings of God with us, that as men and women we do not at the time know are working for our good, but think them dark evidences against us, that we are not objects of God's love. Paul did not intend to assert that by our natural senses we know, but by faith we know. Thus we often worry and distress ourselves because we cannot find in our natural man those characteristics which the New Testament gives of the child of grace; as though there was in the christian no difference between the old man and the new, between reason and faith. It is by faith, and by faith only, that we know spiritual things. And that faith which constitutes a person a believer in Christ is actual knowledge of the thing or truth which it receives. **It is the evidence of things not seen.** "Through faith we **understand** that the worlds were framed by the word of God" Heb. 11:3. Thus the faith of the gospel is materially different from the belief which is produced by education. Well may those who have only this latter belief cry up charity for those who differ from them in religious sentiments; because the one has no more claim to being the truth than others, they are all the product of human teaching. But you may as well undertake to convince the child of grace that the sun is the source of darkness to the earth as to attempt to persuade him that there is uncertainty about the truth of what his faith has actually received; for that which is received by faith is not learned of men, but is received by the revelation of Jesus Christ, and comes with that power that he knows it is God's truth. See Gal. 1:12 & I Thes. 1:5. But it is not everything which the child of God receives and contends for as truth that he has received by faith. Hence we may all have more or less errors about us. But we may, I think, by a careful examination, distinguish between what we know by faith and what we have received as truth from men or books, or from our own reasonings. Second: **That all things work together for good.** We might prove by arguments drawn from the Scripture testimony that all things work together for good to the people of God, and your mind may become fully satisfied of the truth of it, but this would not be knowing it for yourself; it would not bring it to your feelings when tried by afflictions or temptations. It requires that knowledge which faith gives to make us feel the truth of it. Yet it is proper to notice the Scripture testimony showing the correctness of faith's knowledge on the

point; or in other words, showing that the revelation made to faith is from the same spirit of truth who made the revelation contained in the Scriptures. The Scriptures testify that **Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.** Yes, redeemed us from under the law, so that the children are **not under the law but under grace,** so that sin shall not have dominion over them. Hence the sin that they feel in them cannot reign unto death or to the infliction of the penalty of the law. And Christ declares these children, as He characterizes them, Mt. 5:3-12, blessed. Now, where there is no curse, how can any evil come? And wherever they are blessed of God, how can anything but goodness and mercy follow them all the days of their lives? But it may be thought that this may be the case in God's immediate dealings with His people, but that events may arise from other sources, as from our corruptions, from Satan and from the world, &c., that will work evil to the children of God. But we are assured, Eph. 1:11, that **God worketh all things after the counsel of His own will.** The **all things** in this text are as extensive as the all things in the other text. The Scriptures also reveal God as infinite in wisdom and knowledge, infinite in power and goodness. All things must have been present to the infinite knowledge of God when His will counseled the disposal of them, and His infinite wisdom must have seen the direct bearing that everything would have and enabled Him to order all things so as to accomplish what His infinite goodness willed. And His infinite power certainly would enable Him to carry out His purpose of making all things work together for that good which He purposed. Herein we have the **absolute** of God's sovereign **predestination of all things.** Some will say God is infinite. O, yes, there is nothing too great for God to do. But again; they will say, There are things too small for God's immediate notice, and special providence; that He has established certain general rules and laws, and has left men and devils, &c., to pursue their own volitions, subject to the consequences. Such persons lose sight of the fact that if there are things too small for God's knowledge to embrace, or His government to control, the infinitude of God and of His attributes are as effectually denied as though it was contended there are things too large for His government. That which is infinite cannot be limited by either large or small things; God being infinite, His knowledge and government must embrace alike the largest and smallest things. Hence it is said, "God shall bring every work into judgment with **every secret thing,** &c." Ecl. 12:14. It may be asked, Are not some things evil in themselves? Truly, they are. It is not said that **all things are good to them,** &c, in our text; but that **all things work together for good,** &c. The treachery of Joseph's brethren, and of Potiphar's wife, were in themselves evil acts, but they were important parts in the arrangement of God's providence whereby He brought about good to Jacob and his posterity. Peter's denying his Lord, after having made such strong assertions of his faithfulness, was in itself an evil act; yet on a little reflection, I think no discerning person can doubt its having an important effect in connection with other circumstances, such as Christ's looking upon him, &c., in

converting him from that self-confidence which he had so lately manifested, and thereby worked together with the other parts of Christ's government over him for his good.

I might notice the crucifixion of our Lord as confirming the same point, but I will come, my brother, to your own experience. In your exercises under the law, did not your failing to keep your resolutions to do better, and the bursting forth of the corruptions of your nature on every temptation, work together with the teachings you were receiving concerning the law to abase you, to strip you of your own righteousness, to make you feel how exceedingly sinful sin is, and to kill you to all legal hopes, and thus prepare your heart for receiving and rejoicing in the gospel plan of salvation? So I think, if you do not at all times know it, that you will find in the end, that,

"Temptations, trials, doubts and fears,
Wants, losses, crosses, groans and tears,
Will, thro' the grace of God, our friend,
In everlasting triumphs end."

But faith in its exercises does not stop thus to reason us into the belief of these things. It lays hold at once on the blood of Christ; presents God to us in Christ as a Father, and makes us feel that He is love. Not as the rainbow which hems the passing cloud, and gives us to feel, notwithstanding the devastations which the hail and the wind may have made around us, that we are yet spared, and that there is still hope for us; but faith burnishes the whole cloud with love, and makes us to feel that the affliction is sweet, that the temptation was needed to humble us, and gives us to praise God that we are not left to pass on carelessly without chastisement. It is a sweet knowledge which faith gives that all things are working together for good. Third: **To them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose.** As I have been so lengthy on the former parts of this subject, I shall try to be brief on this part. We have in these words two important characteristics by which those who are born of God and are the objects of His love, are distinguished from others. 1. **They love God.** The religion of Christ is a religion of love. Its subjects are drawn by the cords of love, not drawn by fear of punishment in their obedience to God, because they love God, they love His revealed will and the ways He has appointed. They love the children of God when they see, and as they see, the image of Christ in them, the evidence of their love to God, and see them walking in the truth, or in obedience to His word. They loathe themselves because they see so little in themselves, like God, and so much that is opposite to Him, so little of conformity to His word. These are decisive evidences of being born of God. "For every one that loveth God is born of God" I John 4:7. And these evidences are more or less manifested in the experience and walk of the child of God. Yet the child of grace, while having these evidences about him, often doubts whether it can be possible that he loves God. The Comforter, and He only, can clear away these doubts. Yet, we may appeal to

such to say whether amidst all the workings of their corruptions there is not evidently in them a desire after God, and to be brought more into conformity to His word and will, and whether these desires could be in their breasts, if there was there no love to God. 2. **Them who are called according to His purpose.** It appears then that there is a **special call** by which the predestinated children of God are called from darkness into the light and liberty of the gospel; for it is according to God's purpose. It is also an **effectual call. For whom He called, them He also justified, and whom He justified, them He also glorified,** &c., verse 30. This call is internal, but irresistible. It draws the subject on from step to step, though he knows not why, and though Satan and his own unbelief tells him all is wrong, that every step is leading more into sin and farther from God, until at length his astonished soul beholds the light of the gospel, and he sees that he had been called and led from Sinai to Calvary, from self to Christ as his only hope of salvation. If God has thus called us to a knowledge of His salvation and given us to love it, **He is for us,** and "if God be for us who can be against us?" verse 31. These remarks fall far short of giving an adequate view of the subject, but they are the best I have to offer. I have written this while laboring under a cold, which indisposes me both in body and mind, so that I have hardly energy enough to write. Yours, I trust in love;

From: SIGNS of the TIMES:
Vol. 27 (1859)
S. Trott.

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 456-460

# REMARKS ON THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD

Brother Beebe: In *Signs* No. 12, present Volume, Brother Mitchell has request for my views of Luke 16:9, "And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations". This has been to me, and I believe to many others, a very difficult text to understand. One difficulty has arisen from its connection with the parable of the *unjust steward* and whether, like him, we are to make use of other people's property to make to ourselves friends, as the terms *mammon of unrighteousness*, that is, *riches unjustly obtained or used*, would seem to imply. Such an idea would be revolting to any one having the principle of grace. Another very serious difficulty arises from the idea of any friends we could make thereby, being to *receive us into everlasting habitations*. Hence I have formerly thought that this text was spoken ironically by our Lord to show to His disciples the absurdity of coveting after or trusting in the riches of this world. This would very well correspond with the concluding declaration, verse 13, "No servant can serve two masters, etc". But by comparing this text with 1 Timothy 6:17-19, I conclude it is to be taken in a different sense. The passage in Timothy reads thus: "Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life". Indeed on a little reflection, the comparison of a disciple in his relation to his Lord, to the case of the unjust as here presented, appears much more close than is discovered on a superficial view of the subject. The child of grace is brought so to feel his relation and accountability to God, as to know that all he possesses whether of an earthly or spiritual nature, he holds, not as his own, but as entrusted to him as a steward by his Lord. And we are taught by this text, and the one in 1 Timothy 6:17-19 and in other Scriptures, that whatever is thus entrusted to us is neither to be held as for our personal or family accommodations only, nor to be viewed as entrusted to us to be held close, as in trust, subject only to our Lord's personal calls, as is the case with that entrusted to worldly stewards, but is to be used to enable us *to do good*, and to *distribute* and *communicate* to our *Lord's debtors*, as occasion and opportunity calls. Thus, if gracious communications are made to us, we are not to lay them up to ourselves, but to seek to *comfort others with the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God*, and to administer the instruction which we receive; so of gifts, they are not to be *kept laid up in a napkin*, but to be employed for the *edifying of the body of Christ*. So of worldly riches, if we have them and rightly view their use, instead of supposing, as is too often the case, that they are given to us to hold fast, and to make us drudges to them,

till they are taken from us or we by death are taken from them, and are thus *put out of the stewardship*, we should view them as committed to us, to make us more useful, according to the station assigned us, in doing good to others, and in serving our Lord, not in person, but in His members. “The Lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely.” So our Lord, in His word, commends those stewards to whom He has committed riches, when they, according to worldly wisdom, waste them in distributing of them to the necessities of His debtors, especially those who are debtors to His grace, notwithstanding what human reason and self may say about the prudence, if not righteousness, of holding the riches fast in their own hands to transmit to the hands of their children. But why in our text are riches call *the mammon of unrighteousness*? Certainly not that our Lord requires His disciples to make use of any riches they may have acquired by unrighteous gain, for distributing to the poor or communicating to His saints or cause, instead of making restitution for the same. Such course only befits those who, instead of trusting Christ, are for purchasing heaven and worldly glory together, by their donations and bequests. But worldly riches are fitly so termed because most of the unrighteous acts among men are done with a reference to acquiring riches. Besides, they are the *unrighteous mammon* in the hands of Christ’s disciples (and those are the persons He addresses), however honestly obtained, when hoarded up by them for their exclusive personal and family use instead of being so employed as to make themselves or their wealth useful to the cause and people of Christ; seeing that He has a just claim on them and all they have. Thus it is seen that what was unjust in the steward of the parable in giving away his Lord’s goods is, in substance, the very use which our Lord requires His disciples to make of the goods He commits to them.

We now come to inquire concerning these *friends*, which we are to *make to ourselves*, and the *everlasting habitation*, etc. It is not said, “Make to yourselves friends with the mammon of unrighteousness”. In that case it would be supposable that, like the unjust steward, we were to make friends of those on whom we bestowed our Lord’s goods, and that should be the object in bestowing them. But the direction is: “Make to yourselves friends of the, etc.”, that is, the friends are to be made *of the mammon of unrighteousness* and not of the persons to whom we make distribution. When we trust in riches and seek to hoard them up, *to have and to hold* for our special benefit, instead of being our friends, in reference to the heavenly mansions, they become our masters and grind us down to servitude under an earthly yoke. But when, instead of trusting in them, we *trust in the living God and do good*, being *ready to distribute and willing to communicate*, according to what we have, our riches that we may have then become our friends in the Christian life; they enable us to be more useful or *rich in good works*, which, of course, is what the Christian delights in. Riches thus used become instrumental in furnishing a decisive evidence of our love to Christ in our love manifested to His members; and consequently, of His love to us, and therefore of our

interest in those mansions He has gone to prepare a place in. Hence *when we fail*, when heart and flesh fail under afflictions, persecutions, etc., riches, being thus made friends, instead of tying us down to earth, point our dejected spirits to those mansions in the house above, and thus in anticipation welcome or receive us into *everlasting mansions*; or as Paul has it, enables us to *lay hold on eternal life*. No wonder the covetous Pharisees who heard our Lord, derided Him. They thought more of providing earthly mansions for themselves and their children with their riches, than of securing in anticipation a reception into everlasting mansions. If this is a correct view of our Lord's instruction in the text, as I think in substance it is, how few comparatively of disciples in our day obey the instruction. Farewell.

August 19, 1846.
S. Trott
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 14 (1846)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs 339 – 342

## REMARKS RESPECTING THE SABBATH, &c.

Brother Beebe: – In attending further to the enquiries of Brother Moore, the perpetuity of the Sabbath comes next in order. This subject has been already two or three times discussed in the *Signs.* Brother Beebe has once given his views thereon, and I have once, if not twice, given mine. But Brother Moore and perhaps other readers of the *Signs*, may have seen neither of the communications heretofore published on this subject. I will therefore again give my opinion concerning the Sabbath, in as brief a manner as I can, consistently with the nature of the subject.

Admit the correctness of the position I took on the subject of the *washing of feet*, namely: that the Apostles, being seated on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, are to determine (that is, by their writings), all things pertaining to the kingdom of God, or the gospel dispensation, and this subject is decided at once. For neither the Apostles, nor

their Lord, have anywhere enjoined the observance of a seventh-day Sabbath on the disciples under the gospel. Neither have we any instance in the New Testament of Sabbath breaking that is, in a literal sense, being reproved as a sin, excepting by the Scribes and Pharisees. When, in addition to these facts, we recollect that the Apostles when sitting in council on the case of the Gentile disciples concerning their keeping the law of Moses, decided, and that by the guidance of the Holy Ghost, that no greater burden should be laid upon them than these necessary things; that they abstain from meats offered unto idols," &c. (Acts 15:28,29), we certainly must conclude that the Gentile churches are *loosed* from the observance of the Sabbath in its typical and ceremonial relation. But it is said by those who hold to the perpetuity of the obligation to observe one day in seven as the Sabbath, that the law requiring the observance of this day was included in the Ten Commandments, written on tables of stone, and therefore, like the rest of the decalogue, it must be perpetual in its obligation. But it should be remembered that *the law is spiritual,* also that under the gospel, God is peculiarly revealed as a Spirit, and as requiring them that worship Him, to worship Him *in spirit and in truth* John 4:23,24. I cannot conceive of any good reason that can be given why the observance of one day in seven as holy time, in distinction from the other six, is not as much external and carnal as is the holding of one place, such as Jerusalem, to be more holy than another as a place of worship. But further we find all the other commands of the decalogue, in the spirit and substance of them, recognized by Christ and His Apostles, and the observance of them enforced upon the churches, whilst the observance of the Sabbath, in the letter of it, is no where, as has been before noticed, in the New Testament required.

My understanding of the fourth command of the decalogue is that it is ceremonial and typical in the letter of it, and moral, or perpetually obligatory, in the spirit of it. That it is ceremonial is shown from Ezek. 20:12, if not by its being so completely connected with the other ceremonies of the law. In the text just referred to, God says of Israel, "I gave them my sabbaths to be a sign between me and them," &c. And it is evidently shown in Heb. 4:3-11, that the seventh-day Sabbath was typical of that *rest* which Christ gives to His people when they *come to Him* or believe in Him, because He *hath ceased from His own work* – the work of redemption – as God did from His. Why then, it may be enquired, was this command inserted in the decalogue? Because there is a spirituality in it which is morally obligatory. The number seven and seventh is used typically to denote completion or fullness; hence Israel's being required nationally to observe the seventh day as holy time taught the obligation of man, and his sinfulness for not complying therewith, to consider his whole existence as *holy to the Lord,* and not therefore to have served self by doing his own acts, or thinking his own thoughts. In this sense the obligation of this command is recognized by the Apostles in the New Testament. The strictness also of the Levitical law in enforcing the observance of the typical Sabbath

upon Israel, and upon Israel alone, teaching the awful penalty which stands against those who, professing to rest by faith in Christ, are doing their own works for acceptance with God, and thus polluting the gospel Sabbath.

There are others who hold to the perpetuity of the command to observe the seventh-day Sabbath, who yet observe the first day instead of the seventh, pretending that the day has been changed by divine appointment. This they infer from the fact of the disciples meeting together on the first day of the week to *break bread*, &c. But this is altogether human assumption; for the Scriptures nowhere declare God's having authorized the change of the first day for the seventh, in the keeping of the fourth command. So long, therefore, as we walk in obedience to the Scriptures as our only rule of faith and practice in religion, and reject the traditions of men as a rule, we must reject this idea of the first day's being the legal Sabbath. But we have also very pointed proof to show that the writers of the New Testament did not understand this more modern doctrine of the substitution of the first day, for the seventh, as the Sabbath of the law; for they uniformly, not only before the resurrection of Christ, but throughout the New Testament, make use of the term Sabbath to denote the seventh-day, the day which the Jews observed as such. Thus; Matt. 28:1, "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first of the week," or *first day of the week*, "came Mary, &c." See also Luke 23:56; 24:1, in connection as being more full. We read also throughout the Acts of the Apostles, of Paul's going into the Jewish Synagogues on the Sabbath days. These were the days on which the Jews were assembled therein, and, of course, their Sabbaths. On the other hand, whenever the day is named on which the disciples met together, it is always said to be, not on the Sabbath, but on the *first day of the week.* See John 20:19; Acts 20:7; I Corinthians. 16:2. Is there not then a manifest line of distinction kept up throughout the entire New Testament between the *first day of the week*, that on which the disciples met together to *break bread,* and the Sabbath of the Scriptures? Who then, since the Apostles had sealed up their decisions, has had any authority to take away this line of demarkation, or "remove this ancient landmark"?

It may then be asked, Do you esteem every day alike? In point of holiness I do. I do not conceive that we have a right to sin against God one day or hour, more than another, but that we should at all times: "Glorify God with our bodies and our spirits which are His." As the Apostles appear to have established among the churches the practice of meeting together on the first day of the week for worship, I esteem it an apostolic pattern set for the churches in all after ages. And I care not how particular any are, in setting apart this day as a day of worship, when circumstances will so admit, providing they do it on gospel principles; that is as a voluntary setting it apart for the observance of the institutions of the gospel, such as the church's meeting together for worship, and in grateful remembrance of the resurrection of Christ as the Head and Representative of

His people, having finished the work of redemption in their behalf, from under the law. But the observance of this day as the Sabbath, and in obedience to the law, savors too much of legality for such as have become "Dead to the law by the body of Christ." I know that judaizing teachers may bewitch the children of God into legal observances, as they did the Galatians; but, as said the Apostle on that occasion, so I would say to these: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" &c. Gal. 4:21-31; see also Col. 2:16-23.

The next subject of enquiry is Acts 15:29. "That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well," &c. Here we have the decision direct of the Lord's *enthroned judges,* on these points, binding the observance of these several prohibitions upon the disciples from among the Gentiles. It must extend, therefore, to us.

I would here remark that the obligation to abstain from the fourth item in this catalogue, namely: fornication, is so generally admitted and so fully enforced by the Apostles in their epistles that I need not say any more. And in reference to the first item, the *abstaining from meats offered unto idols*, the Apostle, in writing unto the churches, owing to their being so much intermixed among idolaters, had occasion to enlarge so much on this prohibition that I might, with propriety, pass it by were it not that it gives me occasion to remark that the anti-christian idolatry of our day may well be considered as embraced, in substance, in the same prohibition. Hence, those brethren who, trusting to their knowledge, think they can stay with safety in connection with churches where the worship of mammon, or the potency of moneyed institutions to further religion, is maintained, and thinking that they can take the good and leave the bad, or join in the worship of God without participating in the moneyed plans, may with propriety consider the Apostle as addressing them when he says, "If any see thee which hast knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols?" Or, in other words, to participate in the idolatrous schemes there practiced? "And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died." That is, dwindle away and become useless to the body, the church, or be cast away from it. "But when ye sin so against the brethren and wound their weak consciences, ye sin against Christ" I Cor. 8:10-12.

The parts of this verse which Brother Moore, I presume, had more immediately in view, are, the *abstaining from blood and from things strangled.* These two points amount to nearly the same. One refers to eating the blood drawn from animals killed, the other to eating animals killed without being bled, which is mostly done by strangling. There are, I am inclined to think, many who profess to receive the Scriptures as their guide, who yet pay no kind regard to this apostolic prohibition. They probably have adopted the idea that the obligation to *abstain from blood* was imposed only by the Levitical law, was on

a footing with the prohibition to eat swine's flesh, and like that abrogated under the gospel, or rather, never binding upon the Gentiles.

But it is not so. If it had been, I cannot think it would have seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to the Apostles to have decreed this restraint to be put upon the disciples at Antioch. The fact is, the eating of the blood of animals was prohibited to Noah, when the license was first given to man to eat animal food. Gen. 9:3-6. The license and prohibition thus go together. "Every moving thing shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things. *But the flesh with the life thereof which is the blood thereof shall ye not eat.* And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it." &c.

As this restriction was laid upon Noah as the Progenitor of the postdeluvian world, it must be binding upon the whole human family, Gentiles as well as Jews; all being his posterity. Hence the original and universality of this prohibition of the eating of blood shows the propriety of the Apostles' thus establishing its force upon the Gentile disciples. It is an acknowledgment which God thus early required man, in allowing him the use of meats, to make, that He alone was the giver of life and Creator of all things; and that man in taking it, is taking what God alone can give. And I see no good reason why, under the full light and liberty of the gospel, whilst still enjoying the privilege of the use of animal food, we should not be under as strong obligation to acknowledge God as the giver thereof and the alone Author of all life, as were those in the earlier ages of the world.

As for myself, although I frequently see the blood of animals designed for food, shed without being duly impressed with the idea that the act of pouring out the blood thus upon the ground was designed of God as an expression of returning the life of the animal to Him as the alone giver of it, and as an acknowledgment of Him as the Creator of all things, and Author of all our mercies; yet I have for years been so convinced of the divine authority of the apostolic restriction in this case, that I object in my family to the life even of fowls designed for food being taken without its being done by the shedding of their blood; and also to the practice of snaring game designed for food, it being a species of strangling.

As the apostolic injunction requiring the abstaining from things strangled and from blood was intimately connected with that requiring the abstaining from meats offered to idols, the direction which Paul gives in reference to eating at another's table; to whatsoever is purchased in market; concerning meat offered to idols will, I presume, hold equally good in this other case, namely: "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles (or butcher's stall), that eat, asking no question for conscience sake: For the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof. If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye

be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake, &c." I Cor. 10:25-34.

The other subjects embraced in Brother Moore's enquiries I will leave for another communication. I remain as hitherto, Yours to serve in the gospel.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan. 6, 1840
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.8 (1840)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 194-200

## REPLY TO BRETHREN: SONSHIP & UNION.

BROTHER BEEBE: – I would not reply to these brethren, and especially so soon after sending you a communication on a similar subject, were it not that they have given so wrong representations of the views of myself and others, on this side of the question, that I cannot for the truth's sake, nor for the sake of my standing among brethren consent to leave the matter here.

Discussions on religious subjects, when conducted in a spirit of enquiry after truth, and of mutual submission to the testimony of the scriptures as the standard, are calculated to be both pleasant and profitable. But when otherwise conducted, they may as well be let alone, any further than as they may be in defense of truth. For these reasons, I am constrained to reply to these brethren, and in so doing, review some of their positions. I desire to do it, as briefly as I consistently can, in candor, and in love of the truth. I esteem these brethren as christians, as Old School Baptists, and on account of my intercourse with them. In my communication, in the 10th number, present volume of the SIGNS, in replying to brother Barton's query concerning the churches being *created in Christ Jesus before the foundation of the world*, I took the ground, that the expressions

"created in Christ Jesus," naturally involved the idea that his church was created in his creation, as the Head of his church, and of course, as far back as he stood as her Head. I referred to I Cor. 15:45, as sustaining the same idea, and also to Rev. 3:14 & Col. 1:15 as further justifying the application of the idea of creatureship to our Lord in reference to his headship. It used to be that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word should be established; but it seems it is not so now. These brethren in replying to that communication, do not notice the text, Eph. 2:10 {"For we are his workmanship, *created in Christ Jesus*, &c.,"} although I founded my main arguments on it. The other three scripture passages above named they notice, and how they dispose of them shall now occupy our attention.

They ask, "Do the Scriptures give any information of anything being created before the beginning?" If they mean by *beginning* the beginning of the creation of God; I answer no, for Christ is that beginning. But, if they mean by it, the beginning of time, as in Gen. 1:1, I say yes; for in that beginning God created the heavens and the earth, but Christ, being the Beginning of the creation of God, and the First born of every creature, must in this sense have been created or brought into existence before these, and therefore before time. As no other reading has been attempted to be given to these texts, Rev. 3:14 & Col. 1:15, I still think them good authority as they read. But as they do not satisfy these brethren, I will produce other corresponding texts. In John 1:4, we read, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." This is said of the Word as he in the beginning was with God, and was God. John 1:1. Will any person after candid reflection say of this life that is so particularly spoken of as distinct from the Word, as being described to be *in the Word*, and again as if to prevent mistake, it is said, and the "life was the light of men," not simply that it *was the light*, &c., that it is itself the Word or the essential existence of the Godhead? If not, must they not admit that this life was produced, that is begotten or created existence in the Word, or be driven to the necessity that there are other self-existencies than God, and therefore other gods? If then this life was not a self-existence, then it may properly be termed a creature, as being produced of God. Remember, Christ is that light. Again, in Isaiah 51, the LORD, or Jehovah addressing himself to that personage in the singular number, of whom he calls himself, verse 13, The LORD *thy Maker*, and in verse 15, says, "I am the Lord *thy God*," says in verse 16, "And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people." These brethren certainly must admit that this personage of whom the Lord says, that he is his *Maker* and that he *hath covered him in the shadows of his hand*, &c., is not himself the essential self-existent God, in the sense in which he is spoken of; but that he is a creature. This is said of him before the planting of the heavens, &c., and therefore the *beginning* of time. It cannot with any consistency be said that this was spoken merely by a decree of fore-ordination of what should take place in

time, because it is expressly said, “I have put my words in thy mouth, &c.,” that “I may plant the heavens, &c.,” and therefore spoken of as an antecedent work, preparatory to planting the heavens, &c. {I have left it for these brethren to decide for themselves who this personage is, whether Christ personally as the Head of his church, or the church as in him; they amount to the same thing. By a comparison with Isa. 49:2, I should think it is Christ personally; but then his church was thus in him. Ps. 90:1,2, & 91:1, and Prov. 8, as compared with chapter 7.} Other like texts I might quote, but if these can be thrown aside, fifty might be, I therefore forbear.

I next pass to their notice of the two texts, Rev. 3:14 & Col. 1:15. They say in reference to them, “We desire to give the fairest construction we can, according to the *tenor of truth*.” Why not according to the reading of the texts? This *tenor of truth* I presume is the same with the *analogy of faith*, which we have heard so frequently spoken of. Brethren, I would reason with you a little on this point, if it be not taken as presuming in me, considering my inferiority to you, and my being so full of inconsistencies myself. But whatever I may be, I would like to see in my brethren a *going on to perfection*, and not a setting down satisfied that our fathers have provided for us a sufficiency of knowledge, and that their *cisterns* are better to draw from, than the *fountain of living waters*. Brethren, if we consider, that not only the matter of the Scriptures is by *divine inspiration*, but also that an Apostle has said, “Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual,” {I Cor. 2:13,} shall we not feel bound to respect each text, and the *words* of it, as resting upon the authority of God; unless the text be an interpolation, or the translation be not a correct representation of the original? Second. Is not this *tenor of truth* or *analogy of faith*, a matured opinion, we, or others, have formed of what, to be consistent as we think, must compose the parts of God’s revealed truth? If so, and we further consider that our knowledge is so imperfect as to lead Paul to say, “If any man think that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing, yet as he ought to know,” {I Cor. 8:2,} would it not much better consist with that humility which becometh us, to admit the truth of what each portion of Scripture declares in reference to the subject spoken of, and according to its plain import, than to implicate the Holy Ghost with saying what is not so, that our views of the *tenor of truth* may stand?

To return to our subject, we will now notice how this *tenor of truth* works in reference to those texts. First. In reference to Rev. 3:14, “The beginning of the creation of God.” They quote the text, and without attempting to show that there is any mistake in the reading, or that the word *beginning* does not properly mean beginning, but *beginner*, they try to show that the text does not mean what it says. Their *modus operandi* it is not necessary for me to notice. They next come to Col. 1:15, “The First-born of every creature.” By quoting the following verses, in which in connection with the 15th verse,

Paul is giving such a representation of the Son of God and Redeemer as to show that in his complex person, *He in all things has the pre-eminence*. But they would thereby make the impression that he is not the *first-born* of every creature, and of course that in this particular he has not the pre-eminence over his brethren, and is not like them, though verse 18 says, "That in all things he might have the pre-eminence," and Heb. 2:17, reads, "In all things it behooved him to be made like his brethren," in that they are *born of God*, and he not according to these brethren, for if born of God he has a derived existence, and therein is a creature in distinction from the self-existent Godhead. The same course of reasoning would also prove that he is not the First-born from the dead. For if his being God forbids the idea of his having a *created existence* in personal union with his Godhead, he never could have been in the state of the dead, to be *born* from it. They ask in reference to the declaration, "Who is the image of the invisible God," former part of verse 15, "Can a creature be the image of the invisible God?" It seems Adam was created in the *image of God*, {Gen. 1:27,} and so is the new man renewed after the image of him that created him. {Col. 3:10.} But wishing to answer them more fully on this point, I will ask them, if according to their views the Son as such does not exist as God, and only as God? If so, is he not the invisible God equally with the Father? And third; Can the *invisible God* be an *image* of the invisible God? I say, no; for an image, according to the general and natural import of the word, means a visible representation former of some person or idea; as the image of liberty, &c. I do not believe that the self-existence, as such, of God was ever represented in an image, but all the attributes of God I believe are expressly represented in and through the Son or Christ. And I know not that God has ever been represented or *declared* to men, but by Christ. John 1:18. If God is declared in the works of creation, all things were created by the Son, {Col. 1:16,} but then God "made the worlds by him," as Solomon made all the vessels for the temple through Hiram. I Kings 7:14-48. See Heb. 1:1-2. So "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." II Cor. 5:18,19. Thus we see that God acts through Christ or the Son as an agent, and therefore as the Son, Christ must have an existence distinct from the *invisible God*, though personally one with him. From the notice we have taken of the attempts of these brethren to deny the correctness of the declarations of these several texts, we see the tendency of their attempts to square the Scriptures according to their views of the tenor of truth. And it is evident that the dispute about these texts, is no longer between me and them, but between them and the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost says that Christ, is the beginning of the creation of God, and the First-born of every creature, and that his people were *created in him*, &c.; they, in effect, say it is not so. Hundreds of other texts might be named on which the same dispute would arise; but I will forbear.

I now come to the wrong representations these brethren have given of the views advanced by me and others, on this subject. When I first read their piece I felt so

sensibly the injustice of their representations, that I was ready to pronounce the whole a base slander and there leave it. But on a little reflection I concluded that these brethren did not design to slander us; that they honestly, though strangely, had misconstructed our views. One wrong representation is found in this sentence and connection, “Now the *fancied* system of our dear brethren, that this eternal new creation has nothing to do with the soul or body; the soul is not prepared for eternal life by its implantation nor any influence at all to control any of the disordered passions of nature,” &c. This contains such a sweeping charge that I hardly know how to get at all its points, without taking it word by word. But let us examine the two, and see which has the advantage in these particulars, the life with which they fancy they have been quickened, or the life with which we fancy we have been quickened; though indeed, I did hope, this being quickened was something more than fancy, both in them and us, as also the system of doctrine taught in the Scriptures. They believe that the Holy Ghost is the quickening power, but that he does not *create little gods* in them; of course it is not a communication of himself, so as to become their life, and that he does not *purify the Adamic nature in whole or in part*, of course neither soul nor body is changed; but he *implants new spiritual life in the soul*; and *this spiritual life is entirely distinct from their natural life*, &c. This life then must be a creature, a distinct existence, created in them by the Holy Ghost. Is it any better to be created in them, than to have been created in Christ Jesus? As the quickening of each individual must be a distinct putting forth of the power of the Holy Ghost, the life in each must be a distinct creature, having no relation to one another, other than of being alike the creatures of the Holy Ghost; and they are creatures of time too. Hence, there is no being the seed of Christ, no actual relation to him as a head, no being of *his bones and his flesh* in their life. If these brethren can make any thing different out of the description they have given, I cannot. No wonder they want a *bond of union* to form a body of Christ out of these separately existing branches. There is no analogy to such a body as this in any kind of body God has ever formed. Christ says, “I am the vine, ye are the branches,” but they would have his body made up as they make brush brooms to sweep their yards. The life with which we believe the soul is quickened is Christ – *Christ in you the hope of glory*. Col. 1:27 & 3:3,4. Christ who is the Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; begotten or created in the Word, and his people in him, and thus ever existing in personal union with the Godhead, both from eternity, and as he is manifested in the new birth in the believer, as he says, “As thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.” Again, “I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.” John 17:21,23. Thus Christ our life existed as the Head and Husband of his church, before the heavens were planted, or the foundations of the earth laid, in the secret place of the Most High, in the shadow of God’s hand, and as one with God, and therefore as God whilst he is the Son of God. Hence when persons are born again, born of the Quickening Spirit,

they are manifested as members of Christ's body, as his seed, and through him – the only begotten of the Father, they are *born of God*, and are the *sons of God*. Now if your life dwelling in the soul as a detached lonely creature, can prepare the soul for heaven and exercise an influence over the person, &c., one would think that Christ in the soul and God in Christ, would be quite as likely to produce these effects. You say the soul is not prepared for eternal life by its implantation. Why, it is eternal life in the soul, {John 3:36, 17:2-4 & I John 5:12,} not a creature of time as you describe, but a life existing from eternity in union with God, and existing to eternity with him. You say the *eternal new creation*, meaning by this epithet the Christ of God, as the Christ, has nothing to do with the souls and bodies of men. Strange he has not, with his people, when they are his sheep that shall never perish, the gift of his Father, and he is their life, their Redeemer, their salvation and their sanctification. But perhaps you have reference in the remarks above noticed to my having spoken of the *new man* in the believer, as a dependent infant, that cannot bring forth its fruits of love, faith, patience, &c., only as the Comforter, the Holy Ghost brings them into exercise. If your life gives you an independency in these things, and strength to love and to exercise faith, patience, &c., at your own pleasure, I have only to say, {I speak in this only for myself,} your experience and mine in this differ significantly. To will and desire is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not, only as an influence independent of me, may graciously bring these fruits into exercise, in a measure, and that but momentarily. But perhaps you meant by this charge, to imply that our belief is not as productive of *good works* in us, as is yours, in you. If so, whilst I positively deny the correctness of the charge, as it relates to the brethren implicated with me, for myself, I am dumb, if a child, I am the vilest, and am still the chief of sinners. Lord save, or I perish, is my cry.

Another wrong representation of my views, and the views of others, is found in their having throughout their communication, spoken of our views, as though we held that Christ as the Head of his church existed personally distinct from God and therefore distinctly as a creature. Where as we have never admitted that as a person he is a creature, but on the contrary, whilst we say that as man he was a creature, and that as Son, or as the Head of his church, or as Mediator, and Christ he is a creature; that is, that the existence in him which constituted him these, was not self-existent, but was brought into existence of God, yet that he took both of these existences into union with himself as God, the latter in eternity, the former in time, thus existing as God, as the Son of God, and the son of man, in one complex person. He thus exists as a distinct person, having distinct personal qualities from the Father and the Holy Ghost, but one with them in the Godhead, thus constituting him a fit and adequate person to be the *one Mediator* between the *one God*, and *men*. And thus in his complex person, whilst he is one with the church, he is one with the Father, whilst he is the husband of the church, he is her Maker and Lord; and whilst he is the elder brother of his people and joint heir with

them, he is their God, and the alone proper and delightful object of their worship. This is the ground I occupy and have occupied, how far the brethren implicated with me, agree with me in all these points is not for me to say. When it is recollected that in the close of the communication to which these brethren have replied, I remarked among other things, in substance, that his being created as the Head of his church no more conflicted with his essential Godhead as God; than his being made flesh did, I think these brethren on reflection will acknowledge they were not warranted from the premises, not from former communications, to give the representation they did of my views, and therefore that the charge is unjust. I am willing to meet these brethren in argument in reference to the proper grounds we each occupy, and if they from the Scriptures can show that they are right, and I wrong, so be it; but I do not like this fending off these blows aimed at an effigy of their own, and christened with my name.

One more remark of theirs I will notice; they say in a parenthesis in reference to our having advocated the doctrine of the church's having been created in Christ as her Head, &c. "Which has caused so much unnecessary talk and writing." Why brethren, if you could be divested of your notions, of making your views of the *tenor of truth* a standard by which to determine the meaning of Scripture, so as to receive as truth just what the Scriptures declare as such; and could give up the idea of a begotten person in the Godhead, which amounts to a begotten God, shape it as you may, and look at the Son of God, self-existent as God, but begotten as the life and head of his people, and they in him, you would see such glory and majesty in the undivided Godhead, such a fullness and excellency in Christ as the Head of his church, and as the one Mediator; such glory and stability in the union of Christ and his church, as having commenced in eternity and not subject to the changes which attend time things; such security in the believers life being *hid with Christ in God*, and such harmony, beauty and fitness in the whole scripture testimony, that you would feel, if you were to hold your peace from declaring these things, as though stones would immediately cry out.

It would be useless to ask to be excused for the length of this communication, but I will ask the brethren to forgive me, and to forgive anything which may appear harsh or incorrect.

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., July 18, 1849.

# REPLY TO BRETHREN: THE NEW BIRTH.

PART I

BROTHER BEEBE: – I wish to connect these brethren together in a reply, because in some instances an answer to one, is a reply to another.

1. **BROTHER CLARK on I Cor. 15:45** – Brother Cark commences with some remarks relative to the words, *was made*, being a supply, to which I should have no objection, were it not for his saying, "These supplied words are very convenient things, as they can be cashiered or retained, as it suits the fancy or according to the use we wish to make of the passage," thus insinuating that I made such use of these words without due regard to the sense of the text. He seems however not to have found any iniquity in me in the cases referred to, until he had found me using such words to wrest the meaning of the Scriptures, he might have spared himself the trouble, and me the pain, of such an unkind insinuation.

Brother Clark's first argument on the text is to sustain him in denying the correctness of my former assertion, that *to be made* is equivalent *to being created*. I admit what he takes considerable trouble to prove; namely, that the Greek word here used is of very general import, but one of its primary meanings is, *to be made*. I also admit that *to create* in its strict sense differs from *to make*; thus, man can make, but not create. Still these words are frequently used in the Scriptures as of the same import. In Gen. 1:26, it reads, "Let us make man," and in verse 27, "So God created man." The same idea is intended to be conveyed in both verses. In verse 31, *made* is used as meaning the same as created. See also Gen. 5:1 & 2. What I said was, "To *be made* is equivalent to being *created*." Is it not so? Has brother Clark proved anything else by his many references to the use of the Greek word? Is not the thing made the production of him that made it, and therefore the creature in the common acceptation of the word? Is the thing that is created anything more? But let us come to the text itself. Brother Clark admits that the words, *was made*, in the latter part of the text is a supply; I am glad he does; for otherwise we might have had some more criticism to show they did not mean the same, as do the same words in the former part. As it is, he must admit that the words, *quickening spirit*, stand in the same grammatical construction with the one verb, *was made*, as do the words – *living soul*. Hence the *was made* has the same bearing on the one as on the other. He also admits the former part is a quotation from Gen. 2:7, which reads, "And man became a living soul." The Hebrew word here used is of the same general import as the Greek

word used by the Apostle, and like it having for one of its primary meanings, *to make*, and to *be made*. The question is, was Adam's becoming a *living soul* the result of his own will, was he self-existent as such? Or was it the result of God's *breathing into his nostrils the breath of life*? If the latter is the case, as I presume all will admit, then Adam in *becoming a living soul* was as much the creature of God as in being formed of the dust of the ground; and the expression, *was made*, is correct in the text I Cor. 15:45. And as both parts of the text are in the same grammatical construction; that is, the Apostle makes exactly the same affirmation concerning the last Adam's being a *quickening spirit*, as he does concerning the first's being a *living soul*, the legitimate conclusion is that the *last Adam was made a quickening spirit*, and as such is as much the production or creature of God, as was the former in being a *living soul*. And brother Clark's many references to show the various uses of the Greek word amount to nothing.

Brother Clark uses a more plausible argument against the conclusion I have before drawn from this text, in assuming that it only has reference to the resurrection. But his position, "That if therefore it means a creature, Christ was not created until after Adam was, because he is declared to be the *second* Adam," will not stand. In the 47th verse, where the Apostle is not speaking of their being made, but of their distinct natures, he calls the *earthy man* the *first man*, and the Lord from heaven, the *second man*; he might therefore just as well conclude that from the terms *first* and *second* in this verse, that the earthy man existed before the Lord from heaven did, as to infer from the other text that Adam was made first. Paul is not here saying *when* they were made, but *what* they were made; and he uses the terms, *first* and *last*, and *first* and *second*, to designate them one from the other, having reference by these terms, not to the commencement of their existence, but to their manifestations in the world.

Neither will his other position, that the Apostle in this and the following verses had reference only to the resurrection, stand any better; for in that case Adam in being made a *living soul* would be, and only be the contrast to Christ as the resurrection. But not so, for the Apostle had before shown in verse 21 & 22 wherein Adam was the contrast to Christ as the resurrection, "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here then is the contrast in reference to the resurrection, death is the counterpart to it. Paul having pursued the subject of the resurrection on to verse 44, where making the assertion that, "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body," he proceeds in verse 45-49 to show whence these different bodies come; namely, "from two distinct Adams or Heads, and draws the contrast between them as such, showing their different natures, the one made a *living soul*, the other a *quickening spirit*; the one *natural*, the other *spiritual*; the one, of the *earth earthy*, the other, the *Lord from heaven*. He then shows that the distinguishing characteristics of this second Head or Adam are to be

carried out even to the bodies of his posterity in the resurrection. This appears to me as the only consistent view of this passage. So that I think brother Clark will have to let my former inference from it still stand, unless he can bring something more weighty against it.

Brother Clark, on this text has passed over the idea of being *made a quickening spirit*, but I will notice it, and notice it in connection with some remarks of his in his preceding communication on this subject. He said, "To quicken is to give life to the dead and this is conceded to be equivalent to regeneration or the new birth." It may be so conceded by many, and I may have so conceded, but I cannot now. I conclude that to quicken is to *restore life* to the dead, and in some instances that it means a reviving of a person who is in a lifeless or stupid state. I understand the word to be used in this last sense in Psal.80:18 & 119:25, and other verses. In the other sense *to quicken the dead*, that it is a restoring to life to that which has died is evident from Paul's declaration, speaking in reference to the resurrection, he says, I Cor. 15:36, "Thou fool; that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." Hence according to Paul, a quickening implies a previous dying. Again, I admit that there is a quickening connected with regeneration, and the new birth, but it is as distinct from regeneration, as sowing the seed is from its vegetating. I think there is an analogy between all natural seeds; I will therefore say the sower sows the seed, but he does not quicken it, that is another process; so in a natural birth, and of course so in regeneration. Of all the texts which brother Clark quotes on this subject, there are but three or four which I supposed anybody thought had reference to regeneration. John 6:63 is considered as having that reference; but this I have disputed and still do, on what ground is known. Eph. 2:1 & 5, and Col. 2:13, have been explained as referring to regeneration. But in Ephesians there is a *raising* connected with the quickening, just as in John 5:21, and both in Ephesians and Colossians they are said to be *quickened together with him*, that is Christ. It is therefore something in which Christ participated with his people and they with him. Will brethren persist in an opinion which so fully involves the idea, that Christ participates with his people in regeneration. As they were quickened *together with him*, this must imply that they were quickened when he was quickened. Peter tells us when that was, when he says, "For Christ was once offered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit." I Pet. 3:18. In being offered the just for the unjust, were not the unjust offered with him, and did he in being offered and *put to death in the flesh* leave them in the grave; or were they not quickened together with him, and raised up together, and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus? Not earthly places, not again under the *Sinai* covenant, but in heavenly places, under the provisions and protection of the heavenly covenant which would secure their being preserved and called, as the other could not. Our Lord uses the same figure of seed sown, in reference to his own death and resurrection, as above quoted from I Cor. 15:36.

He says, “Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit.” John 12:24. Here a quickening is evidently implied. When a corn of wheat first vegetates or is quickened and sprouts, is there not in the sprout the germ of all the fruit it will afterwards mature? So Christ in being quickened and raised, brought up with him under the requisitions of the law, all the fruit or people represented by him. Well therefore does the Apostle say in reference to this, *quickened together with him and raised up together*, &c. “That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Jesus Christ.” Eph. 2:7. That is, the all of the *us* being *quickened* and raised up together with Christ from under the demands of the law, God might in every after age be showing his grace and kindness toward us as born into the world in calling us to the knowledge of salvation, &c. Thus we see there is a harmony and beauty in thus applying these texts in Ephesians and Colossians which cannot be in the other application.

Something more in reference to this *quickening spirit* as illustrated in Christ and in the experience of the believer, for the subject of grace has a fellowship in experience, as well as in fact, in the death and quickening of Jesus Christ. Peter says of Christ, “being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit;” but not quickened until after he was put to death, though he evidently had the spirit before, thus showing as in grain sown, death must precede the quickening, and that as in grain there must be a quickening principle not involved in the death. I have before spoken of the quickening as commencing with the first influence of the implanted spirit in regeneration upon the soul, but I was wrong, as brother Thompson says, death must first come before quickening, as illustrated by the seed sown and illustrated in Christ Jesus. Now we see how the *quickening spirit* worked in Christ, for it is to that, which I understand Peter to refer. This spirit, this life constituted him the actual Head of his people, as they were in this life in him. Hence as the Head and Husband of the church, he was involved in the demands of the law against them and must therefore come under the law to meet those demands. Now it was just so far as he was made under the law, and no further, that he died and that was as made flesh or man, {for his soul participated in the sufferings.} Now however perfect were his sufferings, if Christ had only existed in this fleshly relation to his people, and therefore as under the law, I do not know that there could have been any security of his release from death, for the law knows nothing about release. But standing in this spiritual relation to them and under a covenant ordered in all things and sure, established before the law came into existence, which while it involved him in the demands of the law, secured his not being *left alone* and that his *soul* should not be left in hell, nor be suffered as the Holy One to see corruption, this could secure his release. Hence Peter said, “It was not possible he should be holden of it;” that is, death. Acts 2:24-28. Now Peter does not ground this impossibility upon the Godhead of Christ, but upon those promises through David made to him. I hope brethren will not

hereby infer that I deny his Godhead. If his being God would admit of his being made under the law, it would, I should think, admit of his being made the Head of his people, and as such under covenant and promise. Hence we find promises made to him. See Psalms 89, and Isaiah 42. These same things were typified by the promises to Abraham and the Sinai law. See Gal. 3:16-18. Thus this life was in Christ a *quickening spirit*. So in his people. In its first implantation it brings them experimentally under the law. This life being the *light of men*, it enlightens the soul to see and know the law as spiritual, and thereby to know sin. Hence by it he is slain. Now the soul being in this situation, could reason ever quicken itself, as in the case of grain sown? No, because reason of itself never could comprehend or receive the idea of acceptance with God in any other way than by the law. For God has "hid these things from the wise and prudent," Matt. 11:25; and, "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God … neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." I Cor. 2:14. This then establishes this point. Here then this life is manifested as a quickening spirit; it can and does by faith hear the voice of the Son of God, and receive the tidings of salvation through Christ, and thus quickens the soul to newness of hope of acceptance with God. Paul says of the seed sown, "Thou sowest not that body which shall be, &c." I Cor. 15:37. So Christ in dying died as a Servant under the law, but in being quickened, he arose as the Son of God and above the law. See Rom. 1:4. So the believer is not quickened to the legal life in which he died, but is quickened and raised to a life of justification, to be no more a servant, but a son, and an heir of God. Gal. 4:7. Of all seeds in the vegetable kingdom, I know of but one that does not in its sprouting leave the old body dead in the ground. The bean is an exception, in this the sprout brings the old grain up with it on its top. This completes the figure found in the vegetable world of spiritual things. Christ's soul and body were quickened, his soul not left in hell, nor his body to see corruption. So in experience, in the quickening, the whole person is brought forth with the new life in the new birth, into a state of liberty; and the person now exists as standing in a new relation to God as his Father through Christ Jesus; and to the saints as brethren.

The balance of brother Clark's communication, I will leave to stand with the 'thousand and one things' which have been spoken and written for an *effect*. He must know, that in taking my positions in their connection, he can draw from them no such idea as he conveys by the expression, *a created Son of God*. Though by taking detached positions and expressions he might do it, and lead others to do it; just as by taking detached texts I might represent Christ as altogether inferior to the Father. If the scriptures can thus be distorted, no wonder my feeble writings can. I speak thus with plainness because I think the occasion justifies it. The terms *creature, created* and *made* are used in the Scriptures in relation to Christ; and I dare not alter their plain meaning and application to please brother Clark or any other brother.

S.TROTT.

P.S. – Brother Beebe, after having mailed my letter, containing the reply to brother Clark, &c., I recollected that I had left myself liable to be charged, from it, with representing the quickening spirit as raising Christ from the dead, &c., that is, according to the manner in which my communications have of late, been construed, and I see no more convenient way to remedy it than to send you this postscript to be inserted with the reply. Brother Clark it seems, does not understand that my representing wherein both yourself and he had misapprehended my intended meaning concerning the text, "It is the spirit that quickeneth," though my carelessness, implied, of course, an intimation that he had misrepresented my views. Hence, his twice repeated declaration that I had not charged him with misrepresenting my views. I am not now disposed so to charge him, as it would imply a willful misconstruction, but as a fair specimen of the manner in which he has throughout represented my views, I would request of brethren and of him to turn to the 2nd number, present volume of the SIGNS, and read what I say, concerning God's regenerating persons; and then notice his declaration in his letter in number 9, same volume, in which he says of me, that "He says he knows of no authority in the scriptures to believe that it is the province of the Holy Ghost or God to quicken or first regenerate dead sinners?" Those who do thus read the two passages will I think be satisfied, that let me be guarded as I may in expression, I may be wrongly represented. Still I wish to use due precaution. My mind is quite defective, more so than it once was, so that when I have one subject or point anywise intensely in view, I am apt to lose sight too much of other circumstances connected with it. Thus in the above reply to brother Clark, in endeavoring to illustrate how that Christ as the life of his people was the *quickening spirit*, even in his own case, in that the promise, as that "his soul should not be left in hell, &c.," were made to him as the Head of this life, rather than to his manhood, which was made under the law, and the law strictly knows neither promises or release, I omitted distinctly to say, that he was raised by the power of God in conformity with those promises made to him, though it was implied in referring to them. But to prevent misapprehension, I now say, that Christ was raised from the dead by the power of God; and not only that, but that it was "according to the exceeding greatness of his power," as Paul speaks, Eph. 1:19 & 20. So in speaking of regeneration, as a distinct operation from the quickening of the soul, having so recently declared my belief, that it was God who regenerates, I omitted distinctly to repeat it in this case, I therefore now say as then, that it is God who regenerates and none other, though I still doubt the authority for confining the work of regeneration to the Holy Ghost distinctively from the Father and the Word. Again, in speaking of the soul's being quickened from its death and condemnation under the law, to a state of justification, &c., by faith as an exercise of Christ in us, or of the life which he is, and also of the necessity of a revelation being made to this faith of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, I may have omitted to say by whom this

revelation is made. I therefore now say that the idea of a revelation is that it is a direct communication from God, and further that I understand it to be peculiarly the province of the Holy Ghost, to make this first revelation of Christ to faith and all after revelations made to it of God's truth, as being the Comforter and Teacher, and he who shall take of the things of Christ and show them unto his people.

There is one thing more, though it is swelling this postscript unreasonably, I wish to notice. In my remarks on brother Clark's chapter, I used this expression, "Let them receive in heart this third existence of our Lord, &c." When I first saw it as published I was convinced that many brethren would understand me as having reference to an experimental receiving of this truth by faith. As that was not at all my meaning, {I was not speaking of experience, but of theory,} I determined I would embrace the first opportunity to correct it. But in brother Clark's answer it was not noticed in that way, and at the same time there appeared such a determination on his part to force a split, I thought I would let him have what capital he could make from it. But on second thought I have concluded to explain and say that I had no disposition to call in question the genuineness of their faith in Christ; but at the same time I cannot comprehend how in theory they can heartily and truly, {and this is what I meant by the expression *in heart*,} believe two such opposite positions, as that Christ as God is absolutely self existent, and yet in reference to the same identical existence as God he is the begotten Son of God. Brother Clark says in his last letter, that he was satisfied there would be too many scriptures. Quite too many; they prove that Jesus is God, is the Son of God, and is man. Just my position. Can he now prove that three are only two?

S.T.
April 21, 1850.

# THE BEASTS AND THEIR IMAGE.

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

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

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

evidence of being the legitimate offspring of her *mother*, the church of England, and of her grandmother the church of Rome.

Your suggestion concerning the idea I had advanced, relative to the *life* to be given to the *image of the beast*, that it might refer to an establishment by law in this country, has certainly much weight in it. Such a combination of Church and State would in truth be a beast. And from year to year there are fresh developments, showing that this Image can have life in our country without any special Law, establishing a union between it and the civil government. We see it in the manner in which the actions of religious bodies are trumpeted forth in the political and miscellaneous papers. The awfully delusive ceremony also of *taking the veil* among the Catholics, is sounded forth with great seeming applause. And the proceedings of Conventions, missionary Meetings, associations, and even the discourses and prayers of individual preachers on special occasions, are taken down and reported for the newspapers; the same as the proceedings of legislative bodies and political meetings, as though they were all of a class. Some occurrences took place recently in the House of Representatives, showing how these things stand in the American Congress.

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

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

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

In reference to brother Meredith's request for my further views on certain prophecies, I would inform him that my present feelings on the subject of prophecy, brought about, probably in some measure, by being disappointed in the calculations made concerning the Turks, are that the fulfillment of every prediction, is in safe, unerring hands; that our speculations on them, or seeking to understand them before hand, any further than God may for wise and gracious purposes be pleased to give his people to understand them, cannot alter the accomplishment, nor profit any one. So far as prophecies which yet are not fully accomplished, in all their predictions, are fulfilled in some parts, or are being fulfilled, we may with propriety compare the events with the predictions, and thus trace the accomplishment as it progresses. Thus we may see the Ten-horned & Two-horned beasts and their Image, standing before us, and things apparently nearly ready for the accomplishment of the prediction that "no man may be allowed to buy or sell, save he that hath the mark or the name, or the number of the name" of the beast. The causing, "all, both small and great, rich and poor, to receive a mark in their right hands or in their foreheads," is evidently now progressing rapidly before us. Of these things we may with propriety speak; and so of other events as they transpire, we may watch their progress,

and examine and speak of them as we discover their conformity to prediction and their place and period in prophecy. But in reference to events and periods which are manifestly yet future, I repeat, that it is safest, and most conformable with that *wisdom which is from above*, to leave them with God, who will accomplish everything in its place and season.

Yours with christian love,
S.TROTT.
Centreville, Va., May 1, 1844.

## THE BEING AND NATURE OF ANGELS.

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

In reference to prophecy, it is a generally admitted fact, that the words employed in prophetic declarations are generally used not in a literal, but in a figurative sense, and hence we have to wait the fulfillment of prophecies to understand clearly their import.

Hence the inconsistency of taking words used in positive declarations according to their import in prophetic style, unless we suppose all Scripture alike figurative with prophecy. For I cannot believe that, unless God, in condescending to allow the Scriptures to be written in the languages of men, intended the words used to be understood according to their legitimate import, he would have suffered them thus to be written, but would have appointed a sacred language to be used.

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

That if Error is tolerated to be published among us, Truth should be left free to combat it. But I do desire that our Old School Brethren would be careful to publish nothing, under the guise of Old School sentiments, but what is sustained by the plain declaration and construction of Scripture; then the occasion for dissensions among us would be removed, and our Sister's benevolent wish would be accomplished in a safe way.

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

My second position is, that the angels are spirits and so made of God, therefore that they are the creatures of God. This I prove from Ps. 104:4 & Heb. 1:7. "Who maketh his angels spirits and his ministers a flame of fire." In reference to this passage as found in the 104th Psalm, could the order be changed without doing violence to the established usage of the Hebrew, so as to read, *Who maketh spirits his angels*, &c., or as some would construe the passage, *winds his angels*, then there might be a propriety in supposing the term *angel* to mean merely a *messenger*. But not only does the usage of the Hebrew require us to preserve the order in which it stands, but the quotation of the passages, Heb. 1:7, in an argument showing the superiority of Christ as a Son, requires us to understand by *angels* here the highest order of created beings. To suppose with Dr. George Campbell that this text is quoted to show that the sonship of Christ is superior to the office of *messengers*, by showing that even inanimate things such as the wind, are God's messengers, is superlatively ridiculous. Not less so, than would be the idea, that man must be great because a worm is so insignificant. When we consider, that the Holy Ghost directed the Psalmist in the original declaration, and directed the Apostle to make the quotation in proof of the superiority of Christ, as Son, over all created beings, we shall understand by *angels* in this first chapter of Hebrews, that superior order of beings which Christ took not on him, and that which man, and Christ in his humiliation, was made a little lower. Psal.8:4-6 & Heb. 2:5-9. If so, we must believe that, whilst God

maketh his ministers, whether natural or spiritual, a flaming fire to communicate light and heat and to burn up all that would oppose, he also maketh his *angels spirits,* that in ministering to them who shall be heirs of salvation; they may perform their office without being discernable by the natural senses of man. But if God maketh his angels spirits; angels must be his workmanship, and therefore his creatures. What then becomes of the challenge of our western brother to me; to prove that angels are created beings?

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

The fourth position I shall lay down, is that the angels which have not left their first estate, have their standing secured by the *purpose of God in election*. This is proved, first from the fact that in Scripture they are repeatedly denominated *holy angels*. They cannot be in themselves independently holy; because as has been proved they are creatures of God; hence are dependent on him not only for their existence but also for existing as they are. Persons are, according to Scripture, sanctified or made holy, by being cleansed from pollution; as national Israelites, ceremonially, by water and blood; and saints, spiritually, by the blood of Christ. But we have no evidence, that these angels were ever polluted. Again, saints are holy, by being partakers of the *new man*, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. In this they were created in Christ Jesus, and come into actual existence in this relation by being born of God. But only the saints are represented in Scripture as being created in Christ Jesus. The only other sense in which the Scriptures represent creatures as becoming holy, is by their being appointed or set apart of God to his special service. In this sense then it must be that the angels are holy, in being set apart by the electing purpose of God, in their innocency and uprightness, to be his messengers to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation. But, secondly, this position is proved from I Tim. 5:21, "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels." Here a regular gradation is observed in the order of invisible beings, in whose sight Timothy is thus reminded, that he acts, whether seen of men or not. By the Apostle here, the purpose of God, by which these angels are set apart to holiness, is showed to be according to election by which they were chosen whilst others were passed by. But in reference to this text, we are met by an assertion, and a bare assertion it is, not having a particle of Scripture proof to sustain it, that the *elect angels* here mean men; namely, the presbytery who ordained Timothy. There are repeated instances in the New Testament in which the term *angels* is used in the figurative language of prophecy, to denote ministers, as in Matt. 24, Rev. 1 and the 12th chapters, but in no instance where the term is used in positive declaration, in the

translation, is there anything in the connection, or any other authority for understanding it to mean anything else but *angels* in the proper sense of the term. Nor in the Greek, do we find the term used merely for *messengers*, excepting in cases where the connection shows them to be messengers of men; as in Luke 7:24, *messengers of John*, so Luke 9:52, and James 2:25. But further we have nothing in the New Testament sanctioning the idea of electing particular elders to officiate in ordaining any individual. There was no selection spoken of in the church at Antioch, Acts 13:1,2. In the case of Timothy, be it remembered, that he was an Evangelist, II Tim. 4:5, and therefore received his ordination to the work directly from apostolic authority. And though the laying on of the hands of the presbytery is spoken of in I Tim. 4:14, yet this term does not necessarily involve the idea of plurality, it simply denotes the office of eldership; and to settle the point, Paul in II Tim. 1:6, speaking of the gift in Timothy, the same gift undoubtedly that is mentioned in I Tim. 4:14, speaks of it as being in him, simply by the laying on of his own hands. Surely Paul would not thus connect himself with God and the Lord Jesus in his charge to Timothy. Hence in no view which can be taken of the subject, on Scriptural grounds, can we find any apology for the above noticed assertion. By the same rule that one may assert that the presbytery which ordained Timothy, is intended by the *elect angels* in this passage, another might assert another class was intended, and thus the language of the Scriptures would be rendered entirely indefinite. Besides, such a construction of the passage countenances the Arminian notion, that the Election of the New Testament, is merely an election to office. I think, therefore, that those, who are disposed with childlike simplicity to receive the language of Divine Inspiration, will believe, with me, upon the authority of this text, that the *holy angels* have their standing secured, not in their own strength, but by the purpose of God *according to election*; and that boasting is excluded from them, as well as from the saints; so that instead of raising, in heaven, the notes of self-glorying that their standing has been preserved by their own purpose and strength, they also will give God the glory of their being what they are.

My fifth and last position is, That some of those spiritual beings designated by the term *angels*, kept not their standing in uprightness, but sinned. My proof for this is found in II Pet. 2:4, “For God spared not the *angels that sinned*, but cast them down to hell and delivered them into chains of darkness,” &c., and in Jude 6, “And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.” Attempts have been made, in order to get rid of the proof these texts afford of a future judgment, to make us believe, that these angels were Jews, or national Israelites. But where is the proof for such an idea? It is not found in the connection, not in the scriptural use of the term angel, nor in any corresponding passage of Scripture. As has been noticed, inferences drawn from prophetic language cannot be authority in construing terms used in positive declarations. Peter is showing the certainty of the punishment of the false teachers, who would arise

after the manner of the false prophets among national Israel, though they might escape in this life, as is also Jude; this he proves from the judgment of God upon the angels that sinned, as being first in order. From them he passes to the old world, as the next signal instance of God's just judgment overtaking the wicked, and from that to the case of Sodom and Gomorrah. The punishment of the false prophets and teachers, is what these apostles are showing as certain, though they escape in this life, therefore they cannot be intended by the *angels*. These Apostles speak of *angels*, and what right have we to say they do not mean what they say; especially when, by representing them to mean something else, we turn the beauty and harmony of the order observed by Peter, into confusion? We are therefore warranted by these texts, taken in connection with I Tim. 5:21, in the belief that whilst some angels were elected to holiness, others being passed by and left to themselves, sinned, and in sinning left their first *estate*, or that uprightness in which they were created. We are not directly informed that these sinning angels are the devils spoken of in Scriptures; but we know that like the devils they are *wicked spirits*, and are reserved in *chains of everlasting darkness*, or in everlasting opposition to God who *dwells in light*; and like the devils have hell for their habitation. What particular *occasion* occurred to lead them to sin, we are not informed, unless it be found in Heb. 1:6. But we know, that they transgressed the law, under which they were placed; for "sin is the transgression of the law," and they sinned. Hence they cannot have been created with a wicked nature, because no law would require them to act contrary to their nature; neither could they have been self-existent, for then they would have been without law, and where no law is, there is no transgression.

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

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

The first is, That angels in heaven could not be subject to temptation and therefore would have nothing to lead them to sin. Whilst it is admitted that there is no account of their being tempted; yet the idea that angels could not sin without being tempted, wants proof both from reason and Scripture. We are informed that they sinned, they were of course as before noticed, under a prohibitory law; this is proof positive that they were

liable to depart from the rectitude in which they were created, else why prohibited by law? And as a law only commands, without providing the principle of obedience in the subject, it would not remove their liability to disobey, if left to their own choice. And whilst God's having created them, involved them in an obligation to obey him, it involved on him no obligation to constrain them to obey. So that this argument has evidently nothing to stand upon.

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

A third idea advanced, is, That if angels could sin and fall from heaven, saints might do so too when they get there. If those angels which have been established in holiness by God's electing purpose were to fall it might afford some plausibility to this argument. But even this would not establish the truth of their position. Nothing short of proof, that Christ is liable to fall, can prove the liability of the saints falling from heaven. This argument therefore shrinks away at the first touch. Nevertheless, as so much stress is laid on the idea of the angels being in Heaven, in these arguments, we will notice that idea a little. But no candid person would infer, that the terms *heaven* or *heavens* as found in the Scriptures, always denote the place of heavenly glory, where Christ in his glorified body is enthroned at the right hand of the Father. Paul speaks of a man whom he knew being taken up to the third heavens; {II Cor. 12: 2,} and Solomon says, That the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain God. I Kings 8:27. According to these texts there are more heavens than one; so that these angels might have been in heaven, without being where the glorified body of Jesus is. As to Milton's poetic phantasma, I have never quoted him as authority, and therefore no one has a right to charge his visions upon me.

In speaking of the angels which sinned as being in their creation heavenly beings, I consider myself sustained by the fact that they were *made spirits*, and therefore not earthly, not serpents, nor any other beasts of the field, and as the Scriptures speak of but two regions or spheres which God created, the *heaven* and the *earth*, they must of course been heavenly. Thus much I infer without assigning them a place in the *third heavens*, or *heaven of heavens*.

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

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Va., Nov. 23, 1842.

## THE BENEDICTION.

BROTHER BEEBE: – There is so much uproar made about introducing discussions, and disputable points into the SIGNS, that I feel a hesitancy at introducing almost any subject, as discussion might grow out of it, unless I am requested to give my views. I had intended writing a remonstrance against the ground taken by several brethren, but your *veto* put a stop to the discussion then going on. I should have taken this text, “Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.” Phil. 2:4. This is applicable both to things spiritual and things temporal. What if we do not want for ourselves either to receive, or give, any of these enlarged views on doctrine and order, or are so well instructed in the things of the kingdom, that we received no edification from the writings of our brethren on these subjects; or have got our opinions fixed and do not wish to be jostled from them, lest we should be charged with changing our views, and consequently of being wiser today than we were yesterday; ought we to

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

to occupy the SIGNS with it. I hope brother Woodward will consider this a sufficient excuse for not further complying with his request.

Brother Burritt requests my views on the subject of pronouncing at the close of a meeting, what the Paedobaptists call *the benediction*, but which I, and I supposed, most of our O.S. Baptists consider merely as a *dismissal*, or *salutation*. If brother Burritt has been difficulted only on that point in the order generally observed in our worship, he has escaped much better than I have. Soon after my first entering upon the ministry, my mind was considerably difficulted as to that order which was general among the baptists, in conducting their meetings for worship and preaching; not being able to find apostolic example for it. For some few years, the Scotch, or Waldanian Baptists, as they are called, had attracted some notice, by setting aside the prevailing forms, and professedly observing a strict regard to apostolic example in all the parts of their worship. In most of our cities, little companies had separated from the Regular Baptists, and met together on every first day to break bread, and preach, &c., according to what they considered strict New Testament order. I read some of their writings on the subject and endeavored to test the same by the New Testament. The result was, that I became satisfied, that the order which had obtained among us in the arrangement of singing, praying, and preaching, &c., was a mere assumed form; and among the Waldanians there were some points of order, not regarded by us, which evidently was according to established apostolic order, and there were other points on which they laid much stress, which were mentioned in the New Testament as mere incidental circumstances, and others again, in reference to the ministry of the word, which were important errors. The enquiry which next occupied my mind, was, whether I should continue to observe the formal course among us, or to endeavor to introduce where I worshipped a stricter regard to what appeared as New Testament order. Whilst unsatisfied on this point, and still hesitating, I was convinced from the ill success which attended the Waldanian attempt to reform, that the Lord did not favor it, and come to the conclusion that so far as real corruption was not involved it was better to bear with some departures from apostolic order, than to split off from those whom we believe to be saints of God and grounded in the truth, and to wait till God shall please to cleanse his church from all its impurities in doctrine and order; which, I am impressed with the idea, will not be whilst the church remains in its present wilderness state; that as he suffered Israel in the wilderness to neglect circumcision and some other of his appointments, so of his church, during the reign of antichrist. I did hope when the church, the O.S. Baptists, separated themselves from the human inventions of the Image of the Beast, as seen in the New School, to the standard of the Scriptures, that they would go on purging themselves at least from all those human devises, which had manifestly been productive of evil. But it seems it is not to be so, as a general thing, among the churches. Those therefore who see the evil must content themselves with purifying themselves from such evils so far as they can, without

separating from the fellowship of their brethren, and to exhorting their brethren as occasion may offer to test their systems and practice by the Scriptures of truth. As to the arrangement of the parts to be attended to in the meetings of the church for worship, I am satisfied that this arrangement is left unestablished as a thing indifferent, provided *all things be done decently and in order*. This opinion I have derived from that particular direction which Paul gave to the church at Corinth touching the exercise both of the ordinary and extraordinary gifts. I Cor. 14. There is no direction given when or how often they should sing and pray, though both are referred to; nor in reference to preaching or prophesying, excepting that *two* or *three* might speak, if so many were present having any message given them; and that one was not to continue speaking so long as to exclude the others from an equal opportunity, as is sometimes the case among us. So in reference to the Lord's supper, the Apostle, in I Cor. 11:23-26, has given clearly what is essential in that ordinance. For he *delivered to them, that which he had received of the Lord* concerning it, and surely he must have received of the Lord all that is essential in that ordinance. But there is nothing in what he delivered them, specifying at what hour, nor how often they should observe this ordinance, as *oft as ye do it*, is the specification on this point; nor in what place, only that it was when *the church were come together in one place*. See verses 18 & 20. So that the circumstances of being in an *upper room* and at *night* on which some lay so much stress, are things indifferent. But here I do not mean by it that because such and such things are not forbidden, they are indifferent. For instance, infant sprinkling is not in direct terms forbidden, yet the appointing of believer's baptism to be observed, is itself a prohibition of the substitution of anything else in the place of it, and therefore *not a thing indifferent*. So the appointing of churches as the order by which the disciples are to be associated together in one visible body, and the committing of the administration of all the Lord's appointed order, to the churches severally, is a forbidding of the constitution of other religious bodies, and of such bodies assuming the management of any part of the affairs of the gospel. But in the arrangement of the parts of worship, the Apostle has enjoined that *all things be done decently and in order*; it is self evident that some arrangement is necessary to different things being done in order, otherwise, singing, praying, speaking, &c., might be going on at the same time; the very confusion which Paul objects to in that church. This arrangement is not specified in the New Testament, and is therefore left as a thing indifferent providing decency and order is observed. Hence I know not that the arrangement which generally prevails among us is not as good as any other would be; excepting that I have sometimes thought that the having always one uniform arrangement, is more likely to sink into a kind of formal thing, than would be the varying of that arrangement according to circumstances. What I have said above has only reference to the order of worship where the church be come together in one place. In reference to preaching to other congregations than when the church is met, there is on

such occasions not only no authority for these forms in singing, praying, &c., but apostolic example is uniformly against their use. The order we observe in such appointments for preaching has grown out of infant baptism, whereby the posterity of professors are placed in circumstances to be considered acceptable worshippers. By conforming to this custom we so far sanction this principle. The same in full may be said of the practice of putting forward persons making no pretensions to religion, or for whose pretensions we have no fellowship, to lead in singing. Yet to both of these customs I have conformed rather than to single out from my brethren.

To come to the particular point of order to which brother Burritt refers, the form of dismissing the meeting; if this was considered as an attempt to impart a blessing to the people by any virtue there is in the lifting up of the hands, as our Lord blessed little children brought to him, I should shrink from the attempt too. But I do not, neither do I think our brethren generally, view it in that light. At most it is but a short prayer to God for a parting blessing upon the people. This appears to me a proper subject of prayer, and being offered at the close of the religious exercises in which we have been engaged. I should not consider it an infringement of that *decency and order*, which the Apostle enjoins. But I have rather looked at it as a *parting salutation*, and have considered the examples of the apostles Paul and Peter in closing their epistles, to be good authority. Paul does not call that close, *a blessing*, but a *salutation*. See II Thes. 3:17, and other places. As I have thus viewed the subject for many years, I have felt no difficulty in conforming to that order, generally, though I have considered there was rather an impropriety in giving this salutation, when we were only adjourning for half an hour or so, expecting the same people again to come together and resume the exercises of the day. Paul speaks of *blessing with the spirit*, from his immediately calling it a *giving of thanks*, I conclude he refers to blessing God, rather than blessing the people. I Cor. 14:15 & 16. So the *blessing of the bread*; {Matt. 26:26,} and the *cup of blessing*, {I Cor. 10:16,} as these cases are spoken of as *giving thanks* in Luke 22:19 & I Cor. 11:24, I think refer to *blessing* or *thanking* God for them. I have thus given brother Burritt my experience and conclusion on this subject, if the relation shall afford him any satisfaction on the point about which he is difficulted, or any comfort from the consideration that others are constrained to conform to points, about the correctness of which they are not satisfied, I shall not have labored in vain. May I conclude with the salutation?

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

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

# THE END OF THE WORLD.

EXPOSITION OF MATTHEW 24:29-51.

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

This subject has considerably occupied my mind for some time past, in consequence of certain opinions advanced among Old School Baptists on the one hand and Mr. Miller on the other. Between these two, the two distinct comings of Christ revealed in the Scriptures, are as completely mixed up and confused, as ever any subject was. The prophecy or prophecies contained in this 24th of Matthew, have in part been differently understood by me at different periods; though at no period have I been able to receive the idea, that the whole received an entire accomplishment in the destruction of Jerusalem and events connected therewith, for reasons which I shall have occasion hereafter to notice. But recently my mind has been led to what is to me a clearer view of the subject, than I have formerly had; whether by the Spirit of God, I will not presume to affirm.

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

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

events, relative to the gospel and gospel Church, which were to intervene between the destruction of Jerusalem and his second, personal coming.

Verse 29, “Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened,” &c. Some expositors, setting aside the order which Christ here gives to these events, as being *after the tribulation of those days*, represent the *darkening of the sun*, the *moon not giving her light*, and the *falling of the stars from heaven*, as being accomplished in the destruction of the temple and the consequent overturning of the legal ceremonies, priesthood, and worship. But I cannot admit, that any light remained in any part of the Mosaic economy, after Christ had fully come out of it in his resurrection, ascension, &c., as he was the whole light and substance of the economy, whilst he remained buried in it. Even Dr. Gill makes the *sun being darkened* represent the Shekinah or divine presence being withdrawn from the most holy place, when the temple was destroyed. He should have recollected, before making this blunder, that the Shekinah, or God’s presence communing with the high priest was from off the mercy seat which covered the ark and from between the cherubim, and that consequently, as the ark of testimony was involved in the destruction of the first temple, and the gold of the mercy seat and cherubim was carried away by Nebuchadnezzar, the second temple was entirely deficient of all these, only as Christ, the grand antitype and substance of them, came to this temple agreeably to Hag.2:6-9. The truth is, that as Christ describes that *tribulation* to be greater than any which had been *before* or should *come after*, verse 21, so the *tribulation of those days* can be nothing less, than the entire destruction which came upon the Jews, their city and temple. Hence it being *after the tribulation of those days* that the sun should be darkened; this must be an after event; and therefore as above remarked, must be an event preceding the second coming of Christ. But the word *immediately*, requires some attention – “immediately after the tribulation,” &c. If by this expression we are to understand the event to be one directly connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, and in quick succession according to our notions of time; then as we find nothing recorded in history answering to the declarations in this verse, either literally or figuratively, as having thus taken place, we are placed in the deplorable predicament of believing that our blessed Lord delivered a prophecy, which failed to be accomplished, or at any rate, one, the truth of which is left very doubtful. But if we understand the word *immediately* to point out the next leading event in the history of the church after the destruction of Jerusalem, as it may with propriety be understood, then we shall escape such unpleasant predicament. So I understand it to be used, and by the expressive and figurative language of this verse, according to the order of prophetic style, I understand the whole rise and power of the *man of sin*, on to the witnesses being killed, as being prophetically described. By the *sun darkened* I understand the gospel as being obscured in the rise and reign of antichrist, and as being entirely hid from public view during the time the two witnesses shall lie dead. By the *moon* not giving *her light*, I understand the church as

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

The Master having thus pointed out the events relative to the gospel, which were to precede the periods embraced in each of the two questions of the disciples, without giving any direct answer to them, now turns more directly to their enquiries, and in reference to the first, "When shall these things be" – that is; When shall the temple be destroyed; shows them {verses 32-35,} with what certainty they might know its near approach, and that it should take place before that generation was past. And then in verse 36, and on he gives an answer as to the period referred to, in the other enquiry; namely, that, "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven &c.;" that is,

he hereby informs them, that the period of the *end of the world* God has never made a subject of revelation. He has revealed by his servants the prophets the distinct periods of other events, but never this; and further, according to Mark, he informs them, that the Son as sent of his Father is not authorized to reveal it. Thus we see that Mr. Miller and his disciples have altogether gone beyond revelation in their calculations. That I am correct in making this distinct application of the declarations in verses 34 & 36, appears from the demonstrative adjective pronouns here used. Grotius, a learned Greek scholar, says that according to the idiom of the Greek, the two distinct pronouns used in verses 34 & 36, the one translated *these* and the other *that*, point out a plain distinction in the subjects to which they each relate; distinguishing the one as near, the other as more distant. The same distinction is often made in our own language by using of the words *this* and *that*. If our Lord had intended by the *day and hour*, vs.36, the same period as that intended in vs.34, the use of the demonstrative pronoun *ekeinos*, or *that* was improper; the proper mode of expression would have been *but of the day and hour* &c. As there is therefore clearly a distinction pointed out by the mode of expression used in reference to the subjects of these two verses, I think we are warranted in concluding the distinction to be that of the distinct enquiries. The comparison of this latter period; namely, the end of the world, with the days of Noah, corresponds with what we might infer will be the case, from the description given of the Laodicean church state, the seventh and last state of the church militant, {Rev. 3:14-17,} and other declarations of Scripture, which, I think, relate to the same. But the comparison here made with the days of Noah, certainly does not correspond with the description given in Luke of the period connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, nor with the account given in history of those times. See Luke 21:25,26. So also the declarations contained in verses 40 & 41, do not hold good in reference to the destruction of Jerusalem; for according to the uniform testimony of history all the Jews without exception found in Judea, that did not perish in the war, were taken captive and sold for slaves. But that the distinction pointed out in these verses will be manifested at the second coming of Christ, we may conclude from the description given by Paul of that event {I Thes. 4:16 & 17;} namely, that "*we which are alive* and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air." Hence one will be changed and taken up and another left. And I think the admonitions given in the remainder of this chapter, refer to the event of Christ second coming, or *the end of the world*. But here I will remark as to that subject. As some speak of the comings of Christ, we might infer, that they think him like some of the importing merchants and factors in our cities; these having business to transact both in Europe and in this country, have frequently to pass from the one country to the other, to attend to it. But those who so represent our Lord, forget his Godhead and omnipresence. His first coming or his *coming in his kingdom* instead of being confined to one instantaneous appearing is like the coming of the day, progressive, now

manifested in this degree of longitude then in that, so of our Lord, who will continue to come in the one coming in his kingdom, until the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, is ground to chaff, and the gospel church or his kingdom, represented by the *stone cut out of the mountain without hands*, fills the whole earth. So in reference to his second coming, it has been in effect progressive to every succeeding generation of men, and will be until the dead in Christ are raised and the world burned. That is, when we or others are called from time by death, time things have no more to do with us, and therefore it is the same with us, as though time was ended as to any changes we may know, but the one in the resurrection of our bodies. Hence the admonitions contained in these latter verses of this chapter; also the declaration contained in Rev. 22:7, "Behold I come quickly," &c., and other like ones, are as appropriate to us as they will be to any future generation of men on the earth. O that the Lord would give us grace to obey these admonitions of our Lord, and to watch for his coming; that is, to us.

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

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

# THE FOUR CHARIOTS FROM BETWEEN TWO MOUNTAINS OF BRASS

"*And, behold, there came four chariots out from between two mountains; and the mountains were mountains of brass.*" – Zechariah vi, 1.

The chariots denote different warlike powers which shall prevail, and the color of the horses in each, indicated the result from the reigns of the several powers, to the Jews, as the color of the horses in Revelation vi, 1-8, pointed out the nature of the events which should prevail under the first four seals in John's vision.

It is generally admitted that the first three chariots correspond with the first three beasts of Daniel's vision – Daniel vii, 1-8, and with the three higher parts of Nebuchadnezzar's image of which he dreamed in Daniel ii, 31-40. That is, that the first chariot represented the Babylonish Monarchy, having red horses in it, denoting the bloody wars that nation waged against the Jews. As this Monarchy was already succeeded by the Mede-Persian Empire when Zechariah had this vision, nothing more is said of this chariot and red horses.

The second chariot represented the Persian government; and the black horses, the gloomy and oppressed state of the Jews under that Monarchy. For although they had release from captivity and liberty to rebuild their Temple given them by Cyrus the Great; yet they met with such a constant series of opposition and discouragements, during that period, that their state was truly dark.

The third chariot represented the Grecian Monarch under Alexander the Great. This chariot had in it white horses, the emblems of peace. While Alexander was carrying war and rapine to all the nations bordering upon, or near Judea, the Jews enjoyed peculiar peace, and received from his special privileges and favors.

Alexander while laying siege to Tyre sent a deputation to the Jews requiring them to submit themselves to him. To this the Jews refused, at which he was so enraged that he was determined to take signal vengeance upon them. As soon therefore as Tyre was taken, he marched with his army directly towards Jerusalem. But in the mean time, he saw in a dream a large company of unarmed persons, preceded by a venerable looking personage richly attired approaching him in supplication. The Jews hearing of Alexander's approach, determined to throw themselves upon his mercy, and accordingly formed a procession headed by the High-priest in his priestly robes, and went forth to meet Alexander. As they came nigh him, Alexander recognized the High-priest to be the same venerable personage, and the company to be the same he had seen in his dream; and being forcibly struck with the providence of what he now saw, with his dream, he lighted from his horse, did reverence to the High-priest, and granted the Jews their request, and left them in peace. This, I believe, is the amount of what is related by Prideana and others concerning this affair: though not having the history near at hand, I have to quote from memory.

It is said in verse 6, "The black horses which are therein go forth into the north country, and the white go forth after them." The Persian conquests were principally of Babylon

and other countries north of Judea; and Alexander over-run these same countries after the Persians subdued the nations generally of the north country [central Hia, or Asia] under his yoke and introduced the Greek language among them, and caused the Jewish Scriptures to be translated into Greek; and thus was this country in a great measure prepared for easy access to the preachers of the Gospel and the Scriptures, when the time appointed should come. Hence the quieting of God's Spirit in that country, verse 8. They were afterwards brought under the Roman yoke, but the Grecian language and culture continued to be the principal language and customs.

The fourth chariot, had two sets of horses, the one grisled, (or *hail-spotted* as the Hebrew signifies,) the other, bay. Following the order of Daniel's vision, this chariot ought to represent the fourth beast, or the Roman power, and which is the *iron* power of Nebuchadnezzar's image, – Daniel vii, 7, and ii, 33, and verse 40. The bay horses very properly represent the conquests of the Romans as walking to and fro through the earth. The grisled colored horses would in this case represent the Syrian government under the Antiochuses as being at sometimes destructive to the Jews; at other times the Jews obtained the ascendency.

But the more general idea is that this chariot and horses represented the Syrian and Egyptian powers, or the governments of the Grecian Antiochuses and Ptolemy, two of the four horns or kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided- Daniel viii, 8, and 23. These two horns being contiguous to, more affected the Jews than did the other two horns, or divisions. In this view of the subject, the grisled horses represent the Egyptian government as being sometimes friendly and sometimes hostile to the Jews. And the bay horses, the Syrian government, particularly under the reign of Antiochuses Epiphanes, who as a scourge to the Jews is particularly pointed out by the "little horn," – Daniel viii, 9-12, and xxiii, 25, and in Daniel xi, 21-45, and has been justly considered an eminent type of antichrist or the "man of sin" under the Gospel.

But which ever is the true application of this fourth chariot, it is evident from a little attention to history, that no period of five hundred years, (that being about the length of time represented by these four chariots,) at least, since the fall of the Roman Empire, can any ways be compared with this, for bloody wars, extensive conquests, and ravages of nations. It embraces, First, the wars and ravages of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. Second, Of Cyrus, Darius I, and II, and Cambyses and the other Persians monarchs, including Xerxes' famous invasion of Greece with a host, including sea and land forces, women and other attendants, that is recorded by historians to amount to upwards of five millions, the larger part of which were slain by Leonidas and his little band at the pass of Thermopylae, and the remainder nearly all perishing before Xerxes got back to Persia. Third, The conquests, ravages, rapine and bloodshed of Alexander and his successors are included. And Fourth, probably the Roman conquests as well. Hence, what has

particularly attracted my attention, is that these four chariots, representing such a vast amount of devastation, misery and destruction of human life, should be denominated the "four spirits of the heavens;" and should have come out from between "the mountains of brass." "These are the four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth." – verse 5.

What will the opposers of God's predestination say to this? Will they admit, or will they not, that this subject is a striking illustration of that specific text. "Shall there be evil in the city and the Lord hath not done it?" – Amos iii, 6. We are not to understand that they, in the devastation and misery which they occasioned, represent the spirits of heaven. Nor on the other hand, that the spirits of heavens, are the spirits of hell or the power of darkness. I understand nothing else by their being said to be the spirits of the heavens, &c., than that it is to teach us that the angelic spirits are employed in conducting the providential government of the world, and in directing and controlling the effects of the ambition, rage, &c., of men so as to make them conduce to the accomplishing of the purpose of God. "Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty-days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for yet the vision is for many days." – Daniel x, 13,14.

Although men are disposed to quarrel with the eternal and sovereign predestination of God, and to represent it as making God the author of sin, &c., we here see it guarded by the *brazen mountain of eternal Justice*, which stands side by side with it. As streams which runs out, from between two mountains in nature, and is fed from both, so all the events which transpired in the government of God, whether in Providence or in Grace, have source from these two mountains; flowing from, and having the impetus to their directed course given to them, by both, – the predestination and the justice of God.

If we look more particularly to the monarchies represented by these four chariots, whilst we see God unerringly accomplishing His decreed events exactly as foretold in prophecy, and bring about by these various revolutions and conquests, the great purpose of breaking down the national barriers by which the subjects of these conquests had been separated one from another, bring them ultimately to be settled peacefully under **one government – the Roman**, and to have a general acquaintance with **one common language – the Greek**, preparatory to the coming of Christ; and the Jews, whilst they were scourged for their iniquities by these governments preserved amidst all the revolutions and down fall of nations, a distinct people, in their own land, and in a good measure governed by their own laws, the laws given by Moses, until Shiloh or the

Messiah came, we on the other hand find one conqueror after another made the instrument of punishing the preceding monarch for his rapine and cruelty.

As God said of the King of Assyria, after using him as His rod and send him against a hypocritical nation &c. “Wherefore it shall come to pass that when the Lord hath performed His whole work upon Mount Zion and Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the King of Assyria, &c.” – Isaiah x, 5-15.

Besides these general judgments, we find in the history of this period, several instances of signal judgment, as in the death of Antiochus Epiphanies who has already been noticed as a special type of antichrist, he was visited with so extremely a painful, lingering and loathsome disease, that he was made to confess it to be a just judgment upon him for his cruelty to the Jews and the insults he had cast upon their worship.

So of the Romish antichrist and its image after God has used them according to His purpose as instruments for deluding and punishing the people because they believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness, 2 Thessalonians ii, 9-12, and making them a scourge to drive His people nigher to Himself, and a fire to try and refine His churches and saints, He will in turn, give them blood to drink because they have shed the innocent blood of saints and prophets. – Revelation xvi, 6.

And, my brethren, the stream of salvation which flows to you through a crucified Redeemer, comes to you, out of between the mountains of God’s purpose and His justice; these mutually so supply the stream and give to it, its course, that the will of God is accomplished, and justice is pleased in the salvation of each poor sinner that is brought to Jesus.

Well in conclusion may it be said to those who are vainly and impiously kicking and fighting against the mountains of brass, or the doctrine of predestination and eternal justice, “Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God.” – Romans ix, 20,21.

Samuel Trott,
Fairfax C. H., Va.,
March 21, 1838.

# THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.

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

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

That the Gospel Ministry as entirely originated from the express appointment of the Lord, as did either of the ordinances of the Gospel must be manifest to every reflecting Christian. Consequently the obligation to pay a strict regard to all the divinely prescribed parts of this institution without altering, adding unto, or diminishing from them, is tantamount to the obligation to own the Author of the institution as Lord. See Luke 6:46, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord; and do not the things which I say?"

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

First, in relation to those who are to officiate in this important work, as in the command given; *Go ye teach*, &c., being originally directed to certain baptized believers, chosen for the work. Matt. 25:16,19. We find those first employed in this work, were called directly by the Lord himself and sent into the work; afterwards as in the case of Paul and Barnabas, we find the precedent set of the preachers of the Gospel, being called to the

work by the Holy Ghost, and being *recommended to the grace of God for the work*, or separated to it, by the Church. See Acts 23:1,2, compared with Acts 14:27,27. Again it is declared that the *ministry of reconciliation*, is given to them of God, II Cor. 5:18; and that they are given especially to the *churches for the work of the Ministry of Christ*, and consequently are made manifest to the Churches, by their peculiar gifts, given to them by the Holy Spirit, I Cor. 12:4,7,8, & 28; or as expressed in I Tim. 3:2, being *apt to teach*. See Eph. 4:11,12; consequently it belongs exclusively to the Churches to separate persons for the work of preaching or teaching the Gospel, and they have no more right to send others into this work, than they have to authorize others to baptize; the authority to *teach all nations*, and that to *baptize*, being both found in the same command.

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

Third, the command given to the Eleven, contains the authority to *teach all nations* and to *preach the Gospel to every creature*; consequently God has appointed the same ordinance for making known the Gospel to the heathen and to the young, as to others.

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

those who preach because they are hired or because they *have been maintained from the King's Mission Palace*, do not preach the Gospel. As the avowed object of Mission, Tract, Sunday School and Bible Societies, is to make known the glad tidings of salvation, they are as manifest substitutes of human contrivance for that order which God has particularly appointed for publishing the Gospel, as infant sprinkling is for believers Baptism.

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

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

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

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

# THE GROUND OF CHRIST'S GLORY.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The power of sin to *reign unto death* over the whole human family, as was showed in treating of Sin, was given to it of God as a judgment upon man for his transgression, and was but an infliction of the penalty upon Adam, as a public head, annexed to the prohibition; "For in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:17. Hence "the sting of death is sin; and *the strength of sin is the law*." I Cor. 15:56. This leads to a very different conclusion from the one, that the object of God's sending his Son into the world, with all its preparatory and attendant circumstances, was to measure power with the devil and conquer him, thereby to redeem the elect. It leads us to the certainty, that it was the immutable Law of God with its incurred curse, which was to be met, satisfied and honored, for the redemption of his people from under it. And certainly his being able to deliver sinners from the curse of God's unchanging law, and raise them above its

demands, by a perfected redemption, even to the privilege of being sons and heirs of God, whilst he magnifies and makes honorable the law in all its demands, is a far greater manifestation of Christ's Almighty power to save, than could have been given by his measuring lances with Satan and conquering him. When the devil had the impudence to meet Christ Jesus, face to face, Christ had but to say to him as to his vassal, "Get thee hence, Satan," and the devil quailed before him. But when he came to meet the law with its sword of eternal Justice awakened up, we find him agonizing in the garden under a view of *the cup given him to drink*; yea yielding unto death before it; yea as standing in the law place of his people, Immanuel was weak to resist the demands of the law, and *was crucified through weakness*, II Cor. 13:4, *yet he liveth by the power of God*. Having by his death satisfied the sword of Justice, conquered death, removed the curse of the law and redeemed his people from under it, He arose victorious, was *declared to be the Son of God with power*, and manifested as "ABLE TO SAVE TO THE UTTERMOST all that come unto God by him." The parable of the *strong man armed*, Luke 11:21,22, appears from the connection to refer to Satan; and by the figure he is represented, not as a self-existent being, but as a creature, the figure being that of *a man*. He considered himself secure of a dominion over the whole human family, being armed, as he thought, with the penalty of the law holding them in a state of death in sin. This penalty Christ by his death took away; thereby stripped Satan of his imaginary dominion over the elect, and *divided his spoils*. By this we must understand, that the elect and non-elect were in Satan's estimation alike his *spoils*.

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

The *lawful captive*, {Isa. 49:24,25,} cannot mean a captive to Satan, he having no legal right to make God's creatures captives. But they having transgressed God's righteous law, God, as the rightful Judge, had an undoubted right to assign them over to captivity under sin or depravity, according to the requisition of his law; and being thus under judgment *to condemnation*, they stand prominent, as the prey of God's *terrible* wrath. He who could thus deliver the *captive from the mighty* and take the prey from *the terrible*, must be GOD ALMIGHTY; and not only must he put forth omnipotent power, but must exercise an infinitude of goodness, of love and humiliation, in coming *under the law* and being *made a curse* for sinners. Thus the true glory of the Son of God, does not consist merely in his having put forth omnipotent power, nor in his destroying an enemy, but in his putting it forth for the salvation of rebel, ruined sinners. How infinitely brighter is this glory, which encircles the brow of our Immanuel, than any which could be reflected by the mere conquest of a contending power! The holiness, the infinite love and goodness, which led Him, who was rich, *to become poor*, who was *in the form of God* and thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*, to make *himself of no reputation* and as a servant to become obedient unto death, that he might save vile sinners from the merited curse of the law, and raise them to be participants with himself in heavenly and eternal happiness and glory, is that glory which he showed forth as *the Only Begotten of the Father*; that *glory* which he had with the Father before the world was, and with which he is glorified in his risen humanity in seeing of the travail of his soul and bringing his loved, his redeemed, his heaven-born bride home to partake of that during, holy happiness, which is of the Father reserved for her. When we contemplate the Son of God as *crowned with such a glory* as this; how trifling, how insipid appears the attempt to swell the devil to a self-existent, independent power, that Christ might have the glory of trying prowess with him and conquering him!

It appears to me, that these Western brethren in their whole advocacy of the *Two Seed* system, mistake the occasion, or, if you please, the necessity of the putting forth of the power and other attributes of the Godhead in the great work of redemption. For they represent, whether they so intend or not, this most glorious display which God has made of himself, to be from an occasion entirely out of himself, yea to be from a necessity laid upon him by the independent existence of an opposite being, in order to carry out his purpose in spite of the opposition of this enemy. Or if they say, "No; that God foreknew the existence of this enemy, and that he would intrude upon his creation, {which by the by is a positive absurdity, which they have never attempted to meet, that God should actually know what an independent being, who acted of and from himself, would do, when in fact this being could not have willed thus to intrude, until he knew of the existence of an occasion,} still it would leave the purpose, which God purposed in Christ Jesus to have been dependant on the voluntary action of this self-existent and self-acting being! Take which view they please of it; it cannot be made to correspond with the

declaration which God made of himself to Moses, when he said, “I AM THAT I AM.” Ex. 3:14. The Psalmist says, “He that is our God, is the God of salvation.” Hence, as to be God, is to exist, to will and to act sovereignly and independently, salvation must be, from the original occasion and purpose of it, with all its provisions unto its ultimate accomplishment, all of God, the result of His infinitely wise and sovereign choice. The occasion was God’s goodness in choosing to bring into existence beings, and to raise them to a happiness and glory, in nearness of likeness to and communion with his glorious and holy self, which as mere creatures, however upright they might be, they could never attain, or participate in. The plan embraced those provisions, which are adapted in infinite wisdom to the communication of the greatest good and happiness; such as the creation of these chosen vessels in a natural head, leaving them to fall in him by transgression and become sinners, that they might be proper subjects of the redemption and thus be raised above the accountability and servitude of the law of their creation, even to the privilege of sons; whilst the evil of their depravity as leading them to will and act for self-gratification, is contrasted with the infinite goodness of God, as manifested in the gracious purpose of the Father, the humiliation and sufferings of the Son for them, and the gracious teachings and indwelling of the Holy Ghost as a Comforter; and whilst from Christ, as their spiritual Head, is communicated to them spiritual life, in which they discern and delight in the *good*, and know and abhor the *evil*.

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

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

# THE LAW

Brother Beebe: – In the communication signed P., *Signs* no.2, vol.12, Jan.15th, 1844, there were the following sentences, - "The Decalogue was given exclusively to National Israel, and its duration, in letter, was throughout their generations; and was predictive in all its requirements, and was coupled with the prophets until John, whose mission was to point unto Him in whom both the law and the prophets should concentrate. The burden of prophecy from Adam to Zechariah foretold the coming of Christ in the flesh. The demands of the law being perfect, holy and spiritual, predict the righteousness of Christ being imputed to those who are born of His Spirit: hence Jesus quotes from the law, and He doubtless knew the use of it, saying, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy might, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. &c."

I waited, thinking there were other brethren who would not let the sentiment advanced in the above quotation and its connection pass unnoticed; feeling quite averse to again appear in the *Signs* as an opposer of the sentiments of Old School brethren, being aware of the offense I have formerly given to many by my opposition to kindred sentiments with the above. I have wished that I could feel in consistent to let every thing pass as good which appears in the *Signs* from Old School brethren; but it is not so. With me, error appears as wrong, and perhaps more grievous, when found in the *Signs* than when advanced by those not of us. But, brethren, though I have been very troublesome to many of you as readers of the *Signs*, by being, as you think, too strenuous, and even fastidious, bear with me a little longer; I may soon cease to be numbered among you.

What I wish in this case, brother Beebe, if you will permit me, is simply to show my dissent from the sentiment advanced by P., and some of my reasons for such dissent. I have no intention of engaging in a prolonged discussion of the subject. I dissent from the sentiment advanced in the above quotation: **1st.** Because, if the Decalogue, or law of Ten Commands, *was given exclusively to national Israel*, and in the *letter of it was restricted to their generations*, and in its *perfect, holy and spiritual demands*, it is to be viewed as a *prediction of the righteousness of Christ*, then I know of no revealed law which God has ever given showing to the Gentile world what God demands of them as creatures and what sin is. If so, I cannot conceive how Paul could say, "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent," unless the gospel is to be viewed as a law to the Gentile world. The world is bad enough now, with all the restraint which the Decalogue evidently has upon them. But it would be worse if they

could be persuaded that God has never forbidden their killing, committing adultery, or stealing, &c. Besides, although I have been, and still am, willing to bear the reproach of being called an *antinomian*, when so called for maintaining that Christ accomplished a complete redemption of His people from the demands of the law, believing with the Apostle that this doctrine instead of *making void the law, establishes it* (Rom. 3:31), and that the charge is false. But I am not willing to countenance a sentiment which would give the enemies of truth just ground to charge us with making void the demands of God's revealed law. It is true, it is not our business to consult consequences in receiving and advocating truth. But what is truth? Christ says to His Father, "Thy word is truth" John 17:17. But certainly the Scriptures tell us nothing of the abrogation of the Decalogue. When Christ came "to the law and to the testimony:" speculations may have been useful in advancing human science, but in reference to the revealed truth of God, they can have no other effect than to obscure that truth, and bewilder the inquirers after it.

**2nd.** I further dissent from P.'s view of the law, because if we Gentiles were never under the revealed law, then all our convictions of sin and sense of condemnation by the law must have been as completely imaginary and delusive as ever a Campbellite represented them to be. And not only me, but Paul must also have been deceived in reference to his own experience as a child of grace, for he says, "Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet" Rom. 7:7. This Paul spoke, as is evident from the connection, of his Christian experience in common with the brethren to whom he wrote. And he shows clearly what he meant by the law, for he quotes the very letter of the Decalogue, that is, from the ten commandments, *Thou shalt not covet.* But if the Decalogue, in the letter of it, was restricted to fleshly Israel in their generations, what had it to do with Paul in reference to his gospel experience?

**3rd.** I dissent from P.'s views because, if I can understand the Scriptures on the point, the redemption wrought by Christ was a redemption from the demands of the law. Thus Paul says, "Ye also are become dead to the law, by the body of Christ" Rom. 7:4. And again – "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us" Gal. 3:13. And further he says, "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to *redeem* them that were under the law," &c. Gal. 4:4,5. If the Gentiles were never under the law, they, of course, were never under its curse; upon that ground I cannot see what part they could have in redemption accomplished by Christ's death.

**4th.** I dissent from P. because I am in favor of taking the New Testament, after allowing for parables, prophecies, and figurative expression, as it reads. Certainly, according to the plain reading of the New Testament, those to whom its books were addressed, namely: believers in Christ, were once under the law. Thus they are represented as

having stood in a relation to the law similar to that of a wife to her husband, and as having become *dead to it by the body of Christ* (Rom. 7:1-6), and Paul says, that, "Whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that *every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God*" Rom. 3:19. This certainly looks as though all the world were under the sentence of the written law.

P., I apprehend, has not made the proper distinction between the law, as given as a covenant and in covenant form to national Israel, and the precepts of that law in their spiritual extent as being the revealed and unalterable standard of righteousness. Our Lord, in His instructions, instead of representing the law in its essential nature as passing away at the setting up of His kingdom, illustrates its stability and exceeding broadness as in Matt. 5:17-32, and 22:36-40. P. also has evidently mistaken the distinctive nature of the law in confounding it with prediction. The law, being the standard of righteousness, showed what was required of Christ to the redemption and justification of His people from its demands; but instead of merely predicting of foretelling that Christ would bring in such a righteousness, it demanded it of Him, as standing in the law place of His people. I have taken the words of P. according to my capability to understand their natural import. I may have misapprehended his meaning, or he may have a turn for his expressions which I have not thought of; for I know some an give turns to their declarations, which I never should have imagined. Or he may cover himself under the position that the legal dispensation continued in force until the destruction of Jerusalem; but that position I cannot allow. But P. may be a person not wanting to avail himself of such a position. If so, I shall be glad to see him correcting, with candor, any misapprehension of mine concerning his views. Yours to serve,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
March 14, 1844.
S. Trott.

From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.12 (1844)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 291 – 294

# THE LIGHT OF GOSPEL SIMPLICITY

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

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

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

For there they exist, the humble followers of Jesus, amidst the wealth, the grandeur, the hurry and pride of the Emporium of the Eastern States, and which perhaps surpasses in these things, any spot of the same size in America . Again, they have on one hand in this vicinity the Unitarian College, called Harvard University, and not far from them the Baptist Theological School at Newton, and near them in Boston, the Baptist Foreign Mission Rooms, and Board of Missions in all the splendor of their operations, and are encompassed with what are called the Baptist churches of Boston, of Charleston, Cambridge and Newton, with their great D.D's for pastors. And yet these Brethren have had boldness given them to come out from all this pomp in religion and to meet by

themselves for the purpose of worshipping God in the simplicity and spirituality of his instituted worship. Then the humble, meek and quiet spirit which Brother Hovey's letter breaths, renders it more estimable, than a million of such Reports of great human exertions, as emanate from the foreign mission rooms, with Dr. Bolles' or Dr. Sharpe's name appended to them. I did feel on reading the letters of these brethren as though I should be rejoiced to visit them, were I at liberty to roam among the scattered bands of my Master's little flock.

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

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

To show the justness of my remarks, I will quote a few of his expressions. He says, "By being taught their own characters and the character of God, they are fully convinced that no mercy can be found out of Christ." Again, "They cannot see how it is possible that God should be just, and yet justify any but those who came to Christ and believe in Him for salvation." He speaks of God's terms of mercy in a way of implying condition. His idea of the failure of the similitude of the Prodigal is I think incorrect. Sinners when brought to return to God in the penitent spirit of the Prodigal, know no more in reality of the Mediator than the Prodigal did, until he is unfolded to them, as in figure he was to him, in the robe, feast, etc. He says, "They are willing to come to Christ and rely upon his mediation and atonement as the sole ground of their complete restoration to the divine favor." If they are willing to come to him, they know not that they may come, till his work is applied to them; the best robe must be brought and put on them, etc. But I will not multiply quotations. A little attention will show that his was a legal gospel, and an un-regenerated unborn, renewed man; if I may use the expression.

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

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

## THE NEW BIRTH.

Brother Beebe: – I received, a short time since, a letter from brother Davis S. Woody, of Missouri, in which he makes the following request:

"Dear Brother: For the satisfaction of some of my dear brethren, who I think do not understand you and brother T.P. Dudley, on the subject of the new birth or regeneration, I would like to have your views on that subject, and what it is that is born again. Dear brother, the reason in particular that I ask your views on this subject is that some of the brethren think that brother Dudley laid down premises which would justify the non-resurrection principle. If you see proper to give your views, I would rather have them through the *Signs.*"

---

In accordance with brother Woody's wishes, I forward my answer to you for publication in the *Signs*, if you think it proper to publish it. If you have any objection to doing so as tending to revive controversy, please so enclose this in another envelope, and direct it to brother Woody, Mexico, Osage County, MO. If he gets the answer in manuscript, he can probably show it to such brethren as he pleases.

Brother Woody, in replying to your enquiries, in order, if possible, for me to make my views plain, I wish first, if I can command language to do it, to explain myself on one important point connected therewith. The point is this: that a person, one who exists as an individual being, may have a distinct nature from what he before existed in, superadded to him, so as to be made to exist in that distinct nature, without destroying his former personality, and yet changing his personal relations into conformity to his new nature, or new birth; for since the creation of Adam and Eve, I know of no way in which an individual existence in nature is produced but by a birth. Many brethren seem not only entirely indisposed to admit the correctness of such an idea as the above, but also to allow me and others to believe it. But if the above position, in substance, is not correct, I am ignorant, and must remain so, of the testimony of Scripture concerning both the *new birth* and the incarnation of Christ; as well as concerning His spiritual headship.

As I understand the Scriptures, the correctness of the position I have above laid down is fully demonstrated in the testimony given concerning the incarnation of Christ. According to the testimony of Scripture, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" John 1:1. Again in verse 14, it is said, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." And according to Gal. 4:4, "God sent forth His Son, made of a woman and made under the law." Now I presume no Old School Baptist will understand by the declaration, John 1:14, that the Word, the Godhead, was changed into flesh, nor by that of Gal. 4:4, that the pre-existence of the Son was destroyed, and that He was made the Son of God of the woman. Yet the declaration, "made of a woman and made under the law," is affirmed of the *Son,* as in the other text, the affirmation is, "The Word was made flesh." What is it then but that a fleshly nature, in which He did not before exist, was superadded to Him personally, as the *Word,* and as the *Son sent forth?* Here then my position is fully proved. Christ is made to exist distinctively in a fleshly nature, or as man, in being born of the Virgin, yet this fleshy birth in no sense destroys His personal identity as the Son, or as the Word, but He remains the Son *sent forth to serve,* and to *learn obedience by the things He suffered,* is still the *Word made flesh, is one with the Father,* is God manifest in the flesh, and brings into His servitude under the law, and in the things which He suffered, all the majesty, power, dignity, and even all the fullness of the Godhead. Yet while His original personality is not changed, His personal relation is changed; from being the giver of the law, He now in *being made of woman is made under the law,* made subject to its demands; and we behold Him in the flesh of a servant under it, a *minister of the circumcision, come to minister, and not to be ministered unto.* So I understand Christ's existing in the beginning, as the only begotten of the Father, as the production of God, or the beginning of the creation of God, in that *life* which *is the light of men,* and which constitutes Him the *Head of His church,* the *life* of His people, and their *elder brother,* to

be His existing in that superadded life to His Godhead, and which in no sense destroyed His personal identity as God, but that He remains, whilst thus personally related to, and one with His people, to be the Jehovah, the self-existing God. The reason why some have charged me with being an Arian for holding Christ to exist in this near relation to His people, is that they will not allow, notwithstanding the proof I have presented of the fact, that a distinct nature can be superadded, of God, personally to Himself, without destroying His personal identity as God.

I now come, brother Woody, to give you my views, briefly, on the new birth, as to what it is. Regeneration, as I hold it, is the implanting in an individual, or adding to his mind, that *incorruptible seed* which Peter speaks of, even the spiritual seed of Abraham, which is Christ, *Christ in you,* and which is that *life* that was in the Word, *which is the light of men;* for Christ *is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world* John 1:9. Hence this individual sees his relation and accountability to God and to the law, and sees his sinfulness as he never saw or felt it before, for *by the law is the knowledge of sin.* He sees this as the natural man cannot see it, for the law is spiritual. And he so sees and knows the reality of these things, that he cannot shake off or drive them from him as he could former impressions, which arose from mere fleshly views, or a natural conscience. The reason of this is, that whilst the implantation of this seed is of God, and of God only, and not through any instrumentalities of men, the seed itself being life and light, quickens the mind and conscience to such a sense of the reality of these things, that the individual feels himself as standing before a heart searching and rein trying God; and in the ultimate view of this, and of the purity of the law, all his goodness and doings are turned to corruption, and he falls helpless at the footstool of mercy, or at the feet of that God against whom he has sinned. Being thus stripped and killed by the law, he is prepared to be married to another, even Christ, or brought to view in his relation to a crucified and risen Jesus.

The new birth I understand to be the *being born again of the incorruptible seed by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever.* Whether by the *word of God* in this text is understood the essential Word, who is God, or, as is frequently intended by the *word of God,* that which God directly speaks or communicates to a person, is immaterial, for both ideas are true. For Christ said, “Verily, verily I say unto you, The hour is coming and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live” John 5:25. This person being, as we showed, dead, killed by the law, is now made to hear the voice of the Son of God, the proclamation of pardon and salvation through Christ’s atonement. And every child of grace knows that it took something more than the power of man to make him hear; that it came with the power and as the word of God; and he already having Christ or the seed of life in him, he is enabled to receive, believe and rejoice in that word, and feels himself standing in a new relation to God, no

longer a condemned and banished one, but a pardoned, justified one; has peace with God, and is enabled to cry Abba, Father; that is, he feels that God is his Father. Thus in the new birth there is a striking correspondence to the natural birth; to each there is a seed implanted, and then a quickening by which life is manifested. And when the natural child is brought to the birth, the sorrows of the woman in travail, the fetus being broke loose from that by which alone it had been hitherto nourished, strongly represents the agonies and the killing by the law belonging to the second birth. But then there is a contrast in the births. In the first birth the child comes into the world in the image of Adam, an alien from God and subject to pain, disease and death, as the fruits of depravity and condemnation. In the second birth, he comes into the kingdom of heaven, where *grace reigns through righteousness;* has communion with God as a Father through Christ; stands manifested as one with Christ; and having a common interest with all the members of Christ's body, in all that Christ accomplished by redemption, in all the promises of God, and in that inheritance which is reserved for the saints in light.

I now come, brother Woody, to your second point of enquiry, namely: "What it is that is born again?" If by this enquiry, you mean what is the production of the new birth? I answer, the "New man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" Eph. 4:24. This *new man* I believe to be Christ in you the hope of glory; for Paul said, It was *Christ that lived in him.* See Col. 1:27 & Gal. 2:20. But I presume that your enquiry relates to that which has been the matter of discussion in the *Signs* formerly. I therefore answer, our Lord said, "Except a *man* be born again;" and I know not what right I have to suppose He did not mean as He said, did not mean the man. In conformity to this I say, in reference to brother Woody's being born again, that it is brother Woody himself in his whole person that was *born again.* And here is the application of the position with which I started, namely: That a distinct nature may be superadded to a person so that he shall actually exist in that new nature, without destroying his former personal identity, or his former existence. This I illustrated in the case of the Word *being made flesh.* So I understand that a spiritual nature called *life* has been superadded to brother Woody by the spiritual seed being implanted, and he being brought to the birth, by his being brought to live the *life he now lives in the flesh, by the faith of the Son of God,* that is, as before God. Yet his individuality is not changed, it is Davis S. Woody, his old man or nature is the same as it was before, his rational powers the same. And yet his personal relations by the new birth are altogether changed. He no longer belongs to Adam's family, but to Christ's; is a living member of Christ's body; is not under the law, but under grace; is not of the world, as Christ is not of the world; is not under condemnation, but in a state of justification; although he feels the workings of depravity in all he does, it is no more *he* that does it, but *sin that dwells in him.* He is, in a word, a son of God, and a joint heir with Christ to glory; although he has in the old man all the elements that

would constitute him a child of hell if still standing in his relation to Adam and under the law.

In reference to the idea that the principles laid down by brother Dudley favoring the non-resurrection notion, I will say that so far as I have understood brother D., I know of no material difference between his views and mine in relation to the new birth. And the views I have above advanced as to what is *born again* are the only views, in my estimation, consistent with the idea of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints to glory. For I cannot believe that whatever is not born again of God can ever enter heaven to participate in the glory of Christ. Whilst what ever is born of God through Christ, the only begotten of the Father, must partake with Him in glory. Hence if I believed that only the souls of persons were the subjects of regeneration and the new birth, I must believe that only their souls enter heavenly glory. But believing as I do, that it is the *man* that is born again; that after the second birth he exists personally in a spiritual life, whilst he retains all that in which he before existed as a natural person, and in which he still exists in his fleshly life, and therefore believing that his whole person was represented by Christ in His atonement, I must believe that in his whole person, soul and body, he must enter glory, as a member of Christ's body, and as a trophy of Christ's redemption and of His conquest over death. And I can see nothing in this sentiment concerning the new birth that can favor the non-resurrection notion.

Thus, my brother, I have tried with plainness to give my views on these points; it is for you to examine the Scriptures for yourself, to judge of their correctness. Yours with kind regards,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
July 27, 1853.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.21 (1853)
Writings of Elder Samuel Trott
pages 404 – 409

# THE PARABLE OF THE WHEAT AND THE TARES.

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

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

Elder Parker applies this parable to the introduction of sin into the world, making the *good seed* to represent the *elect*, as created in Adam; *the tares*, the non-elect and as such

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

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

Second. *The good seed*; these are *the children of the kingdom*. Verse 38. The preached gospel is represented as seed in the parable of the sower, verses 3-8 & 18-23 of the same chapter. Again, Christ represents himself as seed or wheat sown, when he says, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." John 12:24. But in this case our Lord expressly declares, that "the good seed are the *children of the kingdom*;" and so of course we must understand it. And who are more definitely "the children of the kingdom," than the apostles? As seed, when sown, is scattered over the field, so Christ sowed his twelve Apostles in the field of the world, sending them forth into all the world, &c.; and hence he says unto them, "I have chosen you and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit and that your fruit should remain." John 15:16. And they have been bringing forth fruit unto this day, in the believers and gospel churches which have been growing up from their testimony or gospel. For it is through a belief of the gospel which they testified unto, that persons are

brought into the liberty of gospel grace; and it is through a belief in and submission to the order which they established, that gospel churches have grown up.

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

Fourth. The enquiry of the servants, "Wilt thou that we go and gather them up?" and the answer, "Nay, lest whilst ye gather up the tares ye root up also the wheat with them." We are here to bear in mind, that the field is not the church, but the world; and therefore the direction here given interferes not with that discipline, which the New Testament enjoins on the churches, such as to "Put away from among you that wicked person." &c. It may be asked, whether the churches and servants of Christ have ever had power to root up or destroy the antichristian interest in the world. Not to any great extent. They might however had they not been restrained, have applied to the governments under which

they lived, to put down these false interests and thus have manifested a persecuting spirit. To guard the disciples of Jesus against indulging in such a spirit, this instruction is here given. It is the nature of tares to supplant and root out the wheat; but the wheat yields to such encroachments upon it, rather than having a tendency to root out other plants that get among it. And herein is manifested the spirit of the Gospel, in distinction from Antichrist, as being of a yielding, and not of a persecuting nature. Where we see men disposed to put down by worldly force those, who differ from them in religion, or to use any other weapons against them than the sword of the Spirit and a faithful gospel testimony, there is not the spirit of Christ; he *came not to destroy men's lives, but to save*. In the second place, this instruction of our Lord may be designed to show the tendency of a persecuting spirit; it knows no stopping place short of entire uniformity. It may begin with *tares*, but it will soon attack the *wheat*. The early professing church began with persecuting the Arians and other like sects, but it soon turned the army of Constantine against the Novatians and Donatists; because they would not fellowship the corruptions of the popular churches, in receiving members and restoring those, who had fallen away on account of persecution. So the recent persecutions in our country raised by popular excitements, have commenced with the Mormons and Catholics; but let O.S. Baptists look for the sequel. When we reflect, that so murderous an excitement could be raised against the Catholics in Philadelphia, and that a grand jury taken from that intelligent community, could be found *to excuse*, in their presentment, such excitement, on the ground that the Catholics had provoked it by contending for equal religious rights with the Protestants in reference to the public schools; and if at the same we consider how odious we, Old School Baptists are to the popular religionists on account of our opposition to their principles and measures, and also how far the public mind has been already excited against us by the degrading, opprobrious descriptions given of us by the popular party, we shall be satisfied, that not much more will be needed than Benedict, Peck & Co.'s perverted historical account of our religious character, and that generally circulated, to prepare the public mind, throughout the country, for as bloody an excitement to be raised against us, as was raised against the Catholics in Philadelphia.

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

us then beware of encouraging the putting forth of any legal or popular force for putting down any religionists as such.

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

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

As there are repeated instances, mentioned in the Scriptures, of angels being employed in executing the purposes of God in providence, both for good to Christ and his people, and for evil to their enemies; I see not why we should not believe, that God still employs these invisible spirits in accomplishing those special dispensations of his providence, which are manifestly beyond the agency of man. I certainly need not stop to prove, that angels were employed in acts of kindness, as in delivering Peter out of prison and other instances; but the idea of those pure spirits being employed in executing evil, may not be so readily received; I will therefore notice some instances in point, recorded in Scripture. Their being employed in pouring out the *seven vials of the wrath of God*, is fully in point. Rev. 15:6-8 & 16th chapter. When our Lord said, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve legions of angels?" Matt. 26:53, he evidently intended to convey the idea of their being given for the purpose of defending him against those who would take him. It was an *angel of the Lord*, that smote the camp of the Assyrians, II Kings 19:35. It was an angel of the Lord also that smote Herod, Acts 12:23. The angels spoken of, Psal.78:49, being called *evil*

*angels*, may denote the character of those angels sent among the Egyptians, as being such as had not *kept their first estate*, or they may have been called *evil* from their being sent to inflict evil on Egypt, though for good to Israel. In either case it shows the employment of angels in the administration of God's providence. Any person, who can believe that, in either of the above cases, mere human beings were intended by the term angels, must be able to believe more without proof or reason, that I can.

Seventh. *Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father*. This corresponds with Isa. 30:26, "Moreover the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be seven-fold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people and healeth the stroke of their wound." This I think, has special reference to the restoration of the Jews and their conversion; and also corresponds in idea with Zech. 12:8. These texts thus show that the *moon*, the church, is yet in this world to be clothed with the full and perfect light of the gospel, and therefore to *shine forth as the sun*; and so of course will the righteous.

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

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

# THE RESURRECTION.

Reply To Elder Goldsmith On The Resurrection.

BROTHER BEEBE: – Elder Goldsmith's queries touching the resurrection now demand some attention from me, as my name is particularly referred to therein. His first position or query, imports that the resurrection spoken of in the New Testament is one and the

same thing with being born again, or that the impartation of spiritual life in regeneration is the resurrection. His words are, “Now we believe that the whole body of the church were dead in trespasses and sins, according to the Apostles’ doctrine; resurrection is the opposite of death, or deliverance from it; and there is no deliverance from death, but resurrection, &c.” I do not wish to be severe, but really these expressions imply that Elder Goldsmith is as ignorant of the nature of the new-birth as was Nicodemus; for they imply that the being *born of God,* is only the having a life again brought into exercise which had been before lost in death, as Nicodemus supposed from Christ’s doctrine that his natural life must be a second time brought into existence. The natural and scriptural import of the word *resurrection* being that of reinstating in a life which had been lost in death; so also the word *raised* as used in reference to the dead, as in the case of Lazarus, John 11:23-25; and 12:1-9; and Matt. 11:5, also in reference to the bringing up from the grave the body of Jesus, as in Matt. 16:21; Acts 2:31,32; 4:2; and 17:31,32, and other places. Indeed the proper import of the word *resurrection*, is a *revival from the dead*; a *return from the grave*; so also the Greek word *anastasis*, rendered *resurrection* from the word *anisteemi,* to excite, to awake or stir up. Our English word *resurrection* is formed from the Latin word *resurgo*, which signifies to *rise again, to flourish again, to be renewed*. So that the idea conveyed by this word is clearly that of a renewal of a former principle of life or action; very different this from the idea of bringing in a new and distinct life or principle of action, which is embraced in the notion of being *born again*. *Being born* is never understood to be a *reviving up of an old existence*; it is a *beginning to exist*. Consequently, being *born again* or with another birth, is the commencement of a new and distinct existence, not a new beginning of the old existence as was Nicodemus’ notion of being born again, and as is implied in the idea of a resurrection. According to the view I have given of the *new birth*, the Master explains it, when he says, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.” John 3:6. A resurrection does not come up to this idea at all, it is a raising up of that which had before died, a springing up of that which had been sown; whereas the believer is manifested in a spiritual existence, in a relation to another headship. And thus other scriptures describe it, Peter says, “Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, &c.” I Pet. 1:23. Paul says, “Therefore if any man be in Christ Jesus he is a new creature, &c.” “Created in Christ Jesus unto good works, &c.” II Cor. 5:17; and Eph. 2:10. As the texts in Eph. 2:1-5; and Col. 2:13, are frequently applied to the new birth, and as the expressions used, might be construed to import something like a resurrection, though not necessarily involving that idea, I will assign my reasons for believing that regeneration is not what is intended by those declarations of the Apostle. The *quickening* is one in which Christ participated with his people in; and their quickening being with, must have been in Christ. The expressions are, *hath quickened us together with Christ*; and in Col. 2:13, the same in substance. Now this mode of

expressions, is never used, nor the idea ever conveyed by the description given in the scriptures, of regeneration or the *new birth*, the latter being, if I understand it, descriptive of a work performed in the creature. And the idea of Christ's participating in such a *second-birth*, such as he informed Nicodemus was necessary to enable a person to see the *kingdom of God*, is contrary to the whole of divine revelation. But in the execution of the *judgment to condemnation*, upon the posterity of Adam, the people of Christ lay under the curse of the law, or in a state of banishment from God, which is no other than a state of *death in sin*, having lost that *uprightness* in which man was created, and being barred from the tree of life; and thus held by the law in a state of corruption and depravity; this is of course fitly denominated a being *dead*, &c. This legal condemnation, this curse of the law, Christ became subject to, when he came into the law place of his people; not to their depravity, but without this, to the full curse or hell which the law could inflict. Hence the expression, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." From this death Christ was quickened, in receiving a full discharge from the demands of the law, when he arose without seeing corruption; and as he *was raised again for the justification* of those for whose *offences he was delivered*, they participated in his quickening; that is, they were together with or in him quickened or raised up from the *judgment to condemnation*. Although some seem to think there is no distinction between this and regeneration, yet those whose eyes have been opened, will I think on reflection see just the difference between the two doctrines, that there is between our relations to Adam and to Christ as heads, or between redemption and regeneration. This quickening was accomplished by Christ for his people in his own person; hence they are quickened *together with him*. Not so with regeneration, his people are not regenerated together with him; they are regenerated *individually* when they are made to receive the *spirit of Christ*, or the *spirit that is of God*. If indeed the death we died in Adam were a spiritual death, or a loss of the same life, which Christ's people afterwards received from him as a Head, then with propriety might regeneration be termed a resurrection, because it would be a reinstating us in the same life we had once lost in death. And if a single text of scripture can be produced which manifestly speaks of regeneration or the being *born again* as a resurrection, then I must believe that God's *sending forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts*, is nothing more than a raising us up again to the same life or standing which Adam had before he fell, and of course that heaven is nothing more than an earthly paradise. And then might we believe that the whole glory of the New Jerusalem church is seen in this life, and that the *glorious appearing of the Great God and our Savior Jesus Christ*, which the saints through Titus were exhorted to *look for*, was nothing more than his executing judgment upon Jerusalem. Let these believe such notions who desire it, but I desire to thank God that I have a hope that goes beyond the events of this life, as my anchor. But I feel confident that no text can be produced in which the distinctive idea of being born again is represented as a *resurrection* or being raised up; the two ideas,

that of being raised from the dead, and that of being brought into distinct existence as the seed of Christ, are kept separate in the scriptures, by the use of distinct terms and modes of expression. It is surprising that a man of Elder Goldsmith's mind and acquaintance with the scriptures, and withal his *freeness from prejudice*, should so confound ideas and doctrines which the Holy Ghost has so manifestly kept separated, and more so, considering that he himself speaks of the confusion which results from getting *aside from truth and the consistency that is in it*.

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

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

be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain, &c." Verses 12-14. Here the Apostle connects the resurrection of the dead so intimately with the resurrection of Christ, that to deny the one, is in his estimation to deny the other, and to overturn the whole doctrine of the gospel. Let not Elder Goldsmith think this an error to be easily overlooked. Now if it be insisted that the *resurrection of the dead* here spoken of, is no other than the being *born again*, then it follows necessarily that the doctrine of Christ's resurrection, is no other than that he was born of the *water and of the spirit*, preparatory to his being able to see the *kingdom* of God; for the Apostle so connects the two that what is the resurrection in the one case, is in the other. But the expressions here used will not admit of the idea of the impartation of a new and spiritual life; they are, *the resurrection of the dead*, *the dead raised*, &c. Can these literally or strictly mean anything else than that the very identical part which was dead, is in itself the subject of the change expressed by the words, *resurrection* and *raised up*? Should it be asserted that it is only in reference to the resurrection of Christ that the Apostle is here speaking, we have but to refer to some of the following verses to refute such idea. After using several modes of expression showing that he is contending for the resurrection of the saints, he says in verses 22,28, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive, but every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." It must be then that the Apostle is here treating of a resurrection of the saints corresponding to the resurrection of Christ; if, of course, we can understand what is meant by Christ's being raised up, we shall arrive at a clear understanding of what is meant by the resurrection of the dead. Need I argue the point to show that the resurrection of Christ means that the very same body of his which died on the cross was raised up, was reanimated? The disciples had full proof of this fact, as when he said to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side and be not faithless, but believing." And when he again said to his disciples, "Behold, my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself. Handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." John 20:27; Luke 24:39. This then being so clearly a fact that the *resurrection of Christ*, consisted in his being raised up in that same body in which he was crucified, it must be that the Apostle means by the resurrection of the dead, their being raised up in the same bodies in which they died. Again, the Apostle speaks of Christ's being the *first fruits of them that slept*. What were the *first fruits* under the former dispensation, but a part and of the same kind and an exact representation of the coming harvest? What then can he mean by this expression, other than that the resurrection of Christ was an exact representation, and sure pledge of the resurrection of them that slept, and of the same kind? If he means what his words in this case plainly imply, then he means that as Christ was raised, so will they be that are his, at his coming; that is, in the same bodies in which they died. Before Elder Goldsmith can get

rid of these conclusions, and admit the Apostle's doctrine, he must show that he did not mean what he said; an unenviable task. Elder Goldsmith quotes verse 38, "But God giveth it a body, as it hath pleased him and to every seed its own body," or rather he makes an assertion, founded I presume, upon this text. But he certainly could not have noticed the connection in which that text stands, or methinks he could not have thought of a spiritual seed in this relation; and, indeed, I should have thought him too well acquainted with the nature of seeds in general not to have talked of a *spiritual seed* producing a *spiritual body*, &c., even if the Apostle had said nothing on the subject. But what says the Apostle in the immediate connection? See verse 36, "Thou fool; that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Here the nature of seeds is presented in few words. But it is proper here to notice the ground on which the Apostle introduces this and the following figures. He seems to anticipate in verse 35, some man, making the same objection to his doctrine, which Elder Goldsmith has actually made to it, on the occasion of my having incidentally referred to it, without having given any illustration of my views thereon; the objection appears to be, that there cannot be a resurrection of the body without its being raised in the same corruptible earthly state in which it was sown. To refute this notion by plain common sense observations, he brings forward the figure of seeds sown, in which resurrection in figure is an every day occurrence. The seed in its original form does not come up; it dies, becomes extinct in that form, and yet there is in that very body sown a principle which is quickened, and identity of the body which springs up, and this identity is fully preserved in the after growth, so much so, that you have no expectation from a seed of wheat sown to reap barley, as the Apostle illustrates in the 37, 38th verses. This figure, to be sure, falls short, as all figures do, of a full illustration of the subject, but as far as it goes it illustrates what Elder Goldsmith calls *my notion*. The fact is, I have no notion on the subject, excepting just what the Apostle has taught in this chapter, with the further illustrations and confirmations found in other portions of scripture. I make no pretensions to ability to philosophize on the subject, or to understand the *modus operandi*. The Apostle then goes on further to illustrate, and insist on the fact, that the identity of the body must be preserved in the resurrection, though it be raised a heavenly and not an earthly body, by showing that every distinct body must have its peculiarities, as in the different flesh of different things, and also that there may be a difference of glory between the heavenly or risen body, and the earthly or sown body, and yet the identity be preserved, by showing that visible heavenly bodies have their distinct glories, as that "there is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, &c." And this is what the connection shows is the import of the Apostle's argument in saying, "For one star differeth from another star in glory;" a text which men are fond of *abusing*, to support their notion of different grades in glory among the saints. See verses 37-41. He then goes on to declare, not in a figure, but in plain terms, what is the fact relative to the resurrection. He says, "So also is the

resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," &c. Verse 42, and on to verse 45. He herein clearly shows, not only that it is the resurrection of the body, and not of the soul of which he is speaking, but also that the identity of the body is preserved in the resurrection. He declares that the same thing, the same *it*, which is sown in dishonor, is raised in glory, &c. He goes further, he names the *body*, and declares that, "*It* is sown a natural *body*; it is raised a spiritual *body*," &c. How can Elder Goldsmith get rid of these positive declarations of the Apostle in support of the doctrine of the same body that dies, being raised, not in its earthly form, but in a heavenly, without wresting the scriptures from their plain import? Some difficulty may be stated to this view of the subject, from the fact that Christ arose with his body in its natural state, having flesh and bones, &c., as is evidenced, as already noticed from his disciples handling him, and also from his eating before them after his resurrection. See Luke 24:42,43. It was necessary that he should be thus raised, to show that he saw no corruption, and thereby to show that in his death justice had received its full satisfaction for the sins of his people; as it was necessary that he should die in the peculiar manner he did, to show that in it he was *being made a curse* for them. But the peculiarity of his resurrection no more than the peculiarity of his death, affects the general principle of his being in his resurrection, the *first fruits of them that slept*. It is the fact of the resurrection of the body, and of its identity in its resurrection, that the Apostle shows is established by the resurrection of Christ. I will now state what is my *own notion* on this subject; though even in this, I consider my views sustained by plain inferences from scripture. My notion is this, that though Christ was raised with his body in its fleshly state, yet that it was changed at his ascension, to a spiritual body. I infer this from the text, "That flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," {I Cor. 15:50,} compared with this, "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," &c., Phil. 3:21, taken also in connection with the fact that those saints who do *not sleep* at the *coming of Christ*, will be *changed* at their being *caught up* to meet him; and also that Christ gave an example of the change in his transfiguration. See I Cor. 15:51,52; I Thes. 4:16,17 & Matt. 17:2.

One remark more, of Elder Goldsmith's, demands some little notice; he says, "Nor does it appear matter to break fellowship on." I have no wish lightly to withdraw fellowship from those who have been recognized as brethren, nor excepting on scriptural grounds. But does Elder Goldsmith, or does he not hold that any other resurrection awaits the saints, than that which they experienced in receiving Christ by faith? Does he, or does he not hold that those bodies which return to dust are again raised? If he does not hold those points, does not his views relative to the resurrection imply that it has passed already in reference to all that have believed? If so; wherein do his views differ from the declaration of Hymeneus and Philetus? If he cannot show an important difference, am I not required by what the Apostle says to Timothy, to withdraw fellowship from him? He

says, “But shun profane and vain babblings, for they increase unto more ungodliness; and their word will eat as doth a canker, of whom is Hymeneus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred; saying, that the resurrection is passed already, and overthrow the faith of some.” II Tim. 2:16-18. I shall be glad to know that Elder Goldsmith is not involved in this Apostolic sentence; and that all other correspondents of the SIGNS escape it, in carrying out their positions. I wish no break in our ranks if it can be avoided, and truth and order maintained.

I remain your brother,
S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Jan.7, 1842.

## THE RESURRECTION. # 2.

A Reconsideration Of Reply To Elder Goldsmith.

BROTHER BEEBE: – On looking over my reply to Elder Goldsmith, touching the resurrection, as published in the fourth number of the SIGNS, current volume, I find one expression which I much regret should have slipped my pen. It was this, “But really these expressions imply that Elder Goldsmith is as ignorant of the nature of the new-birth as was Nicodemus.” In the first draught of that communication I find there is a little variation of expression, and additional word which perhaps would have prevented the force of the expression being applied to an object different from what I intended. For it is not the severity of the expression that I now regret, but its liability to a wrong conclusion, as though I intended to infer from Elder Goldsmith’s remarks, that he was *experimentally* ignorant of the *new birth*, that he was *not a regenerated man*. It was not my intention at all to convey such an idea, but only to convey the idea that his expressions, in themselves, conveyed as wrong a notion of the new birth as did Nicodemus’ remarks, as I go on to show in what follows. I have no disposition to judge the man, but only to judge his sentiments. Indeed, I have seen nothing in Elder Goldsmith’s writings, {and through them is the only acquaintance I have with him,} that

would lead me to believe that he is not a subject of grace. We frequently hear and see a direct denial of what the christian knows is the essence of an *experience* of grace and also a denial of the true ground of a believer's hope; in such cases we are constrained to believe that the persons are ignorant of an experience of grace; but on the other points, I am far from being prepared to set the limits as to how far a person may advance error and yet be a subject of grace, unless the criterion is discovered in the spirit manifested. But this I know that God hath purposed to *destroy the wisdom of the wise, and to make foolish the wisdom of this world*, and therefore, it is that he doth not suffer even his children to attempt to be wise beyond what is written on subjects of revelation without making foolish their wisdom by leaving them to run into error; and the stronger confidence they have in their own understanding, or that others have in the powers of their mind, perhaps the greater error they run into.

But to return to the subject. I regret the more the unguardedness of my expression above referred to, lest any should suppose that I was hurt of Elder Goldsmith's accusing me of prejudice, and that I said what I did in answer to his views, in a spirit of retaliation. It is true, I noticed that accusation for the sake of other remarks, and afterwards touched the subject once and again in a jocular way, to show that I was not hurt at it, and that my object in writing was not to retaliate for that. The fact is, I felt more deeply wounded, than such an expression would wound. I felt as though, instead of having the SIGNS continued as a faithful beacon, a banner, a kind of rallying point, we were likely through it, to be split all to pieces. A series of communications were being published, in which, although a denial of the resurrection was not directly made, yet according to my understanding of things was fully implied. For if the coming of Christ promised in the scriptures were consummated in his coming to take vengeance on the Jews; and therefore no future coming is to be looked for; then of course no future resurrection is to be looked for; and then when Elder Goldsmith by his queries implied a direct denial of the resurrection of the body, I felt as though Quakerism; yea, infidelity was to be inscribed on our flag in company with truth. I therefore designed and aimed to present the subject of the resurrection in the strong light in which it is presented in the New Testament, in hopes it might lead those who had erred, to a reconsideration, and awaken our brethren generally to a consideration of the importance of that doctrine. That the scriptures declare that a denial of the resurrection involves fully a denial of the resurrection of Christ, and therefore involves *infidelity*; and also that the advancing of the sentiment that the *resurrection was passed*, was not future, tended to overthrow the faith of those that received it. Hence it is evident that this point of gospel doctrine is placed on no ordinary footing in the New Testament; it is declared, defined, and the consequences of its rejection are pointed out with peculiar care. I remark further, that this point of doctrine is presented to us in the New Testament as pure revelation, as exclusively an object of faith, human reason cannot begin to investigate it further than to

enquire what is written; it must at once be resolved into the display of that sovereign power which the Father hath committed unto the Son according to his declared will. The instant we depart from this rule we plunge into error.

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

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

Neither would I wish by any means to dictate, brother Beebe, to you what is to be admitted into the SIGNS; that is, what is to be admitted as Old School sentiments, for error may be published as error, without incurring the charge of sanctioning it. Nor do I desire the SIGNS to be closed against a candid discussion of such points of doctrine, or of circumstances connected therewith; such, as brethren may honestly differ on. But what I wish to be at is, that there are certain limits relating to doctrine, as well as to measures, which, when passed, it ceases to belong to the Old School cause; and whilst my confidence, brother Beebe, in you remains firm, that you would not directly sanction what would be a passing such bounds, I would say, let not your confidence in man, neither in brother Trott, nor any other brother, lead you to admit speculation, as from them, and as Old School sentiments; which are manifest and self-evident departures from, or going beyond the limits of consistency, as Old School views.

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

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

# THE SABBATH.

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

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

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

But again Col. Johnson evidently favors the opinion of those Christians who observe the *first day* of the week, not as a requirement of the law, but as a Gospel Institution; these observe it not as Disciples of Moses, but as Disciples of Christ. This was enough to draw upon him the charge of Deism from all the Legalists in the Country. Such charges, however contain no other proof, than that of a want of argument with those who make them. The important inquiry is, Do the Scriptures support the views of these Christians relative to the *first day* of the week? If the word of God was allowed to contain a perfect revelation of the will of God upon this question, the question would at once be decided, for it contains no direct authority for observing this day peculiarly as a day of worship,

but that of Apostolic example. If any deny this assertion, we challenge proof, Scripture proof, to the contrary.

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

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

Second: We infer that the Command to observe the seventh day as a Sabbath, was not in the letter of it, a moral precept, like the other Commands of the Decalogue. By a moral precept we mean that which enjoins the observance of such things as were morally obligatory upon man as the creature of God, and which do not depend on any express Command for their fitness and obligation; and which of course can never cease to be obligatory and fit, so long as man stands in the relation of a creature to God, such are the other nine Commands of the Decalogue. We infer that the Command to keep the *seventh day holy*, as a Sabbath is not in this sense a moral precept, from the following Scriptural facts: First, had it been thus moral, as delivered from Sinai, it would have remained obligatory upon man, under the Gospel as under the former dispensation, the Gospel not altering, but *establishing* the law, Rom. 3:31. We should also in this case find the New Testament sanctioning the observance of this Command, and the Churches cautioning against the sin of transgressing it, as is the case in reference to each of the other of the Ten Commands. Instead of this we do not find the observance of this Command once enjoined upon the Disciples, either by the Lord or his Apostles; nor Sabbath breaking once noticed in the New Testament, excepting as it was charged upon Christ and his Disciples by the Jews. When therefore we look into the New Testament we readily discover to whose company those belong who are so zealous about the Sabbath.

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

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

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

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

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

Many suppose it is because its literal requirements are equally moral with the other precepts. Of this class among the professors of Christianity, the seventh day Baptists are alone consistent in practice with their belief. To believe that the requisitions of this Command are morally obligatory, and to believe that, "one jot, or one title {the *smallest letter or even point*,} shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled," and at the same time to believe that in this Command, one *word* or day, may be substituted for another, involves a complete absurdity. In addition to this absurdity, by this alteration, the reason assigned for the Command; namely, that the Lord *rested the seventh-day*, is completely made void. Others suppose that this Command was included in the Decalogue, because that, although the requisition to observe the *seventh day* was positive, yet the obligation to observe one day in *seven* was moral. This explanation refutes itself. If man is under moral obligation to devote one day in seven to the service of God; why not the *seventh day* agreeable to the reason given for the Command. This explanation, however is very convenient for those religionists, who think the seventh part of their *time is enough* to devote to the service of God, or to be religious in. The spiritual Christian can never adapt such an idea to his feelings. He wishes all his time to be holy to God, and to be spent in his service. Such will consider the following explanation of the subject, as more accordant with the spirit of the law as written upon their hearts; namely, that as the term seven and seventh are repeatedly used in the Scriptures to denote a full amount or a completeness; so this Command, while in the letter of it, was a positive Institution to the Jews, and a shadow of good things to come to the Gospel Church, had a spirituality in it, like the other parts of the Decalogue, figuratively set forth by the letter, which included a moral obligation, *to wit*, that the *fulness of our time*, or in other words *all our time*, as well as all our faculties, should be holy to the service of God, as the Apostle explains it, "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do," "do *all* to the glory of God." I Cor. 10:31. Hence we see a propriety in its being placed in the Decalogue, as it is like the other Commands Spiritual, and as such moral, though the letter of it being adapted to the external religion of National Israel, was not moral, but positive. Had the letter of this Command as delivered to National Israel, been commensurate with its Spiritual requisition, considering the nature of their service being external, it would have allowed them no time to till their land.

When therefore the Christian, taking the New Testament for his guide, devotes the first day of the week to the exercises of public worship; he does it in commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ, in obedience to Apostolic example, upon Gospel principles. He will not on this account be disposed to neglect this any more, than any other Gospel

Institution. Yea, he feels it to be a privilege to assemble himself with the people of God. As he does not need, so neither can he approve of the compulsion of human laws to enforce the observance of this day, more than in the case of Baptism or other New Testament ordinances.

There is at this day, as there was in the Apostle's days, much Judaism prevalent among Christians. Those who are under the influence of this, will still be disposed to look at the day with *Moses' veil* on. The Apostle's direction is, *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind*. I wish not to offend the conscience of a Brother, whose mind is thus shackled; but I wish each one to examine the subject for himself, in the light of the New Testament. If after such examination, any should not be satisfied, relative to the day, to leave Moses the *servant*, and follow Christ the *Son*; still I think they will not be disposed to denounce as *Deists*, all who differ from them relative to the obligation to observe the day; especially if they attentively consider Rom. 14:1-10; not the *gloss* that may be put upon it, but the *passage* itself.

THE WALDENSIS.
Valley of Achor, Feb.20th, 1833.

Elder Samuel Trott

## THE SABBATH

Remarks on Isaiah 58:13, 14.

Brother Beebe: – Having been led recently to speak from Isaiah 58:13,14, I was somewhat impressed, from reflection on the subject, with a sense of the great extent of the gospel standard, of *holiness to the Lord;* at any rate my judgment was convinced on the subject. As to feeling impressed with its importance, or with the beauty and excellency of *walking after the Spirit, and not after the flesh*, I do not feel as I would wish. But whatever may be my own, or the feelings of others on the subject, an

examination of it, as presented to view in that text, and illustrated in the New Testament, may not be unprofitable to me or my brethren.

The words of the text are these: *If thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.*

By the Sabbath here, I think the gospel Sabbath evidently intended, as there are requisitions mentioned concerning it, such as are not named in the *fourth command,* or by Moses, in reference to the *seventh-day Sabbath.* Whilst a fresh zeal is now being manifested in enforcing an observance of the Jewish Sabbath in a transposed state from the seventh to the first day of the week, surely we who have a hope of having been delivered from the bondage of the law may well be engaged in inquiring and doing what the Lord requires of us, to honor Him, and that *rest* which He gives.

I have formerly given through the *Signs,* my views of the seventh-day sabbath as being typical of that rest which the believer enjoys through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, as shown in Hebrews chapter 4. The text now before us is, in my estimation, a confirmation of those views. They were briefly these: 1st. That as Israel was required to keep the seventh day holy, as a rest, in acknowledgment of God's having finished the work of creation in six days, having made all things *very good,* having given to man and beast for meat that which He had caused the earth spontaneously to produce, thus Himself making ample provision to meet every want His creating power had produced. So Christ also having finished the work of redemption; having brought in everlasting righteousness; made an end of sin, removed the curse, and provided an ample fullness to meet the wants of every sinner, who, under a sense of his guilt and ruin, is drawn to Him for salvation. He, having removed every barrier to this fullness flowing spontaneously to sinners has entered into His rest, having *ceased from his own works, as God did from His* (Heb. 4:10), and gospel faith apprehending this, leads the individual to cease from his works under the law, to rest in Christ. He is further required to keep holy this rest in honor of what Christ has done. As under the law, the Israelite who did any work on the seventh day practically denied God's having made ample provision for the wants of man in the six days creation; so under the gospel, the individual who works for acceptance with God denies Christ's having finished the work of redemption, and is a sabbath breaker.

2nd. That as *seven* in the figures of types and prophecy was used to prefigure *a fullness* or a *whole,* &c., so the observance of the seventh day, seventh year, &c., showed that

under the gospel there should be, to the true Israel of God, not merely a rest of one day in seven, and one year in seven from the toils of the law, but a complete and continued rest from all its toils and burdens. And as the seventh day rest was to be holy to the Lord, so the believer in Christ is to believe all his time and himself holy to the Lord, and not to be satisfied with keeping one day in seven holy. Or as the Apostle teaches, they are to consider themselves not their own, that *they are bought with a price,* and that *they should glorify God in their bodies and in their spirits which are His* I Cor. 6:19,20. But the same law which required the Israelites to rest the *seventh day* from all their work, also required them to *labor six days.* The same law, therefore, which was designed to bear testimony to God's having finished the work of creation, and made *all good,* all subserving the wants of man, and anticipating them, was also a standing witness of the curse that was upon the ground on account of man's sin, whereby man, instead of finding it continuing to bring forth spontaneously for his wants, was doomed to eat his bread in the sweat of his face; thus showing also the curse of the law that was upon man, so that by it he was debarred from attaining to the tree of life, and eating and living forever. Not so under the gospel; Christ having become the *end of the law for righteousness,* and having *taken the curse out of the way,* the believer has but to *eat His flesh and drink His blood* which He giveth, and *he hath eternal life.* Hence as life and salvation flow spontaneously to the believer through Christ Jesus, he has no occasion to sweat and toil for a righteousness of his own to save him from the curse of the law, but may devote himself and all his time to glorifying God, that *whether he eat or drink,* or *whatever he does,* he may *do all to the glory of God* I Cor. 10:31. Do those great Doctors of the Lord's-day conventions, who are so zealous for a *legal sabbath,* know anything of this spiritual rest which remains unto the people of God from all the demands of the law?

After this lengthy preface, I will proceed with as much brevity as I can to notice the several parts of the text. It divides itself into two general heads: First; What God requires of His people, that they may honor Him in a due observance of the gospel Sabbath. Secondly; Certain promised blessings, consequent upon the right observance of those requisitions.

1st. The *requisitions: If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day.* Our turning away our foot from it, as showed by the connection, does not mean a turning away from it in not observing it; but we are to turn away our foot from it, in that we are not to trample upon it as something common, or which may be thrown aside, for our own works or exercises. We are also to turn away our foot from it, in not doing our own pleasure on His holy day. The gospel dispensation is brought to view as one day. *It is the day which the Lord hath made* Psalm 118:24. It is the day made by His resurrection, and which He rules, as He made the sun to rule by day

in natural time. It is holy, in that it is the period devoted to the exercise of the power of the exalted Jesus over all flesh, that He may give eternal life to as many as the Father hath given Him. It is holy to the triumphs of the cross, and to the treading down of His enemies. It is holy as the day allotted to the church of Christ, from age to age, to bear witness to the truth of the gospel testimony, to the power of Jesus to save ruined sinners, to the nature of His salvation as a salvation from sin, and to show her love and subjection to Him as her Lord. As such should believers esteem it. To this end are all the trials and deliverances of the saints, all their joys and sorrows, their seasons of light and of darkness, of temptations and persecutions, made by grace subservient. *Not doing their own pleasure.* The term pleasure here, according to the original, signifies, not amusement, but inclination, will or desire. The import of this passage, therefore, is that as the gospel day is holy to the power and reign of the Lord Jesus, those who profess to be of the Israel of God are not to consult their own inclination, not lean to their own understanding, nor depend on their own strength in things pertaining to His kingdom, but to be in entire submission to His revealed will, and dependent on His arm to save. Thus, for instance, those who claim liberty to consult their own inclination instead of the Scriptures, whether to contribute their money or otherwise support the popular inventions for moralizing or evangelizing the world, are doing their own pleasure on the Lord's holy day, are breaking His Sabbath. So those who consult their own inclination to avoid reproach, by not contending for the faith and order of the gospel, by not bearing faithful testimony against the subversions of the gospel, by countenancing those who do subvert it in its doctrine or order, by meeting and associating with them in worship and other things pertaining to religion, &c., are more doing their own pleasure than honoring the Lord and His truth: they are not regarding the holiness of the day. Again; when preachers consult their own convenience, ease or worldly interest, in their manner of preaching, or in attending to their appointments, or to occupying the field the Lord in His providence has directed them to; or when private members consult their convenience, ease, or worldly business in reference to assembling with the church, and govern their contributions for the support of the gospel and other purposes, not according as the Lord has prospered them, but according as they think they can spare from their plans for enlarging their funds or business, or farms, or from furnishing themselves and family with every desired extravagancy, such are doing their own pleasure, and not acting under a sense of not being their own, but the Lord's. So also when we intemperately indulge in any of our appetites and passions, or give way to a conformity to the world, we are doing our own pleasure, and are not being separate to the Lord. Indeed, there is at this day too much of a propensity among christians to follow their own inclinations, to *do our own pleasure on the Lord's holy day.*

2nd. *And call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honourable.* Call that is manifest that it is their delight, their happiness, to trust in the Lord Jesus alone, and to

give Him the glory of their salvation; to sit at His feet and wait to be led and taught of Him, and to have His word as authority for what they believe and do. If I know anything of a christian's experience, there is a principle within him which, how much soever nature may oppose, leads him to desire not *to do his own pleasure*, nor to have his own way, and, of course, which causes him to be truly happy, as he can feel that he has laid his own wisdom and all that is of himself in the dust, and is receiving what the Spirit makes known to him, and as he makes it known, as truth; and that he is leaning alone on the Lord for his wisdom, his guidance, his strength and keeping, as well as for his final salvation. *And the holy of the Lord honourable:* The salvation by Christ Jesus, and His religion throughout, is a revelation from God, and is therefore as such wholly separate from all human wisdom and creaturely doings, and hence is truly the *holy of the Lord.* If every human mixture, made with the holy appointments of God in the tabernacle service, *received a just recompense of reward,* surely the mixtures which are made under the light of the gospel, with the *holy of the Lord,* will receive an awful retribution. When we, in preference to the applause bestowed upon those who conform to the world and its notions of religion, choose to meet the reproaches attendant upon a strict conformity to the revealed truth and will of God, and to be marked as companions of the Lord's afflicted and despised people, and as separate from the popular religious combinations, we practically *call the holy of the Lord honourable.* And when we, with patience and meekness bear the reproach and contempt thus cast upon us, we show that we not only *call,* but we esteem the *holy of the Lord honourable.*

3rd. *And shalt honour Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words.* We honor the Lord by showing an implicit confidence in Him, in His promises and declarations, and by strict obedience to His word, and not otherwise. We in many cases would obey the Lord, but we do it in *our own way.* Moses, in obedience to the Lord, gathered the congregation together at the rock, and took the rod to smite it, but he *did his own way* in the thing, *finding his own pleasure.* He spoke unadvisedly with his lips, and did not sanctify the Lord before the people. Numbers 20:12 & Psalm 106:33. So we may be zealous to bear our testimony against error, but instead of *in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves* we may suffer our zeal to lead us to *speak unadvisedly,* and to speak language which has the appearance of bringing *railing accusations* against those who hold the error. We may be obedient to preach the word; but instead of being only intent to honor the Lord by a plain declaration of His word and manifestation of His truth, we may *do our own ways.* We too often, instead of losing sight of ourselves in a view of the glory of the Lord, like to attract a little attention to ourselves; we would be thought something; we would be noticed either as bold or as mild, as good speakers, or as oddities, as *sons of thunder,* or as *sons of consolation,* &c. Consequently we find much to lament in our services, as having too much of self in them. So in all the relations which we sustain as disciples, in our

submission to ordinances, in attending to church discipline, to keeping up an intercourse and correspondence with brethren, &c., there is a doing these things so as to *find our own pleasure* and do our own ways, instead of doing just what the Lord has commanded, and as He has directed. We are too apt to think that we may consult our own notions and feelings in many things pertaining to religion. Some may be too fond of going before as leaders; but a great many more keep back from a faithful discharge of duty in various ways, from fear of incurring some special responsibility or blame. Again, in our intercourse with the world, in our transactions of business, and even in our choosing our locations and our course of pursuit, we ought no less to act under a sense that we are *not our own,* that we are members of the one body of Christ; and therefore at no more liberty to *do our own ways,* and *find our own pleasure;* that is, regardless of the fellowship of our brethren, of our usefulness in the cause of Christ, and of the honor of His cause, than in things more immediately religious.

*Not speaking thine own words.* Many professors are very fond of speaking their own words, or of giving their own imaginary construction to the words of Scripture, instead of seeking the plain meaning of the Holy Spirit therein. This is certainly not *honoring the Lord,* but our own judgments. We are frequently too little impressed with a sense of the holiness of the revelation which the Holy Ghost has given, and hence too often take the liberty of displaying our ingenuity in giving to the words of Scripture a turn to suit our sentiments; as do lawyers their law books in their pleadings. This is not what the Apostles did. Paul says, "Not handling the word of God deceitfully." Again, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual" II Cor. 4:2; I Cor. 2:13. We are not to understand by the Apostle's expressions here, *the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,* that the Holy Ghost taught the Apostles any different language from what is common among men. The words used in the Scriptures have the same grammatical construction and the same literal meaning as when used in reference to natural things. But when the Holy Ghost revealed to them a spiritual truth, they declared it in plain, unequivocal language; not in words representing it as human wisdom would apprehend it, but in words conveying the very idea taught by the Holy Spirit: *comparing spiritual things with spiritual;* comparing them with Christ and His salvation, not with the Sinai covenant, nor with philosophy, or husbandry, &c. The *not speaking our own words* has also no doubt a reference to the same idea taught in Zeph. 3:9, "For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent." There is, no doubt, an allusion here to the language taught Adam in the garden when he gave names to every beast of the field, and every foul of the air, &c. Those names given being descriptive of some peculiar characteristic of each beast and fowl. Hence the words taught him were not like the words of modern languages in their refinements, mere signs of our ideas, but they were his ideas

themselves, embodied in expressions. By the expression, to call upon the name of the Lord to serve Him with one consent, there seems also a reference in that text to the fact that the whole earth was of one language and one speech until God confounded the language of the people for their presumption in building the tower of Babel. Throughout the former dispensation, the service consisting in outward forms, much of their fear *towards the Lord was taught by the precepts of men;* they were taught, from father to son, a form of expressions in their worship, which they used without regard to the feelings of their hearts. Such also is the case with much of the language used in religious services at this day; the words spoken are not even *signs of their ideas.* But grace teaches under the gospel that only the language of the heart, the feelings thereof embodied in suitable expressions, is acceptable to God, and the child of grace, so far as acting from grace, is led to use this language of his heart in all his intercourse with God and men. Hence there is a oneness of language among the children of God in speaking of what they know of religion by experience; for whatever diversity there may be among them in their manners of expressing themselves, whether they speak in broken or distinct words, when one hears another declare his experience, he at once recognizes it as the language of his own heart; they understand one another. So when a preacher preaches the preaching which God has bidden him, the believer, from the correspondence which he finds in his own heart with the words spoken, is prepared to say amen. So grace would lead the believer also in his more general intercourse with men, uniformly so to speak the unequivocal language of his heart, that with all who knew him, his yea would stand for yea, and his nay for nay. So in the case under consideration that we are *not to speak our own words.* Whenever we are disposed, plainly and unequivocally, to declare the real sentiments and feelings of our hearts, we have no need to hunt round for words, expressions will spontaneously flow out; our words may be few and not so elegant as we might have found by studying, but they will be expressive of our feelings, and so understood. But when we want to equivocate, to deceive, or hide our feelings or sentiments, we have to guard against letting the language of our hearts come out, and to hunt for other words to speak. This is what is forbidden in this clause relative to the gospel Sabbath, no *labored expressions* to be used in our approach to God, but the *spontaneous* language of our hearts. And in speaking in His name publicly or privately, we are to speak *that we do know, and testify that we have seen.* But in speaking the language of our hearts, we should be careful that it is the language of the renewed heart. The language of the old heart, which is corrupt, may be full of bitterness, strife, and every vile thing.

I now come to the second branch of the subject contained in Isaiah 58:13 & 14, namely: The blessings promised as consequent upon a right observance of the Gospel Sabbath, as declared in the 14th verse: "*Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob*

*thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.*" Taking this subject in the connection, the *if* of the preceding verse with the declaration of this, and it might very readily be taken for a conditional promise, the same as the legal promises made to national Israel, which ran thus: *I will if thou wilt,* contrary to the order of the new covenant, which is I will, and they shall. God has evidently made wisely and graciously the present enjoyments of the comforts of religion intimately to depend on the believer's correct gospel walk; and so of the prosperous state of the church. But to avoid mistake here, we must know what is a correct gospel walk. It is very far from a self-confident going forward in religious, or moral duties, as though we would show our zeal for the Lord, like Jehu, or like Peter when he said, *Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee.* It is described in the Scriptures thus; "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to *walk humbly with thy God*" Micah 6:8. It is; *To work out our salvation* (that is, from the daily snares, temptations, corruptions, and errors, with which we are beset), *with fear and trembling,* from a sense of our weakness, but trusting in the Lord *to work in us to will and to do of His own good pleasure* Phil. 2:12,13. It is; *To be poor and of a contrite spirit, and to tremble at God's word* Isa. 66:2. Hence it is frequently the case that while the believer is ashamed and debased in spirit on account of his past improper walk, he receives some precious promise applied to his case. But I was going to remark that it is quite a difficult part in the gospel ministry to represent the comforts of religion as thus dependent on a proper walk without representing them as conditional, and thus *sowing the vineyard with divers seeds; and ploughing with an ox and ass together* Deut. 22:9,10. But we should ever bear in mind the declaration of the Apostle that the Son of God, as preached of him, *was not yea and nay,* and that "All the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him amen, unto the glory of God by us" II Cor. 1:19,20. The subject before us having a special reference as before showed to be the gospel rest, and gospel day, must be understood as harmonizing with this Apostolic declaration. Therefore, whilst we have no right to expect or to represent that the church collectively will be seen *riding upon the high places of the earth,* whilst she does not rightly honor the Lord and His Sabbath, but *finds her own pleasure, and does her own ways;* nor that individual churches will be in a truly flourishing and exalted state, enjoying the manifestation of the Spirit's presence among them, whilst the members thereof are consulting more their own worldly interests and comforts than honoring of the Lord and His truth, and a doing of His ways. Whilst they are going after a covetousness instead of manifesting a fellowship for the gospel, by contributing freely for its support, as the Lord *has prospered them,* and for the support of them that preach it, and by a regular attendance upon it, and a steadfast adherence to it, how can they expect it to be blessed to them for their increase, and for their being built up in the truth and consolations thereof? Neither that we as individual christians or as preachers, can expect to find our evidences bright, or the promises of God our support, whilst we are

indulging in our corruptions, are going after the world, neglecting our privileges, and an attendance upon our religious exercises, or performing them as a lifeless task. And whilst we as preachers ought, perhaps more than we have done, to enforce upon the churches and the brethren the importance of honoring the Lord, and His *holy day,* by close observance of all that He has enjoined upon His people, and as individual members should exhort one another to *love and good works,* and to hold out to one another the encouragements which the word gives to a faithful discharge of duty; yet we have no right to tell the churches and the saints, neither can we, if led by the Spirit, that the increase of the churches, the prosperity and triumph of Zion, the steadfastness of the saints or their growth in grace, or any other blessings promised are subject to their exertions, or neglect; that by their own efforts they can forward the promises of God, or by their neglect they can retard them. We can, if left to ourselves, bring darkness upon our own souls, and disorder into the church; but the Lord alone can restore life and order to the churches, and comfort to our souls; and this He will do at His own pleasure, and prepare our hearts to look to Him for it. The blessing must come from Him; the blame is ours. So far from our being able, from any efforts of ours, to raise the churches from their present low and trodden down estate, it is more than probable that were it the Lord's pleasure now to revive His work in His churches, and the graces of His Spirit in the saints, their trials and their persecutions would in the same proportion be increased. But in this case, the saints would be better prepared to bear those trials with christian meekness and patience, and thus more to honor the Lord under them. And indeed if we felt right, I think we should feel that if we could but honor the Lord we should have but little choice, whether it was on the *mount* or in the fire.

Should it be asked, then, What are we to do with the *if* in this passage? I answer, the text is a prophetic promise concerning Zion, and looks forward to the period when the church shall have been delivered from all those corruptions which have crept into her through the influence of anti-christ, marring her beauty and her peace, and bringing coldness upon her. The prophesy embraces in it this purging of the churches, and a bringing them back to an entire subjection to the gospel, and an entire resting in Christ, as well as the exaltation of Zion. And the *if* teaches that whilst the churches and saints are found trampling upon the Lord's Sabbath, *finding their own pleasure, and doing their own ways,* they may not expect to witness that exalted state of the church herein promised. On the other hand, it teaches that when the churches shall be restored to the purity of gospel doctrine and practice, and as we see them thus restored, we may confidently look for the downfall of the *man of sin,* the breaking to pieces, *like the chaff of the summer threshing floor,* the four great monarchies of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, in their present subdivisions and intermixtures of iron and clay; and for the church and gospel of Christ to fill the whole earth. The blessings promised in the prophecy are, 1st. *Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord.* The experience of the children of God, if I

am not mistaken, shows that we cannot delight ourselves in the Lord and in the world both at the same time, that if our delight is in the world and the things of the world, though we may have some remembrance of the Lord's excellency, and of His love and mercy to our souls, some little reviving at times under preaching, &c., of our remembrance of Him, and some momentary seasons in which we feel our hearts drawn off from the world to delight in Him, yet the main current of our desire will be after the world, in one shape or another; even our prayers will show the object of our delight. On the other hand, when our delight is in the Lord, as when we were first brought into gospel liberty, and perhaps at some other special moments, the world, with all its concerns, appears as vanity itself; we can then cheerfully let them all go, having the Lord for our portion, it is enough. So frequently with the saints when about to depart; their delight is so in the Lord, that their having to leave the world is to them no loss, they anticipate the event as joyful. I will not say that all our delight in the world is wrong; much of it is sinful, vile, and, loathsome; but I have thought that, in our present state, a certain portion of it is necessary, to enable us to fill, with fidelity, our several stations and relations in the world. But it is all earthy, and therefore it *brings forth its thorns and its thistles to us.* On the other hand, the saint's delight in the Lord is all heavenly, *all very good*, nothing in it to vex or annoy, or to cause the sweat of the face. A happy period of the church will that be when this promise shall be realized by her, when the saints shall so delight themselves in the Lord that with David they can say, "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want;" and with the spouse, "I am my Beloved's, and my Beloved is mine." When they can so realize the Lord's presence with them as to make the world and all its concerns sit easy about them, and to view the world as a platform, provided of their Father's goodness, for them to stand on till the door is opened for their entrance into their *house not made with hands;* a stage on which, not to represent the human passions, but to display their love to Jesus, and bear their witness to His power to save, and *to His grace and faithfulness to sustain.*

2nd. *And I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth.* Solomon says, "There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, as an error which proceedeth from the ruler: Folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in low places. I have seen servants upon horses, and princes walking as servants upon the earth" Ecc. 10:5-7. This evil has been for ages fully manifested in most countries, and is beginning to be plainly seen in this. The *rich in faith,* and the *princes of the kingdom,* are being put down, whilst religious folly and Moses' servants are being exalted to dignity. But the tables will, by and by, be turned. The Lord will yet appear for the destruction of the *man of sin*, and for vindicating the cause of His people. His church will be seen riding (a mark of dignity), and riding upon the *high places of the earth,* treading them under foot. By the high places, we may understand both the *high places* of religious establishments, and the high places of worldly governments and honor; answering to the ancient *high places* in which

they worshipped, and to the *high places* in which is *spiritual wickedness* I Kings 11:7,8; Eph. 6:12. The church will be exalted above these, ride upon them, be *exalted above the hills.* John had a vision of the church as thus triumphing over anti-christ and the kings of the earth Rev. 19:1l-21.

3rd. *And feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father.* Jacob is here represented as a father of the gospel church, or spiritual Israel. He was such, in fact, as he was one of the fathers from whom Christ (concerning the flesh) came. Hence God promised unto him that, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed" Gen. 28:14. Secondly, Jacob was the representative father of the gospel church or spiritual Israel, in that he was a special example of God's electing love, that as he was made to inherit the blessings of Israel before his elder brother Esau, by the purpose of God according to election, so the spiritual Israel was preferred before the elder brother, national Israel, to the blessings of the Messiah. And so of the saints severally, being preferred according to their being chosen in Christ, and not according to their creation in Adam, and the elder or first manifested. Thirdly, Jacob was such to the gospel church in being made a special object of God's overruling providence and care, as an example for the encouragement of the saints in all after ages to *commit their ways unto the Lord, and to wait patiently for Him;* so that God in His promises unto Christ and to His church repeatedly declares Himself as the God of Jacob. See among other texts, Psal. 20:1 & 46:7, 11. This special providence was exemplified, first: In causing the law of nature in a special manner to favor Jacob, as in the increase of his cattle Gen. 30:31-43 & 31:7-13. Secondly, In providing before hand for Jacob's preservation and sustenance, when God's judgment was upon the land in the seven years famine, and in overruling the wicked intent of his sons, for the accomplishment of this object, as well as that of Potiphar's wife Gen. 45:4-1 1 1. Thirdly, In causing even his family afflictions to work for his good. Fourthly, In restraining the wrath of men against him, so that they should not hurt him; as in the case of Laban, Gen. 3 1:24, 42; in the case of the Shemites, Gen. 35:5; and of Esau. Fifthly, In God's imparting to him from time to time special manifestations of the angels of God as God's host, thus encouraging him to seek a meeting with Esau Gen. 32:1-5.

Surely in this history of God's dealings with Jacob, the saints may see exemplified how "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose." Whilst others with their Canaanitish and Ishmaelitish wives may dwell at ease in the *fat* of the land, those who are called of God, in all their wanderings and pilgrimages, are better provided for in having the God of Jacob for their help. By *the heritage of Jacob* with which the church and saints of God are to be *fed* we may understand, both that providential care which God exercised towards Jacob as above exemplified, and that blessing which he inherited from his father Isaac, as preferred before Esau, namely: "God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of

the earth, and the plenty of corn and wine: Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee; be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee; cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee" Gen. 27:28,29. Moses, describing the land of Canaan, says – "It is not as the land of Egypt from whence ye came out, where thou sowest thy seed and wateredst it with thy foot, like a garden of herbs," &c. Deut. 11:10. He refers here to the case of Egypt where they have no rain, that they have to dig pits, &c., in which water may remain from the annual overflowing of the Nile; with this they watered their seeds, raising it by buckets frequently worked by treadwheels. But the blessing of Jacob was the *dew of heaven* which descends without the labor of man, and distils, softly moistening and softening the earth, not washing and hardening the ground as do beating rains. Again: Moses says in his song (Deut. 32:2), "My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herbs, &c." There is much of *watering* the seed planted, *with the* children of God; but a full supply to the churches, and to the saints individually, of the *bread and consolation* of the gospel. So of the other branches of this heritage. *People and nations,* instead of oppressing and persecuting the church, as they have done from the dawn of the gospel day to this hour, will serve her and bow down to her. And *her mother's sons,* those leaders who, departing from the faith of the gospel and from the church in her order, have introduced systems of their own, and drawn away disciples after them. These, instead of glorying over the church as they *now* do, boasting of their popularity, will be humbled and brought down, and their systems given to *the moles and to the bats* when anti-christ goes down. These false teachers are not Christ's seed, but only the sons of the church; as they were brought into a profession of faith in the church, and then *went out from it, because not of it.* See Acts 20:30. *Cursed be every one that curs eth thee; and blessed be he that blesseth thee.* All who have received the *mark of the beast,* and therefore united with that interest in opposing and reproaching the gospel and gospel church, are under the curse that is denounced against such, and *shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God,* &c. Rev. 14:9,10. Whilst he that blessed the true church, acknowledging her as the church of Christ, and her doctrine as the doctrine of Christ, and being thus kept from worshipping the beast, will be kept also from the judgment that awaits it, and afterwards be brought to experience the blessings of the gospel, because his *name is written in the book of life of the Lomb slain from the foundation of the world.* See Rev. 13:8. The declaration before us is that the Lord *will feed* the church with the heritage of Jacob, &c. This is different from God's dealing with national Israel in giving them the land in possession, and which they again lost. *Feeding* implies administering from time to time to the present want, as the manna was distilled daily upon the camp of Israel. The church and saints are not to be, neither have they ever been, as is the Arminian in his estimation, like a child that can run to the cup-board and help himself as he pleases, and therefore thanks no one for it; but they are like the infant

which is I constantly dependent on its nurse to be fed, and therefore shows sense of its dependence by crying. The Lord, like a faithful nurse, will feed His people with this rich heritage, administering to them as their case may require, and keeping them sensible of their dependence.

Fourthly, The certainty of these promised blessings: *For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.* Even Balaam testified that, “God is not a man that He should lie, neither the son of man that He should repent: hath He said, and shall He not do it? or hath He spoken and shall He not make it good?” Num. 23:19. Yes, as He has spoken, so He will make it good; and that He may thus bless, He will bring the church properly to reverence His *Sabbath,* that is, the gospel and its order, and that rest which it inculcates and gives. I have represented this passage as prophecy, as having a reference still future, whilst it teaches that holiness to the Lord, which the gospel revelation has in all ages inculcated, and because it is so inculcated, I believe the church must yet reflect it. If you and I, brother Beebe, now differ on this point, it is because the church is not yet brought to that full unity which the gospel inculcates, and we must wait the Lord’s time. And in His time I think He will show He has spoken nothing in vain. *Hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good?* Yours with christian regards,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Feb .8, 1844.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES. Vol.12 (1844)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
Pages 276-291

# THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE – Rev. 3:1-5.

PART I

BROTHER BEEBE: – Sister Izor, in her valuable communication in the SIGNS, Aug.15th, has made two requests of me; one in common with others to write our experiences; the other to give my views on Rev. 3:1-5. I have been so much from home since August, that I have not had time to attend to private correspondence as I ought. But I will now give such views as I have on the passage in Revelations, and hope next if spared to attempt to the other request.

I understand the seven churches addressed in this, and the preceding chapter to represent the church in its several changes, and periods on from the days of the Apostles, to the coming of Christ to take his church home to himself. I however differ perhaps from most others; in that, I do not consider the mere nominal church or professing world thus represented, but the true visible church, as professing the doctrine and order established in the New Testament. The several states of the church, as thus pointed out, may probably be understood to be as follows: The 1st as representing the apostolic age; the 2nd the period from that age to the establishing of religion by Constantine; the 3rd from that period, including the separating of the church from the nominal or anti-christian interest, until its location in the *wilderness*, or the commencement of the prophesying of the *two witnesses*; the 4th, the state of the church in the wilderness until it had again become corrupted; the 5th or *SARDIS* state of the church, as commencing with the scattering of the church in consequence of its corruptness, in its being driven from the valley's of Piedmont, or to a future period. I have formerly thought that this church state terminated about the time of the church's having again become corrupted through the influence of the *two horned or second Beast*, and the separation of the church as Old School Baptists from the mass of corrupted baptists, and therefore that we were in the Philadelphian church state; but I do not now believe that the church has as yet, that *open door* which is to characterize the Philadelphian state. {Besides the promise to the Philadelphia church to be kept from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, and try them that dwell upon the earth, cannot belong to the church at the present time any more than in the past ages. For whilst anti-christ still sits as a *queen*, and sees no sorrow, the church is still reviled and persecuted and will continue to be, until the Witnesses are killed. But when they are raised up again, the tables will be turned; then will come the hour of temptation upon anti-christ and the world, from which the church will be exempt, and she will have an open door set before her. Hence I now conclude that the Sardis church state will continue until the raising up of the Witnesses, and then will commence the Philadelphian church state.} We are therefore

now in Sardis, and the message of that church belongs to us; *our work is not perfect*. In thus considering the text, I will first notice the particular descriptive character which our Lord assumes in addressing this church; namely, "He that hath the seven spirits of God, and the seven stars."

1st. The seven spirits of God. One important point of difference between me and some of the brethren in the recent controversy, is that I do not believe that the Holy Ghost in his distinctive being, or God as he exists as the Holy Ghost, is intended by the term *spirit* as generally used in the Scriptures, nor even by the term *spirit of God* in every instance; so in this case I cannot think that the essential Holy Ghost is meant by the *seven spirits of God*, for I understand him to be *one*. Neither do I understand them to intend the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ. But I understand by them that universal power given to him as the exalted Head of the church by which he exercises a providential government over all things in heaven and in earth, and which is subordinate to none, but to him who "put all things under him." I Cor. 15:27. Hence these seven spirits of God are represented by *seven eyes*, Rev. 5:6; see also Zech. 3:9, compared with 4:10. Hence also the *four chariots* which Zechariah saw coming out from between two mountains of brass are said to be, "Four spirits of the heavens, which go forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth." Zech. 6:1-8. By the *two mountains of brass*, I would understand *predestination* and *election*, or God's *purpose* and *grace*, and by the *chariots coming out from between them*, I suppose the particular providences thereby indicated were subordinate to God's purpose and grace, or God's decrees concerning the world and concerning the elect. As these chariots were bounded by the two mountains of brass, so the all power given to Christ as Head of the church is exercised specifically for giving eternal life to as many as the Father hath given him. John 17:2. Hence the Apostle's assertion as above quoted, that "He is excepted which did put all things under him." These *seven spirits of God* being represented by *seven eyes* shows the perfect foresight and knowledge by which Christ governs all things and events. Hence the propriety of our Lord's declaring himself as having this important characteristic in reference to this church state, for the encouragement of his church to trust in him amid all the great and important events that have transpired and are still transpiring in the political and religious world, during this period of the church; such as the church's being driven from her retreat in the valleys of Piedmont and another asylum being provided for her by the discovery, settlement, &c., of America; and the rapid strides of the second Beast to power and in putting the mark of the Beast on all whose names are not written in the Lamb's Book of Life, &c.

2nd. Having the *seven stars*. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, chapter 1:20. Those angels have been generally understood to be the pastors of the churches. But angels signify messengers. Hence, I conclude that if those *stars* have

reference to the gospel ministers, as probably they have, they relate to them rather as messengers of Christ, and of the churches sent forth to preach the gospel, than as exercising the pastoral office. Hence the propriety of the expression in each case, "Unto the angel of the church … write, &c.," that is, transmit to him to be delivered to the church; one angel representing all the ministers of that period, as the churches are represented by one church. Thus we find the several messages apply directly to the churches and not to the ministers only, as is evident in this to the church at Sardis and in most of the others, it being addressed to a collection of persons and not an individual. Also at the conclusion of each message it is said, "He that hath an ear let him hear what the spirit saith unto the churches." So in fact, in all ages gospel ministers are Christ's messengers to the churches, and whatever treasure he puts into their earthen vessels, it is that they should empty it out to the churches, and I do not think that any of us have a right to keep back any of the treasures committed to us, for fear of being butted by our brethren for bringing forward some ideas which may be to them *new things*. Christ's *having the seven stars*, and *having them in his right hand* – chapter 1:16 – denotes his having both the gifts for the ministry and the ministers at his own disposal, and under his protection and direction; and that all concerning them is ordered with divine skill. He sends his messages by whom he will, and when and where he pleases; and that is, wherever in his infinite wisdom he, in his walks "in the midst of the golden candlesticks," sees occasion for it. So that the churches may with confidence look to him to supply all their needs, and the ministers, commit themselves to his disposal, provision and direction. And either churches or ministers by looking to any other sources, dishonor him; the one, as their husband; the other, as their master. But let the churches beware of false prophets or messengers, those who come in his name, with messages from others, or run without being sent of him.

3rd. We now come to our Lord's address to this church state, or to the churches of this period.

1st. His complaint against them. "I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest and art dead;" again verse 2, "For I have not found thy works perfect before God." We have been accustomed to speak so highly of the Waldenses as comprising the true church in its external form, during the dark ages, that it may surprise some that I should consider these charges as having any bearing upon them. But as in individual christians, they generally render themselves needful of chastisement by in some way leaving their first love, before God sends it, so I think of the church, it needed being driven from the valleys of Piedmont and scattered, for its purification from corruptions. The occasion for the churches becoming corrupted in these valleys was very natural. They were in a great measure insulated from other people, knew no other religion than that which they professed, except the Catholic, and that, they held in abhorrence. Parents and children

thus living together as a distinct community from generation to generation, alike prejudiced by education against the Catholics, and in favor of their own religion, it is no wonder that they should have sunken into a formal state, and the unregenerated portion, if they did not, many of them, actually got by profession into the churches, yet should exercise a strong influence in their religious affairs. Hence whilst they had a name that they lived they had become dead and formal as a body, and their work therefore of separating themselves from unregenerated professors and formal worship, to the spiritual religion and worship of Christ's gospel, was not fully carried out, and therefore "not perfect before God." Hence being in this state, no wonder that when Calvin and the Geneva church sent their messengers among them, with professions of friendship and sympathy for them, they by their superior advantages of education, and persuasion, should disciple many of this simple people to Calvin's creed and infant sprinkling. Hence the claim set up by the Paedobaptists that the Waldenses were paedobaptists. Hence *they had a name that they lived*, were members of the true living church, but were as to the great body of them, a dead mass; and their works were not perfect before God, they did not maintain the perfect order of the gospel; did not *go on unto perfection*, but rather into corruption. These complaints against the church in Sardis, are evidently given as the general characteristic of that church state. Hence we shall find these complaints remaining equally good against the church since its being driven from the valleys of Piedmont as before. It is true that those *few* of whom it was said "they shall walk with me in light, &c.," who had known the truth experimentally or spiritually, and were preserved from the general destruction of that people, being driven from their valleys, wandered over the various Protestant countries of Europe, hoping to be protected, as Protestants, particularly Calvinists had appeared to take so much interest in their behalf, but as wherever they went, they were constrained to bear their testimony to the truth, and that to the simple gospel truth as they had received it from the Scriptures, and to believers' baptism; they soon drew down upon them persecution from the Protestants. In England in particular, although persecuted, the members discipled to the truth and order of the gospel increased, and among these were some learned men, and others who were impatient of persecution and who persuaded the body of these Waldenses, or Lollards, or Baptists, as they were called, to associate together in associations, and to put forth as their united belief a Confession of their faith, as a protection against persecutions; and further took steps to have schools established in order to educate men for the ministry, &c. But in these Articles of Faith, they still professed believers' baptism as the only gospel baptism, how then could this course screen them from persecution? 1st. They had before, in common with the Baptists in Germany, been charged with Arianism and many other monstrous ideas, but now with Calvin adopting the substance of the Nicene Creed, and Calvin's views generally of doctrine, they showed that they were with the Presbyterians in doctrine, and hence were known as Calvinistic Baptists. 2nd. By

forming associations they were enabled more fully to show their numbers and increase, and the men of influence they had among them, and thus to show they were not so despicable a class as they had been held to be. 3rd. By establishing schools of learning and taking care to have learned ministers among them; they obviated the charge of ignorance made against them. Hence whilst Mosheim in his Ecclesiastical History speaks with the utmost contempt of what he terms the Ana-Baptists on the continent, he exempts the Particular Baptists of England from this censure, and speaks of their doctrine and order with commendation and that "their community is ruled by men *eminent for piety and learning*." Cent. 15th, Sect.3, Part 2D. These Articles of Faith became through their associations a test of fellowship, and were adopted by most of the Baptists in this country as such. I have no doubt that our churches and brethren mostly have held on to these Articles, &c., as necessity safeguards against the introduction of error and carnal professors among them; but experience has undeniably proved that instead of being safeguards they were no other, than *sheeps clothing*, ready made, for *wolves* to put on. This may appear harsh; but where is there the O.S. Baptist who was such thirty or even twenty years ago, who does not remember the annoyance he used to experience at seeing churches, and ministers, coming forward and claiming fellowship and seats in associations, upon the ground of their holding to the Baptist Confession of Faith, when it was known that they were bitterly opposed to those ministers who preached experimentally the doctrine set forth in that same Confession, and were preaching and countenancing a system of doctrine opposite to it. And did the grievance wax worse, until a majority of the churches and associations of the Baptist denomination had become completely leavened with this deception of carrying one Confession of Faith in their letters to the associations, and another into the pulpits, and on their tongues generally; until the Old School Baptists had to come out from this deceptive and dead mass by the skin of their teeth?

Can there then be any doubt as to the Baptist denomination, that *their work was not perfect before God*, and that whilst they had a *name* as the living or visible church of Christ, they were collectively a dead mass?

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., Dec.5, 1850.

# THE SARDIS CHURCH STATE – Rev. 3:1-5.

PART II

BROTHER BEEBE: – In the former Number, I briefly stated the history of the Sardis church state, from the scattering of the Waldenses to the separation of the Old School from the New School Baptists. The enquiry will arise, whether the work of the Old School in separating from the corruptions among the Baptists, was a *perfect work before God*; and whether they came out altogether a living body? I think not, for we are yet in Sardis, and the complaint still stands against us. The fact is that as Rachel in leaving her father to go with Jacob to Isaac, in the land of promise, took with her the images or gods of her father, so the Old School Baptists have brought out with them customs established by their fathers, such as Confessions of Faith and Associations; and they can make no better plea for them, than Rachel made to hide those she had stolen and which involved in it an acknowledgement of present barrenness. Excuse me for the reference, "For whatever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through faith and comfort of the Scriptures – {not of men's productions} – might have hope." Rom. 15:4. Whether these things will have any less evil effect among the Old School in the end, than they had among the Baptists formerly, is difficult to say. But generally it may be assumed that like causes under similar circumstances, will produce like effects. It is true we have no schools among us for educating young men for the ministry, and have as yet made no move toward it. Our associations appear pretty well guarded against any encroachment of power over the churches, but not more so than were the constitutions of the early associations among the Baptists. The fact is, let there be in an association one or two leading brethren, who have obtained the confidence of the churches, and let there be in them, a secret, but governing hankering either for popularity, or for power over the churches and with the advantages of the associational compact, they will lead the churches into bondage before they are aware that their safeguards have been encroached upon; as past experience abundantly shows. As to written Confessions of Faith, they are what they ever have been from the day that Constantine's Council first established one at Nice, until the present moment; a ground for persecuting in one way or other, all who dared honestly to enquire for themselves on the several points embraced, and were thereby led to differ from them, even in expression. But the images or gods were all given up to Jacob before he went up to Bethel, *the house of God*, and hid under an oak in Shechem. So before the visible church will again be truly distinguished as the *house of God*, all these devices of men will be

given up, by Rachel, or the *sheep*, as *Rachel* signifies. Rachel also died whilst in travail with her last son. So I think before the raising up again, the two Witnesses, even the Old School Baptist Church in its form and present organization will die. And the Witnesses that are raised will be indeed *a man child*; a *Benoni*, a son of the church's sorrow in her last persecution, in the killing of the Witnesses; a Benjamin, the son of Jacob's right hand, but left handed men that can sling stones at an hair's breath and not miss. They will rule all nations with a rod of iron, beating down everything that is in opposition to the truth and order of the gospel. See Gen. 35:4 & 18, Judges 20:16 & Rev. 12:5.

I have showed how that the works of the Waldenses, and of the Baptists were not perfect, and how they were *dead*, &c., and have glanced at the same complaints as standing against the Old School Baptists; but I wish to offer a few more remarks on these points with particular reference to the Old School Baptists.

First: I cannot think our work is perfect before God until we come explicitly to his standard. And this certainly is not, and will not be the case, so long as we adhere to the productions of men, {as are the Articles of Faith,} as a more correct delineation of God's truth, and a more perfect test of truth and error, or discrimination between them, than are the Scriptures, which are God's own revelation on the subject. As to *being dead whilst we have a name to live as the church of Christ*; I have a hope that the great body of the Old School Baptists are not at this time a *dead mass*, but as before remarked I see not why the same causes may not produce the same effects among us, as they produced formerly in the Baptist denomination. We have the same elements of death among us as were among them, for whilst we profess to receive the Scriptures as a perfect standard of truth and order, a great majority perhaps, of us hold to the Confessions of Faith, as a more convenient, if not a more perfect criteria of truth, and to associations, as an order that cannot be dispensed with. Associations are the creatures of men, and are therefore liable to be used of men for any purpose, and molded into any shape. The Confessions of Faith are but a *dead letter* standard, for it is impossible for men to infuse into their productions, that *spirit and life* which are in the *words* of Christ. Hence, natural persons can receive sentimentally all that is contained in them; and children can be educated in the belief of all they contain as easily as they can in the Episcopal Creed or the Westminster Standards; and we, some of us, know what strenuous advocates many persons formerly were for the doctrine of the catechism, who gave no evidence of being anything but natural persons. But it may be asked, Would the Scriptures be any more of a definite standard by which to discriminate between truth and error, and between true and false believers, than are Confessions of Faith? I answer no, not in the mere letter of them; for where is there the religionist that professes not to believe the Scriptures? *Dead letter* preaching and believing, amounts to nothing, whether the Scriptures or Creeds be the standard. There are a good many of those whom I hope are subjects of grace, that

seem to lose sight of the fact that the words which Christ speaks, are spirit and are life, and therefore that the *flesh profiteth nothing* in understanding or receiving the doctrine of Christ. But the flesh does profit a good deal in knowing and understanding the letter of the Scriptures, for it is by our natural powers that we learn to read them, &c. The *spirit* alone *quickeneth* to an understanding of the truth as it is in Jesus. And the spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God, and therefore he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." God never designed that natural persons should know the doctrine of Christ, he has hid these things from the wise and prudent. Hence, I believe that it is the spirit of the word, it is "Christ in you the hope of glory," that is alone the criterion between truth and falsehood in religion, and he alone who is spiritual, is capable of judging of these things. Set up any *dead letter* standard you please, and you make the church accessible to any one who has experienced a conversion; and by *conversion* I do not mean *regeneration,* natural persons can be converted. Hence I cannot think that the works of the church will be perfect before God, till laying aside all other standards she comes to the spiritual standard. But it does appear to me that the tendency of things among us at this time, is the other way. A quotation of texts of Scripture to support a position, both in preaching and in writing, with a mere reference to the sound of the words, without considering the idea intended by the Holy Ghost to be conveyed thereby is too common. The Scriptures may be more readily, and more deceptively perverted by quoting them in false connection; than in any other way.

Second: I come to Christ's words of commendation and promise concerning a few in Sardis.

1st. "Thou hast a few names, even in Sardis, which have not defiled their garments." This expression, *even in Sardis*, shows the church is here described, to be in her lowest state, unless perhaps the Laodicean may be worse. There were those among the Waldenses, who were experimentally established in the truth and order of the gospel, and who therefore could not be persuaded by Calvin's missionaries, nor driven by the severe persecutions of the Papists, to depart therefrom. These therefore did not corrupt their profession by a departure therefrom, nor defile their garments by an intercourse with the *Mother of Harlots*, or with any of the Protestant daughters. So in reference to the Baptist denomination, there were as has been manifested, even in the church as existing among them, those who did not defile their garments, by the corruptions brought in with the second Beast, but separated themselves therefrom. So also however corrupted the church may become as now existing among the Old School Baptists, there will undoubtedly a few be found at the last who have not defiled their garments; but will endure faithfully the persecutions connected with the killing of the Witnesses.

2nd. “And they shall walk with me in white for they are worthy.” Walking does not seem to indicate that resting from their labors in glory which awaits all saints; but rather their travels here in the wilderness. Christ walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, and they walk with him as followers of him. They walk with him in white. It is said of the bride, that; “She should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints;” {Rev. 19:8;} and Christ is their righteousness. Hence as the saints walk by faith, they view themselves as *clean and white* before God, how much soever they may see their own pollutions, and the world may esteem them vile. But again it is said of that innumerable multitude which John saw around the throne, “These are they which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” Rev. 7:14. The washing of the saints from their sins is ascribed to Christ, “Who hath washed us from our sins in his own blood.” Rev. 1:5. But in the other text, they are said to *have washed their garments*, &c., and this in connection with their having come out of great tribulation, and therefore to their having endured persecution. This is what I think is intended in the expression, “They shall walk with me in white,” that they shall be honored with suffering persecution for Christ’s sake. There is nothing short of the drawings of God’s love, that has so great a tendency, as persecutions for the truth’s sake, to lead the saints not only to seek to keep themselves unspotted from the world, but also to adhere more closely to, and more earnestly to contend for the doctrine of the cross, or Christ’s special atonement, in distinction from all compositions, and mixtures of men’s devising; and therefore to keep their garments or profession free from pollution. Besides, their being persecuted for the truth’s sake, shows clearly that they are *virgins*, {Rev. 14:4,} and therefore emblematically clad in *white*. Thus, those Waldenses, who escaped from the valley of Piedmont, and those who succeeded them as Baptists, were severely persecuted by the Protestant States of Europe. So those Old School Baptists that shall be found standing fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free, will have in the end, to suffer persecution.

3rd. “For they are worthy.” Yes, even of so great a privilege. But wherein? Not, in themselves more than others; but in the worthiness which Christ has been pleased to put upon them, in enabling them faithfully to follow him.

4th. “He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment.” John saith, “Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” I John 5:4. Faith then is that by which believers overcome the world. As Watts sings,

“Faith hath an overcoming power,
It triumphs in the dying hour.”

It enables the saint to resist the allurements and flatteries of the world, to face its scorn and frowns, and even its persecutions unto death, with triumph. This faith, which is not the result of testimony, nor in any way the exercise of the rational faculties of man, but is spiritual, and is the gift of God, will be tried in those saints who live at the time of the slaying of the Witnesses; and in a measure, in those who live from this time on, as it has been in times past; but it will overcome, and bear the saints triumphantly through.

"The same shall be clothed in white raiment." This may have reference to the saint's ultimate triumph in glory. Though I think it probable that it has special reference to those who shall continue *steadfast in the faith* and out live the killing of the Witnesses, and their being raised again; for then all the reproaches will be cleared away from the faithful in Christ Jesus; they will be generally acknowledged as the church of Christ, whilst Babylon with all its confederacies will sink under the scorn and hatred of the nations of the earth, to rise no more.

5th. "And I will not blot out his name out of the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Father and before his angels." *And I will not blot out his name out of the book of life*. Were not similar expressions found in other texts, there would be no difficulty in understanding this declaration as designed to give confidence to Christ's doubting, tempted, persecuted ones, that they will not be disowned of their Lord, notwithstanding all their fears to the contrary, arising from a sense of their own unworthiness, and from seeing so many turn from the truth and order of the gospel, for the sake of shunning persecution. But as in Rev. 22:19, we read, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.," and in Psal.69:28, concerning some, "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous;" there seems to be a call for some further explanation of this expression, of *blotting out of the book of life*. I have no idea that the Lamb has literally a book which are recorded the names of his people; but as typical Israel were so regularly numbered, and their names and genealogies so particularly recorded and transmitted down in the books of the Old Testament, we are thereby taught the particular knowledge the Lord has of his people, of what kindred soever they may be. Hence the declaration of the Apostle, "The foundation of God standeth sure having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his." II Tim. 2:19. Again on the return of the Jews from their captivity, there were among them those who were accounted and named as priests, who could not find their *register* when they came to be reckoned by genealogy, that is their register as being of the sons of Aaron, and were therefore "as polluted put from the priesthood." Ezra 2:61 & 62. And this is the idea intended to be conveyed by the expressions under consideration as I understand them; namely, that among those who have a *name to live*, as being members of the church of Christ in its visible form, but are dead will not when their faith is tried find their *register*, or show

that faith which proves their genealogy to be from Christ the great High Priest, and will therefore as polluted, in some way, be severed from the priesthood, or church of Christ. Whereas those who have that overcoming faith which shows their genealogy to be from Christ, will be owned of him, as members of his church, in its triumph over antichrist, and in its triumph over death; or in its being brought out from the *captivity* of each.

Third: I now will notice Christ's exhortations to this church or to his church in this state, as found in the 2nd and 3rd verses.

1st. "Be watchful and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die." This intimates that what we still have among us of a spiritual and living nature are ready to sink into a cold and lifeless formality. May we then be led to watch, that nothing further of dead letter forms be admitted among us in doctrine and worship, and that our churches be not further filled with formal professors. And may our attachment and regard be strengthened toward those things which we have received by faith, and not of men; for those only have life. What we are taught of God *is spirit and is life*; what we learn from men, however correct it may be in theory, is mere *dead letter* knowledge. Let us then pay more respect to experience, and less to the opinions of men.

2nd. "Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard." Paul says to the Galatians, "This only would I learn of you, Received ye the spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" And again, "Are ye so foolish; having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Gal. 3:2 & 3. These enquiries are highly important to be considered by us, in *remembering how we have received and heard*, that we may know for ourselves, whether we received the gospel, on which we hope for salvation, *of man* or *were taught it by the revelation of Jesus Christ*. That which we have received of the Lord, let us hold fast; that which is after man, is of no value.

"And repent." Certainly not of that which we are to hold fast, for that would be contradictory. But whilst we hold fast that which the Lord has taught us, and was received by faith, and which therefore is life, may we repent of every system and notion of man's devising, these are dead; and dead notions work death in our minds to that which is spiritual and even a persecuting spirit towards those who contend for that which is *spirit* and *is life*.

We as the professed living church are with propriety called upon to repent. But still we shall not truly repent unless the Lord is pleased to give us repentance. Repentance he will give to some, but whether he will grant it to us generally as a church and people, or whether he will leave us to go on self-confident in our own opinions and ways, until the troubles connected with the killing of the Witnesses come suddenly upon us *like a thief in the night*, is not for me to say. But indications certainly more and more appear to be that the latter will be the case.

But, brethren, May the Lord, if consistent with his will grant repentance both to you and me, and count us worthy to walk with him in white.

Brother Beebe, I have been led in this communication to dwell somewhat on some points which have been heretofore controverted through the SIGNS. I have not done it with any desire to provoke a revival of those controversies, or to give offense, but simply to give what I honestly believe to be a correct exposition of this prophecy. If any brother not satisfied with this, will give a more Scriptural exposition, I shall be glad to see it, and will not reply in controversy.

Yours with kind regards,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Dec.17, 1850.

## THE SEALING OF THE SPIRIT.

BROTHER BEEBE: – As our brother Mitchell has requested, through the MESSENGER, my views on the *sealing* of the Spirit, mentioned in Ephesians 1:13, I will endeavor to comply with his wishes. The text reads thus, “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, after that ye believed, *ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise*.”

The idea of a *seal*, or of *sealing*, is that of *confirming*, *ratifying*, or *making safe*. So I understand the expression to be used here, and in other corresponding texts. Hence in the 14th verse it is represented as an earnest of our inheritance. The apostle has, I have no doubt, in this text, infallibly laid down the particular steps or order by which a person is led in experience, into the liberty and privilege of a son of God. 1st. There is faith, or *a hearing of the word of truth, the gospel of their salvation*. For the *hearing* here spoken of is only by faith; it is no mere outward hearing that produces trust or hope in Christ. Hence in the next sentence the apostle calls it *believing*. 2nd. A *trusting* in Christ; or a

*hoping* in him, as the marginal reading of many Bibles is; and as is a correct rendering of the original word; as is also *trust*. I notice this change of the word from *trust* to *hope*, not because it makes any difference in the sense, but because *hope* is the term more generally used to express this exercise; and because many would confess that they *hoped* in Christ, when they would fear to say that they trusted in him. 3rd. A being *sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise*, as an *earnest* or pledge of our inheritance. But as important a point as this is, in a believer's experience, being designed to confine his hope in Christ of eternal salvation, we very seldom hear it noticed by persons in a relation of their experience, or by preachers in preaching experience. It is true that faith or believing is the more material point at which a person passes from death experimentally to life, he then *hears the voice of the Son of God and lives*. And belief, hope or trust in Christ immediately springs up in the breast. Hence *believing* is spoken of in the Scriptures as the distinguishing characteristic of a saved one. This sealing is, or once was, not essential to salvation, for none of the Old Testament saints enjoined this privilege, but were all their *lifetime subject to bondage*; as I shall have occasion again to notice. But still this *sealing* is too important a point in a believer's exercise to be passed unnoticed in our preaching, or in our examination of ourselves whether *we be in the faith*; because where this seal is, it confirms the genuineness of our faith, and the certainty of our being the children of God.

The first head of enquiry, in meeting brother Mitchell's request, is, In what does this sealing consist? I have been led to believe that this sealing consists in the shedding abroad in the heart of the believer the spirit of adoption whereby we cry *Abba Father*. I am confirmed in this belief by comparing this text, Eph. 1:13 & II Cor. 1:22, with Gal. 4:6 & Rom. 8:15,16. When this spirit is imparted, we view God as a father, and approach him with our wants as a child does its parents, and not as a servant would his master. We can then see how God could provide for us that fulness which is in Christ, notwithstanding our utter unworthiness, that is as a father provides for his children; and whilst we feel humbled under a sense of our vileness, we can look up to God as a loving and gracious Father, and feel a confidence in rejoicing in the consolation and provisions of the gospel. In the experience of some I know that this sealing follows in quick succession after their hoping in Christ, so that it is, as it were, all one exercise; and yet the parts of it are distinguishable on a careful review. We shall see that Christ crucified as the way of salvation, was the first presented to our view by faith, afterwards a sense of God's fatherly love. But with others, I should judge from a relation of their experience, a considerable time elapses, with some longer, and others shorter, between their being brought to view Christ crucified as the way of salvation, with their having a hope of being saved by him; and their receiving the spirit of adoption. They see Christ as the way of salvation, as a full and suitable way, and in spite of all difficulties there is a hope of being saved by him; but it cannot be for me, says the trembling soul, I can do

nothing to merit such favor. Of this nature will be their exercises until they are sealed. We can know ourselves, only as the creatures of God, subject to him as a legal sovereign, and dependent on him as such, until we *receive the adoption of children*. If, then, we perform our services because it is our Father's will, without any idea of merit or of earning wages or reward thereby; and if we approach God with our wants, without regard to worthiness, or unworthiness in ourselves, but simply to unburden to him our wants and distresses freely, and as depending wholly on him for help, under a sense of his loving kindness as a Father, and knowing as we of course do, if we have faith, that he can consistently with the holiness of his character, bless us through Christ; there is the witness of having received the adoption of children. Consequently, there is the *seal*; for, "if children then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Rom. 8:16.

The second point of inquiry, is, What are we to understand by that *Holy Spirit of promise with which we are sealed*? As the sealing, as showed before, follows believing, the holy spirit here spoken of must be distinct from the spirit of life communicated in regeneration, although it must be in the spirit; that is, that of which we are born in the new birth, that we are sealed, as "the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit;" they are *spiritually discerned*. Hence Paul speaking as I understand it, of this sealing, says, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom. 8:16. Hence also the Old Testament saints could be born of the Spirit, could have faith, without being sealed with the spirit of adoption. That the saints were not thus sealed, but were *shut up under the law*, until the fullness of time had come, when God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law, I think is clearly showed by the apostle's argument on the subject, in Galatians from chapter 3:19, to chapter 4:6. From what I can understand from the Scriptures, I judge that this *Holy Spirit of promise* is the Holy Ghost in the sense in which it was said he was *not yet given*, because "Jesus was not yet glorified;" {John 7:39,} and in which Christ said to his disciples, "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." {John 16:7.} And as He says again, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not," &c. John 14:16,17. See I John 3:1, in connection with the above text. I say *in the sense* in which he is thus spoken of, as being *given* and *sent*; for these things cannot refer to his essential being, or his sovereign acting as God. As God, he always was, he *moved upon the face of the waters*, Gen. 1:2, moved the prophets to speak and write what it was his pleasure to reveal. II Pet. 1:21. It must therefore be that these things are said of him in reference to some special relation to, or manifestation concerning the plan of salvation. If this be so, it shows that it is not his special province in the economy of salvation to regenerate, for persons had been in all ages regenerated previous to its being said; "for the Holy Ghost was not yet given," or *was not yet*; the *given* being a supply.

It is said of Jesus Christ, that he was "declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead." Rom. 1:4. Peter in giving an explanation of the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, said, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." Again, he said, "Therefore let the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Acts 2:32,33 & 36. Thus it was by the baptism of the Holy Ghost that the exaltation of Jesus as both Lord and Christ, or Messiah, was declared or confirmed, and consequently he was thus declared to be the Son of God with power. So by this same Holy Spirit in being communicated to the believers, it does not make them sons, but seals or confirms them as sons. Hence it is said, Gal. 4:6, "And *because ye are sons*, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your heart, crying Abba, Father." It is here called the *Spirit of his Son*, not because it is that life which Christ is to his people, and which is communicated in regeneration, but because it is the *spirit of sonship*, being that by which Christ was declared to be the Son of God, and that by which they are *sealed* as sons. Thus showing that their sonship is in his Sonship, or that they are sons in union with the Son of God, and therefore are *joint heirs with him*.

I have thus brother Mitchell, given you my views fully on the points you requested. I know they are not altogether according to the standards which men have set up. If you find them sustained by the Scriptures, you will no doubt appreciate them as such. If you discover that in whole, or in part, they are not in accordance with the Scripture testimony, I hope you will point out the error. With desires for your health, and for your enjoying the consolations of the gospel.

I subscribe myself your brother in tribulation,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., August 21, 1854.

# THE SIN UNTO DEATH.

Dear Brother Beebe: – As the sin undo death mentioned in I John 5:16,17, has been referred to in the late discussion in the "*Signs*" on the "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," and as I have had some reflections and views recently on the text, I will give them to you for what they are worth.

It has been a prevalent idea that the sin unto death here spoken of was some extraordinary sin, and hence the notion has been general that it is the peculiar sin spoken of by our Lord, Matt. 12:31,32. But really, as I now look at the passage in John, the most remarkable part of it seems to be his saying, "There is a sin not unto death," seeing he has told us in this epistle, 3:4, that "Sin is the transgression of the law," and that the law saith, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them;" and again, "The soul that sinneth it shall die;" and so that death passeth upon all men, for that all have sinned. Sin, therefore, must reign unto death in all that are under the law. How is it, then, that there is *a sin unto death?* Paul told the saints at Rome, Rom. 6:14, "Sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." This text has, no doubt, puzzled many of the children of God, sin having such a control in them and over them, they have concluded that they could not be subjects of grace, or its power over them would have been killed. What is *dominion*, but the power of sin? And what is the *reign of sin*, but unto death? (See Rom. 5:21.) Break then, the dominion of sin, and its power of reigning unto death is destroyed. How is this dominion destroyed? By a redemption from under the law; for the strength of sin is the law I Cor. 15:56. The word here rendered *strength* signifies power and dominion as well as strength. As Christ came to redeem His people from under the law, He was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, I John 3:8.

If we were to understand the devil here, and also in Heb. 2:14, as personating sin in its reign or dominion, I think we should be sustained by the connection of those texts. In redeeming His people from under the law, Christ also brought them under the reign of grace, which is unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord, and which secures that God will forgive their iniquities and remember their sins no more, Jer. 31:34. Those, therefore, who are born again, born into the kingdom or under the reign of grace, cannot commit sin unto death, or sin as a transgression of the law, for his seed, that is, the seed of his new birth, remaineth in him, and he cannot become unborn, or sink back under the law, or the dominion of sin. Therefore, though sin dwells in him and sows itself in outward acts, it is not unto death, for its dominion is destroyed. Whilst those who are not born again, existing personally only as the seed of Adam, remain under the law of sin and death, and their depravity and actual transgressions are unto death, and must be so

while they remain under the law. Here, brother Beebe, permit me to remark that the views you expressed on the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost are fully applicable to the sin unto death, which John here speaks of; but that blasphemy, as before expressed, I consider a different thing.

But it may be asked, how can the children of God, seeing that sin is a transgression of the law, and they being not under the law, but under grace, commit sin? I will give as an answer this: **1st.** John informs us in the text, that "All unrighteousness is sin." **2nd.** That the law, whilst it comes with its penal demands only against the posterity of Adam as such, is the eternal standard of righteousness in the spirit of its precepts. All unrighteousness is, therefore, sin in that it is a departure from the law as the standard of righteousness. Hence, by the law is the knowledge of sin.

We will not come to the apostle's remarks concerning praying, &c. "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and He shall give him life for them that sin not unto death." John, in the two preceding verses, had spoken of the prayer of faith. He said, "And this is the confidence that we have in Him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, He heareth us," &c. Nothing short of faith could give us to feel this confidence, and nothing short of faith could assure us that we were asking in accordance with His, God's will. The children of God, in seeing a brother sin in whom he has confidence as a believer in Christ, knows that it is not unto death; for says Christ concerning His sheep, I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish. And he has the assurance that his sin shall be forgiven, for God has promised in covenant that He will forgive their iniquity and remember their sins no more. Here, therefore, is full room for his praying in faith his brother's sin may be forgiven, and he be restored to the enjoyment of spiritual life. In thus praying for his brother, he manifests his brotherly love and sympathy for him, as well as his regard for the honor of Christ's cause. If we would more observe the apostle's injunction, in this case, and pray for our brethren when we see them sin, instead of reporting their failings abroad, it would be much more for the peace of the churches and for our own comfort.

The other case, "There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it." In the first place, it is to noted here that John gives no intimation that a brother may commit this sin. Secondly, That he does not say the child of grace shall not, in any sense, pray for it. That would be to set aside the example of Christ, when He prayed, concerning those who put Him to death, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do;" as also, contrary to the injuction of Christ, that we "should pray for them which do despitefully use us and persecute us." It is proper that we should pray for such as an expression of a forgiving spirit toward them; and to pray for our fellow men, *for kings and for all that are in authority*, thereby expressing our love and good will toward them. But these are not prayers of faith, and in truth cannot be, for there is in the Scriptures no

promises to the unregenerate, no assurance that God will forgive their sins, and faith must have the word or promise of God to rest upon. But John, as we have showed, was speaking of the prayer of faith; and he, in speaking of sin unto death, and saying, I do not say he shall pray for it, that is, with the prayer of faith – must have had in view the practice which would spring up in the professed church, that of inviting or encouraging persons to come to the church, or to the preacher, to be prayed for, under the idea that thereby they will obtain forgiveness and salvation, thus holding forth that they can pray the prayer of faith in their case. But John gives no encouragement for such praying. It is, in fact, an awful presumption for men to encourage poor ignorant sinners to look to their prayers for that salvation which can come only through the atonement and intercession of Jesus Christ.

This view of this passage of Scripture may be new to many, and it may not be correct in all points, though it seems so to me. You and other brethren can examine it, an dif you find it not consistent with the word of truth, please to point out the error. Yours, I hope in love,

*S. Trott.*

**P.S.** – The sin unto death, which the apostle does not direct to pray for, may have reference to a sin you see committed by one who has a place in the church as a brother, but who you have strong reason to fear is not born again, but is either a hypocrite or a legalist. In this case, you cannot pray in faith for him, having, according to your views of him, no assurance from the word of God that his sin shall be forgiven. Therefore John does not say that you shall pray for it.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Jan.19th, 1858.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 26 (1858)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 447 – 450

# THOUGHTS ON PREDESTINATION.

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

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

As this notice is designed simply as a contrast of my views with yours, I will briefly state the occasion of your communication. It is no secret with Predestinarian Baptists that their peculiar doctrine is represented by others, as making God the author of sin, and as implying that he made the wicked for the express purpose of damning them, irrespective of their character. Such in substance had formerly been charged upon my views of absolute predestination, in the neighborhood where you live. I have taken frequent occasion in preaching to rebut this slander upon our doctrine. In preaching to the church of which you are a member, in February last, from Songs 2:3 & 4, I was remarking on the absoluteness of the expression, "His banner over me was love," endeavoring to show that in no point of view did the gospel involve anything but love; and in the course of these remarks I took occasion to meet the above named objection, as it had been made against one point of gospel doctrine; namely, election, and speaking in a way calculated to draw attention, I remarked that the final condemnation of the wicked was not on the ground of their not having been elected; perhaps I said the non-election of the wicked was not the ground of their condemnation, but that they were condemned as transgressors of God's law. This is what you took exceptions to, and what afterwards brought on a discussion between us, in which you advanced and advocated the ideas that God *made sin*, and *made the devil, a devil*. As I did then, so do I now, maintain that the wicked are not condemned for not being elected, but for being transgressors of God's law. And am I not sustained in this by the scriptures of truth, from the condemnation passed upon the serpent, "Because thou hast done this, &c.," upon the woman, {Gen. 3,} upon Adam, {Gen. 3,} upon Cain, {Gen. 4,} upon the old world, {Gen. 6,} and on, in every recorded case of condemnation to the end of Revelations? As I did then, so do I now, reject the idea, that *sin came directly from God*, the Fountain of all good and holiness, although its introduction was a consequence of God's creating goodness; that is, had intelligent creatures not been brought into existence, sin could never have had a

being. And I did then, and do now, reject the idea that Satan, as the *prince of darkness*, came such from the creating hand of God, who is *Light*, and in whom is no darkness at all, and as the *father of lies*, from him who is the God of truth. To the contrary of this, I have uniformly maintained from the analogy of God's having created Adam in uprightness, and from his attributes, as declared in the scriptures, that Satan must have come from his hands an innocent or upright being. If bother Beebe as editor, and the patrons of the SIGNS generally, can suffer such sentiments as the following extracts from your communications, to pass uncontradicted, as Old School Baptists sentiments, so be it. These are the extracts: "Who was made the prince of darkness to infuse his deeds into the world, whereby causing sin, sorrow and death." Page 66, column 2. And this in the same column; "It was for this he made the serpent, the devil, that old dragon, and he made a people in him spiritually who should come into the world through Adam," &c.; and this on column 3, "Always a devil – such he was made, and such he will be."

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

Yours, &c.,
S.TROTT.
Centerville, Fairfax County, Va., June 15, 1842.

# SCRIPTURE: THE ONLY CERTAIN RULE & FINAL AUTHORITY.

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

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

Now with this general principle in view, we will proceed to notice the particular articles of inquiry. Mr. Dennison's first inquiry is, "Have you any Scripture warrant for formularies of faith?" I answer that we have the following Scriptures as proofs, that the primitive Church was of *one faith*: Acts 2:42, "and they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine." Acts 4:32, "and the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul." Jude 3, "that ye should earnestly contend for *the faith* once delivered to the saints;" and from I Cor. 1:10, it is equally evident that it is incumbent upon the Gentile Churches to maintain the same unity of faith; for the apostle says, "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." From these texts it is manifest,

that there was in the primitive church, and that there is required in the Gentile Churches, a perfect understanding of *the faith* received, and to be *contended for* &c.; but whether this understanding among the Members of the Church was had, or is to be obtained merely by their conversing together upon the doctrine preached by the Apostles, or whether this doctrine was committed to writing for the mutual examination of the views of the members of the church, is not said.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

His last inquiry is, "Where even that for the erection of Meeting Houses, with their *cushioned pews* and *baptisteries*?" As to cushioned pews, baptisteries and other furniture, and ornaments of worldly splendor, we old fashioned Baptists plead not guilty.

Such things, as well as extravagant houses are generally found among those Baptists who boast so much of their benevolent exertions for the salvation of men, and preach so strongly the necessity of giving money to their *benevolent institutions*, in order to *help save* the heathen from *perishing* in their sins. If you believe what you preach, why not sell your damask cushions, costly carpeting, extravagant chandeliers, &c., and content yourselves to worship in a plain house, that you might have more to give yourselves, and show yourselves less conformed to the world. But the evil of this extravagance does not stop here; many of these churches have run heavily in debt to get up this pompous show, and then admit anything into their pulpits, but the Gospel, that they may draw a congregation of the rich to help them keep down their interest. Yea, some of these *popular benevolent* Churches have contrived to cheat their creditors out of their just dues, and still hold their splendid Meeting Houses.

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

Thus, we see that of this mighty catalogue of charges which Mr. Dennison has brought forward against the old Baptists, of departures from the word of God, there is but the one, of choosing Moderators that will stand against them; and even that fails, unless it can be proved that a Church has no right to transact business in the absence of a Pastor, unless there are Churches, who in the presence of their Pastor, throw contempt upon that scriptural office, by choosing one to preside in their meetings, if so they must answer for themselves. Now one word, upon Mr. Dennison's very *modest* remark, "We for one shall be satisfied to go on as we have commenced, desiring to labor, with all our might in the *broad field of benevolent effort*." This *broad field of benevolent effort* evidently is the *charitable institutions of the age*, which he tacitly acknowledges have no other scriptural warrant, but what he calls *authorized implication*. It of course, is not the field which the

Baptists of past ages, nor even the Apostles labored in. This he modestly terms the *broad field of benevolent* effort; theirs by *authorized implication* was the *narrow field of scriptural selfishness*.

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

Farewell,
A WALDENSIS.

Elder Samuel Trott

## SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST

Dear Brother Beebe: – I see by some of the recent numbers of the *Signs of the Times*, that being asked, you have given your views on the "Sin against the Holy Ghost," and that your friend Mott, objecting to your views has also given his. From your mutual criticisms, each of the others views I am inclined to think that the readers of the *Signs* will think the subject is left about as much in the dark as before. For my own part, I think each of your criticisms just. According to your friend Mott's view of this sin, I am confident that many of the subjects of grace in their first exercises, as you showed, have committed it. I did, and Satan charged me with it on the spot, which threw me into a distress of mind, as nigh to absolute despair as I think a person could be in this world, which lasted me perhaps fifteen minutes, when I was relieved by a suggestion being applied to my mind with as much force as Satan had made the charge.

The suggestion was this, that if my exercises were from the teachings of the Holy Ghost, God had begun a good work in me, and, therefore, I could not be left to commit the

unpardonable sin; and if it was not God's work, then I was correct in saying that my exercises were from the devil. Besides, I can see no reason from the Scriptures to suppose that a sin against the Holy Ghost, in His distinct relation, can be any more heinous than against the Father or the Word. God is holy, either as Father, as Word, or as Holy Ghost. As to your views, I have two objections to them.

**First:** God has certainly revealed Himself distinctly as Father, as Word, and as Holy Ghost; although I am not able to define these distinctions any farther than the Scriptures make them, yet they are there marked, though not as distinct persons. This marked distinction our Lord clearly makes in mentioning the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost as distinct from other blasphemy. This distinction you destroy by blending this sin as common with sin and blasphemy in general.

**Second:** According to your exposition of this text, you make, if I understand you, the ground of condemnation, rather, the final perishing of the wicked, different from what you and other Old School Baptists would make it on other occasions. I do not think we need to go beyond the law, and the transgression of it, as the ground of the sinners final condemnation. Where any have not the written law, they are a law unto themselves, Romans 2:6-16. But I think that persons will infer from your argument, whether you meant so or not, that the ground of the unpardonableness of the sins of the non-elect was that they were not born and expiated by Christ, and hence they will infer that these perish, not because of their transgressions of the law, but because they were not redeemed by Christ. But, my brother, I cannot see any special meaning or propriety to our Lord's words in this case, unless He meant to point out a special sin, a sin that is an exception to the *all manner of sin and blasphemy* spoken of in the connection. In giving my views on this sin, I may probably lay myself as liable to criticisms as you and your friend Mott have, yet as I have had for years fixed views on this subject, which I have not hesitated to declare, I will present them for your consideration and review.

**First:** I will say I have no objection to the idea which you ascribe to the learned, as involving in the committing of this peculiar sin, *light in the head* (not heart), and *malice in the heart,* when properly defined. But I do not believe that any but Jews, nor any but Jews of that generation, ever did or could commit this sin, that is, that no others were ever placed in circumstances to commit it. Christ, when. He came in the flesh, came peculiarly and exclusively to *His own,* to the Jews, as His national people. Hence, His disciples, in proclaiming His coming were not to *go into the way of the Gentiles.* In thus coming in the flesh, He came as pointed out by Moses, and the Jews, therefore, were subject to that injunction given by Him when He said: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee" &c. Deut. 18:15-19. Hence, because of their not hearing, God would *require it of them.* He came also in accordance with prophecies going before as spoken by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. And when He came, He

performed by the Holy Ghost those miracles which incontestibly bore witness of Him that He was that prophet whom Moses spoke of, and that Messiah who was prophesied of. Hence, the people were constrained to say, “Is not this the Christ?” Hence, Stephen charges upon them, “Ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did, so do ye.” See Acts 7:51-53. Hence, their rejecting Him was peculiarly a sin against the Holy Ghost. That this sin, in persuading the people to reject Jesus by representing that those miracles which He performed by the Holy Ghost He did by Beelzebub, was against light, is, I think, evident from the following Scriptures. Jesus testified, “The works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father has sent me.” See John 5:31-36. Again He says, “If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin; but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father” John 15:24. In a preceding verse He says, “But now they have no cloak for their sins.” Consequently, they must have known that the works He did proved Him to be the Messiah. So Nicodemus said, not *I know,* but, “We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him” John 3:2. So that it was against the clear light of the testimony of the Holy Ghost that they rejected Jesus. It must, therefore, have been because they hated Him when they saw Him, that is, from *malice in their hearts.* That this sin was confined to those who were eye-witnesses of the miracles of Christ is evident, not only from those texts above quoted, but also from the case of Paul. He speaks of himself as a *blasphemer* and a *persecutor,* &c., and then says, “I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.” I have never been able to reconcile this declaration of the Apostle with his doctrine that *God will have mercy on whom He will have mercy,* only as understanding him as speaking in reference to the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. That is, instead of understanding him, as assigning his *doing it ignorantly in unbelief* as the *cause* of his obtaining mercy, he assigns it as a reason why notwithstanding his blasphemy and rage against Christ, he could consistently, with the declaration of our Lord concerning the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, obtain mercy. Paul was a native of Tarsus of Silicia, a province of Asia Minor, and although brought up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel, that is, educated in his school, yet it is not likely that he saw any of the miracles of Christ, for he was a young man at Stephen’s death, and not many of our Lord’s miracles were done in Jerusalem. And being prejudiced by the Pharisees against Christ, he did not believe the reports concerning His miracles. So that he *did it ignorantly in unbelief.*

Besides, the only account we have of Paul’s persecuting spirit was after Christ’s kingdom was set up on the day of Pentecost, and, therefore, after He had finished His ministry under the law, and to the Jews as a nation. Persons are apt to lose sight of the peculiar relation in which Christ stood to the Jews as a nation, whilst He was a minister of the circumcision, and hence they try to find an application under the gospel, not only for our Lord’s declaration concerning this sin against the Holy Ghost, but also for other

declarations which were made with a peculiar reference to the Jews and to His disciples while they remained under the law previous to His death. But in reference to this sin against the Holy Ghost, or any other unpardonable sin, rest assured that from the gospel revelation we have no authority for believing that under the gospel there can be any such sin in itself considered. For we are assured that "the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." And the declaration is that, "Through this man (that is through Christ) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from *all things*, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." These views I leave at your disposal. Yours in love,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia
Nov.19, 1857. S. Trott.
SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 25 (1857)

## SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS FROM Gal. 3:3.

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

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

investigate the origin of sin, the nature of angels, and the existence of God as Father, Word and Holy Ghost, and alas; what confounding, and what dividing of God into parts they produce by their philosophy and the figures they employ to make a likeness of him. The doctrine of the resurrection also is reasoned away to be no resurrection, but only a disencumbering of a supposed spiritual bodily existence, from these bodies of dust or flesh in which they are thought to dwell, or according to others, it is a clothing of the soul with a new spiritual body. I see by the religious papers, that a new champion for a non-resurrection of the body has come forth, who by his elegance as a writer, and his philosophical acumen is delighting the polite world. From what sketches I have seen of his system, I think he differs not much from Drew on the resurrection. He, in the estimation of his admirers, demonstrates fully the folly of supposing that the identity of the person can in any measure consist in these external bodies with which we are clothed; the philosophical conclusion that the body at no two given periods is the same, owing to its constant changes through the passing off of the particles of matter of which it is composed, and their place being supplied from the food we take, &c., so that if the identity consisted to the body, the person who died in impenitency at fifty years old, could not be punished for the sins he committed in youth, because it would not be the same person. What astonishing discoveries philosophy makes in religion. I am confident there are persons who have not seen me for twenty years, who on seeing me now would instantly recognize me, and yet who make no pretensions to a gift, either for seeing or discerning spirits. Hence there must be some bodily identity by which I should be known. The birth of Isaac, I presume will be admitted to have been from the bodies of Abraham and Sarah; if so, according to this wonderful discovery in philosophy, the promise to Abraham recorded in Gen. 15:4, “He that come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir;” was not verified, because those bodies of Abraham and Sarah of which this was spoken, were not the same they had fifteen or twenty years after, when Isaac was born. Besides the peculiar miracle of Isaac’s birth is destroyed, by this calculation, for if Abraham and Sarah were old, their bodies were not, having become new, and young, not by miracle, but by natural principles. Another objection to the resurrection of the body, is that after its death and decomposition, the particles of dust may become scattered and incorporated in other bodies, &c. If the particles of dust could get beyond the reach of God’s control this would be a serious objection, but from the belief I have in both the universal and special government of God, over all things he has made, even to the chemical gasses, I cannot apprehend it to be impossible with God. The truth is, the birth of Isaac was presented to Abraham in the promise as an object of faith, and not as matter of philosophical research; and so is the resurrection of the body declared in the Scriptures. So much is this the case in reference to the resurrection, that the apostle fully identifies the faith of the gospel with a belief in the future resurrection of the body; hence he says of Hymeneus and Philetus, not that they had overthrown a

part of the faith, or the faith on any particular point, but absolutely, that they *overthrow the faith of some*. II Tim. 2:18. And this broad position he establishes in his epistle to the Corinthians by showing that the resurrection of Christ is involved in a denial of the resurrection of the body, and in this also is involved the efficacy of Christ's atonement. I Cor. 15:12-18. And with propriety is the doctrine of the resurrection thus made a criterion of gospel faith, seeing that it has been a subject of scorn and mockery from the wise men of this world, from the learned Greeks of Athens, Acts 17:32, down to the present day. Those who by their philosophy would explain away the entire dependence of those things which are matter of revelation, upon the absolute and sovereign will of God, and to make them the results of certain general laws, as is more or less the case with most of the systems of men, are trying to give us a mere natural or fleshly religion for a revealed one. May we not then say to any of our brethren who may be advocating or receiving these systems; Are ye so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, having once learned your own weakness and ignorance, and dependence on the teaching of God, are ye now made perfect by the flesh; by putting forth the force of reason and imagination? May we, as also our brethren, be more enabled to sit as humble learners at the feet of Jesus.

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

## SOME OBJECTIONS ADDRESSED.

DEAR BROTHER WILLIAM: – Brother Mitchell's letter in the number of the MESSENGER for February 15, 1854, has put me in the notion of saying a few words to him through the MESSENGER; and whilst I am writing I will also offer a few remarks for the consideration of brother Pate.

In reference to brother Mitchell, I was truly sorry to hear from him of the grievous temptations, in addition to his other afflictions, under which he appeared to be laboring

at the time he wrote that letter. I know he is in the hands of him who *knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations*; and that though he may have suffered Satan to *have him*, so far in his power for a season, that he may sift him as wheat, yet the Lord will take care that not the least grain shall fall upon the earth. I also know that, "No chastening for the present seemeth joyous, but grievous, nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." But that which I wish particularly to remark upon, is the temptation brother Mitchell seems to be under, that because his own mind is in darkness with regard to the present comforts of religion, and because he cannot clear the clouds which hang over himself, he concludes that he can no longer be instrumental in edifying and comforting others, and therefore he will not try. If brother Mitchell's communications had drawn upon him as much opposition from brethren as mine have upon me, and caused them to say as many hard things of him as they have of me, there might be some ground for him to hesitate about writing for a periodical designed to be in part at least, supported by those who condemn his writings. But it is not so with brother Mitchell; the brethren I think have generally been well pleased with his writings. Or if when he attempts to write on any subject the Lord is pleased so to shut up his mind, so that the subject is dark to him, or that he cannot collect or arrange his thoughts, as I know he can do both, when we attempt to write or attempt to preach, whilst such is the case it may be well to be silent. But brother Mitchell when his health admitted of his preaching, because at one time his mind was shut up, or because he felt too unworthy to attempt to speak to the people, would not have felt justified in refusing to try to preach any more.

If he is afraid that the circumstance of brethren so frequently calling upon him for his views of texts of Scripture will tend to lift up with pride, this very trial he is now in shows how easy the Lord can lay him low in his own estimation, and keep him humble. So that I hope he will reconsider this matter, and as the Lord shall give him strength and opportunity he will still let the brethren hear from him, and will give them such views as the Lord gives him.

In reference to brother Pate, when he first wrote his objections to an opinion of mine which I had casually dropped, you were good enough to take up the subject and to say all that I thought was necessary in reply. And when he wrote the second time, it was not because I thought brother Pate's remarks not worth replying to, nor that his arguments were not as good as could be produced on that side of the question, that I have not sooner noticed it, but in part because I did not think the subject, in itself considered, of that importance, that I do not know that brother Pate would be made any more *wise unto salvation*, were we to convince him of the correctness of our position, or that we should be made any more thus wise, were he to convince us of the correctness of his. But still there is a principle or two involved in the matter that is of some importance. 1st. Under

the gospel, Christ is revealed as the *One Mediator between God and men*, hence he is not only the Head of the church, as his body, but is the immediate Head of all communication between God and his people. The New Testament recognizes no intermediate heads, no semi-mediators, as between Christ and the people, however fashionable they are among the various religionists of our day. The apostles as I was showing when I made the remarks to which brother Pate objects were the immediate representation of the gospel church in its visible form, with its gifts, &c. Hence in order to bring a proper representation of the immediate dependence of the church upon Christ, they were called directly of Christ as are all subjects of grace, not through others being sent to them, and the twelve were directly ordained of him, as apostles. It is true, that one of those he ordained betrayed him and thus fell from his office, and as Peter showed from the Psalms *another* was to take his bishoprick. Now the enquiry is, as well as the point of difference between brother Pate and us, was this substitute to the office of Judas, to be appointed according to the Old Testament order, by lots and intermediate agents, or according to New Testament order, immediately by Christ as the Head? If the former be considered, as practiced by the eleven in the case of selecting Matthias, as being established gospel order in making an apostle, then I see not why it is not an example to be carried out, and why we may not resort to secondary means for filling the churches with professors, and for supplying the churches with preachers. If the New Testament order was to be observed in this case, then it would have been the place of the disciples to have waited till the Lord should call and ordain for himself an apostle in the place of Judas; and so according to this order it becomes us, instead of manufacturing christians and preachers, to wait on the Lord to bring in the subjects of his grace, and to send forth laborers of his own choosing into the harvest in his own time and way. So that the point is whether grace reigns sovereignly, or whether there is an interposition of secondary means. That is, as the subject appears to me; it may appear differently to brother Pate.

Another principle apparently involved, is whether the principle contended for by the Old School Baptists; namely, that a command of Christ is requisite to sanction our doing anything as a religious act; or whether we are at liberty to do whatever seems to us right in religion regardless of any direct command from Christ. Now we have direct evidence that Christ commanded the disciples to tarry in the city of Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high; to wait for the promise of the Father, &c. But not one word of testimony that he directed them in the mean time to select one to fill the place of Judas. As Christ was seen of his disciples forty days out of the fifty, which intervened from his resurrection, or from the Passover to the day of Pentecost; and considering the importance of this matter that when he was speaking to them of the things concerning the kingdom of God, that he should not have given directions on this point, or himself to have selected the man, if the place was to be filled out of those who accompanied with

them is to me singular. And to me it is evident that he gave no such command, else why did not Peter refer to the command of Christ, instead of preaching them a sermon from the Psalms, in order to induce them to engage in that enterprise? If such an important work as that might be undertaken without any command to them to do it, why may not other things which seem reasonable from prophecy, be undertaken without any direction in the New Testament for it, such as converting the heathen to Christ, &c.?

Brother Pate speaks approvingly of casting lots in this act pertaining to the gospel kingdom. It is true that lots were appointed in certain cases under the Old Testament as an appeal to God's decision, and were consistent with that shadowy dispensation, in which so much of their intercourse with God was through external forms. But even then there was nothing corresponding with this case in selecting an apostle. In the case of deciding which of the goats, which Aaron was to take from the children of Israel, should be for the Lord and which for the scape goat, the case was referred directly and fully to the Lord, and this showed that in the grand anti-typical atonement nothing is left to man's choice, but all is of God's appointment. But in this case of undertaking to appoint one of the Lord's apostles, they go to work themselves and select *two*, out of how many, I know not by the description. Peter speaks of, perhaps *seventy*, and then in effect tells the Lord that he may have one of the two for to supply the place of Judas; and they cast lots upon the two only that he may designate his choice. This does not look to me like submitting the matter entirely to the Lord's choice, but men appeared to have the greater share in making the selection. It looks very much like many transactions of our modern missionary gentry, in pretending by prayer to submit the choice of their missionaries to the Lord, and yet select them themselves, and send them out as the Lord's missionaries or sent ones, as Matthias was represented to be the Lord's *apostle* or *sent one*. In reference to Paul's saying that the Lord was seen of the twelve next after being seen of Cephas, it is perhaps more than we can do, to determine with precision, which of the appearings of our Lord to his disciples he has reference to, but I should judge he had reference to that special appearing which Matthew and Mark both mention. In which the *eleven* according to a previous appointment of Christ, went into Galilee to meet him. And as there is no account of any but the eleven going there to meet him, I think Paul's using the term *twelve* instead of *eleven* was from that same humility which led him to say that he was the last of the apostles, and that he was not meet to be called an apostle, &c., that is he would not assume to himself the province of denying that there were not twelve apostles without him. Yet at other times when his authority was disputed, he was bold to claim the authority of his office, he could say, Am I not an apostle? "Am I not free? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" Again, he could speak of himself as "called to be an apostle." An "apostle of Jesus Christ, by the will of God" and by the commandment of God, and as ordained to be a preacher and an apostle, and he affirms the truth of his ordination. The passage in Rev. 21:14, it appears to me requires a little

more attention than brother Pate gives to it, for he would intimate that the distinction is to be kept up in the New Jerusalem between Jews and Gentiles, and therefore Paul is not one of the definite *twelve apostles of the Lamb*. Now, brother Pate, you must excuse me, but I cannot believe in a distinction of that kind in the church militant or triumphant. And I do believe that Paul, although the apostle of the Gentiles, is as much honored, as having as a *wise master builder, laid the foundation* as any of the apostles. Paul says himself, "For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing."

Thus, brother Pate, I have gone more lengthy into this subject than I had intended, or than perhaps the subject required, were it not for the principles involved in it. It may be that on reviewing the subject you may see that in contending for the dignity of the disciples, you have in some measure, in this case, lost sight of that proper, that whole dignity which belongs to our Lord Jesus Christ.

However, I have given you my reasons for differing from you on this point. If they are satisfactory to you, I shall be pleased, if they are not I have no wish to be offended with you.

Yours with christian regards,
S. TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., March 6, 1854.

## SOME OBJECTIONS NOTICED.

DEAR BROTHER WILLIAM: – I find by the 13th & 14th number, present volume of the MESSENGER, that brother Purdy has some objections to certain ideas advanced by me in my communication in answer to brother Fisher. His objection seems to be mainly against an idea which I threw out rather as a suggestion, than as a fixed opinion. This suggestion is found in the sentence quoted by him from me. "Thus the manifestation of the justification of the Old Testament saints, and the justice of God in their justification was made perfect, {that is, by Christ's being delivered for their offences, and raised again for their justification as spoken of before,} as it was not to them while on earth, at

least, even if it was to them in heaven, until the everlasting doors were opened, and the King of glory, or Christ triumphant first entered, then they no doubt entered in with him." That is, that the saints which died previous to the ascension of Christ did not enter into that heaven where the saints are with Christ and behold his glory, until he as the Leader and Head of his people first entered in, and was seated on the throne of his glory, then they entered in to be with him, &c. I threw out the idea rather as a suggestion, because it was an idea I had not previously particularly thought of; though when it was presented to my mind, certain texts which I also quoted were brought to my mind as supporting the idea. But the fact that brother Purdy has not been able to bring one text of Scripture in support of the view that the ancient saints enter at death, is sufficient to confirm me that his view is not right, even if I had not plain Scripture to support my idea. For since my mind has been led to the subject it must take something more than traditional assumptions to convince me that the Old Testament saints could at their death enter into the glory of Christ, whilst *Jesus was not yet glorified*. See John 7:39.

But brother Purdy seems also to object to the idea that the Old Testament saints had not the full manifestation of their justification, as they and the New Testament saints have, since Christ was *raised for their justification*. I will offer the few remarks I have to make on this point first.

1st. As this seems to involve the doctrine of *eternal* or antemundane justification, a subject which has been heretofore fully discussed. Besides the doctrine of the union of Christ and his bride or people, which has been more recently discussed, necessarily involves the idea that as Adam's posterity stood and fell in him by virtue of union, so Christ's bride remained under the demands of the law, whilst he, her husband, remained under it, and was justified when he received his clearance on her behalf by his resurrection. So I am not disposed now to discuss these points. I wish only to notice a few texts of Scripture. First, Gal. 4:3, which I quoted before. Who does Paul mean by the *we* in verse 3? We national Israel, or we spiritual Israel? Do not his various addresses to those to whom he wrote his Epistles show that he addressed them as brethren in Christ or spiritual Israelites? If so, can brother Purdy explain this passage so as to allow that the believers, the spiritual Israelites were not in bondage under the elements of the world, until the fulness of time was come when God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law? And could they receive the adoption of sons before they were thus redeemed by Christ's coming and death? Or what does Paul mean by what he says in the 4,5 & 7th verses? Again, Rom. 3:24-26. What can Paul mean, after saying, "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God," by repeating, *To declare* and uniting it by the expression *at this time*, if he would have it understood that

in all past time God's righteousness in the remission of sins, was declared through types, as now through the actual death of Christ? Brother Purdy took no notice of these texts as quoted in my communication to which he replied. They certainly stand for something, and their meaning must be definite. If brother Purdy will carefully examine them, I think he will be convinced that the actual death of Christ was important, and vastly important in the redemption of his people from under the law, and as much so in reference to those who lived before his coming in the flesh, as for those who have lived since. Many other texts might be quoted to the same amount, but I will just name two others. Matt. 5:17,18, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, until all be fulfilled." What can this mean, if the law and prophets were fulfilled by the types and shadows, or by faith, so that the saints were freed from the law and made perfect? See also Rom. 10:4, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." How could Christ become the end of the law for righteousness, {if the law could not be destroyed, nor one jot or tittle pass from it,} without his actually fulfilling it? And if not, how could the Old Testament saints be delivered from it, so as to be no more servants, but sons? Will brother Purdy reflect on these things, and show us if he can that the faith of the ancient saints by looking at the shadow, could see as clearly the end of the law, and the justice of God, in justifying the ungodly, as does the faith of the New Testament saints in looking at the substance, Christ, with *open face* and not through a veil. See II Cor. 3:13-18.

But brother Purdy seems to place great stress on the purpose of God going before. As there is so much of this *purposed salvation* afloat among us at this day, and represented to be of equal efficacy and equally complete with actual redemption and salvation, I may perhaps be indulged in noticing it a little. But I wish first to notice the vast difference between the infinitely omniscient God with whom there can be no future, no past, and finite creatures who are of yesterday. With God, his law was magnified and satisfied from the beginning. But could God impart to finite creatures, or has he ever done it, a faith, that equals his own omniscience? I think not. And I should think brother Purdy, when calmly reflecting on it, would admit that it is the prerogative of Jehovah alone to *declare the end from the beginning*. And yet what short of this, does he ascribe to the faith of the Old Testament saints? If I can understand some parts of his remarks, salvation must be an actual deliverance from the obligations or bondage of the law, as well as from sin, for the strength of sin is the law. I Cor. 15:56. God as the sovereign law giver, could suspend the infliction of the curse incurred on his people, until *the fulness of time* by him set had come, then the Son coming forward in that nature which the law could take hold of, that curse fell on him, as having by his eternal relation to his people been placed between them and the law, they being in him. Hence God could *spare them from going down to the pit*, saying, "I have found a ransom," {Job 33:24,} and give them

a type of that ransom in the sacrifices of beasts, &c., and give them faith to behold through these that provided ransom, and therefore give them hope of final deliverance. But how he could give them faith to believe, that they were already justified or cleared from the demands of the law, seeing that Christ had not then redeemed them by his death, and seeing that faith is a belief of the truth, I cannot see. Neither can brother Purdy point me to a single shadow, or a single declaration in the Old Testament that points backward to the redemption and deliverance from the law as already accomplished. Hence as faith, genuine faith, can embrace only what God has revealed, it could only believe that they should be delivered from the law and its bondage; not that they were then delivered. Brother Purdy speaks with surprise at the idea of the old Testament saints being born again and not being justified from the law and enjoying all the liberty of sons; but Paul speaks of those who preceded the fullness of time when God sent forth his Son, &c., as being children, and yet as being in *bondage under the elements of the world*. Gal. 4:8, already referred to, so that brother Purdy must reconcile this matter with Paul, not with me.

Brother Purdy seems to suppose that to believe in God's having purposed to redeem will have just the same effect in giving liberty, as to believe that he has fulfilled that purpose in sending his Son to redeem. Why then did not the faith of the old saints look back to the purpose of God as the ground of their hope instead of looking forward to the coming of Christ to redeem them? But that such is not the case, brother Purdy's own experience I think is sufficient to convince him, if he will attend to it. Brother Purdy I presume believes that according to the revealed purpose of God, he being a child of promise, his body is yet to be changed like unto the glorified body of the Son of God when he will be freed from all corruption, earthliness and mortality; and being Christ's and therefore the seed of Abraham, he believes it with the same faith that Abraham had, and as strongly as Abraham could believe that in his *seed should all nations be blessed*. Does his faith in this purpose of God, in this case, enable him to realize the change as already taken place? Or does he like Paul and others still "groan, being burdened with a body of sin and death?" How then can he suppose that faith can bring that which is future and existing only in purpose, into present and actual existence? What is it then? Why brother Purdy believes that this glorious change will take place, therefore does he hope and quietly wait for it. So I have no doubt the Old Testament believers, *hoped and patiently waited* for their redemption and justification from the law. This purposed salvation carried to the extent which some do even denying that the Mediator existed only in purpose, until he was born of Mary, I cannot view as anything else than *cloaked deism*. For if for four thousand years men could approach God, and be accepted, without any existing Mediator through whom to approach and could enjoy perfect deliverance from the demands of the law without being actually redeemed from under it; I see not why others in after ages, might not so approach and be accepted of God without the existence

of a Mediator. What is this but open *deism* or infidelity as it is called? But I have a hope that brother Purdy does not carry his *purposed salvation* so far.

But brother Purdy evidently misunderstood me in arguing as though I had represented that the Old Testament saints were not made equal with those living under the gospel, that is in heaven. I said no such thing, and thought no such thing. In the very sentence which he quoted from me I said when the "everlasting doors were lifted up and the king of glory or Christ entered, they no doubt entered with him." Of course fully partook of that justification for which he was raised, and of his spirit as son and of his glory, as much as any who have entered where he is since. So that the text, "They are all one in Christ Jesus," which he quoted has no bearing against my position, but supports it as showing that they were all alike and at the same time redeemed in Christ, and glorified in him. I now come to brother Purdy's objection to the idea that the Old Testament saints did not enter into that heaven or glory which followed Christ's death, into which the saints who died before, and those who have died since the ascension of Christ, have alike now entered.

1st. I will notice his remarks on the two texts to which I referred in advancing my idea. First, he notices my reference to Psa. 24:7-10. Brother Purdy remarks upon this, "Brother Trott has a plurality of doors for the admittance of the old saints. We had cherished the belief that there was but the one way to heaven, &c." I had supposed there was but one way to the Father, and that Christ is that way. But I was speaking of Christ having triumphed over death, &c., entering into his glory, so I understand the Psalmist to have reference. As I only referred to the passage without quoting it, I used the term *opened* instead of *lifted up*, as synonymous. As the Holy Ghost by David spake of *doors* and *gates* in the plural, I still think I was correct in using the language of inspiration on the point. As Christ is the Head of the body, the church; the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all he might have the preeminence, I then thought, and now think he would be the first to be received up into glory; that glory which I understand to be the heaven of the saints. Brother Purdy also notices my reference to the parable of Lazarus. I said, "Hence Lazarus, instead of being represented as being with Christ is said to have been in Abraham's bosom; that is, resting for the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham." Thus it will be seen that I understand the expression as figurative of resting on the promise made to Abraham, waiting its fulfillment in the manifestation of the seed, Christ, if I had not added this explanatory remark, but merely quoted the expression of Christ. I cannot but think the remark of brother Purdy was rather ill aimed, – "Ah! One saint resting in the bosom of another saint," because the language was the language of the Son of God, not mine. The idea of brother Purdy, that Abraham is here mentioned as figurative of the Father and Lazarus of the Son, is not only to me strange, but awful. A man, a figure of the absolute, sovereign, self-existing, and invisible Jehovah! Can there

be any other likeness of God, but the Son, who is the *express image of his person*? Did brother Purdy ever consider the second command of the Decalogue of Moses' remarks, Deut. 4:12-16, or did he recollect that God is a spirit, or the text, John 1:18. "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him?" Then to speak of the Son as being carried by angels to the bosom of the Father, as though he did not always dwell there, and as though he was raised up and transported by angels. As to Abraham, he is frequently mentioned in the New Testament, as well as in the Old, but never as a type or figure, but always of himself, in that peculiar relation in which God had placed him as being the *Father of all them that believe*, as well as of national Israel. That parable with its closing instruction shows that Abraham as the father of the Jews was there intended. But brother Purdy noticed my reference to those two texts, why not notice the quotation of Heb. 9:8, in connection with 10:19,20. There is contained a positive declaration, that "the Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing."

Let us notice what this state of glory, or heaven, or the antitypical *holiest of all*, into which the saints enter since the coming of Christ, is described to be in the New Testament. Paul speaks, Phil. 1:23, of having a desire to depart and be with Christ. This then was the heaven he had in view. Christ in his prayer to his Father, John 17:24, says, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me." He had before said, verse 5, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was." And still before, he had said, verse 1, "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee." It appears from this that he had this glory with the Father, before the world was in that eternal purpose which God purposed in him. That is as he dwelt in the bosom of the Father, and was *hid in God*, but now the hour is come in which he was to be personally and manifestively glorified, as the Son or Mediator to the admiration of angels and saints. Again, Christ says in John 14:2,3. "In my Father's house are many mansions; if not, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there may ye be also." I do not understand this house as being confined in its mansions to the heavenly glory, but as the typical house or temple had its most holy place, shadowing forth *heaven itself*, into which Christ has entered, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Heb. 9:21-26. The language of these texts clearly show, that those whom the Father had given, had not been with him in that *heaven* to which he has now entered; that he had not before entered, with *his own blood*, and had not *prepared a place* for his people, and had not as the Mediator been personally glorified. Whatever then may have been the heaven signified by the term *Abraham's bosom*, and by the term *paradise*, it is evident that the saints who died previous to the everlasting doors being lift

up, and Christ's entering into this heavenly glory, could not have been with Christ to behold his glory, where, according to his prayer, they and other departed saints now are. The paradise, where Christ promised the thief, saying, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise," whatever it imports, I think cannot have been designed to denote this state of heavenly glory, from the meaning of the word as signifying a fruit garden, and from its being first applied to Eden in the Scriptures; besides on the third day, after his crucifixion, Christ said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." John 20:17. In conclusion, if brother Purdy will lay aside imagination and the traditions of men, and search the Scriptures on the subject, he will find that I was not so erroneous as he thought in my reply to brother Fisher. I have been more lengthy on the subject than I could have wished. Indeed the subject simply of the state of the departed saints previous to the resurrection is in itself rather unimportant, but involving as this question does, the glorification of Christ and the enquiry whether his people were glorified with him, and in him; or whether a part of them were glorified before he was, and therefore in themselves independently of his glorification, is a subject of no small importance. I hope you may consider this worthy of a place in the MESSENGER.

With christian regards, yours,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., Aug. 22, 1856.

## SOME THOUGHTS ON Heb. 11:40.

BROTHER WILLIAM: – I see by number two of the MESSENGER that brother William Fisher of Florida wishes an explanation of the text, Heb. 11:40, "God having provided some better thing for us, *that they without us should not be made perfect*." If I believed with brother Fisher that the prophets and saints of the Old Testament were not born again, not born of a spiritual birth, I should think that this text contained a mystery that never could be explained in accordance with New Testament testimony. For as brother Fisher admits, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" – "he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Not being born again, could Abraham ever

enter into heaven? If not they never could be made perfect. The *natural* or *first man is of the earth, earthy*, not heavenly, and therefore never could enjoy anything higher than an earthly paradise. Brother Fisher says they were saved by faith as was Abraham. Abraham have faith? The faith of God's elect, and not have spiritual life, or be born again? For "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh." It is that which is born of the spirit, that is *spirit*. Paul does not include faith in the works of the flesh, but names it as a *fruit of the spirit*. Gal. 5:19-23. If I believed that faith was an act of the natural man, I should think our Arminian preachers were correct in telling their hearers that they can believe at any time, and they are bound by the law to believe, and therefore are condemned for not believing. Did not Abraham rejoice to see Christ's day? {John 8:56.} In seeing it, did he not see the *kingdom of God*? See that which is spiritual? How could he have seen that, if not born again? Did not Abraham and other Old Testament saints worship God in truth? But how could they do it if not spiritual or born again? "God is a Spirit and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and in truth." As the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned; and to receive or believe in Christ is to receive the *things of the Spirit of God*, I must believe that Abraham and Abel and others were born again, though brother Fisher thinks it absurd. Thus we are told, John 1:12,13, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believed on his name, which were born, not of blood, but of God." Here are two or three things to be noted, 1st, from this text we are showed that to *receive* Christ, is the same as to *believe on his name*. 2nd, that it does not say, *to them gave he power to become the sons of God*, by being born, *not of blood*, &c., *but of God*. But it simply affirms that he *gave them power*, and afterwards it affirms of them that they *were born* of God; that is that *they had already been born of God*. Hence the difference between them and others in their *receiving him*, or *believing on his name*, whilst the body of the Jews did not receive him. How he gave to these who were thus born of God, *power to become the sons of God*, will be showed in showing how the ancient subjects of faith were *made perfect*; that is, by being redeemed from under the law. Paul explains the whole matter of brother Fisher's inquiry, in chapter 4, of his letter to the Galatians. He commences with saying, "Now I say brethren, that the heir so long as he is a child differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father. Even so we, when we were children were in bondage under the elements of the world," verses 1-3. In noticing the Apostle's position here, we must remember that, "the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith," it is added, "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void," &c. Rom. 4:13,14. Hence the Apostle does not mean to represent by the heir in his position, those which are of the law; that is, those who are only the natural seed, and therefore

resting only upon the law, but those which *are of faith*. These he calls children. In a word he is speaking not of the Jews nationally, but of the church of believers as it existed previous to the redemption by Christ, when he says, “even so we brethren when we were children were in bondage under the elements of the world;” that is, under the Sinai covenant or law. Thus showing that although the saints under the Old Testament were believers and heirs, yet they were in bondage under the law, and therefore knew not the privilege of sons, had not the Spirit of adoption. Yet they were children, and of course I judge that they must have been *born children*, and of course *born again*. Paul goes on to show that in the fulness of time God sent forth his Son to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons, and adds, “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father; wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son,” &c., verses 6,7. Thus we see that though the children of God under the law, *obtained a good report* on the revealed promise of the Seed, the Christ, and rested on that promise for their righteousness, yet they did not *receive the promise*, or that which was promised, or in other words were not actually justified from the law, and could not be until Christ being delivered for their offences, *was raised again for their justification*. Until then the *righteousness of God for the remission of sins that were past*, was not declared, neither was it known how he could be just and the “justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” Rom. 3:25,26. Hence the Apostle says, “God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.” That is, we are permitted to witness and to bear testimony to the resurrection of Christ for the justification of all them that have believed or shall believe in Christ. Thus the manifestation of the justification of the Old Testament saints and of the justice of God in their justification was made perfect, as it was not to them while on earth, at least, even if it was to them in heaven, until the everlasting doors were opened and the King of glory, or Christ triumphant, first entered, then they no doubt entered in with him. Hence, Lazarus instead of being represented as being with Christ, is said to have been in *Abraham’s bosom*; that is, resting for the fulfillment of the promise made to Abraham. Hence also says the Apostle, “The Holy Ghost thus signifying that the way into the holiest of all, was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing.” Heb. 9:8. But in chapter tenth, 19th & 20th verses, he speaks of entering into the holiest by a new and living way; that is, *by the blood of Jesus*.

I have very strong objections to brother Fisher’s idea that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the new birth. A baptism and a birth are very different things, a birth is a bringing into existence that which had not individually existed before, or a person being brought to exist in a life in which he had not before existed personally. Baptism is a representation of the burial and resurrection of the same person. That extraordinary communication which occurred on the day of Pentecost is uniformly in the Scriptures called a baptism, never a birth. Besides, it uniformly had an external effect upon those who were subjects

of it. Cloven tongues as of fire were seen upon them, and they all spake with tongues, so that persons of different languages could hear their speech as in their own tongue. I know of no authority other than the Quakers for saying that a person has not been baptized of the Holy Ghost unless he has the miraculous power of speaking externally with tongues. Neither do I know of any authority in the Scriptures for saying that believers are born of the Holy Ghost. They are born as the seed of Christ and of the Spirit of Christ, and therefore have the Spirit of Christ, or Christ in them. But no more at present.

Affectionately yours,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., Jan.28, 1856.

## SOME VIEWS REGARDING MANASSAH: KING OF JUDAH.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: – Having received a letter from brother John S. McColl, of Albdorough, Elgin County, Canada West, dated the 27th November, and requesting my views on II Kings 24:3,4, in view of what is said of Manassah, in II Chron.33:11-18, I will by your permission, answer him through the SIGNS.

Dear Brother McColl: – After thanking you for the kindly expressions of fellowship, contained in your letter toward me and the writers in the SIGNS and MESSENGER, and assuring you that I feel thankful that there are brethren in Canada who agree with the remnant in the United States, in the belief of the doctrine of Christ being the life of his church and people, and therefore in a life-union of him with them from before the foundation of the world, I will proceed to give you such views as I have, of the text proposed. You will excuse me for answering you through the SIGNS, instead of doing it by private letter. My reason for this course may be thought by some to be indicative of vanity in me. The passage in its connection, no doubt, appears difficult to many besides yourself, and yet since you called my attention to it, it has appeared to be of easy

solution, and I therefore thought that my explanation might be beneficial to others, as well as yourself. If I am deceived I hope the error will be corrected.

The passage, II Kings 24:3,4, reads: “Surely at the commandment of the Lord came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manassah, according to all that he did; and also for the innocent blood that he shed, {for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood;} which the Lord would not pardon.” It will be seen from the connection, that the judgment which is here spoken of as coming upon Jerusalem and Judah, as a punishment for the abominations which Manassah committed, and which he caused Judah to commit, was inflicted many years after Manassah’s death, and even after the good reign of Josiah; thus showing that the Lord did not, and would not, pardon this thing. On the other hand, I think, brother McColl, with you, that the account given in II Chron.33:11-18, of Manassah’s penance, &c., shows clearly that his prayer was heard of God, and therefore that he prayed in faith, and was personally forgiven of God. The question then arises, how is this apparent contradiction to be reconciled? It is easily reconciled by considering the difference between the Sinai covenant and the gospel. If Manassah was forgiven and accepted of God, as we think he was, it was through Christ, and not by the provisions of the Sinai covenant. Though Christ in his flesh, lay in embryo in that nation and under that covenant, and was the Holy One of Israel, and thus preserved them from being destroyed as a nation, by all the judgments they brought upon themselves, until the fulness of time come for him to be personally manifested in the flesh; yet he averted none of those judgments from them. And though by his death he redeemed his people from under the law, and took the whole handwriting of ordinances out of the way, yet he averted not the consummation of the full curse of that covenant from falling upon them as a nation. The truth is, Christ’s atonement was for individuals of the human family, and has no reference to nations as such. But the abominations which Manassah perpetrated, and led Judah to commit, he enacted as the king of Judah and therefore as the head and representative of the nation; hence it was a national act, and therefore drew down the judgment upon the nation long after his death. Indeed, God left him to act out the vileness of his nature, in leading the nation to do these abominations, and thus to fill up that measure of their iniquity which should bring upon them the Babylonish captivity, as a punishment for their rebellion against God from the day he brought them out of Egypt, according to II Kings 21:15. And as God said unto Moses, Exod.32:34. The same principle is carried out under the gospel; the believer has evidence of pardon and acceptance with God, yet in this life he is not relieved from those curses entailed on him by Adam’s transgression, such as death, thistles and thorns, &c., nor from that depravity under which he groans. So of national judgments, such as wars, pesthences, &c., the believer has to share with others in their infliction. Not only this, but although all the sins and depravity of the believer are covered over by the atonement of Christ, and can never come in judgment against him, yet he will be made

to feel, in this life, the consequences from his sins and errors, or the evils they produce. And as Moses said to Israel, {Num. 32:23,} "Be sure your sin will find you out;" so with the believer, as he will be made to feel the burden of his sins sooner or later upon his conscience.

You wish, further, that I would give my views concerning the *innocent blood* which Manassah shed. II Kings 21:16 & 24:4. By turning to Deut. 19:10, we find that the killing the man-slayer, who slew his neighbor ignorantly, would be shedding *innocent blood*, and also the killing a man from hatred is shedding *innocent blood*. See verse 13. Instead, therefore, of supposing that the innocent blood which Manassah shed was the blood of infants, and that was innocent because of their purity from sin and depravity, as Arminians have said, we are authorized to consider that *as innocent blood*, which was shed without provocation. See also, as a further confirmation of this, I Sam. 19:5 & I Kings 2:31. By Manassah's shedding innocent blood, we are therefore to understand his procuring the killing of many without just provocation, and perhaps because they would not go with him into his idolatry. Probably your enquiry embraced the idea of the antitype, whether there is anything there answering to the figure. The blood of Christ was truly *innocent blood*, and that has been shed in spiritual Israel. It had its effect upon the Jewish nation more direct than the blood which Manassah shed, both in filling up the measure of their iniquity, and in the judgment of God which it drew in on them. But this was only the consummation of the depravity of that people of which the reign of Manassah was only a prelude, and cannot therefore be viewed as the antitype. The depravity thus showed in the type was but a true figure of the depravity which every believer has to acknowledge belongs to, and hangs upon the spiritual seed in their old man; and such are made to feel that it was their sins which caused the Lord of glory to bleed and die. Does not the believer, at times, feel the force of the poet's words?

"Was it for crimes that I had done,
He groaned upon the tree?"

It was Manassah, the king of Judah, that shed innocent blood. It was Christ, the King of Israel, that shed this in Zion. He says, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself," &c. John 10:17,18. Still the sins and depravity of his people's were the occasion of his doing it, they being laid on him. The consequence of the shedding of this innocent blood has followed the church of Christ from that day to this, not calling for vengeance, but calling down mercy and pardon upon all the children of grace; thus illustrating the distinction between the two covenants; between law and grace. In a worldly point of view; that is, in relation to the outward man, and the outward appearance of the church, the shedding of Christ's blood has had an apparent different consequence upon the church. It has drawn down upon her persecutions, and more than

Babylonish captivity, occasioning her to be considered as the offscouring of all things unto this day. Not as retributive justice, for Christ took all that out of the way, in expiating our sins, according to the peculiarities of this letter covenant, under which the church lives; but as a natural consequence of the doctrine of the Cross of Christ; such is the enmity of the human heart against God's way of saving sinners by grace. But the wisdom and grace of God are alike manifested in both cases. By permitting the house of Judah to draw upon themselves the Babylonish captivity, and other repeated judgments, it was manifested that the purpose and grace of God in Christ would override all their sins, and the consequence thereof, so as still to preserve the sceptre in Judah until Shiloh came. Thus God's dealings with that people stand as a confirming testimony to the experience of the saints, that this same purpose and grace of God can, and will, bring all the heirs of promise to the knowledge of the truth, and preserve the church as a faithful witness to the truth, notwithstanding all the opposition of their own corruptions, and the world, and the world's governments array against that truth, until all the ransomed ones are brought in, and all be saved to sin no more.

Thus, my brother, I have given you my views, perhaps not in as explicit language as I might, but I hope you will be able to understand them, and be edified by them, if they are in substance correct, as I think they are, or I would not have given them. If you please, let me hear from you again, publicly or privately, and if you have objections to these views, inform me of them.

Yours in the bonds of the gospel,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Dec.9, 1855.

## SOVEREIGN GRACE AND GOOD WORKS.

Brother Beebe: – Brother Jewett, in the Number of the *Doctrinal Advocate* for May, 1845, proposed that I, or some brother, should treat on the connection which may exist between the doctrine of *Sovereign Grace and Good Works*. When I first saw the

proposition, I shrunk from it as a task less befitting me to undertake than others of our brethren, seeing that my practice or feelings seemed less corresponding with the gospel than was the case with others. But on further reflection, I thought that my experience in the case might have its use, and would be more consoling to some of the children of God than would a treatise from those who have been enabled more uniformly to keep under the awful corruptions of their nature; if indeed mine is the experience of a child of grace. I therefore commenced writing on the subject previous to brother Jewett's death; and I have since thought that perhaps what I had written might not be unacceptable to some of the readers of the *Signs*; I have therefore finished what I had to say on the subject, and changed the address to the *Signs*. I have no doubt that some positions which my experience will oblige me to occupy will astonish some brethren.

Brother Jewett rightly qualified this subject by defining it as a *spiritual reception of the doctrine of Christ*; for a mere theoretical reception of sound doctrine, or having only the natural judgment convinced of the truth of it, is but a dead faith, and of course brings forth no spiritual fruits. A connection between the doctrine of Sovereign Grace and Good Works was evidently understood by Paul, to exist; for after making a full representation of the sovereignty of God as manifested in the experience of salvation, (Titus 3:3-7,) he immediately adds, (verse 8,) "This is a faithful saying, and these things, I will, that thou affirm constantly, that they that have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works." He thus teaches not only that this doctrine has a tendency to good works, but also that this is the proper theme to excite believers to them. How different this, from the notion that this doctrine tends to licentiousness! When the natural judgment alone is convinced that salvation is by grace, and there is a reliance on that only for escaping future punishment, there may probably be a tendency to licentiousness. And it is no wonder that the opposers of this doctrine, who know nothing but natural reason as their guide, should view the doctrine of grace in this light. But we may be assured that whoever can deliberately draw such a conclusion and act under its influence, gives decisive evidence that he is ignorant of that *hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, even that mystery, that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure*. I Cor. 2:7 & Phil. 2:13. Such know nothing of that implanted desire after holiness which belongs to the new man.

In coming more directly to the subject in view, I will first try to determine what *good works* are in a gospel sense. The old scholastic definition of good works, is, that they are such as are *done from a right principle, by a right rule, and to a right end*; but I would prefer a definition more simple. Indeed, good works do not require so much to be done by rule; they are not like positive institutions which require a strict observance of the letter of the command. Hence our Lord has resolved all rules upon this point into one, "Therefore all things that ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

Mt. 7:12. The term explains itself, for *good works* are such works as are *kind* and *beneficial* to others. Hence the Apostle defines them by saying, “These things are good and profitable unto men.” Titus 3:8. Many seem to suppose that good works principally consist in religious exercises. Hence the great stress they lay upon a round of what they call duties, or upon a certain kind of bodily exercises; and being attentive to these, they are not careful to avoid covetousness, dishonesty, hatred, &c. They suppose that they are to *do good* to God, and that for this goodness He will reward them; as though if they kept the Sabbath strictly, or gave their money for religious purposes, God was thereby benefited. Even Eliphaz, the Temanite, had a better view than this of these things; he says, “Can a man be profitable unto God as he that is wise may be profitable unto himself?” So Elihu, “If thou sinnest, what doest thou against Him? or, if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto Him? If thou be righteous, what givest thou Him, or what receiveth He of thy hand? Thy wickedness may hurt a man as thou art; and thy righteousness may profit the son of man.” Job 22:2 & 35:6-8. The Psalmist in evidently personating Christ says, “O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord: my *goodness* extendeth not to thee; but to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight.” Psalm 16:2-3. Religious exercises, such as waiting upon God, come more properly under the idea of privileges, than of works, though there is an obligation resting upon the believer to observe the institutions of the gospel, and to honor God in all his ways. Good works are set forth in the scriptures as a carrying out the spirit of the second table of the Decalouge. Thus Paul in his exhortations to the Romans, sums all up by saying, “Love is the fulfilling of the law.” He before said, “For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, &c., and if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;” and adds, “Love worketh no ill to his neighbor.” Rom. 13:9-10. By an examination of all that is said on this subject in the New Testament, we shall find they are presented to view as both positive and negative: that is, they consist in being beneficial to others, or in doing good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith, as we have opportunity, and also in a faithful discharge of the duties of every station and relation we may sustain in life, both civil and religious; as well as in refraining from whatever would be injurious to others. But then good works, in a gospel point of view, or as evidences of a gracious state, consist in something more than a mere performance of the act. Many acts which in themselves are beneficial to others, are performed in a spirit or from a motive that is not good, but evil. Such is the case manifestly with much of that display made of what they call charity, and self-denial, &c., by the religious multitude of this day. They are done either to be seen of men, or as a means of bringing those to whom they are done, in some way under their influence; or to make up a sum of righteousness on which to rest their hopes of salvation; or perhaps in a real infidel spirit, to show how good they can be and how

much better human nature is, than those who believe the scriptures, describe it to be. There is a meekness, a kindness of feeling in doing good works, a fear of God and regard to the honor of His cause, in shunning to do wrong, which are more decisive evidences of a gracious spirit, than the mere doing or shunning the act. Yea, the humility and self-condemnation frequently manifested by the children of grace, for doing what they ought not to have done, and for not doing as they ought, gives more assurance to others of their true love to God, than would the not doing or doing the acts. The child of grace does nothing for mere ostentation and show, but from a sense of duty and a love to uprightness. Neither is a studied secretness, unless on some peculiar occasions, necessary. Some are so sly in what they do for the poor, and for the support of the gospel ministry, as almost to lead to the belief, that they are ashamed to have it known that their religious impressions disposed them to kindness to the one, or fellowship for the other.

But to come to the existing connection between a spiritual reception of the doctrine of Christ and good works; we will remark, *First.* That such reception of the doctrine of Christ, implies the being born again – not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible; consequently it implies that the law in its spirituality has been written in their hearts, or that the love of God has been implanted therein. In this change, is at once presented the principle of good works. Love to God leads to a desire to be like Him, and to a delight in His law after the *inward man*. This change also produces in equal proportion a loathing of sin and of ourselves on account of it, and consequently we desire not to be under its influence. But the inquiry looks to the idea, whether soundness of doctrine as received by faith tends to the maintaining of good works. Its direct tendency evidently is towards the maintaining of good works. The notions of conditional acceptance with God, by obscuring the holiness of God, in supposing that He can be pleased with impure or imperfect obedience, and by hiding the exceeding sinfulness of sin so as to make the creature satisfied with his imperfect and unholy performance of duties, tends to make him careless about motives, so long as he can keep up the appearance of religious devotion, and about the performance of good works or religious duties, any further that he expects to be rewarded for them, or than he supposes necessary to secure his acceptance.

But the doctrine of Christ gives such enlarged views of the holiness of God as to lead those who receive it so to feel the hidden abominations of their own hearts in contrast therewith as to destroy all confidence in any of their own acts, and to pant after more holiness in heart and life. In addition, sound doctrine gives such a view of the riches of the love and grace of God towards vile, unworthy sinners, that whenever faith gives a glimpse of it, every power of mind is captivated thereby, and they are made earnestly to desire to glorify God in their bodies and in their spirits which are His.

Again; a belief in this doctrine, by giving us a deep sense of the deceitfulness of our hearts, and the depravity of our natures, leads us to be guarded against trusting to our own hearts, or depending on our own resolutions and strength, and to seek frequent supplies of grace and strength to resist temptations, and to overcome the corruptions of our nature, and to do that which is right. And what was Paul's experience, is the experience of every believer, "When I am weak, then am I strong." II Cor. 12:10. And again, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Phil. 4:13. Whenever we go forward carelessly or with self-confidence, we are sure to come short or fall; but none is ever confounded whilst, sensible of his weakness, his heart truly trusteth in God. Once more, that faith which receiveth and resteth upon the doctrine of Christ, is that which overcometh the world: "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith." I John 5:4. Faith, taking hold of the immutability of God in His purpose and promises, leads us forward as disciples of Christ, to face the frowns and scoffs of the world; presenting to us the certainty and fullness of salvation in Christ Jesus, it shields us from the fiery darts of the adversary, and strengthens us to meet the sword and faggots of the persecutor; assuring us of the love and mercy of God to our poor souls, and the beauties of the Saviour, it drives away those death- chills which the world by its influence tends to throw over the graces of the Spirit and our soul's comforts; and presenting to our minds the declarations of God's word, it foils the tempter in his aims to ensnare us, as for instance, when Satan would persuade us that we might indulge in this gratification of the flesh, or that, without reproach to the cause of Christ, as it would not be known, &c., faith brings forward such antidotes as these, "Be sure your sin will find you out." Num. 32:23. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore will I punish you for all your iniquities." Amos 3:2. Or as temptation is varied, so faith brings from the treasury that which meets it.

There are an abundance of inducements connected with the reception of sound doctrine, to maintain good works. 1st. As already noticed, the love and mercy of God towards us invites to gratitude, and a strong desire to show our love to Him by a denying of ourselves, and a walking in obedience to His ways. 2nd. From our love to the doctrine, the very reproach and opposition it meets with, tends to increase in us the desire to show forth its holy and beneficent nature in our lives and conversation, and to avoid occasioning reproach to it. 3rd. The promises of grace and strength, and of escape in the time of temptation, which this doctrine shows to be *Yea and Amen in Christ Jesus*, encourages us to pursue the path marked in the New Testament, regardless of the difficulties we may meet with. I will add, the fear of experiencing the frowns of our heavenly Father, and of being left to ourselves, and to mourn in darkness, is a strong inducement, to those who have known what it is to have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, to watchfulness and prayer against temptation. So that with these and the like inducements, the child born into gospel liberty needs not to go back to the letter

and bondage of the law, to find in its demands and threats that which will excite him to good works.

I have thus sketched the direct tendency of sound doctrine to good works, and the consequent connection between them. But do we at this day see this connection fully manifest in ourselves and others generally, who, we hope, believe the doctrine of Christ? I think not; though in none is there as great a deficiency, perhaps, as in myself. How are we to account for the failure? I might briefly answer, from the weakness of our faith, and the prevalency of that *sin which so easily besets us*, namely: unbelief. But I wish to be indulged in some extended remarks on this point.

In the first place, we are to bear in mind, and we shall be often reminded of it to our sorrow, that whilst we are made partakers, if children of the kingdom, of a life that *was created in Christ Jesus unto good works*, and therefore in the new man delight in holiness, yet the old, the Adamic man is not changed, but is in itself as earthly, sensual, and devilish as ever. Hence the warfare in the believer, between the flesh and the spirit, between Christ and Adam. Here I wish, if I can, to present the subject of the warfare in its different bearings in a true light. For just here it is that the formalist who, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, bolsters himself up in his own self- importance, and trusting to his own self-taught belief of the doctrine of Christ, he walketh after the flesh without remorse of conscience. And here it is, that the child of grace finds an abundant source of doubts and fears.

The position I have above laid down, that there is no change in nature, is correct; but still the implanting in us of that *life which is the light of men*, has given us to know the hidden depravity of our hearts, has convinced our natural judgments, that *the law is good, and that the commandment is holy, just and good*, and that a departure from the principle of love to God and love to our neighbor, is evil and sinful. And we know, as men, that an indulgence in sin, and a neglect of our obligations as christians, brings darkness and sorrow, and convinced of the truth and consistency of the doctrine of Christ, and our minds and affections participate in the joys and sorrows of the new man. Yet after all this, our passions, appetites, self-love, &c., are left in their natural strength and depraved bias; and not only show themselves as such in the breast of the believer, but come forward with their demands for gratification. I am led to the conclusion, from the confidence which natural persons have in their power to keep themselves, and from the equanimity of mind and the strict morality that many such are able to maintain, contrasted with the bitter complaints the children of grace make of themselves, that the depravity in believers is frequently stirred up, and made in one shape or another, far more turbulent in their breasts, and impudent in its demands for gratification, than in others; so that if it were not for the opposition of the new man, and its leaning them in their straits to look to God for deliverance, they would be overwhelmed in their

corruptions. Not only are their sins revived, stirred up at first by the demands of the law being set home, but God, as in the case of Israel in the wilderness, (Deut. 8:2) will have His people from time to time know what is in their heart, and therefore suffers Satan to stir up their corruptions.

At one time a temptation will be presented for indulgence, under so much disguise, and with so much plausibility, and at another time it will come so suddenly and unexpectedly, that the poor believer is almost swept away by it, and would have been quite, had not the Lord made a way for his escape. At another time some temptation from without will unite with some inward corruption, and make and pursue its demand for indulgence in such an insinuating manner and with such perseverance, notwithstanding all the remonstrance of the judgment, and all the abhorrence of the spirit at the idea; and perhaps at times the spirit and judgment both appear to be asleep, and the affections seem to contemplate with pleasure the indulgence, so that when the mind is again aroused to a sense of the danger, the poor, ashamed, and confounded soul, concludes that he is gone, and carried away he must be by the temptation, and becomes discouraged, and almost arrives at the conclusion that it is no use any longer to contend against it. Perhaps in this state of the confusion of his mind Satan tempts him with the suggestion that the only way to escape being led into open sin, and from disgracing his profession, is to put an end to his existence.

Thus the believer is at times tossed in his little ark upon the billows of his corruptions, raised by the winds of temptation, and his Lord appearing to be asleep, or to care not for him, yet in the end, at the last extremity, he will be made to cry for help, and the Lord will appear to hush the storm and give peace. Hence I conclude that it is not grace, or the Spirit of life, in the believer, that will keep him from being overcome by his corruptions, and the temptations he meets with, but special grace is manifested in calling his faith into exercise, or otherwise encouraging and strengthening him to maintain the contest, or in some way providing for his escape. Hence the evidence of being a child of grace, though it is ground for hope that the Lord will keep him, is no just ground for the individual to conclude he can keep himself from falling; nor on the other hand, is his being tempted a just reason for him to conclude that he is not a child of grace. Watchfulness and prayer, and enduring hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ, are important duties of believers – they are essential to his enjoying the consolations of the gospel, and to his glorifying God in his body and spirit. But still the believer's strength and security for living thus to God, is not in himself, but alone in God, and his having a spirit of prayer is as God is pleased to impart it.

I think I am sustained in my views above expressed, both by the experience of the believer and the language of scripture; thus, for instance: Rom. 8:20 – "For the creature (the new creature)was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who

hath subjected the same in hope." Also, John 15:5 – "For without me ye can do nothing."

In the second place, if the facts are so as we have endeavored to show from experience is the case, and this sustained by scripture, then the conclusion must be, that the present low and cold state of the churches, and the severe conflicts which many of the children of God are experiencing at this day, with the world, the flesh, and the devil, are God's appointment. Whether this be as a chastisement for their ingratitude in being kept from being swept away by the anti-christian flood, and for too great a disposition to yield to the influence of the world, or whether it be for the purifying of the churches, by separating from them all who *are not kept by the power of God*, and for disciplining the saints to a sense of their weakness and of their dependence on God to keep and sustain them, preparatory to the great struggle with the man of sin, which may be shortly approaching, or both, I am not prepared to say.

In conclusion, I would say that I would like to see some of our brethren on this subject, and particularly on the struggle between the flesh and the spirit, and of the believer's being kept not by any power in the new man, but by the *power of God through faith*, &c. Brother Barton knows something of fightings without and fears within, so does brother Buck, and others, if they would write.

In my former draught, I referred also to brother West, but his pen is laid silently by; being, happily for him, exchanged for a harp of glory, having passed victoriously through the *great tribulation, having washed his robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb*. Though we may miss the wholesome productions of his pen through the columns of the Signs, and many a scattered sheep grieve the loss of his ministerial labors, yet for him we have no ground to mourn. But will such be the case with some of us who are yet in Bochim? Yours, &c.,

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.13 (1845)
S. Trott.

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott.
pgs. 302 – 310

# UNION OF CHRIST WITH THE CHURCH.

Brother Beebe: – Our brother Raymond was not mistaken in supposing that his ideas would not all be received, by the readers of the *Signs*. I think he labours under a mistake relative to that union which constitutes the oneness of Christ and His people, and probably relative to the idea intended to be conveyed when we speak of the substitution of Christ. I will propose for his consideration what appears to me to be the Scriptural doctrine of the union of Christ and His church.

Instead of that nominal union which many talk of, which is produced by the creature's believing – the Scriptures speak of a real *oneness*. "Both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are *all of one*," is the Scripture testimony (Heb. 2:11) and so I believe. I cannot conceive how the spotless Lamb of God could be made to bleed, or bleeding, how His blood could, sanctify or cleanse from their sins any of the family of Adam unless such a union previously existed between Him and them as made their sins, of right, chargeable to Him; and His suffering of death and enduring of the curse, accounted as done by them. Instead of this union being founded in Christ's assumption of human nature; the Scriptures speak of His taking flesh and blood as a consequence of His relation to children who were partakers thereof. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; &c." What children? Those of whom Christ says, "Behold I and the children which God hath given me." See Heb. 2:14,13.

Instead of this oneness being a union of feeling or views, the Scriptures speak of it as a *oneness of life*. Hear the Apostles; "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God, when Christ, who is your life shall appear &c." Col. 3:3,4. This life which is one in the *Head* and in the *body*, was in the only begotten of the Father, from the beginning; for in *Him* was that *life* which is the *light of men*. John 1:4, compared with vs.14. Hence as it was said of Adam – Gen. 5:1,2 – "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him. Male and female created He them; and blessed them, and called their

name Adam, in the day when they were created;" so it must have been with Christ, when He was *set up from everlasting, from the beginning, and brought forth when there were no depths* (Prov. 8:23,24); He must have been brought forth a perfect Christ, head and body, He and His bride in Him. Hence His people were *chosen in Him*, (not into Him) *before the foundation of the world; and they were created in Christ Jesus unto good works* and as Christ – not as the essential Word, He is the *Beginning of the creation of God* (Eph. 1:4; 2:10 & Rev. 3:14). Christ was thus another or second Adam, not of the *earth, earthy, but the Lord from heaven; not a living soul merely, but a quickening spirit*. I Cor. 15:45,48. Again as Eve when produced from the original creation in Adam, was *bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh*; so the church in her quickened members, being born again, born of the Spirit, they are manifested as members of Christ's body; and are *of His flesh and of His bones*, spiritually. See Gen. 2:23 & Eph. 5:30. Thus Adam both as a *husband and a head was a figure of Him that was to come*.

As is the distinction between the two *Heads* – the *first man* and the *second man*, so is the distinction between the two lives brought forth severally in the distinct heads; consequently, so is the distinction between the bonds of union by which each Head is united with its body and members. The one bond is earthly, the other is spiritual; the one commenced in time and is dissolved in time, the other commenced in eternity, and therefore unchanged by time, will be eternal.

The one head, Adam, being created under the law, and his posterity in him, they as *servants* are driven by the terrors of the Law. The other Head, Christ, as the Son of the Father, was set up and His posterity in Him, under the everlasting covenant, that is ordered in all things and sure, they are therefore as sons loved with an *everlasting love*, and with *loving kindness are they drawn*. Again, as the members of Adam's family, or of the creation in him, are made manifest as such by being born after the flesh; so the members of Christ's body can be manifested only by *being born again* of the Spirit. They are by this brought into personal existence as new creations and are now personified by their new life. Hence says Christ speaking of His disciples, "They are not of the world even as I am not of the world." John 17:16; and says Paul, "Now if I do that, I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Rom. 7:20. See also I John 3:9 & 5:18.

As the posterity of Adam came into existence under the curse of the law as having been in him when he fell; so the posterity of Christ in their new birth, are born into the blessings of the new Covenant, as well as those exceeding great and precious promises given them in Christ as that full provision for their deliverance from under the law; therefore they *receive not the spirit of bondage again to fear, but they receive the spirit of adoption whereby they cry, Abba, Father*. Thus much in relation to the union of Christ's people with Him.

I will now briefly notice this union with Adam, &c. Whilst they were thus set up in Christ, and as such loved with an everlasting love, it was the pleasure of the Father that they should be partakers of *flesh and blood*, and therefore as rational creatures they were created in a natural head, Adam, and under the law; were in common with all his posterity, left to fall in him, and became subject to the curse of the law. While they were thus a part of the same fallen family of Adam involved in the same condemnation, they by the eternal purpose of God were distinguished from the rest of the human family – and were *from the beginning chosen unto salvation; and predestinated unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ*, and were given to Christ as His portion, as it is written: *the Lord's portion is His people, Jacob is the lot of His inheritance*. It was also necessary in order to their being brought into liberty as sons and receive the spirit of adoption, that they should be redeemed from under the law and also to be slain by it, that their union to it might be dissolved. For all this provision was made in the everlasting Covenant and the accomplishment thereof assigned to the Son and to the Holy Spirit in their respective offices. Their redemption could alone be accomplished by one who could fulfill the demands of the law and make it honorable in their behalf, and consequently alone by one who could be acknowledged by Divine Justice as standing in their law place. Christ being their Brother, their Head, their Husband in the everlasting Covenant, and in relation to the life therein set up, the right of redemption belonged to Him, and being not Himself under the law, He could take their law place and obey in their behalf, and be so accepted by Divine justice.

One leading idea more, relative to this subject I wish distinctly noticed, namely: that it was not as the children of Christ, but as the children of Adam that the elect were subject to the law, had sinned against it, &c. It was then as the children of Adam alone, that they needed deliverance from the curse of the law, justification from its demands and a dissolution of their relation to it.

If our Brother Raymond would duly reflect on the different relations the elect sustain to the distinct Heads, he would I think abandon the stand he took in his letter published in the 9th number of the *Signs*. He speaks of substitution as involving a separation between Christ and His people. Do not the Scriptures teach a manifest separation in this respect? Was Christ created with His people in Adam? If so He is but a creature and a branch of a fallen stock. Or was He as the Head of His people set up under the law? If so the inheritance coming through Him is but earthly and must fail. On the other hand, Christ being the elder Brother of His people in the everlasting Covenant, it was His province to interpose Himself as their Redeemer that the law might not remain a barrier to their being put in possession of the inheritance bequeathed in the better Testament. Hence it is said, *He was made sin, or rather, a sin offering, for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him – and being made a curse for us*. II Cor. 5:21

& Gal. 3:13. If I know anything of the use of words the doctrine of these texts is the doctrine of substitution; and the word for is used, in them, in the sense of *instead of*. He *being made a curse for us*; for what purpose? *To deliver us from the curse of the law*. Did He not then endure that curse which He would deliver His people from? And would they not have suffered the curse, if He had not borne it? What is this, but His bearing it in their stead? And what can that be, but substitution? Again, we are told that Christ *laid down His life for the sheep* . Now if He did not lay down His life in the place of the sheep, how will we find an atonement in the death of Christ? And how will we find a ransom in it? If He laid down His life for us in any other sense than as suffering that punishment which was due to our transgressions then there was no ransom price in the death of Christ; for a ransom is an equivalent rendered for the demand against those to be ransomed, and consequently involves substitution.

Brother Raymond challenges proof from the Scriptures, that God's children were ever *appointed unto wrath*. That God's children were as the children of Adam, under the curse of the law, and *children of wrath, even as others*, we are prepared to prove from the Scriptures of Truth. But there was no need of God's appointing any man, save the man Christ Jesus, unto wrath; for left to themselves the wrath of God would assuredly *abide upon them*. See John 3:36.

Brother R. seems throughout his letter, if I understand him, to suppose that the children of God were never viewed in any other relation, than in their relation to Christ. If this were true I would venture to say that God never viewed them as sinners; for they never sinned in Christ, nor with that life which they derived from Christ as a Head.

Once more; He remarks that it is a day full of substitutions, I grant it. But to me there is a very important difference between men's presuming to substitute human systems instead of God's revealed truth, human ceremonies, instead of God's ordinances, and human schemes instead of that order and plan which God has established in His word; I say there is a great difference between this substitution of men, and God's substituting His Son as a ransom for those who had been given Him. And those who are the fondest of these human substitutions, are the ones who by their substituted systems, do away the substitution of Christ in the law place of His people. Most of these new substitutions are the offspring of *Fullerism* and its twin sister *Hopkinsianism*, and both of these systems virtually, if not formally, deny the proper substitution of Christ.

Brother Raymond will of course act his own pleasure in writing again on this subject. But I hope if he does, he will be led to take a stand in support of the doctrine which is according to godliness. And I hesitate not to say that if he is what I hope he is, one taught of the Lord, he would never have found peace for his *burdened soul* had he not by faith discovered the Lord Jesus as having been as completely substituted in his law place

as was the *ram caught in the thicket*, in the place of Isaac. He will then write in union with the doctrine which the *Signs* are pledged to support.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
May 13, 1833.
S. Trott.
From:SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol.1 (1833)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 39 – 43

# VALID BAPTISM.

BROTHER WILLIAM L. BEEBE: – A brother in Georgia, {brother Matthews,} requests my views, through the MESSENGER, on the following queries:

> 1st. What qualifications are requisite to constitute a lawful administrator of the ordinance of baptism?
>
> 2nd. Can a person, after having been once so qualified, so act as to disqualify himself?
>
> 3rd. If so, is it right to hold a baptism administered by such persons valid?
>
> 4th. What course would you advise the Primitive Baptists to pursue in receiving members from the Missionary Baptists, with whom they have declared non-fellowship?

Brother Beebe, as my views are requested on these points, I trust that I shall be permitted to give them irrespective of what may be the views of others. I give them as the views I individually entertain, but claim no infallibility for them, any further than they are sustained by the testimony of the word of God. God's revealed word is

infallible, what therefore that sustains as truth is infallible, and what does not sustain, however ancient may be the idea, is error.

In noticing the first query as to what qualifications are necessary to constitute a valid administrator, in order to obtain a Scriptural answer, we must enquire who were the persons and what were their qualifications to whom our Lord the only and Great Head of the church, gave the command to baptize. The testimony of the Scripture is that it was given directly to the Apostles, and there is no account of his having directly so commanded any others. Matt. 28:20, “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” appears to me clearly to imply that there was to be a succession to them in the application of the commands he had given them. The inquiry next arises, Where are we to look for the apostolic succession? The idea has been very prevalent from a very early period of the church, that this succession is to be found in the ministry. As this idea affords so good a plea for the ministry to assume the authority over the churches such as the apostles exercised by their Lord’s appointment, it has been much insisted on by the clergy of all denominations. And a good many Baptist ministers, who would dissent from this full influence drawn from the above idea of succession, still claim the succession to themselves so far as relates to baptism, and perhaps to preaching. Hence they conclude that they have the independent right to baptize whom they please without the consent of the church; of course if they may act independently of the church in one case, they may in another. And therefore being once ordained to the ministry, they may claim to themselves that having been called of Christ as were the apostles, that is directly, and not through the judgment of the church, they may go on independently of the government of the church, preach what they please, baptize whom they please, &c., and require that the churches should fellowship their acts. But certainly no candid reader of the New Testament can find therein any sanction for ordinary ministers; that is, *pastors and teachers*, claiming to themselves any such independency of the churches; they are called to the work of the ministry through the judgment and fellowship of the church, are of right subject to the discipline of the church, are the servants of the church.

There is another class of Baptists, who, rejecting this notion of ministerial succession, claim that every disciple or baptized believer, is individually a successor of the apostles in all but their peculiar apostolic gifts; that is, this I judge to be their views from the ground they occupy. They claim for each disciple the individual right to baptize whom and when he pleases; and some consistently with that claim, also claim it as their right to preach the gospel merely on the ground of their being disciples. A church upon this principle instead of possessing the harmony of the human body, would be like a body in which every member claimed the right to occupy what station he pleased in the body, and to act from his own impulse, and not in subjection to the will of the whole. This, if I

understand the apostle, is the very kind of disorder which he is reproving, and the opposite to that order which he declares to belong to the gospel church as the body of Christ, in I Cor. , 12th chapter throughout.

The inquiry then returns as to wherein the apostolic succession is found. I answer that the apostles as they were found on the day of Pentecost, were the representation not of the gospel ministry only, but of the gospel church with all its gifts, with all its power, and with all its weakness; and were thus the visible embodiment of the gospel church, as were the twelve sons of Jacob, of the twelve tribes of Israel. Hence the repeated reference to the twelve tribes of Israel in connection with a reference to the apostles, as in Matt. 19:28; James 1:1; Rev. 7:8-10, & 21:12-14. The eleven were commanded by their Lord after his resurrection to tarry in Jerusalem until they were *endued with power from on high*. In the mean time however they must show a little of that creaturely impatience which has been common to the church in all succeeding ages, without waiting for this *power* as directed, they undertook to manufacture for their company a twelfth apostle out of Matthias. But the Lord instead of being forestalled by them, in his purpose, in his own time and order called Paul to the apostleship. Still when the day of Pentecost was fully come, we find them all with one accord in one place. A company of as poor, helpless creatures, destitute of any kind of worldly influence to sustain or encourage them, as need to be. Such has been the case of the true church in all ages since. But the power of God was so manifested for encouraging them and strengthening their faith in the baptism of the Holy Ghost, that with boldness they preached the gospel of Christ. And as a further manifestation of Christ's presence with them, and of his power over all flesh, multitudes were brought to obey the gospel, and to rejoice in his salvation. Although this baptism of the Holy Ghost was an extraordinary manifestation, in visible form, in the cloven tongues as of fire which sat upon them, as an evidence of their being endued with power from on high to preach the gospel among all nations, yet this same manifestation, as were also the miracles wrought by the Apostles, was for the encouragement and confirmation of the saints in all after ages, in the faith that Christ with his all power in heaven and in earth would be with his church always, even to the end of the world, to sustain her, and to furnish her with gifts adequate for feeding the sheep and lambs of his flock, and for preaching the gospel wherever it is his pleasure to send it.

Again, the three thousand baptized at the time of the Pentecost are said to have been *added*, or as in our version *added unto them*. As the Apostles were not afterwards to remain together, in a visible body, as the churches were to be, but to be scattered in the fulfillment of their ministry, and a visible church now existing at Jerusalem as established in their doctrine, those who afterwards became disciples, were said to be added to the church. Not only this, but we soon find the apostles, directing the church to

the exercise of a part at least of that authority, which they themselves had hitherto exercised, in reference to choosing from the church men to take charge of supplying the poor. Acts, 6th chapter. And from then on we find the church participating with the apostles in the exercise of authority, see Acts 13:1-3, compared with 14:26,27, as showing that it was the church and not the prophets and teachers which sent Paul and Barnabas forth through the direction of the Holy Ghost. And in Acts, the 15th chapter, we find the church connected with the apostles and elders in deciding on the difficulty which had occurred in the church at Antioch. And in no instance except in the cases of Timothy and Titus, whom Paul had sent to certain churches, as his proxies to set things in order whither it was not convenient for himself to be, and who were therefore called evangelists, as were also certain ministers sent forth by the apostles earlier in the history of the church; I say with these exceptions, there is no instance in which the apostles acknowledged the succession of authority to exercise the government and discipline of the church to be vested in any other than the churches. Paul exhorted the Elders of the church at Ephesus, and Peter exhorted the Elders which were among the churches to whom he wrote, but they only directed them in reference to themselves and to feeding the church and flock of God. Acts 20:28, & I Pet. 5:1,2. To sum up on this point, Paul tells the church at Corinth, “All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.” I Cor. 3:21-23. Thus making the churches to stand next to Christ. And so again he shows that all the gifts are given to the churches. Eph. 4:11,12. Consequently as the apostolic gift was for the churches; when churches were planted and lesser gifts were given, they were in subordination to the churches, in government.

If then the commission to the apostles to “go and teach all nations, baptizing them,” &c., is transmitted in succession to the churches, we see that all Missionary, Tract, Sunday School, and kindred societies are cut off from all claims to authority for spreading the gospel from this commission, and those who sanction them are rebels against the kingdom of Christ, and are assuming an authority which belongs of right only to the bride, the Lamb’s wife.

But how is the church to preach the gospel and baptize? Evidently through the gifts of pastors and teachers given her for that purpose. Why are these gifts bestowed if the Lord designed every member to perform that for which they are specially given? And why are servants especially given if all the members of the family are alike to serve? These pastors or servants are given as before noticed to the churches, and are therefore to act in subordination to the churches, and not as some assume independent of their fellowship. Hence a man though he may afterward show himself to have been a wolf in sheep’s clothing, having administered baptism under the sanction and fellowship of a gospel church, the baptism, notwithstanding his after defection, thus administered is valid. On

the other hand, of course a baptism administered in form, without the authority and fellowship of a gospel church, cannot be gospel baptism. Certainly if our Lord has connected the ministration of the gospel and its ordinances with the church, we have no right to sanction or own anything as gospel order which is severed from the church.

Our brother's 1st query is above answered; that is, the qualification requisite to constitute a lawful administrator, are that he must have a standing in the fellowship of a gospel church, and officiate in such administration as the authorized servant or minister of a gospel church.

The 2nd query; namely; "Can a person after having been once so qualified, so act as to disqualify himself?" According to the view I have taken of apostolic succession, he can. And does become disqualified for administering Christ's ordinance of baptism, whenever by his own withdrawal, or by the exclusion or suspension of the church he ceases to stand in the fellowship and to minister under the authority of a gospel church.

Consequently in answer to the 3rd query, whenever a person becomes disqualified according to the answer to the 2nd query, or has never had the qualifications noticed in answer to the 1st query, it certainly cannot be right to acknowledge any performance of such person, as gospel baptism, of gospel order.

The 4th query, "What course would you advise the Primitive Baptists to pursue in receiving members from the Missionary Baptists, with whom they have declared non-fellowship?" My advice is, and let it stand for what it is worth, that you should either fellowship the Mission Baptists as standing in gospel order as churches of Christ, or not fellowship them as such. And if you fellowship them, to fellowship the Paedobaptists also; for if we sanction a departure from the New Testament as our *Rule* in one instance, why not in another? When you get beyond the New Testament you are out in open sea without a compass; who then is to say which course is right? If on the other hand you are disposed to maintain the stand of acknowledging nothing as belonging to the gospel kingdom, but what is in accordance with the "pattern showed in the mount," then I would advise you to hold Mission Baptists and other will-worshipers just as the Apostles held all such classes of religionists in their day. If a person who has been among the Mission Baptists applies to be received among you, and if he was baptized by one who at the time of administering the ordinance to him, stood in fellowship with you as a gospel minister, then receive him as you would any other excluded person, upon the evidence of his repentance. If the applicant for membership was baptized by one who at the time stood excluded from your fellowship, or which is the same thing, from whom you had separated, thereby declaring non-fellowship for him, and you were to receive this applicant as a baptized member, would you not by such reception disannul your declaration of non-fellowship, and in acknowledging the dipping as gospel baptism

thereby acknowledge the administrator as a gospel minister, and the bodies with which he is connected as gospel churches? Hence I would advise the treating of the applicant just as though he had never professed religion; if by the relation of his experience he gives you evidence of being a believer, and shows a willingness to honor Christ as the King of Zion, by being baptized according to his own appointed order as delivered in the New Testament, then receive him to baptism and membership, and not without. A form of baptism can be of no avail wherein Christ is not honored; and certainly no one can show that Christ ever authorized any to administer baptism in his name who were disconnected with his visible church. I should think that when a person once found himself connected with a society with which he could no longer for conscience sake walk with as a church of Christ, he would not wish to countenance any of their acts as gospel ordinances.

Christ's kingdom is not of this world, and he sanctions no compromising with the world or with the world's religion by the subjects of his kingdom. He tells us that he "came to send fire on the earth." Again he says, "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay, but rather division." He further shows that the members of the same natural family are to be divided one from the other, even the tender tie of the mother and daughter must have no binding influence on that which relates to his kingdom, they must be at variance where one is the subject of grace and the other not. The daughter in order to show herself a disciple of Christ, must disregard the opinions, prejudices, or wishes of her unregenerated mother on this subject, and hear only Christ; even natural sympathy for her feelings must be laid aside. And a mother must make no compromises of either doctrine or order in order to bring her unregenerated daughter with her into the church. See Luke 12:49-53; Matt. 10:34-36. But how many Baptists there are who are unwilling that the doctrine and order of the gospel should be fully insisted for fear of offending their unregenerated children and friends. And some are afraid of rejecting New School baptism, for fear of giving offence. These fleshly feelings should have no place in the church of Christ.

Excuse my having written so lengthily. I feel that the subject is an important one.

With christian regards yours,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., April 22, 1853.

# VIEWS ON ELDER PARKER'S TWO-SEED SYSTEM

Brother Beebe: – Having been requested by a brother in Missouri to give him my views on the TWO SEED System, as also on a part of the ninth chapter of Romans, I have concluded to send my answer through the Signs of the Times, if you will publish them.

Dear Brother: You say that some believe that when God created Adam and blessed him, &c., there were none but the elect stood and died in him, and that after the transgression, God multiplied the woman's conception, and this brought forth the people of God's curse. Now can any rational man believe that, with the exception of Mary in the case of the birth of Jesus, any woman from Eve down ever conceived and brought forth children without the immediate agency of man as the cause of such conception? If there was any increase of posterity intended, the multiplication must have been in the man, as all are the seed of the man. Thus, in the case of Cain, who was accursed of God, it is expressly said: "And Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord." Cain and all the non-elect must be creatures of God, for God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth. For we are also His offspring, Acts 17:26-29. But God rested on the seventh day from all He had created and made, the heavens and the earth being finished and all the host of them Gen. 2: 1, 2. The non-elect, therefore, in common with all that proceeded from Adam, must have been created in Him in the six days creation, and have stood in Him, when "God saw everything that He had made, and behold it was very good." And thus Paul ascribes the origin of the sin and death of all men to the same source, namely: "By one man sin entered into the world and death by sin" Rom. 5:12. Thus the origin of sin in the world, not in the elect, is ascribed alone to Adam, leaving the woman out of the question. Consequently, if all were involved in Adam's transgression, all must have been represented by him, and therefore, have been created in him. Let us take a faith's view of this subject.

You, I presume, will admit that faith in receiving and resting upon the teachings of God leads the mind to the knowledge of truth. If so, I will ask you, my brother, to point to a single instance of one who gives evidence of being a subject of grace, ascribing his salvation to his possessing any better or distinct nature from his neighbor who is without faith; that is, that he was originally created in Adam, and pronounced good, and therefore, is a subject of grace, whilst his neighbor was the production of God's curse? On the contrary, does not each subject of grace believe and feel that his nature is as vile,

as depraved and as justly under the curse of God's law, as that of any around him, and that it is nothing but God's sovereign and distinguishing grace that has made him to differ from others in having hope of salvation? And that this grace reigned not through Adam, but through Christ? That it is because God will have mercy on whom He will have mercy independent of all distinctions in nature that he has hope. If then God's teachings does not lead our faith into error, our experience establishes the fact that we are not saved because we are any better in nature than others, or of a different production from them, and that all boasting in the creature is excluded. The above could not be the experience of God's teachings, if we are made to differ from others in being subjects of mercy because we were created in Adam and they were not.

Let us now come to a faith's view of the Scriptures, and a faith's view is necessary in order to know the Scriptures. That there are two distinct seeds brought to view in the Scriptures, both in the type of the Old Testament and in the substance of the New, is manifest to all who spiritually know them. Elder Parker's idea, if I understand him, was that the one seed was that which was created in Adam, and is the elect; the other seed is the multiplied conception of the woman, and is the seed of the devil. You express the idea differently, but to the same amount. God, according to this idea, instead of choosing some of Adam's posterity or seed and leaving the rest, appointed the whole of His creation in Adam to salvation, and the rest of mankind are an after production for the display of God's wrath. This certainly does not correspond with the scriptural idea of election. There is no choice in it. Christ said to His disciples: "I have chosen you out of the world" John 15:19. Again, it is said: "Thou was slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation" Rev. 5 :9. The people created in Adam must be, and ever remain, one kindred according to Elder Parker's view, however much they may be mingled with others, and the distinct seed produced by multiplying the woman's conception must be another kindred. If then those around the throne were redeemed out of every kindred, they must have been redeemed then out of both of these kindreds. This will not accord with the idea that the whole of one was appointed to salvation, and the whole of the other to the curse of God. Whatever is implied in the declaration, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception," it is evident that if it meant that God would produce a distinct seed from those created in Adam, these must be as directly God's production as the other; for God says expressly, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception." So the devil could have no more claim to this class than to those created in Adam. God, therefore, according to this system, must have determined to produce this class from the woman expressly for the devil, or for making them the subjects of His curse. But certainly this idea cannot agree with that revelation which God has made of Himself as a God of justice and of love, and is one which I cannot receive without direct proof from the Scriptures. I think I am willing to go as far as others in acknowledging the absolute sovereignty of God as

consisting with His holy, self-existing and independent Being; but when this sovereignty is extended to God's denying Himself or any of His holy attributes, which would be the case by making Him the author of sin or the direct cause of any of His creatures being accursed, I cannot admit of its correctness. God's predestinating sin to come into the world, or the human family being made sinners by Adam's voluntary transgression, and His predestinating to leave part of Adam's posterity to go on in sin, and thereby entail upon themselves the curse of the law, whilst He predestinated others to salvation by Christ Jesus, are very different from the idea that sin directly emanated from God, that pure fountain of love, or that He produced a class of beings for the express purpose of showing upon them the power of His wrath.

The woman has a seed brought to view in the Scriptures distinct from Adam's seed; but this seed which should bruise the serpent's head, is very different from the seed of the serpent; for this seed was no other than Christ Jesus. The woman has no other seed spoken of in the Scriptures distinct from Adam's, and Adam was created with his seed in him, like everything else. It is true the devil has a seed spoken of. Christ said to the Jews: "Ye are of your father, the devil." And Cain is said by John to be of that wicked one. But the Scriptures nowhere represent the devil and his seed as contrasted with Adam and His seed. The devil and his seed are uniformly contrasted with Christ and His people. Thus the devil or Satan and his interest is called anti-christ. So Paul draws the contrast between Christ and His ministers and Satan and his ministers. See II Cor. 11:13-15. Thus also John in his First Epistle, 3:8-12, contrasts the children of God with the children of the devil. So in the parable of the wheat and tares, as explained by our Lord, it is not God that sowed the good seed, but the Son of man; the good seed is not the creation of God in Adam as such, but the children of the kingdom, and the tares are the children of the wicked one, not God's multiplication of the woman's conception; the field is the world. Consider the wheat and the tares as the two religious interests set up in the world, the kingdom of heaven or of Christ, and the kingdom of anti-christ or of the devil, and all harmonizes in the parable, and in the history of the world.

Thus it is as religionists, and not in their natural existence, that the one class are of the kingdom of heaven, and the other belong to the anti-christian interest. Hence, in reference to the kingdom of heaven, it is not as the seed of Adam that they can enter it, but they must be born again or they cannot see it. So of Cain and Abel, it was not because of Abel's natural birth that his offering was accepted, but because he offered in faith, thus showing that he had been born again, see Heb. 11:4; and Cain's anger against Abel was wholly because Abel's offering was accepted and his own rejected. So that it was altogether as a religionist that Cain was of that wicked one, and manifested his spirit in slaying his brother. This, I think, taking the whole verse in connection, John 8:44, is the sense in which the devil is said to be a murderer from the beginning; the beginning

of his religion being a murderous one. I think, my brother, if you will carefully examine these several portions of Scripture on which Elder Parker so much relied to support his two-seed theory, you will find that they afford no direct testimony to support the idea of two natural seeds. It seems strange that Baptists, like Protestants, whilst they profess to take the Scriptures as the rule of their faith, should reject and in so many ways attempt to hide from view the revealed truth of Christ's headship of a spiritual seed, as Adam was the head of a natural seed. Many, indeed, instead of receiving the Scriptures as God has given them as the rule of their faith, attempt to make their belief rule the Scriptures, and therefore wrest them to suit their notions. The plan of making Adam by creation, the head only of the elect, and the making the devil by tempting Eve, the head of the existence of the non-elect, is only one among the many devices to set aside the actual headship of Christ to the elect as a spiritual people. Another device which formerly prevailed extensively, and which is being revived by certain professed Old School Baptists, is that of Adam's being created a spiritual person, and dying a spiritual death, &c. This, in effect, makes him a double head. The head of spiritual life, in that what the Scriptures calls regeneration, is only a restoring to men the life they lost in Adam, and hence regeneration is only a quickening. And the head of the natural life of the human family, by transgression is the source of their depravity. But by examining Rom. 5: 12-21, we shall see the two headships of Christ and Adam distinctly marked, Adam as the natural head of the whole human family, through whom flowed to them sin and death, and Christ as the head of the spiritual family, through whom flowed to them life and righteousness. Take, for instance, the 18th verse, "Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." By the offense of one – one what? Certainly one man, Adam. Even so by the righteousness of one – one what? Correspondingly one man, Christ Jesus. See verse 15. It is manifest that if the non-elect are men, condemnation came on them through Adam's offense, and not through the woman or the serpent; because by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation. Hence, all men must have been in Adam, and thereby become partakers in his transgression and condemnation.

So on the other hand, the elect must be considered as men in their relation to Christ, distinct from their manhood derived from Adam, and in the sense in which Christ is distinctly the second man, that is, a spiritual man, or universal justification unto life must be considered as passed upon all the human family; for if there be but one class of men, or men only as they flow from Adam, the all men in the latter clause of the text must correspond with the all men in the former part, for in both parts the declaration is full and absolute without any reserve. But do the Scriptures in other portions sustain the idea of this distinct manhood of Christ other than in His being made flesh, and of the elect in Him? They evidently do. First. In reference to Christ, it is said, I Cor. 15:47,

“The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.” The declarations in the following verses show that each of these men or heads has his distinct seed bearing his distinct image, the one an earthy, the other a heavenly seed. “As is the earthy, such are they also, that are earthy; as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.” It is also evident from the Scriptures that the believer has been the subject of a second birth, as distinct from the first as spirit is distinct from flesh. Being the subject of two births, he, of course, has two existences, he is two men; the old man hich is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness Eph. 4:22-24.

If we turn to Rom. 9, to which you referred me, we find the two seeds of Abraham brought to view. Paul says, “Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called; that is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed” Verse 7,8. Thus the one seed is they which are born after the flesh, the other seed is supernatural; it was God’s promise that produced the birth. “For this is the word of promise, at this time will I come and Sarah shall have a son” Verse 9. The birth of Ishmael was the natural result of Abraham’s fleshly intercourse with the bond woman, but the natural fleshly powers of both Abraham and Sarah were dead at the time the promise was made concerning Isaac, see Rom. 4: 19,20, so that it was not by nature but y faith that Abraham had power to communicate seed, as it was through faith Sarah received strength to conceive. See Heb. 11:11. Paul expressly declares that these two births were an allegory of the two covenants, or the mothers were an allegory of the two covenants under which the earthly and heavenly Jerusalems exist; consequently, the two births were figurative of the children of the two covenants, under which the national and spiritual Israel exist. Now, my brother, these figurative persons were both Abraham’s sons, so the two Israels are both called his seed. The one is Christ, and they that are Christ’s, see Gal. 3: 10-29, not the creation in Adam. The other was his natural seed, for Isaac was his son born of his body, though it was through faith he received strength to beget him, and as the natural seed of Abraham, through Isaac and Jacob they inherited the land of Canaan, and were subject to the covenant of circumcision. It was the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not as the seed of their wives, that national Israel inherited the land of Canaan. Now, if you receive the idea of an extra production as a people of God’s curse, distinct from His creation in Adam, how will you account for any of this seed of the devil being blended in the persons of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? seeing they were persons of God’s special choice and blessing, especially in Isaac who was altogether a child of faith. And if, as natural men, they existed only as the creation of God in Adam, how could they possibly transmit any other than the seed of Adam to their posterity? I think you must see that Elder Parker’s system of two seeds cannot be carried out in this case, and that although the Jews were peculiarly a people of God’s curse, yet

that being the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, they must have been a part of God's creation in Adam. But when we view the one seed of Abraham natural, and the other being Christ and Christ's people, as spiritual, we find the whole New Testament supporting the idea of two such seeds. Those who have faith find in the idea of this spiritual seed existing in connection with the creation of God in Adam, a harmony with the declaration, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness;" and of Adam's being the figure of Him that was to come, and that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.

If we pass to the case of Esau and Jacob, verses 10-13, and inquire into the reason why the elder should serve the younger, we find nothing said of their being originally of two distinct productions as of one's being God's creation in Adam, and the other of an extra production; but on the contrary, we find it asserted expressly that it was, that God's purpose according to election might stand. We have already noticed that there could be no election where God created one class of people expressly for salvation, and produced the other expressly for His curse. But every connecting expression goes to point out the sovereignty of God in personal, individual election in this case. 1. It ascribes the choice as being between the children. 2. That it was not from any personal distinction, they being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil. So that there was no respect of persons with God in this case, but simply that God will have mercy on whom He will have mercy. And this is the doctrine of election, as held by Old School Baptists, and as we believe fully taught in the Scriptures, namely, that God is not influenced in His choice of persons to salvation by any consideration whatever arising from a difference in the subjects of this choice from others, or from anything else, save His own sovereign purpose.

I now come to that portion of Romans, chapter 9th, to which you more particularly refer, namely: verse 21-24. Paul asks, in reply to those who would cavil at the sovereignty of God in election as he had set it forth, "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump, to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?" No doubt some have inferred, because man was originally made of the dust of the earth, that Paul meant by this figure to convey the idea that God created some part of the human family for happiness, and some for misery. But the apostle is not treating in the connection of the original creation of man; this figure, therefore, which he uses in defending his position, was not designed to apply to creation. Paul was treating of God's dealings with men as they exist, in having mercy on whom He would, and whom He would He hardened. To this the figure applies. The potter does not make the clay, he finds it ready made, and after softening and preparing it for his use, puts it on his wheel and shapes it into whatever vessel he chooses. Open to the view of God from the beginning were all His works, and all events on to the end. He saw man as the production of His hands, and saw

him fallen by transgression; and thus fallen, dead in trespasses and sins, He saw him as fit material from which to form a vessel of mercy or a vessel of wrath. As vessels of wrath, God need but to leave, as far as He sees fit, men to act out their depravity, and to choose their own course of open sin, or of depending on their own works and ways for acceptance with God, and they are fitted for destruction. This you know by experience, if you are what I hope you are, a subject of grace. Men, also, by transgression, became fit material for vessels of mercy or of honor. For, without being sinners, men would not be objects of mercy; and without being just such ruined, helpless sinners, as they are in themselves, fitted to destruction, they would not be objects on which God could display the riches of His grace and mercy.

Here then was present in eternity, to the view of God, the whole lump of clay out of which to make both the vessels to honor and to dishonor. And if a potter has power over clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another to dishonor, has not God the right and power, when all had alike sinned and come short of the glory of God, and therefore justly deserving His wrath, to choose within Himself whom He would make the objects of His mercy, and to decide whom He would leave to their own destruction? Verse 22 reads thus: “What if God willing to show His wrath, and to make His power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction.” What if God willing, that is, designing and determining to show His wrath, His opposition to sin in finally punishing the transgressors, and make His power known, that is, to vindicate His law, and to bring the transgressors to judgment in His own time; endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction. In the vessels of wrath is evidently meant those left out of the election of grace, and therefore left to meet the demands of the law in their own persons. If the question is still farther asked, how are these vessels fitted to destruction? In addition to what I have said already on this subject, I will refer to the testimony of Scripture on the point. We are told, in Rom. 5:19, that “By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners;” and in verse 18, that, “By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men unto condemnation.” In Eccl.7:29, we read, “That God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions.” In Rom. 1:28-32, it is written, “And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind,” &c. In Rom. 2:5, Paul speaks of man thus: “But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.” Now from these testimonies we learn that God made man upright; man universally, of course; and that by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners. Now there is no room left here to bring in an extra production from the woman in order to find a people fitted to destruction, nor for a supposition such as some have entertained, that the election of God was that which made the rest of mankind vessels of wrath. It was “by one man that sin entered into the world, and death by sin” Rom. 5:12.

Verse 23: “And that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy which He had afore prepared unto glory.” We are told, Prov. 25:2, “It is the glory of God to conceal a thing.” Surely God’s purpose of mercy was concealed from the view of Israel and the nations of the earth, whilst He permitted the Gentiles to go on in their ignorance, folly and vile idolatry, whilst He was long suffering toward them and did not suddenly cut them off. But behold the riches of His grace in all this, in that, through His long suffering, He in His own good time has brought forth from them a seed to serve Him, an innumerable multitude of vessels of mercy. From the Gentile nations being so universally left, and that for ages, to their ignorance and idolatry, we must suppose that if any people came into existence as the seed of the devil, they were universally that people, seeing that from age to age they were left to worship devils or idols; yet from one of the expressly accursed nations of God, the Canaanites the harlot Rahab was taken; and out of Moab, another cursed nation, Ruth was taken, to be mothers through whom the Messiah was to proceed from Judah. Thus, blending in the man Jesus the blood of both of these accursed nations. In view of God’s overruling the unbelief both of the Gentiles and the Jews to the making manifest the vessels of His mercy, well might Paul exclaim, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God; how unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out” Rom. 11:33.

Not only is the riches of God’s glory thus displayed in making those nations and individuals who were the objects of God’s wrath, the progenitors of a people who should be the objects of His mercy, but also in the riches of His mercy on those vessels of mercy, in that His mercy toward them was made to override, not only their individual sins, but also the provoking sins of all their ancestry, so that that ancestry was so spared as to secure their descent from Adam and Noah down to their own birth, and after their birth in sparing them until they were called by God’s grace. How divinely glorious is that mercy which can and does cover over all our sins without having found either in us or in our ancestry one redeeming quality to induce the exercise of that mercy towards us. I understand this to be the apostle’s meaning, that whilst He was willing, or purposed to show His wrath and make His power known on the vessels of wrath, endured them with much long suffering, that He might make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy.

I will proceed to notice the import of the declaration, “Which He had afore prepared unto glory.” Paul does not say afore prepared to mercy; for, as before showed, transgression alone fitted them to be objects of mercy. It is true the preparation was afore made for their being recipients of mercy, consistently with justice, by having life given them in Christ, being created in Him, and therefore chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, whereby Christ was one with them as they were one with Adam; and therefore as the law could inflict its penalty on them in consequence of Adam’s

transgression, so the law could take hold of Him when He came within its power, by being made of a woman and made under the law; and did demand of Him the suffering of the penalty due for their sins. His Godhead gave that divine value to the offering of Himself as the spotless Lamb of God; that by that one offering He forever perfected them that are sanctified, and became their redemption from under the law. Persons having eyes to see must, on looking at the subject, see the necessity of just such a Mediator as the Scriptures reveal and we contend for. If there had not been a life oneness of Christ and His people, so that their transgressions could be accounted His, as Adam's transgression was accounted ours by virtue of such oneness, the law could never in justice have inflicted its penalty on Him for those sins. If He had not been made flesh, or made under the law, the law could not have inflicted the penalty on Him; and if He had not, in His same one person, been God Almighty, He could not have borne that penalty so as to have exhausted it, and triumphed over death and the whole curse. Let others ridicule this idea of a Mediator, as they can bring no real argument against it, but we rejoice in such a Mediator as could bring honor to the law, and perfect redemption to His people.

But this preparation for the elect's being recipients of mercy did not of itself prepare them for glory; for neither in any higher sphere than he originally occupied before he transgressed or was charged with transgression. And Adam and his family were originally created of the earth earthy, and therefore could occupy no higher sphere than that for which they were created; that is, as the subjects of that creation. Hence the redemption by Christ only cleared away those legal barriers which stood in the way of the elect being made manifest as sons of God and heirs of glory. Hence the force of the truth, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." It is as absolutely necessary that we should be partakers of the spiritual or heavenly nature, or life, of the second or heavenly man or head, in order to our enjoying the heavenly inheritance, as it was that we should be partakers of the rational and earthly life of the natural man in order to our occupying the station of men on the earth. No separate creation in Adam could, therefore, have prepared any for glory, for that which is born of the flesh is flesh.

The term afore shows that this preparation was before the manifestation either of the vessels of wrath or of mercy, and therefore before Adam's dust was fashioned into man. And it must have been in Christ, the spiritual man as head. It must have been by their being created and chosen in Him before the foundation of the world, and being predestinated to the adoption as children by Him. As Christ, in being set up as the Head and life of His people, was brought forth as the Son of God, they were in that life brought forth as sons in Him, and therefore afore prepared unto glory, or as heirs of glory. Wherefore it is written, "If children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with

Christ." Being thus afore prepared, they are in time made manifest as heirs of glory, or personally prepared unto glory, by a second birth, being born of the Spirit, or as the seed of Christ, the spiritual man I Cor. 15:45-47.

Thus, my brother, I think I have showed clearly that the two seeds spoken of in the Scriptures, are the seeds of the two men or heads, Adam and Christ, and that like their two heads, the one is fleshly, the other spiritual; the one earthy, the other heavenly. I think every (I do not mean professor, nor every professed Old School Baptist) child of grace has the evidence of the existence of those two distinct seeds in himself. He is conscious of a living principle in him, that is heavenly in all its aspirations and desires, that finds its delight in communion with God, and would cast the world behind its back; and when its influence is felt in the exercise of faith, the reproaches, wants and afflictions of the world sink into insignificance in comparison with the enjoyment of the presence of God and the glory had in view. At other times, and that more frequently, his whole mind seems absorbed in the world and its concerns; not only his fleshly feelings, but his reason and judgment tell him it is right and proper to attend to the world and its concerns and are as earnestly engaged in arranging his worldly business, with discretion, as they were while in a state of nature; so that he has the evidence of its being the same rational soul it ever was, and therefore that in its nature it is not changed. But when faith, as before noticed, is in exercising and presenting spiritual things to view, the soul with all its faculties enters into the love of the truth, and into the enjoyment of the hopes and consolations of the gospel. Here, then, is decisive evidence that the soul, though unchanged in its nature, is prepared under the enlightening and quickening influence of the new or spiritual man to enter into the enjoyment of heaven whenever it shall be released from its relation to this world, by laying aside this fleshly tabernacle.

I will here leave the subject with you, hoping you may search the Scriptures for yourself, and be established in the truth as you find it there revealed, without being influenced by the teachings of men for or against it.

Yours, affectionately;
S. Trott

# VIEWS ON Gen. 3:22.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: – I some months since received a letter from brother Duggan, of Louisiana, requesting my views on Gen. 3:22, former part: "The man is become as one of us, to know good and evil." I would hereby inform brother Duggan that the reason of my so long neglecting his request, is that I have been so much from home that I have the past fall had but little opportunity for writing.

He requested me to answer his request either through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES or SOUTHERN BAPTIST MESSENGER. I had intended giving my views through the MESSENGER, until recently having seen some numbers of a periodical, called the EARTHEN VESSEL, an English Baptist publication, in which your name, brother Beebe, and mine are mentioned by a New York correspondent, in connection with some gross perversions of our views and some unwarranted assertions, as also in reference to brother Goble, of New York, who is also mentioned. I have no disposition to enter into a discussion with this New York correspondent on the points referred to, nor to occupy your pages with a refutation of his slanders. But as an expression of brother Duggan's text will lead to an expression of our views on the points referred to, I have concluded, with your permission, to give the exposition through the SIGNS, as being more likely to meet the eyes of some of the readers of the EARTHEN VESSEL, than if published in the MESSENGER.

I will just mention, in connection with the above, that I saw in that paper, the EARTHEN VESSEL, a communication from another, and probably an English writer, in which he attempts to explain the doctrine of the Trinity, and to refute the notion of the pre-existence of the soul of Christ Jesus. Whether it was designed as a refutation of this American heresy or not, I cannot say. As to the absurd idea concerning the pre-existence of the soul of Christ, we have no affinity with it. This writer, in explaining the Trinity, asserts that the Three: The Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost – are three distinct persons, or subsistencies, and that these three compose the one God or Jehovah, thus representing the God of the Scriptures as a compound of three distinct subsistencies, or real beings. God has nowhere thus declared himself; saying, *We are the Lord*, or *We are God*, as it should read, if such doctrines were true. But he declares, *I, even I, am the LORD*. Again, Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that *I am God* – not *we are God*. Isaiah 43:11,12. Hence men who say such things as above cannot be God's witnesses, on that point.

But I will pass to a consideration of our text. In the expression, “The man is become as one of us,” there is, manifestly, a reference to distinct persons. It is true, Unitarians, as they style themselves, say, that in expressions like this, God conforms himself to the custom of kings, who, to express their dignity, use the plural number in speaking of themselves, as modern editors, and some correspondents, who would assume the dignity of editors, do. But there is in this text a distinction in the persons, in the expression *one of us*, that refutes all that reasoning, showing that when God says *us* he means *us* in the plural. On the other hand, the Trinitarians, as they call themselves, contend that when God uses the plural pronoun, saying, *Let us make man*, &c., he refers to the several persons in the Godhead, and that it expresses a consultation among these distinct persons concerning the making of man. But when we come to consider the expressions of our text, I think we shall find their position as lame as that of the Unitarians. Although the correspondent of the EARTHEN VESSEL, before referred to, seems to make the persons composing the one God but *component parts* of God; yet Trinitarians generally, I believe, hold that each of the persons is God. If they do not, the Scriptures clearly declare that the Father is God, the Word is God and that the Holy Ghost is God. If, then, there is but one God, as the Scriptures fully declare, each of these persons must, if each is God, be that one God. How, then, could it be said, *as one of us*? It should be as us; for if, upon that position, man became as one, he became as each one, or as the three, for each is alike God. Again, although God absolutely, of his own infinite understanding, knows good and evil, yet man in this way never has, nor can know good and evil as God knows it. Man knows good and evil only by experience, and that in contrast; in this sense, it cannot be supposed that God knows it; he cannot experience evil, nor depend on contrast for his knowledge of good and evil. Hence it must be manifest that the one of us must be a person distinct from the Godhead. Such person is found in the Mediator, the Son of God; for, in order to be a proper Mediator between God and his people, he must be a person distinct from each. As such, he is clearly revealed in the Scriptures. His being revealed as the Son of God, reveals his distinct personality from God. The idea of son is that of *a person whose existence is derived from another*. In Heb. 1:1,2, we read, “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets; hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.” There are in this text several ideas that call for particular notice in treating on this subject. First: That this person by whom God hath spoken unto us, &c., must be a person distinct from God, who spake by him. Second: That this person cannot be a distinct person in the Godhead, and therefore God equally with the Father. For I am certain that no one of those who contend for distinct personality in the Godhead, would, on a moment’s reflection, if the idea could be separated from their notion of personality, admit that God, as such, could be an *heir*, much less would be *appointed heir*. Is not God the sovereign Creator of all things? As

such, has he not the absolute right to them and the sovereign control of them? How then, can he be said to inherit them? And from whom could he inherit them? Hence then, his being *appointed heir*, and therefore his sonship and personality must be distinct from his being God. Third: The expression, *By whom he made the worlds*, shows that this *Son* and *Person*, who is thus distinct from God, was concerned in the creation of the worlds, and hence he evidently was the person whom God addressed when he said, *Let us make man*, &c., and of whom he spake in saying, *The man is become as one of us*. I will endeavor to show wherein this personality, and therefore the sonship consists. First: It is manifest that the sonship and therefore personality of Christ does not consist in his manhood or being made flesh, for in his manhood he was made of a woman – made of Mary – and therefore could not in that manhood have been present at the making of the worlds. But as Son, he was present, as God made the worlds by him.

By turning to John chapter 1, we will find clearly revealed a person distinct from God and yet with God in the creation; for he was *in God in the beginning*. "For in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." And in verse 4, we are told, that, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." It does not say that he, the Word, was the light, &c.; but distinctively the life was the light of men. And verse 5, "The light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehendeth it not." As the life is the light, whatever is said of the light belongeth to the life. In verses 9 & 10, it is said of this light, "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not." It is, therefore, clear from these quotations, that this *life* or *light* by whom the world was made is a person, and as such is distinct from God, from the Word, in whom he the life or light, was. Christ is identified both with, this *light* as such and as the *life*. In John 8:12, Jesus saith, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the *light of life*;" thus showing that the light which he is, is the *light of life*. Again, in John 12:46, he saith, "I am come a light into the world that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." He thus connects faith with being enlightened by him. In Eph. 5:8, the children of God are characterized as children of light. It reads, "For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord; walk as children of light." Does this not show that being *light* is one with being *born again*? Again, in Col. 3:3 & 4, the brethren are told, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear," &c. Christ is here directly declared to be the life of his people; not only so, but the life which he is, evidently is identified with the life that was in the Word; for it is *hid in God*. Once more, the Son is identified with this life; for in John 5:11 & 12, we read, "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. Now, it appears to me, that any person who is willing to take the plain declarations of Scripture for his guide,

independently of creeds, confessions of faith, and traditions, will be satisfied from these quotations, that the *life* which was in the Word, existed in God from the beginning, was personally distinct from God, for it is the *light of men, was in the world*, is that eternal life which God hath given to his people, and is their life; that it is one with Christ or the Son of God; and that he, this life, was with God in making the worlds, that he made the worlds by him. Here, therefore, I might with propriety rest the conclusion on this part of my text; that the *one of us*, is no other than Christ the Son of God, as he existed in the beginning, in God as the life of his people. But I am aware that if I leave it here, the same old cry of a created Mediator will be reiterated against us. For if this life, which is the *Christ, the Son of the living God*, is a person distinct from God, in whom he was, he cannot, as such, be self-existent; for there is but one Jehovah, one self existent God. The very idea of sonship clearly implies a derivative existence from another as his Father. There are in the Scriptures an abundance of expressions conveying a similar idea. In Prov. 8:22-25, we read, "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before his works of old." Here, under the idea of wisdom, he is presented to view as distinct in being and person from the Jehovah who possessed him. In verse 23 he says, "I was set up from everlasting." In verse 24, "When there were no depths *I was brought forth*." In verse 25, he adds, "Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth." He is declared to be "the only begotten of the Father." In Colossians, chapter 1, he, the Son, is declared to be the "image of the invisible God, the *first born of every creature*." And in Rev. 3:14, he styles himself, "the beginning of the creation of God." If there is any definite meaning in words, these and other declarations of Scripture which might be quoted, clearly show that the Son, as such, has a derivative and subordinate existence. We contend that these characteristics of the Mediator belong only to his sonship as such, and not to his Godhead, that as God he is Jehovah, absolutely self-existent, as one with the Father. The Trinitarian party charge us with representing him only as a creature. Yet they themselves admit that his manhood is a created existence, and do not suppose that this admission in any way destroys his essential Godhead. And if his creatureship as man does not destroy the essential Godhead of his person as Mediator, neither can his derivative existence as the Son and the life of his people make him any less God, as he is one with the Father. Thus, the Scriptures support our views of a trinity of persons in the Mediator. In the first chapter of John, after declaring that the Word was God, and that the life that was in him was the light of men, and that this light, as before showed, was presented to view as a person, the Evangelist goes on to say, not that the light was made flesh, but that the *Word*, and therefore God with the *life* in him *was made flesh*, and "we beheld his glory as the glory of the only begotten of the Father." Thus, whilst he was man and Son, he was the brightness of God's glory and express image of his {God's} person. The Godhead shone forth in him.

The truth is, we do and have contended that Christ is a perfect Mediator between God and his people. In order to be such, it is not enough that he should be entirely impartial between them, but he must be equally identified with each, so as fully to appreciate each case, and be equally interested in each. None could sustain that independent stand to enable him to act with impartiality but he who is the self existent God. And none could truly appreciate what is due to the justice, the honor and glory of God, but he who is absolutely God. And how could he as truly feel for the welfare and happiness of his people, and impartially advocate their cause, unless he was as completely one with them as he is one with the Father? Now, Christ's being made flesh, would not constitute such oneness with his people, as he has with the Father; for he was only made in *the likeness of sinful flesh*. Rom. 8:3. This manhood was not in itself considered one with theirs. They did not derive their manhood from him, as their natural head, neither did his flesh, like theirs, descend from Adam. It is true, his being made flesh was necessary to his representing his people under the law, and to perfect him as their High Priest through suffering, and to make him a compassionate High Priest, by having been himself tempted. See Heb. 5:8,9 & 4:15. And this could only have been in consequence of his previous union with his people.

But in Christ, being the life of his people, we see in this life a oneness – he the Head, and they the Body – he as the antitype of Adam, the Husband, and they his Bride. This life is one in the Head, and in all the members of his Body, as in the Vine and its Branches. The Branch was in the Vine, and one with it from its first existence; though it was not manifest as a Branch, until it shot forth. Its manifestation as a branch, neither constitutes nor destroys its oneness with the vine. It remains the same one vine, with all its branches, that it was before the branches shot forth. So the whole believing Church is but one Christ, the Life that is hid in God; the Life that was in the Word in the beginning. Thus says 1st Corinthians 14:12, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and the members of that one body being many, are one body; so also is Christ." See also verse 27. It is *Christ in* every member the *hope of glory*, that manifests a child of God, a distinct branch of the one vine.

Some persons seem to suppose that by this union of Christ and his people, we mean that the natural man was from the beginning in union with Christ. The natural man was one with the earthly Adam, and remains in union with him under the law, until he is killed by the law; then, when born again, born of the Spirit, or Life, he is born into life and all the blessings of Christ's redemption; and stands manifest as a child of God and one with Christ in that life which is in him, and by which he is quickened.

But to return. We have in Christ, thus a perfect mediator, as being God and being the life of his people, both being actually united in him, and therefore represented by him, as he says in John 17:21, "That they all may be one; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee,

that they also may be one in us." Again, "I in them and they in me, that they may be made perfect in one." As this oneness was from the beginning so he was in the beginning as Mediator, as it is said of him, Isaiah 63:9, "In all their affliction, he was afflicted and the angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them *and he bare them and carried them all the days of old*." I will now notice the other part of the text. "To know good and evil." The idea has been entertained that man *knew good and evil*, in knowing a state of innocency, and then knowing a state of guilt and transgression. Man's goodness in innocency, was like that of Ephraim and Judah as the *morning cloud and early dew*; there was no real goodness in it, because it was not substantial. The text does not read, "knowing good and evil," as though it was something he had then learned, but "to know," that is, he is now by transgression placed in circumstances *to know good and evil*. This man is to know, as *one of us* – that is, as the Mediator, was to know it. Now the Mediator was made to know by experience what it was to bear sin, and all the consequences of it, such as condemnation and death. And he knew the good of redeeming his people, of conquering death in their behalf, and of entering into his glory as their forerunner. So his people are made to know the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and condemnation and death by the law, and by faith are made to know the superior value and goodness of the righteousness of God, *which is by the faith of Jesus Christ*, and which Christ is to his people, and the good of that inheritance which is spiritual and heavenly, over that earthly inheritance which Adam lost by transgression, &c.

This will give an idea to brother Duggan, of what I understand by the *good and evil* which man knows, as the one of us knows them, or which he knows in common with Christ. We have fellowship with Christ's sufferings under the curse of the law, and participate in the redemption; and are to be with Christ and behold his glory, and are joint heirs with him, &c. The *good* in the text is placed before the *evil*, and it is true we must be somewhat enlightened in the knowledge of God and of his goodness, before we can know the evil of sin.

I have also, in the views above given, supposed that *the man* here represented the elect of God, not that I do not understand that all the human family were created in Adam; but I understand that Adam or *the man* was a figure of Christ in his creation, and thus represents Christ and his church and people; and, in fact, that this was the grand end of his creation. The Lord's portion is his people, &c.

These are the views I have of this subject, and as such I give them, leaving to others to give us better views if they have them, and subscribe myself yours in love,

S. TROTT.
Dec. 26, 1859.

# VIEWS OF HEBREWS 8:11.

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

This declaration is embraced in that *new covenant* which God said by the prophet Jeremiah, {Jer. 31:31-34,} he would make, in the *days which shall come, with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah*; and which the Apostle quotes in the connection as the *better covenant*, which was established upon better promises, and of which the man Christ Jesus, the Son, is Mediator. See Eph. 7:28, and 8:3, 6-8, and I Tim. 2:5. Hence from the Apostle’s representing this covenant, as that of which Christ is Mediator, it is evident that the *days which should come*, are the days of the Messiah, or the gospel day, and therefore that the house of Israel and of Judah with which it should be made are the spiritual Israel and Judah. Christ with his people in him, being in national Israel and Judah as their substance and their Holy One, the affirmation that it should be made with them, terminates in him and in his people, as brought out from that type. The making this covenant with them spoken of, is the making it manifest as the distinct covenant or dispensation under which they stand, and through the provisions of which they approach unto God. It is a *new covenant*, in that it is new to them, when manifested, and is manifested only to the *new man*, or to them as born again. It is new, in that it is a new dispensation which was to be set up in the world. Not *new* as established with Christ, nor as the *purpose and grace* or the substance of it were *given* to his people *in him before the world began*.

Among the provisions of this covenant, is this, “And they shall not teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother saying; Know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest.” Hence the knowledge of the Lord as possessed by spiritual Israel as such, shall not be that rational knowledge such as national Israel learned of their parents and teachers; but it shall be a knowledge not received of men, nor obtained by any natural or fleshly powers of the mind; for, “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned.” I Cor. 2:14. How then, say you, Do they know the Lord and the things of the Lord or of the Spirit of God? The answer is provided, “God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.” I Cor. 2:10. Or as our Lord referring unto the promise made unto Zion or the gospel church, Isa. 54:13, says, “They shall be

all taught of God." John 6:45. From what we have said, it is manifest that the *all* who shall know the Lord, are the all of spiritual Israel and Judah, and that all of them shall know him, without exception, from the least to the greatest, and that by God's teaching or revelation. Hence he who knows the Lord only as he has learned of men or by the force of his natural reason, has never been manifested as one of the Israel of God. Hence also, surprising as may be the remark, all that the child of grace knows of the Lord and of the things of the Lord, only as he has obtained it from men or by study, is of no spiritual benefit to him.

The enquiry arises whether this revelation is made to the natural reason or mind of man. Not so; for whatever we can comprehend by our natural reason, we can communicate to others of like rational faculties. Hence we could and should *teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother, saying know the Lord*, in contradiction to the express declaration of this new covenant. So the Apostle shows that as no man "knoweth the things of a man {things peculiar to man,} save the spirit of man which is in him; even so the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God." And adds, "Now we {we believers} have received, not the spirit of the world {in our regeneration} but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." And these are things which "God hath revealed unto us by his Spirit." See I Cor. 2:11 & 12, compared with 9 & 10. Thus we see that in order to know the *things of God*, it is not only necessary that God should reveal them unto us by his Spirit; but that we should also first receive the *Spirit which is of God*, of God as its Father, and of God as he who alone communicates it in regeneration. Thus God has purposed and provided that the spiritual Israel and Judah shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest of them. If we understand by the *least* and *greatest* here, those who are so naturally; the least shall know the Lord; for as human reason has no part either in the communication or reception of this knowledge, neither infancy, idiocy, nor derangement of mind can prevent them from being made to know the Lord. On the other hand, the greatest intellect with the most intensive knowledge of science, and the self-pride consequent thereto cannot prevent any of the elect Israel from being brought to know the Lord; for he will convert them to become as little children, as babes, and to enter the kingdom of God as such, and to account all their wisdom and learning as foolishness in this case. If by the *least* and *greatest* we are to understand such in a spiritual sense; the apostles who were the greatest among the saints and therefore most eminently their minister according to Mat.20:26, evidently knew and preached the doctrine of the Lord; whilst the least lamb in the flock could receive and judge of that doctrine, not by the written creeds, systems or expositions of men, but by the inward teachings of the Spirit of God. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things." I Cor. 2:15.

Is it true that God hath said of his spiritual Israel, *They shall all know the Lord, from the least to the greatest*? And is his *shall*, absolute, almighty, and irreversible? How presumptuous then is it, to set up Articles of Faith and other uninspired writings as standards of faith or truth, which christians must come up to in their belief, as though the Holy Ghost would not be faithful to teach the truth to all the elect, or teach all the truth necessary for them; or as though we would bring the teachings of the Lord to our notions of systematic divinity. It may be said that these Articles of Faith, and other standard books are such as we believe were written by persons who had been taught of the Lord; and that they seem necessary to test the pretensions of those who profess to be believers. The latter of these excuses for such standards would appear plausible, if God had not given us the Scriptures written by inspiration as a standard, and to his people the spirit of judgment in their own experience. As it is, the excuse is vain. The other, that they were written by men who had been taught of the Lord, is very fallacious. If we admit that in truth these writers were all subjects of grace, who does not know, or from reflection might not know how universally prone we are to speculate on, and to bring every thing to the test of reason, which is presented to our minds even as religion, and to mix our own reflections and preconceived ideas with what has been revealed in us? How seldom do we ever hear a person relate his experience who does not mix some of his own thoughts or traditional notions with what the Lord has taught him, and which in themselves are of no avail in giving us an evidence that he is a subject of grace? How difficult it is truly and fully to become fools that we may be wise? What constitutes the difference between the writings of the Bible and the writings of uninspired men, as to infallibility, other than this: That the inspired writers wrote only as they were guided by the Holy Ghost to write, and therefore wrote only what he revealed to them or assured them was the truth; though they {uninspired writers} may write what the Lord has taught them and which therefore in itself is equally true with the Scriptures and supported by them, yet in writing mix more or less of their own thoughts, and conclusions from reason, and perhaps wild speculations with what they write? It is true that the writings of christians may often be useful in counteracting the errors one of another and of others, and may be for edification and comfort as they show the dealings of God with his people, and as the Holy Ghost may thereby lead persons to an understanding of the Scriptures; but when he does this, he gives them a witness of its truth from the Scriptures and their own experience. But whenever we do not read human writings as the Bereans heard Paul preach, “searching the Scriptures whether those things are so;” whenever we read uninspired writings as true because they are so held by persons in whom we have confidence, or when we receive indiscriminately as true the opinions of any man or set of men, because they appear rational, and not because we have the witness from the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures or in our experience of their truth; if we get any truth we are sure to get error mixed with it, and our views become

either contradictory, or erroneous in the whole. Hence the dissensions and divisions, I do not say among professors, but among the saints and which we cannot expect to see healed, until they learn more fully not to put confidence in man as to any part of their salvation, as well as to what they *believe*, as to what they are to *feel and do*.

What the Lord teaches is true, and it is the same truth in all who are taught of him, and when the saints become satisfied to receive as truth only what he teaches them, then, and not till then, shall we have the satisfaction of seeing again the multitude of them that believe of one heart and one soul.

S.TROTT.
Centreville, Fairfax County, Va., June 23, 1848.

P.S. BROTHER BEEBE: – As Paul did not think the enquiry of the Athenians, "May we know what this new doctrine whereof thou speakest, is," unworthy of a reply, I presume we may take the same liberty in reference to *certain strange things brought to our ears*, or eyes, in the SIGNS. I will therefore venture to pronounce some queries on two or three points for the consideration and reply of yourself or of some one of your correspondents.

1. In reference to the *believer's mind*. Paul says, Rom. 8:7, "The carnal {or fleshly} mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." I ask, Was that mind which "cannot be subject to the law of God," the same which he had reference to, when he said, {chap.7:25,} "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God"? If so, is nature changed in regeneration, is the mind which by nature is earthly and fleshly changed to that which is heavenly and spiritual? If so, I ask, Can that which is heavenly and spiritual be involved in the cares of earth; and could the believer with only a heavenly mind engage himself in the business of the world? If the carnal mind is not changed, what becomes of it when the new birth is experienced, unless it remains as ever in its relation with *the old man*?

2. In reference to believers, sinning and being wretched. Was not David, though not living under the gospel dispensation, a child of God, a believer? Did he not in the case of Bathsheba and Uriah sin against the Lord, as he said he did, II Sam. 12:13? Was there no mind in exercise, no reasoning upon the subject in his desires first to deceive Uriah and then to kill him? So in the case of numbering Israel, was there no sin, no mind or reasoning powers involved in it? Did David feel no *wretchedness* or distress, when convicted through

Nathan of his sin concerning Uriah, or when concerning numbering Israel he cried out, “Lo, I have sinned and I have done wickedly; but these sheep what have they done,” &c.? In the case of Peter, was there no sin in his denying Christ, and in his *cursing and swearing*, no mind in it, no wretchedness when he went out and wept bitterly? Are not believers subjects of repentance? Does not that repentance produced by godly sorrow imply a sense of having sinned? Does not *godly sorrow* such as produced in the saints at Corinth, {II Cor. 7:9-11,} indignation, fear, vehement desire, zeal, revenge, &c., involve wretchedness or distress of mind?

3. Concerning believers, complaining of the depravity and wickedness of their hearts. Is not the spirit of God’s Son in the believer a spirit of holiness, and therefore of opposition to sin? Is it not therefore consistent with a believer that he loathe sin, as much in himself as in others? Does not a sense from time to time of God’s love and goodness to him make his own sinfulness and depravity appear more loathsome to him? Can he when he speaks of himself, speak of anything but of his poverty, wretchedness, and guilt? May he not with propriety so speak of himself as an illustration of the riches and freeness of that grace which brings pardon to his guilty soul, as well as for the encouragement of others who know the plague of their own hearts? I will in addition propose one or two queries in reference to the 7th chapter of Romans. 1. Is it consistent to suppose that Paul in personating a person as *under the law* would speak of himself, as distinct from sin dwelling in him, as though he had been delivered from his sense of accountability to the law; and of the inward man in distinction from the flesh as though he had been born again? 2. Is it supposable that Paul would declare his own experience under the law and his being slain by it, as in the past tense, as he does from verse 7 to 13 and then turn round and in the following verses represent himself in the present tense still as under the law? I hope the forthcoming exposition may clear up the point embraced in these two latter queries.

S.TROTT.

# VIEWS ON ISAIAH 2:4.

DEAR BRETHREN: – I see in the Messenger for December 1, 1859, a request from sister Jane Luce, for my views on Isaiah 2:4. With your permission I will give such views as I have through your paper. The text reads thus, "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

In verse 1, we are told that this is the *word that Isaiah saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem*. Verse 2, "And it shall come to pass in the *last days*, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains," &c.

The expression *last days* is used in the Scriptures repeatedly to denote the last or gospel dispensation, that is the coming and reign of the Messiah. See Acts 2:17, and context; and Heb. 1:2. Hence as that whole dispensation is the establishing of a spiritual worship and the reign of Christ, is a spiritual reign, so this, that was to come to pass is spiritual. The Lord's house is the spiritual house, the gospel church; and the *top of the mountains* in which it shall be established, is no other than the Rock on which the church is built, Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God. Hence it is not said to be the *tops of the mountains*, nor the *top of the mountain*, but the *top of the mountains*, and *above the hills*. Christ is above all the mountains and hills of political and ecclesiastical governments, and the *top* of them all, having the entire control of them; for, "All power is given to him in heaven and in earth." As Christ's kingdom which is here spoken of, is not of this world, but is spiritual, and comes not with observation, but is *within you*; that is, internal in its influences and reign. See Luke 17:20,21. So we are not to understand in this 4th verse, that his reign, or religion, was to interfere with nations or civil governments. Christ, on a certain occasion, asks, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" Luke 12:14. One of the early corruptions that crept into the church was that of conforming the church and religion of Jesus Christ, to the national religion of the Jews, and hence the attempts to bring the natural seed of believers into the pales of the church, as also to connect the church with civil governments. Hence also the popular idea among national religionists, and all who receive their ideas, is that such texts as this 4th verse related to the nations of the earth as nations. And because they have not yet seen the event in that way accomplished among those nations and governments which profess to be christian, they have adopted the idea of a worldly Millennium, when these events will be fulfilled. Hence also the attempts to hurry in the Millennium, by peace societies for

abolishing war, &c. Not only are the Protestants filled with such notions, but also the Friends or Quakers, who profess a religion that is altogether spiritual, to the exclusion even of the ordinances of the gospel, have run into the same error. The truth is, the *spirit* of their religion is too much of a *fleshly spirit*. Hence their making their Society or church a fleshly or national church by holding their children under the control of their Society, as much as do the Protestants. Hence their opposition to anything like war, and to oaths, &c., in cases relating to worldly governments.

But the New Testament does not authorize a belief that war will cease among the kingdoms of this world while they continue. Christ said, “If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews;” thus showing that the order of the kingdoms of this world in relation to wars was not changed by his coming. John 18:36. Again he said, “Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword.” Matt. 10:34. The prophecies in the book of Revelations, in their fulfillment thus far, show clearly that by the *sword* in that declaration, our Lord meant wars and fightings.

Sister Luce will enquire, What is then intended by the prophecy under consideration? I answer, that in the first place it shows that the Judah and Jerusalem intended; that is, the kingdom of David’s Son, Christ, was to be extended and established among the Gentiles. Hence the declaration in verse 2, “And all nations shall flow unto it;” and in verse 4, “And he shall judge among the nations.” In the second place, it teaches, that this kingdom of the Messiah is not to be established and extended on the principle on which the national kingdom of David was established; that is, not by the *sword* and *spear*, but it is established and extended in the spirit of peace and *good will toward men*. The Lord compares the extending of his kingdom among the nations thus, “And he shall spread forth his hands in the midst of them, as he that swimmeth spreadeth forth his hands to swim,” &c. Isaiah 25:11. That is, as the swimmer takes the advantage of the weight of the water, by spreading out his hands, to press himself forward, yet as he passes leaves the water to return to its wonted level and smoothness, so our Lord is establishing his churches in the midst of the nations, whilst he takes of the citizens of those nations to form the subjects of his kingdom, or the members of his church, he does not overturn, nor interfere with the government or laws of those nations, nor take from them their citizens, but leaves the subjects of his grace as much subject and obedient to the governments under which they live as though they had not been brought into his kingdom. Hence if the government is at war, they are ready to bear their proper share of its burden. Whilst in spreading the gospel or extending the church of Christ, they will use no force of law, nor weapons of war, but simply the peaceful implements of the plough share and pruning hook, or the preaching of the gospel and bearing witness to its truth.

Again, the Lord compares his defending of Jerusalem or the church to *birds flying*. See Isaiah 31:5. Birds flying are different from beasts rushing upon their prey. The latter tread down and crush everything in their way. But birds destroy not the equilibrium of the air, leaving no wake behind them. So the Lord will appear for the defense of his church, his people, and his cause. He will defend them so that *no weapon that is formed against them shall prosper*, no evil shall come upon them. Yet the Lord will not destroy their foes, nor crush the government that may persecute them, until his time comes to take vengeance on them, but he will overrule and so control all their machinations and rage as to cause the *wrath of man to praise him*, and to cause *all things*, which he determines to *work together for good to them that love him*, and the *remainder of wrath he will restrain*. This is carrying out the absolute predestination of God as we hold it. Hence as the Lord is thus a sure defense to his people, and cause, hiding them under the shadow of his wings, they have no occasion to seek protection from laws against those who oppose, nor to take up weapons of war against those who persecute; but if they "smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee on the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also," that is, for righteousness sake, or for thy faith in Christ. But if, as a citizen, we are injured in person or property, we have the same right to seek protection and redress from the laws of our country, as have other citizens, or even to defend ourselves, our family, or property. So in reference to oaths, or the direction *swear not at all*, if in our church relations, we have not sufficient love to, and confidence in one another, to let each other's yea, be yea, without its being confirmed by an oath, it is time such church relations were dissolved. But in dealing with people of the world in worldly transactions, we are dealing with those, who at least, do not want to show any more confidence in us, on account of our religion, than we have in them; and we are dealing with them on the principle of human laws, which ought not to make any distinction between the disciples of Christ, and other citizens. Hence if in such cases an oath is necessary for confirmation, let us take it unhesitatingly.

I have thus attempted to illustrate what I believe to be the spirit of the text under consideration, without coming directly to the words of it. I will now briefly notice the words, in their order. 1st. "And he shall judge among all nations." The *he* here must refer, for its antecedent, to the *God of Jacob*, named in the preceding verse. As the whole connection of our text shows that Christ is the personage brought to view, it is evident, that Christ is the God who declared himself to Jacob at Bethel, as the LORD GOD of Abraham, &c. See Gen. 28:12-15. *And he shall judge the nations* – No; for he *came not*, in the view given of him in our text, to *condemn the world*, but for salvation. Hence it reads, "He shall judge among the nations." That is, he shall judge *his people* that are among the nations, and he shall convict them of sin and just condemnation, and yet shall justify them by his blood. "And shall rebuke many people." There are many, very many

people who find a good deal of *condemnation* in their religion. Their religion is *Adam* or the *natural man* reformed. Hence when they can find any reformation in their lives, any religious excitement or zeal in their passions and feelings, they think it is commendable, and expect that God will commend them for it. But there are, and have been, many people who find nothing but *rebukes* to themselves in their religion. Whilst under the law, they found nothing but *rebukes* for their want of conformity to its holy and spiritual requisitions, until they became disheartened from all attempts to be accepted upon the ground of their obedience, and fell helpless and condemned at the feet of mercy. They hoped when faith was given them, to behold Christ as *the way* that they should so live, so walk in obedience, as to feel approved before God and their own consciences. But they have found nothing but rebukes against themselves from that day to this. They have been daily rebuked. They have been rebuked for the coldness of their love and zeal, for giving way to their appetites and passions, for the workings of corruptions within, and their proneness to yield to temptations, for their worldly mindedness, and for the mingling of the flesh or self in all their religious exercises and doings. Why is it so? Because Christ, who is in them, or the *new man* is holy as God is holy, whilst the *old man* is corrupt, and so of course are all its acts; hence the spirit or new man rebukes and abhors all its doings. No wonder that the people who are thus rebuked should be humbled and abased in their own eyes; and therefore esteem others better than themselves. Hence that instead of wishing to compel others to be conformed to themselves in religion, their great desire and effort should be to be in themselves more conformed to the image of Christ, and more anxious to show forth his salvation. Hence, that they should exchange the implements of destruction, for the implements of production and peace; the implements of war, for the implements of husbandry, which are implements for producing that which is good, to man.

“Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” The kingdom or church of Christ is composed of persons who are of different nations and owe allegiance to different governments; yet as subjects of Christ’s kingdom, they are a *peculiar people*, and a distinct and *holy nation*. Although the nations and religions of the world have repeatedly lifted up the sword against this nation, yet it has never lifted up the sword against them. And the subjects of this kingdom have no prejudices against one another because they are of different nations of the earth; but let them meet together, from different nations, and different parts of the earth, and as soon as they have seen in each other, that they are of the spiritual circumcision, they will embrace each other in their affections as brethren, and of the same family. And when the *kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ*, as I think they will at the close of the Philadelphian church state, or after the destruction of the man of sin; then whilst under the influence of the spirit of the gospel, they will no more lift up the sword,

nation against nation. But no human effort can bring this about, for the prophecies concerning the Beasts, and their destruction, must first be accomplished.

"Neither shall they learn war any more." Under David, Judah learned war, but under Christ, the spiritual Judah, instead of learning war, learn to love one another, and to act from the principle of love, having the love of God shed abroad in their hearts.

Such are my views of this subject, and as such I give them.

Yours, I hope in love,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., Jan, 2, 1860.

## VIEWS ON I JOHN 3:15.

DEAR BROTHER: – I see by the MESSENGER for February 1, 1856, that our brother Wm. M. Mitchell, requests my views on I John 3:15. The views I have I readily give. The text reads thus: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer; and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him."

This has been a difficult text to me, as well as to others. The difficulty has arisen, I apprehend, from the idea we have attached to the term *murderer* as used in the text; that is, applying it as the word is commonly used among us as denoting one who had literally killed or caused the death of another. According to this sense of the word, every son and daughter of Adam must have been literal murderers; for the testimony which Paul bears concerning himself and others, {Titus 3:3,} that in times past they were *hateful and hating one another*, applies to all. Hence according to our text, if we give this sense to the word all must be shedders of human blood directly or indirectly. On the other hand, giving this sense to the word, and not only must we decide according to the text, that every person, without exception who commits self-murder was destitute of eternal life, but also that David had not eternal life abiding in him as he in this sense was evidently a murderer in the case of Uriah.

But I now understand John as drawing throughout this epistle a close and discriminating line of distinction between those who are the sons of God and those who are not, or who are as he calls them, *the children of the devil*. Hence his words are to be understood not as *in the letter* merely, but as *in the spirit*; that is, he is not speaking merely of outward acts, but of the whole character of the two classes, the natural man and the spiritual man, of the children of the devil, and the children of God. The natural man or the unregenerated having nothing but a carnal mind is as stated in Titus 3:3; hateful and hating, is enmity against God, not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Rom. 8:7. Hence he is guilty of the whole law, and is therefore a *murderer* in view of the law as spiritual. But the "new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness," is in its essence the very spirit of the law; it is love to God and to its neighbor. And "love is the fulfilling of the law;" hence, "Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." But what is it that he who is *born of God*, loves after the *new man*? Is it sin or depravity? No. Is it the flesh with its lusts? No. It is love to God, and therefore love to Christ, and to the image of Christ wherever it is seen; it is love to the *new man* or to the *spirit and its fruits*. Hence the declaration of our Lord to his disciples, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another." The law required that we *should love our neighbor*; but this is a new command, it referred to the new man and his affinities, not to the natural man. The children of God will love one another. No one that is born again can see the fruits of the Spirit, or the evidence of the new birth in another without feeling his love drawn out to them and to him in whom he sees them, as a subject of grace. Hence if anyone who professes to belong to the brotherhood of Christ, can see the evidences of faith in another, and hate him for it, hate him as a brother, as Cain did Abel, he is a murderer, he has not eternal life abiding in him, and is therefore still under the law and held by it as a murderer or guilty of the whole law. And no one that is held under the condemnation of the law, or as a murderer, has eternal life abiding in him.

John in the context refers to Cain evidently as illustrating what he was expounding. He says {verse 11,} "For this is the message that ye have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another." Referring evidently to the *new* command of the Lord. He then adds, "Not as Cain who was of that wicked one and slew his brother; and wherefore slew he him?" Was it for any mere fleshly or worldly advantage or lust? No, but, "because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." Because his brother offered in faith and was accepted, and he did not, and therefore was rejected. Here then we have an illustration of the murderer in our text – verse 15. And here we have a true illustration of the spirit of persecution in all after ages. And no one who can engage in persecution for righteousness sake, "hath eternal life abiding in him." He is a *murderer*. Thus we see that David was not a murderer in John's sense of the word, neither typically

nor antitypically. Not typically, because Uriah was not an Israelite, but a Hittite, one of those nations whom God commanded Israel to destroy. And we have no reason to believe that it was for Uriah's faith that he was killed. Yet David's sin in the whole matter was great, yet repentance was given him and his sin forgiven before the Lord, notwithstanding according to the Sinai law he was made to suffer external retaliatory punishment. See II Sam. 12:1-14.

I will here remark for the consideration of brethren who may be exercised on the subject, that from the view we have taken of the love which characterizes one who *has passed from death unto life*, it is not consistent with this love, that we should love every member of the church alike. It is a love of the Spirit of Christ, hence if we are influenced by this love in proportion as we discover this spirit in any member, we shall love him, and where we see a worldly spirit, or that which looks like pretence, or self-exaltation in religion we shall dislike it.

Although I have been already more lengthy than would have been necessary simply to give brother Mitchell my views of the text, yet there is one point more in it that I wish to notice. It is the expression, "Hath eternal life *abiding* in him." The idea which appears to be entertained by many of our brethren concerning the eternal life which a believer hath, is that the soul is merely raised from a state of death to the privilege of living eternally. Hence the *new birth* is frequently spoken of as a *resurrection*, and as a *quickening*, &c., that is, by men. But John represents *eternal life* as something which *abides* in the new born person. If so, must it not be a real existence that dwells in the believer, distinct from anything that dwells in others, and therefore distinct from the human soul. This corresponds with the idea of a birth, which is a bringing into individual existence, that which had not before existed except seminally in its head or progenitor. This principle of *eternal life* as an incorruptible seed being thus implanted in the soul, it quickens the soul to a sense of its accountability to God and dependence on him, &c. But I will not now enlarge upon it.

I have thus given such views as are given to me of this text. If brother Mitchell thinks them not scriptural, I need not tell him to throw them by, for he will certainly do it. But in that case I think I have a right to insist on his giving his views of the passage.

With christian regards,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax C.H., Va., Feb.13, 1856.

# VIEWS ON MARK 8:22-26.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: – I see by the second number of the SIGNS, volume 24, that sister Culver desires my views concerning the blind man's being restored to sight – Mark 8:22-26. I gladly accept the invitation, not that I have any special or very clear views to give on this miracle, but because being so much detained at home, and from my meetings, during this very inclement winter so far, I am glad of anything to draw my mind to the Scriptures and exercise it thereon.

The many instances recorded of our Lord's opening the eyes of the blind and of healing other diseases, were designed as external, visible proofs of his being the long promised Messiah. And these afforded an evidence which the Jews could not wholly overlook. Thence said Nicodemus, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him;" thus speaking not only for himself, but for others also. The different instances in which he opened the eyes of the blind, show the sovereignty of his power in doing it, with or without instrumentalities. In the case of blind Bartimeus, he simply said to him, "Go thy way; they faith hath made thee whole;" and "*immediately* he received his sight." He touched the eyes of others, and they received sight, Mark 10:46-52 & Matt. 20:30-34. In the case of the man blind from his birth, John, chapter 9, Jesus spat upon the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and sent him to the pool of Siloam to wash; and when he had washed he *came seeing*. In the case under consideration, Mark 8, he spit upon the eyes of the blind man and put his hand upon him, and told him to look up, &c. These different methods of restoring sight to the blind, showed, perhaps, more conclusively, that it was by his own divine power that he performed these miracles, than the performing of them all by one method would have done, as it showed that he could open the eyes of the blind in what way he pleased. But as the various maladies, and particularly blindness, which our Lord healed, are referred to in Scripture to show the miserable state of the sinner in regard to spiritual things, so the performance of these external miracles were evidently designed to bring him to view, as the great physician who can heal all the inward maladies of sinners, and as doing it as readily, as freely and as sovereignly to all who look to him for it, as he did to the infirm in body. It is in reference to the opening of the eyes spiritually, as presented to view in

the case of this blind man naturally, that I presume sister Culver wishes my views. To that I will now attend.

Verse 22, “And he cometh to Bethsaida; and they bring a blind man unto him, and besought him to touch him.” It is not said whether this man was born blind or not. It is not material in this case. It is true that all men are born blind spiritually; but none in a state of nature know that they are thus blind. Until that life which is imparted in regeneration, we, like the Jews, say we see, or, at least, think so; and whilst this is the case, *our sin remaineth*. John 9:41. This man was sensibly blind – so are all those, spiritually, who apply to Christ to give them sight.

Verse 23, “And he took the blind man by the hand and led him out of town.” As Bethsaida was one of the places on which our Lord had pronounced a woe, {Matt. 11:21,} it may be, therefore, that Christ thus led him out of the town because he would not perform the miracle in the presence of those he had thus given up to their own destruction. At any rate, in the spiritual miracle, he does not open the eyes of the blind in the sight of those he has left to their own delusions; and not often, if ever, in their assemblies. Often, persons whom we hope are subjects of grace, in giving a relation of their experience, mention having been led in their exercises to go up to a front bench or some way in public to be prayed for, thinking thus to have their eyes opened to behold the Savior; but they and their leaders are disappointed; instead of opening their eyes then, he leads them out in their blindness from these public resorts and from confidence in them and their measures, and in private gives them the touch that opens their eyes; but not till he has *spit* upon them. Note, some of the children of God have had their eyes opened in the assemblies of the saints, and under the regular preaching of the gospel, and during the prayers and conversation of the people of God, but not in those assemblies under whatever name, got together for the purpose of converting sinners. When the eyes of the blind are opened to behold Christ as the way, it is always so done that the doing of it is by the individual ascribed to God only, independent of all human helpers. “And when he had spit on his eyes, and put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought.” We know that in performing the literal miracle, this *spitting* on his eyes was not necessary to our Lord’s opening them; there must, therefore, have been some other design in doing it; and I know not that the design is found anywhere but in the antitype. To spit upon a person is to cast great contempt upon him. Thus God said concerning Miriam, “If her father had but spit in her face, should she not be ashamed seven days?” Num. 12:14. And thus the widow, in case her husband’s brother refused to take her and raise up seed unto his brother, was commanded to loose his shoe, and spit in his face. Deut. 25:9. So, did any ever have their eyes opened until the Lord had first spit on them; or, in other words, had so treated with contempt all their prayers, tears, and other efforts to recommend themselves to his favor, that they were utterly ashamed and

abased, and made sensible that they were so ruined by sin, that there was no power in themselves, or in any human being to take this widowed soul, and raise up seed unto his brother, that the Lord must save, or this inheritance is gone forever. “And put his hands upon him, he asked him if he saw ought?” We lay our hands upon a person when we are going to speak to him, to engage his attention. So the Lord is sure to fix the whole attention of a person when he is about to speak peace to him, or to open his eyes; sometimes he does it by his being made to see a light, or hear a voice apparently, as is frequently the case in the experience of colored persons.

Verse 24, “And he looked up, and said, I see men as trees walking.” I understand by this expression, simply the idea of an indistinct vision, as though he could see something moving or walking, as we see the motion of a thing before we discern particularly its parts, but could not distinguish its appearance from that of a tree. Many persons, when Christ touches them, immediately receive sight, to see how God is just in justifying the ungodly, through Christ’s atonement; but others again, like this man, have at first only an indistinct view of salvation. Some text is applied to them which they take as a promise of salvation, or their burden is removed and they feel great peace of mind; and in these things they see God moving toward them in salvation, or conclude that he is going to save them, and they feel happy for the time, but at the same time have no distinct view of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, or as suffering in the sinner’s stead. As, “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus,” without faith in Christ as the way, they have no solid ground for their hope to rest upon. They may be led, while in this comfortable frame, to unite with the church, and get along for a time satisfied with their experience; but when temptations and trials come, as come they will, their good frame is gone, and they are tossed about without knowing about resting by faith in Christ. It is true the Lord, in the meantime, may have touched them again, to behold, through the reading or the preaching of the word, or by an application in some way of the word, Christ is the way, the truth, and the life. And though they believe now in Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, and speak of him as the Lord our righteousness, still, in those times of trial and darkness they will go back to that experience which they told the church; and in that they never can find that which satisfies themselves, or which they think ought to satisfy others, that they have faith in Christ, and therefore go on dissatisfied with their own experience through life unless, as in some cases, they are led to look to their after teachings as that in which they were enabled to believe in Christ. It is true that when the Lord has begun a good work, he will carry it on to the day of Jesus Christ; but my opinion is that where persons have had their eyes only partially opened, it is much better for their future comfort for them to wait, without being hurried into the church, until the Lord is pleased to lay his hands on them again, and give them a clear sight of Christ. Others, on receiving this partial deliverance, are in some way prevented from speaking of it, and are soon left to

darkness again; and they now think their case worse than ever, their burdens are gone, and no view of Christ. In their distress they are led to cry unto the Lord. “After that he put his hands again upon his eyes and made him look up; and he was restored, and saw everything clearly.” That is, some portion of Scripture suiting his case is so applied to him that he feels it is of God, and through Christ as the way of salvation, and the salvation is clearly revealed to him, and he rejoices in him as *the Lord his righteousness*, as the *chiefest among ten thousand*, the *one altogether lovely*.

Verse 26. “And he sent him away to his house saying, Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town.” Our Lord frequently charged those whom he healed not to tell of it, thus fulfilling the prophecy, “He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street;” thus illustrating the spirit of the gospel. The religion of Christ does not consist in external parade and show, but is retiring from the pomp and display of the world. There is nothing like boasting, like, Come and see my religion, my zeal for the Lord. When the Lord opens the eyes of any one to see clearly, instead of leading them to go among the popular religionists, or those who make a boast and show of religion, he leads them to look for his despised and afflicted people, and makes them feel that among them is their home.

Such are the views I have to present for the considerations of sister Culver on the portion of Scripture she designated. I leave it for her and others to judge of their correctness.

With brotherly love,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Feb.6, 1856.

## VIEWS ON MATTHEW 12:43-45.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: – A friend and reader of the SIGNS, from Catskill, has, by letter, requested my views on Matt. 12:43-45, I therefore send such as I have to you for publication in the SIGNS, if you see fit.

The passage is that declaration of Christ to the Jews, that "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man," &c. There are, no doubt, many young believers, and some old ones too, who, with the friend making this request, have thought the remarks contained in this passage was a description of their own cases. The time was when they had thought their vile affections and corruptions were subdued, and Satan did not worry them; but when for humbling them, or for the trial of their faith, the Lord leaves them to feel the power of their corruptions, and the assaults of the adversary, they have been led to think their case could not be worse, if they had seven devils in them, for they feel the force of their corruptions to be seven fold, and hence they are ready to conclude that they are not what they had hoped they were – subjects of God – but that *their latter state is worse than the first*. But such may rest assured that this text has no reference to their case, no relation to the trials and experience of the children of God; that the whole was designed to show the peculiar state of that generation of the Jews, as the context with the concluding remark in the text shows. Our Lord, in his remarks, refers, as an illustration of the state of that generation, to what appears to have been a generally conceived idea among that people, concerning the operations of evil spirits upon individuals, and from the positive declaration which he made concerning it, I must conclude that this opinion concerning unclean spirits and their influence over individuals, was a correct one. I admit there are difficulties in the way of our comprehending how distinct existing spirits should have and exercise such influence and power over men. We have been accustomed to ascribe similar influences and effects, when witnessed among us, to disease, to depravity, or some derangement of the faculties or the mind. Human science would reject, as fictitious, such statements, though found in the Scriptures, as are incomprehensible to us. But however much the power of Satan or devils, in this respect, over men, may have been abridged since the resurrection of Christ – when I consider that the statements found in the Scriptures were written by inspiration of God, and written, not as fiction, but as a revelation of truth – I at present feel constrained to believe, from those recorded statements, that there did exist as distinct intelligent beings, such unclean spirits, or devils, as are spoken of, and that they were permitted of God to take possession of individuals, and exercise such power over them as is described. Witness the case of the man among the tombs, Mark 5:1-13; see also, Mark 3:11-12 & 1:23-26; also, Acts 19:12-17. How far the devils may have similar power given them over individuals under the Gospel, or whether any, I pretend not to say; but from the accounts given, I am inclined to believe the devil has power given him to exercise through human beings – witchcraft in our country the same as in the case of the witch of Endor – though the spirits raised at this day, do not, and cannot, speak the truth through their mediums, as did the spirit of Samuel through the witch of Endor.

Having premised this much concerning unclean spirits, let us notice the words of Christ: "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man." This is not a case of the devils being

cast out by the finger of God, and forbid any more to enter the man; but of his voluntarily going out of his own accord. Very different this, from a work of grace upon the heart. “He walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none.” The expressions used in the following verse, such as, “he taketh to himself seven other spirits,” show that it is the unclean spirit here spoken of, as acting individually or personally, and not the man. “Seeking rest and findeth none.” That is, he roamed at large, without being permitted of God to enter in and possess any other person; for he was as much dependent on God’s absolute sovereignty to enter any one, as was the legion, to enter the swine.

“Then he saith, I will return unto my house, from whence I came out.” That is, I will return unto the man I had before possessed. “And when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept and garnished.” Being *empty*, shows that the grace or spirit of God had not been communicated to this man, neither had any other evil spirit possessed him. And being freed from the influence of this unclean spirit, the man had reformed his life, from those unclean or corrupt courses to which he had been led, and of course had garnished himself with decent and moral, if not benevolent conduct.

“Then goeth he and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is worse than the first.” That is, being now possessed by seven more spirits, and these more wicked than the first, his conduct was worse, as also was his condition.

“Even so shall it be, also, to this wicked generation.” That is, like unto the man thus represented, the Jews had been addicted, previous to their captivity, to idolatry, and to a disregard of the law; but after their return from Babylon, and the building of the sacred temple, every vestige of their former idolatry was swept away, they were obedient to the law in its letter; and were garnished with a zealous regard to the worship of the true God. But the generation then on the stage, when our Lord was on earth, adhered more to the traditions of the fathers than to the law of God, and were, therefore, in truth, idolaters; though they shunned the form, they were hypocritical in their worship, were self-righteous, and with it were proud, bigoted, oppressive, persecuting, blasphemous, &c., so that they were filling up the measure of the iniquities of their fathers sevenfold, and about, thereby, to draw upon themselves, in the rejection of Christ, a judgment sevenfold worse than the Babylonish captivity, so that their *last state was worse than the first*, like the possessed man. I will remark, in addition, that there is much in our day resembling the state of that generation and of that possessed man. Many persons speak favorably of revival efforts who do not profess to approve of their systems of religion; they say these conversions tend to moralize the people. But according to Christ’s view concerning that generation of the Jews, the state of these persons is likely to become sevenfold worse. These men made converts, or excitement converts, may leave off drunkenness if they

have been addicted to it, and profanity, gaming and the like. But, on the other hand, it makes them hypocrites in leading them to profess a religion which they do not possess, their religion being leGal. This religion being a selfish one, it makes them more selfish in their intercourse with men, however liberal they may be in giving to religious purposes, it leads them to have self-righteous opinions of themselves; and self-righteousness always embitters the heart of its possessor against the truth and those who hold it, and enlists them in opposition thereto; so that they become revilers of the truth and of true believers, and are prepared instruments for persecuting the saints, in any form and to any extent, in which persecution may be permitted of God. More might be said on this point, and yet not appear over-drawn to any candid observer of the popular religion of our day. This is so from the nature of things; for where the heart is not changed, and the love of God not imputed, the enmity of the heart toward God and the depravity of nature, remain in their full force, and in the conversion from a man of the world to a religious professor, the individual will act under the influence of his enmity, selfishness, &c., more freely in his religious course than formerly he did in his worldly course, because conscience has more or less restraint upon men of the world to keep them within bounds, but now this man thinks he is doing God service in reviling and seeking to put down the truth, and will satisfy himself in opposing those he gets under his power, and in overreaching and taking the advantage of his neighbor in his dealings, because the more he can gain in this way, the more he can give to religious purposes. Now, my friend, from your enquiry, I presume this is not your case.

S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., June 23, 1856.

## VIEWS ON I PETER 4:17,18.

DEAR BROTHER BEEBE: – In the 16th number {present volume} of the SIGNS, there is a request from brother C. Jackson, of Virginia, for my views of I Pet. 4:17 & 18:

“For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God, and if it begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?”

Peter in verse 12, says, “Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you as though some strange thing happened unto you.” In the verses intervening between this and verse 17, he exhorts them in reference to the fiery trial, and in his remarks, he shows that by it he refers to some special persecution about coming upon them, and then in verse 17, informs them that the occasion of this *fiery trial*, is, that the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God.

As Peter substitutes the word *us* for the *house of God*, in the second clause of the verse, and also from the connection, it is evident that from the expression, he meant the church of the saints, or Gospel church. And as Peter was an Apostle of the circumcision, his epistles were originally addressed to the believers among the Jews. Hence by the expression, “Them that obey not the Gospel,” he undoubtedly means the unbelieving Jews.

*The time is come*. This expression evidently refers to some anticipated period. Our Lord had foretold his disciples of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the Jewish nation in their nationality, Matthew, chapter 24, and had limited the time to that generation. This judgment came upon that people and city in A.D. 70. Christ had also told his disciples that before these things, “They should lay their hands on them, and they should be brought before kings,” &c. Luke 21:12. The Jews had, from the commencement, persecuted the Christians, so far as they had the power, and had in some instances instigated the Roman governors to persecute them. But in A.D. 64, Nero, the Roman Emperor and tyrant, issued his edict against the Christians, authorizing them everywhere to be put to death. Thus commenced the first general persecution against the Christians, which lasted until Nero’s death, A.D. 68. In this persecution, multitudes of Christians were put to death by every species of cruelty. According to Chronologists, Peter wrote this epistle, A.D. 65; therefore, at the very time this severe persecution was about commencing, and this, no doubt, was the *judgment* he directly referred to.

*Judgment must begin at the house of God*. Why begin there? Because whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth, Heb. 12:6. And as he said of the type, so also of the antitype, “You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.” Amos 3:2. Hence, “the slaying must begin at God’s sanctuary.” Ezek.19:6.

But brother Jackson may be ready to enquire whether God inflicts judgment upon his people? I answer, Yes! “The Lord shall judge the people.” Again, “God judgeth the righteous.” Psal.7:8,11. “With righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people

with equity." Psal.98:9. God had, previous to Peter's writing this, judged the church according to the strictness of his righteous law, and had inflicted the entire penalty due for her transgressions, upon her head and husband, Christ, who for this purpose, was made under the law. Again, her husband having, by enduring the curse, satisfied the demand of the law; she, by his resurrection from the dead, was judged clear from the law, or justified. Rom. 4:25. But Peter says, "the time is come that judgment must begin." This, therefore, refers to another judgment, and as the church had already been redeemed and justified from the demands of the law, this judgment could not be upon legal principles, but upon Gospel principles, or in love, as a father judgeth and chasteneth his son for his good.

The church and people of God, have in no age kept up the Gospel standard. They have come short in faith, in the order and discipline of the church, and in practice. In times of outward peace, the churches are apt to become careless in reference to these things; the living members will become lukewarm and too much disposed to conform to the world, and persons destitute of grace are suffered to get in and remain with the church. Hence the importance of the churches being first purged before God inflicts his judgments upon their enemies. In the times of persecution and some other judgments, these judgments will do for the churches what they had failed to do for themselves by a faithful and correct exercise of discipline; the dead members will fall away and go to their proper associates, and thus be in a place to meet the judgments awaiting the enemies of the truth. As in that judgment to which Peter particularly referred, many Jews no doubt had professed Christianity, without a living faith; these, when the Romans persecuted the Christians, would go back to Judaism, and thus become involved in the destruction which awaited that people. And although many christians, by this persecution, were taken from the church, and from their relations to the world; yet, there was no wrath in it to the church, nor to them, for still the Lord preserved a remnant sufficient to proclaim the Gospel, and to bear testimony to the truth. And as to those who suffered death, they were placed in their sufferings, in circumstances to bear a much more efficient testimony to the truth of the Gospel, and to the power of divine grace to sustain them, than they could have borne while living in peace; and besides, they were the sooner released from the world and its troubles, and from the corruptions of nature, and taken to rest.

Besides, these judgments tend to manifest the faith of the children of God. Hence, Peter speaks of these manifold temptations as being for the trial of their faith, chapter 1:6,7. Whilst living in comparative ease many of the children of God hardly know whether they have faith or not; indeed often much doubt having any, and cannot so clearly prove their faith to others; but when the judgments of God are upon them and the church, they are led to look to Christ as their wisdom, their strength, and their salvation. They now feel that without him they are lost, they can do nothing, they have neither wisdom, nor

strength to meet their trials; he is, therefore, their only hope, and they know that he is able to save and keep them. What but faith would lead them thus to cling to Christ, under afflictions, divisions, reproaches, &c., as their last hope and trust? And in remaining steadfast in the doctrine and order of the Gospel, whilst the church is enduring these judgments, whether they be persecutions unto death, or reproaches and defaming, or divisions and a thinning of the members of the church, &c., they give evidence to their brethren of their faith. Again, these judgments often lead the children of God to see and feel the evil of errors, neglect of discipline, and sins which they had before overlooked or paid little attention to.

I now come to the part which brother Jackson wished me particularly to notice: “And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?” In reference to the *salvation of the righteous* here spoken of, I will remark that there are two kinds of salvation spoken of in relation to them. There is the salvation from the law and its curse, from sin, death, and the grave, to a state of justification here, and of glorification hereafter. This is wholly through the redemption which Christ accomplished by his death, resurrection, and ascension. Christ is this salvation, it is found wholly in him. There can, therefore, be no scarcity in this salvation, for he is God all sufficient. The Scriptures represent the redemption of Christ of his people, as a complete triumph over the last enemy, death. Hence it is said in reference to his ascension as the Redeemer, Head, and Forerunner of his people, “God is gone up with a shout, the Lord with the sound of a trumPet. ” Psa. 47:5. Again, “Thou hast ascended on high; thou hast led captivity captive.” Psa. 68:18. Again, “Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in. Who is this king of glory? The Lord strong and mighty; the Lord mighty in battle.” Psa. 24:7,8. Surely when we consider that Christ’s people were quickened together with him, and raised up together, and made to sit together in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, Eph. 2:5,6; and that Christ has so signally triumphed over all he had to encounter in accomplishing their redemption, has *led captivity* itself captive, has subdued everything that could bring into or hold his people in *captivity*, has entered in and taken possession of eternal glory, and been honored as king of glory, as the forerunner and in behalf of his people; we must be convinced that there can be no deficiency in this salvation, that the word *scarcely* cannot be made to apply to it.

Again, the term *righteous* will not apply to the elect as objects of the salvation by Christ’s blood. They are made righteous by this salvation; but it is as sinners that they are saved. Christ came into the world to save sinners and only sinners; so that I think brother Jackson will be satisfied this is not the salvation intended in his text.

The other salvation spoken of, is a salvation in providence and grace, a being preserved in existence and from evils, and a being kept from the corruptions that are in the world

from errors, from temptations, &c. Understanding this to be the salvation intended by the Apostle in relation to this judgment, it will readily be seen that the righteous were *scarcely saved* during such a severe and lengthy persecution. But a mere remnant at most, of those who belonged to the church at the commencement of the persecution were saved from its ravages; others were added to the church, and many of those met death at the very onset of their profession. John was, perhaps, the only apostle that survived it. So in the persecution of the Donatists in the sixth century, and of the Waldenses in the seventeenth century, in both cases these people were scarcely saved, mere remnants escaped and they scattered. In the repeated judgments of God upon his church since, in suffering errors from time to time, to get in and gain such an ascendancy as to cause divisions, and to compel the lovers of truth to separate from the multitude, mere remnants have been found to have escaped the prevailing corruptions or errors; so that the declaration of Scripture, "A remnant shall be saved," applies not only to national Israel, but also to the visible church down to the present hour. I think, also, if the children of God will reflect on their own individual experience of the judgments of God upon them, in leaving them to encounter sore temptations, and in leaving them to feel something of the power of their own corruptions, they then have been brought to feel how weak was all their resistance, and it has not been till all hope was gone that they should be saved or escape, that the Lord appeared for their deliverance, and like Paul and his companions, when they escaped from the dreaded shipwreck of their profession, it was only on planks or broken pieces of the ship. So that they have known there was no safety in the ship, nor in themselves, nor in any resolutions, nor plans of theirs to weather the storm; and that nothing but the interposing mercy of God saved them. Hence all boasting in their strength, in their resolutions, in their love to holiness, &c., was excluded, and shame and self-abasement followed. Again, bodily and family afflictions, want, embarrassment in business, have been visited upon others as judgments, and when this has been the case they have been left for a season to darkness and unbelief; and under the influence of these, they have concluded that these adverse providences were evidences against their being children of God, and that they were but the beginning of God's wrath against them for their hypocrisy in professing religion. Even unbelief had evidently got the better of Paul, when he said, "All hope that we should be saved was then taken away." For before he left Jerusalem the Lord had stood by him and said, "Be of good cheer Paul, for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." Acts 23:11. But this was forgotten of Paul, when "neither sun, nor stars in many days appeared, and no small tempest lay on them." How many of the children of God have experienced such seasons spiritually, and if Paul could be left thus to unbelief, no wonder their unbelief of nature should prevail, when thus tried, until God is pleased to send some angelic message to them to revive their faith, as he did in Paul's case. Acts 27:23. In fact, this shipwreck of Paul's throughout, is a striking illustration of

Peter's declaration in our text, "If the righteous scarcely be saved," &c. But when it is applied to the eternal salvation of the saints, as Arminian preachers frequently apply it, there is a gross degradation of Christ and of the efficacy of his blood, for it would represent Christ, the glorious ark of safety, could be broken in pieces. Amidst all these hair-breath escapes which the children of God meet in this world, and all that despondency of soul which they are left to, so that all *hope is taken away that they shall be saved*, the angel of the Lord stands by them, and as the angel said unto Paul, "Lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee," so Christ, the angel of the covenant says, in his word unto his disciples, "Not an hair of your head shall perish. In your patience possess ye your souls." Luke 21:18,19.

If the righteous thus scarcely be saved, when God visits them with his judgments for their wanderings, and their worldly mindedness, "where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear," when God, laying judgment to the line and righteousness to the plumet, shall visit them for the enmity and rage they have manifested to his people and cause? This question, brother Jackson, I presume, does not wish me to answer. It is enough for us to know that God will deal righteously with them, and will vindicate his own and his people's cause, that where they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, he will give them blood to drink.

Yours in love,
S.TROTT.
Fairfax County, Va., Oct.9, 1856.

## VIEWS ON PHILIPPIANS 3:10 & 11.

> "That I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."

Brother Beebe: – As your Correspondent F. refers to me as well as to yourself for an exposition of Phil. 3:10-11, and you have seen fit to submit the subject to me, I will give such views as I have of the passage.

Paul having in some of the preceding verses, showed his superior religious advantages in his natural state, over many, in reference to legal or conditional acceptance, and consequently the great advantage he had on the ground of creaturely boasting; then states the great change he had experienced, in being brought to count those religious advantages which he had considered a great gain, a *loss*, a real *nuisance*, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, his Lord; and speaks of so accounting them that he might *win Christ*. The term *win* is here not used in the sense of obtaining a prize by venture or exertion, but in the sense of esteeming Christ as his *prize or gain* in contradistinction from those things he formerly counted *gain*. Then to have Christ would have been esteemed by him as a loss, now, those things he formerly prized, he knows to be *loss*, and Christ he esteems and desires as his *gain*. That is, not merely to have Him in name, but – "to be found in Him, not having," he says, "mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith." How completely does the Apostle here cut off all *creaturely means* in the article of a justifying righteousness; it is *through faith* – not of works; it is by *faith*, not of the preacher or hearer, but of God.

Paul goes on to say in the 10 & 11 verses; "That I may know Him and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings; being made conformable unto His death. If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." That I may know Him: Not that Paul did not know Him as the long expected Messiah, as the God of Abraham, the Immanuel; nor that he did not know Christ crucified as the only way of salvation, as the *end of the law for righteousness* &c. But the sense here may be, the same as he told the Corinthians, "I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ and Him crucified;" that is, as the subject of gospel preaching, or the ground of gospel hope, so in reference to himself he desires to know Him as the only ground of his hope and trust. Formerly he knew many things, when under the law, as grounds of hope, such as his circumcision, his blameless life, his zeal &c., but when sin revived and he died, all the goodness of these was destroyed; and now Christ Jesus only does he know, or even desire to know, as his trust and plea for acceptance with God. We may in some measure appreciate the force of the Apostle's expression: "That I may know Him," when we consider how prone we are to look to other things as grounds of our hope and confidence, such as our love, religious zeal, upright walk &c. Again Paul may have desired to know Christ, or God in Christ, in the sense in which he says, "now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known," I Cor. 13:12, that is, he desires a more perfect knowledge of the "Only wise God our Saviour." We know but in

part in reference to His exalted, glorified state. We have but a faint conception of the putting forth by our exalted Jesus of all the attributes of Jehovah for the salvation of His church and people. If we did but know Him more; know more of His love, truth, power, wisdom, and of the riches of His grace &c., we should not be so often doubting whether He could or would save such poor wandering sinners, who have no other hope. Paul partook of this imperfection of knowledge and was therefore susceptible of a growth in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ; and this he desired.

"And the power of His resurrection." In considering the *power of His resurrection*, we must remember that He died as the Head and Representative of His people, having all their iniquities upon Him, when He arose, He arose triumphant over their killing power, had expiated them, and left them buried, never to arise for His people's condemnation; and as He represented His people, in bearing sin and dying; so He in His triumph, brought them forth freed from the curse of the law.

Again, He was under the law to redeem His people from under the law; to Him therefore the law looked for the redemption price as standing between His people and its demands; when therefore He came forth from its servitude, having canceled its demand, and was "declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead," He brought them forth with Him, from bondage into the same relation of sonship to God, as *brethren* and *joint heirs* with Him; and therefore brought in a dispensation of sonship under the *new covenant* in the place of legal bondage. There His people *were quickened together with Him, and raised up together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus*. {Eph. 2:5 &6.} So that when any are born again, they are born free from the curse, born in a state of justification, of liberty, of sonship and receive the spirit of adoption, crying Abba Father.

No wonder then, that Paul wished to know the power of Christ's resurrection; to have a constant and sweet experience of it, in enjoying the privilege and confidence of a son and heir of God; and to have an abiding sense that all this comes by Christ's resurrection. How much more glorious a state this, than that of legal servitude! What a display does it afford of the grace of God! What confidence does a knowledge of these things give in approaching God; beyond what we could have while dependent on our own faithfulness and acceptance with Him.

"And the fellowship of His sufferings." Christ in His sufferings under the law, on account of sin, and in enduring its penalty, suffered, as has been noticed, as representing His people: They have therefore a mutual fellowship or participation in those sufferings, and the redemption wrought thereby. They have thus through Christ their Head, received what the prophet calls, *Double for all their sins*; have received full punishment due for them and rendered full satisfaction to law and Justice. {Isa. 40:2} No Fullerite evasion

of the demands of the law, in this thing. When we so feel our sinfulness, as to query whether a just God can have compassion on such base transgressors; how comfortable to know our fellowship in Christ's sufferings, and that thereby our sins have been expiated, and justice on their account satisfied. We then know that a just and holy God can be favorable to us, notwithstanding our vileness as sinners. Alas, how few and scattered are the moments when, in this day of coldness, we know these things in real heart experience.

"Being made conformable to His death." This is an important consideration. Neither Paul, nor any other subject of grace would be satisfied with knowing the above things, whilst sin had its full dominion over them. We are told of Christ, that, "In that He died, He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God." Rom. 6:10. In regeneration and the new birth we are in this thing made conformable unto His death. When the *commandment comes, sin revives and we die*. We so know and feel the exceeding sinfulness of sin, that we fully acquiesce in the justice of the sentence of death, which the law passes upon us. And instead of wishing to live any longer in our sins, we desire to be saved from them. And when born again, or brought into gospel liberty, we are born of a principle of life which lives not unto sin, but unto God. It has no delight in sin, but delights in God, and in a conformity to His will.

This is a source of many doubts, particularly to young christians; these are apt to suppose that this dying unto sin, is a being delivered from the sinful propensities of nature. Hence when they feel these working in them, they fear they have been deceived in their hopes of having passed from death unto life. Paul felt the same propensities, *with his flesh he served the law of sin* &c. Rom. 7:15-25. This death unto sin has often been represented, *a being dead to the love of it*. But this helps not the matter; for the natural affections are no more changed than in nature itself. Hence we find our affections setting towards that which is sinful, like a current. As Watts expresses it:

"The fondness of a creature's love,
How strong it strikes the sense;
Thither the warm affections move,
Nor can we call them thence."

Christ did not die unto the love of sin; for He never did love it. But He died under the sentence of the law on account of the sins of His people laid upon Him. And if we have been made conformable unto His death, we die daily to all creaturely glorying, and creaturely confidence on account of finding sin mixed in every thing we do; so that we no more have any confidence in the flesh, in our gracious exercises; nor love for it or its doings; but have confidence in God and a desire after Him, and after a conformity to His will. Thus, we see the propriety of the Apostle's exhortation – "Likewise reckon ye also

yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin &c." Rom. 6:11-13. No more consider sin your proper element. Again, Christ died unto the servitude of the law, and if we are made conformable unto His death, *we have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father*. And therefore *we serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter*. Rom. 8:15 & 7:6. Now when we are thus made conformable to Christ's death, an increased knowledge of the *power of His resurrection, and of the fellowship of His sufferings*; instead of leading to looseness of life, will lead us the more earnestly to *desire to live unto God*.

"If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Not to stop to inquire what any supposable meanings of this text may be, I will inquire what the *resurrection of the dead is*, and let Paul answer. He says, "it is raised in incorruption; it is raised in glory; it is raised in power; it is raised a spiritual body." I Cor. 15:42-44. Who that knows the internal warfare of the christian, does not, when his desires are not benumbed by the world or the flesh, desire like the Apostle to attain to this holy perfection in body as well as in spirit? Not that they are so anxious to be *sown*, or to be dead and buried; as the Apostle shows by another figure when he says, "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; *not for that we would be unclothed*, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." II Cor. 5:4. Paul with propriety illustrates the extent of the desires of the *new man* by the idea of the *resurrection of the dead*, because he well knew, that neither he, nor any other christian would realize the satisfaction of these desires, short of the resurrection of the dead, as says the Psalmist: "I shall be satisfied, when I awake with Thy likeness." Ps. 17:15. That Paul designed thus to express his earnest desire after entire perfection in heart and life, and therefore did not rest satisfied with any attainments short of it, is evident, from the further explanation which he gives in the following verses of the chapter, and which those who wish for satisfaction on the subject will do well to read. Here I will stop, lest remarking further on this verse, I should touch on controversy.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
Sept. 24, 1846.
S. Trott.
From: SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 14 (1846)

Select Works of Elder Samuel Trott
pgs. 342 – 347

# VIEWS ON THE SEED OF THE SERPENT.

Brother Littell: – I will now in answer to your other inquiry, attempt to give my views relative to the seed of the Serpent. I shall simply state my views and my reasons for them. I understand then the seed of the Serpent not to have reference to men as men, nor as sinners simply considered, but altogether to men as religionists.

My reasons for this view of the subjects are as follows: 1. I understand Christ, in saying to some "Ye are of your father the devil," as speaking in reference to their great pretensions to religion, and as a contrast to their claiming to be of God. And in the same connection He gives us a sketch by which to draw the line of distinction between the seed of Christ and the seed of the Serpent. Satan is represented as a *murderer or liar,* and the *father of lies,* John 8:44. Christ is the *truth* and the *life,* John 14:6. As is through *the belief of the truth,* II Thes. 2:13. Satan's by being given up to *believe a lie,* same chap., verse 11. Christ's seed are known by being gentle and inoffensive like sheep; Satan's by possessing a persecuting spirit like wolves, however much they may wrap themselves in *sheep's clothing.*

2. He whom Paul calls a *child of the Devil,* Acts 13:10, was manifested as such, not by not attending to the *right ways of the Lord, but by perverting* them. So at this day the children of the Devil are known by perverting the truth and order of the Gospel.

Thus Satan's ministers are manifested in the transforming themselves into the *Apostles of Christ,* as though they had authority to set things in order in the churches. II Cor. 11:13. An account of one of Satan's ministers and of his doctrine we have in the case of the damsel who annoyed Paul & Silas, at Philippi, Acts 16:16-18. It is true this was s female, but Satan sometimes employs such even at this day. The doctrine is worthy of particular notice: "These men are the servants of the Most High God, which *shew unto us the way of salvation.*" Strange how many disciples this *witch* has, at this day, even among the Baptists; who, like their leader, are preaching that the ministers are the *mighty ones* who can *shew unto the people the way of salvation.* Whoever may preach this doctrine, we can have no hesitancy, with this waymark before us, in pronouncing it to be from the spirit of witchcraft. Paul preached Christ unto the people, but he never pretended to show *them the way,* that is, make them see the way of salvation, that he

knew none less than the Holy Ghost could do. He was therefore grieved that any should say it of him.

3. Another reason for my views relative to the seed of the Serpent is drawn from the parable of the wheat and the tares, as explained by the Master Himself in Mt. 13:24-30 & 36-43. In this parable we have the seed of the Serpent as the *children of the wicked one contrasted with the seed of Christ as the children of the Kingdom.* Two things relative to this parable are worthy of notice. First, it is not the creation of the world that is likened to the incidents of the parable, but the *kingdom of Heaven,* therefore it has reference to events connected with the Gospel dispensation. Hence this parable affords no support to our Brother Parker's *two-seed system.* Second, the *field is the world* – not the church. The doctrine therefore, "Let them both grow together" has no reference to the exercise of church discipline, but has reference to the Spirit of the Gospel as not countenancing persecution.

In this parable as in the other instances I have noticed the seed of the Serpent is contrasted with the good seed of the Son of man. It is an illustration of the fact that wherever Christ sows His seed, that is, sends His gospel, plants His churches, and calls out His people, there Satan will have his mock-gospels, mock-churches, and mock-professors.

4. Another reason for my views, as laid down at the commencement of this letter, I find in what is said concerning the two seeds, Gen. 3:15, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed." I understand from this declaration that there would be a continued, fixed enmity between these two interests in the world. But there certainly has never been any such enmity manifested between the *elect* and *non-elect,* as such; not between the gospel and the church of Christ, and sinners as such. Hence this does not support the *two seed* system of the West. I know well that there is a law enmity against the sinner, that is, the law condemns him, and that the *carnal mind,* both in the elect and non-elect is *enmity against God, not subject to the Law,* &c. But the text under consideration has reference to Christ; not to the law. The song of the angels, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men," I consider as expressive in the clearest and fullest sense of the design of the coming of Christ into the world and of the tendency of the Gospel. And the Gospel tends not to communicate to its true ministers nor to any who receive it, anything like enmity towards sinners or carnal men as such, but on the contrary, it produces more tenderness towards them, and a greater desire for their real happiness. Neither do carnal persons while inattentive to religion, manifest any enmity to the Gospel or to Christians. They have no relish for the Gospel. Like Gallio, they care for none of those things, therefore, like him, they will have no hand in persecuting the followers of Jesus for their religion.

But let one of these Gallios' become converted into any of the systems of men and he is at once enlisted into the ranks of Satan, and will soon begin to manifest his enmity against that gospel which proclaims *Glory to God in the Highest,* and against those who preach it. We have an illustration of my views upon this subject, in the case of Cain and Abel. These brothers lived peaceably together, so far as we know, till Cain became a religionist of his own contriving, then because Abel brought an offering, not of human contrivance, but *in faith,* and was therefore accepted, the enmity of Cain's heart burst forth against him and against God. Indeed, we see numerous illustrations around us, in the cases of the modern converts of the *mourners bench* and of the *altars* &c. It is by means of conversions to the various religious schemes which Satan has set afloat through the instrumentality of his ministers, that he has from age to age kept up his army for waging war against the church of Christ. And he is now mustering all the forces that the *election of grace* will allow of his collecting, for the purpose of making one more desperate attempt to bury the walls and city of Zion by assault. He will succeed in killing the *watchmen on the walls,* the true *witnesses.* But Zion's foundation is sufficiently strong to withstand the assault, and the result will be that his army will be overwhelmed and become the subjects of their own destruction.

On the other hand, although there is no malice on the side of the gospel, yet it inculcates upon its followers a firm and manly stand in opposition to the assaults and intrigues of the enemy and his forces. Christ says concerning the *tares, He shall send forth His angels and shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity and shall cast them into a furnace of fire,* &c. We hear the Angel proclaiming that "If any man worship the Beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture, &c." Rev. 14:9, 11. Paul says, "though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. 1:8. John also says, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." II John, verse 10 & 11. Again, the Apostle to the Gentiles exhorts his Ephesian brethren in these words, "Finally my brethren, be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might. Put on the whole armour of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil &c." Eph. 6:10-11.

Indeed, I cannot conceive how a person can be brought experimentally to know and love the truth as it is in Jesus, and not so feel his heart bound to that truth, that the setting up of anything in opposition to that truth would be like rending his own soul. There is in this truth as it is known and felt by the believers everything to enlist all the better feelings of the soul. The glory of the three-one God is involved in it. The sovereignty, glory, wisdom, love and mercy of the Father; the love, faithfulness and power of the

Son, and the efficacy and completion of His work, and sovereignty, faithfulness and divine energies of the Holy Ghost are all so contained therein, and connected with the truth of the gospel, that there has never been a system of doctrine contrived by men but what has struck directly at one or more of these divine attributes. Again, the believer knows that the whole Godhead as is known as Father, Word and Holy Ghost, is necessary to secure the salvation of a sinner; hence as any of the divine attributes are left out or thrown into a background by any system introduced, he must feel that the foundation of his hope and comfort is struck at; and at the same time he knows that as such system is received into a confidence in that which will leave them to perish at last; and knowing all this; can the christian refrain from manifesting his abhorrence of such a system, and his opposition to it? That christian must be under the influence of a most dastardly spirit, who can turn from such divine glory and excellency as in the *truth as it is in Jesus*, or who can approbate or even wink at any attempts to deface it, and that from the mean desire of thereby securing a little worldly ease, and worldly applause. Yet there are those, known to some of us, especially in some of our larger cities, who are very Davids in the pulpit, wielding the *sword of the Spirit* manfully, in cutting down error and in defending the truth of the gospel that *salvation is of the Lord*, but who, when out of the pulpit, are lending their names and influence to sanction and help on this, and the other scheme of human contrivance, for saving those whom, as they represent it, the Lord would otherwise leave to perish.

Thus we see, there is a constituted separation between truth and error in religion, and between the lovers of truth and lovers of error. On the above and like reasons, I rest my views relative to the *Seed of the Serpent.*

Now, my brethren, you who have received the love of the truth, let me address a few remarks to you upon this subject. God, we see, has put enmity between the *woman's seed and the seed of the Serpent.* Where God has put enmity have we any right to make peace? And when God has called us to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ; and to take the whole armour of God, that we may be able to withstand in the evil day; and having done all to stand, what right have we to sneak cowardly away, and leave the enemy to pursue unmolested their devastation of the divine system of truth and to plant their systems in its place? There are many excuses made for such a course; but will they stand? Look at Israel. God put enmity between them and the nations around them, but they were repeatedly making peace, forming alliances and intermixing with those nations. The consequence of every such departure from the direction of God was the introduction of idolatrous principles and worship into the land. So spiritual Israel has ever been found to form alliances with the seed of the Serpent; and thereby worldly professors, worldly principles and practices have been introduced into the church of Christ. It has now got to that pitch of intermixture of the two seeds, that we need an Ezra

chapters 9 & 10; Neh. 13:1-9 & 23-30. Brethren, let us take the New Testament for our Ezra, and by its directions, arise and make the required division, separating ourselves from every system, scheme and divice of Ashdod and Moab. Let us erect the standard of truth over our camp, that we may be distinctly know that great exertions are being put forth to drown all confessions of faith by those who are afraid to have their principles see the *light.*

I am surprised that any *Lover of the word* should join them in the attempt. Let them succeed and we shall see Unitarians, and Trinitarians, Universalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, &c. &c., all united in one mingled mass in *battle array* against the truth. Let us separate ourselves from the whole *mixed multitude.* Declarations of faith, I know, have been abused, such abuses we would do well to put down. For instances, the *name,* "Philadelphia Confession of Faith," the principles being overlooked has been used as a *password,* or rather as a *flag of truce* under which the seed of the Serpent have been coming into the very camp of Zion, till in many instances they have the entire command of the *gateways,* admitting and excluding whom they please, and even of the *batteries,* so as to point the artillery against Zion herself. This *name* therefore I would willingly drop; but let us make an unequivocal declaration of what we believe to be the faith and practice taught in the word of God, as we have learned it in the school of Christ – the *Old Baptist School,* and instead of dropping this *declaration,* let us nail it, as the sailors say, *nail it to the mast,* and rally round it in one solid body.

Brethren, let me entreat you to reflect on these things, and earnestly to enquire at the word of the Lord, after the course which belongs to you, as the Israel of God, to pursue. But amidst all our reflections, let us ever remember that the *weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty,* – not through human might, human wisdom, human stratagem, nor anything human – but *through* God to the pulling down of strongholds &c. And let us ever keep in mind what is written, *Vengeance is mine; I will repay saith the Lord,* and therefore not give way to any emotions of revenge. I subscribe myself yours, &c.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
June 25th, 1833
S. Trott

SIGNS of the TIMES: Vol. 1 (1833)

# WHAT ARE THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION?

Brother Beebe: – The next subject on which my views are requested is embraced in this inquiry: What are the Conditions of Salvation?

If the term *condition* were at all admissible in reference to that which is the sovereign act of Jehovah, I would give these as the conditions of salvation, namely: 1. That there are guilty, justly condemned sinners to be saved; and 2. That a way was provided in which God is just in saving sinners or in justifying the ungodly. These are certainly inseparable from the idea of salvation though not conditions in the common sense of the term. If we were not sinners ruined in ourselves, and already condemned by the just and unchangeable law of God, we had not been proper subjects of salvation; but on the contrary would still be *probationers;* that is would be in such circumstances that our future destiny whether of happiness or misery would depend on our acts or the course we take. Could we get to heaven under such circumstances, it would be as much the consequent result of our own acts, as would be our going to hell in pursuing a different course; hence there could no more be salvation in the one case, than there would be unjust oppression in the other. So also in reference to the other circumstance or condition, justice must be satisfied; the law of God must be canceled in its demands or it would forever bar the flowing of grace to the sinner: God *cannot deny Himself.* Hence the grand leading subjects of revelation are that these circumstances actually exist, or that these conditions are fully met in reference to all who are chosen to salvation. Thus the use of the law on the one hand, to show our guilt and condemnation; “That sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.” See Rom. 7:7-13 & 3:19, 20. So on the other hand, the gospel is a declaration of Christ Jesus having magnified the law and made it honorable, and being *the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;* and hence, of redemption and salvation in Him. Of Him it is said, “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare I say at this time His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Rom. 3:25 & 26. Hence the justice of God is manifested in fully acquitting and justifying all them that believe in Jesus though in themselves *they have sinned and come short of the glory of God,* and are justly condemned by the law. So in christian experience, none can receive the hope of salvation in truth until they know themselves sinners, ruined and justly condemned by the law; and by faith know that God is just in pardoning and saving sinners alone through the redemption that is in

Christ Jesus. On the other hand he that knows and feels his just condemnation as a guilty transgressor of the law, and the deep pollution of his nature and acts so as to have lost all hopes of escaping the curse by any thing of his, is the very character, whom, as declared in the Scriptures, Christ came to save. He *came to seek and to save that which was lost.* And he that by faith knows and receives Christ as the end of the law for righteousness, his hope for salvation resting upon a foundation that can never fail, is according to the Scriptural decision, a saved one.

But I presume the inquirer had in view conditions according to the common notion of the term; something found in us or done by us, which at least gives us the ground to hope for acceptance with God; such as our repenting, believing, sincerely seeking and loving God, &c. The natural mind becomes so completely imbued with this notion of conditions, by hearing and reading of them so much, as set forth by men, that even believers frequently, notwithstanding what they have been taught of themselves, and of Christ's full work, will be looking for some of these conditions as an encouragement to hope, instead of looking to Christ. Hence the propriety of discussing this subject. In contradiction to all notions of conditions performed by creatures interposing in the work of salvation; 1st. We are taught that "Salvation is of the Lord," that "He that is our God is the God of salvation." The consideration that He claims salvation to be of Himself and that He is self-existent and absolutely independent, that everything else exists of and from Him, and therefore that He cannot be influenced to act from anything out of Himself, shows that salvation being of Him, it must be exclusively of Him. Were He induced to save by the creature's performing certain conditions, He would be controlled in the act by the will of the creature, and could no longer justly claim the sovereignty He does, when He says, "I even I am the Lord {Jehovah} and besides me there is no saviour. I have declared, and have saved, and I have shewed when there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God, &c. Isa. 43:11-12. 2nd. The fact that those who are saved were, *from the beginning chosen to salvation,* and therefore before they actually existed or had *done any good or evil,* effectually excludes all conditions or works done by the creature. See II Thes. 2:13, Rom. 9:11. 3rdly. Salvation as wrought out is embraced in redemption; it is redemption from the curse of the law, and from under the law. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Gal. 3:13. And receiving the adoption of sons was the result of this redemption, GaI.4:4 & 5. And mark, it was God that sent forth His Son, &c.,to redeem, and hence it was not that He was moved to it by any act of the creature. Even in His very birth as a Saviour, all fleshly power was excluded, He was *made of a woman;* not born by any act of man. And lest men might claim that God's thus sending His Son was the result of conditions performed by Abraham or his posterity, it is declared that, in the very relation in which Christ was born as a Saviour, *His goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.* Micah 5:1 & 2, and Matt. 2:5 & 6. Thus

effectually debarring all creaturely influence or conditions from having any control over His coming. 4th. The experience of salvation, or being brought to have communion with God as a Father, is so represented in the Scriptures as effectually to deny its dependence on conditions. God is a Spirit, this communion of course must be spiritual, and of which the flesh can have no part. Therefore to enjoy it we must become spiritual. This can only be by our being born of the Spirit; *that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.* The fleshly birth is the result of being begotten of the flesh. The spiritual birth of course must be the result of being begotten of the Spirit. So says our Lord, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.* Of course the flesh has no part in the quickening or begetting. No room then for conditions here. See John 3:6, and 6:63. And of this birth as sons of God or as spiritual, it is said "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1:13. Here all natural or blood descent is excluded, and of course all conditions performed by parents. No fleshly volition wills it, nor any will of man, even though he may be regenerated, produces it; but it is of God's sovereign volition. If we perform a condition as such do we not will the result? In excluding then the will of the creature, is not the condition excluded? – But 5. Not to be extremely tedious in multiplying proofs establishing the same fact, I will confine myself to this one more point of illustration. Paul in confirmation of the view above given of salvation as wrought out, says, Eph. 2:4 – 6, "But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, {by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Here he shows that the saints were delivered from it; and were raised up together and made to sit together in *heavenly places* – not placed back again in Adam's original state of innocency and like him left subject to conditions or the requisitions of the law; but embraced in the provisions of the heavenly or everlasting covenant, having no *ifs* in it, no conditions to render it uncertain, but *ordered in all things and sure*. Well therefore might Paul interrupt the thread of his discourse to exclaim, "By grace ye are saved," every line, and word, shows God as going forth in the sovereignty and independence of His love and mercy, toward guilty sinners; a love that even their being dead in sins, could not check, and one therefore which creaturely works could never have drawn forth. But Paul goes on in verse 7 to show an object God had in *raising them up and making them sit together in heavenly places;* namely, "That in the ages to come He might show the exceeding riches of His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus." *In the ages to come,* that is, in the experimental deliverance, in all succeeding ages, of those He had made to sit together in heavenly places, He might show the *exceeding riches of His grace,* &c. One might have supposed that if Paul had mentioned only the *riches* of God's grace as that which He intended to show, no one would ever think of its being found so scanty as to be limited and confined within the bounds of

such conditions as puny man could comply with. But the Holy Spirit knowing the proneness of man to bring every thing, even God's rich grace, down to the standard of *earthly things and places,* which all have limitations, directed the use of the still broader expression, the *exceeding riches of His grace.* That which is *exceeding,* must *go beyond, over-top* everything in competition; but if the grace of God in salvation, were suspended upon any conditions whatever, those conditions uncomplied with must bar that grace and therefore exceed it. And hence where sin abounded in the noncompliance *grace could not abound.* Not so, such is the riches of God's grace that it must exceed every impediment. So is the testimony, "That where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5:20 & 21. It certainly can not be possible that a conditional salvation can consist with the exceeding riches and sovereignty of God's grace. Salvation must flow as sovereignly free from Him as did creation, for He is alike the God of both.

But again, many persons, generally sound, hold the idea of a conditional covenant contracted between the Father and Son, the salvation of the elect being suspended on Christ's fulfilling the conditions thereof. The inquirer may have had reference to this idea. But there is no declaration made in the Scriptures of any such contracting between the Father and Son, nor anything to justify the idea of such a conditional covenant. That there is an *everlasting covenant ordered in all things and sure* established with the elect in Christ as their Head I think the Scriptures clearly teach. Of this covenant {or *testament* as the original word is in some cases rendered, though more generally rendered *covenant*} Christ is revealed as the Surety, Heb. 7:22, the Mediator, Heb. 9:15, and the Messenger, Mal.3: 1, each of these terms conveys an idea very different from that of a contracting party, as will be manifest on a moment's calm reflection. The great mistake in reference to this covenant arises from man being disposed to think of God as *such a one as themselves,* and therefore when God's covenant is spoken of, they conclude it must be like the covenants existing between men; and to carry out the idea they split up the Godhead into contracting parties having distinct, and therefore clashing interests in the concern. But no such idea is conveyed in the language of any covenant revealed in the Scriptures. As the Psalmist says of the everlasting covenant, Ps. 111:9, "He sent redemption unto His people: He hath commanded His covenant forever &c.", so it will be found in every covenant recorded, and in every reference to the everlasting or new covenant made in the Scriptures, that God appears as the sovereign Jehovah establishing every part by His absolute *wills* and *shalls.* Look at the covenant God established with Noah, &c., Gen. 9:8-17; the one established with Abraham, Gen. 15:7-18, and the one, Gen. 17 – then to the covenant mentioned by David, II Sam. 23:5 & Ps. 89:19-37 and see the wording; and David's views of it, as confirmed to him as the type of Christ, II Sam. 7, and then pass to lsa.59:21, and to the new covenant – Jer. 31:31-34,

and see if in any instance God appears in relation to those covenants in any other light than as the sovereign God commanding and promising in His own absolute independency? And then look through the Scriptures and see if you can find a single promise made to Christ as the Head or to His people in Him, depending on an *if* or contingency. If you cannot satisfy yourself hear Paul's testimony: "For all the promises of God in Him are yea, and in Him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." II Cor. 1:20. I said above, this covenant was made with the elect in Christ their Head; thus all the other covenants mentioned in the Scriptures were made with certain persons as heads and their seed in them; the head being subject to the provisions of the covenant in common with the posterity. So in this in an infinitely fuller extent; He being their Head, their Life, their all, every provision centers in Him, whilst its blessings terminate in His seed. Thus the purpose and grace which secures their salvation, are given in Him, II Tim. 1:9; all the promises of God are in Him, II Cor. 1:20; and indeed He is the covenant; was *given for a covenant of the people*, lsa.42:6 and 49:8. And notice in all this, that Christ instead of being represented as stipulating and coming forward as a contracting party, is represented as the servant, God directing and promising that He shall do it and succeed. So Christ Himself represents the matter. He says not, that I *came down from heaven to fulfill my part of the contract;* but that, "I came down from heaven not to do my own will, but the will of Him that sent me," &c. John 6:38-39. Thus, in accordance with the above, when the sword of justice was commanded to awake, it was to awake against Him who was the Lord's *Shepherd*, against the *Man* that was His *fellow.* Zech 13:7. Thus, it was not by contract, but as the Lord's appointed *Shepherd* that He was accountable for the safety of the sheep. See also John 10:11-16. It was not to the God that was *fellow to the Lord of hosts*, but to the *Man* that was His fellow. It has been said that *fellow* means an *equal.* Not so, its proper meaning is an associate, and it here particularly designates, that *Man* who is the one Mediator, and who is associated in personal union with the Godhead. I think if the Scriptures are carefully examined on this head by anyone disposed to receive Scriptural truth, he will be convinced that the covenant securing salvation as sovereignly free and absolute as the purpose and grace thereby revealed: that God appears as God commanding it; and that Christ and His people are one in all its provisions.

To the inquirer then, in conclusion, I would say trouble not yourself about *conditions of salvation.* If you have been taught by the law to know that you are altogether sinful in yourself and justly condemned, be assured that God has provided in Christ Jesus a full and free salvation for you as thus helpless.

Centreville, Fairfax County, Virginia,
S. Trott.
Dec.14, 1847.