

LITERARY AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

NO. XI.—SEPTEMBER, 1836.

ART. I. EXEGESIS OF ROMANS, 9: 2, 3.

By REV. HENRY MILLS, D.D. Prof. of Sac. Lit. in the Theological
Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

... ὅτι λυπή μοι ἐστὶ μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος δόνη ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου,—
ηὐχόμεν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ,—ὕπὲρ τῶν
ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα. . . .

* * * "that I have great sorrow, and my heart unceasing anxiety, (for
I myself did [once] wish to be anathema from Christ,) for my brethren,
my natural kindred:" * * *

ACCORDING to this version and pointing, the apostle, to obviate if possible the strong aversion of the Jews to himself and doctrine, most solemnly declares his deep and abiding solicitude on their behalf. He saw that, by their blind opposition to the gospel, they were excluding themselves from the salvation of Jesus their promised Messiah. He felt for them as brethren, and the more, as he was no stranger to the violent prejudices by which they were governed; he had himself been subject to their sway. He could sympathize in view of the awful ruin that awaited them; for he had been exposed to the same, and was snatched as a brand from the burning.

The words in parenthesis assign a special reason for Paul's peculiar solicitude.

It is no part of this interpretation that Paul, before his conversion, had wished to be anathema *for his brethren*: it simply exhibits the solemn declaration of his *present* anxiety on their account, and alleges a cause which must naturally deepen such anxiety.

Thus much to secure a right understanding of the exegesis proposed.

And when they once hide themselves in this refuge of lies, it is extremely difficult to dislodge them. A deceived heart hath turned them aside. They think they are something, when they are nothing.

ART. V. REVIEW OF HODGE ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

BY GILBERT MCMASTER, D. D. Duaneburgh, N. Y.

A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, designed for students of the English Bible. By Charles Hodge, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Princeton. Philadelphia. Published by Grigg and Elliot, No. 9 North Fourth street. 1835, pp. 588.

BETWEEN the works and the word of God, ingenious men have often remarked a striking analogy. In the details as well as in the outlines of this analogy, we are able to trace those impressions of the divine hand, and those features of the divine character, which, to our minds, identify the Creator of nature and the author of the Bible.

In the field and in the forest, upon the mountain and in the valley, the Botanist will find all the materials of the botanic garden; but then he will not find his classes, orders, genera, and species, collated and distinctly arranged in their respective plots. To find them, in order that he may thus arrange them, he must traverse the fields and the forest; examine the valley, and ascend the mountains; observe with discrimination, and gather with care the objects of his pursuit. For these toils the lover of nature will find a compensation in the great variety of relations presented to his view, and in the profusion of beauties and riches scattered around his path, which are sought for in vain in the artificial arrangements of the gardener's beds. Neither the views of a vigorous vitality, nor the enjoyments of the numerous and varied connexions of the products of nature, found in her own unmeasured plains and on her elevated hills, are furnished in the order and system of the garden, how beautiful soever, otherwise, that inclosure may be.

It is thus in the Book of God's revealed will. In its pages of light we have no technical system. The materi-

als of a system are, indeed, very abundant. The illuminating Spirit of inspiration has spread out the pages of the sacred volume, and as a mean of sanctifying the souls of men, has made it their duty and privilege to examine with diligence, earnestness, and solemnity of mind, the contents of those pages. The several parts of the revelation which they embrace are in perfect accordance with one another; and much of their beauty and efficiency lies in the enlightened perception of this harmony, and in the application of the several truths in their appropriate relations. The first principles of Christianity though comparatively few, are, nevertheless, like the letters of the alphabet, capable of indefinite combinations with each other and with the objects to which they are related; and in every form of combination they present so much that is peculiar and deeply interesting, as almost to justify in each presentation the appellation of a new principle. To discover these principles, whether in reference to the articles of faith or the duties of religion and morality, we must neither confine ourselves to abstract propositions, nor limit ourselves to express commands. Beyond these we must go to the features of character delineated in the Book of God; to facts in life and events of providence there recorded. These exhibited in a thousand forms, and modified by innumerable circumstances and relations, unfold principles and instructions of deepest interest to man. These principles stand in appropriate relationships to each other, and to ascertain their connexions and relative bearings, is the business of the theological student.

This we can by no means view in the light of an useless or unimportant labour. Whilst guarding against the danger of forming a system in anticipation of supernatural revelation, and then having recourse to that revelation to compel its testimony in favor of our theory, it would be no trivial error should we disregard the harmony of the principles of revealed truth, and satisfy ourselves with a view of them as insulated facts. There is a proportion—*αναλογία*—of the Faith of the Gospel, which involves the idea of system; a disregard of which will raise very great obstacles in the way of a sound and satisfactory *exegesis* of the sacred Scriptures, and will greatly retard the Christian's progress in his advances toward that acquisition of Bible knowledge, which is demanded for efficient christian action. Let, however, care be taken, that this *proportion*

of faith be deduced from the Scriptures themselves. The value of a compend of first principles, in the study of every other department of science, is well known, and why it should be contemned or overlooked in Theology, no good reason we think, can be assigned. The material for such a compend is abundantly furnished in the Bible, and when judiciously formed and employed, it aids in the progress of Bible investigation. With a view to such aid that chief of Theologians and prince of Scripture Expositors, *Calvin*, composed in an extended view of that early document, the apostle's creed, his invaluable "Institutes."

The Epistle of Paul to the Romans is, to some extent, an exception to the above remarks. In this letter the great outlines of a theological system are distinctly marked, and the filling up is as complete as either the epistolary form of composition, or the object of the sacred writer required. It is matter of sincere gratulation, that, for some years past, public attention has been invited, and continues to be invited to the study of this Epistle. The importance of its matter and the difficulty of its exposition have been generally admitted; and the admission of the difficulty of success has probably contributed its share in the production of that comparative neglect with which, we are sorry to say, this deeply interesting portion of the New Testament, in certain quarters has been treated. Among the indications of good and ill, of which our age is so very prolific, we are inclined to hail as one of promise, the aroused desire to understand the apostle of the Gentiles, in this chief production of his inspired pen. In aid of the object of this desire, Calvin is brought from the obscurity in which he has been too long suffered to remain, and in a modern dress is introduced to the fellowship of the English reader. Tholuck at Halle, on the European continent, and in our own country, in rapid succession, the commentaries of Stuart and Hodge have made their appearance. These commentators have laboured, indeed, with various success; but all of them with advantage to the cause of sacred literature.—Whatever provokes men to read, study, and understand the epistle to the Romans, or any other portion of the divine word, so imperfectly understood as that epistle generally is, does service to the cause of religious knowledge. The exceptionable, or more imperfect work will call forth into action those who can do it better. Acceptable com-

mentaries, too, have a tendency to bring back to the pulpits of our country, and to make fashionable, the good and profitable old custom of the Sabbath morning *lecture*,—the exposition, in order, Sabbath after Sabbath, of a portion of some book of Scripture till the whole shall be finished,—explaining its difficult terms, pointing out the relation of its several parts, stating its doctrines, and showing its practical use ; a custom which has extensively, and for the interests of Bible knowledge and a solid acquaintance with true religion very unhappily, too long yielded its place in the sanctuary to the little fancy piece, the vehement but ill-sustained exhortation or the intellect-destroying and death-producing vapid declamation. How very different from, and superior to these, the exhibitions of truth deduced immediately from the fountain of truth itself, pervaded by that fullness of spiritual vitality which gives life to the soul.

Our purpose at present is to notice, and that very briefly, the “commentary” of Professor Hodge. We very cordially welcome this work, as a valuable acquisition to the Theological literature of our country. Without pretension it evinces research, and without the angry spirit of ill-conducted controversy, it repels what the author views as error, and maintains with firmness what he believes to be truth. It gives us great satisfaction to say, that in the attention we have been able to give to the work, we have not discovered any doctrinal error. Professor H. is an advocate of the old Reformation views of the doctrines of grace, as these are set forth in the symbols of the reformed churches. His exposition will be read with advantage by every one who is desirous to understand the apostle Paul, in this portion of the sacred volume. It is a sound and able work, and may, very confidently be recommended to the attention and regard of every class of readers. That all the forms of expression employed in the course of the work are equally happy and appropriate, we need not affirm ; or that the author has seized with equal power, the spirit of every text in this epistle, none will expect. A faultless exposition of a scripture so profound is too much to require of any uninspired man. This remark will, we trust, guard us against misapprehension, in those which follow.

In a compendious “Introduction,” we have given us an outline of the character of Paul ;—a view of the origin and condition of the church at Rome ;—of the time and

place of the composition of the Epistle ;—of the proof of its authenticity ; and lastly an analysis of its contents. In this analysis, the author considers the Epistle as consisting of three parts. “The first which includes the first eight chapters, is occupied in the discussion of the doctrine of justification and its consequences. The second, embracing chapters 9, 10, 11, treats of the calling of the Gentiles, the rejection, and future conversion of the Jews. The third consists of practical exhortations, and salutations to the Christians at Rome. p. 13.

Analysis, in this instance, is, perhaps, rather a matter of taste, than of great utility. To that given by Prof. H. no great objection can be made, as it is, in its parts, sufficiently comprehensive, and to a wearisome detail exceptions may very justly be taken. Without attaching too much importance to the matter, we would prefer some such distribution of the epistle as the following: After noticing the Apostle's introduction, which we are inclined to *think* is found in the first fifteen verses, together with the general statement of his subject in verses 16, 17, and 18, he gives,—

I. In the remaining part of chapter i. and to verse 21, of chapter iii. a view of man's fallen state, in which he establishes the truth of the guilt, depravity, and helplessness of both Jews and Gentiles.

II. The discussion of Justification, through faith in the righteousness of Jesus Christ. The state of fallen man being unfolded, the way was opened for the introduction of the doctrine of the satisfaction of the Redeemer, in order to the justification of the believing sinner. This discussion occupies that portion of the epistle between chap. iii. 20, and the end of the fifth chapter.

III. Chapters vi. vii. viii. to verse 29, embrace the doctrine of sanctification with its issuing in glory.

IV. From verse 29, of chapter viii. to the end of chap. xi. a view is presented of the sovereign purpose of Divine mercy in behalf of ruined sinners, together with an outline of the plan of administration fixed in the sovereign wisdom and goodness of God, giving to the believer assurance of the infallible accomplishment of the designs of grace. In illustration of the subject, the rejection of the Jews, in accordance with the foresight of Israelitish prophecy ; the calling of the Gentiles, and the restoration of Israel to their church state, when the day of the fulness of the Gentiles shall have dawned.

V. Chapters xii. xiii. xiv. and xv. to ver. 13, contain a distinct summary of Christian duty.

1. In chapter xii, there is exhibited a comprehensive view of Christian obligation, personal and social; inclusive of a distinct reference to ecclesiastical officers and their peculiar duties.

2. Chapter xiii. brings before us the Divine authority of civil government, and the duty of Christians, as well as others, toward legitimate authority, in the respective countries where they may reside.

3. In chapter xiv. xv. to ver. 13, we find the great principles and leading rules of Church Fellowship, in which is prescribed the course to be pursued, in the formation and maintenance of ecclesiastical relations.

4. The remaining portion of the letter is occupied with various incidental remarks, salutations, and the conclusion.

Whatever may be the form of analysis, it affects not the substance of the exposition. That is, certainly, of greatest consequence, and will be found in the progress and details of this work, in which great and leading principles of the religion of Jesus Christ find a prominent and commanding place, and with the filling up of which outline we have found no material discrepancy. To enter into minute discussions, or to take up in detailed remark, any of these leading doctrines of the Gospel, is beyond our present intention. A reference to a few of them is all that is purposed, and this is attempted with the design of recommending the careful perusal of the work itself. Among the doctrines upon which the author appears to lay special weight, are the following :

1. The eternal filiation of our blessed Redeemer. Prof. H. decidedly takes the ground that the idea of the *Sonship* of Jesus Christ necessarily embraces that of Deity. *Godhead* is his, because he is the Son of God,—the *only begotten* of the Father. To us, indeed, it seems passing strange, that any should consider necessary Deity as the prerogative of the ὁ Λόγος,—a denomination so obviously seeming to designate the second person of the adorable Trinity, as the efficient agent in the revelation of JEHOVAH to the various tribes of his rational family, and especially to man; rather than of the ὁ Θεός, which so naturally indicates the essential necessary possession of Godhead, in virtue of the filial relation of the Son to the Eternal Father. The exposi-

tion of ver. 4, chap. i., found in this volume, will, we trust, be satisfactory to such as may have entertained doubt upon the subject. We deeply regret that any advocate of the Supreme Divinity of our Redeemer should have, at any time, hesitated upon the truth of his *eternal* and *necessary* Sonship. We still believe the denial of this truth to be dangerous to the faith of the Christian profession. What idea of the distinct personality of his Saviour, has the simple hearted professor, beyond that of his Sonship? When we have succeeded in persuading him that Jesus of Nazareth, *as Son of God*, is not supremely Divine,—equal with God the Father,—the work of the Socinian, who may soon follow us, will not be found of difficult accomplishment.

We cannot avoid the conclusion, that some good men, in their speculations upon this subject, have pushed too far the supposed points of analogy between human and divine *γενεσις*. The danger of pushing analogy, in reasoning, into the place of proof, is not unknown; and the absurdities that follow the carrying of illustration by it as a help, beyond the proper bounds, are in abundance before us. It might, too, not be amiss for some ingenious speculators upon the mysteries of the Divinity, whilst employing analogies derived from created nature, to stop ere they advance too far, and inquire how much they really know of that which they put in requisition for the explanation of the more hidden subject. Did we bear in mind the very narrow limits that set bounds to our knowledge of what goes to the constitution of the relationships of paternity and filiation among men, we might be saved from some rash conclusions, and from some needless perplexities upon the subject before us. Did we ascertain more precisely the true extent of our information on the subject of this department of physiological inquiry, it is very probable we should, in reference to the second person in Deity, utter and hear fewer suggestions of *communication, derivation, dependence, inferiority*; all which terms, if not limited to the humanity, or mediatorial character of our Lord, are offences against the acknowledged faith of the Church of God. Upon certain points, analogy was intended to shed a divine light; but the analogy, when pushed beyond its authorized bounds, casts a shadow of darkness under which every object becomes indistinct. In what, among men, does the personality of the son depend upon his father? What of the

personality of the son is a *derivative* of his father? In what is the son, as a human person, inferior to his father? On the part of the son, observation does not justify the idea of inferiority, in any essential attribute of human nature, to the father; physiological investigations authorize not the conclusion of inferiority; and in the organization of society, humanity in the son is guarded by as many legal provisions as it is in the father. In reference to our Redeemer the case is plain. In calling himself *the Son of God*, while sojourning among men on earth, he was understood as asserting his equality with God. The inference he did not deny. Upon this subject, however, the *τις*, *the how or why?* is the difficulty. What is his NAME, or his son's NAME, if thou canst tell? Fancy here should be restrained. In inquiries concerning the structure of nature, fancy may flutter around the blossom of the rose, imagination may form its theory of geology from a partial knowledge of facts respecting the strata of the earth, or arrange its system of physiology by suppositions ill sustained, and if kept in their own place, such theories may be harmless; but this they cannot be, when employed as the measure by which we would fathom the deep mysteries of God. The whole limit of the mountain where the Divinity dwells, is holy, and in approaching his temple, on the summit of that mountain, a voice reaches the ear, and in the warning language of admonition, addresses us, saying—*Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God,—be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter any thing before God: for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few.* When God, in condescension to our weakness, speaks to us of his attributes and relations, after the manner of men, it becomes us to separate, as far as possible, from the ideas communicated, all that pertains to, or that marks the imperfection of the creature.

Upon this subject, Prof. H. indulges in no rash speculations, nor does he attempt any theory, the tendency of which would be either to amuse or perplex his reader.

2. The righteousness of Jesus Christ, consisting of his obedience unto and in death; or, which is the same thing, his obedience in life and propitiatory sufferings unto death, as the substitutionary sacrifice for sin, which enter into the constitution of the mediatorial righteousness of our Redeemer, Prof. H. brings distinctly and decidedly into

view, in accordance with his text, as the immediate, proper, and only ground of the sinners justification ; to the exclusion of all works, dispositions, and personal excellencies, whatever, as constituting a reason for the bestowment of pardon, acceptance, and eternal life upon guilty man. Faith has assigned to it its proper place, that of a divinely appointed and provided means, which embraces, or appropriates, the righteousness of the Saviour to the soul. Between the justifying sentence of God and that righteousness, as its exclusive foundation, reason, or meritorious cause, there is nothing intermediate. We are glad to find this fundamental point so clearly stated, inasmuch as we have some reason to apprehend, that the *Neonomian* view of the way of justification has, for some time past, been making somewhat silently, perhaps, its way into the creed of professors deemed otherwise evangelical.

Against the danger, too, into which some respectable and orthodox men seem likely sometimes to fall, Prof. H. guards with very laudable circumspection : we refer to the importance of faith in the doctrine of justification. Much is said, and truly said, of the imputation of the righteousness of the Redeemer as the ground of pardon, acceptance, and eternal life, while faith in that righteousness, in order to its imputation, is occasionally not so distinctly or emphatically noticed as it ought to be. Faith is not the righteousness by which we are justified ; yet without faith there is no justification. It is by faith that the righteousness of Jesus becomes actually ours, and because it is thus ours, it is placed to our account for justification.

It is well known, that, without a formal rejection of the righteousness of the Redeemer, as the procuring cause of this primary blessing of the new covenant, there may be such forms of introduction given to intermediate circumstances as will, in a measure, place it out of sight. This will always be an evil, attended with great danger to the honour of the Saviour, and the peace of the souls of men. It is not enough to affirm that human works, of themselves, cannot merit pardon and eternal life. This, in her darkest hour, Rome could and did affirm. It is not doing strict justice to that apostate and very corrupt Church, to charge her with authorizing the declaration that simply in themselves, "good works merit heaven." This position, though held by individuals of that communion, has been condemned

by more than one of her popes. Whatever merit she ascribes to good works, is, in her decrees, admitted to be ascribable to the mercy of God, expressed in the gracious promise of the new covenant. A careful perusal of the decree of the Sixth Session of the Council of Trent, on the subject of justification, will show that the doctrine of that Church differs not, essentially, from that of those protestants who put faith, with its accompanying graces and virtues, in the place of the works of the law; not as meritorious in themselves, but as accepted of God for Christ's sake, and, thus only, making justification to us gratuitous.

Upon this subject we regret to find in circulation, among the churches, such instructions as the following, addressed to inquiring sinners: "God has been pleased to appoint (faith) as a condition on which men may be treated as righteous. It expresses a state of mind which is demonstrative of love to God; of affection for his cause and character;—and is, therefore, that state to which he has been graciously pleased to promise pardon and acceptance." What? Faith the condition of justification, as it indicates a mind in possession of holy affections, constituting *that state* to which is made the gracious promise of pardon and acceptance? But we, perhaps, misunderstand such writers; we do not, therefore, assert that their doctrine would have passed current at Trent, when Rome sealed her apostacy from Jesus, the Mediator between God and man. Yet we may affirm that at Geneva, in the days of Calvin, it would have been stamped with the mark of reprobation; and at Wittemberg, by Luther and Melancthon, it would have met with no better reception. Upon this vital point, Prof. H. is not likely to be misunderstood. In his pages, no slips or oversights of the above description will be found.

3. The guilt, depravity, misery, and helplessness of mankind, as stated by the Apostle, the commentator does not conceal. He states them in their connexion with the first transgression of Adam, as the covenant representative of his posterity. But, upon these points, we are forbidden by our limits to venture a remark.

4. The nature and necessity of personal holiness, together with the merciful provision of God for securing it to every believer, and its proper place and influence when secured, are brought prominently into view. No room is

left to the objector against the doctrine of justification as stated in this volume, to allege that the claims of obedience in life are forgotten.

5. In the course of this work, we find a distinct representation of the true believer, drawn in the colours of inspired light. He is indeed holy, but he is not yet, nor while upon earth, will he be perfect in holiness. He is really a saint, though an imperfect one. We are glad to find the humble, ingenuous, struggling, penitent, and confiding character, delineated in the seventh chapter, so well vindicated, and so ably rescued out of the powerful hands of those, who, under the influence of misapprehension, would affix to it the seal of reprobation, and consign it to the doom and companionship of the damned. The character of the saint here drawn, has been the means by which the Spirit of grace has sustained in hope, many an humble and sorrowing heart. Luther felt this, when, in his own strong and somewhat unguarded manner, he said, "It is a great comfort to us, when we hear that even the saints, who have the spirit of God, do sin; which comfort they would take from us, who say that the saints do not sin."* The argument of Professor H., we cannot insert at large; and yet we feel it would not be altogether just to the reader who has not seen the work, to deprive him of a specimen of his reasoning. The following is his third remark pp. 300, 301.

III. While there is nothing in the sentiments of this passage which a true Christian may not adopt, there is much which cannot be asserted by any unrenewed man. As far as this point is concerned, it depends, of course, on the correct interpretation of the several expressions employed by the apostle. 1. What is the true meaning of the phrases "inward man" and "law of the mind," when opposed to "the flesh" and "the law in the members?" The sense of these expressions is to be determined by their use in other passages, or if they do not elsewhere occur, by the meaning attached to those which are obviously substituted for them. As from the similarity of the passages, it can hardly be questioned, that what Paul here calls "the inward man" and "law of the mind," he, in Gal. 5: 17 and elsewhere, calls "the Spirit;" it is plain that he intends, by these terms, to designate the soul considered as renewed, in opposition to the "flesh," or the soul considered as destitute of divine influence. 2. It is not in accordance with the scriptural representation of the wicked, to describe them as consenting to the law of God, as hating sin and struggling against it, groaning under it as a tyrant's yoke, as delighting in the law of God, i. e. in holiness; doing all this, not as men, but as men viewed in a particular aspect, as to the inward or new man. This is not the scriptural representation of the na-

* Comment on Gal. ii. 12.

tural man, who does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, and cannot know them, 1 Cor. 2: 14. On the contrary, the carnal mind is enmity against God and his law. They, therefore, who are in the flesh, that is, who have this carnal mind, hate and oppose the law, Rom. 8: 7, 8. The expressions here used by the apostle, are such as, throughout the scriptures, are used to describe the exercises of the pious, "whose delight is in the law of the Lord," Ps. 1: 2, 3. Not only do these particular expressions show that the speaker is a true Christian, but the whole conflict here described is such as is peculiar to the sincere believer. There is, indeed, in the natural man, something very analogous to this, when his conscience is enlightened, and his better feelings come into collision with the strong inclination to evil which dwells in his mind. But this struggle is very far below that which the apostle here describes. The true nature of this conflict seems to be ascertained beyond dispute, by the parallel passage in Gal. 5: 17, already referred to. It cannot be denied, that to possess the Spirit is, in scriptural language, a characteristic mark of a true Christian. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," Rom. 8: 9. Those, therefore, who have that Spirit, are Christians. This being the case, it will not be doubted that the passage in Galatians, in which the spirit is represented as warring against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit, is descriptive of the experience of the true believer. But the conflict there described is identical with that of which the same apostle speaks in this chapter. This is evident, not merely from the fact that one of the antagonist principles is, in both cases, called *flesh*, but because the description is nearly in the same words. In consequence of the opposition of the flesh and spirit, Paul tells the Galatians they cannot do the things that they would; and he says here of himself, that in consequence of the opposition between the flesh and the law of his mind, what he would he did not. The same conflict and the same bondage are described in each case; if the one be descriptive of the exercises of a true Christian, the other must be so also.

We recommend to special notice our author's exposition of the 5th and 7th chapters throughout. The aim of the Apostle is very happily kept in view. This is indispensable to a right understanding of the subject of which he treats.

We have already intimated our impression, that Professor H. is not equally happy in apprehending and presenting the apostle's idea in every place. To give an instance of a less happy exposition, we refer to ver. 2 of Chap. viii. *For the law of the spirit of life, &c.*

He notices three interpretations distinguished by various shades of meaning, by Calvin, Beza and Witsius; and of these, gives preference to the third, that of Witsius. The gospel, whose author is the life-giving Spirit, is the idea which he selects as that of the text. We do think the interpretation either of Calvin or of Beza, or that of Guyse, in his critical note on this verse, preferable to this; but especially the view of Beza appears to be sustained by the

chain of the apostle's reasoning, and by the import of the terms. Philology and logic unite in its favour. Professor H. is a known advocate of the existence of a *principle of grace* or of *spiritual rectitude* in the soul of the believer, distinct from action, and the more immediate spring of holy activity. This text, we are persuaded, furnishes a very direct proof of that truth. It is admitted, that this application of the term law, is in correspondence with apostolic use; but he supposes it not to harmonize with the context in this passage. His reasons do not appear to us valid, and their invalidity rises chiefly from a slight misapprehension of the apostle's process of thought. The fact is, that the truth in ver. 2 is not, as Professor H. supposes, adduced in support of the assertion in the former clause of ver. 1. *There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus*; but it is intended to connect with the latter part of that verse, in order to show the *principle* whence proceeds the believer's walk, which is "not after the flesh but after the spirit."

The second reason against the interpretation we prefer, is not well founded, however true in itself the doctrine which the Professor purposes to guard. The believer, indeed, is not, while in this life, made perfect in holiness; and yet he is freed from the *dominion* of sin. Thus *he that is born of God sinneth not*, as he once did. There is a high and very important sense, in which the penitent believer is made free from the law of sin and of death, though not absolutely exempted from the influence of that *principle* of indwelling depravity. The third reason against Beza's interpretation, being expressed with some history, requires no remark, and the weight of the other two are removed by a more consistent view of the context.

The first part of ver. 1st finds its reason or foundation in the statement of ver. 3d., and not in the assertion of ver. 2d. The *sacrificial offering* of the Son of God in our nature is the ground, or procuring cause, of our justification, *περι ἁμαρτίας*, on account of his sacrifice for sin, God condemned sin. The construction is the same as that in Luke xix. 37. *περι πάντων—δυναμειν*, for all i. e. on account of all the mighty works, &c. This is Professor H's own interpretation of ver. 3d. It is worthy of notice that the apostle's reference, in this place, to justification is only incidental. He had disposed of that doctrine before he entered upon the sixth chapter; in that and the seventh chapter, he

discusses, as is shown in this volume, in a very satisfactory manner, the subject of sanctification. In those chapters, however, Paul did not finish this discussion; but carries it into chapter viii., and with great power and by a gradation of great beauty conducts us through the privileges, exercises, and trials of the sanctified believer, to a contemplation of his glorified state. A form of caution, not justified by this passage, against *Arminianism*, seems to have led our author, as it had done some distinguished and sound men before him, to overlook the prominence which sanctification continues to have in these verses. The following remarks will aid in presenting what is now considered as the apostle's plan.

1. The believer, engaged in the christian warfare, is the subject of the latter portion of Chap. vii. Holiness is so far predominant as to give him a commanding, though not a perfect, character, for rectitude of heart and life. His character is one of mingled attributes and aspect. Light and darkness, order and confusion are found there. From this view of the character, the inquiry, whether by an objector or the partially instructed, might very naturally be—"What is the *legal state* of this man before God? Does it correspond with his imperfect character? Is he but partially justified? Must he, so far as he is sanctified, be justified, and so far as he is found defective in holiness, be condemned"? The answer to these perplexing queries is found in the assertion, ver. 1. *There is now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus*. Their justification is complete. That justification, in no degree, rests upon their sanctification; but exclusively upon their interest in the righteousness of their Redeemer, in virtue of union with him.

2. The evidence of this union with the Saviour and consequent interest in his righteousness, is found in their holiness of life. They walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

3. This course of life is more than an external form. It has its immediate spring in a *principle of spiritual vitality*, supernaturally incorporated with the faculties of the renovated soul, lying deeper, we think, than their disposition, toward what is holy, for it gives that disposition. This spiritual vitality, this operative principle of godliness, is a *law* of the constitution of the new man, implanted within him by

the life-giving Spirit of God ; it quickens him to a divine life and hence its denomination, *the law of the spirit of life*—that is, the principle of spiritual life. The operation of this law gives character to the believer's *walk* ; and, at the same time, evinces his relation to Jesus Christ, and his consequent exemption from condemnation.

With those who speak of this principle under the names of *habit*, *disposition*, or *permanent tendency* under the influence of the Spirit of God, we will have no controversy. We, nevertheless, are inclined to the idea of an effect of grace, intermediate between the agency of the Spirit of God and that tendency of the mind which is toward spirituality of action, and which gives to the mind that tendency. This involves the idea of *ability* corresponding with the nature of the moral or spiritual action required by the moral or spiritual law, and performed by the spiritual man. Dependence upon the efficiency of God is disputable, and so is the indistinct agency of God and man. The agency of the renovated soul, as well as that which belongs to the natural man, must be considered in its whole character, as distinct from the agency of the divine Being. For this peculiar action of the renewed man, there is, in his renovated constitution, an adequate cause beyond the impulse of motives—something to which the motives are adapted, and which is fitted to respond to them.

4. The meritorious cause of all this is brought into view, in ver. 3d. The obedience unto death of the Lord Jesus. *Through the sin offering* presented by the Son of God in our nature, the sentence of condemnation was executed upon sin ; pardon directly secured, and that, in its train of blessings, brings the influences of grace for sanctification. The satisfaction of the Redeemer does not more certainly procure forgiveness, acceptance, and eternal life, than it secures holiness of heart and life. See Tit. ii. 14. To both justification and sanctification, as secured by the obedience unto death of the Saviour, the apostle's eye is directed ; but justification as before remarked, being incidentally introduced, rather than directly discussed, the bearing upon it of the reference to the offering for sin, is of the same character, while the main subject of discussion,—progressive holiness,—is kept chiefly in view ; and hence, while it is true that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, it is equally true, that the righteousness of the law, in virtue of the

sin offering of our Lord, should have a fulfilment in the evangelical obedience of the justified believer, rendered in obedience to the law as a rule of life presented to us in the hand of the Mediator. This, it is believed, the context requires us to consider as chiefly intended, in this Scripture. That these remarks do not, in doctrine, clash with the principles of Professor H., will be obvious to every reader. All the doctrines here involved are, by this commentator and ourselves, viewed substantially in the same light, as Bible truths. The *exegesis* of this passage is the only point in question.

Reference may be likewise made to another part of the viii. Chapter, as furnishing another instance of oversight in this excellent commentary. It is found in pp. 335, 336.—In the passage which verses 19—23 embrace, Paul himself appears to be transported, by the grandeur of his subject, beyond the usual boundaries of even inspiration itself. In this instance, the poetic *afflatus* is in combination with the didactic. The commentator is not insensible to the magnificence of his subject, and his comment, in general, recommends itself to the inquiring student. The exposition of ver. 20 is less distinct and more unsatisfactory, than most other parts of the work.

The argument of Professor H., in settling the import of the word *κτίσις* in this text, is very much to our mind. The 20th verse is a parenthesis in Paul's usual manner. In matter, the 19th and 21st verses connect, directly with each other. The inferior orders of creation are represented, by a bold but frequent figure of speech, as earnestly desiring and expecting the day of the revelation of the glory of the sons of God. This gives occasion to refer to, and account for, the present degradation of those lower orders of nature, together with their subjection to vain and criminal abuses. *The creature was made subject to vanity*,—to suffering and the perverse abuse of sinful man; *not willingly*,—it is not in accordance either with its nature or original end, thus to suffer and be made the instrument of sin; *but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope*. He, who has thus subjected the creature, is not God, but man, by his first transgression and subsequent abuse; *by reason of him—on account of himself*, to gratify his unregulated propensities, in making himself his chief end; *in hope*, in the vain expectation of gratification and enjoyment from the crea-

ture, rather than from the Creator. The interpretation is surely very forced, which connects hope with the creature. The creature *in hope* was made subject to vanity! It is still worse to connect it with God. The divine Being hoping! We are not unfrequently shocked with the anthropomorphic language so often and so inappropriately applied, in our country, to the Deity. "The feelings of God" is a phrase, that grates upon something deeper than our ears. The Son of God assumed our nature before he could feel, and that he might be capable of sympathizing with us. Professor H., however, let it be noted, does not favour the idea of ascribing *hope* to God, though he does ascribe to him, we think unhappily, the subjection of the creature to vanity. But it is not our purpose to enter into critical details. Both time and room forbid us to do so. The attentive reader will perceive, that the "expectation" of ver. 19th finds its reason in ver. 21st. *Because, &c. in, since the creature shall be delivered, &c.* Should the words, *in hope* be connected with ver. 21 the idea will not be materially changed. *The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth—in hope, since the creature, &c. &c.* Logical analysis, however, favours the view we have taken of its relation to ver. 20.

The exposition of the often ill explained ninth chapter, is very satisfactory. Prof. H. keeps at a due distance from the revolting views of the *supralapsarian* school, and guards, with decision, against the interpretation which imposes upon the passage a diluted sense, unworthy, not only of the inspired Paul, but also of rational natural theology. God is supreme, man is a voluntary being; the salvation of any sinner is a matter of grace; the abandonment of the transgressor to the tendencies of his evil heart, and the results of those tendencies, is an act of righteous retribution, for which the Sovereign Lord of the universe may not be called to account. Every favour enjoyed by the sinner is of grace; every part of his punishment is the wages of sin.

Chapter xiii. brings into view the Christian doctrine of civil government. The circumstances of the church at that period, demanded a statement of those principles which are fundamental to political association, the subject being one very intimately connected, both with the safety and happiness of man, and with the glory of God, the Sove-

reign Ruler of the world. Occasion was furnished, by existing circumstances, for laying down those first principles of political science, by apostolical authority, which would constitute a satisfactory rule of conduct to the several departments of the body politic, in every land, in subsequent times, as well as at that day. To the too rigid application of the letter of the judicial law of the Israelitish commonwealth, the Christianized Jews were doubtless generally inclined; and that the believing Gentiles, now turned from idols to the living God, should look upon the authority which was lodged in the hands of the votaries of Jove, Venus, and their associated rabble of heathen deities, with doubts of its legitimacy, is not unreasonable to suppose. They saw the Capitol and the Pantheon in close neighbourhood, and as they had abjured the worship of the one, it was not unreasonable to inquire what fealty they owed to the other.

The Apostle, in meeting this condition of things, pursued a course worthy of his own great mind, and of that inspiration by which he was directed. Often has the narrow minded spirit of partyism presumed to wonder, how Paul could dispose of a subject so practical and so exciting as this, in terms so general. He furnishes no weapon, which either the tyrant or the restless factionist can employ, to subserve his purpose. Paul enters into no minute details for the gratification of curious speculation, nor does he encourage the scruples of a morbid state of conscience. He lays down general principles, easily apprehended, and leaves them to work their own way, and produce their legitimate effects. To the neglect of any duty, or to the invasion of any claim of God, or right of man, he gives no countenance; nor does he employ an expression that can be fairly brought to encourage schemes calculated to shock or convulse society; while every principle of his code, and every maxim of his instructions, is calculated to improve the order of the social state, and to purify its character. Our own age and country, require the political principles of the Apostle to be distinctly brought into view. The tottering thrones of despotism, and the mouldering altars of superstition, which, in the meridian of their alliance, so extensively and deeply effected the debasement of man, have still a few votaries. The infidelity of radicalism is in violent effort to blot out from civil society, all sense of obligation to God,—all feel-

ing of social dependence upon, and of responsibility to him, in the conducting of public affairs. It becomes the friend of moral order,—the Christian and the patriot,—to guard the foundations of the fabric. The authorized expounders of the moral law of God, ought to be qualified to indicate, with clearness, the application of its principles to the moral condition of the state. But let them stand aloof from the mere party brawls of the busy politician; and let them, ere they open their lips upon the subject, see to it, that they understand it well. We know not how this can more effectually be done, than by a profound study of the doctrine of the Apostle of the Gentiles, as stated in the passage before us; and then, by causing it to be understood, felt, and applied by the people at large. A brief analysis of the first verses of this chapter will set the whole matter in a clear point of view.

1. An orderly subjection, — *ὑποτασσέσθω* — is enjoined upon every member of the commonwealth. 2. This subjection is to *authority* — *ἐξουσίας* — *legitimate powers*, not usurpers, not tyrants. From the term rendered *higher*, considered in its “concrete” import, we are not inclined to exclude the idea of moral excellence. *Ἐπερχων* is an epithet familiar to Paul, and by him is employed in connexions which involve moral worth. The character of fellow-Christians, the knowledge of Christ, and the peace of God, exemplify this remark. (See Phil. 2: 3, and 3: 8, and 4: 7.) And when describing an institution of God for the good of man, we can find no good reason for limiting the import of the term to mere political elevation, irrespective of moral character. 3. A reason for this subjection to *authority*, and one of sufficient weight, is immediately added: There is no *authority*, *ἐξουσία*, *except it be of God*. It is well known there are two very different descriptions of power; the one moral, the other immoral. The latter is of God by *permission* only, and is disapproved of him; the former is of God by appointment, and has his approbation; this is authority. It is of this the text speaks; it is legitimate; it is the ordinance of God—appointed by him, and to which he requires our *conscientious* subjection. 4. An additional reason for subjection is found in the end of the magistracy: It is for good to man; the functionary invested with it, is *the minister of God to thee for good, a terrour to evil works, he bears not the sword*—the symbol of power—in vain; he is a praise

to those who do well. Thus in a few inspired words, we have the duty of the citizen, *subjection*; the *authority* to which subjection is required, the higher powers; the *source* of that authority, the appointment of God; the *end* of its appointment and existence, the good of the citizens; and the *character* of the authority which has legitimate claims upon the support of the citizens, a terroure to evil works, and a praise to those who do good.

We are not certain that we rightly apprehend the meaning of the commentator in the following declarations: "Every person who is, in point of fact, clothed with authority, is to be regarded as having a claim to obedience, founded on the will of God." p. 522.—"Those who are in authority are to be obeyed within their sphere, no matter *how*, or *by whom* appointed. It was to Paul a matter of little importance whether the Roman Emperor was appointed by the senate, the army, or the people; whether the assumption of the imperial authority by Caesar was just or unjust, or whether his successors had a legitimate claim to the throne or not." (p. 523.)

Prof. H. is, in politics, neither a modern radical, nor an advocate of the exploded passive obedience and non-resistance of former times. We do not understand him as affirming that, had the Roman government been at all in the eye of the Apostle, it would then have been a matter of indifference to him whether it was a legitimate authority or an immoral power; whether it was a tyranny or an institution which answered to the moral ordinance of God. He has, in the exposition, and in the statement of doctrines, guarded against such a conclusion. It will be readily admitted, that if, as Prof. H. supposes, (and in this he is no doubt correct,) the Apostle's aim was to lay down the fundamental principles of the doctrine of civil government—irrespective of the form or character of any existing power, then indeed, so far as that was concerned, it was of no consequence to him what was the spirit or form of the Roman government, or of that of any other state. The assertion, however, is not happy that, "Those who are in authority, are to be obeyed within their sphere, no matter *how*, or *by whom* appointed." All who attach importance to free constitutional frames of social order, without more explanation than is given, will be slow to subscribe to the assertion.

Indeed it does not appear altogether in keeping with the other parts of this commentary.

The subject is one of great importance, and should be treated with correspondent precision. Infidels urge that the affairs of states and religion should be altogether unconnected. Fanatics plead that no authority can be legitimate unless it explicitly own subjection to the religion of Immanuel. These extremes are equally distant from the truth. Prof. H., if we rightly apprehend his views, is liable to be misunderstood in this place, and his pages to be pressed into a service, he wishes not. To escape this undesirable result, perhaps, either less or more should have been said upon the subject.

The profane alliances between church and state, which so extensively corrupted both in the nations of the old world, and which have been so prolific in persecutions of harmless opinion and innocent practice, as well as in the repression of free and enlightened discussion, are objects of just and intense abhorrence. But surely between the persecutions dictated by the spirit of bigotry or by that of a ghostly ambition, and the licentiousness of an infidel philosophy, there is a way of safety, in which nations may travel, in order to obtain the ends of the social state. Man is a moral being, and, in his constitution, the foundations of the religious character are deeply laid. The principles which enter into his constitution, he carries along with him into every relation of life. National society, as a moral person, is the creature of God, and as such, is an appropriate subject of his law.—Magistracy is the moral ordinance of God as the moral Governour of the world; and upon the subject of social morality as well as of that which is personal, the Bible, in whatever land it obtains a place, distinctly gives instruction. To escape from the imputations justly cast upon the meddling ecclesiastic, who, by mingling in the mere party strife of the politician, dishonours his high and sacred vocation, there is no need that the enlightened and consistent minister of religion should yield to the infidel his impertinent claims, by not giving that prominence to a broad exposition of social morality which his text book—the Bible, authorizes, and which the importance of the subject to man, as a citizen and a christian, imperatively demands. Is it too much to say?—Upon this subject, on the part of the christian ministry, there must be more high intelligence and less ignoble

shrinking. A moral institution, originating from God as the moral governour of the world, having man, a moral being, for its immediate subject, the principles of the moral law of God for its rule, in guarding the person, life, property, and rights of man, civil and religious; and yet neither religion nor morality, as such, within the sphere of its authority! The statesman and the jurist maintain that religion and morality must be laid at the foundation of the social state; and to defend the foundation of the state, we are disposed to think, is within the legitimate sphere of government, as the efficient organ of the commonwealth.— Were it so that morality and religion should be, in no sense, within the legitimate sphere of government would it be an unwarrantable assumption, that “civil functionaries, as such, are under no obligation to know what is the law of God?” We know the position, to some extent, has obtained currency, and within the period of our own memory, the experiment was tried, to establish a government irrespective of religion. What was the result? The darkest hour in the history of France, and the bloodiest page which records the transactions of that dark hour, furnish a reply to this inquiry. That an institution appointed of God, founded in the nature, relations, and condition of man, has, under certain aspects, both religion and morality within its appropriate sphere, is a position which ought to be universally understood, and emphatically affirmed. The right application of the principle of this position may, like all other important principles, require discretion; but of such application, we are well assured it is capable, and that in perfect consistency with entire exemption from all vicious connexion of Church and State, and with the protection of all freedom of opinion, discussion, and practice, on this side the regions of licentiousness. In a land enjoying the advantages of supernatural revelation, we do not hesitate to affirm, that the people, illuminated by that light, are morally obliged to instruct the constituted authorities of such land, as their representatives, to honour the God of heaven by the distinct recognition of the existence of his peculiar empire, and by the protection of all the rights of that empire. The recognition of the existence of the church of Jesus Christ as a divine corporation, and as having external rights to be protected, involves no encroachment upon any natural right of man, nor can it either justify, or lead to any act of

political oppression. Man has religious as well as civil rights, and they are in perfect harmony with each other. In dismissing the subject, we beg leave to say, that in the remarks now made, no imputation, even by implication, is intended against Professor H.'s views of public morality. Between his principles and our own, if we rightly interpret his pages, there is no discrepancy; but we again say, we think, in some of his assertions, he is liable to be misapprehended.

The xiv. chapter brings into view the principles according to which, the fellowship of the church, or which is the same thing, the communion of saints, should be regulated. Upon the exposition we have no remark, except that of approbation, to offer. He presents the ideas of his text, with his general perspicuity of manner and candour of sentiment. We have only to regret that Professor H., induced by the importance of the subject and the perception of its bearing upon the actual condition of the church at large, did not, in a well digested exercitation—something in the shape of what is done at the end of chapter vii., give us a more extended developement of the principles laid down by the apostle.

The unity of the Church of God, as set forth in the sacred Scriptures, and there urged upon our attention in so many forms, as an actual existence we have never known. In our own, and in our fathers' days, few objects have been more prominent, or agents more active, than has been the spirit of schism. To the consequent state of faction, we have been so habituated as scarcely to feel it to be an evil. Not a few, perhaps, could deem an opposite condition of affairs undesirable. The spirit that influenced, on this subject, the Apostles of the Lamb, apostolic men, and the more prominent agents in the Protestant reformation, alas! is rarely felt in modern days. Calvin, we have heard some professed Calvinists say, did not understand the principles and the application of the principles of Church fellowship. Against the genius of Apostolic authority, no less opposition appears, though its form of expression may be somewhat modified. This is not the place, nor is it our intention, to enter into a developement of the primitive causes of the divisions of Zion, nor into an enumeration of those effects which, in their turn, themselves become unnamed and undesigned causes of uncalculated and incalculable power, in prolonging, extending, and giving intensity

to the spirit of schism. It is, too, beside our purpose to notice in detail, the ill advised, though well meant, measures to heal the wounds inflicted in the strifes of faction, upon the expectants of immortality. Such developements and details, though we are not so rash as to expect from them the healing of the maladies of which complaint is made, may, nevertheless be, in their proper place, a step in the process preparatory to the effectual application of the healing balm. The time for this application has not yet come. Faction has not yet finished its evil work. It must go forward until even its votaries, in whom any trace of moral goodness may remain, shall be weary of the violence, and urge a release from their unprofitable, as well as dishonourable drudgery.

While, then, we do not advise those who see, and feel, and weep over those worse than follies, and their effects, to lay aside their mourning weeds, we do say to them, "sorrow not as those who have no hope." Other and better agencies are in active operation. These are giving direction to an undercurrent of great efficiency, whose influence will, in due time, be felt and seen. Let none imagine, as a cure for existing evils, the amalgamation into one body of the mistakes, prejudices, selfishness, and the spirit of faction found in the respective ranks of parties now upon the field. The Redeemer and Lord of Zion has, doubtless, settled and marked by his own authority, a safe and ample ground on which all his redeemed, believing, and penitent disciples can meet in visible, as well as invisible fellowship. May we not hope, that after inquiring men shall have thought, prayed, written, and consulted upon the subject, God will raise up, among the sons of Zion, some mind of commanding power to gather the scattered rays of light, and direct them to bear upon it with such splendour of evidence, as to leave in the breast of every right hearted man, no place for doubt, as to what God requires of him, and what he himself ought to do?

At present, the general commonwealth of the Israel of God exhibits a remarkable aspect of her condition: old foundations of faction have been shaken, and yet the spirit of schism is in active operation. Let the upright in heart, who have been unhappily carried into this current, pause, ere they reach the dangerous falls below. To all, we have sometimes thought, the following somewhat complex, yet

easily apprehended rule might be of use, if consistently and perseveringly applied: Ascertain with precision the principles which entered into the constitution of the Apostolic Church, and the relative position of those principles, as terms of ecclesiastical fellowship, and as subjects of instruction, for the initiated who occupy, in the school of the great Prophet of the covenant, their respective forms; in the light of inspired prophecy and promise, then look forward and understand what shall be the practical application of those principles in the millennial age; these points being settled, let each department of the divided Zion, speedily endeavour an approximation to that standard. Thus, instead of doubtful disputations, the parties may extend to each other a helping hand, and in place of retarding, will mutually further their progress, and ere they be aware, with delightful surprise, find themselves upon the summit of that mountain, whose *whole limit round about shall be most holy*, occupying a common ground, in possession of the same faith, the same baptism, the same spirit, and the same hope; for they shall have, and confess the same Lord. Then shall Jerusalem, the city of our solemnities, be *a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down*.

Other places of this valuable work, which had been noted for remark, are passed over by us. It will appear to the reader, that whilst we attribute to this production of Prof. H. great excellence, we, nevertheless, consider it as capable of being improved. To this, the learned author will, no doubt in his hours of leisure, pay due attention, while its spirit of firmness, liberality, and kindness, will in no degree be impaired. It is trusted the abridgement which is noticed in the public papers, but which we have not yet seen, however well adapted to the class of persons for whom it is designed, will in no respect supplant the original work. We cannot anticipate a compend that will embrace the learning, reasoning, and consequent illustration of the larger volume; and these the student cannot spare.