

IF ONE DIED FOR ALL —.

II COR. v. 14.—Because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.

“IF one died (*apethanen*) for all (*huper pantoon*).”
 The “one,” of course, is Jesus, the Christ, who “died” on the cross, the piercing of his side by the soldier’s spear, demonstrating the fact, as the condition of the issuing blood indicated death. But a main point is the signification of the phrase “for all,” *huper pantoon*. The preposition *huper* has various meanings; it being rendered, for, above, more than, on (our) part, than, concerning, of, on behalf of, in the stead of, toward, beyond, more than, to, over, than: yet each of these accords with its local meaning, over, above a place; and, properly, without immediate contact; (*Xen. M.* 3, 8, 9, *ho helios tou therous huper heemoon kai toon stegoon poreuomenos* (the summer sun passing over us and our roofs), *Herod.* 2, 6, 9.) *Winer*, 382. In the N. T., *huper* is only used in a figurative sense, and in this place, according to very judicious critics, means *in the stead of*: and so we accept it.

Thus, *Philem.* 13, Paul writes of Onesimus, “Whom I would have retained, that in thy stead (*huper sou*) he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel: but without thy mind would I do nothing,” etc.: The sense is so clear here, that our translators adopted the rendering, as cited, without placing any sign of doubt in the margin. Again we have this rendering in *II Cor.* v. 20; “— we pray you in Christ’s stead (*huper Christou*), be ye reconciled to God.”

We admit, that where the local sense of a preposition is established, and its figurative sense will allow of fifteen

various renderings into our language ; great care must be exercised in the choice of renderings, in any particular passage. Our rule is, that the rendering selected shall agree with the scope of the place, and the plain statements of the divine revelation. It is not sufficient that the proposed rendering is to be found elsewhere. The question is, will it suit here, and allow the passage to accord with the plain statements of the Scripture ?

We are taught, especially, *Rom. v. 12-21*, that Adam, in some sense, acted instead of us all ; represented us all ; so as to involve us disastrously in his deed : and that Jesus, the Christ, the Lord, in some sense, acted instead of us all ; represented us all ; so as to involve us blessedly in his deed. How Adam poisoned us unto death, or how Christ supplied the antidote unto life : how one dragged us down, without any consent on our part, into death ; or how the other quickened us, without any consent on our part, into life ; we are not informed : no one knows : but those two facts are so clearly revealed, that they are accepted by the great mass of Christian people ; although their opinions on some other points diverge.

So, by the rendering, " if one died in the stead of all," we agree with the plain statement of the revealed fact, that Christ, in the great work of redemption, acted in our stead ; and one chief, essential part of this work was his dying, for which a human body had to be assumed by him ; in which to die in the form of man, in man's stead. And it certainly agrees with the scope of the passage, which concludes with the marvellous statement, " For he (God) made the one not knowing sin (not having sinned and deserved punishment) to know sin instead of us (or as one having sinned and been punished for it ; and all this, his bearing the likeness of a sinner, and bearing the punishment as a sinner, in our stead), that we might appear as righteous in

him:" in our substitute who died expiating our sins, and rose in a state of righteousness, the law having no further claim against him. So then, the rendering responds satisfactorily, to each demand of our prescribed rule.

"Then were all dead:" Our favorite commentator, Dr. Clarke, says that this is justly inferred from the foregoing affirmation that Christ died for all mankind; the Doctor appearing to regard the chief idea to be the extent of the death, and not its character; making *pantoon*, all, the emphatic word, and not *huper*, for, in the stead of. Therefore he adds, "for if all had not been guilty, and consigned to eternal death, because of their sins, there could have been no need of his death. Therefore, as he most certainly died for all; then, all were dead, and needed his sacrifice, and the quickening power of his Spirit." All this is very true, and is sound doctrine; but it does not develop what we regard to be the force of "for all" in the first, nor of "were all dead" in the second member of the sentence: or, as Dr. C. puts it, the apostle's first, and second, position.

We, also, hold that he infers the second from the first position; but, we regard the matter thus: "if one died in the stead of all, then all died:" the act of the one was the act of the all: the act of the representative is the act of the represented; *qui facit per alium, facit per se*, what one does by an agent, himself does. There needs little argument here, we think; it being only necessary to notice the verb employed in the case. "If one died (*apethanen*) for (in the stead of) all, then all died: *hoi pantes apethanon*." Nothing can be clearer than that *apethanen* and *apethanon* are the same verb, in the same *voice*, the same *mood*, the same *tense*, the same *person*; and that they only differ in *number*; the one being in the third person *singular*, the other in the third person *plural*: and this only because their nominatives differ in number; the one, singular; the other,

plural. So, the correct rendering must be, "if one died in the stead of all, then all died:" died by their representative, their surety. If A becomes a surety to B, for a debt contracted by C; and at the failure of C to pay, pays it; B has no claim upon C, as he has been paid by A: the last being the only one to whom C is indebted. Thus Paul, who describes redemption from the curse of the law, by Christ, *Gal.* iii. 13; so that we are not under the law, *Ibid.* v. 18; yet speaks of himself as a redeemed sinner, being "under the law to Christ." *I Cor.* ix. 21.

There can be no propriety in the rendering, in the very same connection, *apethanen* "he died," *apethanon* "they were all dead." It is only accountable upon the hypothesis, that the translators, as Dr. Clarke, failed to see the emphatic character, or force, of *huper*; and had their attention fixed upon *pantoon*, as expressive of the extent of Christ's mediation. Certainly if all died, all were dead, subsequent to the dying. But the present rendering puts the state of death, as previous to Christ's dying, and as the cause of his dying: which destroys the figure. For, if one be condemned to die, and another is accepted as a substitute to die in his stead: the latter does not die because his friend is dead; but because he is living, and his plan is to die for him, that his friend may continue to live. So the death of Christ in our stead, is to be accepted as our death; and the claim of the law against us ceases; we having paid the penalty by our substitute.

Dr. Parkhurst, to whose learning and patient investigation we have been so frequently indebted, quotes a very interesting passage from *Doddridge*, upon the sense of *huper*, in this and similar places, being *in the stead of*. "Raphelius (Not. ex Xen. in ver. 8) has abundantly demonstrated, that *huper heemoon apethane* signifies he died in our *room and stead*: nor can I find

that *apothanein huper tinos* has ever any other signification than that of *rescuing the life of another at the expense of our own*, and the very next verse (i. e. verse 7) shews independent of any other authority, how evidently it bears that sense here, as one can hardly imagine any one would die for a good man, unless it were to redeem his life by giving up his own." This criticism by Dr. P. refers to *Rom.* v. 6-8. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for (in the stead of) the ungodly (*huper aseboon apethanen*). For scarcely for a righteous man (*huper dikaiou*) will one die: yet peradventure for a good man (*huper agathou*) some (one) would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us (*huper heemoon apethanen*)."

In this connection, we will examine the use of *huper* in the twentieth verse of this fifth chapter of II Corinthians. "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ (*huper Christou our presbeuomen*, in the stead of Christ we act as ambassadors) as though God did beseech you by us: we pray (you) in Christ's stead (*huper Christou*), be ye reconciled to God." Even an unlearned reader will perceive, that the place is somewhat obscured, by rendering the first *huper*, for; and the second, in stead, (the possessive form "Christ's" causing "in Christ's stead," in place of "in the stead of Christ:") the "for" signifying here, and frequently, "in the stead of," is an accurate, but not a happy rendering. In its present reading, the passage has the appearance of an alternation between the words "God" and "Christ." Now then we are ambassadors for *Christ* (as though Christ had sent us), as though God did beseech you by us (as though God had sent us): we pray you in *Christ's* stead (as though Christ had sent us), be ye reconciled to *God* (as though God had sent us). A uniform rendering of *huper* gives another air to the expression.

“ Now then (therefore) WE are acting the part of ambassadors in the stead of Christ (who, when in the flesh acted this part), as though God did beseech you by US (as he once did by his Son, Christ, our Lord): WE pray (you) in the stead of Christ, be ye reconciled to God.” As the grand ambassador of God, Christ, our Master, with us, apostles, in his suit, prayed you, sinners, to be reconciled to God: coming in the “ express image of his person,” he demonstrated that there was nothing in God, but what fairly challenged your admiring love; so that you “ hated him without a cause:” and he besought you to cease your hostility, and be reconciled to him, who sent not his ambassador to order you to lay down your weapons, and be punished, but to cease to resist his efforts to bless you with all the wealth of his loving care. You slew his ambassador; rejecting his gracious overtures: and now WE are negotiating in the stead of Christ, as though God did beseech (you) by US: WE (now) pray (you) in the stead of Christ (whom ye slew), be ye reconciled to God. We are acting ambassadors, in his place, and reiterate the same proposition of peace; *the injured party paying all the expense of the unprovoked war!* As the heavens are high above the earth, so are God’s ways above the ways of man!

Buxtorf says, in his account of the Ten Days Penitence, at which occurred, in happier times, the ceremony of the two goats, the one slaughtered, the other sent off as the Scape Goat; that on the ninth day, the Jew slew a cock, striking it three times on the head, following each blow with these words, “ May this cock be in exchange for me; may he come into my place; may he be an expiation for me; may death be visited upon this cock, but to me and to all Israel, a happy life. Amen.” This he does three times successively, i. e. for himself, for his sons, and for the strangers that may be with him; as the High Priest also made expiation, as recorded in Leviticus. Placing his hands upon the cock,

as formerly in the sacrifices, he proceeds to slay him ; and drawing the skin at the neck, he thinks within himself that *he* is the one who deserves *to be strangled*, but the cock is substituted and offered in his place : next he cuts the throat with a knife, acknowledging to himself that *he* is the one worthy of being *smitten with the sword* ; and immediately throws him violently to the ground, that he may denote himself to be worthy of being *covered with stones* : lastly he roasts him, that he may thus signify, that himself merits *to be burned to death* : and so, these four modes of death the cock should sustain for the Jew. Care must be exercised, that the cock be white ; as red is the color of sins, *Isai.* i. 18, and a red cock abounding already with sins, would be unfit to bear the sins of the Jew. Antonius Margarita writes in his book on the Jewish faith, that certain persons affirmed, as having come down from their ancestors, that for this expiatory oblation an ape should be taken ; as more resembling a man, etc. But the cause of preferring the cock to any other animal is this ; one of the Hebrew appellations for a man, is *Gebher* : so if *Gebher* has sinned, *Gebher* ought to bear the punishment of sin : but as the punishment is more than a Jew can bear, a cock, which in the Talmudic or Babylonish dialect is called *Gebher*, is substituted in his place, and so he satisfies the justice of God : for since *Gebher* hath sinned, *Gebher* (the cock) hath also been smitten. *Syn. Jud.* 508-512.

It is added that Leo de Modena affirms, this rite to have been abrogated in Italy, and in the East, as being unfounded and superstitious. Nothing of the kind, we think, is practiced in this country, or in this age. But, the Jews have a ceremony of prayer, and offering the will and intention for the deed : in which they continue to recognize their idea of expiation ; believing that if they could offer a victim in sacrifice, that the victim

would be their substitute, and bear their sin; the shedding of his blood, would be the same as the shedding of their blood: not understanding that the victims offered in sacrifice under the Mosaic system, were but types of the true sacrifice, the Messiah; but believing that "the blood of bulls and goats COULD take away sins." *Heb. x. 4.* Let us take care that we, Christians, do not put less value upon the true Victim, slain once for sins; than the Jew puts upon the types, the animal figurative victims. Let us not forget the record, the witness of the Spirit, that the great High Priest, "— now once in the end of the world hath appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." *Heb. ix. 26.*

It is this very idea of substitution of the victim, that is taught in the Apostle's "Because we thus judge, if one died for all, then indeed the all died:" the all suffered by their substitute; having been "crucified with Christ;" so that the debt has been paid, the punishment has been exacted, "BY HIS STRIPES WE ARE HEALED." Such is the witness of the Spirit.

THE FLESH AND THE SPIRIT.

GALATIANS v. 17.—"For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

THIS is a chilling announcement to the Christian, sincerely desirous of doing right. When he reads of Zacharias and Elizabeth, "— they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless;" *Luke i. 6*; and then

reads here, that he "cannot do the things that he would," he inquires, whether the duties of a Christian are so much more difficult of performance, than those of a Jew? And when Peter answers that Judaism was "a yoke * * * which neither our fathers nor we (Jews of his day) were able to bear;" he knows not what to think concerning the advantage of Christianity over Judaism, if they are alike impossible of being obeyed by their subjects. Yet Zacharias and his wife really did conform to the intolerable Judaism; while Paul is represented as declaring Christian duty impossible. There must be some mistake here.

Our first objection to the idea of the impossibility of living properly, on the part of Christians, is; that such an understanding of this ver. 17, is flatly inconsistent with the verse preceding it; "I say then, walk in (with) the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." This exhortation is to a course we can pursue: for it would be unjust to this magnificent intelligence, to suppose he would exhort to an impossible course; especially when he connects with it the assurance, that by so doing, we will be able to resist the enticements of the flesh: ye shall not fulfil (complete, consummate) the lusts of the flesh: they will tempt you, but will not overcome you. And could such a man as Paul exhort us to a course, assuring us that in case of compliance, we should not consummate the lusts of the flesh; and then, in the very next breath, mockingly declare that the consummation is inevitable, as we cannot refrain from fulfilling the lusts of the flesh! we can never believe this of Paul, until our struggle to disbelieve it shall have been crushed, by the weight of resistless testimony.

Then another objection. The expression "so that ye cannot do the things that ye would" is very general in its terms; and lacks an important adjective, to restrict it to the sense usually ascribed to it: we allude

to the adjective *good*, as qualifying *things*: for as the sentence now stands, we cannot do anything, good or evil, that we would. If we *would* do something *bad*, we cannot: our determining to do it, makes defeat inevitable; for we cannot do the things that we would. On the other hand, if we *would* do something *good*, we cannot: our determining to do it, makes defeat inevitable; for we cannot do the things that we would. The only chance for us Christians, is to never determine to do right, and be always persistent in our determination to do wrong. Very queer ethics.

Our third objection is, that such a statement extinguishes every hope of inheriting the kingdom of God. For this same Paul, the apostle, and not behind the "chiefest," affirms, only a few verses on, in speaking of the works of the flesh, which we are supposed, by the idea we are opposing, to be unable to keep clear of; "Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." *Ver.* 21. We cannot pursue our course through life, without doing such things; and as the doers of such things cannot inherit the kingdom of God, our hopes are vain; we are lost. Our war with the flesh must result in our ruin. Very queer gospel.

A fourth objection. In absolute antagonism to our supposed helplessness in the hands of this all victorious flesh, Paul, *ver.* 24, says, "And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." No affirmation could be more direct and positive. The flesh, with its passions and lusts, has been crucified by the Christian; the deed is done, it is in the past. One crucified, nailed to the cross, may not yet be dead; but is of necessity in a conquered, suffering, unformidable condition. Certainly he is proved to be inferior to his crucifier. And thus the Christian, he that is Christ's

is represented to be the conqueror of the flesh: which suffers, writhes, complains, but is under the control of the Christian. The expression, too, is very comprehensive. It is not the uncommon, the extraordinary, the most favored servant, soldier, of Christ, who is represented as achieving this victory: but "they that are Christ's;" which certainly includes all real Christians. This is a very different picture, from that supposed to be delineated in our passage: this, painting the Christian in possession of actual victory; that, representing him to be amid the mortification and sorrow of a hopeless struggle and inevitable defeat. Let us see if a fair criticism will rescue the apostle's words from such a predicament; surely a very awkward one for him, who "could do all things through Christ who strengthened him." *Phil.* iv. 13.

Paul had been discussing points of Christian propriety, and remarked, "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." Then, lest the Galatian brethren should be ignorant of their real condition of weakness, as to the flesh; and strength, as to the Spirit: and be discouraged at the conscious strife of opposing powers within them: and especially that they should not be surprised, at the fact, that they, regenerate believers, should be subject to the enticements of the flesh, the corrupt nature; he adds: "For the flesh (*sarx*, the corrupt nature of man) lusteth (*epithumei*, strongly desires, so as to urge the active powers to obtain the object of desire, and that in a good or evil sense) against the Spirit (*kata*, against, contrary to the

pleasure, will, word, prompting of the Spirit) and (*de*, a particle of frequent use, very often adversative, as *Acts* xii. 9, "And he went out, and followed him; and wist not that it was true which was done by the angel; but (*de*) thought he saw a vision,") the Spirit against the flesh: and (*de* is found here in an explanatory sentence and evincing somewhat of its adversative force (*Winer*, 443), may be rendered "but," especially as we remove the colon after "other," by substituting a comma; as the sense requires, and as maintained by high authority) these are contrary the one to the other (*tauta de alleelois antikeitai*, and these, the flesh and the Spirit, oppose each other) so that not (*hina mee*, lest: *hina*, a word used with great frequency, more than six hundred and fifty times, in the N. T., is rendered "so that" twice; here, and *Rev.* xiii. 13. Connected with the negative *mee*, as in this case, the usual rendering is "lest," equivalent to "that not:" as "— then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest (*hina mee*) they should believe and be saved." *Luke* viii. 12; "For I would not, brethren, that ye be ignorant of this mystery, lest (*hina mee*) ye should be wise in your own conceits." *Rom.* xi. 25. Of this *hina*, *Robinson* says, in defining its N. T. use: "I. Properly *telikoos*, as marking the final end or purpose, *to the end that, in order that*; and with a negative, *hina mee, in order that not, lest*." Therefore we remove the colon after "other," substituting a comma, and render *hina mee*, lest, and make the closing sentence to be the object sought by the parties to the strife before mentioned. That is, the flesh and the Spirit oppose each other, in an effort to influence and control the Christian's will; can you do the things that ye would (*hina mee ha an theleete tauta poieete*, lest the things ye may wish, those ye may do. If the flesh incite you to wish to do wrong, the Spirit opposes and strives

to hinder the flesh from overcoming you; and if the Spirit incite you to wish to do right, the flesh opposes and strives to hinder the Spirit's success. The word "cannot" is not warranted in the sentence. To express the idea of impossibility, the N. T. writers do not employ a mere subjunctive form of the word, as this *poieete*, here. As, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see (*ou dunatai idein*, not is it possible to see; and not simply *ideete*, may see) the kingdom of God." *John* iii. 3.)

Therefore, the proper rendering is, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, but the Spirit against the flesh: but these are opposed the one to the other, lest those things you may wish, you may do." The flesh will oppose the Spirit in all his influencing you toward the good; but the Spirit will oppose the flesh in all its influencing you toward the evil. Now comes the grand question, Which of these two mighty powers is the mightier? Is the flesh stronger than the Almighty Spirit? We need not hesitate as to the correct reply. Then again, Which of these powers is FOR us? Certainly the Almighty One: and surely we may say with David, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?" *Psalms* xxvii. 1. Were the Spirit against us, we could have no hope: but with him asking the control of our will, let us have the common sense to yield it to his direction. For "— if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law:" the flesh will not bring you into disgrace and condemnation. We will avoid the horrid works of the flesh, enumerated, in part, verses 19–21: in part, for in verse 21 the apostle seems to sicken in the disgusting recital, and winds up with "and such like." And, indeed, it is a loathsome catalogue; and it is fearful to think, that any one should interpret Paul as teaching that we do such things of

necessity, notwithstanding the almighty aid of the Spirit, and the sure promise, "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." *I Cor. x. 13.*

And not only, in the gracious leading of the Spirit, will we avoid the works of the flesh; but we will exhibit the fruits of the Spirit, as detailed in verses 22, 23; "against which there is no law." This is a happy prospect, a blessed hope, a glorious heritage.

After all, then, this apparently discouraging Scripture, when properly interpreted, discloses to us, that we have an almighty ally, in our efforts to resist temptation. So, "If we live in the Spirit (*pneumati*, by the Spirit, by the agency or power of the Spirit) let us also walk in the Spirit (*pneumati kai stoichoomen*, let our orderly life be regulated by the same pure and mighty Spirit)."

OF WHOM THE WHOLE FAMILY IS NAMED.

EPHESIANS iii. 14-19.

"FOR this cause (my desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you) I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:" there being no praying to glorified saints, in Paul's days: nothing of that sort being mentioned in all Scripture.

"Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named:" all the children of God, Jew and Gentile, departed from earth or lingering upon it, constitute the

family: in separate apartments, but the same family. Another proof, too, of there being no intermediate state; the "whole family" is in "heaven and earth:" nowhere else: so, even admitting an intermediate state, there is no one of God's children in it; as "heaven and earth" contains them all. But the name: of whom are they named? Not "our Lord Jesus Christ." For, the whole family does not bear his name: the name Christian was not heard of, before the gathering of disciples there, which was subsequent to the conversion of Paul; and the appellative must have been adopted slowly, as the word occurs but three times in the Scripture: so that the whole family is not named *Christian*. But if it were, Christ is not the name of our Lord Jesus; but, his title: as is Lord: his name being Jesus, so named by the angel, *Luke* i. 31. Nor is it the custom to name a family from a son, but from a father. The Scriptural name of the whole family is, *saint*; God being *holy*, his children are *holy*; and this is the meaning of the word, *saint*. Furthermore, the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrine codices all omit "of our Lord Jesus Christ:" the verse stopping with "Father."

It is most likely, that the apostle refers to character, and privilege, rather than to mere appellative, or family name; as in *Gen.* xlviii. 15, 16; "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." These lads were Ephraim and Manasseh, who never bore the name Jacob, Isaac, or Abraham; and though they were called Israel, as it regards their descendants, yet Israel was not the name of Abraham, or of Isaac, but of Jacob alone. The patriarch had

reference to character and privilege, with regard to being members of the great nation, to spring from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, from which was to come the Messiah. In this sense, the word "holy" applies to the Abrahamic nation, as it was SEPARATED from all others, for this specific purpose; and to believers in Jesus, whose faith, like circumcision, separates them from all others, and constitutes them children and heirs of God. *Rom.* viii. 17.

"That he would grant you (Gentiles who have believed in Jesus, and have thus entered into this family of saints), according to the riches of his glory (his glorious riches manifested in this ample scheme, for the salvation of all, Jew and Gentile, by faith in the blood of the Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world) to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man (*eis ton esoo anthroopon*, unto the inner man; which, in fact, is THE man; Paul caring nothing about mere ritualism, church millinery, genuflexions, a strength of display; but praying that these children of Abraham, by faith in Christ Jesus (*Gal.* iii. 19), who had nothing to show by way of Jewish ritual, might through the Spirit, be strong in faith, love, and hope).

"That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith:" another of the petitions of his prayer. He desires that they may have such a clear apprehension of, and faith in, the system of salvation by Jesus Christ, the Lord of all; that it will be with them, as though Christ actually, personally, was dwelling in their hearts, directing and controlling their emotions, and being the very spring and impulse of their words and actions.

"That ye, being rooted and grounded in love:" Dr. Clarke admirably explains, "Here is a double metaphor, one taken from *agriculture*, the other from *architecture*. As *trees*, they are to be *rooted in love*; this is the *soil* on which their souls are to *grow*: into the infinite love

of God, their souls, by faith, are to strike their *roots*; and, from this love, derive all that nourishment which is essential for their full growth. * * * As a building, their foundation is to be laid in this love, etc. * * * In this, as its proper *soil*, it *grows*. On this, as its only *foundation*, it *rests*." *In loco*. These observations are just, beautiful, lucid, every way well expressed. The Christian is to grow as a tree grows: the tree's roots striking into and stretching through the soil, so as to procure the nutriment to sustain and enlarge its growth; to which ends the roots are essential; a living tree with a dead root, was never seen: so faith enters into a perception of the love of God, in giving his Son to be the Saviour of the world, stretching out in every direction through the *divine* word, searching for Christ, the great evidence of the divine love, and finding him in every page, and sending the blessed food of the soul, to every part, so as to maintain and enlarge its growth in grace. A tree bearing fruit, to profit man and please God. The Christian is to rise and enlarge, as a building rises and enlarges: its foundation securely laid, and the superstructure rising by the care, and according to the plan of the skilled architect: the material well selected, the plan convenient, commodious, beautiful. A temple in which God will dwell and be worshipped.

In each of these expressive figures, do we see the true doctrine of sanctification. The tree grows up, steadily, and brings forth its fruit: and this separateness to its development, begins with its beginning, and accompanies it continually: it does not, at any time, by any sudden, mighty, extraordinary impulse and shooting up, attain this separateness of being a tree only: it is this or nothing. The house is built up from the foundation, and its separateness, or holiness, is not attained in any one moment more than another; for it is this house, or it is not. So with the Christian: he "cannot

serve God AND mammon ;” if a friend of the world, he is the enemy of God ; he must be a Christian or not ; he must be regenerate or unregenerate ; a sinner can have the form without the power of Godliness, but a Christian cannot. Sanctification is not a grace that a Christian attains ; it is what a sinner attains when he becomes a Christian, and what he retains while he remains a Christian. It is an essential ; for, “ Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.”

“ May be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height ;” These terms of mensuration apply to the building just referred to, as a figure of the Christian ; and, therefore, they relate to Christian edification, experience, as we style it. These Gentiles converted to Christ, were to be able to comprehend equally with all saints, especially the saints of the family of Abraham, and with Abraham himself, and with Isaac and Jacob, the grand privileges and expectations, as well as duties and usefulness of a Christian life. “ But what can the apostle mean by the breadth, length, depth, and height of the love of God ? ” *Dr. Clarke.* With all due respect, we answer, Nothing. He is not alluding to the measure of God’s love, which none can comprehend ; but to the measure of Christian experience based upon faith in the divine love, which is comprehended, he says, by all saints.

“ And to know the love of Christ that passeth knowledge : ” A splendid utterance of this grand writer, who needed these paradoxical phrases, in the rushing forth of his full ideas, too great for usual modes of expression. The love of Christ, like the overhanging sky, is too vast for our thoroughly investigating it : and yet, as we can know something of the vasts of the unsearchable sky, and may reasonably conclude, that what lies beyond our ken, is like that which lies within it ; so with the love of Christ, we may know that he loved us,

and gave himself for us, that his love induced him not only to die for us, rise for us, reign for us, but to provide ample means for our learning all this, and to pledge his changeless word to receive every one that will come unto him, and give him grace to live a happy, useful life, leave time in full hope of a blissful eternity, and dwell with him in heaven forever. This is a great amount of knowledge of the love of Christ; which yet stretches like infinity, beyond, so far beyond, so indescribably beyond the finite! Yet, the Christian really knows the love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

“That ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.” Of course no sane person can entertain the idea, that a Christian can contain all the fulness of God, in any absolute sense. But, there must be some sense, in which we can understand the apostle, as praying for what is intelligible and possible. By regeneration, we become partakers of the divine nature: “—that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature (*theias koinoonoi phuseos*), having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.” *II Peter* i. 4. God being our Father, we have in a certain sense, his nature, his characteristics. Having lost his image in which we were created, by the defection of Adam, it is restored to us by the mediation of Jesus, the Christ. And especially was this joyful intelligence to the Gentiles, who had been regarded as being so far away in sin and hopelessness. Throughout this passage, we must keep in mind, that Paul, a Jew, trained to look upon Gentiles as being outside the covenant; and whose touch was polluting to a Jew (*Acts* x. 28); is here gazing upon the development of the great mystery, of the Gentiles having equal privileges with the Jews, in the boundless blessings brought to mankind by Christ. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God.” *I John* iii. 2. “Every one that loveth is born of God.” *Ib.* iv. 7. “Every

one" includes Gentile and Jew. Then as the Christian is a child of God, he partakes of God's nature, wears his image, resembles him, partakes of his fulness, *i. e.* the fulness of his nature, his moral nature: thought, emotion, will, love, forbearance, compassion, etc., are the same in kind, but indescribably different in degree, in the Christian as in God: he is a Godly (Godlike) man: as a small bowl of water dipped from the vast ocean, contains the same elements; and is the same water, in kind; but as to quantity, too infinitesimal even for comparison. All the glory of having a character like that of God, is attainable by the once despised Gentile. The amazing blessings of Christianity, comprised in our restoration to the divine likeness, are freely offered to all. "Ho every one that thirsteth, come!"

The student may obtain some assistance, toward a correct understanding of the place, from observing the use made by the apostle of *hina*, in its proper telic sense (*to the end that*). It occurs thrice: 1. "That he would grant" (*hina dooe*); 2. "May be able" (*hina existhuseete*); 3. "That ye might be filled" (*hina pleerootheete*). In the first instance the aim, purpose, end, of his prayer was, that certain great blessings might be granted to the Ephesian believers: and in the second instance, a certain one of these (their being rooted and grounded in love) "that ye * * * may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height:" *i. e.* that they, a tree rooted; or a house founded; might then comprehend, as all saints do, by experience, the propriety and beauty of such a tree growing on such a soil; of such a house, resting upon such an ample and sure foundation: the tree having nothing in its structure, but the elements drawn from that soil, love; the house being in exact keeping with its foundation, love. In the third instance, his petition is, that they might know the love of Christ,

surpassing knowledge, that (*hina*, to the end that) they might be filled with all the fulness of God. For the Gentile Christian meditating upon the love of Christ, who gave himself for us, in accordance with the love of God, who gave his Son to be the Saviour of the world, all who will come unto him; will be changed into the same image; for having borne the image of the earthy, he shall also bear the image of the heavenly: and when he bears the image of Christ, he also bears the image of God; for Christ is "the express image of his person." Christ is the Son of God; and Christians are the sons of God: having the divine nature.

This line of thought again makes it clear, that the mensuration terms refer to the Christian tree, or edifice; personal or social; and not to the love of Christ, or of God.
