

Original Miscellany.

MR. SCHULTZ,

Please to give a place in your paper to a candid review of the review of M—t, and a few additional remarks on the subject controverted, and I shall take a final leave of it. Who M—t is, I have no conjecture. Nothing that I shall say, therefore, can be considered as personal.

A question was proposed for answer; "What is the meaning of the word preach in the Bible?"

The simple object of the question seems to be the Biblical sense of the word preach. The only method to ascertain the meaning of this word, certainly is, to examine the passages where the word occurs in the Bible, and not in any modern dictionary. This was my method. And as our Bible is a translation, I appealed to the original of the New Testament. Two things I intimated as useful to arrive at the truth, viz. to ascertain the connexion of the word with others, and whether the word was always the same in the original.

The word I found to be a translation of several different words, in the original, of which I gave the senses. And I verily believe, that I gave the legitimate senses of the Greek words, translated preach in the New Testament. Hence I concluded, that the word signified different things.

And hence another conclusion was, that a person may be said to preach in the scriptural sense of the word, when he delivers a religious discourse, extempore, or memoriter, or from written notes before him, or when he relates what he remembers of a discourse that he has heard.

M—t thinks differently, and I readily admit that he has full liberty to think, and express his thoughts. And I believe that he will allow me to express my thoughts, on his thoughts, expressed in your paper.

M—t refers to the second definition of Walker's dictionary of the word preach, as a correct one, and which expresses the meaning of the word in the Bible. I quoted Walker when I said, 'To preach, as a n. v. is, to pronounce a public discourse upon sacred subjects.'

But this I could not consider as a full explanation of the Biblical sense of the word. Hence I examined the originals of the word there used, and stated the result.

After M—t refers to Walker's second definition, he cites II. Tim. iv. 2, where he finds *Keruxanton*; but there is no *Keruxanton* there as it happens. I suppose, however, it was a *lapsus penne*, and admit that the word is there which was intended. And this is precisely the same verb, though of a different mode and tense, which I cited from Matt. iv. 17, and said, signifies to publish, *proclaim, set forth*.

M—t observes, that Rosenmuller says the word 'is applied to those, who in the fields, streets, and open air, lift up their voices that they may be heard by many.' And another 'living prodigy of learning,' says 'it signifies to proclaim and call aloud, and manifestly refers to the human voice.' Suppose I admit all this, what then? Do those learned men, say the original words signify nothing else? Preach, in one of its original words, I said before signifies to proclaim. And I have no objection to add, cry aloud, lift up the voice like a trumpet, so as to be heard from the north, to the south pole. Still I assert, that it also signifies different things, to publish, set forth, to own, confess, say or affirm, report.

From the above strictures, it is added, "we conclude that the word preach in the Bible, literally means proclaim orally or with the voice." Now suppose, without granting all this, that the original word literally signifies to proclaim aloud with the voice, will it follow, that it has no other signification? It does signify to proclaim as a herald. But the herald did not always proclaim with his voice; the will of his Prince. He frequently carried private messages in writing. The presidents of the United States have proclaimed fasts and thanksgivings. But did they proclaim orally, so that their voice was heard through the states? Did they not convey their will and pleasure through the land, by the instrumentality of newspapers? Thus they proclaimed, but did not do it orally. Hence according to both ancient and modern practice, a proclamation may be made without the voice. Hence as it is admitted that proclaiming is preaching, so I contend that a man may literally preach, and not do it orally.

But suppose, without granting, that the original word under discussion, always means to cry aloud with the voice, M—t gains but little, unless he proves that the other words I produced signify always the same thing. This he cannot do. To prove that *Keruxanton*, for that is the word, literally means to proclaim orally, M—t adds Walker's 'second definition, to proclaim or publish in religious orations, to inculcate publicly, to teach with earnestness. Here are three definitions, by I know not what philological, or logical process, metamor-

phosed into the second. Walker gives three definitions of the word preach, as an active verb. 1st. To proclaim or publish in religious orations. 2dly, To inculcate publicly. 3dly, To teach with earnestness.

What does Walker mean by the word proclaim? 'To promulgate or pronounce by a solemn or legal publication.' And to publish, is, among other significations, 'to put forth a book into the world.' So that to proclaim an oration orally, or publish it in a book, is to preach according to his definitions of the word;

M—t admits that there are different modes of preaching. This is exactly what I deduced from the different original words translated preach, and their different senses. He adds 'when the word preach is used to express them distinctly, it embraces different ideas.' I question, whether Rosenmuller could explain this sentence. How can a single word express distinctly, different modes? It is impossible. But the same word which expresses distinctly different modes, and embraces different ideas, 'when it signifies an exhibition of truth to the mind, does not mean different things, but the same identical thing.' Here is a strange association of words. M—t admits there are different modes of preaching, and yet endeavors to prove that there is but one. And what is that one? 'A proper use of the organs of speech, is the essential mode of the verb to preach.' Here is a new grammatical discovery. I did think I knew something about the modes of verbs; but I never knew before, that any use, proper or improper, of the organs of speech was the essential mode of a verb. Essential, implies a non-essential, and proper, implies an improper. Now what kind of a mode, I should like to know, would an improper use of the organs of speech constitute? If M—t will explain that whole sentence, so that I can comprehend it, *tunc illi gratias possum reddo*. I shrewdly suspect that your press, Mr. Schultz, would groan under the explication.

I will briefly notice the word preach in the Old Testament. And here this word, is the translation of several original words.

Basher, is thus rendered in 40 Ps. 9. v.

Basher signifies generally, to spread. It is rendered in Is. 60. 6, to shew forth; in 40. 9, bringest. In 11. Sam. i. 20, to tell. This word is translated by the 70 into the Greek *euangelizo*, which signifies, as before stated, to tell, relate, &c.

Quera is another Hebrew word, translated preach, Jonah iii. 2.

Quera signifies to call, Exod. ii. 7. 'Shall I go and call thee a nurse.'—Deut. xxv. 8. 'The elders of his city shall call him.'

To invite to a feast, II. Sam. xiii. 23.—'invited all the King's sons.'

To proclaim, Jer. xxxvi. 9. 'They proclaimed a fast.'

To pronounce, Jer. xxxvi. 18. 'He pronounced all these words unto me.'

To read and pronounce from writing! Deut. xvii. 19. 'He read therein.—i. e. the copy of the laws.' Jer. xxxvi. 6. 'Read in the roll—in the ears of all the people.' Neh. viii. 8. 'They read in the book, in the law of God distinctly.'

Two Hebrew words rendered preach signify differently; to shew forth, bring, tell, call, unite? proclaim, read and pronounce from writing. And it is evident, that a person may call and unite with, or without the voice—proclaim with the voice that thousands may hear him, or send a written proclamation. He may pronounce with the voice extempore, or memoriter, or from a written discourse before him.

Hence a man may preach in the Biblical sense of the word, in the three ways before mentioned. Which is the best method, I shall not now determine.

Since writing the above, I have read a publication signed by Machaon. I agree with him, generally in sentiment. What he says about Ambassadors' needs explanation. The prophets and Apostles were, in one view only excepted, no more Ambassadors, than well qualified, and regular licensed preachers at this period. The Bible written by them, contains the messages which God, from time to time gave them by divine inspiration. In this sense ministers are not now Ambassadors. But the ancient Ambassadors, I apprehend, not only delivered, but also explained their messages, added many arguments to induce those to whom they were sent to accept them, and act accordingly. Ministers now carry the same messages to their hearers, with explanations, and exhortations. So that except divine, immediate inspiration, I see not but present ministers of the gospel, are strictly speaking, Ambassadors of Christ.

I attempted an explication of the Biblical sense of the word preach; From that explication, I drew a conclusion concerning the different methods of preaching.

And now according to promise, I bid you Mr. Schultz, Adieu. ED..

FOR THE WASHINGTON WHIG.

In the Whig of March 2d, the following Theological question is proposed, and a concise answer required:—What appears to have been the qualifications of the first preachers? If no more lucid answer should be received, the following facts and observations may afford some illustration of the subject.

The first preachers of the gospel were the Harbinger of Jesus Christ, John the Baptist, Christ himself the author of that redemption which he proclaimed, his disciples and immediate followers. While he dwelt on earth, the author of Eternal Salvation, employed extraordinary teachers or preachers to lay the foundation of his kingdom, and before his ascension he commissioned his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. We are informed by the Apostle Paul, Eph. iv. 11. That "he gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers." To these no doubt may be added all those to whom the gift of tongues, or speaking languages which they had never learned, were imparted through the Omnipotent influence of the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of the hands of the Apostles. Many early writers undertook to give the biography of the Apostles; but the only account we have respecting them which can be depended upon, is contained in the New Testament. Still less information of the seventy disciples, is to be obtained from any profane writer. It appears from St. Luke, that their commission at first extended only to the Jewish nation; yet it is highly probable, that after the ascension of their master, they were authorised to perform the functions of evangelists in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation, and teaching the means whereby it might be obtained, in various countries. Certain it is they were endowed with miraculous qualifications. Luke tells us that on their first return, they reported with joy, "Lord even the Devils are subject unto us, through thy name. And he said unto them, I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall by any means hurt you," Luke tenth.

All these different orders of preachers spoken of in scripture were qualified with supernatural endowments, and vested with divine authority to preach the gospel. They were commissioned to bear the banners of the Cross among all people, and with what fidelity and disinterested benevolence they executed their offices we learn from the unerring oracles of truth.

If the author of the question under consideration, extends his views further than to the original inspired preachers of the gospel; he may receive some satisfaction from reading the Epistles of the Apostles, and also from the Fathers and early writers of Church History. Paul's directions to Timothy and Titus, his sons in the gospel are plain and explicit. To Titus he writes, "a Bishop" or preacher "must be blameless, as the steward of God, not self willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word that he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort, and convince the gainsayers."

It appears probable from what is recorded of them, that the apostles, possessed peculiar authority; and were invested with the power of making laws, of controlling and restraining transgressors, as well as of uniting in the bonds of one sacred society, those who were attentive and obedient to the word of God addressed to them, and lived agreeable to the purity of the gospel.

On consulting the earliest and most authentic ecclesiastical writers, we learn that the Christians of the first century assembled stately in the first day of the week, either in their own dwellings, or in houses appropriated for the purpose, to enjoy social Christian communion to strengthen each other in the faith of the gospel, and for their mutual improvement in religious knowledge. When conveyed for these purposes, the holy scriptures were read in proper order, by some one, the best qualified. They followed an exhortation, enforcing the doctrine and duties contained in the word, in a plain and forceable manner, and delivered in the natural expressions of zeal and charity, which was concluded with singing and prayer. Few of these teachers were literary characters; but from their knowledge and experience which they had acquired; they declared and explained the divine will and commands, in an unostentatious, plain and affecting manner; with great gravity and solemnity. Even the Fathers of the first century usually called the Apostolic Fathers, and the other Christian writers in the infancy of the church, have never been esteemed as men possessed in any high degree of eloquence or erudition. The qualifications most conspicuous in these early preachers of the gospel, were sound discretion, profound knowledge of human nature, and the effects produced by the influence of the divine spirit on the mind of man; together with great meekness and humility of disposition and an upright, conscientious observance of the religious, social and relative duties of life.

We do not find that either Christ, or his holiest Apostles established any certain and determinate form of Church Government. Hence, in the early ages, all the Christian societies were governed by the lights derived from the Apostles, and their own discretion, agreeably to the circumstances in which they were placed. No one among them attempted to exercise any dominion, or use any dictatorial language. The influence which any obtained was derived from their superior knowledge of the scriptures, and their greater sanctity. A perfect equality subsisted between the different societies of Christians, and no one attempted to exert any influence over another but what Christian charity dictated. Zeal for the cause of their ascended Saviour, and love for one another, supplied the place of all coercive regulations. But this pure and hallowed state of things was not of long duration. Pride, avarice, and ambition, soon operated, in depraved hearts, to corrupt the pure word of the Lord. The sacred ties of charity were held forth, by aspiring men, as being too slender to hold the societies together in Christian communion. They hankered after more distinction than those simple forms afforded; hereupon associations were formed, by their artifice, of deputies from different churches, first among the Greeks, and afterwards in all the provinces where the gospel had

been planted. These assemblies of deputies were called by the Greeks Synods, and by the Latin Councils. At first little authority was claimed, but towards the close of the second century they began to form rules for the government, and prescribe doctrines for the belief of all the churches within their bounds. As it was necessary to have a presiding officer in each assembly, a distinction among the clerical order began to prevail, which eventuated in the establishment of the Roman Hierarchy. In earlier times the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, were mostly plain sensible men, of small attainments in literature, or the philosophy of the schools; and taught the christian system in all its native and beautiful simplicity. Their articles of faith were few in number, and their public teachers did not inculcate any doctrines but what are contained in the Apostle's Creed, nor require any other qualifications of fellowship but a profession that Jesus Christ was the promised Messiah, and a desire to join the society of the faithful.

About the beginning of the third century, this plain preaching began to give way to the tenets of a Chimerical Philosophy, and the dark subtleties of an imaginary science. Even in these times the orthodox sentiments were seldom lucidly and systematically stated. Some of the Fathers write excellent observations on many important points in faith and practice; but they did not define the indisputed doctrines of christianity with sufficient precision; hence it is that every sect, which has since arisen in christendom, pretend to find decisions which go to maintain their peculiar tenets in their writings.

About the period of which we are now writing a fancy entered into the heads of aspiring ecclesiastics, which has been attended with the most deleterious effects to this day. Which was to derive the Christian Ministry from the Jewish Priesthood. A sentiment founded on such an erroneous footing, and tending so directly to increase the functions of the clerical order in importance, and to add to their wealth and external dignity; could not fail to open wide the floodgates of corruption in the christian church. At this time also the importance and utility of human learning to a christian teacher was agitated, and has continued a moot case to the present time.

From the above observations, derived from the most authentic ancient records of the church, I am prepared to give a plain and concise answer to the question. The first preachers of the gospel were qualified for their office, either by extraordinary effusions and inspirations of the Holy Ghost; or by possessing a sound understanding, and inscribing from the common operations of divine grace, just sentiments of the plan of salvation through Christ, and showing forth their love of him by a holy, discreet and charitable course of life and conversation.

EUSEBIUS.

FOR THE WASHINGTON WHIG.

PATRIOTIC EFFUSIONS.

The love of one's own country, as it is natural, so it is one of the most dignified passions that can animate the human breast. Incapable of meanness, detesting injustice, spurning danger, and defying death, it has often plucked the sceptre from the grasp of tyranny, and given the usurper a grave, where he sought a throne. But it does not always triumph. When oppression is supported by all the arguments of sophistry, and the arts of corruption, and entrenched behind the terror-frowning battlements of power too great to be assailed with success; when the feelings of the Patriot are divided between the sufferings of his country, and the personal welfare and safety of his family or friends; the passion burns in secret; grief unnerves his arm, mistrust and jealousy suspend his resolution, and despondency chills his heart. He perceives, one after another, his compatriots entombed in dungeons, or sentenced to perpetual slavery in some inhospitable shore; and nothing remains for him but to become the victim of his oppressors,—to dissemble his feelings,—or to retire into voluntary exile, where, placed beyond the reach of tyranny, he may fearlessly indulge the bursting transports of a wounded spirit.

I am now addressing a people whose fathers shook off the yoke, from which I have fled. Had I been born an American, and lived at the era of her Revolution, I too would have shared in the toil and the danger, the glory and success of that auspicious event. I would have lived to see my country free, or would have perished in the contest. My friends would have mourned my fall—would have consecrated my memory—would have pointed to my narrow grave; and said, "Behold, here rest the ashes of a hero!" but I am denied that consolation. I must live to see corruption mounted on her triumphal car, loaded with insolence and infamy, with chains and cruelty, and pursued by the ceaseless curses of wretchedness, and the protracted scream of starving millions, driving relentless over the prostrate genius of my country, which seems great, commanding, and majestic even in death. I must live in the dwellings—I must expire in the arms of strangers;—I must be beholden to a foreign country for a tomb; for Britain—happy, free, and powerful Britain is no more!—A base, designing, self-elected faction personate her genius, and ape her departed greatness. Traitors to their country, regardless of the means of suffering humanity, contempters of the rights of man, they have destroyed the liberty they engaged to defend; they have subverted the constitution which they swore to maintain inviolated.—But I proceed to facts.

The struggle which America maintained with ministerial rapacity, and her eventual emancipation from the gripe of royal injustice, drew the attention of every reflecting mind; and taught many to think, who had never thought before. The nature of the social compact became the subject of serious investigation; the natural and civil rights of man were in a great measure ascertained; a new system of Political Economy was raised agreeable to the principles of human nature, and pointed out by reason, as that which would afford society a greater share of security, liberty, and prosperity, than had hitherto been known. To this system as a standard, they brought the existing governments of Europe, and were astonished that they had so long bowed with blind respect and veneration, to customs, prejudices, and impositions, marked with the

most
jesty
and
spise
the n
ple, a
cated
philo
In
prog
and
princ
was
true
woul
citad
shou
ed th
secu
gaun
they
cons
ble,
pent
into
In
mad
form
num
lette
tition
of P
tensj
was
aver
Spie
The
atte
viole
poll
deat
ed th
infer
they
acti
and
thes
son
clifi
pene
crea
ed,
pow
thei
the
our
ban
ry i
mit
dro
next
plur
and
eigh
stor
fore
D
the
rest
ty to
the
that
less
of o
pne
dow
Brit
wan
to o
of u
ers,
con
cha
to a
dea
gan
otlu
I
B
wit
we
the
rent
T
the
hav
we
sing
wer
tire
hou
ceil
are
hich
ligh
ly a
Som
whi
ed c
som
been
T
triv
Abc
KIL
been
visi
had
blo
and
Mr.
ine
I
fire
allo
of s
hov
may
abl
str
and
acu
tha
I
way
the

