

are according to the reality of things? Shall we, *can we*, believe that the Infinite, Eternal, and Unchangeable Being, comes and goes, walks and flies, smells, hears, and sees, and has heart and bowels, hands, arms, and feet? Or that he deliberates, inquires, suspects, fears, ascertains, grieves, repents, and is prevailed upon by importunity to repent again and resume a rejected purpose? Do not the same Scriptures furnish us amply with the proper exponents of those figurative and, strictly speaking, degrading terms? Do they not, for example, tell us; "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent. Hath he said, and shall he not do? Or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good? —I am Jehovah: I change not."* What then will ye do, ye worthy men that make this objection? Must ye not admit that the language of inspiration is couched on the plan of the boldest figures? Such figures as, if we were not protected by this authority, we should not dare to employ? And do ye not always explain that language by stripping off the figurative coverings, and drawing forth the simple truth, which ye then express in some kind of abstract phrase, metaphysically more accurate, but far less mighty to impress the human mind?—You are convinced that this is *necessary*: and you do not for a moment admit that, in doing this, you derogate from the truth and inspiration of the Bible. Apply then your just methods of interpretation to this case: I ask no more. Mr. Romaine lays down the principle, in saying, "The Holy Spirit does not reveal God to us as he is in himself, but as he stands related to us:" and this knowledge is best conveyed to mankind in the style of condescension to our own low estate of acts and habits, feelings and language.

If the view of the range of inspiration, that *its proper*

* Num. xxiii. 19. Mal. iii. 6.